A Bourdieuan Analysis of Qualitative Authorship in Entrepreneurship Scholarship

Sarah Drakopoulou-Dodd
The Hunter Centre for Entrepreneurship, University of Strathclyde.
Seonaidh McDonald
Institute for Management, Governance and Society, The Robert Gordon University.
Gerard McElwee
Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University.
Robert Smith
Aberdeen Business School, The Robert Gordon University

Abstract
Empirically, this study builds on responses from leading qualitative entrepreneurship scholars. We carry out a Bourdieuan analysis of the field of entrepreneurship scholarship—particularly heterodox qualitative writing—and the way that scholars learn to play this game (habitus). It discusses unchallenged assumptions (doxa), commitment to shared stakes (illusio), the practice to achieve these stakes (practice), and the struggle for glories and riches (capital). By deploying Bourdieu's frame, we have been able to expose key processes, structures, and relationships within qualitative entrepreneurship authorship. These offer four types of practical outcomes: guidance for good practice; insights into emotional aspects of authorship; warnings of potentially dysfunctional practices; and a celebration of our successes.

Introduction

Entrepreneurship scholarship has long been characterized by a dominant positivism orthodoxy, typically enacted through quantitative methods, perceiving reality as best made tractable through reification into "numbers, ratios, averages and other mathematical notions" (Ogbor 2000, p. 622; see also, e.g., Chandler and Lyon 2001; Coviello and Jones 2004; Grant and Perren 2002; McElwee and Atherton 2005; Smith et al. 2013). Yet there is also a persistent minor voice within the field that has taken a heterodox and critical stand against the mainstream. Smith et al. (2013) maintain that "it is the strength and influence of this work which has led to so very many recent calls for a more open approach to qualitative, or

pluralist, or contextualised, or narrative entrepreneurship scholarship," and like others, propose that more attention be paid to studying the nature and implications of this ontological and methodological contrast (Chandler and Lyon 2001; Cope 2005; Coviello and Jones 2004; Down 2010; Gartner 2004, 2010a, 2010b; Grant and Perren 2002; Jones and Spicer 2005; Ogbor 2000; Steyaert 2005; Steyaert and Hjorth 2003; Steyaert and Katz 2004). To address this research gap, leading qualitative scholars of entrepreneurship were invited to share their insights into the field's processes and structures, and their textual responses to our survey have provided the data upon which our analysis draws.

The key purpose of this paper is to compare and contrast a conservative, essentially positivist "orthodox" ontology of entrepreneurship, with the growing and persistent heterodox scholarship in the field, which is so often expressed through qualitative field work. We seek to deepen understanding of the relationship between these two forms of entrepreneurship scholarship and, especially, to provide a richer analysis of the minor critical voice. To achieve this aim, we carry out a Bourdieuan analysis of the *field* of entrepreneurship scholarship—focusing particularly on heterodox qualitative writing—and the way that scholars learn to play this game (*habitus*). We discuss unchallenged assumptions (*doxa*), commitment to shared stakes (*illusio*), the practice to achieve these stakes (*practice*), and the struggle for glories and riches (*capital*).

Bourdieu's work is especially relevant for a reflexive analysis of the field of entrepreneurship scholarship. One of his particular concerns was that his tools also be reflexively applied to the uncovering of the capital, illusio, habitus, doxa, and practice of the academic fields that adopted his methodology (Bourdieu 2000, p. 4; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, p. 40; Özbilgin and Tatli 2005, pp. 858–60). Scholastic thought could all too easily become trapped within the limits of ignored or repressed presuppositions (Bourdieu 2000, p. 15). Busily engaged with interpreting others' practices, figuring out *their* unspoken assumptions (doxa), and shared commitment to idiosyncratic "stakes," we can only too easily fail to notice our own (Bourdieu1977, p. 2; Golsorkhi et al. 2009, pp. 786–91).

Golsorkhi et al. have recently argued for the value in

examining doxa and domination within practice theory from a Bourdieuan perspective (2009). Exposing illusio and challenging doxa inevitably involves exposing domination structures and as such may lead to clashes with a field's hierarchy (Friedland 2009, p. 888). The focus of this paper is on analyzing the field of (qualitative) entrepreneurship scholarship through a Bourdieuan lens. Utilizing a Bourdieuan framework is not a novel approach as evidenced by the works of Swartz (2008), De Clercq and Voronov (2009a, 2009b, 2009c), and De Clercq and Honig (2011).

The paper provides a grounded theoretical account of the development of entrepreneurship's critical minority voice, turning the lens upon scholars and scholarship. This matters because it helps to explain what has been studied, how and why, from a social constructionist perspective. Deepening our own understandings of the context, structures, and processes of the discipline allows for a more robust and informed engagement with our research, our writing, and our subjects. Postpositivist epistemologies demand such reflexivity that not only constantly interacts with the lived world of the research subject but also addresses itself to the situated, contextualized, relational, political, socially constructed world of the scholar.

The paper is structured as follows. First, we briefly revisit our research aims, articulating them in terms of Bourdieu's theory. Next, we explain why Bourdieu's work is useful for our analysis by offering a literature review that draws upon his key themes and highlights ways in which entrepreneurship literature has already drawn upon Bourdieu. We then provide a methodology and offer our results before finally drawing up some conclusions.

Research Aims

The key purpose of the paper is to compare and contrast a conservative, essentially positivist "orthodox" ontology of entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Baker 1997; Brush, Manolova, and Edelman 2008; Gartner and Birley 2002; Kyrö and Kansikas 2005), with the growing and persistent heterodox scholarship in the field, which is so often expressed through qualitative field work. We seek to deepen the understanding of the relationship between these two forms of entrepreneurship scholarship and, especially, to provide a richer analysis of the minor critical voice.

