



Libraries and Learning Services

University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

Social Entrepreneurial Subject Formation within Collective Affects: An Analysis of
Hope at the 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum

Michael Robert William Mann

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in
Geography, the University of Auckland, 2018.

Abstract

The aim of this thesis is to answer the question of how affects operated within and through the Social Enterprise World Forum to contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. Social entrepreneurship has emerged as an important new economic practice in recent decades and is regarded as a significant new force for social change. Existing approaches to the analysis of social entrepreneurial subjects, however, have tended to under-estimate and over-estimate the capacities of the social entrepreneurship to address social and environmental problems. Stepping back from these debates, this thesis begins from the need to understand the diverse settings and spaces from which social entrepreneurship emerges and within which individuals become motivated to engage in social entrepreneurial practice. This is approached through collective affects as 'structures of feeling' and 'affective atmospheres'. A qualitative case study approach was selected for analysing collective affects the Social Enterprise World Forum. This case study involved two forms of data collection, observation through attendance at the Social Enterprise World Forum and documentary data collection of pre- and post-forum promotional material. Data was descriptively organised and coded through thematic analysis. In this thesis I have framed the Social Enterprise World Forum as a technology of government within which attempts were made to promote the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. I subsequently argue that the Social Enterprise World Forum was situated within, and permeated by, a series of hopeful affects. It is part through these affects that the forum became an important space for the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The forum was situated within a hopeful structure of feeling through which social entrepreneurship became a source of collective hope for social change. This hopeful collective mood was experienced through the forum and attached to social

entrepreneurship through the affective atmospheres of forum spaces. Optimism, excitement and doubt are identified as significant affective atmospheres within the forum.

Acknowledgments

There are a range of people and institutions that provided support integral to the completion of this thesis.

Thank you, first to my supervisor Dr Tom Baker, for constant support, encouragement, and incisive feedback over the course this project. Thank you again to Tom, and the Marsden Fund, for the financial support that enabled me to produce this work.

Thank you to the University of Auckland for further financial support through a research Master's scholarship.

Thank you to the organisers and attendees of both the 2017 Institute of Australian Geographers conference and the 2017 Cultural Studies Association of Australasia conference. Previous versions of material in this thesis was presented at each conference. Thank you to again to Tom for the financial support that allowed me these opportunities.

Finally, thank you to Ruby Porter for proofreading large segments of this thesis and providing an endless well of material and emotional support.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments	iii
Table of Contents	iv
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature review	6
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship	7
<i>Rational-Economic Analyses of Social Entrepreneurship</i>	9
<i>Political-Economy Critiques of Social Entrepreneurship</i>	11
<i>Post-Structural Analyses of Social Entrepreneurship</i>	15
2.3 Governmentality	20
<i>Rationalities and Technologies of Government</i>	21
<i>Advanced Liberal Governmentality</i>	25
2.4 Affect and Subjectivity	33
<i>Structures of feeling and affective atmospheres</i>	34
<i>Affect as an Element in Social Entrepreneurial Subjectivity</i>	41
2.5 Conclusion	47
Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods	50
3.1 Introduction	50

3.2 Qualitative Case Studies as an approach to studying affect	51
3.3 Methods of Data Collection	55
3.4 Analysis	59
3.5 Conclusion	61
Chapter 4: Structures of Feeling at the Social Enterprise World Forum	63
4.1 Introduction	63
4.2 The Social Enterprise World Forum 2017 as a Technology of Government	64
4.3 Structures of Feeling in Pre- and Post-forum Promotional Material	70
4.4 Conclusion	80
Chapter 5: Affective Atmospheres at the Social Enterprise World Forum	82
5.1 Introduction	82
5.2 Optimism, Values and Identity in the Forum	84
5.3 Sociality and Networking within the Forum	90
5.4 Ambivalent Affective Framings of Government within the Forum	97
5.5 Conclusion	103
Chapter 6: Conclusion	106
Bibliography	109

Chapter 1: Introduction

Over the past two decades social entrepreneurship has emerged around the world as a popular new way of doing business (Dacin et al. 2011). As an emerging sector, there have been significant definitional debates surrounding social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, however social enterprises can be broadly defined as purpose-driven organisations that use business methods to achieve a social or environmental goal (Grant 2008, Ākina Foundation 2017e). Social entrepreneurship represents a form of practice associated with a specific actor — the social entrepreneur. Social enterprise and social entrepreneurship have become a popular subject of discussion for policy makers, academics and governments around the world (Parkinson and Howorth 2008, Teasdale 2011). Despite increasing focus on the social enterprise sector, however, little attention has been paid to social entrepreneurs and the contexts within which they emerge as specific forms of subject. This thesis is concerned with addressing this gap by investigating the ongoing emergence of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand through an investigation of social entrepreneurial subject formation.

Within existing approaches to social enterprise, social entrepreneurs are framed in three main ways. The first approach, from a rational-economic perspective, sees social entrepreneurs as positive innovators who use the market to address social and environmental problems. Social entrepreneurs are represented as those individuals who are able to identify opportunities and mobilise resources to drive social change. Conversely, the second approach, from a political economy perspective, sees social entrepreneurs as individuals involved in driving the marketisation of social provisioning. Social entrepreneurs here represent the product of a dominant neoliberal ideology. These approaches, however, under-estimate and over-estimate the

capacities of the social entrepreneurship to address social and environmental problems. The approach taken in this thesis can be located within the third approach, which I have labelled post-structural. Post-structural analyses focus on the diverse settings and spaces from which social entrepreneurship emerges and within which individuals becomes motivated to engage in social entrepreneurial practice. A significant focus here is on understanding the constitutive elements of social entrepreneurial subject formation.

Educational and promotional spaces are one significant series of spaces within and through which individuals may become empowered to pursue the practice of social entrepreneurship. The case study that forms the basis of this thesis was one such series of spaces — the Social Enterprise World Forum (SEWF), hosted in Christchurch in late 2017. The aim of thesis, then, is to answer the question of how affects operated within and through the Social Enterprise World Forum to contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The thesis has three key objectives. The first objective was to develop a theoretical approach to social entrepreneurial subject formation that facilitates an understanding of affect as one of the constitutive elements of social entrepreneurial subjectivity. This is the focus of the second chapter. The second objective was to understand how the Social Enterprise World Forum was situated within a structure of feeling through a reading of pre- and post-forum material. This is the focus of the fourth chapter. The third objective was to understand how the staging of the Social Enterprise World Forum generated affective atmospheres and how these atmospheres might contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. This was the focus of the fifth chapter.

The thesis is structured as follows: In chapter two I will provide an overview of the literature on social entrepreneurship as well as discussing governmentality and

affect as theoretical approaches to understanding subject formation. Governmentality provides a set of theoretical tools for the study of subject formation, including rationalities and technologies of government, while empirical analyses of advanced liberal governmentality have highlighted the significance of the changing spatial imaginaries of government in the emergence of social entrepreneurship. However, governmentality approaches have been criticised as presenting a linear idea of subject formation. I therefore turn to affect as a way of emphasising the ephemeral qualities of the spaces within which social entrepreneurial subjects are formed. Collective affects, apprehended as 'structures of feeling' and 'affective atmospheres' (Anderson 2016, 2015, 2014, 2009) offer a pragmatic approach for understanding the significance of affect in relation to social entrepreneurship. An attention to collective affects is useful as it provides a path between the rational-economic and political-economy approaches to social entrepreneurship and highlights the significance of educational and promotional spaces as one important set of spaces for social entrepreneurial subject formation.

In chapter three I will outline the methodological approach and methods of data collection and analysis utilised in this thesis. This research adopts a qualitative case study approach to studying affect in relation to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. This chapter begins with a discussion of methodological issues for studying affect and highlights the need for an attention to processes of affective composition, that is, how specific affects work in specific contexts (Anderson 2016, Michels 2015). The case study selected for the research was the Social Enterprise World Forum, a large social enterprise event hosted in New Zealand in late 2017. Two methods of data collection were utilised for the thesis, observation through attendance at the forum and

documentary data collection of pre- and post-forum promotional material. Thematic analysis was the method of analysis used to organise and analyse the data.

Chapter four and five represent the main empirical and analytical chapters. The overarching argument across these two chapters is that the forum was a technology of government situated within a hopeful structure of feeling and permeated by a series of overlapping affective atmospheres. In chapter four I will frame the forum as a technology of government. The forum provided a series of spaces within which various actors aimed to develop and promote the growth of the social enterprise sector in New Zealand, a process that involved attempts to produce social entrepreneurial subjects. I will then situate the forum within a hopeful structure of feeling through a reading of pre- and post-forum promotional material. Hope here is defined as a relationship with the future marked by possibility. This hopeful structure of feeling served to draw together actors in the social enterprise sector, intensifying around the forum, and Christchurch, as a specific social entrepreneurial space through which social entrepreneurship could be actualised as a method for creating social change.

In chapter five I will turn to the staging of the forum and argue that the forum generated and was permeated by a series of overlapping affective atmospheres through which the hopeful collective mood surrounding social entrepreneurship existed, was expressed and enhanced in relation to social entrepreneurship as a project for social change. The three atmospheres I focus on in this chapter are, first, an optimistic atmosphere, second an excited atmosphere, and third, an ambivalent atmosphere where hope emerges out of doubt. Through these overlapping atmospheres hope becomes attached to social entrepreneurship. The attachment of hope to social entrepreneurship represents an important constitutive element in social entrepreneurial subject formation as it provides reasons for individuals to pursue social

entrepreneurship as a practice. The forum was thus situated within a broader affective mood, while affective atmospheres worked through the forum to contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects.

In chapter six I conclude the thesis, outlining the key conclusions of the research. I will also briefly discuss both the limitations and implications of this project, including potential future lines of research.

Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to contextualise this thesis by providing an overview of the literature on social entrepreneurship as well as discussing theoretical approaches to understanding subject formation. As social entrepreneurship has grown in recent years, a body of literature has emerged that aims to analyse social enterprise and social entrepreneurs. One side of this research discusses the technical features of social enterprise business platforms and the characteristics of social entrepreneurs. A more critical perspective analyses social entrepreneurship as one facet of changes in social provisioning associated with neoliberalism. Both approaches are marked by a tendency to over-estimate or under-estimate the capacity of social entrepreneurship to address social problems. In order to develop a more detailed understanding of social entrepreneurship, I turn to a third approach which I have labelled post-structural. From this perspective, the goal of this thesis is to examine the 'how' of social entrepreneurship. How, within spaces of social entrepreneurship, are individuals motivated to act as social entrepreneurial subjects?

In order to address the question of social entrepreneurial subject formation I turn to two theoretical approaches to subject formation. First, the governmentality literature. Governmentality approaches to subject formation demonstrate how government operates through a diverse range of actors, including the state, community organisations and corporations that seek to act on, enhance and facilitate the development of certain types of subjects. Advanced liberal governmentality highlights the significance of changing spatial imaginaries of government in the emergence of social entrepreneurship. Governmentality approaches have, however, been criticised as presenting a linear idea of subject formation. I therefore turn to affect

as a way of emphasising the contingent qualities of social entrepreneurial spaces that contribute to the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. Collective affects form part of the conditions within which social formations such as social entrepreneurship become significant to individuals. Within a governmentality inspired analysis of social entrepreneurship, then, in this thesis I am concerned with the ‘structures of feeling’ and ‘affective atmospheres’ of social entrepreneurship, and how these become attached to, circulate around, or emerge from, particular spaces and arrangements of actors.

The chapter is separated into three sections. In the first section I will discuss the literature on social entrepreneurship through three approaches to understanding social entrepreneurs. First a rational-economic approach, second a political-economic approach, and third a post-structural approach. In the second section I will discuss governmentality as an approach to subject formation. This section will outline rationalities and technologies of government as theoretical tools before discussing how they have been applied in contemporary analyses of advanced liberalism. In the third section I will discuss affect in relation to subject formation. Here I will provide an overview of the literature on affect before introducing collective affects as ‘structures of feeling’ and ‘affective atmospheres.’ The chapter ends with a discussion of the role of affects in relation to social entrepreneurship more specifically.

2.2 Social Enterprise and Social Entrepreneurship

Research on social enterprise frames social entrepreneurs in three main ways. First, the *rational-economic* approach frames social entrepreneurs as positive figures innovatively using the market to address social problems that the state and market have failed to address. Second, the *political-economy* approach criticises the impact

of market forces on social provisioning and frames the emergence of social entrepreneurship as an example of a dominant neoliberal ideology that valorises markets as the solution to social problems. Social entrepreneurs here represent a product of this dominant ideology—individuals actively engaged in extending market incentives into the sphere of social provisioning. Considering these two approaches, I argue first that the rational-economic perspective over-estimates the capacities of social entrepreneurs by locating the ability to address social problems in the will of entrepreneurial individuals. Conversely, the political-economy perspective, while raising strong criticisms, under-estimates the potential of social entrepreneurship to address social problems through reference to neoliberalism as a determining ideological structure.

Based on this, I turn to an emerging third approach to social entrepreneurship, informed by *post-structural* analyses. Post-structural analyses focus on the diverse settings and spaces from which social entrepreneurship emerges and within which social entrepreneurial subjects are created. Tensions between both discourse and practice, and between social and economic incentives, mark the terrain within which social entrepreneurs are created and operate. The social entrepreneur here is an individual who, as a result of their social and spatial context, becomes motivated and capable of acting as a social entrepreneur. Post-structural analyses, then, begin from an attempt to understand the constitutive elements of social entrepreneurial subjectivity. Claims about the capacity of social entrepreneurship to address social problems rely on the existence of social entrepreneurs capable of driving social innovation. That is to say, in order to understand social entrepreneurship, we need to understand better how people *come to act* as social entrepreneurs. This section will

first address the rational-economic approach before moving on to the political economy approach and finally the post-structural approach.

Rational-Economic Analyses of Social Entrepreneurship

Rational-economic analyses of social entrepreneurship offer a positive image of social entrepreneurs as heroic individuals responding innovatively to a range of social problems (see, for example, Bornstein 2004, Dees 2007). These positive interpretations of social entrepreneurship focus on the technical aspects of entrepreneurship, locating the source of systemic social change in the willpower of individuals who can recognise opportunities and mobilise appropriate resources in order to solve social problems. From this perspective social problems are '*knowledge* problems that can be solved by technical innovation driven by competition among individual social entrepreneurs' (Ganz et al. 2018). The need for innovation through social entrepreneurship is, from this perspective, the result of the failure of traditional state based social provisioning and 'bureaucratic, ineffective and wasteful' government (Dees 2007, 25). Alternatively social entrepreneurship may be seen as a necessary reaction to the failure of the market to provide for marginalised communities (Teasdale 2011). Here social entrepreneurship is a rational response to economic restructuring, providing services and economic development for communities.

The rational-economic paradigm tends to over-estimate the capacities of social entrepreneurs to address social problems by focusing on individual 'hero' entrepreneurs as the driving force of social change. Within the rational-economic paradigm, social entrepreneurs are represented as individuals with innovative methods for solving entrenched social problems. Individual entrepreneurs have been promoted by powerful organisations and the popular business media as 'heroic individuals' who have the potential to change the world (Dacin et al. 2011, 1203, see

Bornstein 2004). The Skoll Foundation describes social entrepreneurs as ‘society’s change agents [...] transform[ing] our world for the better’ (cited in McNeill and Silseth 2015, 67). Ashoka, similarly, explains that ‘rather than leaving societal needs to the government or business sectors, social entrepreneurs find what is not working and solve the problem by changing the system, spreading the solution, and persuading entire societies to move in different directions’ (cited in McNeill and Silseth 2015, 70). These, and other intermediary organisations, have been involved in encouraging the growth of social entrepreneurship and the development of global networks of social entrepreneurs over recent decades.

The change agents that make up these entrepreneurial networks and communities are seen as possessing the capability to solve a range of complicated social problems and environmental problems. In the context of the recent emergence of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand these problems have been argued by the Government to range from inequalities in health and wealth to climate change and environmental degradation (Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance 2016, 3). Dey and Steyaert (2016, 629) argue that the popular rational-economic framing of social entrepreneurship appears at times as an ‘evangelist discourse’ in which social entrepreneurs represent ‘the proverbial embodiment of ethical virtuousness’ as a result of their individual devotion to achieving systemic change (Dey and Steyaert 2016, 628). Following the triumphalism apparent in these accounts of social enterprise, it is difficult to imagine a social problem that is *beyond* the scope of these entrepreneurs.

Academic analyses of social entrepreneurship from within the business and management literature have also largely been positive. These approaches retain a technical focus on the importance of innovation as the distinctive entrepreneurial

aspect of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs here are individuals who are able to identify opportunities to engage in the pursuit of social value in spaces neglected by the private and public sectors. The identification, evaluation and exploitation of these opportunities are the fundamental aspects of social entrepreneurship (Certo and Miller 2008, Luke and Chu 2013). This focus on the entrepreneurial aspect of social enterprise can be seen in the attention within the business and management literature to technical 'issues of performance, efficiency and best practice' (Cho 2006, 43), including opportunity recognition, organisational launch, funding and financing (Perrini and Vurro 2006, 65). Nicholls and Cho (2006, 99) characterise this as a 'methodological preference for strategic reflection often underpinned by profiles of "hero" social entrepreneurs.' By framing social entrepreneurship as a technical process of innovation the impacts of social entrepreneurship are constituted as positive *a priori*. Social enterprise is thus positioned as a positive rational-economic response to social and environmental issues.

Political-Economy Analyses of Social Entrepreneurship

Political-economy approaches to social entrepreneurship provide a critique of the rational-economic perspective highlighted above. Against the idea of individual entrepreneurs driving systemic social change, political economy approaches argue that social entrepreneurship is a regressive embedding of market-orientated solutions to social problems, one that negatively effects both democracy and citizenship (Sievers 2016, 79). There are two main lines of critique within political-economy accounts of social enterprise. The first critique of social entrepreneurship relates to the business and market orientation of social entrepreneurship.

At the most general level, social enterprise has been characterised as 'indistinguishable from neoliberalism' and incapable of rectifying unemployment caused by economic reform (Cook et al. 2003, 57). Work integration social enterprises (WISEs) are one form of social enterprise that has received particular attention. WISEs aim to provide job opportunities and training to people facing barriers to employment. Garrow and Hasenfeld (2014, 1476) argue that these enterprises 'express the dominance of the market logic and the importance of the work ethic as guiding principles in integrating the poor and vulnerable into society.' The growth of WISEs is then connected to the development of a neoliberal welfare logic that focuses on individual responsibility, freedom and the virtue of competition, as well as the privatisation and devolution of social provisioning (Garrow and Hasenfeld 2014, 1478-1479). The result of this is a situation in which social assistance becomes conditional on participation in the labour market.

This neoliberal welfare logic is argued to exist in opposition to a social democratic welfare logic premised on the decommodification of labour and the provision of a social safety net as a citizenship right (Garrow and Hasenfeld 2014, 1479, see Epsing-Anderson 1999). The marketisation of the non-profit sector represents one of the ways in which citizens have been reconceptualised as consumers in a social services marketplace (Eikenberry and Kluver 2004, Eikenberry 2009). The consequences of this neoliberal welfare logic are manifest in the quality and inclusiveness of social provisioning. Garrow and Hasenfeld (2014, 1484) argue that business aspects of social enterprise are a 'Trojan horse' that invades the social mission of organisations. Under pressure to produce quantifiable social impact, social enterprises may avoid groups who are most disadvantaged, instead seeking out moderate income clients who can participate effectively in a business or pay for a fee-

based service (Garrow and Hasenfeld 2014, 1486, Sievers 2016, Eikenberry and Kluver 2004). This uneven and contingent social provisioning calls into question the capacity of social entrepreneurship to provide solutions to systemic social and environmental problems.

Similar criticisms exist against the idea that social entrepreneurs serve marginalised communities. Cook et al. (2003, 66) criticise analyses of social enterprise as a source of community and social cohesion, arguing that 'a series of disparate communities pursuing competitively driven aims will not necessarily develop shared social cohesion.' They further posit that a differentiation of service provision may occur as dynamic communities with greater entrepreneurial skills will be relatively advantaged in relation to more deprived communities (Cook et al. 2003, 66). Gray et al. (2003, 150-151) argue that a communitarian emphasis on participation and the realignment of spatial imaginaries from the national to the local level present an overly homogenised and optimistic view of the potential for communities to contribute equally to systemic social change. Rather than solving social problems, social entrepreneurship may rather be a contributor to inequalities between communities based on the capacity of various social entrepreneurs and the local level of intervention.

The second major point of criticism that political-economy perspectives engage with is aimed at the neoliberal ideological climate within which social entrepreneurship has emerged and been legitimised as a concept. Dart (2004, 412), for example, argues that the emergence of social enterprise can be interpreted through the lens of moral legitimacy stemming from a wider social and political context. As socio-political values have shifted with neoliberal reform, the role of the private sector and the market has changed. The previously dominant ideology of the welfare state has been replaced

with a 'renewed and pervasive faith in market and business approaches and solutions' (Dart 2004, 418). Social entrepreneurship here represents one example of a broader neoliberal discourse where businesses are allocated the power to produce social change and solve social problems (Teasdale 2011, citing Dey and Steyaert 2010). From this perspective social entrepreneurship is one outcome of the legitimisation of market-based solutions to social problems. The result of this, from a political-economy perspective, is a situation in which producing social benefits and commercial profit appear mutually constitutive, rather than as two goals in an ambiguous or contradictory partnership (Teasdale 2011, citing Dey and Steyaert 2010). The solution to social problems caused by market forces is more, not less, exposure to those same forces.

