Work-In-Progress

Title:

How Activists and Target Organizations Collaborate in the Face of Emerging Contingencies

Setbacks and Inaction: Constraining or Enablers of Change?

Raymond Loohuis

r.p.a.loohuis@utwente.nl Netherlands University Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Ariane Von Raesfeld

a.m.vonraesfeldmeijer@utwente.nl Netherlands University Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Bart Hutschemaekers

barthutsch@gmail.com Netherlands University Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands

Aard Groen

a.j.groen@utwente.nl Netherlands University Twente, faculty Management & Governance

Abstract

In this paper, we attempt to examine the sources of agency of target organizations when engaged in collective change processes organized by activists concerned with environmental issues and sustainable development in the eastern part of the Netherlands. In combining social movement and institutional entrepreneurship literature, we examine why and how target organizations engage in collective action, change their practices, and adopt new ones in the pursuit of solving a common issue with the help of activists. We found that motivations and intentions to contribute to collective action were instrumental in the beginning of their participation. However, as the project evolves, intentions changed through a reorientation of existing practices and positions in the collective change process of target organizations. This shift was caused by inaction and other setbacks where target organizations and activists were exposed. These changes in turn, set in new practice development and organizational forms necessary to continue collective change. With these findings, we contribute to an understanding of network mobilization by showing the emergent and dynamic character of collective change and especially indicate setbacks and inaction as both constraining and necessary condition for change.

Key words: resource mobilization, activists, target organizations, motivations, change of agency, inaction, setbacks

Introduction

Since a few decades, environmental concerns about excessive use of natural resources, sustained agricultural development, seem to gain interests among policy makers and those who raise awareness and call for action. Such concerns are considered as common issues because of their public character. However, common issues are not exclusively the concern of governmental or institutional bodies. Activists too raise awareness for common issues and attempt to find solutions to solve them. Common issues are not objective phenomena, but are socially constructed meaning that different viewpoints towards a common issue may arise (Berger and Luckmann, 1967). One important task for activists is to objectify a common issue in such a way that it becomes salient for society, communities, policy makers, and business actors to help solving it. In doing so, activist engagement can be organized in so called non-governmental organizations (NGO's) like Greenpeace but also operate as 'modern environmental workers' organized in loosely structured networks (Ritvala and Salmi, 2010, Loohuis et al., 2011, Brito, 1999). These studies show that solving common issues requires resource mobilization in the context of heterogeneous networks consisting of public and private actors with a different motivations and interest (Loohuis et al., 2011, Araujo and Brito, 1997).

Especially social movement and institutional entrepreneurship literature have showed that collective change and emergence of new business practices and networks in markets concern multiple actors and interactions between them and which' s outcome cannot be accorded to a single change agent (Maguire et al., 2004, Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007). Social movement theory typically shows how so called "activist" engage in challenging existing practices and advocating new ones from "outside" the institutions they wish to change. In doing this institutional work, social movements apply framing strategies, construct identities, mobilize resources, and engage in changing the political current in favor of their cause (King and Pearce, 2010, Rao, 2009, Rao et al., 2000). As such, social movements can provide enabling conditions to embedded agents to diverge from existing structures in terms of providing them producer identities, regulatory structures, corporate and industry opportunities, and compelling reasons to participate (King, 2008, Rao et al., 2000). Because operating from "outside" the institutions they want to change, social movements are not affected with the institutional logics (DiMaggio, 1988) of the field that they wish to change and therefore seem to have more freedom to exert their agency but on the other hand, lack the resources, legitimacy and network position which embedded agents have.

It seems that there is a vast body of literature investigating the collective mobilization processes and the strategies deployed by activists to induce change. However, there is only a limited understanding of the motives and change initiatives of embedded actors and particularly target organizations to contribute to collective change when engaged by activists (Ritvala and Salmi, 2011, Dutton et al., 2001). Examining motives to participate and change processes from the perspective of target organizations during the interplay with activists might potentially enhance our understanding of how change in collective mobilization regarding a common issue comes about against the backdrop of contextual dynamics. For instance, drawing on stakeholder theory, Ritvala and Salmi (2011) have showed how this interplay comes about by investigating the motives of why firms engage in collective action and contribute to solve common issues. In their analysis, they identified factors such as network benefits, organizational issues (goals, values, and image), individual values and identity as important motivations. Next to that, they found that firm size, closeness of the

issue to the core business, individual's role and position, and economic and socio-political situation as important mediating factors. Earlier, Araujo and Brito (1997) demonstrated how motivations of actors to contribute to collective change take different forms over time and therefor are instantly subject of negotiations and alignment of interest. In their analysis, they found that mobilizing in networks is a matter of taking account for aligning the interest of target organization and channeling their agency towards a solution for the common issue. The purpose of this paper is to contribute to this relational perspective on network mobilizers and target firms engaged in joint resource mobilization processes