Adopting Bourdieu's frame allows us quite a structured format for articulating and enacting this purpose as a linked series of research aims or objectives (see Table 1, and the subsequent section, which presents this work in more detail). Summarizing our aims using Bourdieu's frame, let us first note that the field within which the inquiry takes place is that of entrepreneurship scholarship and that our particular interest is in exploring qualitative writing. Our aim, with regard to *field*, is to give voice to the subordinate, critical, qualitative element within entrepreneurship scholarship, and to analyze this phenomenon in contrast to the dominant orthodoxy of the field. We recognize that one of the paramount symbolic *capitals* within the field is publication in top academic journals, and take as our informants those qualitative authors who have nevertheless managed to secure such capital (which is typically mainly the preserve of the orthodox). In so doing, our objective is to ascertain how these heterodox colleagues have nonetheless succeeded in amassing mainstream symbolic capital. We also aim to uncover the other *capitals* that may have been garnered in and through the process of authoring qualitative entrepreneurship scholarship. We seek to identify and explore the specific *practices* that such colleagues engage in, as well as trying to account for the logic, the generative grammar (*habitus*) underpinning these practices. It also seemed important to us to ascertain how this grammar, these rules of the game, had been learned. As well as these potentially more accessible elements in Bourdieu's frame, we also sought to lay bare the unchallenged assumptions of the field, both orthodox and heterodox, giving voice to the unspoken, and the unspeakable (doxa). Finally, we aimed to explore the degree to which qualitative scholars of entrepreneurship defer to, reject, or challenge the field's shared belief in the status quo (*illusio*).

Table 1: Research Aims

Field	Giving voice to a subordinate element within the field of entrepreneurship scholarship: qualitative authorship.
Capital	Engaging with colleagues who have secured very valuable symbolic capital within the field (top-ranked journal publication) in spite of their heterodox practices. Exploring other "capitals" won by engaging in qualitative authorship within the entrepreneurship field.
Practice	What do (successful) colleagues do, which practices do they enact, in their authorship of qualitative entrepreneurship research?
Habitus	What is the generative grammar, the logic of these practices? How do we learn the rules of the game?
Doxa	Laying bare the unchallenged assumptions of the field, both orthodox and heterodox; giving voice to the unspoken and the unspeakable.
Illusio	Exploring the degree to which qualitative scholars of entrepreneurship defer to, reject and/or challenge shared belief in the status quo.

Bourdieu's Theory of Practice

For Bourdieu, a field is "the local social space in which newcomers and incumbents are embedded and toward which they orient their actions" (Bourdieu 2000; De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 805). As an inherently agonic relational space, a field is structured by the social positions of the dominant, and the dominated, and by their ongoing struggles for position, power, and capital (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 801; Golsorkhi et al. 2009, p.782). Institutional fields are relatively autonomous games, arenas each with their own gravitational logic, zones in which particular forms of capital have efficacy in the pursuit of that which is at stake in the game (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, pp. 97–101; Friedland 2009, p. 888).

Relationships of domination are perpetuated, and unequal balances of power legitimated, through institutionalized exchanges of capital, where meaning and power—as much as resources—are exchanged and accumulated (Bourdieu 1977, pp. 195, 189; De Clercq and Voronov 2009b, p. 399). In "Homo Academicus," for example, Bourdieu argues that capital includes professorships in particular institutions, and top

publications, as well as other forms of academic prestige and power. Just like any other field, academia is a struggle to establish and maintain the rules for legitimacy, membership, and hierarchy and to determine the forms of capital that this game will value as its highest stakes (Bourdieu 1988, p. 11). He then demonstrates empirically that the distribution of works according to their degree of conformity to academic norms corresponds to the distribution of their authors according to their possession of specifically academic power (Bourdieu 1988, p. xviii). That is to say, writings that conform to the norms of the field in terms of their content and style confer the desired symbolic and economic capital of the field upon its authors. As Friedland highlights, scientific reason is a struggle for dominance, in which reason is a medium through which agents struggle to secure dominance and command the profits of the field (2009, p. 901).

Each field will be characterized not only by special power structures but also by differentiated distribution, volumes, and forms of capital, most especially the generic forms of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital (De Clercq and Voronov 2009b, pp. 399–400; Friedland 2009, p. 889). It is through the strategic enactment of capital that agency of individuals can be expressed, as they use strategies to transform, allocate, and distribute their volume of capital among different forms which, in turn, determine the boundaries of their agency (Özbilgin and Tatli 2005, p. 864). Bourdieu (1977, p. 195) maintains that it is only in the form of symbolic capital that economic capital can be accumulated.

A commitment to the stakes of the game, to the specific forms of capital that matter within a given field, causes one to be "caught up in the game" (Bourdieu 2000, p. 11), to the extent that one subscribes fundamentally to the value of these field-specific stakes (Golsorkhi et al. 2009, pp. 783–4). This commitment is what Bourdieu terms *illusio*. Indeed, Bourdieu notes that the shared illusio can be so compelling that the field's stakes quite literally become a matter of life or death (Friedland 2009, pp. 903–4). It is also important to note that illusio is "a collective understanding," as "the whole society pays itself in the false coin of its dream" (Bourdieu 1977, p. 195).

The forms of capital can be considered the stakes of the game, and being caught up utterly in the game equates to Bourdieu's

illusio. The rules of the game, its spirit and logic, however, comprise the habitus (2000, p. 11), the generative grammar of a field, the cognitive assumptions that shape behaviors, and give meaning to them (Bourdieu 1977, p. 95; Golsorkhi et al. 2009, p. 783). Habitus structures purpose, intention, and direction without imposing them. It frames the valuation of various forms of capital (Patel and Conklin 2009, p. 1,049) and the structures for their exchange (Friedland 2009, p. 888). Though encouraging conformity, habitus is "unstable enough to allow changes in the field's current arrangements" (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 106). Habitus simultaneously represents embodied history and dispositions toward the future (Özbilgin and Tatli 2005, p. 864). Although habitus is not the result of reasoned coherent intelligence, nevertheless, it generates reasonable, intelligent, coherent patterns (Bourdieu 1990, pp. 50–1):

> *an acquired system of generative schemes . . . the habitus is an endless capacity to engender products—thoughts, perceptions, expressions, actions—whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production. (Bourdieu 1977, p. 95)*

If the habitus is the logic that gives rise to action, then *practice* is the action itself, how one actually plays the game (Golsorkhi et al. 2009, p. 783). Habitus influences and shapes practice, but does not determine it, any more that the rules, spirit, and tradition of rugby, say, determine what a player will do at any moment in an actual match (De Clercq and Voronov 2009b, pp. 400–1; Friedland 2009, p. 888). Practice does not express either complete creativity and freedom, or total conditioning (Bourdieu 1990, pp. 50–1). Practice is largely organized through the "world of *doxa*, the taken-for-granted, naturalized world of everyday life" (Friedland 2009, p. 889). Doxa are the fundamental beliefs of a field (Bourdieu 2000, p. 15) "what goes without saying, and what cannot be said for lack of an available discourse" (Bourdieu 1977, p. 170), the unreflexive viewpoint of the dominant (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 807; Golsorkhi et al. 2009, p. 785). As Bourdieu points out, those who are the dominated classes within a field have a special interest in challenging and pushing at the doxa's boundaries (1977, p. 169), in establishing together "their right to be spoken and to be spoken publically" (1977, p. 169). The so-called critical entrepreneurship scholars are thus not only authoring themselves, as well as giving voice to the stories of