An important aspect of this dominant neoliberal ideological climate is an individualised focus on entrepreneurs as the source of social change and the sidelining of social and democratic processes. Pearce (2003, cited in Parkinson and Howorth 2008, 291) argues that the contemporary context of social enterprise is characterised by three 'discursive shifts': from political engagement to problem fixing, collective action to individual entrepreneurs, and democratic structures to a focus on social purpose. With the emergence of social entrepreneurship as a technical solution to social problems, the meanings behind the 'social' aspect of social enterprise have been lost or ignored, replaced by the valorisation of entrepreneurial individuals as the source of harmonious social change (Parkinson and Howorth 2008, 292). Likewise, Cho (2006, 46) argues that much of the social enterprise literature rests on a narrow appeal to value maximising individuals at the expense of social deliberation. This has been identified as the 'irony of social entrepreneurship' (Boddice 2009, 148): that visions of systemic social change are dependent on an individualised focus on entrepreneurs. The contemporary buzz surrounding social entrepreneurship might

thus have as much to do with the personality of change-making entrepreneurs as it does with the idea changing society (Boddice 2009, 147).

These political-economy accounts of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship highlight important points. They direct inquiry away from an uncritical focus on heroic entrepreneurs and technical issues towards fundamental questions regarding the 'social' aspects of social entrepreneurship. They critically interrogate the capacity of social entrepreneurship to drive social change and the significance of the social and spatial context of entrepreneurship beyond a narrow focus on individual entrepreneurs. However, while emphasising the significance of the social, references to neoliberalism and marketisation as a macro-explanatory structure often result in an underestimation of the capacities of social entrepreneurs. In so doing, the critical and creative agency of social entrepreneurs is passed over by reference to neoliberalism as an all-encompassing and determining governance project. From this perspective, social enterprise and social entrepreneurship largely represent passive vehicles for the marketisation of social provisioning.

Post-Structural Analyses of Social Entrepreneurship

In order to critically analyse the problems and possibilities of social entrepreneurship it is necessary, as Gerrard (2017, 48) argues, to 'move beyond representations of neoliberalism as an ideological whole transplanted onto social practice.' References to macro-explanatory structures obscure the practises and socio-spatial settings from which social entrepreneurial subjects emerge and act. In order to explore the reality of social entrepreneurship it would seem pertinent to 'avoid easy generalisations and pay closer attention to developments that might once have been dismissed as simply 'more neoliberalism'' (Larner 2014, 197). Such an emphasis requires an attention to the 'diverse negotiations of everyday life' (Larner 2014, 147) within which social

entrepreneurship emerges and is practised. This section will focus on post-structural emphases on discourse, practice and tensions within social entrepreneurship as a pathway forward for understanding the 'how' of social entrepreneurship — how it is that in certain spaces individuals come to be empowered to act as social entrepreneurs. Post-structural analyses highlight the ambivalent nature of social entrepreneurship and heterogeneous connections between discourse, social relations and the ongoing construction of social entrepreneurial subjects (Bandinelli 2017, Dey and Steyaert 2010, Parkinson and Howorth 2008). Two points that are significant here are the tension between discourse and practice, and between social and economic objectives.

The first significant theme of the post-structural literature on social entrepreneurship is the tension between the public discourse of social entrepreneurship and its enactment in practice. Discourse based approaches aim to examine what Dey and Steyaert (2010, 86) label the 'political process of narration', the process by which representations of social entrepreneurship shape 'the imagery of social entrepreneurship and its space of influence and intervention.' As Teasdale (2011, 100) argues, the 'construction of social enterprise is ongoing, and fought by a range of actors promoting different languages and practices tied to different political beliefs.' The previously discussed celebratory accounts of social enterprise exemplify a discourse presenting an individualised and 'optimistic script of social change' (Dey and Steyaert 2010, 86). By contrast, the idea of a dominant neoliberal discourse of marketisation downplays the agency of social enterprise practitioners, reducing them to passive enactors of elite discourses (Teasdale 2011, 107). However, such singular and powerful discourses rarely exist in practice. As such, it is necessary to avoid recourse to simple 'top-down discourses of privatisation, citizen responsabilisation,

sustainability and community cohesion' when examining phenomena that might be associated with neoliberalism (Larner 2014, 197).

A productive avenue of analysis might seek to pay attention to tensions within and between social enterprise discourses. One significant tension identified in the literature is between policy discourse and the on-the-ground experiences of practicing social entrepreneurs. This point is exemplified by Parkinson and Howorth (2008) in their discourse analysis of actors involved in UK social enterprises. In highlighting the broader emergence of an entrepreneurship discourse in the United Kingdom, of which social entrepreneurship represents a part, Parkinson and Howorth (2008) found a significant gap between dominant policy rhetoric and the subjective experience of social entrepreneurs. This extended to the rejection of the label of 'social entrepreneur' by some of their participants. Parkinson and Howorth (2008, 301) argue then that the 'myth of the entrepreneur' was dislocated from the participants' experiences of doing social work. The social needs that these actors were attempting to address were not conceptualised as 'opportunities' as in business analyses of entrepreneurship, rather they saw themselves as reactively working for their communities (Parkinson and Howorth 2008, 301, 303). The discrepancy between entrepreneurship rhetoric and the experiences of those involved with social enterprise points to the significance of the 'nonlinear' (Dey and Steyaert 2016, 632) relationship between discourse and subjectivity.

The tension between discourse and the subjectivity of social entrepreneurs' points to the need to understand in more detail how various discourses come together in the spaces out of which social entrepreneurship emerges. This involves a focus on the *formation* of social entrepreneurial subjects. A focus on entrepreneurs is necessary as they represent the key actor in most contemporary social enterprise discourse

(Bandinelli 2017, 82). This is not however, an individualised focus, rather it represents an attention to social and spatial processes involved in the production of social entrepreneurial subjectivity. Directing attention to social entrepreneurs can contribute to 'a better understanding of how social entrepreneurs define themselves' as well as shedding light on 'whether the discourses of social entrepreneurs are consistent with those of the actors that study, fund and teach them' (Hervieux et al. 2010, cited in Dey and Steyaert 2012, 100). Educational and promotional materials are one important feature here, as they aim to produce certain types of subject by highlighting the attributes required of social entrepreneurial 'change-makers' (Bandinelli and Arvidsson 2012, 68). The ways in which policy, educational and promotional materials represent social entrepreneurship, and how individuals draw upon these, are important aspects of the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects.

A second point highlighted by the post-structural literature is the ongoing negotiation between social and economic objectives within the day-to-day practice of social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship represents an 'entanglement of conflicting logics' (Sievers 2016, 90). Social entrepreneurs must balance the desire to produce meaningful social change with the commercial pressures of the market which provides the resources to enable their desired social impact (Hudson 2009, Zahra et al. 2009). It would then seem necessary to highlight the 'ethical negotiations' (Hudson 2009, 502) involved in the discussion and presentation of social entrepreneurship and efforts to encourage social entrepreneurial action. To draw attention to these ethical negotiations is to draw attention to the practise and promotion of social entrepreneurship in concrete settings and spaces.

One example of the productive potential of this line of analysis is provided in Sievers (2016) analysis of a Danish social enterprise involved in job training for

vulnerable citizens. Sievers (2016, 83) argues for attention to the specific practices and micro-processes of social entrepreneurship. One example here is the tension between allowing those vulnerable citizens employed by the social enterprise to participate on their own terms and the need to run a competitive business (Sievers 2016, 89). The organisation studied in this particular case relied on large numbers of volunteers as a source of stability, however, this limited opportunities for disadvantaged volunteers to progress into paid work within the organisation (Sievers 2016, 88-89). While social entrepreneurship might be seen in a more positive sense as a new approach to community development that involves the possibility of creating new opportunities for the participation of marginalized citizens, Sievers (2016, 90) locates this within and against the broad emergence of neoliberal forms of social provisioning.

In order to understand how social entrepreneurs negotiate the day-to-day practice of social entrepreneurship, we need to understand how it is that in certain spaces individuals come to be empowered to act as social entrepreneurs. As Sievers (2016, 91) argues, we need to 'become much more aware of the conditions that need to be present in order for social enterprise to become an expanding practice that can contribute to community development and demarginalisation' as well as 'the conditions that pull social entrepreneurship in a more limited and limiting direction'. Idealised visions of social entrepreneurship construct these competing logics as mutually compatible while critical analyses have highlighted only negative aspects. Both over- and under-estimations of the capacity of social entrepreneurs to generate social change result in an incomplete picture of what social enterprise is about and what social entrepreneurs can do. A more productive line of analysis might involve the 'how' of social entrepreneurship. That is, an attention to how, in certain social

entrepreneurial spaces, social entrepreneurship emerges as a practice that is carried out by a certain type of subject.

Rather than heroic individuals or products of a market-based neoliberal ideology, social entrepreneurship may be better understood by beginning from the practices and socio-spatial settings within which social entrepreneurs emerge. This thesis advances such an approach by paying attention to the practices and spaces through which social entrepreneurial subjects are created. In the next section, I turn to the Foucauldian literature on governmentality, which provides one theoretical lens through which to approach the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. As such, it can contribute to an enriched understanding of social entrepreneurial subjects beyond the heroic individuals and macro-ideological structures I have described in the preceding paragraphs.

2.3 Governmentality

The literature on governmentality is concerned with government as a specific form of power relations and provides a series of theoretical tools with which these power relations can be analysed. Government is defined by Foucault as the 'conduct of conduct' (Foucault 2000 [1982], 341, Gordon 1991). In this sense, government refers to efforts by forms of authority to guide the conduct of those subject to that authority. It is important to note here that 'government' is used in a broad sense throughout the governmentality literature. It is not reducible to the state; rather it involves a diverse range of actors, including the state, community organisations and corporations seeking to act on the conduct of others. Government in this broad sense is a useful way of approaching the diverse arrangement of actors and spaces that constitute the social enterprise sector, particularly as various groups aim to promote the sector and encourage people to pursue social entrepreneurship as a practice. The

governmentality literature also provides an insight into the significance of the spatiality of government in relation to social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial subjectivity.

This section is organised as follows. First, I will introduce the theoretical tools utilised in the analysis of governmentality. These are rationalities of government and technologies of government, of which one element are technologies of the self. Second, I will look at how these have been applied in practice through a discussion of the social governmentality that prevailed in the developed world in the post-war period and which, from the 1980s, was superseded by an 'advanced liberal' form of government (Rose 1999, Miller and Rose 2008). The concept of advanced liberalism is useful as it provides an insight into the changing spatial and social processes of governing in the contemporary world. It is within this context that social entrepreneurship has emerged as an important vehicle through which social and environmental problems can be addressed by ethically motivated subjects.

Rationalities and Technologies of Government

Rationalities of government and technologies of government are integral to governmentality. First, an analysis of governmentality involves an attention to the 'rationalities' or 'mentalities' of government (Dean 2010, Miller and Rose 2008); that is, an analysis of the modes of thought that inform and underpin governmental action. Government, as the conduct of conduct, delineates a network of power relations in which the possible action of subjects is acted upon or directed by a source of authority (Foucault 2000 [1982], 341). Governmental power is thus always exercised in relation to specific rationalisations, that is, the specific goals sought by authorities when seeking to shape the way people act (Rose et al. 2006, 84). Rationalities of government are the systems of knowledge and language that present a claim to a

'true' understanding of social reality. It is through these representations that aspects of social life are made manageable (Miller and Rose 2008, 31). To say that governmentality involves a rationality of government is to say that it involves a form of knowledge that functions and is utilisable as 'true' for the purposes of government.

Rationalities of government provide a foundation for governmental action by constructing a vision of the social world within which specific forms of subject are created. Rationalities therefore possess a distinctively moral character and involve a claim to knowledge of the appropriate values, ideas and principles that should guide efforts at the conduct of conduct. Government requires knowledge of what constitutes virtuous action, as well as ideas of justice, freedom and responsibility, among others (Dean 2010, Rose 1999). It is within and through these ideas that government aims at the conduct of conduct. An example of this from social entrepreneurship is the ethical motivation to 'do good' that at least partially underpins the use of social entrepreneurship as a platform for tackling social and environmental problems (Bandinelli 2017). An analysis of governmentality then requires attention to the 'regimes of truth', or forms of knowledge, that are drawn upon as frames of reference in relation to certain visions of the social world. It is through the acceptance of regimes of truth that individuals become certain types of subject and construct certain types of relationship with themselves, with others, and with the sources of authority through which government operates.

Rationalities of government inform and guide technologies of government. Technologies of government represent empirical interventions, the 'actual mechanisms ... through which various authorities seek to shape, normalise and instrumentalise the conduct, thought, decisions and aspirations of others' (Miller and Rose 2008, 32). These technologies may involve a range of features, including

discourses, modes of calculation and assemblages of various material objects and devices, all directed at the specific goals of various authorities in relation to the governed (Rose 1999, 52). For example, the educational materials supplied by social enterprise intermediaries represent a technology of government that aims to encourage a certain course of action and create a certain type of person – social entrepreneurship and the social entrepreneur (Bandinelli and Arvidsson 2012, Bandinelli 2017). Analysing technologies of government draws attention to the methods by which government is accomplished through situated practices, techniques and objects in a diverse range of spaces and settings.

Inclusive within technologies of government are technologies of the self and processes of self-government. Technologies of the self represent the ways in which political rationalities and technologies connect to the self-formation of individuals as subjects. They concern the ways in which people come to understand and act upon themselves within certain regimes of authority and knowledge and through techniques directed at self-improvement (Rose et al. 2006, 90). Technologies of the self provide a lens to analyse the process by which ‘human beings are made into subjects’ (Foucault 2000 [1982], 326). Foucault (2000 [1982], 331) argues that the term ‘subject’ has two meanings, the first refers to the idea that one is ‘subject to’ someone else through forms of control or dependence, the second referring to the connection of oneself to their own identity through forms of self-knowledge. From this perspective, it is through these dual processes of subjection, where one is ‘subject to’ government, and subjectivation, where one governs themselves through forms of self-knowledge, that government operates.

In practice, these are inseparable and intertwined processes within modern society. The subjectivity of the individual is always tied to their subjection (Cremonesi

et al. 2016, Cruikshank 1999). Subjectivation refers to a more agentive process: the ongoing construction of oneself through certain practices and technologies of the self (Lorenzini 2016). The process of subjectivation represents a type of 'creative activity' through which individuals construct and relate to their subjectivity (McNay 1994, 146). By producing certain discourses as truths about themselves, individuals construct themselves as specific subjects (Lorenzini 2016). A point necessary to emphasise here is the contingency of these processes and practices. That is to say, 'particular domains of government have sought the cultivation and stylisation of personal attributes and capacities' (Dean 1995, 560) with the aim of creating specific types of subject (Raco 2003). However, governmental projects do not determine subjectivity, rather they aim to promote and foster certain desirable attributes in subjects (Dean 2010, 43). The process of subjectivation is a contingent and creative process within which individuals come to understand themselves as a certain types of subject within a web of social relations and actors (Lorenzini 2016).

Governmentality, then, directs analysis towards how rationalities of government guide the technologies of government that operate within and through particular spaces to contribute to the creation of subjects. These concepts represent 'local conceptual devices', tools for understanding the systems of power in which we live (Barry et al. 1996, 4). They can be applied to social entrepreneurship in an effort to develop an understanding of the guiding rationalities of social entrepreneurship and the empirical interventions through which social entrepreneurship becomes a reality for social entrepreneurial subjects. It can then be asked what discourses and visions of the world are drawn upon in the presentation of social entrepreneurship? What are the mechanisms and interventions that make up social entrepreneurial spaces? Finally, how do these come together to create or facilitate the creation of social

entrepreneurial subjects? Having summarised the key components of governmentality we can now shift onto the empirical analyses provided by the contemporary governmentality literature.

Advanced Liberal Governmentality

Advanced liberalism represents the form of governmentality that has emerged out of shifts in the nature and operation of government since the 1980s (Rose 1999, Rose et al. 2006, Miller and Rose 2008). It is significant as it draws attention to changes in methods of social provisioning and the 'spatial imaginaries' (Larner 1998) of government. Three points are of particular importance here. First, the shift in advanced liberalism to government through freedom. Second, the shift from 'society' to 'community' as the object of government. Third, the emergence of entrepreneurial citizen-subjects. In order to understand the processes, strategies and spaces involved in the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects, it is necessary to understand the terrain of advanced liberal governmentality upon which social entrepreneurship has emerged.

Advanced liberalism emerged out of 'social governmentality' of the twentieth century. Social governmentality or 'governing from the social point of view' (Miller and Rose 2008, 18) was constructed around a social view of the citizen articulated through the language of social responsibility and national solidarity (Miller and Rose 2008, 48). Emerging out of the economic crises of the Depression, the welfare state and forms of collective insurance and state intervention in the economy represent the technologies of government characteristic of this social governmentality (Rose 1999, 120). Related to this was a unified vision of the compatibility of the nation-state and economy with society conceptualised as the national population (Larner 1998, 601). Within this governmentality the state was seen as a guarantor of social progress and

security, ameliorating the damaging social consequences of the market while retaining a space for private enterprise (Rose 1999, 120). As this model of government entered a period of crisis in the 1970s, a new emphasis on freedom, autonomy and competition emerged in the form of an advanced liberal governmentality.

Taking Britain as an example, critiques of the welfare state and bureaucratic inefficiencies were tied to emphases on enterprise and entrepreneurship and an associated language of choice and autonomy that was translated into a series of governmental strategies for rectifying the aforementioned issues (Miller and Rose 2008, 48-49, Rose 1999, 51). From a New Zealand perspective, Wendy Larner (1998, 604-605) has argued that the framing of globalisation by the fifth labour government developed into a political rationality aimed at addressing the issues presented by the need to remain economically competitive in a rapidly globalising world economy. The object of economic governance was re-specified, shifting from the nationally scaled social intervention of the welfare state to the facilitation of 'entrepreneurial, competitive, and individualistic ways of being' among individuals, communities and specific sectors (Larner 1998, 604). This represented significant change in the 'spatial imaginaries' (Larner 1998) of government as governments shifted towards 'governing at a distance.'

With the shift from the notion of a unified economy and society to an emphasis on individual freedom and autonomy, governments must now pay attention to 'the role of indirect mechanisms for linking economic, social and personal conduct with socio-political objectives' (Miller and Rose 2008, 26). A diverse range of actors must be linked together across a range of contexts. The notion of government-at-a-distance draws our attention to these indirect mechanisms, highlighting the ways in which calculations in one space are connected with action in others through a 'delicate

affiliation of a loose assemblage of agents and agencies into a functioning network' (Miller and Rose 2008, 34). An important aspect of government-from-a-distance is the use of calculative practices as technologies of government. Budget disciplines, accountancy and auditing, for example, provide methods for linking and facilitating forms of conduct across space and time, facilitating the processes of marketisation that characterise advanced liberalism (Larner 2000, 13). In relation to social entrepreneurship, the concept of producing a quantifiable 'social impact' represents one potentially motivating factor for prospective social entrepreneurs aiming to 'do good'.

Government-at-a-distance draws our attention to the ways in which various actors become linked in relation to common goals or problems. The emergence of social entrepreneurship as a distinct sector might here be conceptualised as an example of government-at-a-distance. If, as Miller and Rose (2008, 35) argue it is 'through adopting shared vocabularies, theories and explanations that loose and flexible associations may be established between agents across space and time', then it can be asked what vocabularies, theories and explanations provide the basis for the emergence of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial subjectivity? Furthermore, how do social entrepreneurial subjects relate to each other, the various problems they are attempting to solve and communities they are attempting to serve? Finally, how might the existence of a 'functioning network' of social entrepreneurs in New Zealand be connected to the goals of those actors involved in promoting social entrepreneurship?

Related to the changing spatial imaginaries of government within advanced liberal governmentality is a shift from 'society' to 'community' as the object of government. The emergence of community ties together both administrative

government and self-government, highlighting how governmentalities and subjectivities are necessarily spatialised (Raco 2003, Rose-Redwood 2006). In contrast with the social security and national solidarity that characterised social governmentality, the community represents an emergent space of governmental focus 'as a new territory for the administration of individual and collective existence, a new plane upon [...] which the micro-moral relations among persons are conceptualised and administered' (Miller and Rose 2008, 88). The Third Way policy discourse of the Blair and Clark governments appealed to the community as a 'moral field' that bound individuals together, providing a 'space of *emotional relationships* through which *individual identities* are constructed through their bonds to *micro-cultures* of values and meanings' (Rose 1999, 172). This point is significant as it highlights the role of affect or emotion as constitutive elements of subjectivity within advanced liberal governmentality.