In doing so, we apply and combine social movement literature interested in the emergence of new market arrangements and organizational form (e.g. Sine and Lee, 2009, Swaminathan and Wade, 2001, Weber et al., 2008) and institutional entrepreneurship theory (e.g. Fligstein, 1997, Battilana et al., 2009). Social movement accounts for collective change processes conducted by social movements or activists as their representatives. Institutional entrepreneurship focuses on the agency of individual agents including the intentions to depart from existing structures (Fligstein, 1979, Greenwood and Hinings, 1996, Child et al., 2007). Combining both streams of literature enables us to examine the interplay between embedded target organizations as change agents, and activists from the perspective of collective as well as organizational change. The research question guiding our efforts is: How do activists engage target organizations in collective change processes, what makes these target organizations to participate, and what shapes the agency of target organizations?

We draw on an in depth case study investigating the collaboration between activists and target organizations in creating a sustainable market for biomass energy based on wood chips as fuel that can provide as alternative for traditional energy sources. As in almost every European country, finding sustainable solutions for energy consumption like windmills, biomass, solar, received priority by policy makers but countries vary in the way support is provided for entrepreneurial initiatives in that direction (Jacobsson and Bergek, 2004). We show in this context how activists concerned with sustainable use of energy collaborate with public agricultural associations responsible for maintenance of local coppices in a rather inert context. Our empirical data provided us the opportunity to examine in depth the change processes these agricultural associations have undergone by collaborative efforts of activists and because of reflections on their own position and practices. We explain the transition of how rather mundane agricultural associations engage in the process of change and adopting entrepreneurial practices, develop alternative organizational forms, and have the potential to develop themselves as institutional entrepreneurs.

With our paper, we hope to contribute to the literature on network mobilization in general (Mouzas and Naudé, 2007) and more specifically in the context of common issues (Ritvala and Salmi, 2010, Araujo and Brito, 1997, Ritvala and Salmi, 2011)
We structured this paper as follows: we first discuss theoretical background, then we introduce method and case, and finally address main finding and conclude our paper.

Theory

We base our approach on the social movement literature that focusses on: (1) how new market arrangements are created by efforts of social movements (King and Pearce, 2010, Weber et al., 2008) and (2) the efforts of social movements in mobilizing supportive resources

for entrepreneurs such as time, money, skills, effort, and knowledge (Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001). We further build our approach on social movement theory interested in the development of "green' markets and development of alternative organizational forms (Sine and Lee, 2009, Weber et al., 2008, Swaminathan and Wade, 2001). The implications of social movement efforts can be large. For instance, Sine & Lee (2009) demonstrate how social movements contribute to the emergence of entrepreneurial activities in the US wind energy market by constructing and propagating cognitive structures, norms, values, regulatory structures and a pre-existing social structure. They came to the conclusion that social movements can play a critical role in shaping entrepreneurial activities "*by challenging consumers' preferences and consumptions patterns, reframe marketing and distribution efforts, and alter the means by which goods and services are produced*" Sine & Lee (2009 p 124) Social movements thus can shape which opportunities are salient and support new types of entrepreneurial activities and organizational forms (Swaminathan and Wade, 2001). Social movements can also change taken-for-granted understandings and values of the material-resource environment and relationship towards actors. By resource environment is meant, moderating the effect of supply, demand, technology, and the industry's structure (Scott, Ruef, Mendel, & Caronna, 2006). Furthermore, Sine & Lee (2009) suggest that material-resource environment is socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) sensing that it provides opportunities for social movements to transform the current practices within the material-resource environment, that is the way use and production is regulated. This transformation process in turn, requires framing techniques and subsequent mobilizing (Snow, 2004). Others show how transformations of the resource-environment come into play in the context of sustainable agriculture and promoting of alternative consumption to promote health. Weber et al. (2008) for instance, showed how a grassroots coalition mobilized cultural codes that changed the value of grass-fed production from inferior compared to conventional corn or grain-fed cattle production methods to a premium priced niche product. Nevertheless, the establishment of such a niche required careful attention of social movement members to the target strategies used. In their study, they found that motivations of grass-fed rangers to contribute to change were not solely based on instrumental motivations such as expectations about financial gains. The observed that entering this alternative production method was more the result of sharing the cultural codes and the vocabulary provided by framing strategies of social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). These studies suggest that social movements seems to be capable of helping to develop alternative market arrangements by framing strategies, developing cultural codes, creating producer identities, and provide sufficient resources to support participating actors throughout several stages of the transition.