"their" entrepreneurs, but are also authoring a shared voice, speaking *us* publically, legitimating the heretical. Making the heretical heard, giving voice to "the true nature of the symbolic domination," can lead to destabilization and change even in quite stable fields (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 809). We wonder whether this is what we are currently experiencing, in the wake of many robust calls for more contexualized and pluralist approaches to entrepreneurship (Chandler and Lyon 2001; Cope 2005; Coviello and Jones 2004; Down 2006, 2010; Down and Reveley 2004; Gartner 2004, 2010a, p. 2, 2010b; Grant and Perren 2002; Jones and Spicer 2005, p. 236; Ogbor 2000, p. 622; Steyaert 2005, p. 7; Steyaert and Hjorth 2003; Steyaert and Katz 2004, p. 189).

Indeed, a notable upsurge has been evident in the articulation, dissemination, and promulgation of pioneering qualitative research in top- tier journals, particularly in relation to unusual settings and applications and novel forms of research methodologies. For example, consider the 2005 *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice* special issue on pioneering research (see the works of Dana 1995; Kaufman, Welsh, and Bushmarin 1995; Van Auken and Holman 1995; and Westhead 1995); the 2007 special issue in *Journal of Business Venturing* (Ahl 2007; Baker 2007; Fletcher 2007; Gartner 2007; Hjorth 2007; O'Conner 2007; Terry 2007); and the 2011 special issue on Community-Based, Social & Societal Entrepreneurship in *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* (in particular, see the articles by Dana and Light 2011 and De Clercq and Honig 2011). These qualitative studies are characterized by their diversity, covering such diverse topics as reindeer farming and epic poetry.

Our focus will be on analyzing qualitative entrepreneurship scholarship through a Bourdieuan lens. First, however, we will briefly present the use that has been made of this conceptual approach to consider entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur as inherently relational phenomena. Özbilgin and Tatli argue that Bourdieu's works "capture the layered, intersubjective, interdependent nature of social phenomena better than the *mainstream* concepts" (2005, p. 856, our emphasis). Interestingly, entrepreneurship's adoption of Bourdieu's work indeed focuses critical interest on counter-cultural, nonmainstream, theories of the entrepreneur. Within entrepreneurship, one can identify three main areas where Bourdieu's ideas have already been influential: social

capital and networking research; studies of transnational entrepreneurs; and explorations of legitimating processes and of entrepreneurial learning. Networking scholarship has made a substantial contribution to (re-)establishing the relevance of social embeddedness and context, over models of the (isolated, rational) individual (De Clercq and Voronov 2009b, pp. 395–6; Drakopoulou-Dodd and Anderson 2007). Karatas-Ozkan and Chell have empirically and theoretically explored the use of Bourdieu's work to analyze entrepreneurial learning. Studies of transnational entrepreneurs, and of nascent entrepreneurs seeking legitimation, explore the marginal rather than the mainstream, the new, rather than the established. Like much other work associated with the growing Critical Entrepreneurship School, issues of relationality, power, dominance, and disruption prevail.

Alongside the important influences of Burt ((1992) and Granovetter (1973), explorations of the role of social capital in embeddedness and entrepreneurial networking have also drawn substantially on Bourdieu's work (Batjargal and Liu 2004; Davidsson and Honig 2003). Drakopoulou-Dodd and Anderson argue that orthodox theory has stubbornly insisted on an undersocialized understanding of the entrepreneur, clinging instead to "the convenient myth of the romantic of the heroic individual" (2007, p. 341)[i]. The authors invoke habitus to explain the significance of context and community to the entrepreneur, and the entrepreneurial process, as well as noting the inherent recursivity of habitus, iteratively (re)enacted by its members, including the entrepreneur. In their longitudinal study of networking practices and entrepreneurial growth, Anderson, Drakopoulou-Dodd, and Jack (2010) provide a lengthy discussion and application of Bourdieu's habitus, "identified as a socially constructed cognitive meeting place and a socially conceived operating space, bounded by shared values, aspirations and mutual understandings" (2009, p. 8). Their study identified five spans of patterned practices—the habitus' modi operandi—through which entrepreneurial growth is cocreated.

Work on entrepreneurial learning draws on Bourdieu's sociology to explain and connect the micro-level capital of individual nascent entrepreneurs to the meso-level habitus they help build and are embedded in (Karatas-Ozkan 2011; Karatas-Ozkan and Chell 2010). By taking a relational process approach, grounded in the social constructionist perspec-

tive, these scholars are able to account not just for individual agency, but to explain how this relates to the socio-economic context of the entrepreneur. Furthermore, they draw on Bourdieu's concept of the field to link these micro and meso phenomena to the wider macro context of the enterprise culture, thus developing a multilayered appreciation of situated entrepreneurial learning.

Recent scholarship exploring transnational entrepreneurship has similarly proposed a Bourdieuan frame, which addresses habitus-as-dispositions, power relations, practice, and the deployment of specific forms of capital across two (or more) transnational social fields (Drori et al, 2006, 2009; Patel and Conklin 2009; Tersejen and Elam 2009). Transnational (migrant) entrepreneurs are embedded in both home and host country social fields but require bifocality to identify and deploy various capitals effectively across both (Patel and Conklin, p. 1,050[ii]). Georgiou et al. (2013) similarly argue that variances between entrepreneurs from colonized and colonizing countries "emerge from the need of (relatively) marginalized groups to overcome lack of influence using a range of social strategies." However, the most detailed and sustained argument in favor of applying Bourdieu's theories to entrepreneurship research is surely that put forward by De Clercq and Voronov (2009a, 2009b). De Clercq and Voronov argue that to become an entrepreneur means that one has been awarded the identity, the "social categorization" of the entrepreneur, by the incumbent members of a given field. This legitimation, awarded to the individual by the collective, is, they suggest, dependent on the would-be entrepreneur managing to conform to the field's modus operandi and norms, so as to enact, to embody, membership of the field (De Clercq and Voronov 2009b, p. 402). To become field members, they must "fit-in" with the status quo and perform legitimating accounts of themselves. Embedding themselves in the field's habitus, newcomers also recognize the right of "incumbents to dole out rewards and sanction misbehaviour," that is, to dominate the field (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 801). In so doing, they reinforce and support the existing structures of domination, whose struggle for power constructs, comprises and reproduces the field itself.