Community as a focus of advanced liberalism is also significant as the space within and upon which technologies of government operate. The spatial shift towards government through a series of 'heterogeneous, overlapping and multiple' communities (Miller and Rose 2008, 90) represents a shift in the operation of technologies of government from the national or societal level towards the local level (Miller and Rose 2008, 90). The emergence of the idea of 'community' may be read as an attempt to ameliorate the effects of market based social reforms by promoting community level initiatives aimed at local participation and empowerment (Miller and Rose 2008, 92). A critical interpretation of the emergence of community in advanced liberalism sees it as a shifting of responsibility from the state. Brown (2015, 131-132), for example, argues that through the devolution of social provisioning, large scale and complex social problems are sent 'down the pipeline' to smaller units such as

community organisations and charities that are 'unable to cope with them technically, politically, or financially'. Here communities are reconceptualised as an 'autonomous, self-sufficient, [and] enterprising' (Pathak 2013, 70), rather than relying on the state for social services, they are able to provide their own through the marketplace or third sector.

The community also provides a new source of ethical obligations through the moral commitments that tie an individual to their particular community. Individuals are here reconceived as autonomous actors responsible for themselves but also to their communities, a contrast with the universalism of social government and collective social security (Miller and Rose 2008, 91). This line of reasoning can be closely related to market-failure explanations for the emergence of social entrepreneurship where entrepreneurs aim to provide services and opportunities to variously marginalised communities. Social entrepreneurship may then be tied into this process through a focus on the search for self-sustaining solutions to social problems. What remains to be seen however is if and how the shift towards community is manifest in the discourses and materials of social entrepreneurship. How do social entrepreneurs see themselves in relation to the communities they operate in and what understandings of citizenship and social provisioning inform their social goals? Furthermore, might social enterprise be seen as an advanced liberal technology of government through community? The answer to this question lies in a more detailed understanding of how social entrepreneurial subjects emerge and how their motivations and aspirations are produced and shaped in social entrepreneurial spaces.

Shifts in the nature and operation of government are significant because they influence the aims of government, and therefore the types of attributes and qualities promoted as desirable in subjects. A final noteworthy feature of advanced liberal

governmentality is the promotion of entrepreneurial forms of subjectivity. Significant in advanced liberal governmentality has been the emergence of efforts to create more responsible and entrepreneurial citizen-subjects. Foucault (2008, 226), for example, highlighted the significance of *homo economicus* conceptualised as ‘an entrepreneur of himself’. Within Human Capital Theory (HCT) individuals are conceptualised as a form of capital to be invested in through, for example, ‘educational investments’ (Foucault 2008, 229). Labour here represents a creative and cognitive practice through which the self becomes a source of investment: the ‘skill, thought, desire, [and] passion’ of the individual become ‘the “material” of the enterprise’ (Bandinelli 2017, 69). The question remains how this process of investment and self-fashioning might operate with regard to *social* entrepreneurs more specifically.

The entrepreneur of the self highlights the way in which an entrepreneurial mind-set has become an important feature of contemporary social life. Referring back to the concept of technologies of the self, the entrepreneurial self demonstrates a particular ‘relationship that one establishes to oneself through forms of personal investment’ (Beasley and Peters 2007, 164). Self-investment by entrepreneurial subjects is part of a financial logic aimed at enhancing the ‘value’ of oneself in the practice of day to day life (Brown 2015, 33). Professional networking represents one example of the process of working on oneself through ‘attracting investors’ (Brown 2015, 37). In the context of social entrepreneurship Bandinelli (2017) argues that networking with other entrepreneurs is fundamental to the formation of a social entrepreneurial subjectivity. Meeting other entrepreneurs, developing appropriate discursive skills and displaying a willingness to be an ‘impact maker’ are all important skills for gaining career opportunities within the social enterprise sector (Bandinelli 2017, 140, 142, 146). Spaces and opportunities for networking, and access to the

border social entrepreneurship collective, therefore represent significant components of the technologies of government through which socially entrepreneurial subjects are created.

Entrepreneurial forms of subjectivity further extend to contemporary forms of citizenship through the construction of what Mitchell Dean (1995) labels 'active' citizen-subjects. In an 'active' society characterised by advanced liberal forms of government individuals are encouraged to conceptualise themselves as entrepreneurs of the self. Individuals must be 'ready and able to take up such opportunities that the labour market, social provision, education and social networks may provide' in order to minimise the risk of becoming dependent on the social welfare system (Dean 1995, 576). Government aims at the 'sponsorship' of certain types of practice with the goal of encouraging the ability of individual subjects to take care of themselves. In relation to unemployment, for example, Dean (1995, 572) argues that the object of government (what it aims to govern) is 'the social and personal effects of unemployment', the goal of governmental intervention is to act upon 'the attitudes, affects, conduct and dispositions that present a barrier to the unemployed returning to the labour market.' Entrepreneurial or active citizen-subjects therefore represent a type of subject where the traditional use of social provisioning is discouraged.

A focus on subject formation in the context of advanced liberal governmentality also draws our attention to the significance of affect or emotion as an important and underexplored element of the situations and processes through which subjects are created. Affect has become an important focus within and alongside changes in government analysed through the lens of governmentality (Penz et al. 2017). As we have seen individuals' desires, passions and feelings have become a significant target for governmental intervention. Affects constitute part of the contexts in which

rationalities and technologies of government are produced and experienced, as well as being an object-target (Anderson 2014) of government. Considering neoliberalism, for example, Anderson (2015, 10) argues that it is always a 'thinking-feeling, not only a rationality.' New social formations and subjects emerge alongside and within collective affects and feelings. Supplementing an analysis of how rationalities and technologies of government combine to create certain types of subjects with an attention to how affect operates within, through and alongside forms of governmentality may provide an enriched understanding of the conditions through which social entrepreneurial subjects are created.

This point is important as analyses of governmentality have been criticised for producing an overly linear approach to subject formation (Barnett 2008). Anderson (2015, 5) argues that the governmentality literature, when considering affect in relation to subject formation, collapses it into a concern with the production of archetypal 'neoliberal subjects'. Two points are lost here, first how 'collective affects mediate [...] shape how things are made present and come to have force and significance' and how the present moment can be understood as an 'affective present', that is, 'as a series of barely coherent, amorphous backgrounds that people adjust to, live with and dwell in' (Anderson 2015, 8). Affects exist within and alongside forms of governmentality but are not reducible to being purely the results of governmental intervention. Affect directs us towards the contingent and ephemeral aspects of experience within and through which social entrepreneurial subjects are created. In the final section of this chapter, I turn to the topic of affect in more detail to argue that it is an important element of the process of social entrepreneurial subject formation.

2.4 Affect and Subjectivity

Affect and emotion have been the subject of increasing social scientific interest in recent years (Anderson 2014, Pile 2010, Thien 2005, Wetherell 2012, Massumi 2002, Sedgwick 2003, Thrift 2004). There have been large debates within the literature about the relationship between emotion and affect, however for the purpose of this research I will use the term affect as shorthand for a wide range of phenomena broadly encompassing collective and individual emotional experience. As Margaret Wetherell (2012, 2) has argued ‘the turn to affect is [...] a stimulus to expand the scope of social investigation’ involving a ‘focus on embodiment, attempts to understand how people are moved, what attracts them’. She summarises these foci with the question: ‘how do social formations grab people?’ (Wetherell 2012, 2). Taking social enterprise as a formation that has grabbed and will continue to grab people, how might affect feature in the creation and motivation of social entrepreneurial subjects?

This section is organised as follows. First, I discuss the main approaches to affect within the literature, arguing that Ben Anderson’s pragmatic interpretation of collective affects as ‘structures of feeling’ and ‘affective atmospheres’ is the most useful for understanding social entrepreneurial subjectivity. This approach to affect, for the purposes of this thesis, draws attention to the various spaces within which social entrepreneurial subjects are created. Second, I will discuss affect in relation to subject formation in general, and social entrepreneurial subjectivity more specifically. Such an emphasis on affect in social entrepreneurial spaces can be located within the broader post-structural approach to social entrepreneurship taken in this thesis. It involves attention to how affects are generated within the socio-spatial settings of social entrepreneurship. In returning to empirical literature on social entrepreneurship, I argue that affect offers a potential pathway between the rational-economic and

political-economy approaches to social entrepreneurship that I discussed in the first section of this chapter.

Structures of feeling and affective atmospheres

Three primary approaches to affect are noteworthy within the literature, all of which can be located under the broad label of 'non-representational theory'. First, that of Thrift (2004, 2008), second, Massumi (2002), and third, Anderson (2009, 2014, 2015). Non-representational approaches to affect generally argue that affect is a bodily capacity that operates below the level of consciousness and subsequently cannot be consciously understood. By locating affect in the moments before cognition these non-representational approaches pose a number of problems for developing an understanding of affect and subject formation. The primary issue relates to the question of agency—how can individual subjects exercise agency in the context of pre-cognitive affects? A further issue is that of representation, how can we access and understand something that cannot be represented? In order to move past these issues I turn to Anderson's pragmatic approach to affect. Anderson (2014) argues for the need to pay attention to collective affects as they operate within, through and between spaces. Adopting this approach enables the analysis of affect in relation to social entrepreneurial subjectivity within and across spaces, as well as in social entrepreneurial discourses.

In presenting affect as non-representational, Thrift (2004, 2008) argues that affect is pre-cognitive. Avoiding 'individualised emotions', Thrift (2004, 60) identifies affect as 'a notion of broad tendencies and lines of force'. Affect is the experience of the body in the moments before cognitive capacities take hold to interpret the world. From this perspective, affect cannot be accurately represented: it is a bodily

phenomenon and mode of entrainment that 'humans merely receive and transmit' in space (Wetherell 2015, 151). Such an approach presents affect in a layer-cake ontology of practice (Barnett 2008) where the priority of affect over cognition and embodied practice over representation is asserted. Affect functions as a pre-conscious layer through which the body is primed to act in advance of rational thought (Leys 2011, Pile 2010). Within Thrift's account, social actors feature as bodies through which affects flow. As Wetherell (2015, 149) argues, 'the person becomes a kind of semi-intelligent, hormonal ape—already kitted out with basic emotions and drives [...] non-consciously reacting, their pre-consciousness doing most of the work'.

By locating affect in advance of conscious thought, the model of affect put forward by non-representational theory offers an impoverished account of agency in subject formation. Thrift's attention to affect is rooted in a concern with what he identifies as a the 'tendency towards the greater and greater engineering of affect (Thrift 2004, 64). In focusing on the engineering of affect, however, Thrift constructs affect as a new form of control, replacing older models of ideology. As Barnett (2008, 191) argues, within Thrift's version of affect, power is manipulated and reproduced by 'getting at people not at the level of what they think or what they recognise, but more directly at the level of what they feel'. The agency of social actors is here passed over as new forms of control operate below the level of consciousness. Affect as a bodily experience below the threshold of experience all slips into an understanding affect as a monolithic entity that can be 'mapped onto political-economic changes (Anderson 2014, 30). In the context of political-economy critiques of social entrepreneurship, pre-cognitive affects would replace neoliberal ideology as an explanatory factor, neglecting the practices and processes through which social entrepreneurial subjects are created.

A second non-representational approach to affect is offered by Massumi (2002). Massumi's approach shares much common ground with Thrift — the body is affected by the world in the moment before experiences are felt by the 'thinking and representing subject' (Wetherell 2013, 354, citing Massumi 2002). In Massumi's version of affect, however, it is always emergent, a property of the encounters that make up social life. Massumi distinguishes between emotion as 'quality' and affect as 'intensity'. Quality here refers to discourse, language and representation, while the intensity refers to openness, chaos and excess (Wetherell 2013, 354). Affect is set up in opposition to emotion. It is a realm beyond the cognitive against which emotion and discourse represent 'taming' devices – classifying and codifying the autonomous excess of affective life (Wetherell 2012, 52). Affect here functions as a 'synonym for life's exuberant generativity' (Anderson 2014, 90), with the expression and representation of affect as emotion representing only a secondary 'capture' of affect. The fixing of affect in emotion, however, necessarily fails. Below the level of consciousness flows of affect always exceed the attempts of systems of representation to demonstrate affective experience.

By drawing a hard distinction between affect and emotion based on representation, Massumi's model of affect emphasises an openness in contrast with Thrift's concentration on manipulation. According to Massumi, new forms of governance have attempted to construct the 'affective backgrounds' against which people live (Wetherell 2012, 58). In opposition to the 'trope of manipulation' identified in Thrift's version of affect, however, within Massumi's model affect always exceeds attempts by actors to intervene in affective life (Anderson 2014, 92). Affect is then non-representational in the sense that it will always exceed our attempts to both know and represent it. Massumi, however, also neglects agency in relation to the role affect plays

in processes of subject formation and social practice. As Anderson (2014, 92) argues, 'claim[s] about "affect itself" tells us little about how specific capacities to affect and be affected emerge and change.' That is to say, in the context of social entrepreneurship, claims about the excessive nature of affect tell us little about how different affects might feature in the processes and spaces through which social entrepreneurial subjects are created and act.

To understand better how affect might feature in subject formation it is necessary to develop a more detailed understanding of how affects are produced, lived and experienced in spaces by subjects. A framework for this is offered in the work of Anderson (2009, 2014, 2015). Affect refers to the capacity to be affected, which is defined here as 'ways of organising the 'feelings of existence' (Anderson 2015, 2). Analysing affect thus involves an attention to the ways in which social formations become both significant to, and constitutive of, subjects through the creation, circulation and mediation of particular atmospheres or feelings (Anderson 2015, 2). Of particular significance are collective affects, which are part of the conditions within which processes, events and social relations occur. Affect here 'becomes an environment within which people dwell' (Anderson 2014, 105), and within which particular types of subjects are produced. This approach is useful because it avoids the issues of agency and representation present within Thrift and Massumi's accounts of affect. It treats affect as an mediated feature of social life that permeates the sites and spaces of social formations such as the social enterprise sector.

Collective affects draw our attention to the significance of spaces in the formation of subjects. Anderson adopts the phrase 'structures of feeling' from Williams (1977) to distinguish a first approach to collective affects. 'Structures of feeling' can be defined in two senses, first as an affective quality that links practices, events and

processes across sites. Second, as a shared affective quality that ‘acts as a type of disposition towards oneself, others and the world’ and emerges alongside a broader social collective (Anderson 2014, 119). Structures of feeling can be likened to a ‘dispersed mood’ that is constitutive of a ‘specific present’ (Anderson 2015, 13, citing Williams 1977). One example here is Berlant’s (2011, cited in Anderson 2015, 13) analysis of ‘crisis ordinariness’ amidst the ongoing evaporation of the ‘post-war good life fantasy’ that has accompanied neoliberal reform in the United States. Applying structures of feeling to social entrepreneurship, we can ask how, if social entrepreneurship is understood as part of an emergent social collective—the social enterprise sector — is this social enterprise sector accompanied by a structure or structures of feeling? In relation to affect and subject formation, how are social entrepreneurs created as part of the wider practices, events and processes of the social enterprise sector if the sector is characterised by particular collective moods? And how might affect operate to produce, among social entrepreneurs, certain dispositions towards themselves, others and the wider world?

A second way of approaching collective affects is offered through the idea of ‘affective atmospheres’. If structures of feeling exist across and between sites, then affective atmospheres are a way of describing affects as they emerge from particular spaces to envelop ‘specific bodies, sites, objects, people’ (Anderson 2014, 160). Atmospheres are the particular affective qualities of spaces, such as the feeling that permeates a room. Discussing neoliberalism, Anderson (2015, 10) argues that atmospheres are ‘part of the real conditions of emergence for neoliberal styles of reasoning.’ The atmosphere of early meetings of the Mont Pelerin society provide one example here, offering a space within which a suspicion of state economic intervention intensified and circulated alongside a belief in liberalism (Anderson 2015, 10).

Affective atmospheres are therefore an access point to the affective qualities of spaces in which particular types of subjects are formed and capacities to act in the world are shaped. What affective atmospheres then are produced within social entrepreneurial spaces, and how might these contribute towards the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects engaging in specifically social entrepreneurial forms of reasoning?

Structures of feeling and affective atmospheres exist alongside, are generated within, and operate through rationalities and technologies of government. This is not intended to imply, however, that such collective affects are necessarily a specific effect of governmental strategies. Specific rationalities and technologies of government may be imbued with an affective significance, for example Foucault's identification of 'state phobia' as a background anxiety contributing towards the justification of neoliberal policies (Anderson 2015, 7, citing Foucault 2008). Collective affects are also part of the broader context in which rationalities are interpreted and come to have significance for subjects, and technologies operate in an attempt to create subjects with certain qualities. Structures of feeling and affective atmospheres are therefore part of the processes and situations within which rationalities and technologies of government operate in the world and contribute to processes of subject formation. They accompany, occur and are felt within and alongside rationalities and technologies, but are always themselves an emergent property of social encounters (Anderson 2014). Both structures of feeling and affective atmospheres, then, link affects with the experience of particular spaces.

The discursive qualities, material arrangements, and organisation of actors within specific spaces are all elements that contribute to the atmosphere or tone of those spaces. These elements are also interconnected with the formation of particular types of subjects. Rather than analysing affect as a form of manipulation that produces

certain types of affective subject, the process of subject formation is an ongoing process within which affects are produced and experienced (Anderson 2015, 3). Subject formation is here treated as an organising process whereby individuals gain their 'textures, shapes, potentialities' and 'creativities' (Wetherell 2012, 139). Affect is one constitutive element in the formation of subjects whereby capacities to affect and be affected are shaped in a range of social situations, spaces and relations. Social entrepreneurial subjects, then, emerge within a contingent affective background that accompanies and is partially the result of interaction between the rationalities and technologies of government in spaces of social entrepreneurship.

Collective affects as structures of feeling and affective atmospheres are also useful in rejecting a dichotomy between affect and representation. Avoiding the reduction of collective affects to a result of forms of representation (Anderson 2014, 114), an alternative approach aims to pay attention to 'how representations function affectively and how affective life is imbued with representations' (Anderson 2014, 14). Signifying apparatuses and forms of representation mediate affects by 'organising grids of affective investments and distributing bodies' (Anderson 2014, 124, citing Grossberg 2010). They are therefore one of the ways in which collective affects are organised and contribute in some way to 'how events might be felt by individuals' (Anderson 2014, 134). The process of subject formation from this perspective is an organising process through which representations of the world and collective affects, among other elements, come to be experienced by individuals in space. Forms of representation, interpreted through the lens of rationalities of government, and material technologies combine with collective affects to shape the social entrepreneurial capacities of individuals. I now want to shift to discuss specific affects

in relation to subject formation broadly, before discussing social entrepreneurial subjectivity more specifically.

Affect as an Element in Social Entrepreneurial Subjectivity

Social entrepreneurship is a social formation where affect may be especially important as a constitutive element of subjectivity. As Hoffman and St. John (2017, 246) argue, affect 'shapes and cultivates subjectivities.' Affects are produced, circulate, and are drawn upon by individuals in both the spaces of social entrepreneurship and wider coverage of the sector. Various affects contribute to the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects by providing a source of motivation and shaping the capacities of individuals to act as social entrepreneurs. In this section I will discuss affect in relation to subject formation more broadly before discussing social entrepreneurial subjects specifically. I argue that an attention to affect offers an approach to social entrepreneurial subjectivity that steers a path between the rational-economic and political-economy approaches to social entrepreneurship that I discussed in the first section of this chapter. This approach to affect as an element of social entrepreneurial spaces is therefore located within broader post-structural approaches to social entrepreneurship. It draws our attention to the significance of educational and promotional spaces in providing access to affective experiences of enjoyment, hope, and the affective intensity surrounding social entrepreneurship.

Affect can contribute to a more detailed understanding of how certain types of subjects are produced in relation to social and economic practices such as social entrepreneurship. Hoffman and St. John (2017) provide an illustrative example of the analysis of social formations where social and economic modes of thinking are brought into dialogue. They do this in the context of middle class volunteering in the United States and China. Volunteering has been understood in a similar way to social

entrepreneurship, as either an ethically virtuous “giving” of one’s self or the “privatisation” of public needs.’ Hoffman and St. John (2017, 243) argue that, in reality, it represents a heterogeneous assortment of affects, social expressions of responsibility and a set of solutions to contemporary issues of social provisioning. As a social practice that produces certain types of subject, volunteering is not reducible to neoliberalism as an explanatory structure. Economic formations, rather, exist and are lived by subjects in and through different affects.

Volunteering in China was characterised by cross-class relations based in love and concern as approaches to solving social problems. Young urban professionals were identified as those with the material ability to identify and help others who were ‘in need’ (Hoffman and St. John 2017, 251). The Chinese example also highlighted an issue of scale similar to the shift to governing through ‘community’ in advanced liberal governmentality. This involved an approach to addressing local issues that associated the local scale of intervention with the development of authentic social bonds (Hoffman and St. John 2017, 252). They argue that young volunteers in the United States negotiate ‘ambivalent affective attachments’ (citing Cockayne 2015) that combine a caring affect with a self-interested entrepreneurial desire for a productive outcome from their volunteering (Hoffman and St. John 2017). An attention to affect, then, draws our attention to the ambiguous affective nature of spaces within which potentially diverging sets of incentives are brought into contact and held together by subjects as they experience the world.