Whereas social movement theory emphasizes collective mobilization, institutional entrepreneurship tends to concentrate on specific agents (Fligstein, 1997) and the ability of these agents to disengage from "within" a social context and act to change it (i.e. Battilana et al., 2009, Dorado, 2005, Holm, 1995, Greenwood and Hinings, 1996). Disengagement from existing practices is a process that requires collaboration with allies to make change possible (Rao, 1998, Rao, 2009). Institutional entrepreneurs are defined as "change agents who, whether or not they initially intended to change their institutional environment, initiate, and actively participate in the implementation of, changes that diverge from existing institutions" (Battilana et al., 2009 p 70). However, change is not obvious because actors have difficulties in deviating from existing beliefs, practices, and actions. This relates to the paradox of embedded agency (Holm, 1995, Seo and Creed, 2002) which alludes to the tension between institutional determinism and agency (Battilana et al., 2009). Drawing on an institutional entrepreneurship perspective allows us to avoid over-voluntaristic and rational-actor accounts

regarding the motivations and benefit seeking behaviors of target organizations to contribute to collective change. Recent studies show that institutional change need not be based on awareness of actors that they are contributing to change or require purposeful developed strategies to sort effect. For instance, drawing on practice and institutional scholarship, (Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007) show that some actors can unintentionally depart from existing institutions and develop new practices. They conclude that new kinds of activities and new practice creation is an emergent and multilevel process, a notion that can also be found in the work of practice strategy scholars who argue that change is often the result of spontaneous en unintended consequences of human action (Chia and Holt, 2006, Schatzki, 1996). Others suggest that intentions of actors can evolve at different stages of the change process (Child et al., 2007). This suggests that motivations and the type of actions may be subject to chance, an observation also made by (Araujo and Brito, 1997) in their study of industrial actors fighting against the excessive port wine production in Portugal.
With these contributions to institutional entrepreneurship, we potentially enhance our understanding of how target organizations engage in collective change suggesting that contributions can be unintentional or that intentions may vary in different stages and sets in different forms of agency during collective change processes and engagement with activists.

To answer our research question, we particularly focus on the following activities of social movements (activists). First we focus on how issues are framed, that is the efforts of activists to objectify a common issue in such a way that they help develop a vision for target organizations to contribute to change. Second, shaping producer identities, that is the efforts of activists to shape embedded actors' identity and legitimacy as a change agent with practical solutions to solve a common issue towards other actors. The third focus is on transforming the meaning of the resource- environment. By this we mean the efforts of social movements to change the existing patterns and interactions necessary to maintaining existing users and producer interfaces. The fourth on relates to providing hands- on support to target organizations by activists, that is, providing resources like funding, knowledge, and network connections that help changing the orientations and practices of target organizations.
In examining the changes of target organizations, we especially focus on change caused by collaboration with activists and their response to the contingencies of that moment.

Methods

We draw on a single case study. Case studies provide a unique means for developing theory by utilizing in-depth insights of empirical phenomena, in their contexts (Dubois & Gadde, 2002; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Our empirical study draws on a longitudinal, single case study that concentrates on the collaboration between activists, concerned with the preservation of unique landscape elements by promoting sustainable energy, and three agricultural associations concerned to maintain local landscape elements consisting of large amounts of coppices in a region located in the eastern part of the Netherlands. This region, called the "Achterhoek", is a rural area characterized by its richness of coppices and hedgerows, which constitute unique landscape elements; they are culturally important to this region and the Netherlands as a whole.