Yet, paradoxically, to become an *entrepreneurial* field member, it is also necessary to "stand out," to bring about change to some degree that does not actually threaten the field, and its

dominant incumbents, too seriously (De Clercq and Voronov 2009a, p. 803, 2009b p. 402). Entrepreneurs must be "involved in new and untested products, technologies or markets that somehow stir up yet also validate the current field order" (2009a, p. 804). Enacting the habitus of the entrepreneur demands practices that signal innovation, but also acknowledge the status quo, through (only partly conscious) strategies. As Sean Williams has recently written, on a similar theme, "people become what they practice over and over… individuals constantly re-inscribe the society and conditions that combine to form a particular habitus" (Williams 2010, p. 19).

De Clercq and Voronov (2009b, pp. 403–4) argue that cultural and symbolic capital are especially important to the generation of legitimating narratives for nascent entrepreneurs: the former signaling compliance with extant norms, or fitting-in, and the latter aiding innovative narratives of (acceptable) deviance, or "standing-out." Shaw et al. (2010, p. 3) similarly explore the transition of entrepreneurs into the philanthropic field as newcomers seeking to both "fit-in" (as philanthropists) and standout (as entrepreneurs). They find that, rather than their very substantial economic capital, it is entrepreneurs' cultural capital, especially their educational affiliation, which permits them to garner the social and symbolic capital needed for legitimation in the philanthropic field (Shaw et al. 2010, p. 12).

Methodology

The Research Instrument

A questionnaire consisting of 10 (mostly) open questions was designed. These questions were so framed as to enquire what proportion of their research work respondents would classify as qualitative in nature (q1), the main reasons for choosing to do qualitative research (q2), and main overall benefits and disadvantages of qualitative research encountered (q3). The remaining seven questions focused more specifically on writing up qualitative research, and asked respondents to describe their approach to writing up qualitative research (q4), explaining any system, process, or habit routinely followed when writing up qualitative research (q5). Colleagues were also asked how they learned to write up qualitative research (q6) and to specify the single most important thing that they have learned about writing up qualitative research (q7). We

then inquired as to the personal joys and problems for respondents when writing up qualitative research (q8), the best advice they were ever given about writing up qualitative research (q9), and the most memorable feedback received on qualitative writing from an editor, reviewer, or publisher (q10).

This questionnaire was tested using a pilot study undertaken with a convenience sample of six entrepreneurship scholars who were all colleagues of the authors. A review of the results of this pilot indicated that such an approach could indeed produce strong results, and although a few very small changes in phrasing were made in order to further clarify the meaning of the questions, the questionnaire was found to be fit for purpose.

The Sample

As part of another study (McDonald et al. 2004; see also McDonald et al. (forthcoming), we had identified the methods used by papers published in five top ranked general[iii] entrepreneurship journals from the United States and Europe over a 20-year period (1985–2004). These journals, which were selected for the previous study in order to represent global scholarship in the field were: *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *the International Small Business Journal*, *the Journal of Business Venturing*, and *the Journal of Small Business Management*. This database allowed us to generate a list of all the papers published in these journals that presented qualitative data. Four hundred and thirty-eight qualitative papers published in these journals were identified, resulting in a total list of 686 authors. This list is not intended to be representative of qualitative entrepreneurship scholars in a statistical sense. It does not represent all those authors whose work was published in lower ranking journals, or journals not exclusively dedicated to entrepreneurship, or written in a language other than English, for example. Nor does it represent many of those scholars who have published in the target journals more recently. However, although our research instrument is a questionnaire, the data it is intended to capture are predominately qualitative and so our sampling strategy is purposeful: we have determined to ask those scholars we felt could help us most. And so we have contacted a group who have all amassed significant capital (papers published in top-ranking journals) within the field of

entrepreneurship despite their heterodoxy (qualitative methods) because we are interested in their practices and in their habitus.

The full list of authors was compiled into an e-mail list derived from a combination of existing contacts, databases, and extensive web searches. The current e-mails for a total of 294 scholars were located. During February 2010, and again in May 2010, these scholars were e-mailed an invitation to participate in the study about their (qualitative) writing practices. Of the 37 eventual respondents (13 percent response rate), 10 were female and 27 were male, and all are senior, well-respected figures in the field of entrepreneurship, including journal editors and many leading professors.

Data Analysis

Responses to each of these questions were cut-and-pasted into spreadsheet and text files, grouping together all respondents' answers to each specific question in turn, to facilitate analysis. The text file (for questions 2–10) ran to some 25 pages and contained almost 7,500 words of data.

The research team then independently analyzed the data, using the constant comparative method (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000; Glaser and Strauss 1967; Silverman 2000). This methodological approach involves reading and re-reading respondents' answers, making contemporaneous, structured, and relevant notes in a research diary, and periodically breaking for reflection, by scanning notes and looking for emerging patterns across and within cases.

Subsequent iterations of the re-reading and reflection processes resulted in more detailed insights and annotations on emergent themes, which each of the research team then drew together into a logical pattern or list. At this point, interim findings were written up in conference paper format and presented at a leading international conference, as a means of building some reflexivity into the analysis process. Indeed, as some of the survey respondents, as well as many other informed colleagues, participated in the discussion, the subsequent analysis was very much strengthened both by their insights and by their support.

As themes emerged from the data, concepts like "reflexivity," "power," "co-production of knowledge," "relational practice,"

"action and activity," and "challenging assumptions" appeared and re-appeared in our notes. This does not suggest, however, that the philosophical and the methodological are synonymous. Every time these themes were pursued through the wider literature, we reflected on the work of Pierre Bourdieu. We discussed other theoretical frames that we could have used such as Dialogism and Foucauldian framings on the discourse of power. However, the data and Bourdieu's approach "worked" very well in tandem as we carried out our iterative analysis, each enhancing our understanding of the other. In a sense then we were conceptually sensitized to undertaking a Bourdieuan approach. We believe, also, that Bourdieu's work has not been applied as a model to understand the tensions that scholars using qualitative approaches experience in their work. We let the data lead us away from a direct analysis of qualitative entrepreneurship writing and toward a broader interpretation of the dynamics of qualitative and critical entrepreneurship scholarship. This theoretical presentation of (some of) Bourdieu's main concepts, and the subsequent application of his frame to order and interrogate the findings, will both demonstrate and justify this strategy.