Similarly, adopting structures of feeling from the previous section, entrepreneurial work can be characterised by a number of affective attachments and investments. These are located in a structure of feeling based around job satisfaction that permeates the start-up sector. Cockayne (2015, 457), studying entrepreneurial

workers in the San Francisco digital media sector, argues that capitalism works as a form of investment in both an economic and affective sense. Affects are produced in social relations and circulate through the space of the workplace, contributing to the production of subjects attached to and invested in entrepreneurial forms of work (Cockayne 2015, 457). Entrepreneurial work in start-ups was conceptualised as a more satisfying form of work compared with traditional corporate work by participants. The feeling of satisfaction generated in workplaces represented an affective return for individuals who invested themselves in this form of work (Cockayne 2015, 461). Satisfaction was a result of the 'passion' or 'love' that these entrepreneurial workers have for their jobs (Cockayne 2015, 463). These workplaces, then, offered a space for individuals to invest themselves in their passion, generating attachment to forms of entrepreneurial work.

Shifting now to social entrepreneurial subject formation more specifically, affect can be seen as an important element in the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The acknowledgement of affect as one of the constitutive elements of social entrepreneurial subjectivity provides a pathway beyond both rational-economic and top-down ideological accounts of social entrepreneurship. Rather than being economically rational actors, entrepreneurs are 'affected by irrationalities and anomalies.' They are created, exist and act in social, spatial and affective contexts (Parkinson and Howorth 2008, 289). As a fluid and already existing social circulation of emotions, affect is not necessarily reducible to explanation via political-economic accounts of neoliberal ideology (Hoffman and St. John 2017). Social entrepreneurship is neither solely a technical way for entrepreneurs to improve society, nor a mere extension of neoliberalism to social provisioning. As Mauksch (2017, 149) argues, since social entrepreneurship 'may ultimately serve highly diverse attempts to change

social conditions' what is needed is 'sensitive on-the-ground observations of real-world effects for aspirational target groups.' That is to say, it is necessary to understand in better detail how individuals become social entrepreneurial subjects within the web of discourses, spaces and affects through which the sector is constructed.

The types of affects that are produced in social entrepreneurial spaces and invoked in social entrepreneurial discourses are both important factors in the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The ways in which affect may contribute to shaping social entrepreneurs is particularly significant given the 'mission-related internal values and motivations' (Certo and Miller 2008, 270) that provide the basis for social entrepreneurship. Bandinelli's (2017, Bandinelli and Arvidsson 2012) studies of 'change-makers' are insightful in this regard and highlight the complex sociality and affective strategies involved in the formulation of social entrepreneurial subjects. Bandinelli and Arvidsson (2012, 69) argue that discourses between social entrepreneurs within social enterprise intermediaries and hubs focus on subjectivity, highlighting the significance of dreams, aspirations and 'what it feels like to be a changemaker'. Organisations aiming to promote social entrepreneurship are significant as they provide a space for education and socialisation with regards to how to *be* a social entrepreneur (Bandinelli 2017, 144). Educational materials on offer within such spaces promote celebratory discourses that represent social entrepreneurship as a solution to contemporary social problems. They offer arguments for why people should become certain types of (social entrepreneurial) subjects (Dey and Lehner 2017, Bandinelli 2017). Becoming a social entrepreneur is thus critically linked to affects as they circulate within the spaces aimed at encouraging the development of social entrepreneurship.

Educational and promotional spaces represent one set of spaces where affective atmospheres are generated and felt in relation to social entrepreneurship. An example of this is provided by Dey and Lehner (2017, no pagination), who argue that affect can contribute to explaining the 'grip' of social entrepreneurship. Social enterprise hubs represent important intermediary organisations involved in promoting the sector. In their analysis of a single social enterprise hub, Dey and Lehner (2017) demonstrate that references to 'enjoyment' feature as an affective strategy aimed at motivating individuals beyond the rationalist narrative of utilising commercial methods to solve social problems (Dey and Lehner 2017). It is the chance to work creatively, access sources of inspiration and network with other social entrepreneurial individuals that are seen to motivate social entrepreneurial subjects (Dey and Lehner 2017). Affects thus circulate and operate as a constitutive element of social entrepreneurial subjectivity within specific social entrepreneurial spaces.

These educational and promotional spaces provide an insight into the affective intensity or buzz currently surrounding social entrepreneurship. Mauksch (2017, 135) argues that the emergence of social entrepreneurship as a new source of hope has been critically related to the creation of spaces that produce 'holistic experiences through which people may create imaginative links to personal desires and experiential backgrounds.' Put another way, it is within social entrepreneurial spaces aimed at education and promotion that affective visions of social entrepreneurship are created, motivating and inspiring individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship as a practice. She argues for the need to investigate 'the "hows" of staging and creating "buzz" for social entrepreneurship' (Mauksch 2017, 135). Within staged events such as conferences, workshops and seminars, promoters construct collective spaces for the performance and demonstration of social entrepreneurship — creating an

experience that provides 'corporeal, spiritual and emotional access' to themes of hope and salvation (Mauksch 2017, 134). Social entrepreneurial spaces are, then, spaces within which specific atmospheres are created with the goal of encouraging individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship.

Affective atmospheres are generated and in turn contribute to the construction of social entrepreneurial subjects within these educational and promotional spaces. An emphasis within these spaces is placed on self-identification with the goals of social entrepreneurship and the wider collective of social entrepreneurs. Within the seminars that Mauksch (2017, 141) attended, social entrepreneurship was constructed as a 'universal philosophy' based on an individual's spiritual identification with the ethos of social entrepreneurship and a 'can-do' attitude. By affectively investing in social entrepreneurship as a source of hope, individuals become empowered to act as social entrepreneurs. There is a potential tension here, however, between the affective experiences of joy, pleasure or excitement regarding social entrepreneurship and the technical focus on engaging in the correct processes for creating a successful social enterprise (Mauksch 2017). In the context of these spaces Mauksch (2017, 135) argues, technical approaches to social enterprise business models exist alongside spiritual attempts to produce new visions for the future as motivation for participants to pursue social entrepreneurship. The creation of social entrepreneurial subjects therefore involves a process of self-fashioning through the development of social entrepreneurial subjectivity — a process that ties together the affective atmospheres of social entrepreneurial spaces and with rational approaches to creating business platforms.

Affect is therefore a significant feature in the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. A range of affects, including hope, enjoyment and passion can be related to

the emerging social enterprise sector. Affects are not reducible to either forms of representation and discourse, or to political-economic ideologies. Rather, they operate both within and around representations of the world and in spaces of social and economic practice such as social entrepreneurship. Affects are significant in the context of the recent emergence of social entrepreneurship as they provide sources of motivation and inspiration for the pursuit of social entrepreneurship. They are part of the conditions within which social entrepreneurial subjects are created and contribute to an understanding of social entrepreneurship as a practice through which individuals can solve social problems. Becoming a social entrepreneur is thus critically linked to the collective affective experience of social entrepreneurial spaces.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter I have discussed the literature on social entrepreneurship and offered governmentality and affect as two approaches to understanding social entrepreneurial subject formation. I began by discussing approaches to social entrepreneurs within the social enterprise literature, arguing that rational-economic and political-economic accounts are marked by a tendency to over-estimate and under-estimate the capacity of social entrepreneurship to address social problems. I therefore locate this research within a post-structural approach to social entrepreneurship. Such an approach argues for an attention to the practices, spaces and 'diverse negotiations of everyday life' (Larner 2014, 147) within which social entrepreneurship emerges and social entrepreneurial subjects are created. How is it that, within specific spaces of social entrepreneurship, individuals become motivated to act as social entrepreneurial subjects?

In order to address these questions I have turned to the governmentality and affect literature as two ways to approach subject formation. The second section

discussed governmentality, drawing attention to rationalities and technologies of government as constitutive elements of government understood as 'the conduct of conduct' (Foucault 2000 [1982]). The governmentality literature provides a useful way of approaching the diverse arrangement of actors and spaces that constitute the social enterprise sector and draws our attention to the significance of space in the emergence of social entrepreneurship through contemporary analyses of advanced liberal governmentality. A significant focus here is on the rationalities that provide the basis for social entrepreneurial subjects' understanding of the world. What vocabularies, theories and explanations provide the basis for social entrepreneurial subjectivity? Furthermore, what are the discursive qualities and material arrangements of social entrepreneurial spaces, and how might they contribute to the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects?

Governmentality approaches to subject formation emphasise how government aims at the promotion of certain qualities as desirable in subjects. However, governmentality approaches have been criticised as presenting a linear idea of subject formation. It was with this in mind that I turned to the literature on affect in the final section of this chapter. An attention to collective affects is important as it emphasises the ephemeral qualities of social entrepreneurship. Collective affects, understood as 'structures of feeling' and 'affective atmospheres' exist alongside and are generated within rationalities and technologies of government. They are part of the conditions within which social entrepreneurship becomes significant to individuals and can provide an insight into the current 'buzz' (Mauksch 2017) that surrounds the educational and promotional spaces where, in part, social entrepreneurial subjects are created. The aim of this thesis then is to answer the question of how social entrepreneurial spaces might be characterised by structures of feeling and affective

atmospheres, and how they are produced and circulate within and through technologies and rationalities of government to create social entrepreneurial subjects. In the next chapter I will discuss the methodological approach utilised in this thesis in order to addressing these questions.

Chapter 3: Methodology and Methods

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will outline the methodological approach and methods of data collection and analysis utilised in this thesis. This research adopts a qualitative case study approach to studying the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The case study selected for the research was the Social Enterprise World Forum (SEWF), a large social enterprise event hosted in New Zealand in late 2017. This approach and case was selected based on an argument for the need to approach affect through an attention to processes of affective composition – how specific affects work in specific contexts. The qualitative case study approach deployed here involved observation at the forum and documentary data collection detailing the broader affective context of the forum through pre- and post-forum promotion. This data was analysed using thematic analysis. The goal of this was to understand how social entrepreneurship might be characterised by certain structures of feeling and affective atmospheres, and how these contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The chapter is structured as follows: the first section will discuss methodological issues for studying affect and outline the qualitative case study approach adopted for this research. The second section outlines the use of observation and documentary data collection to collect data from the case study. The third section outlines the thematic analysis as an approach to interpreting the data.

3.2 Qualitative Case Studies as an Approach to Studying Affect

The aim of this thesis is to investigate how social entrepreneurial spaces might be characterised by structures of feeling and affective atmospheres and how these collective affects are produced and circulate within and through technologies and rationalities of government to create social entrepreneurial subjects. It is therefore

necessary to elaborate on methodological issues involved in studying affective dimensions of subject formation. Attention to affect has emerged out of a focus on understanding social life as a rich, textured and embodied experience, as well as an emergent property of contingent encounters and relations between human and non-human actors, and the material world (Anderson 2014, 2016, Wetherell 2012). Research with affect as its focus directs attention to the ways in which people come to live and feel. As Anderson (2014, 183) argues, 'it is through affect and emotion that people are connected to the world around them [...] it is also, in part, through affect and emotion that people are touched by and caught up in larger events and processes.' The starting point for research on affect is the idea that they are not natural properties of the world, but relationally and spatially produced and mediated elements of social life (Anderson 2016).

In geography and other social science disciplines growing attention to affect as an object of analysis has resulted in discussion about how researchers access, interpret and represent affect. Affect is seen to pose a challenge to traditional methods of geographical research as it lacks the observable materiality of many other phenomena (Anderson 2016, 184). The emergent and ephemeral nature of affect makes it difficult to both convert into data and represent in research findings (Winchester and Rofe 2016, 15). As a product of social relations and encounters, affects may be difficult to both locate and fix, while individual affects are not always distinct and identifiable (Anderson 2016, 184). Rather, they emerge in the midst of a range other material and non-material aspects of social life. As a result, there is no single way forward for documenting and analysing affect.

One significant methodological debate within the geographic literature on affect relates to the issue of representation. Non-representational interpretations of affect,

such as those offered by Massumi and Thrift, maintain that affect cannot be represented, as it operates below the threshold of consciousness. Affect thus can only be represented in research through a secondary process of discursive 'capture' (Massumi 2002). These claims have drawn significant attention as researchers have debated the possibilities of methodologies informed by non-representational theory for studying affect. Margaret Wetherell (2012, 67) for example, asks how, from a non-representational perspective, can we 'represent that which is beyond the scope of representation?'. She argues that non-representational approaches block 'useful and pragmatic empirical work on affect' (Wetherell 2012, 20). One way of addressing the issue of representing affect would be to direct research on affect towards demonstrating the 'processes of their composition' (Michels 2015, 258), or how affects 'get into' certain spaces (Anderson 2016, 185). From this we can begin to explore 'what affects and emotions do in particular situations' (Anderson 2016, 185). How are they produced in spaces and what potential impacts they have within those spaces and in relation to subjects? Such an approach begins not from a claim about affect itself, but from an empirical approach that aims to understand how specific affects work in specific contexts.

In response to the difficulties of researching affect, I opted for a qualitative case study approach that draws together a range of sources of data in order to offer a speculative account of affects in relation to the construction of social entrepreneurial subjects. Qualitative approaches focus on both social structures and individual experiences of events and places as constitutive aspects of a 'multifaceted and fluid reality' (Winchester and Rofe 2016, 8). Research from a qualitative perspective thus often focuses on intangible aspects of social life, such as discourses and identities (Winchester and Rofe 2016, 3). Affect would also fit into this category as something

intangible in practice. A qualitative approach that draws together multiple strands of data allows us to construct an image of the affective features of particular social formations such as the social enterprise sector. Case study research represents one such approach to research within a qualitative framework. The case study approach taken in this research is idiographic, or depth orientated (Baxter 2016, 134). The aim of such an approach being to build up a more detailed understanding of under-explored or under-theorised phenomena (Baxter 2016, 136).

Case studies represent an overall methodological approach to research, rather than a specific method for data collection (Baxter 2016, Taylor 2016). Case study research is based on studying a single example or small range of examples of a phenomenon in order to provide a detailed explanation of that phenomenon (Baxter 2016, 130). The guiding assumption of case study research is the argument that an in-depth understanding of one or a few manifestations of a phenomenon is valuable on its own (Baxter 2016, 131). Adopting a case study approach is useful as it allows for a focus in detail on affects as they operate in specific spaces and through specific discourses. Such a qualitative approach can therefore provide the basis of a more detailed understanding of social entrepreneurial subject formation as social entrepreneurship grows in significance within New Zealand society.

This thesis is based on a qualitative case study approach to the New Zealand social enterprise sector. A range of actors are involved in the sector, including social entrepreneurs themselves, people aiming to promote social enterprise, local and central government, private sector organisations and the media. New Zealand is a particularly relevant space for this research as social entrepreneurship has only emerged as an object of significant public attention since about 2016. The New Zealand social enterprise sector is in a nascent stage of development and is marked

by efforts to promote and legitimise itself by attracting investment and attention from government and the media (Ākina Foundation 2017b, Department of Internal Affairs 2014, Grant 2008, Kaplan 2013, McNeill and Silseth 2015). As a case study location, New Zealand offers an opportunity to investigate the local emergence of social entrepreneurship as a new form of doing business along with the ways in which this new form of business is imbued with affective significance. We can then ask how the social enterprise sector in New Zealand is characterised by structures of feeling and affective atmospheres, and how these become attached to, circulate around, and emerge from, particular spaces and arrangements of subjects.

By orientating this research towards the affective life of social entrepreneurship, I aim to offer a speculative description of the significance of affects in relation to social entrepreneurial subject formation and thus produce a more detailed understanding of how individuals come to be 'social entrepreneurs'. It is important to note that this case study cannot claim to offer an exhaustive account of the affective life of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. As Anderson (2014, 124) argues, articulating a structure of feeling is 'always a matter of speculative description.' It involves the construction of a 'cultural hypothesis' (Anderson 2014, 124) describing the impacts and changes that affects have in the world. Such a case study approach to studying affects thus requires the construction of a sense of the affective 'situation' (Anderson 2016, 193, citing Stewart 2007) that characterises the case study. The aim of this case study approach is therefore to construct, from various sources, an account of how affects are composed in the New Zealand social enterprise sector.

This thesis examines the New Zealand social enterprise sector through a case study of one large social entrepreneurship event – the 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum. The specific context for this research is the various spaces that made up the

forum. I also collected and analysed documentary material from pre- and post-forum promotional material. This was significant for understanding the affective situation of the forum, how affects work through the forum and how it might be contextualised within a broader structure of feeling. In having a focus on the forum that extended to pre- and post-forum promotional material, my aim was to construct a cross-sectional case study where spaces and modes of representation can be analysed together in order to develop an enriched understanding of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. The intention of such an approach is to remain attentive to the diverse range of influences on the processes of social entrepreneurial subject formation (Baxter 2016, 144). Triangulating multiple methods of data collection provides the basis for a more detailed understanding of the process of social entrepreneurial subject formation (Taylor 2016, 586-597). In the next sections, I outline the approaches to data collection used in this thesis.

3.3 Methods of Data Collection

Two approaches to data collection were used in this thesis: observation and documentary data collection. Observational data was gathered at the 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum. The forum drew together social entrepreneurs from around the world and New Zealand, and is an important event for the development of social enterprise in New Zealand. Public events such as forums represent one of the key spaces within which social entrepreneurship is staged and becomes actualised as a source of meaning for actors in the sector and the wider public (Mauksch 2017). They also represent the most current and up-to-date interpretations of orthodox social enterprise practice and knowledge. Forums, then, are an important source of education and participation within which affects are cultivated and experienced, and specific types of subject are incentivised or promoted (Kraftl and Horton 2007, Craggs

and Mahony 2014). By attending the forum, I was able to gain an insight into an important space of social entrepreneurship.

In attending the forum I engaged in a form of 'observant participation' (Anderson 2016, 192). This observation aimed at developing a heightened awareness of the situation through involving myself in 'the eventfulness of situations as they unfold' (Anderson 2016, 192). I treated the forum as an open public event which I attended. This involved an important ethical consideration regarding privacy. While attending the forum I did not record specific details about the identities of individual delegates. The forum was observed and experienced as a series of spaces implicated in the production of social entrepreneurial subjects. Attendance at the forum provided a direct experience of a significant space within the sector (Kearns 2016, 315). I collected data by taking field notes as I attended the core presentations of the forum programme and moved around other open forum spaces. I also collected relevant promotional material on offer throughout the forum.

Particular focus was placed on the ways in which spaces were used and how particular atmospheres permeated these spaces. I also paid attention to attempts to cultivate particular types of feelings within the spaces of the forum and how these might be related to processes of subjection and subjectivation. The observation component of data collection represents an embodied approach to data collection to be synthesised with the representational focus of documentary data analysis. As Anderson (2016, 187) argues, talk-based methods privilege subjective emotional experience, it should not be assumed that emotions are 'directly speakable'. Wetherell (2012, 95-96) further argues that 'qualitative social science research that relies on after-the-event narratives to scope out the nature of situated affect will only form a partial view'. Affect goes beyond discourse to include embodied experience. The

observational component of data collection thus moves beyond solely talk-based methods of apprehending affect to pay attention to the affective composition of particular social entrepreneurial spaces.

The second method of data collection utilised in this project was documentary data collection. Documentary data is a useful source of information that can provide further context for the research through attention to official and media discourses and statements regarding the development of the social enterprise sector (Tyrrell 2016). In line with the emphasis on triangulation mentioned earlier, documentary data from before and after the forum can provide context for the data collected from observation at the forum (Tyrrell 2016). The aim here, then, was to provide context for the research and locate the forum within a wider affective situation in order to provide a more accurate description of how affects might work through the forum. Documentary data, also provides in-depth information in its own right. It demonstrates the tone of public discussion surrounding social entrepreneurship as well as the discourses drawn upon in efforts to promote social entrepreneurship.

Documentary data collected for this project included policy reports, media coverage, and data from the websites of organisations promoting social entrepreneurship. This was focused on pre- and post-forum promotional materials that situate the forum in a wider affective setting. For example, in 2016 the New Zealand Government released the report 'Social Enterprise and Social Finance: A Path to Growth' (Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance 2016). This report detailed the current state of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand and laid out potential methods for developing the sector, including through the SEWF. Government reports demonstrate the political atmosphere within which social entrepreneurship is

developing in New Zealand as well as the expected capacities of social entrepreneurs and the relationship between these entrepreneurs and the state.

Media coverage and social entrepreneurship websites represent an important source of public opinion as well as setting the tone for the sector. I documented the broader attention paid to the forum by the media, looking at how it was promoted and framed in the period before the forum as well as the narration of the impacts of the forum afterwards. Documentary data was also collected during the forum itself. Documentary data was collected over a time period encompassing 2016 and 2017. This period represents the timeframe over which social entrepreneurship emerged in the public consciousness in New Zealand in the lead up to the Forum, as well as capturing the reaction to the forum over the end of 2017. There was a marked rise in media coverage of social entrepreneurship in the lead up to the SEWF that demonstrated an increasing awareness of the sector. One example is provided by local news website *The Spinoff*, which ran a series of promotional articles in partnership with the SEWF (for example, Wilson et al. 2017). Finally, the Ākina Foundation is New Zealand's largest social enterprise intermediary promoting the growth of the sector. Their website provided a range of news and promotional stories regarding social entrepreneurship and the SEWF (Ākina Foundation 2017a). It therefore represented an important source of documentary data.