The key representatives of social movements in our case are two activists who are temporary members of a cross-border project. This project was established and funded by INTEREG-A, a European initiative established to promote collaboration between European

countries with a common border. The project is called "Energiequelle-Wallhecke/Stoken op Streekhout" (See http://www.energiequelle-wallhecke.de/nl/start). It was set up in September 2009. The role of these activists is to promote sustainable growth in the region by using regional natural resources (wood chips as biomass) as an alternative to traditional energy sources. One of the aims is to develop relationships between communities and possible market parties engaged in the development of a sustainable market for biomass.

The key embedded actors in our case are three agricultural associations. These associations are non-commercial and are responsible for the condition of the unique cultural landscape elements. Agricultural associations are appointed by the local communities to take responsibility for the landscape and to organize landscaping activities. In total, there are seven agricultural associations in this region and each association is funded by government and European community subsidies. Altogether, with 2000 members (mostly farmers), these associations maintain 27 % of the regional coppices and hedgerows. Despite their important role in the region, due to budget cuts these associations are increasingly exploiting the residues from landscape maintenance activities to cover the costs of operations.

Our involvement in this collaboration started in August 2009 and is still ongoing. We used several data collection techniques. The main source of data was in depth- interviews used to gain in-depth insights and to interpret our impressions. We interviewed spokespersons for the three agricultural associations, the CEO of their umbrella organization, local policy makers, and the two environmentalists during the course of our involvement. Each interview took approximately 1, 5 hour. We audiotaped and transcribed each interview verbatim. In addition we studied documents such as project agendas and action lists, minutes of monthly meetings of agricultural organizations and minutes of meetings between members of the agricultural associations and activists. Furthermore, we attended several regular meetings of the agricultural organizations and a symposium organized by the environmentalists and the three associations to promote their activities to the communities and policy makers. Finally, we had two feedback sessions with our informants to verify our interpretations.

We decomposed the data into three successive phases by following a temporal bracketing strategy (Langley, 1999). The decomposition of data into phases enables us to be explicit on how actions in one phase lead to changes in the context that affect actions in the subsequent period. Furthermore, decomposing data into phases enabled us to develop comparable units of analysis, which was helpful in making sense of each successive phase. In analyzing data for reach successive phase, we developed codes and sub-codes (see table 2) documented and structured with a software system called ATLAS.ti. 6.2.

Codes used for activities of activists	**Codes used for contextual factors such as contingencies and responses of local policy makers**	**Codes used for changes within target organizations**
Sub-codes: Framing activities (developing a cause) Developing producer identities (change identities of target organizations) Transforming resource	Sub-codes: Responses of political actors and communities Set backs	Sub-codes: Changing orientations Change of self-understanding (self-identity)

environment (changing patterns users/producers) Providing business support to target organizations (network access, knowledge)		

In the next section we describe how the interplay between activists and agricultural organizations results in the development of social entrepreneurship in a sequence of three successive phases. We start by describing the operating environment and the embeddedness of these agricultural associations prior to their engagement with environmentalists. In the second phase we describe how these associations start to collaborate with the environmentalists in an interregional project and how specific activities of these environmentalists helped the associations recognize and evaluate new opportunities. In the third phase we describe the conditions under which environmentalists and the associations amended their repertoire due to the resistance they encountered in their operating environment, and engaged in the development of social entrepreneurial practices.

Similar to (Ritvala and Salmi, 2011), we divided our case narrative in three phases of the resource mobilization process. In the first phase, we describe the emergence of an issue without any particular coordinated collective action. In the second phase, we describe how activities of activists come into play and how the agency of target organizations changed by the contingencies occurring at that moment and collaboration with activists in the project. In the third phase, we describe the changing orientations towards the future and the effects for new practice creation and the potential for entrepreneurial action by target organizations.

Phase 1: Emergence of an issue: local concerns and existing practices

An agricultural association normally consists of farmers and landowners with an interest in the preservation of the local natural environment and exploitation of landscape maintenance activities. Agricultural associations used to receive subsidies for their activities from the Dutch government and the European Union. Over the past few years, these money streams are shrinking, making it difficult for them to conduct their activities. Due to these changes in political regulations, some agricultural associations, as “t Onderholt” engaged in investigating for alternative solutions. In the period 2005 and the beginning of 2009 some small initiatives where developed by members of “t Onderholt” to exploit the waste from harvesting activities in an attempt to increase their economic independency. One idea was to sell wood chippings (plant and wood material) as biomass energy source to local users. However, wood chips are difficult to sell against a price that covers the cost of processing it. Besides that, biomass as energy source is rather unknown in this part of the region. There are only a few users and they are mostly farmers and members of agricultural associations who use this energy source for heating purposes in their farms. So, in that period, it never reached larger scale exploitation not only because of the lack of a market, but also because members of “t Onderholt” did not see themselves as market party with business principles deployed to professionally exploiting waste from of landscape activities. In addition, other agricultural organizations where seeking for alternative activities in order to become less independent

from government support. Nevertheless, they too consider themselves good preservers of the natural environment and not as commercial organizations.