Next, the research team reanalyzed the material both across all respondents' answers to each question, and across the answers from individual respondents, looking for specific examples of these themes. Illustrated theme summaries were drawn up by the research team independently and were subsequently shared. These summaries formed the basis for detailed discussion, comparison, debate, and consolidation. An overarching theme schema was agreed, and examples from the data were used to provide voice and support for these themes. Furthermore, we link the practices with the background of the respondents, inductively, and demonstrate veracity by telling a convincing story (Steyaert and Bouwen 1997).

Analysis next took the form of exploring the relationship between these findings and relevant theory. As explained previously, the nature of the findings was such that a theoretical frame capable of addressing relational practice, purpose, politics, passion, learning, community, and legitimacy was required. Bourdieu's work was selected as offering a strong "fit" to the main themes identified within the data and strong critical traction to carry out rigorous analysis.

In this pape, we present our findings categorised and considered using Bourdieu's frame.

Reflexivity

Swartz (2008) argues that using reflexivity is one of the fundamental processes that both underpins and distinguishes Bourdieu's work. Within the postpositivist research traditions, reflexivity entails both being aware of your own perspective, and being clear about how this perspective, and the perspectives of others, may influence, and be sustained by the research (Van de Ven 2007). Research design and data analysis in particular are colored by the philosophical and discipline-specific frames we come to our research problems with. Within this study, two academic identities are represented: entrepreneurship scholarship and qualitative research. Because the research team is made up of scholars from both inside and outside the field of entrepreneurship, reflecting on the norms of this field has been relatively straightforward, as analytic conversations have taken place both within and across the boundaries of this field. However, we all share deeply held beliefs about qualitative research, and this has meant that reflexive insights in this sphere have been harder for us to access. Our work with the primary data has provided the main source of an "other" in this respect, helping us to surface and contest the rules and stakes of our own game.

However, the practices under investigation here are examined through the lens of those same practices: we are qualitative writers asking qualitative writers to write about qualitative writing so that we can write about qualitative writers writing. Bourdieu (1999, p. 612) would see this situation, where there is social equivalence between the researcher and the researched, as a double-edged sword leading to the "… perfect match between interviewer and respondent, which lets respondents say everything … except what goes without saying." In other words, as a research team, we are able to get the trust of our respondents, allowing them to share their opinions freely and candidly, but at the same time, it will be hard for us to find ways of getting them to articulate the mundane and/or taken-for- granted aspects of qualitative writing.

In this situation where the researcher and the researched have little social distance, Bourdieu (1999) also notes that

research subjects can demonstrate resistance to objectification. By this he means that because the respondents have access to the analytical turn employed by the researchers, and because their idea of themselves is one of the stakes in the game, they can consciously or unconsciously try to control how they are seen (by others and by themselves) and therefore represented through the data they contribute. These layered challenges make reflexivity an essential feature of this research endeavor.

Bourdieu's Frame and Qualitative Entrepreneurship Scholarship Practice—What Is Done to Achieve the Stakes?

The research aim for this element in Bourdieu's framework was to explore what (successful) colleagues *do*, and which practices they enact, in their authorship of qualitative entrepreneurship research. The main themes that emerged from the data in terms of practice were found to be that (1) writing-up is an inherently analytic practice; (2) respondents deploy a combination of physical and cognitive practices; (3) writing iterations involve narrowing through a vortex; and (4) there is uneasiness with describing qualitative practice[iv].

Writing-up is an Inherently Analytic Practice.

Though the initial aim was to learn about the practices of writing-up qualitative research, a great deal of the data instead told stories of analysis. The respondents did not make a pronounced distinction between data analysis and writing up qualitative data. For example, in question 4, respondents were asked to describe their approach to writing up qualitative research. However, the data obtained in answer to this question led us to query our notional separation of "writing" from "analysis" because by way of discussing their writing processes, a strong theme in their answers centered on the processes of data analysis, such as coding data, searching for patterns, and looking for voices. As so many colleagues consistently mentioned elements of research design or data analysis in their answers this can usefully be interpreted as saying that researchers find it hard to say where analysis ends and writing begins. It may be that the divide is not between data analysis and writing, but between descriptive analysis (counting, coding, quoting, summarising, and so forth) and a more analytical phase of writing which, through iterations of drafting and discussion, becomes writing up. In other words, is writing actually an advanced phase of data analysis? If so, this

might explain both why it is so hard to articulate and also why it is so hard to do. It also suggests that there is an inherent openness in the writing process in that the direction and thrust of an article is not yet stabilized when writing begins.

Deploying a Combination of Physical and Cognitive Practices.

Practicing qualitative entrepreneurship scholarship was portrayed as combining cognitive work—thinking, reflecting, reframing, synthesizing, and restorying— with physical activity. Among the physical practices that were vividly described were the compilation of lists, conceptualizing via notes and pictorially. Lists, typologies, taxonomies, and piles of discarded, crumpled papers are thereby produced. All this is followed by a frantic period of writing, rewriting, crafting, polishing, all interspersed with displacement behaviors—making tea, walking, living. Present in the main data set, these practices were still more evident in the pilot study, where our very close colleagues amused us enormously by the various activities they claimed to engage in during the (not) writing-up process.

These cycles of cognitive and physical activities, often repeated over several drafts, are repeated until the research is ready to be performed—spoken and enacted, stylized and restylized. Immersion in the real, story-sharing, and grounded sense-making are brought together with insights into the larger context, and with theory, so as to generate new patterned dynamics.

Iteration.

Many of the accounts made reference to the iterative nature of qualitative analysis-as-writing. For example, respondents have explicitly characterized the process as abductive and iterative but have also used a whole range of terms that imply cycles of analysis, writing, and editing (refine/embellish/ dialogue/interactive/re-reading/return to the data/interplay). However, there is another sense of movement in the data, which is not only about repetition of cycles of analysis/writing but also about narrowing. Iterations become more focused and tighter, as the writing is honed.

Uneasiness with Describing Practice

Some of the language around qualitative methods stresses the ongoing learning of the researcher and that even this

relatively successful group are unwilling to say that they *can* do qualitative writing and equally reluctant to define how it *is* done, let alone how it *should* be done. Perhaps this can be explained by the fact that entrepreneurship scholars avoid generalization and prescription (Table 2).