The themes, ideas and actors represented in documentary sources related to social entrepreneurship are significant in providing a wider context for the process of social entrepreneurial subject formation. Documentary data is thus informative as a contextualising device. It functions in a corroborative role alongside the experiential data gained from observation, allowing themes of significance to be compared and contrasted across data sources. Documentary data also provides added depth to the

research by demonstrating the prevailing discourses within popular narrations of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. In a similar vein to critiques of methods involving after-the-event narratives, a focus on media discourse might be criticised as offering an impoverished perspective on affect. That is to say, affect cannot be reduced to a form of signification or 'read' in text. However, textual evidence from media coverage provides a valuable set of data from which to gather hints of the collective affects that permeate social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. The ways in which social entrepreneurship is framed in such documentary data represents an important constitutive element of the social enterprise sector, contributing to the mediation of collective affects and, thus, the contexts within which social entrepreneurial subjects are created.

3.4 Analysis

Drawing together these sources produced a range of data through which to understand the SEWF as a space where affects are produced within and alongside rationalities and technologies of government in an effort to create social entrepreneurial subjects. As highlighted earlier, case study research represents a methodological choice rather than an approach to data collection or analysis. It is therefore necessary to discuss how the data was analysed in order to understand the process of social entrepreneurial subject formation. I approached the data utilising thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was selected as it provides a flexible approach for identifying, interpreting and presenting patterns within and across a data set (Braun and Clarke 2006, Cope 2016). It is important to note that thematic analysis involves interpretation—rather than research themes organically 'emerging' from the data, identifying and assigning significance to themes is always a result of the active role of the researcher (Braun and Clarke 2006, 80). The themes identified in the data and

focused on in the research, then, are necessarily partial and reflective of the theoretical and analytical interests guiding the research. Such a descriptive approach is useful for researching affect given the illusive nature of affects as objects of analysis — it allows for an approach to describing affects as they operate in the spaces and discourses of social entrepreneurship.

After being compiled, documentary data were initially descriptively coded. Pre- and post-forum promotional material was coded and thematically analysed in order to identify the prominent features and discourses drawn upon in public coverage of social entrepreneurship in order to understand how these might be related to a broader structure of feeling. This allowed for the identification of important elements for analysis between data sources. An initial descriptive code provided a starting point for identifying the surface level properties of the data based on the empirical and theoretical material introduced in the previous chapter (Cope 2016, 380). For example, explicit references to affects, such as hope, or comments on how social and economic incentives are balanced are identifiable at this stage. Thematic analysis of documentary data allowed for an interpretation of the wider public narration of social entrepreneurship alongside the material and discursive organisation of the forum.

The field notes and other material recorded in the observational component of the data collection were also compiled and descriptively coded. However, observational data represents a less structured form of data that is somewhat less amenable to coding and thematic analysis. After transcription, the descriptively coded observational data was organised into key themes as they emerged across my documentation of the forum experience. This data utilised in order to produce an understanding of affects in social entrepreneurial spaces alongside the data provided from documentary sources (Kearns 2016, 329). Drawing together observational and

documentary data for this research resulted in an approach to analysis that involved interpreting each source of data internally and alongside another. From this an understanding of how social entrepreneurship might be characterised by certain structures of feeling could be developed alongside the descriptive material collected during observation at the forum. Descriptions and quotes lifted from the observational material aimed to describe the affective atmospheres of forum spaces, how they were produced and circulated within the forum and contributed to the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects.

3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the methodological approach and data collection and analysis methods used in this research. As attention to affect has grown it has been subject to methodological debate concerning how to access, interpret and represent it. One potentially productive way of approaching affect is through an attention to processes of affective composition — how specific affects work in specific contexts. Based on this I adopted a qualitative case study approach to studying the significance of affect in the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The case study selected for the research was the Social Enterprise World Forum (SEWF), a significant social enterprise event hosted in New Zealand in late 2017. The forum represented an important space of education and promotion within which affects were generated and circulated, and specific types of subjectivities were promoted. In order to understand how the forum worked to promote social entrepreneurial subject formation I conducted observation at the forum combined with documentary data collection of pre- and post-forum promotional material. Attention to pre- and post-forum promotional materials offered insight into the broader structure of feeling within which the forum can be situated. Observation was geared towards how affective atmospheres were generated

and circulated within the forum to contribute to the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. In the next two chapters I will outline the findings of this research, beginning with pre- and post-forum material, and structures of feeling, before moving on to the affective atmospheres of the forum itself.

Chapter 4: Structures of Feeling at the Social Enterprise World Forum

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will introduce the 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum (SEWF) as an important space for the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects and discuss how the forum was situated within a broader hopeful structure of feeling. I frame the forum as a technology of government through which various actors aimed to develop and promote the growth of the social entrepreneurship, a process that involved attempts to produce social entrepreneurial subjects. Within and through the forum, discourses expressing specific rationalities became tied together with the material arrangements of spaces and actors. These elements combined to promote social entrepreneurship as a specific practice, and a specific type of actor — the social entrepreneur. The collective affective mood within which the forum was situated, and which emerged from the forum, was an important component of the promotion of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurial subjectivity within the forum.

The chapter then shifts to focus on the context of the forum within a hopeful structure of feeling. The representation of social entrepreneurship in pre- and post-forum promotional material provided an insight into the broader collective mood accompanying social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. Pre-forum promotion drew attention to social entrepreneurship as a new business rationality that synthesises commercial and social goals. With the emergence and growth of the sector, social entrepreneurship was framed as a significant opportunity for New Zealand. Post-forum promotion demonstrated the collective and individual impacts of the forum. Focus here was on the increased confidence and coherence of the sector, as well as personal inspiration and development taken from the event. I argue that the forum could be

located within a hopeful structure of feeling, one that exists alongside and within the rationalities that characterise the sector. This hopeful structure of feeling served to draw together actors in the social enterprise sector, intensifying around the forum, and Christchurch, as a specific social entrepreneurial space.

4.2 The 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum as a Technology of Government

The Social Enterprise World Forum was a significant event for the New Zealand social enterprise sector: one through which rationalities, expressed in discourses, tied together with the material elements of spaces to produce, promote and act on the capacities of individuals to engage in social entrepreneurship. My argument here, then, is that the forum represents a technology of government wherein various actors attempted to produce social entrepreneurial subjects and promote the social enterprise sector. This section provides an overview of the case study, describing the aims of the forum and the organisation of forum spaces and presentations.

The ninth annual Social Enterprise World Forum took place in Christchurch, New Zealand from the 27th to the 29th of September 2017. Christchurch had been announced as the host of the forum almost two years prior, at the end of 2015. The bid to host the forum was led by the Ākina Foundation (Ākina), the main social enterprise intermediary organisation aiming to grow the sector in New Zealand. Upon winning the right to host the forum, Alex Hannant, the now former CEO of Ākina, announced on the Ākina website that:

Hosting the SEWF in New Zealand in 2017 is an opportunity to further accelerate the development of our emerging social enterprise sector [...]
New Zealand has made significant progress in the last couple of years; however, our sector remains young, fragmented and underserved – we

still have a way to go in terms of optimising the social and economic benefits on offer. The momentum amongst Kiwi social entrepreneurs and enterprising communities, plus their knowledge and effectiveness, will grow through this conference (Ākina Foundation 2015).

The event was positioned as a significant opportunity for developing the sector both nationally in New Zealand, and as part of a wider emergent social entrepreneurship movement. The forum can, then, be understood as a means through which the widely promoted potential for social entrepreneurship to create social change could be developed and translated into a reality.

In their bid to host the forum Ākina set out a series of objectives that the forum aimed to achieve. These objectives guided the process of designing, promoting and staging the forum. They included such aims as to ‘connect the emerging New Zealand social enterprise community with best international practice and develop linkages at all levels — policy, practice, investment, research and education’, to ‘deliver a world-class event that showcases NZ’s innovative community resilience and culture to the world’, and to ‘provide a focus for NZ’s emerging social enterprise sector, and a legacy/roadmap for the sector’s longer term growth and development’ (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 7). These aims were to be achieved by creating ‘an experience that brings to life the Kiwi innovative spirit and can-do attitude’, ‘utilising the forum to grow awareness and educate’, and maintaining ‘a constant focus on legacy and collaboration post event’. Creating new social entrepreneurs through education and using the forum as a springboard to develop the social enterprise sector were therefore important areas of focus during the forum.

The forum brought together a range of different actors from within New Zealand and across the world. Over 1,600 delegates from 28 countries gathered in the centre of Christchurch for a range of presentations, discussions and workshops aimed at growing social entrepreneurship (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 26). These delegates included practising social entrepreneurs, policy makers, community leaders, investors and academics. The core programme involved 162 speakers from 28 countries (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 27). As was argued by one speaker in the introduction to an initial plenary session, the forum is ‘one of the world’s foremost gatherings of thought leaders.’ It was therefore a significant international event on the social entrepreneurship calendar. The Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance (2016, 33), convened by the New Zealand government to investigate the development of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand, argued that the forum represented a ‘significant opportunity to showcase New Zealand to the world, including overseas investors and political figures.’ The forum represented one specific example of a wide range of similar events, such as the Skoll World Forum, through which social entrepreneurs and other actors come together to meet like-minded people and develop the social enterprise sector (Dacin et al. 2011, 127-1208). Such events have contributed to, and capitalised on, social entrepreneurship as it has emerged as a growing sector in recent years.

The forum was staged across of a number of different spaces within central Christchurch. These were primarily dispersed around two large theatres where the core programme plenary and mini-plenary presentations were held. Located around these theatres were an outdoor pavilion and open space for delegates to eat lunches provided by local social enterprise food trucks. Also included here was a retail and promotional space for local social enterprises to sell their products, alongside a range

of local and international organisations providing delegates with promotional and educational materials. Another important space within which the forum was staged included Christchurch's 'Innovation Precinct' – a post-earthquake development of co-working and incubation areas. The Innovation Precinct offered 'delegates a variety of spaces and meeting rooms to work on their businesses' or 'bring together a group to delve into the issues that matter to them' (Ākina Foundation 2017d). The Innovation Precinct also offered access to technical advice from experts and mentors in relation to their business interests through the 'Kiwibank Mentor Bar'. Beyond the core programme, the forum extended into the community through local social enterprise tours and public spaces where open talks were given.

The experience of the forum was organised across six streams of activity. The forum organisers aimed to provide a range of experiences through which delegates could personalise their experience of the forum (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 23). The core forum programme was organised into four streams of activity: plenary presentations, mini-plenary presentations, participative sessions and workshops. These were 'simplified as three types of experiences: Listen, Discuss, Do' (Ākina Foundation 2017d). The 'listen' component of the forum experience was comprised of plenary presentations — main presentations attended by all delegates, and mini-plenary presentations — smaller presentations that groups of delegates could choose to attend. These both involved a facilitated discussion between small groups of four or five speakers making short presentations addressing specific questions and summarising their work. Plenaries covered big picture issues and themes for social entrepreneurship, such as the issue of values and impact, sustainable development and the future of business. Mini-plenaries were more targeted, addressing topics such as the relationship between government and social enterprise, social procurement and

the 'employers of tomorrow'. In both plenary and mini-plenary presentations questions could be addressed to speakers by the audience through the dedicated SEWF 2017 mobile app.

The 'discuss' and 'do' components of the forum experience were participative sessions and workshops respectively. The goal of these sessions was to be participative and interactive (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 22). Participative sessions aimed to facilitate a dialogue among a limited number of delegates. These sessions addressed topics such as 'creating the conditions for experimentation and systemic change', indigenous social enterprise and equality and inclusion within the sector. Workshops were aimed at solving technical issues for social entrepreneurs through applied learning, they including topics such as business models, customer bases, impact modelling and legal structures. The four core streams were supplemented by two optional streams – the 'Open Stream' and the 'Transitional city Stream'. The open stream was operated through the Innovation Precinct to provide meeting spaces and the mentor bar mentioned previously, while the Transitional city Stream offered delegates the chance to engage with the local community and 'experience the local social enterprise scene, first hand' over eight days (Ākina Foundation 2017d). This included a range of public talks and social enterprise tours.

Building from this overview of the event, the forum can be understood as a technology of government. As I argued in the second chapter, claims about the capacities of social entrepreneurship to address social problems rely on the existence of social entrepreneurs capable of driving social innovation. The promotion, by various actors, of the social enterprise sector as a vehicle for addressing social and environmental issues involves attempts to produce or encourage the development of social entrepreneurs as a specific form of subject. The forum, as an important space

for the promotion of social entrepreneurship, represents one technology of government through which various actors could come together in an attempt to create social entrepreneurs. These actors included both local and national governments, social enterprise intermediaries, funders and investors, as well as practising and prospective social entrepreneurs. The material arrangements of forum activities and experiences provided a series of spaces within which certain rationalities could be expressed in social entrepreneurial discourses with the intention of promoting social entrepreneurial forms of subjectivity. This involved efforts to educate delegates about the practice of social entrepreneurship, as well as to and provide compelling reasons and inspiration for engaging in social entrepreneurial practice.

An important aspect of the forum, understood as a technology of government, was the collective mood the forum was situated and which surrounded and emerged from the forum. Collective affects – structures of feeling and affective atmospheres — are the broader affective situation within which the forum was staged, as well as the particular affects that circulated within the forum itself. These affects can be seen to contribute to increased capacities for social entrepreneurial action as a result of the forum. The forum was situated and operated within a structure of feeling. This structure of feeling served to orientate individuals towards social entrepreneurship as a practice and the forum as an important space for developing social entrepreneurship both collectively and individually. Within this structure of feeling, the forum was permeated by a series of overlapping affective atmospheres that shaped the feeling of the forum. The rest of this chapter will discuss this structure of feeling, whilst the subsequent chapter will address affective atmospheres within the staging of the forum.

4.3 Structures of Feeling in Pre- and Post-Forum Promotional Material

This section will discuss pre- and post-forum promotional material in order to identify and situate the forum within a broader collective mood or structure of feeling. Pre- and post-forum promotional materials are significant here because they provide an insight into the affective 'situation' (Anderson 2016, 193, citing Stewart 2007) of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand leading up to, and emerging out of, the forum. The affective context within which the forum was situated represents an important background element, it was part of the conditions within which the forum was staged and through which the forum was lived. Pre- and post-forum promotional material also directs attention to how affects worked through the forum to form social entrepreneurial subjects and increased capacities for social entrepreneurial action. My argument in this section is that pre- and post-forum promotional materials provide an insight into a hopeful structure of feeling that exists in relation to the social enterprise sector in New Zealand.

The hopeful structure of feeling identified here represents a collective mood based in a particular relationship between social entrepreneurship and ideas of the future. Hope can be defined here as a relation to the future marked by possibility (Anderson 2006, 2014). As Anderson (2006, 733) argues, the circulation and distribution of hope 'animates and dampens social-cultural life across numerous scales [including] larger scale flows of hope that enact various collectivities.' The emergent social enterprise sector represents one such space marked by a circulation of hope. Within this hopeful structure of feeling, hinted at in pre-forum promotional material, social entrepreneurship represents a practice through which alternative possibilities for the future can be constructed. This hopefulness intensified around the forum as a specific space, one through which the potential for social entrepreneurship

as a future-orientated project could be realised through the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The hopeful structure of feeling served to orientate actors towards the forum as an important space for developing the social enterprise sector and individual capacities for social entrepreneurial action.

Within pre-forum promotional material social entrepreneurship was presented as an emerging way of doing business, or as a new business rationality. A social enterprise was defined by then Ākina CEO Alex Hannant, speaking to *The Spinoff* for a promotional article produced in the lead up to the forum, as a ‘purpose-driven organisation that trades to deliver social and environmental impact’ (Hannant 2017b). The factor that made the sector unique for Hannant was an ‘unwillingness to make trade-offs between social [...] and economic goals’ (Hannant 2017b). In the lead up to the forum social entrepreneurship was represented as a ‘fundamental transformation’ of traditional approaches to business by Rob Wise, an Australia-based social entrepreneur featured, again, in *The Spinoff* (Crockford 2017). Since the emergence of the sector in the period since the 1990s, social entrepreneurship has become an ‘increasingly important place for successful entrepreneurs to find greater fulfilment in their work’, as well as ‘consumers look for greater meaning in their purchases’ (Hannant 2017b). As a rationality then, the concept of social entrepreneurship offers entrepreneurship as a method for solving social and environmental problems through commercial methods.

An important theme within this rationality is the convergence of social and economic incentives. One example of this was provided in the lead up to the forum during a panel discussion hosted by *The Spinoff*. The discussion featured field leaders in the New Zealand social enterprise sector, such as Michelle Sharp, the CEO of a Christchurch employment-based social enterprise, who stated that: ‘it’s not “or”, it’s

“and” (Wilson et al. 2017 quoting Michelle Sharp). That is, commercial and economic incentives operating together, facilitating the pursuit of social impact through the use of commercial methods. The idea of convergence extends to the argument that both traditional non-profit and business sectors are moving towards social entrepreneurship as a way of combining commercial methods with the aim of addressing social and environmental problems (Wilson et al. 2017). The Government’s Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance, in their 2016 report concerning the development of the sector, identified social enterprises as emerging both from community organisations aiming to create local change and employment opportunities, as well as ‘business minded entrepreneurs’ aiming to solve social and environmental problems ‘in innovative ways while seeking trading success’ (Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance 2016, 5). Social entrepreneurship was, then, presented as a significant practice within the broader economy for a number of actors.

Expressed as a rationality, social entrepreneurship can be understood as entailing a specific vision of the world — one where social and commercial incentives work towards a common goal. This rationality is expressed in the shared vocabulary of social entrepreneurship. Values, partnership, purpose, and impact, among other catchphrases, outline the contours of the sector and actors within it. The use of the terms social enterprise, social entrepreneurship, and the figure of the social entrepreneur, have only recently emerged within wider public consciousness in New Zealand. The result of this, as reported through an overview of the New Zealand social enterprise sector in the *Pioneers Post*, a United-Kingdom-based magazine and website partnered with the forum, has been a ‘catalysed coherence and unity in the “business for good’ community”’ (Rackham and Malandain 2017). The emergence of social entrepreneurship as a business rationality has opened up a space for

businesses and entrepreneurs to operate in — the social enterprise sector. The sector was not promoted as a strictly as a new phenomenon, rather, the conceptual language of social enterprise and social entrepreneurship has lent visibility to a sector that has 'been part of the fabric of our society and economy' (Clayton 2017 quoting Alex Hannant). The forum therefore took place at a time when the language of social entrepreneurship was growing in New Zealand.

With the emergence of the language of social entrepreneurship, the New Zealand social enterprise sector was highlighted as having undergone significant growth in New Zealand. The New Zealand sector has been regarded as underdeveloped, particularly when compared with similar countries such as Scotland (Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance 2016, Grant 2008, Kaplan 2013). The growth of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand was therefore emphasised throughout pre-forum promotional material. For example, in 2016 the Government's Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance (2016, 4) argued that 'interest in social enterprise is burgeoning in New Zealand, with a raft of new ventures emerging and increasing numbers of initiatives to support market growth.' As an indication of these numbers, Ākina, the hosts of the forum, provided intermediary business support services to more than 700 social enterprise organisations over the 2016/17 financial year (Crockford 2017). In the context of rapid growth, social entrepreneurship in New Zealand was represented as a significant opportunity in the lead up to the forum.

This sense of opportunity highlights how the social enterprise sector exists alongside, and emerges from within, a hopeful structure of feeling. As Rackham and Malandain (2017) argue in their summary of social entrepreneurship in New Zealand: 'social, commercial and government sectors are all beginning to identify social

enterprise as the mechanism best equipped to respond to many of the trials we face today.’ In the lead up to the forum social entrepreneurship was represented as a practice to which hope regarding the future could be attached. In the year before the forum the government identified social entrepreneurship as a possible way of addressing a number of policy issues, such as regional and Māori economic development, as well as public service delivery (Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance 2016, 11-12). For journalist Simon Wilson (2017), hosting *The Spinoff’s* panel discussion, social entrepreneurship represented an ‘important signal for the direction of our economy’ as businesses become ‘key parts of solutions to things like poverty and climate change’ . The social enterprise sector was represented as a collective source of hope, through which various desires for addressing social and environmental issues could be channelled into social entrepreneurial action.