As one member of an agricultural association said:

"As an agricultural association, we conduct landscape maintenance activities en we should not consider ourselves as energy providers"

Despite financial pressures and attempts to explore alternative solutions, these associations primarily believed that their role in the community is practicing good landscape activities at a local level to preserve the natural environment.

Phase 2: Engagement with activists: from local concerns to regional opportunities.

During 2009, a few environmental workers (henceforth, activists) with an interest in regional sustainable landscape development and sustainable use of energy, approached three agricultural organizations including "t Onderholt". The purpose was to interest them for participation in an interregional project. This project is called "Stoken op Streekhout", translated "Heating on local wood". These agricultural associations are of interest for activists because of the large contingents of coppices that these three associations maintain together. In the face of decreasing subsidies, all the three agricultural associations believed it might be an opportunity for them to participate in this project for two reasons. First, members of "t Onderholt" believed that participating in this project fits with their own philosophy of sustainable landscape development and conservation of biodiversity.

As the coordinator of "t Onderholt" remarks;

"*Yes, it was a good idea of Petra en Tony [the activists]. They told us to visit also other agricultural organizations in the region that play with similar ideas in seeking alternative solutions"*

He further remarks that at that time also local authorities where enthusiastic:

"The local authorities immediately respond positive to their initiative because it appealed to them to have a possibility to use regional energy sources in a climate neutral way"

The second reason was to participate was that they now could potentially have a solution to exploit the waste at a regional level, which expand their scope of possibilities and become less dependent on state subsidies.

As a member of one of the three agricultural organizations remarks:

"Today, we exist because of the subsidies we receive for doing maintenance activities and that's the reason why we contribute, we are keen to increase the economic value of the landscape"

A benefit for them was that, as a member of the project, they received money for research and hours spend on the project for the coming years. The other agricultural associations joined this regional project for the same reasons as they are where all looking for continuation of their existing activities.

Picture 1. Project start in 2009.

Between 2009 and 2011, the activists and members of the three agricultural organizations engaged in studies about the potential for material biomass in their region. They conducted research on investments and costs comparisons to competitive energy sources like natural gas, costs and possibilities of large-scale harvesting, quality issues, and potential amounts of biomass material. In addition, they started to engage in sharing knowledge and worked more closely together in coordinating their existing activities. They further learned from project members responsible for the German side of the interregional project, although they were working under different conditions. At the same time, the activists started to engage the communities and local authorities to raise attention for the project and requested their support for regulation and promotion of biomass as sustainable energy source. According to the activists, this was necessary to transform the resource-environment because communities and local authorities considered biomass material as garbage and not as valuable energy resource, yet. In an attempt to transform the identity of this waste, the activists and three associations, organized open-days on location at a few users of biomass to show interested people how the technology works. The efforts to build legitimacy for their project took the form of symposia where local and provincial authorities, technology producers, potential users, other agricultural organizations and members of their umbrella organizations, and other interested people where invited to discuss how a biomass market for their region could emerge and under what conditions. Nevertheless, in spite of these efforts, the project stalled in the subsequent months because no further commitments of business and political actors where given to the project.

Phase 3: Setbacks, reflections, and new practice development

In the period until January 2012, activists and members of the three agricultural organizations began to realize that it is difficult to engage other actors in developing a market for biomass energy. The project stalled.

Attempts to develop legitimacy and motivational frames were only partly successful. Changing the resource environment towards users and other parties was also complicated because of the rather unknown technology and absence of a recognizable market

infrastructure. Moreover, despite the proof of scientific reports and experiences in other countries such as Germany, people in the communities but also authorities considered wood chips as garbage instead of seeing it as a valuable energy source that contribute to a sustainable region. Nevertheless, local authorities said that were willing to support new initiatives, especially when they concern regional sustainable development in general but also see that there is much to do regarding regulation (licenses for technology proof and for storing biomass material), and promotion on a governmental level.