Table 2: Practice

Theme	Illustrative Example
Writing-up is an inherently analytic practice (When we ask about writing, you tell us about analysis)	From all the evidence in front of me I search for major patterns and similarities, then refine and embellish them once I have the basic structure or framework established. The opening is often to contrast findings with received theories and then to unfold the dynamic pattern, which then come to occupy the space that were formerly taken by theory. Broad coding of the emerging themes from the interview data, making sense of the themes. Get the structure of the argument first, then build on it.
Deploying a combination of physical and cognitive practices	I do code my data and stuff, but typically what I have done so far is write up my research question, try to sum up the broad pattern of outcome I have observed, and provide some illustrative example. I draw a boxes-and-arrows framework that emerges from the analysis of interview transcripts, then I find illustrative quotes for each box; try to tell a story that emphasizes the unexpected. It is an interactive process, you start with very broad outline with questions and hypotheses, and then you go to your data and again back to the theoretical part.
The iterative process	Once such inferences are generated, they would be further modified using the accumulated experiential learning coming from the intense interaction with the phenomenon (i.e., through a return to the qualitative data). It's an interactive process, you start with very broad outline with questions and hypotheses and then you go to your data and again back to the theoretical part. Abductive, trying and redoing over and over again, having fun and getting inspiration and ideas.
Uneasiness with describing practice	Not real system. I am still learning. Really depends on context. I am still looking for the magic approach. I do not think I have an "approach." I simply try to report what I have found.

Other respondents presented academic labels—like autoethnography, ethnology, soft systems methodology, and ethnography— rather than offering explanations of their process. In other words, they have told us what they do is

called rather than telling us what they *do*. This may be explained as a general unease about describing what qualitative writers actually do, and we wonder whether describing our practices is still unsayable.

There was a great deal of methodological openness and contingency related by the respondents, a flexibility that fits method to topic, subject, or research problem, and may involve ongoing experimentation and creativity throughout the (iterative) fieldwork, analysis, and writing phases. It seems plausible that inherent openness and contingency are not just part of the ontology (see further) but of the epistemology too. Interestingly, however, these disclosures were presented quite tentatively, as "admissions" of some sort, with respondents seeming a little abashed that they do not really have a fixed system. It seems the respondents are much more uncomfortable with epistemological and methodological contingency and flexibility to the point of being almost apologetic for it.

Habitus—Learning to Play the Game.

The data set contained much material that addressed itself to the two important aspects of habitus highlighted in the research questions: what is the generative grammar and how do we learn to play this game? We found that the data told a story about passionate engagement as the generative grammar of qualitative entrepreneurship scholarship. Colleagues suggested that they had learned to play the game in many ways, most of which were to do with engagement with other people and with text.

A Generative Grammar of Passionate Engagement.

Our data expressed a strong philosophical commitment to qualitative entrepreneurship research, which acts to shape and underpin patterns of practice. This seems to operate on multiple levels, addressing matters of being (ontology), of purpose (teleology), and of knowledge's nature (epistemology), as well as process and practice (methodology).

Specifically, the data set revealed a clear ontological commitment to certain ways of viewing reality. Being and becoming are understood to be engaged, dynamic, collaborative processes. There are many references to the need for engagement with the entrepreneur, for a praxis

orientation, for a thorough grounding in the lived reality of entrepreneurial phenomena (Table 3).

Table 3: Habitus

Theme	Illustrative Example
Generative grammar: Passionate engagement	Fits with who I am . . . and the nature of my intellectual curiosity. It is just the passion I have to share what is interesting for me. Enjoy talking to real people (more than analyzing survey results), richer understanding of the phenomenon of interest. I like gathering and puzzling through the analysis of qualitative data. It gets me up in the morning. I have found out how firms actually work. All the interacting parties of a field-study must recognize what is said about themselves is the truth so that the constructed pattern of dynamics among them looks right from each of the positions. It is also fun carrying out and communicating to practitioners as story-telling.
Learning to play the game: Engagement with people and text	I find models (papers, books, monographs) that I believe are exemplars of what I would like to write, and I tend to use them as templates for how I write up what I'm writing up. I had research method courses, but I have come to the conclusion that the only way to learn how to do this is learn from what other people have done. I picked up some of the more formal notions by working together with sociologists. Find a partner and use each other's strengths to develop the research.

The foundation that underpins our respondents' feelings about their fieldwork is inherently ontological and centers on the desire to engage with "real people," to find out "how firms actually work." There is a strong sense of research as inherently collaborative between practitioner-agents and scholars, and also that this engagement is an education, a joy, a privilege, and a truly enriching experience. Engagement with the real world and the sharing of stories contribute to another very important facet of this theme, that of making sense of the world "in practice" and finding out "what makes an entrepreneur tick." Many respondents used the words "real," "reality," and "actually," and this seems to indicate an important commitment to thoroughly grounding research work in the pragmatic lived experiences of our entrepreneurial subjects. Getting outside of the ivory tower is perceived as a

research imperative in its own right. This engagement with entrepreneurship demands qualitative approaches, because of the dynamic, ever-changing processual nature of the phenomena, reflected in discussions of the dynamics of praxis, and of the ontology of becoming. Furthermore, qualitative research itself is seen as an inherently creative and emergent process, which thus resonates recursively with entrepreneurial praxis (McElwee 2008).

Qualitative entrepreneurship research was also seen to be the expression of a particular teleological view of the academic endeavor. The purpose of research is expressed as bridging the "two worlds," of academia and praxis, through reflexive understanding and exploration. In epistemological terms, we encountered a clear and explicit rejection of positivism, perhaps best articulated by this colleague: "reflecting a feminist perspective, the positivist scientific reproduction of knowledge has effectively marginalised and subordinated women." However, no single, uniform knowledge- focused generative grammar was found with which qualitative scholars replaced positivism. Explicit references varied between a commitment to social construction, critical realism, and/or phenomenology. Epistemological rationales for this "logic" of practice included a need for theory-building when pioneering new areas; a desire to explore and understand the depths inside entrepreneurship; and recognition of the dynamism and mutability inherent in long-term, complex processes. Finally, the modi operandi of our habitus include methodological norms, which enact all of the above, and are firmly grounded in praxis, process, and the coproduction of knowledge.

The data show logic, a grammar, of profound commitment to engaged qualitative research, which is expressed in the very identity of some of our sample scholars and which operates at an emotional level through their passion for the process, as well as at a cerebral level as ideology, combining philosophical and political elements.