The hopeful collective mood may be seen as one contributing factor orientating individuals towards the pursuit of social entrepreneurship, and towards the forum itself as an important event for the social enterprise sector. Structures of feeling represent affective qualities that link multiple spaces and practices, as well as producing collective dispositions to the world (Anderson 2014). Pre-forum promotional material hints at how, in the context of rapid growth, a diverse range of actors, including entrepreneurs, intermediaries, investors and the government, have gathered around social entrepreneurship as a practice. This is only a hint because a collective affect like a structure of feeling cannot be reduced to representation. Representation in promotional material was here, however, an important form of mediation through which hope was generated and circulated around social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. This hopeful structure of feeling represents one way through which a dispersed collective, such as the social enterprise sector, ‘comes to have some form of

coherence' (Anderson 2014, 119). From this perspective, hope existed and exists across various sites of social entrepreneurship linking them together in relation to social entrepreneurship as a project for social change. These might include local social enterprises, co-working, intermediary and investment spaces, as well as the spaces of local and central government that work with the sector. This hopeful structure of feeling represented, then, part of the broader context within which the forum was situated.

Through pre-forum promotional material this hopeful structure of feeling became intensified around the forum itself, and around Christchurch as the host city. This highlights how affects worked through the forum to promote social entrepreneurial subject formation. As Anderson (2015, 14) argues, structures of feeling may 'intensify' around particular spaces or objects and, through this intensification, pull people into the orbit of specific forms of reason or rationalities (Anderson 2015, 14). In the case of the forum this was a social entrepreneurial rationality where business and commercial methods are combined with social values and purpose in order to address social and environmental issues. The forum was argued by Alex Hannant (2017b) to be a 'transformative force' for social enterprise and 'a catalyst for sector development' in a number of ways — through drawing attention to the sector, creating connections during the forum, or constructing a legacy that persists after the forum. Similarly, Simon Wilson, hosting the panel discussion mentioned previously, argued that the forum 'has a powerful track record of launching significant growth for the social enterprise sector' (Wilson et al. 2017). In the context of hope permeating the sector, then, the forum represented a hopeful series of spaces. Within this space, social entrepreneurship could be promoted and actualised as a method for creating social change.

The intensification of hope within and through the forum was demonstrated in pre-forum promotional material through the focus on the staging of the forum across central Christchurch. The choice of Christchurch was significant given that the city has been going through a period of reconstruction after a series of earthquakes between 2010 and 2011. The forum was one of the first large international events held in the city since the earthquakes. As outlined by the forum organisers, Christchurch is 'a city reconstructing itself on every level and it has become an international model of community resilience and innovation – characteristics at the heart of social enterprise' (Ākina Foundation 2017d). Christchurch was represented here as an important environment for innovation in the wake of the earthquakes, an event that catalysed the development of social entrepreneurship in the city (Rackham and Malandain 2017). The city's experience was argued to have 'fostered community resilience and resulted in an infectious culture of community connection, radical ingenuity and determination to build a society equipped to solve environmental, social and economic challenges' (Rackham and Malandain 2017). Christchurch therefore represented a space through which the capacity for social entrepreneurship to generate social change could be demonstrated.

The forum came together, then, as a series of actors and materials assembled in central Christchurch to discuss and promote social entrepreneurship within a hopeful structure of feeling. This structure of feeling intensified around Christchurch as a specific hopeful space within which the development of the social enterprise sector and new possibilities for the future could occur. At the beginning of the forum it was argued by one speaker that Christchurch was a 'city of opportunity [...] a place where anything is possible.' Further emphasising the significance of 'possibility, place and purpose', Christchurch was, the speaker continued, 'proud this week to be the

global capital of social enterprise'. The hopeful structure of feeling was, then, significant as part of the conditions within which the forum was staged as social entrepreneurship emerged as a collective source of hope. It also highlighted how affects intensified around and worked through the forum to promote social entrepreneurial subject formation.

Post-forum materials show how the hopeful structure of feeling highlighted in pre-forum promotion intensified around the forum and was translated into collectively and individually enhanced capacities for social entrepreneurial action. This material was focused on demonstrating the impacts and outcomes of the forum. In their post-forum report, Ākina (2017c) outlined next steps for the development of the sector emerging out for the forum. A range of key themes emerged from the forum as areas of focus, three examples are education, networking and policy. Education involved attention to the development of social entrepreneurship in schools and increasing public and media awareness of social enterprise opportunities, whilst developing networking and collaboration within the sector was highlighted in efforts to develop a national social enterprise network and local or regional hubs (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 32-33). Alex Hannant, writing in *The Spinoff* after the forum, expected to 'see social enterprise "Hubs" popping up across the country, and an increasing array of financial funds, products and facilities specifically designed to serve social enterprises and unlock impact alongside financial returns' (Hannant 2017a). Finally, emerging from policy dialogues, and the engagement with government in the forum, was a focus on reaffirming and developing central government support, and enhancing support through local government (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 32-33).

The forum also solidified the hopeful structure of feeling surrounding social entrepreneurship in New Zealand. One important theme in post-forum promotional

material was a collective confidence among actors in the sector as a result of the event. Alongside the technical aspects of sector the development such as impact funds and networks, the forum also created 'a more subtle benefit in terms of confidence and validation' (Hannant 2017a). In their post-forum report Ākina argued that the design and staging of the event resulted in 'many of our social enterprises finding solidarity at the event and growing a sense of shared purpose which will be a key ingredient to increasing the scale and ambition of our sector' (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 3). Reflecting on the forum, Alex Hannant (2017a) did not think that anyone working in the sector prior to the forum 'realised how many other people were doing the same' and that 'bringing people together who share similar ambitions, experiences, and expertise created instant value' for the sector. The forum was here framed as a sector-building event out of which the New Zealand social enterprise sector, and individual social entrepreneurs, would continue to develop. The hopeful collective mood within which the forum was situated, then, was translated into an increased confidence sector as a result of the forum.

The increasing confidence of social entrepreneurs represented an affective expression emerging from the staging of the forum. This confidence can be interpreted as a result of increasing collective and individual capacities for social entrepreneurial action as a result of the forum. An important aspect of this emerging confidence was the translation of the hopeful structure of feeling within the atmosphere of the forum. The 'buzzing vibe and the family feel' (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 27) of the forum was an important aspect of this increase in confidence. 56 percent of delegates surveyed highlighted a 'renewed energy', 'fresh inspiration', or 'new ideas' emerging from their experiences of the forum (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 30). The Transitional city stream in and around Christchurch was highlighted as a success in this regard, contributing

'a vibe which got released at the beginning of the week and grew exponentially through the week as people made further connections' (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 32). Within and through these atmospheres social entrepreneurship became a lived reality for individuals. Hope here worked through the forum to increase individuals' capacities for social entrepreneurial action, and, therefore, contributed to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects.

Representations of delegates' forum experiences were another important theme of post-forum promotional material and highlight how the forum operated as a space within which the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects occurred. The atmosphere or 'buzz' of the forum was an important aspect of these representations. So, for example, one delegate quoted in Ākina's post-forum report stated that 'the buzz [the forum organisers] created is sounding-out loud and clear around the world as participants travel home', while another declared themselves to be 'empowered by a new kind of rocket fuel!' (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 42). The *Pioneers Post* (Ingram 2017) interviewed a series of delegates during the forum in order to find out what inspiration and lessons delegates were taking from the forum. These interviews highlighted the atmosphere of the forum. One delegate stated that the atmosphere of the forum was 'very friendly' and emphasised the 'grassroots' quality of the forum, demonstrated in, for example, the informal lunches provided by local social enterprises and the opportunity to connect with a range of different people (Ingram 2017). Through post-forum promotional material, the forum was highlighted as a space marked by specific affective atmospheres.

Experiences of personal development and inspiration provided an example of how the forum operated as a motivational space through which individuals could be encouraged to pursue social entrepreneurship. One young student delegate, writing

after the forum, for example, stated that 'being surrounded by people from all over the world who are business-oriented in a way that is for benefit of something bigger than themselves gives me true hope for the future' (McNoe 2017). Continuing, they added that '[w]e have such an opportunity to change the world' — a fact that was demonstrated as various actors came together in the forum (McNoe 2017). Another delegate felt, as a result of the forum, 'validated by social enterprise, and [...] inspired and encouraged by hearing all the case studies. (Ingram 2017). The hopeful structure of feeling that intensified around the forum therefore orientated actors towards social entrepreneurship as a new way of creating social change, and emerged out of the forum as confidence and an increased capacity for action among social entrepreneurial subjects.

4.4 Conclusion

This chapter introduced the Social Enterprise World Forum as an important space for the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects and located the forum within a hopeful structure of feeling. I have framed the forum as technology of government within which various actors aimed to promote the growth of the social enterprise sector through creating social entrepreneurial subjects. The forum provided a series of spaces through which discourses expressing specific rationalities became tied to the material arrangements of spaces and actors. I then situated the forum within a hopeful structure of feeling through a reading of pre- and post-forum promotional material. Pre-forum promotional material highlighted social entrepreneurship as a new business rationality accompanied by the emergence of a shared language. Social entrepreneurship was here represented as a significant opportunity for New Zealand and a collective source of hope. The hopeful structure of feeling hinted at in pre-forum promotional materials

orientated individuals towards social entrepreneurship as a practice as well as the forum itself as an important event for the social enterprise sector.

The hopeful structure of feeling was intensified around the forum as a specific space. Within this space social entrepreneurship emerged as a compelling future-orientated project aimed at creating new possibilities for social change. After the forum, post-forum promotional material was focused on the ways in which this hopeful collective mood was translated into increased capacities for social entrepreneurial action. The confidence of the sector was increased through the forum whilst personal stories and inspiration drawn from the forum experience highlight the significance of the affective atmospheres. The hopeful structure of feeling I have identified can therefore be seen as part of the broader conditions within which the forum was situated as well as highlighting how affects worked through the forum to promote social entrepreneurial subject formation. Having situated the forum within a hopeful structure of feeling, in the next chapter shifts to a discussion the staging of the forum and the particular affective atmospheres that were generated and circulated within the forum.

Chapter 5: Affective Atmospheres at the Social Enterprise World Forum

5.1 Introduction

This chapter turns our attention to the staging of the Social Enterprise World Forum (SEWF). My aim here is to examine how the forum, conceptualised as a technology of government, worked to promote the creation of social entrepreneurial subjects. This was a process that occurred, in part, within and through the creation and circulation of affects within the spaces of the forum. Turning from structures of feeling to affective atmospheres, in this chapter I argue that the hopeful structure of feeling from the previous chapter permeated the forum as a series of overlapping affective atmospheres. These affective atmospheres represent modalities of hope, where hope was expressed in different ways and attached to different objects. The three atmosphere I focus on in this chapter are, first, an optimistic atmosphere, second an excited atmosphere, and third, an ambivalent atmosphere where hope emerges out of doubt. Through these overlapping atmospheres, hope, in various ways, became attached to social entrepreneurship. The attachment of hope to social entrepreneurship represents an important constitutive element in social entrepreneurial subject formation as it provides reasons for individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship as a practice.

The staging of the forum brought together a range of discourses, materials and actors within and through which atmospheres were generated and could circulate to affect delegates. The optimistic atmosphere of the forum emerged from, a focus on the capacities of values-driven individuals. Within this optimistic atmosphere values were offered as the foundation of social entrepreneurial practice. Discursive practices and the material arrangements of the forum promoted social entrepreneurship as a way of realising one's values. This involved an emphasis on the authenticity of these

values and encouraged a process of subjectivation through which individuals could develop a social entrepreneurial identity. An excited atmosphere was generated through the emphasis on networking, connecting and collaborating within forum spaces. The organisation of the forum facilitated networking opportunities between delegates, emphasising connection and collaboration as key aspects of social entrepreneurship and relating individual actors to a wider social entrepreneurship movement. Finally, an ambivalent atmosphere marked the encounter between social entrepreneurs and states within the forum. Within this atmosphere hope was attached to social entrepreneurship in the context of doubt regarding the potential for, and ability of, governments to solve social problems. Hope was here attached to the capacities of social entrepreneurs and the potential for government as a partner or enabler for these social entrepreneurs.

The chapter is structured as follows: in the first section I will outline the significance of values and purpose for social entrepreneurial identity within an optimistic atmosphere. In the second section I will focus on networking, connecting and collaborating as practices through which an excited atmosphere was generated. In the third section I will discuss the affective framing of the relationship between governments and social entrepreneurs. In the fourth section I will provide an extended conclusion to the chapter. Here I will draw the three affective atmospheres from previous sections together to argue that they are a constitutive element of social entrepreneurial subjectivity and one way through which the forum operated to create social entrepreneurial subjects.

5.2 Optimism, Values and Social Entrepreneurial Identity

Optimism was one important modality of hope within the forum. As one particular expression of hope, I take optimism to be a specific affective quality — confidence attached to the agency of actors regarding their ability to achieve goals. If hope represents a relation with the future marked by possibility, then optimism is a belief in the capacities of social entrepreneurial subjects to actualise their visions of the future. The staging of the forum was marked by an optimistic atmosphere within which a focus was placed on values as foundational aspects of social entrepreneurial identity. Discursive practices in plenary and mini-plenary presentations promoted social entrepreneurship as a way of realising one's values. This involved an emphasis on the authenticity of these values and encouraged a process of subjectivation through which individuals could develop a social entrepreneurial identity. The material arrangements of forum spaces beyond plenary also contributed to this atmosphere by promoting forms of social entrepreneurial identity and inspiring optimism through exposing delegates to social entrepreneurship as an immediate reality of bodily experience.

The overall theme of the forum was a significant tone setting device that contributed to the optimistic atmosphere of the forum. The theme was 'Ka korokī te manu - creating our tomorrow'. This was derived from a traditional Māori prayer about birdsong, described by the forum organisers as 'an invitation to create a global legacy of positive change' and a call to 'take an active role in prototyping the world's future' (Ākina Foundation 2017d). The theme of the forum provided an orientating point for much of the discussion and the overall experience of the forum spaces, it was also orientating in an affective sense as it set a 'tone' for the forum. Tone here is invoked in the sense in which Ben Anderson (2015, 11, citing Ngai 2005) uses the term – to describe how something possesses an 'affective bearing [...] towards its audience and

the world.’ Drawing from the theme of ‘creating our tomorrow’, the tone of the theme can be seen as optimistic. One way hope was generated and attached to social entrepreneurship within the forum was through the creation of an optimistic atmosphere regarding the potential for social entrepreneurs to actualise their visions of ‘tomorrow’ by engaging in values-driven social entrepreneurial practice to address social and environmental issues.

One explicit example of this optimistic atmosphere was provided in one of the first plenary presentations. This presentation aimed to ignite a ‘bit of a buzz and set a bit of a tone’ for the forum, as one speaker stated. An interactive poll was run during the presentation that asked people to respond to the question ‘how optimistic are you that social enterprise can change the world?’ Delegates responded by picking a number between one (not optimistic) and ten (very optimistic). By the end of the session over four hundred delegates had responded to the poll. 83 percent responded with a seven or higher, while 31 percent respond with a nine or ten at the most optimistic end of the scale. Just eight percent were lower than five, with nobody responding at the most pessimistic end. The poll likely represents a case of confirmation bias — those attending a social entrepreneurship forum were likely to be at least somewhat optimistic about social entrepreneurship. It does, however, demonstrate the optimistic tone of the forum regarding the capacity of social entrepreneurship to drive social change.

It was in the context of this optimistic atmosphere that forum spaces were focused on the subject of values and social entrepreneurial identity. An important practice for the promotion of social entrepreneurial identity within the forum was the staging of plenary and mini-plenary presentations. These were central features of the forum programme and offered delegates the chance to see field leaders discussing

social entrepreneurship. Plenary and mini-plenary presentations took place in the largest spaces on offer at the forum — two lecture halls with the capacity to seat hundreds. My argument here is that these presentations represent privileged and organised affective encounters through which speakers produced representations of social entrepreneurship imbued with affective significance. The visions of social entrepreneurship offered by speakers in such presentations therefore contributed to the optimistic atmosphere of the forum. These representations also contributed to the development of social entrepreneurial subjects through ‘organising grids of affective investments’ (Anderson 2014, 124, citing Grossberg 2010) in relation to the values that characterise social entrepreneurship. The authenticity of these values as an aspect of social entrepreneurial identity was one idea to which optimism for the sector was attached and which underpinned confidence in the belief that social entrepreneurial work could create a better tomorrow.

Values were offered in forum presentations as the foundations of social entrepreneurial subjectivity and action. Values represented an object of affective attachment as a guiding ethos for social entrepreneurial subjects. The focus on values within the forum offered an opportunity to reflect on the purpose and goals of social entrepreneurship beyond the purely rational-economic use of commercial methods of solve social problems. One speaker, summarising their experience of the forum, made the claim that ‘one of the things that has come out for me over the last couple of days is the focus on values [...] belonging, identity, values, being present’, all of which represented a part of ‘moving away from some of the technical conversations’. Presentations throughout the forum were thick with references to a range of values, including, but not limited to: partnership, respect, innovation, empowerment, quality, leadership, diversity, compassion, collaboration, empathy, love, humility, integrity and

care for the environment. These values were seen to represent the 'shared identity' of social entrepreneurship. They served to link individuals and other actors in the sector with a common understanding of the world that was grounded in a commitment to realising these values through the practice of social entrepreneurship.

The centrality of values represented the factor that sets social entrepreneurship apart from other forms of work. Values, one speaker argued, are what 'give us a competitive advantage'. Continuing, the speaker further argued that in the wake of the global financial crisis 'people [have been] recognising that they want to work for a values driven organisation', and with 'colleagues with intrinsic social values.' Social entrepreneurship was here framed as a way through which individuals can invest themselves in a practice, as part of a broader social entrepreneurship collective, which allows them to realise their values through their work. It offers more than a technical approach to problem solving, becoming a form of empowering action. In a separate presentation young people were represented as 'looking for purpose and meaning.' Social entrepreneurship was offered as a way of finding purpose through values-driven work where 'ethical meaning meets urgent action.' The potential for individuals to realise their values through social entrepreneurial work represented a potentially significant motivating force in the pursuit and development of a social entrepreneurial identity within the forum.

Values also featured as an area of ambiguity for social entrepreneurs. It was here that a process of subjectivation was emphasised for the construction of 'authentic' social entrepreneurial values. In one presentation the speaker asked the question of the audience: 'are we actively shaping the trends around us or pursuing individual passion paths?' The pursuit of individual goals was framed negatively against a

broader emphasis on the role and potential of social entrepreneurship to contribute to social change. In another presentation, the speaker asked the question:

Are we doing this for our own motivations or are we doing it to create a better society for all of us? We need to ask those sorts of questions of ourselves very deeply and honestly and then be a servant of others rather than a director of others.

This represents one moment where the ambiguous character of social entrepreneurial subjectivity was emphasised during the forum. The practice of social entrepreneurship here required individuals to combine their values with commercial business platforms. Within the discourses through which social entrepreneurship was constructed in the forum this was emphasised as a processes of subjectivation through which individuals could develop authentic values.

Representations of social entrepreneurship within the forum aimed at encouraging individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship through the development of authentic values. Social entrepreneurial action was here to be ‘anchored in self-belief and self-knowledge of our values.’ The authenticity of values was an object of knowledge, something that was to be investigated and developed by individual subjects. Attempts to encourage the development of authentic values represent one way in which the forum facilitated the development of social entrepreneurial subjects. In this sense social entrepreneurship can be understood as an ‘identitarian movement’ (Bandinelli 2017, 157) that relies on the subjectivation of individuals within spaces, encouraging them to embody and identify with the goals of social entrepreneurship — to solve social and environmental problems and change the world. The optimistic atmosphere of the forum can be seen to operate as an affective catalyst for this

process. The development and interrogation of one's values was the method through which confidence regarding the potential for social entrepreneurship as a way of creating new possibilities for the future was generated. The authenticity of these values was one idea to which hope for the sector was attached and which underpinned confidence in the belief that social entrepreneurial work could create a better tomorrow. The hopeful collective mood present within the social enterprise sector was here expressed as optimism within the spaces of the forum.

The optimistic atmosphere of the forum also extended beyond presentations to the wider material arrangements of forum. Promotional materials available throughout the forum are one example here and demonstrate how confidence was located within forms of social entrepreneurial identity within the wider forum. One demonstration of this was a space outside the lecture halls where people were able to mingle between sessions. Within this space a number of tables were arranged where over the duration of the forum, social enterprises, intermediary and educational organisations provided educational and promotional materials. One intermediary organisation had a large display that invited delegates to take pictures of themselves and answer the question 'which type of social entrepreneur are you?' Delegates then selected their entrepreneurial profile from a range of ideal types such as 'the innovator' ('people value you for your brains and ideas'), 'the connector' ('you are pro at building relationships for yourself and between others'), or the 'wantrepreneur' ('you fantasize about becoming a social entrepreneur yourself, but you haven't found either the right skills, a passion, or idea, or solution that you can start to tackle!'). Delegates were encouraged to share their 'type' as a way of connecting with friends, in doing so constructing themselves as specific types of social entrepreneurs.