As one local policy maker remarked:

"We like to facilitate every initiative and have a positive stance. However, regarding biomass energy, we need good market regulations, which are simply not available right now. Of course, when we invest as pioneers in this technology for our community swimming pool and use local biomass material we can be an example for others and other parties might be more willing to participate but we lack the financial resources"

In the face of inaction, the activists start to engage in considering alternative ways to induce change. As one activist noted:

"We have to consider alternatives, we have just invested in new campaigns but we notice that the agricultural associations have limited resources to contribute to the development of new ideas themselves"

The point is that the agricultural associations considered themselves as harvesters responsible for local harvest activities. Despite their contribution in helping to think of how a regional market for biomass could emerge, they did not see themselves as the entity responsible for supply and commercial activities.
Nevertheless, their orientation changed by the absence of progress in the project. Another trigger that changed their orientation was the ongoing uncertainty and cut backs in subsidy regulations. In the face of these uncertainties, the need to think of an alternative position for them obtruded more persistently. Encouraged by the activists, they adopted the idea studying if they can organize commercial and distribution activities within a cluster of three associations. The prior collaboration between the associations at the beginning of the project would potentially provide a good background for them.

As one member of one association told us:

"Despite the many administrative requirements for being a member of this large project, the collaboration with the other two associations at the beginning of the project was very helpful in shaping our own ideas about the future. Today we even carefully start to talk about us as a commercial cluster that sells energy and services. We also think of approaching other agricultural associations in this region who are not a member of the project yet"

The national umbrella organization of the agricultural associations responded positive to the recent developments of the associations in this region.

When we interviewed the chairperson of this umbrella organization, he told us that:

"Yes, you have to start somewhere as an association and that's always the problem with this kind of long-term projects. I also see this at other initiatives in the Netherlands. You can make plans of

everything but there is a moment that you have to take the first step. When things start to run, also other associations might see the benefits and step in as well.

Nevertheless, members of the cluster began to get used to the idea of becoming an energy provider. The activists encouraged them in further collaboration by having frequent meetings in how to approach the market and convince local authorities. They also helped them in gathering more knowledge about user preferences and establishing quality requirements to classify biomass material. They based their support on knowledge and experiences from German regions where biomass is a commonly accepted alternative energy source. They also intensified the connections between German counterparts of the project for allowing a better transfer of these experiences. Providing these resources enabled the associations to develop alternative practices by adopting business principle not know before.
Especially the key members who were early involved in the project could image that their role and function would change in the near future. They began to see themselves as energy providers. This however, was not so clear for all the members of the associations. For some of them there is a risk for engaging in such enterprises. Many of them believed that their primary function should remain local landscape maintenance instead of becoming an energy provider. Key members start to organize meetings with members to convince them of the necessity of these changes. The activists where engaged in these meetings as well and present themselves as promoters of the change. While being a part of a cluster now, the agricultural associations now covered an important amount of all the regional available hedgerows and coppices an considered this as an important potential energy source and future income. Moreover, the associations began to see the benefits of being in this cluster and their changing position in the project. As a cluster, they now could impress local policy makers with their potential amount of energy and its impact on sustainable regional development. The activists supported this identity shift for regional campaigns. Today, the development of entrepreneurial practices and activities are still ongoing and it seems that soon a small niche for regional biomass energy is about to emerge.

Results

In answering the question how do activists engage target organizations in collective change processes and what makes these target organizations to participate? We found that at the beginning of the project, motivations of target organizations to contribute to the project were opportunity based because they were based on solving existing problems caused by changing subsidy regulations. It was their wish to become less dependent on these regulations. However, by their participation, they became a member of a regional project, which expanded their scope of possibilities because they changed their vision from local concerns to regional opportunities. In creating and sustaining this vision, the motivational frames presented by the activists where helpful (Rao et al., 2000). However, in analyzing the sources of agency, we noticed that at the beginning of the project, the associations relied on their existing practices and logics belonging to agricultural associations. We saw that their orientation changed by ongoing setbacks occurring during the course of the project. Examples are the lack of support from policy makers and market parties, and ongoing uncertainty about subsidy streams. These setbacks caused a re-orientation on their position and intentions in the collective change process. It includes a radical shift in the way these associations considered their current practices as useful for continuation of their associations. Earlier, (Child et al., 2007) demonstrate how intentions vary throughout collective change processes in the development