Learning to Play the Game Through Engagement with People and Text.

The respondents highlighted several different influences on the route to becoming a qualitative researcher. In line with the previous section, many offer explanations of their choice to do qualitative research as related to the sort of person

they see themselves as being and/or to their ontological stance. The second kind of influence mentioned comes from previous study and is evidenced through the use of discipline-related identity statements, such as "I am a sociologist/ historian"; "my first degree is in literature"; "ended up in a Geography program."

The third kind of influence comes from how they learned—specifically, rather than generally—their trade and seems the most significant. This includes learning with and from others by reading and, most of all, by doing. Learning from experience by "blood, toil, tears and sweat," through "practice, practice, practice," highlights once again the iterative, processual, and perpetually open nature of qualitative entrepreneurship writing.

Learning from others was also given special importance, highlighting once more the importance of engagement and collaboration to these scholars. The respondents felt that they continued to learn from others by researching with them through the teaching process and by the example of others, most especially in the form of exemplar journal articles. Indeed, many scholars shared the insights that a key foundational practice for their work is becoming inspired by text. One of the things that is most attractive about this data set is the wide range of materials that inspire and inform qualitative researchers. Although these are *all* texts, the variety is really, well, inspiring, from novels and biographies, to good papers and books from a range of disciplines. Thus an interest in textual stories also seems important, whether as a journalist, working with biographies, engaging with literature, or reading "The Name of the Rose" (Eco 1983). This passion for text is not to be construed as something simplistic, however, but may give rise to quite sophisticated insights: "truth is both a construction and a mis-construction."

Capital—The Struggle for Glory and Riches.

With regard to capital, a key aim of the study was to engage with colleagues who have secured very valuable symbolic capital within the field, in the form of top journal publication of articles that use qualitative methods. We were fortunate in that so many leading scholars were generous in sharing their insights with us. It was especially instructive to find that, in addition to top-ranking publications, other forms of capital were also argued for by respondents. These comprise, on the

one hand, benefits for research, for our shared knowledge about entrepreneurship and, on the other hand, benefits for the researcher, although they are very closely related: "It's been an enriching experience to talk to people and get to know them and see how their lives are intertwined with larger processes."

A powerful theme, in terms of engagement with entrepreneurs, is the personal joy and enrichment that qualitative scholars experience as they share their subjects' stories. Confidence, independence, and self-understanding were also cited as private benefits that qualitative scholars gain from their work. The process itself carries its own intrinsic rewards of fun and play, puzzle-solving, creating, and crafting. In terms of the knowledge-capital accruing to the discipline as a result of qualitative research, common benefits were found to be access to multifaceted and intertwining complexities over time, space, and culture (Table 4).

Table 4: Capital

Theme	Illustrative Example
Capital as personal benefits	Meeting people and getting to talk to them is very enjoyable. Allowing me to understand myself as a researcher better. Doing what I want to do. Qualitative research offers more satisfaction, is more motivating and stimulating.
Capital as benefits to the research knowledge-base	Greater sense of understanding the phenomenon in question. Understanding better what makes an entrepreneur "tick," and the impact of past experiences on present entrepreneurial actions (decisions, strategies). Gaining deep insights. The benefit is the richness of the data and the ability to dig deeper and learn more. The benefit is understanding phenomena which have previously not been well represented.

Quantitative provides broad averages and some sense of the distribution of the phenomenon, but, to get a clear sense of what is happening, particularly what is happening if it is a process and longitudinal, and, it involves some interplay of intention, action, the interaction of these when events over time change, then, I am likely to use qualitative methods.

A fine-grained richness in detail helps to produce depth in

understanding of unexplored new directions. This exploration of the new, the desire to push out the borders of entrepreneurship scholarship still further, to pioneer, was an especially important theme. This was often expressed as the imperative of building new theory.

Doxa—The Unspoken and the Unspeakable.

The research aim for "doxa" involved analyzing findings so as to elucidate the unchallenged orthodox and heterodox assumptions of the field. Our unspoken assumptions included an expectation that a rich seam of data that complained that the "mainstream" journals were unsympathetic to qualitative research would be uncovered. We were not to be disappointed, although the responses were neither as unanimous, nor as simple, as might have been expected on this topic. There is, for example, just a single assertion that a journal has desk-rejected purely on methodological grounds, balanced by another respondent's counter assertion that journals do not do so (Table 5).

Table 5: Doxa

Theme	Illustrative Example
Quantitative paradigm and journal format "fit"	Feeling sometimes that no matter what I do, reviewers working within a quantitative paradigm (to whom my work is sometimes sent) will not think my approach is legitimate.
	It is easier to write chapters of books or books because you have more space to reflect on field data that are generally very rich and more complex to present.
	Difficult to figure out how generalizable the findings are.
	No serious generalizations.
Unspeakable messiness of process	Blood toil tears and sweat.
	The disadvantage is that it can be more time consuming and messy.
	Qualitative methods tend to be more "craft" based, rather than the kinds of methods that are applied in quantitative studies that are more assembly line and component oriented.
Worship of text as hetero-doxa	I love writing and playing with words, finding the right one, and so get a great deal of pleasure out of crafting a text.
	Before to write my papers, I always consult and read with attention a few good (I mean those I consider as good ones) research papers.

Certainly, as anticipated, the data showed scholars feeling misunderstood by "orthodox" reviewers and editors. Reviewers and editors felt the work was not scientific enough,

or should be more deductive, have hypotheses, or should have a survey added. These findings resonate with a recently article published in *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice* that argues "authors who succeed in publishing their work in prestigious entrepreneurship journals must master the art of responding to critiques and critics while maintaining the integrity of their submissions" (Pearce 2012, p. 193).

There is another frustration articulated when editors express liking for a piece but reject it as unsuitable. However, this line of argument was offset by several insights, especially from those who also act as editors and reviewers, which suggested that it is no harder to publish qualitative work than quantitative work. The perception of difficulty in publishing qualitative work, nevertheless, is an indication that qualitative scholarship perceives its own subalternity, in comparison with quantitative dominance.