Finally, the material arrangements of the forum also contributed to this optimistic atmosphere through exposing delegates to social entrepreneurship as an immediate reality of bodily experience. Social procurement practices, for example, featured heavily within the forum. Lunches were provided by local social enterprises, while the programmes given to all delegates were made from recycled paper by a social enterprise (Ākina Foundation 2017d). 'Walking the talk' through an attention to social procurement was highlighted by delegates as one of the highlights of the forum (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 27). The Transitional city Stream also featured a range of tours were hosted that exposed delegates to social entrepreneurs operating in Christchurch (Ākina Foundation 2017c). Optimism here could be put on display and circulate through the forum by demonstrating the positive impacts of social entrepreneurship in the wake of the Christchurch earthquakes. These details highlight the ways in which the forum organisers created spaces designed to provide 'compelling visions of social entrepreneurship' (Mauksch 2017, 134) through demonstrating how social entrepreneurs realised their values in reality through social entrepreneurial practice. Through these materials and experiences social entrepreneurship, and social entrepreneurial identity, was translated from a topic of discussion into a material reality of the forum experience.

5.3 Excitement, Networking and Collaboration within the Forum

Excitement is the second modality of hope that can be identified in the staging of the forum. I take excitement to be a form of collective enthusiasm — the stirring, moving or agitating of individuals in relation to the possibilities of social entrepreneurship. This excited atmosphere emerged out of the staging of the forum through a focus on networking, collaborating and connecting. Excitement can be seen as generating hope in relation to the social enterprise sector as delegates connected with each other to

create a network of social entrepreneurs capable of creating social change. The material arrangements of the forum included specific spaces, both physical and digital, for networking and connecting. These practices were also an important element of discourse within forum presentations. The forum was offered as an important opportunity for networking and connecting and efforts to encourage conversation created encounters between delegates, exposing them to like-minded social entrepreneurs and the wider sector. Through such conversations, delegates were drawn into a process of subjectivation through the promotion of one's values and social entrepreneurial identity. Finally, the spatially and temporally limited staging of the forum was discursively related to a broader global social entrepreneurship movement. Networking, collaborating and connecting here represented methods through which individuals could enrol themselves in a movement larger than themselves.

Networking, connecting and collaborating was a constant focus in the forum and was practiced across various spaces. These included within different sessions, both plenary presentations and smaller participative session. Meetings were held over the lunches provided by local social enterprises, as well as beyond the specific limits of the forum spaces in the cafes and bars of central Christchurch. The forum, and the potential impacts of the forum on individual delegates, thus extended beyond the specific boundaries of forum spaces. There were, however, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, specific networking spaces provided within the forum. These were located in Christchurch's 'Innovation Precinct' and included co-working and incubation spaces where meeting rooms could be booked by delegates. The 'Kiwibank Mentor Bar' further provided an opportunity for connecting with technical experts for business advice. Discussing co-working spaces, Bandinelli (2017, 132) argues that such spaces operate with the goal of producing an 'ethos of collaboration' that is 'orientated towards

a community purpose'. This emphasis on collaboration was reflected in the discourses and spaces of the forum, and contributed to an excited atmosphere as individuals connected with each other and the wider social enterprise sector.

Another significant aspect of the material arrangements of the forum in relation to networking was the forum app. The SEWF 2017 app provided a dedicated digital space through which forum delegates could connect and communicate. The app design was guided by the desire for 'delegates to interact with each other more than [...] with their own devices' (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 19). It provided a forum programme, a method for addressing questions to speakers and an open feed for delegates to post information and communicate with each other. Posts on the app were primarily divided between personal declarations of individual inspiration drawn from the forum and posts for connecting with other delegates. Numerous posts were thus aimed at organising lunches or meetings through which ideas could be shared and developed. The app was well received by those who attended the forum, although it was intended to only be active for the duration of the event, it was kept active for use until the 2018 SEWF.

The emphasis networking, connecting and collaborating was then a key aspect of forum experience and contributed to an excited atmosphere within the forum. Excitement regarding social entrepreneurship was generated through the forum as it drew together various actors interested in social entrepreneurship and gave them the opportunity to connect with each other. The significance of these material arrangements and opportunities for networking was highlighted post-forum when 88 percent of surveyed delegates rated networking opportunities as 'excellent or good'. A further 56 percent of delegates rated 'connecting with like-minded entrepreneurs' as a highlight of the forum (Ākina Foundation 2017c, 30). These spaces, both physical

and digital, can be seen as one element within and through which an excited atmosphere was generated within the forum. They are significant given the social focus of social entrepreneurship, as one speaker argued, collaboration represents the default for social entrepreneurs: 'the starting point for a new economy and a new world.' For another, collaboration was a necessary element for 'redefining institutions, new ways of thinking and organising.' The staging of the forum therefore tied discursive emphases, such as collaboration, into the provision of specific spaces to facilitate networking and connecting.

Connecting and networking with other social entrepreneurs was an important focus of discourse within forum presentations. One example of this can be drawn from an early session in the forum. This session involved all delegates and operated as a goal setting platform for the forum that outlined collective outcomes and asked individuals to specify personal outcomes. The session began with the declaration that it was 'great to connect with so many change-makers in one place [marked by an] urgency for change'. The forum was framed as an opportunity to 'hear and get inspired by the stories of social entrepreneurs from all over the world' and to 'connect and network with social enterprise practitioners'. An important aspect of this was a focus on individual outcomes framed through the question, 'what do you want from the SEWF?' Delegates were argued to be 'all at different stages of our social enterprise journey in terms of making a difference'. The spaces of the forum provided a context where 'for the next three days, we are a part of each other's story'. Delegates were thus encouraged to see the forum as an opportunity through which to develop and expand their social entrepreneurship networks. This involved becoming a part of each other's stories while developing their own, and realising the potential of social

entrepreneurship through connecting with other like-minded individuals to create a collaborative network.

One example of delegates connecting with each other was the encouragement of conversation within plenary and mini-plenary presentations. These conversations represented individual encounters through which delegates could connect and discuss a social entrepreneurial approach to addressing social and environmental issues. The goal setting session mentioned previously provides an illustrative example here. The speaker declared that it was important to 'connect with the people around you', they continued:

Stand up, turn around and see if you can face people who are sitting down, who you haven't yet connected with. We're going to go for about five to six minutes, and what I want you to do [is] introduce yourself and where you're from, what solution do you want to be a part of, or describe why you're here, and exchange some details.

This small moment produced a prolonged period of discussion amongst the audience. After about five minutes the speaker attempted to continue with the session, however this proved difficult. The conversation amongst the audience continued on, despite the speaker's attempts to rein conversation in, as individuals made use of the networking opportunity. I take this small moment as one example of an excited atmosphere emerging from an arrangement of actors within the forum as they were brought into connection with each other. As a modality of hope, excitement was generated here within and through the interaction of delegates engaged in efforts to 'build an active network' in the social enterprise sector.

These periods of conversation during forum presentations also represent part of the broader process of subject formation. As individuals in these spaces were drawn into contact with each other, they were engaged in processes of subjectivation. Through such discussions they could shape and reaffirm themselves as social entrepreneurs, promoting their values and discussing the world through the lens of social entrepreneurship. My argument here, then, is that such moments of conversation involved an 'activation' of the delegates in attendance as social entrepreneurial subjects. This occurred in the most literal bodily sense as individuals stirred and gathered to discuss their experiences and knowledge of social entrepreneurship. Activation also occurred in the discursive sense as these discussions encouraged the promotion of one's values and social entrepreneurial identity. Moments such as these also operated as elements in processes of subjectivation as individuals reflected on their motivations and demonstrated their social entrepreneurial subjectivity amongst others. These conversations contributed to an excited atmosphere by activating the social enterprise 'movement' in the situated spaces of the forum.

A final aspect of networking, collaborating and connecting at the forum was the language of social entrepreneurship as a global movement. The global scale of the social entrepreneurship movement was highlighted on a number of occasions throughout the forum, One speaker, for example, argued that 'the World Forum' shows us that we are all indeed part of a world community of collaborators [...] all dedicated to harnessing the potential of this innovative way of doing business'. Similarly, another speaker believed that:

We are seeing a genuinely global movement emerge, and you my friends are the pioneers of this important movement [...] together we are

creating something that is so much bigger than the sum of our parts, we are at the brink of expanding this revolution, this social business revolution.

Although the forum was temporally and spatially limited, quotes such as these relate the forum to a broader global network of social entrepreneurs. The networking practices of the forum were, then, contextualised as one element of a larger collective through which social and environmental change could be created. In connecting and collaborating with other delegates, those in attendance at the forum could enrol themselves in this global movement.

The spaces of the forum were, then, marked by excitement emerging from the opportunity for networking and connecting with other social entrepreneurs that the forum presented. The excited atmosphere of the forum can be interpreted along lines similar to Bandinelli's (2017, 134) argument that social entrepreneurial spaces (in her case the intermediary Impact Hub) function based on the idea that by providing an opportunity for interaction between social entrepreneurs (and other actors), they link social entrepreneurs who want to solve social problems with the opportunity to do so. By facilitating interaction between actors in the social enterprise sector these spaces operate on the idea that individuals can translate their values, goals or ideas for social entrepreneurship into reality through developing appropriate connections with other actors in the sector (Bandinelli 2017, 134). The wider mood of hope, in this context, was reframed as excitement generated in the connections between individual social entrepreneurs, and within the wider social enterprise movement. Through providing specific spaces and encouraging networking opportunities, the forum organisers contributed to an atmosphere of excitement regarding the capacity for appropriately connected social entrepreneurs to generate social change.

5.4 Ambivalent Affective Framings of Government within the Forum

The ambivalent affective atmosphere that existed around the relationship between social entrepreneurship and governments was a final significant modality through which hope was expressed within the forum. The relationship between social entrepreneurship and governments was marked by an ambivalent affective atmosphere within which doubt and hope emerged and existed alongside each other. Within this atmosphere hope was attached to social entrepreneurship in the context of doubt regarding the potential for, and ability of, governments to solve social problems. Doubtful affective representations of government served to rationalise limitations on governmental action and opened a space of opportunity for social entrepreneurship. It was through this opportunity that hope circulated alongside doubt. Hope was attached to the capacities of social entrepreneurs and the potential for government as a partner or enabler for these social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship represented an opportunity for a new form of community empowerment, that which is enabled and facilitated by the state.

Both local and national governments were important actors at the forum. A range of presentations and other sessions addressed the role of governments in social entrepreneurship, and a number of policy makers and Ministers from around the world gave presentations. Alongside the core programme, the forum also included two 'policy dialogues' where government officials could come together to discuss social enterprise policy issues (Ākina Foundation 2017c). The forum thus represented an important encounter between the social enterprise sector, local, and national governments. Rather than analysing specific practices, in this section my focus is on the overall affective atmosphere of this encounter as one modality in which hope was generated and attached to social entrepreneurship within the forum. Affectively

imbued representations of the capacities of both governments and social entrepreneurs were a significant aspect of this encounter. Through the forum social entrepreneurship was promoted as an opportunity for a more flexible way of addressing social and environmental problems beyond the grasp of governments.

The overall relationship between government and social entrepreneurs was marked by an ambivalent affective atmosphere. On one side this was exemplified by doubtful representations of the potential for, and ability of, governments to solve social problems. A popular and often paraphrased argument was that, in the face of large and complex social and environmental issues, government 'can't do it all, the market won't do it [...] and charity is a band aid.' As a result of this 'we need a new way' of organising efforts to address these issues. In a separate presentation it was argued by another speaker that 'there is also no sense of [growing inequality] being tackled [...] outside of this room [...] we're are at a loss'. These quotes provide examples of how government was represented within the forum and highlight a degree of apprehension regarding the potential for, and ability of, governments to address social problems. The second speaker quoted above synthesised this doubt with the simultaneous location of the solution to inequality in the space of the forum, that is, in the social entrepreneurial capacities of forum delegates.

Representations of governmental action imbued with a doubtful affective bearing operated to rationalise the limitation of governmental action. Governments were framed as 'conservative' and 'risk averse' institutions constrained by a need for fiscal responsibility and accountability to the public. In the context of significant social change they were marked by an 'inability to keep up'. These discourses share a similarity with the advanced liberal rationalities of government that have served to problematise state based social provisioning over recent decades (Dey 2013). From

this perspective social entrepreneurship might be seen as one facet of emerging forms of government-at-a-distance, as a technology for governing social and environmental problems through the social entrepreneurial capacities of individuals. Social entrepreneurship operates as a concept or rationality through which, in areas where governments have been unable to address social problems, the entrepreneurial capacities of individuals provide a new source of hope. The significant point here is that rationalities of government, such as one that sees social entrepreneurship as a new method for social provisioning, emerge within ambivalent affective atmospheres, where hope emerges out of doubt and becomes attached to a new object such as social entrepreneurship.

Doubtful affects within forum spaces contributed towards opening up a space of opportunity for social entrepreneurs to operate within. Against risk averse governments that are slow to react to change, the social enterprise sector was positively regarded as being able to 'do things more creatively, more flexibly than public services'. As a result, social entrepreneurship was ascribed the capability to address issues in ways that governments could not. Social entrepreneurs and the organisations they run were deemed better able to 'work in areas where the public sector and the private sector are struggling to have any impact'. Elements of discourse such as this synthesise both state-failure and market failure based analyses of the emergence of social entrepreneurship, providing a rationalisation for individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship in order to address social problems. These doubtful representations of government did not circulate in the same affective sense as the 'state phobia' (Anderson 2015, 7, citing Foucault 2008) that accompanied the emergence of neoliberalism. Rather, they were generated and circulated in the context

of an affective ambivalence within which hope was attached to social entrepreneurship and the potential for government as a partner or enabler of social entrepreneurs.

Amidst these doubtful representations of government there were, however, moments of critique, when prevailing affective representations were challenged. One such moment was provided at the end of one mini-plenary presentation. A forum delegate using the forum app asked a question regarding the responsibility of governments to deliver social services – ‘is social enterprise just privatisation by stealth?’ This question is significant as it highlighted an alternative critical perspective regarding social entrepreneurship within the forum, it was also directed at a government representative. In response to the question, the speaker argued that social entrepreneurship is not privatisation by stealth, but rather that ‘an organisation that feels they are better at delivering a service should be given the opportunity to do that’. They further added that ‘in most cases those organisations can do better than what government can do.’ The response recontextualised the issue of privatisation as one of agency and choice for social entrepreneurs. Based on this interpretation, the response can be seen as an extension of doubt that further opens a space for social entrepreneurs to engage in social provisioning. What this moment highlights is that the affective representations and atmospheres these representations are part of are not monolithic and stable, rather they are open to be reconfigured and challenged as various actors encounter each other within affectively charged spaces.

Folded within this ambivalent atmosphere was hope in the potential for government as a partner and enabler of social entrepreneurship. One speaker helpfully summarised this perspective, arguing that governments across the world are ‘waking up to the potential of social enterprise to deliver more efficient and more effective public services [and] more inclusive economic development’. They continued

on, making two important points, first that 'governments have begun to reimagine the role they can play in directing the socially entrepreneurial spirit of existing communities', and second that 'creating an enabling environment to aid the talents, passions and commitments of social entrepreneurs [is] increasingly a priority for governments.' Within the forum, then, hope became attached to the potential for a productive relationship between social entrepreneurs and government. Through this relationship social entrepreneurship could operate as a tool for creating empowered communities. Within the ambivalent atmosphere towards government, as one modality of hope, the level of the local community emerged as an important level of social entrepreneurial intervention.

The interchangeable language of 'partnership' and 'enabling' was an important component through which hope could become attached to social entrepreneurship in the context of ambivalence towards government. The role of government within the forum was framed as one where governments operate as partners with social entrepreneurs, aiming to create an enabling environment or ecosystem for social entrepreneurial action. As one speaker put it, social entrepreneurs, the 'leaders in this room', will drive social change, however 'the important role that government plays in accelerating or hindering that growth is significant.' A key topic of the forum was 'how government as a partner to social enterprise can work with you, can collaborate with you, to build an effective ecosystem to support and enhance the growth of social enterprise.' Some examples of this focus on government as an active partner in the sector included such things as establishing a 'holistic ecosystem of support' for local social enterprise sectors and 'getting social enterprise education into schools'. The role of governments was framed within the forum as the promotion of the necessary conditions for social entrepreneurs to act.

In the context of a relationship where government is framed as partner and enabler, social entrepreneurship emerged as a new form of community empowerment. Another way of putting this might be to say that the 'strength of social enterprise is the power of communities', as one speaker argued. They continued by drawing attention to community empowerment, arguing that social entrepreneurship enables a situation in which communities can say, "we want to", "we can," as opposed to governments saying "you have to", "you must." Social entrepreneurship here was a method for empowering local communities, enabling them to address local social and environmental issues. The emphasis on community empowerment involved a focus on government action aimed at 'creating an institutional framework for the community'. Hope becomes attached to the community as a level of intervention through the identification of social entrepreneurship as a tool for creating empowered communities, one that is enabled through a constructive relationship with the state.

The emphasis on community empowerment through social entrepreneurship was, however, also subject to critical reflection within the forum. As one presenter argued, there is danger 'if we start saying the only way you can have an impact in the community is by selling the service directly to the recipient and being a social enterprise that makes money'. This line of thinking represented a rejection of the reduction of social entrepreneurship to providing for the needs of citizen-consumers as a form of government through community. Continuing the argument, the speaker stated that such an approach devalues 'the really important role of philanthropy and government and community organisations in the fabric of society [...] if we make it all about making money by doing good', adding that social enterprise '[can't be] "the sexy new thing"'. Critical narratives such as this one are important as they demonstrate how

the relationship between social entrepreneurs and the government across was contingent within the spaces of the forum.

5.5 Conclusion

Through the staging of the Social Enterprise World Forum, then, a series of affective atmospheres were generated and circulated around social entrepreneurship as a practice and the social enterprise sector more generally. The hopeful structure of feeling within which the forum was situated existed alongside a series of overlapping affective atmospheres. This chapter has identified three modalities of hope. Optimism, excitement, and ambivalence or doubt. These affects provided different modes through which hope could exist, be expressed and enhanced in relation to social entrepreneurship as a project for social change. Hope thus circulated around the forum and was attached to social entrepreneurship in a range of different ways. It is within and through these affective atmospheres that hope was intensified around the forum and worked through the forum to contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects.

The first modality of hope was an optimistic atmosphere. As one particular expression of hope, optimism represented a confidence attached to the agency of actors regarding their ability to achieve goals. Within this atmosphere, hope, as a relation to the future marked by possibility was attached to the potential for values-driven individuals to engage in social entrepreneurial work and realise their visions of tomorrow. Social entrepreneurship here represented a form of empowering action. Within the forum a focus was placed on values as foundational aspects of social entrepreneurial identity, the optimistic atmosphere of the forum encouraged a process of subjectivation through which individuals could develop this social entrepreneurial

identity. The material arrangements of the forum also contributed to this atmosphere by promoting forms of social entrepreneurial identity and exposing delegates to social entrepreneurship as an immediate reality of bodily experience.

The second modality of hope within the forum was an excited atmosphere. Excitement represented a form of collective enthusiasm through the stirring, moving or agitating of individuals in relation to the possibilities of social entrepreneurship at the forum. Within this excited atmosphere, hope was related to the interaction between social entrepreneurs and within a wider network of individuals in the social enterprise sector. Social entrepreneurship here extended beyond an individual pursuit to represent a collective movement through a focus on networking, collaborating and connecting. The staging of the forum offered an important opportunity for networking and connecting, whilst efforts to encourage conversation created encounters between delegates, exposing them to like-minded social entrepreneurs and the wider social enterprise sector. Through such conversations, delegates were drawn into a process of subjectivation through the promotion of one's values and social entrepreneurial identity. Networking, collaborating and connecting through the forum provided a method through which individuals could enrol themselves in a movement larger than themselves.

Finally, and in a slightly different sense, the ambivalent affective atmosphere that existed permeated the encounter between social entrepreneurship and governments at the forum was the third significant modality through which hope was expressed within the forum. Doubt and hope emerged and existed alongside each other within this atmosphere. Doubtful affective representations of the potential for, and ability of, governments to solve social problems served to rationalise limitations on governmental action and opened a space of opportunity for social

entrepreneurship. Within this atmosphere hope was attached to the capacities of social entrepreneurs at the level of the community and the potential for government as a partner or enabler for these social entrepreneurs.

The affective atmospheres of the forum represent an important aspect of the way in which the forum operated as a space for social entrepreneurial subject formation. As was highlighted in the previous chapter, emerging from the forum the hopeful structure of feeling was represented in personal stories of inspiration drawn from the experience of the forum. Affects thus worked through the spaces of the forum to increase the capacities of delegates for social entrepreneurial action. Returning to a question I posed in the second chapter — about how, within spaces of social entrepreneurship, individuals are motivated to act as social entrepreneurial subjects — one answer lies in the hopeful affective atmospheres that permeated the forum. It was within and through these modalities of hope, that I have identified here, that the intensification of hope around the forum emerged as increased collective and individual capacities for social entrepreneurial action out of the forum. Through these modalities, optimism, excitement and doubt, hope became attached to various objects, for example, the authentic values of social entrepreneurs or the networks of social entrepreneurs emerging from the chatter of conversation at the forum. From this perspective, the emergence and circulation of hope and related hopeful affects around the forum provides reasons for individuals to pursue social entrepreneurship as a practice.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

This thesis has examined how collective affects operated within and through the Social Enterprise World Forum to contribute to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The foundations for this argument were laid in the second chapter of the thesis with a discussion of the literature on social entrepreneurship and theoretical approaches to subject formation. Here I located this research within a post-structural approach to social entrepreneurship that aims to understand the ‘how’ of social entrepreneurship, that is, how, within spaces of social entrepreneurship, are individuals motivated to act as social entrepreneurial subjects? Based on this I outlined and argued for a theoretical approach to the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects that paid attention to the significance of collective affects as part of the conditions within and through which social entrepreneurship has emerged as a practice alongside and within the rationalities and technologies of the governmentality approaches to subject formation. An attention to collective affects as ‘structures of feeling and affective atmospheres highlighted the significance of educational and promotional spaces as one important set of spaces for social entrepreneurial subject formation.