of an environmental protection system in China. As such, our study suggests that setbacks and unintended consequences can be an important driver to change intentions and emergence of new practices (Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007, Chia and Holt, 2006).
Another important factor for change identified is the relationship experience these associations had developed at the beginning of the project. As we have showed, the associations where already engaged in the process of sharing experience and knowledge facilitated by the activists to leverage existing practices. In doing so, they unintended developed a relationship for another purpose but now became beneficial to jointly experience and develop new practices together in a cluster. Our study thus showed thus how network relationships established in the beginning of the collective change process are helpful to develop new practices, lead to different organizational forms in institutional change (Swaminathan and Wade, 2001), and thus point to an important source of change regarding the orientations of target organizations.

Our study also calls for the importance to the ability of activists to act on unintended consequences. We noticed how the activist in our case changed their activities. We noticed how activists support by providing resources (network relationships, knowledge, best-practice evidence, etc.) help shaping new practice developing at target organizations. We also see the importance of changing the way activists provide develop producers identities (Weber et al., 2008). From our case, we noted how activists were able to shift the target organizations' identity from potential resource providers from the perspective of landscape maintainers to future resource full energy providers. Finally, we showed how activists can help in overcoming internal resistance at target organizations, which calls for in depth engagement of activists in the composition of collective change.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to answer the following research question: How do activists engage target organizations in collective change processes, what makes these target organizations to participate, and what shapes the agency of target organizations? We applied social movement theory (Weber et al., 2008, Sine and Lee, 2009) to examine how activists and embedded actors engage in institutional work and engage in developing new markets. We used institutional entrepreneurship literature to take an embedded perspective on how change comes about at target organizations when engaged in collective change processes leading into new practice development and different organizational forms (Lounsbury and Crumley, 2007, Swaminathan and Wade, 2001). In doing so, we could contribute to literature on resource mobilization (Ritvala and Salmi, 2011, Ritvala and Salmi, 2010, Araujo and Brito, 1997, Mouzas and Naudé, 2007). Similar to (Ritvala and Salmi, 2010) we contribute to literature by showing the importance of value based mobilizing at an initial stage of a common issue project. Our research also shows the dynamic character of collective change processes especially when mobilizers (activists and target organizations) face inaction (Araujo and Brito, 1997). We contribute to literature by showing how activists benefit when they act on unintended consequences, collaborate more closely with target organizations in providing resources and overcome internal resistance, and shape and change their identities when necessary when situations are changing. Second, our research showed that motivations and intentions to contribute may at the beginning be based on instrumental benefits but they are subject of change throughout the collective change process (Child et al., 2007). However,

changing motivations and intentions to contribute are not solely the result of new business opportunities, strategic connections, and image benefits that arise during a target organizations 'participation as suggest by (Ritvala and Salmi, 2011). As we have indicated, setbacks and unintended consequences can be important sources of agency that spur target organizations to reflect on existing practices and adopt new ones. Finally, we contribute to literature by showing that network experience during a common issue project can be beneficial for target organizations and activists in facilitating these changes.

While our work still is in progress, we hoped to have reported an interesting study in the pursuit to contribute to the potentially interesting body of research on network mobilization.

References:

ARAUJO, L. & BRITO, C. 1997. Agency and constitutional ordering in networks: A case study of the port wine industry. *International Studies of Management & Organization,* 27**,** 22-46.

BATTILANA, J., LECA, B. & BOXENBAUM, E. 2009. 2 How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals,* 3**,** 65-107.

BERGER, P. & LUCKMANN, T. 1967. The social construction ofreality. *New York: Anchor.*

BRITO, C. M. 1999. Issue-based nets: a methodological approach to the sampling issue in industrial networks research. *Qualitative Market Research: an international journal,* 2**,** 92-102.

CHIA, R. & HOLT, R. 2006. Strategy as practical coping: a Heideggerian perspective. *Organization Studies,* 27**,** 635.

CHILD, J., LU, Y. & TSAI, T. 2007. Institutional Entrepreneurship in Building an Environmental Protection System for the People's Republic of China. *Organization Studies,* 28**,** 1013-1034.

DIMAGGIO, P. J. 1988. Interest and agency in institutional theory. *Institutional patterns and organizations: Culture and environment***,** 3-21.

DORADO, S. 2005. Institutional entrepreneurship, partaking, and convening. *Organization Studies,* 26**,** 385.

DUBOIS, A. & GADDE, L.-E. 2002. Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research. *Journal of Business Research,* 55**,** 553-560.

DUTTON, J. E., ASHFORD, S. J., O'NEILL, R. M. & LAWRENCE, K. A. 2001. Moves That Matter: Issue Selling and Organizational Change. *The Academy of Management Journal,* 44**,** 716-736.

FLIGSTEIN, N. 1997. Social skill and institutional theory. *American behavioral scientist,* 40**,** 397-405.

GREENWOOD, R. & HININGS, C. R. 1996. Understanding Radical Organizational Change: Bringing together the Old and the New Institutionalism. *The Academy of Management Review,* 21**,** 1022-1054.

HAKANSSON, H. & FORD, D. 2002. How should companies interact in business networks? *Journal of Business Research,* 55**,** 133-139.

HOLM, P. 1995. The dynamics of institutionalization: Transformation processes in Norwegian fisheries. *Administrative science quarterly,* 40.

JACOBSSON, S. & BERGEK, A. 2004. Transforming the energy sector: the evolution of technological systems in renewable energy technology. *Industrial and corporate change,* 13**,** 815-849.

KING, B. 2008. A social movement perspective of stakeholder collective action and influence. *Business & Society,* 47**,** 21-49.

KING, B. G. & PEARCE, N. A. 2010. The contentiousness of markets: politics, social movements, and institutional change in markets. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 36**,** 249-267.

LANGLEY, A. 1999. Strategies for Theorizing from Process Data. ***The Academy of Management Review***, 24(4): 691-710.

LOOHUIS, R., VON RAESFELD, A., THE, V. & GROEN, A. 2011. Mobilizing Resources for Collective Action and Sustainable Development. *27th IMP Conference, Glasgow*
LOUNSBURY, M. & CRUMLEY, E. T. 2007. New practice creation: An institutional perspective on innovation. *Organization Studies,* 28**,** 993-1012.
LOUNSBURY, M. & GLYNN, M. A. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic management journal,* 22**,** 545-564.
MAGUIRE, S., HARDY, C. & LAWRENCE, T. B. 2004. Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *The Academy of Management Journal***,** 657-679.
MOUZAS, S. & NAUDÉ, P. 2007. Network mobilizer. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing,* 22**,** 62-71.
RAO, H. 1998. Caveat emptor: The construction of nonprofit consumer watchdog organizations. *American Journal of Sociology,* 103**,** 912-961.
RAO, H. 2009. *Market rebels: How activists make or break radical innovations*, Princeton Univ Pr.
RAO, H., MORRILL, C. & ZALD, M. N. 2000. Power plays: How social movements and collective action create new organizational forms. *Research in organizational behavior,* 22**,** 237-282.
RITVALA, T. & SALMI, A. 2010. Value-based network mobilization: A case study of modern environmental networkers. *Industrial Marketing Management,* 39**,** 898-907.
RITVALA, T. & SALMI, A. 2011. Network mobilizers and target firms: The case of saving the Baltic Sea. *Industrial Marketing Management*.
SCHATZKI, T. 1996. *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social*, Cambridge Univ Pr.
SCOTT, W. R., RUEF, M., MENDEL, P., & CARONNA, C. 2006. Institutional Change and Health Care Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care. ***Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Swedberg, Richard***: 937-950in.
SEO, M. G. & CREED, W. E. D. 2002. Institutional contradictions, praxis, and institutional change: A dialectical perspective. *Academy of Management Review***,** 222-247.
SINE, W. D. & LEE, B. H. 2009. Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the US wind energy sector. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 54**,** 123.
SNOW, D. A. 2004. Framing processes, ideology, and discursive fields. *The Blackwell companion to social movements***,** 380-412.
SWAMINATHAN, A. & WADE, J. B. 2001. Social movement theory and the evolution of new organizational forms. *The entrepreneurship dynamic in industry evolution***,** 286-313.
WEBER, K., HEINZE, K. L. & DESOUCEY, M. 2008. Forage for thought: Mobilizing codes in the movement for grass-fed meat and dairy products. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 53**,** 529.