In the third chapter I outlined the methodological approach utilised in this research. This chapter began with a discussion of methodological issues for studying affect, arguing for the need for an attention to processes of affective composition, that is, how specific affects work in specific contexts (Anderson 2016, Michels 2015). In order to examine the significance of affects as a constitutive element in the formation of social entrepreneurs I adopted a qualitative case study approach to studying the New Zealand social enterprise sector. The case study for this research was the 2017 Social Enterprise World Forum, which I studied through two forms of data collection,

observation through attendance at the forum and documentary data collection of pre- and post-forum promotional material. These sources of data were organised and analysed utilising a descriptive thematic analysis.

In the fourth and fifth chapters I discussed how the forum was situated within a hopeful structure of feeling through pre- and post-forum promotion, and how the staging of the forum generated and was permeated by a series of overlapping affective atmospheres. In this thesis I have framed the forum as a technology of government within which attempts were made by various actors to promote social entrepreneurship through the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. I subsequently argued that the Social Enterprise World Forum was situated within, and permeated by, a series of hopeful affects. It is part through these affects that the forum became an important space for the formation of social entrepreneurial subjects. The forum was situated within a hopeful structure of feeling through which social entrepreneurship became a source of collective hope for social change. This hopeful collective mood was experienced through the forum and attached to social entrepreneurship in various ways within and through the affective atmospheres of forum spaces. Optimism, excitement and doubt within the forum thus represented a series of overlapping affective atmospheres.

In summarising the thesis, it is necessary to highlight several limitations within this research. A first limitation is the focus on a single series of spaces. The forum represented a key event for the development of the social enterprise sector in New Zealand, however the approach to interpreting collective affects I adopted here could benefit from an expansion across other social entrepreneurial spaces. This would facilitate an understanding of the more mundane affective life of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs beyond the buzz of generated within large

events like the forum. A second, and somewhat related limitation is the fact that I only observed the forum as a silent participant. Being able to interact and document the experience of the forum more broadly, beyond documentary sources and my own observational notes, would represent an enriched source of data. This could yield new insights into the actual impacts of similar events and social entrepreneurial spaces as delegates move through them, building on the insights gathered here.

Despite these limitations, several key points can be drawn from this thesis. First, this thesis has demonstrated the importance of collective affects as part of the conditions for the emergence of new social formations such as the social enterprise sector. Collective affects, as structures of feeling, circulate and intensify around specific spaces. The Social Enterprise World Forum represents an example of this, as the hopeful structure of feeling hinted at in pre-forum promotional material intensified around both Christchurch, and the forum itself. The second significant point stemming from this research is the importance of hope as a relation to the future marked by possibility. Hope and hopefulness represent significant affects through which various discourses, materials, actors and affects become organised. The generation and circulation of hope, both in relation to social entrepreneurship, and more broadly, represents an important area of focus for studies of affect and subject formation.

Bibliography

- Ākina Foundation. 2017. *New Zealand to host Social Enterprise World Forum in 2017* 2015 [cited 8th August 2017]. Available from <http://akina.org.nz/news/new-zealand-to-host-social-enterprise-world-forum-in-2017/>.
- Ākina Foundation. 2017a [cited 19th January 2018]. Available from <http://akina.org.nz/>
- Ākina Foundation. 2017. *Our story* 2017b [cited 20th April 2017]. Available from <http://akina.org.nz/about/our-story/>.
- Ākina Foundation. 2017. *SEWF 2017 Final Report* 2017c [cited 19th December 2017]. Available from <https://www.sewf2017.org/images/docs/SEWF-2017-Final-Report.pdf>.
- Ākina Foundation. 2017d. *Social Enterprise World Forum 2017 Guidebook*.
- Ākina Foundation. 2017. *What is social enterprise?* 2017e [cited 14th April 2017]. Available from <http://akina.org.nz/about/our-story/what-is-social-enterprise/>.
- Anderson, Ben. 2006. "Becoming and being hopeful: towards a theory of affect." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 245 (5):733-752. doi: 10.1068/d393t.
- Anderson, Ben. 2009. "Affective atmospheres." *Emotion, Space and Society* no. 2 (2).
- Anderson, Ben. 2014. *Encountering Affect: Capacities, Apparatuses, Conditions*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Anderson, Ben. 2015. "Neoliberal affects." *Progress in Human Geography* no. 40 (6):1-20. doi: 10.1177/03091325156131167.
- Anderson, Ben. 2016. "Researching Affect and Emotion." In *Key Methods in Geography*, edited by Nicholas Clifford, Meghan Cope, Thomas Gillespie and Shaun French, 182-197. London: Sage.
- Bandinelli, Carolina. 2017. *Social Entrepreneurship: Sociality, Ethics and Politics*, Centre for Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths, University of London, London.
- Bandinelli, Carolina, and Arvidsson, Adam. 2012. "Brand Yourself a Changemaker!" *Journal of Macromarketing* no. 33 (1):67-71. doi: 10.1177/0276146712465186.

- Barnett, Clive. 2008. "Political affects in public space: normative blind-spots in non-representational ontologies." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* no. 33 (2):186-200. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2008.00298.x.
- Barry, Andrew, Osbourne, Thomas, and Rose, Nikolas. 1996. "Introduction." In *Foucault and Political Reason*, edited by Andrew Barry, Thomas Osbourne and Nikolas Rose. London: UCL Press.
- Baxter, Jamie. 2016. "Case Studies in Qualitative Research." In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, 313-333. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Beasley, Tina A. C., and Peters, Michael A. 2007. *Subjectivity and Truth: Foucault, Education, and the Culture of the Self*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Berlant, Lauren. 2011. *Cruel Optimism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Boddice, Rob. 2009. "Forgotten antecedents: entrepreneurship, ideology and history." In *An Introduction to Social Entrepreneurship: Voices, Preconditions, Contexts*, edited by Rafael Ziegler, 133-152. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bornstein, David. 2004. *How to Change the World: Social Entrepreneurs and the Power of New Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braun, Virginia, and Clarke, Victoria. 2006. "Using thematic analysis in psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* no. 3 (2):77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp0630a.
- Brown, Wendy. 2015. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books.
- Certo, Tervis S., and Miller, Toyah. 2008. "Social entrepreneurship: Key issues and concepts." *Business Horizons* no. 51 (4):267-271. doi: 10.1016/j.bushor.2008.02.009.
- Cho, Albert Hyunbae 2006. "Politics, Values and Social Entrepreneurship: A Critical Appraisal." In *Social Entrepreneurship*, edited by Johanna Mair, Jeffery Robinson and Kai Hockerts, 34-56. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Clayton, Rachel. 2017. *Social enterprise is fast becoming the new charity in New Zealand* 2017 [cited 20th April 2017]. Available from <https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/industries/88920668/social-enterprise-is-fast-becoming-the-new-charity-in-new-zealand>.

- Cockayne, Daniel G. 2015. "Entrepreneurial affect: Attachment to work practice in San Francisco's digital media sector." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 34 (3):456-473. doi: 10.1177/0263775815618399.
- Cook, Beth, Dodds, Chris, and Mitchell, William. 2003. "Social Entrepreneurship - False Premises and Dangerous Forebodings." *Australian Journal of Social Issues* no. 38 (1):57-72.
- Cope, Meghan. 2016. "Organizing and Analyzing Qualitative Data." In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, 373-393. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Craggs, Ruth, and Mahony, Martin. 2014. "The Geographies of the Conference: Knowledge, Performance and Protest." *Geography Compass* no. 8 (6):414-430.
- Cremonesi, Laura, Irrera, Orazio, Loernzini, Daniele, and Tazzioli, Martina. 2016. *Foucault and the Making of Subjects*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Crockford, Victoria. 2017. *Social enterprise: trendy movement or real change?* 2017 [cited 17th September 2017]. Available from <https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/16-09-2017/social-enterprise-trendy-movement-or-real-change/>.
- Cruikshank, Barbara. 1999. *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dacin, M. Tina, Dacin, Peter A., and Tracey, Paul. 2011. "Social Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Future Directiona." *Organization Science* no. 22 (5):1203-1213. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0620.
- Dart, Raymond. 2004. "The Legitimacy of Social Enterprise." *Nonprofit Management & Leadership* no. 14 (4):411-424.
- Dean, Mitchell. 1995. "Governing the unemployed self in an active society." *Economy and Society* no. 24 (4):559-583. doi: 10.1080/03085149500000025.
- Dean, Mitchell. 2010. *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- Dees, Gregory J. 2007. "Taking Social Entrepreneurship Seriously." *Society* no. 44 (3).
- Department of Internal Affairs. 2014. Government Position Statement on Social Enterprise.

- Dey, Pascal 2013. "Governing the social through 'social entrepreneurship': A Foucauldian view of 'the art of governing' in advanced liberalism." In *Social entrepreneurship and enterprise: Concepts in context*, edited by Heather Douglas and Suzanne Grant. Melbourne: Tilde University Press.
- Dey, Pascal, and Lehner, Othmar. 2017. "Registering Ideology in the Creation of Social Entrepreneurs: Intermediary Organizations, 'Ideal Subject' and the Promise of Enjoyment." *Journal of Business Ethics* no. 142 (4):753-767. doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3112-z.
- Dey, Pascal, and Steyaert, Chris. 2010. "The politics of narrating social entrepreneurship." *Journal of Enterprising Communities* no. 4 (1):85-108. doi: 10.1108/17506201011029528.
- Dey, Pascal, and Steyaert, Chris. 2012. "Social entrepreneurship: critique and the radical enactment of the social." *Social Enterprise Journal* no. 8 (2):90-107. doi: 10.1108/17508611211252828.
- Dey, Pascal, and Steyaert, Chris. 2016. "Rethinking the Space of Ethics in Social Entrepreneurship: Power, Subjectivity, and Practices of Freedom." *Journal of Business Ethics* no. 133 (4):627-641. doi: 10.1007/s10551-014-2450-y.
- Eikenberry, Angela M. 2009. "Refusing the Market: A Democratic Discourse for Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* no. 38 (4):582-596. doi: 10.1177/0899764009333686.
- Eikenberry, Angela M., and Kluver, Jodie Drapal. 2004. "The Marketization of the Nonprofit Sector: Civil Society at Risk?" *Public Administration review* no. 64 (2):132-140.
- Epsing-Anderson, G. 1999. *Social foundations of postindustrial economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2000 [1982]. "The Subject and Power." In *Power*, edited by James D. Faubion, 326-348. New York: The New Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ganz, Marshall, Kay, Tamara, and Spicer, Jason. 2017. *Social Enterprise Is Not Social Change*. Stanford Social Innovation Review 2018 [cited March 27th 2017]. Available from https://ssir.org/articles/entry/social_enterprise_is_not_social_change.

- Garrow, Eve E. , and Hasenfeld, Yeheskel. 2014. "Social Enterprises as an Embodiment of a Neoliberal Welfare Logic." *American Behavioural Scientist* no. 58 (11):1475-1493. doi: 10.1177/0002764214534674.
- Gerrard, Jessica. 2017. "Welfare rights, self-help and social enterprise: Unpicking neoliberalism's mess." *Journal of Sociology* no. 53 (1):47-62. doi: 10.1177/1440783315607388.
- Gordon, Colin. 1991. "Governmental rationality: an introduction." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller, 1-51. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Grant, Suzanne. 2008. "Contextualising social enterprise in New Zealand." *Social Enterprise Journal* no. 4 (1):9-23. doi: 10.1108/17508610810877704.
- Gray, Mel, Healy, Karen, and Crofts, Penny. 2003. "Social enterprise: is it the business of social work?" *Australian Social Work* no. 56 (2):141-154.
- Grossberg, Lawrence 2010. *Cultural Studies in the Future Tense*. London: Duke University Press.
- Hannant, Alex. 2017. *After SEWF: Where to next for social enterprise in NZ?* 2017a [cited 12th October 2017]. Available from <https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/09-10-2017/after-sewf-where-to-next-for-social-enterprise-in-nz/>.
- Hannant, Alex. 2017. *The rise of social enterprise in New Zealand* 2017b [cited 24th Spetember 2017]. Available from <https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/18-09-2017/social-enterprise-alex-hannant-2/>.
- Hervieux, Chantal , Gedajlovic, Eric , and Turcotte, Marie-France B. 2010. "The legitimization of social entrepreneurship." *Journal of Enterprising Communities* no. 4 (1):37-67. doi: 10.1108/17506201011029500.
- Hoffman, Lisa M., and St. John, Hope Reidun. 2017. ""Doing Good" Affect, Neoliberalism, and Responsibilization Among Volunteers in China and the United States." In *Assembling neoliberalism : expertise, practices, subjects*, edited by Vaughan Higgins and Wendy Larner, 243-262. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hudson, Ray. 2009. "Life on the edge: navigating the competitive tensions between the 'social' and the 'economic' in the economy and in its relations to the mainstream." *Journal of Economic Geography* no. 9 (4):493-510. doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbp005.

- Ingram, Rata. 2017. *SEWF 2017: what the delegates thought* 2017 [cited 8th October 2017]. Available from <https://www.pioneerspost.com/news-views/20171005/sewf-2017-what-the-delegates-thought>.
- Kaplan, Mary Jo. 2013. *Growing the Next Generation of Social Entrepreneurs and Start-ups in New Zealand*. Wellington: Fullbright New Zealand.
- Kearns, Robin A. 2016. "Placing Observation in the Research Toolkit." In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, 313-333. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Kraftl, Peter, and Horton, John. 2007. "'The health' event': Everyday, affective politics of participation." *Geoforum* no. 38 (5):1012-1027.
- Larner, Wendy. 1998. "Hitching a ride on the tiger's back: globalisation and spatial imaginaries in New Zealand." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* no. 16 (5):599-614. doi: 10.1068/d160599
- Larner, Wendy. 2000. "Neoliberalism: Policy, Ideology, Governmentality." *Studies in Political Economy* no. 63 (1):5-25. doi: 10.1080/19187033.2000.11675231.
- Larner, Wendy. 2014. "The Limits of Post-Politics: Rethinking Radical Social Enterprise." In *The Post-Political and Its Discontents: Spaces of Depoliticization, Spectres of Radical Politics* edited by Japhy Wilson and Erik Swyngedouw, 189-207. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Leys, Ruth. 2011. "The Turn to Affect: A Critique." *Critical Inquiry* no. 37 (3). doi: 10.1086/659353.
- Lorenzini, Daniele. 2016. "Foucault, Regimes of Truth and the Making of the Subject." In *Foucault and the Making of Subjects*, edited by Laura Cremonesi, Orazio Irrera, Daniele Loernzini and Martina Tazzioli. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Luke, Belinda, and Chu, Vien. 2013. "Social enterprise versus social entrepreneurship: An examination of the 'why' and 'how' in pursuing social change." *International Small Business Journal* no. 31 (7):764-784. doi: 10.1177/0266242612462598.
- Massumi, Brian. 2002. *Parables for the Virtual: Movements, Affect, Sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mauksch, Stefanie. 2017. "Managing the dance of enchantment: An ethnography of social entrepreneurship events." *Organization* no. 24 (2):133-153. doi: 10.1177/1350508416644511.

- McNay, Lois. 1994. *Foucault: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Continuum.
- McNeill, Kellie, and Silseth, Line. 2015. "Growing pains: The fourth sector as a progressive alternative in New Zealand." *New Zealand Sociology* no. 30 (2):59-72.
- McNoe, Tori. 20th October. *Social Enterprise World Forum 2017*. 2017 201720th October]. Available from <http://www.canterbury.ac.nz/business/uce/news-/2017/social-enterprise-world-forum-2017-by-tori-mcnoe.html>.
- Michels, Christoph 2015. "Researching Affective Atmospheres." *Geographica Helvetica* no. 70 (4): 255-263. doi: 10.519/gh-70-255-2015.
- Miller, Peter, and Rose, Nikolas. 2008. *Governing the present : administering economic, social and personal life*. Edited by Nikolas Rose. Cambridge: Cambridge : Polity 2008.
- Nicholls, Alex, and Cho, Albert Hyunbae. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship: The Structuration of a Field." In *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*, edited by Alex Nicholls, 99-118. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parkinson, Caroline, and Howorth, Carole. 2008. "The language of social entrepreneurs." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* no. 20 (3):285-309. doi: 10.1080/08985620701800507.
- Pathak, Pathik. 2013. "From New Labour to New Conservatism: the changing dynamics of citizenship as self-government." *Citizenship Studies* no. 17 (1):61-75. doi: 10.1080/13621025.2012.716215.
- Pearce, John. 2003. *Social Enterprise in Anytown*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
- Penz, Otta, Sauer, Birgit, and Gaitsch, Myriam. 2017. "Post-bureaucratic encounters: Affective labour in public employment services." *Critical Social Policy* no. 37 (4):540-561. doi: 10.1177/0261018316681286.
- Perrini, Francesco, and Vurro, Clodia. 2006. "Social Entrepreneurship: Innovation and Social Change Across Theory and Practice." In *Social Entrepreneurship*, edited by Johanna Mair, Jeffery Robinson and Kai Hockerts, 57-85. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pile, Steve. 2010. "Emotions and affect in recent human geography." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* no. 35 (1):5-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00368.x

- Rackham, Islay, and Malandain, Helene. 2017. *Global Focus: New Zealand* 2017 [cited 14th October 2017]. Available from <https://www.pioneerspost.com/news-views/20170725/global-focus-new-zealand>.
- Raco, Mike. 2003. "Governmentality, subject-building, and discourses and practices of devolution in the UK." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* no. 28:75-95.
- Rose-Redwood, Reuben S. 2006. "Governmentality, geography, and the geo-coded world." *Progress in Human Geography* no. 30 (4):469-486. doi: 10.1191/0309132506ph6190a.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1999. *Powers of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, Nikolas, O'Malley, Pat, and Valverde, Mariana. 2006. "Governmentality." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* no. 2:83-104.
- Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky 2003. *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sievers, Silla Marie Mørch. 2016. "Fragile heterotopias – a case study of a Danish social enterprise." *Community Development Journal* no. 51 (1):77-94. doi: 10.1093/cdj/bsv064.
- Stewart, Kathleen. 2007. *Ordinary Affects*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Strategic Group on Social Enterprise and Social Finance. 2016. *Social Enterprise and Social Finance: A Path to Growth*. edited by Department of Internal Affairs. Wellington.
- Taylor, Liz. 2016. "Case Study Methodology." In *Key Methods in Geography*, edited by Nicholas Clifford, Meghan Cope, Thomas Gillespie and Shaun French, 581-595. London: Sage.
- Teasdale, Simon. 2011. "What's in a Name? Making Sense of Social Enterprise Discourses." *Public Policy and Administration* no. 27 (2):99-119. doi: 10.1177/0952076711401466.
- Thien, Deborah. 2005. "After or beyond feeling? A consideration of affect and emotion in geography." *Area* no. 37 (4):450-456. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4762.2005.00643a.x.
- Thrift, Nigel. 2004. "Intensities of Feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect." *Geografiska Annaler* no. 86 (1):57-78. doi: 10.1111/j.0435-3684.2004.00154.x

- Thrift, Nigel. 2008. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, politics, affect*. London: Routledge.
- Tyrrell, Naomi. 2016. "Making Use of Secondary Data." In *Key Methods in Geography*, edited by Nicholas Clifford, Meghan Cope, Thomas Gillespie and Shaun French, 519-520. London: Sage.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: Sage.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2013. "Affect and discourse - What's the problem? From affect as excess to affective/discursive practice." *Subjectivity* no. 6 (4):349-368. doi: 10.1057/sub.2013.13.
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2015. "Trends in the Turn to Affect: A Social Psychological Critique." *Body and Society* no. 21 (2):139-166. doi: 10.1177/135703X14539020.
- Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, Simon, Hannant, Alex, King, Lisa, Sharp, Michelle, and Wells, Nick. 2017. *Social enterprise: the future of capitalism?* 2017 [cited 30th September 2017]. Available from <https://thespinoff.co.nz/business/29-09-2017/social-enterprise-the-future-of-the-capitalism/>.
- Winchester, Hilary P. M. , and Rofe, Matthew W. 2016. "Qualitative Research and Its Place in Human Geography." In *Qualitative Research Methods in Human Geography*, edited by Iain Hay, 3-28. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Zahra, Shaker A. , Gedajlovic, Eric, Neubaum, Donald O., and Shulman, Joel M. 2009. "A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges." *Journal of Business Venturing* no. 24 (5):519-532. doi: 10.1016/j.busvent.2008.04.007.