There is certainly a mindfulness throughout the data that authors must please editors and reviewers and think about publication potential. However, what we see more of is an expression of the poor fit between the journal format per se and the architecture of qualitative research. The need to tell stories that are evidence based and authentic seems to be constrained by the word length limits set by top journals. We also noted a recognition that qualitative work struggles, if judged against a quantitative paradigm. The inherent conservatism of journal editors is also commented upon, especially with regard to more critical and novel work:

The journal publication process, from my perspective, is inherently conservative in nature. One ends up writing to the most conservative member of the group of reviewers who evaluate the manuscript in order to get it published. So, as certain journals become more 'standard', then, they appear to be less able to be open to the more innovative manuscripts.

Thus, the difficulties that people express about getting qualitative material published seem rather to be about the implicit journal norms that have grown up in a time—certainly for management disciplines—where quantitative studies were dominant, than about the explicit biases or lack of understanding expressed by individual editors and reviewers. This is so entrenched that some of the qualitative authors worried about issues that are inherently quantitative ortho-

doxa, like "difficulties regarding generalisation," "it's not science," "imprecision." Indeed, one respondent's meth-odological process is described as being "to convert the qualitative data into some kind of quantifiable data, and draw inferences from the latter." Here, we can see the performance of legitimating accounts that ascribe to the dominant dogma of the field, showing a desire by our respondents to "fit-in." For every answer like this, however, we found another that expressed resistance to this subliminal domination, which appeared to be imposed at the review stage: "I can see broad patterns of outcome, but I am reluctant to over-generalize and there is only so much I can do to address referees' specific comments." Here, standing out against the field's dominant norms is a matter of pride.

We also noted previously, when discussing practice, that qualitative entrepreneurship scholars express insecurity around many skills that are acquired through informal or practice- based means rather than being taught to do it "properly." Indeed, for one respondent, the main disadvantage of qualitative writing is it is "more time consuming and *messy*" (emphasis added). It seems that though we are all quick to discuss how messy qualitative data are, each of us nevertheless thinks that what we are doing is somehow amateur. That is, our internal monologues emphasize that messiness equates to imperfection, as opposed to highlighting the creative aspects of messiness. There is a feeling that we do not really know how to articulate our processes because they are partly intuitive, and/or we are slightly ashamed of them, and feel they will not bear scrutiny. This strikes us as indicating quite strongly that qualitative methods remain "unspeakable," even to ourselves. The dominant methodological doxa are so powerful that qualitative processes are found wanting by orthodox metrics and remain significantly unvoiced. Though a great deal of dignified pride was evinced about the *ontology* of qualitative work, in terms of passionate engagement, there was a tentative anxiety about the inherent contingency of qualitative epistemology and methodology. Here, it seems, we would prefer to fit in than to stand out. The legitimating accounts we give of ourselves do not seem to have space for a celebratory performance of the inherent creative messiness of qualitative research methods. Few indeed were the respondents who felt able to state that "qualitative methods tend to be more 'craft' based, rather than the kinds of methods

that are applied in quantitative studies which are more assembly line and component oriented." We were interested to see whether the research would unearth any hetero-doxa, unspoken assumptions. We perceived in the data a thread of text worship that reappeared at several levels, from learning the trade, through inspiration and the process of writing; it was clear that we "fall in love with the words and stories of others." We wonder whether perhaps qualitative work accedes (unspoken) privilege to the narrative form, especially if captured in writing, than to other possible sources of data.

Illusio—Commitment to Shared Stakes.

To what degree were aspects of the illusio demonstrated, which might involve critical qualitative work in entrepreneurship deferring, rejecting, and challenging the field's shared belief in the status quo? Certainly, the data indicated a distinctly maverick note in several places, such as when a benefit of qualitative research was stated as being the opportunity to challenge or undermine theory.

Other instantiations of patterns of resistance to "illusio" included colleagues who had abandoned the pursuit of journal publication to publish books and book chapters instead and who had established unique (counter-cultural) training programs to help younger qualitative scholars tackle the hurdle of writing publishable papers. Already discussed previously at some length are the explicit challenges to the ontological dominance of positivism and a rejection of the detachment of quantitative studies for the intimate engagement of the heterodox. And yet, in our many attempts to "fit in," as presented throughout the paper, we continue to subscribe to a large degree to the overriding illusio of entrepreneurship scholarship.

Field.

We were very interested, also, in what the data say about the importance of entrepreneurship-practices-as-reality on the one hand, and all the voices expressing tenets of the more academic doxa—systematic, rigorous, transparent, etc.—on the other. It has made us question which illusio is guiding these writers, or, differently put, which field they are practicing in. We wonder whether there is a tension between the academic illusio and the entrepreneur's field and habitus. In other words: is the qualitative entrepreneurship scholar a servant with two masters? To what degree is there a substantial

tension between commitment to the shared stakes of academia and full engagement with the pragmatic messiness of entrepreneurship? Are not the social capital and the symbolic capital of these two fields very different (Table 6)?

Table 6: Illusio and Field

Theme	Illustrative Example
Just a little maverick!	To discover new patterned dynamics and undermine received theories is such a beautiful game.
	Gaining more confidence in terms of believing that the mainstream approaches on the topic I was working on were wrong.
	Feeling sometimes that no matter what I do, reviewers working within a quantitative paradigm (to whom my work is sometimes sent) will not think my approach is legitimate.
Which field are we in?	Being close to the phenomenon I am studying; making my research more relevant for practitioners.
	Here you bring the two worlds together (social science and the world) and create the conditions for being mutually useful.
	Deeper insights into causal processes and mechanisms.

Furthermore, we wonder if in fact the accumulation of social and or symbolic capital in *one* field actually reduces or diminishes (or even degrades) the social capital in the *other*. If the accumulation of one of these social capitals actually diminishes the other, then the question is not of transferability. One way to reduce cognitive dissonance is of course to make use of the quantitative doxa of pretending to have "distance from research subjects" to legitimate a movement away from the entrepreneur toward the "academy." Qualitative researchers do not enjoy this luxury but seem to struggle with the twin demands of two quite different fields.

Within the field of entrepreneurship scholarship, we believe our findings support an emerging consensus that qualitative scholarship is gathering momentum. We sought to enquire about writing practices for qualitative scholars, and instead were presented with wonderful narratives of politics and passion, of a fierce anti-positivism, an inherent, creative openness, a focus on opening up new vistas, and a spirit of grounded engagement, collaboration, and coproduction of knowledge. We hope what became an investigation of critical entrepreneurship, through a Bourdieuan lens, has helped to

shed some light on the practices, habitus, capital, doxa, and illusio, as well as the field of entrepreneurship scholarship.

Discussion and Conclusions

By deploying Bourdieu's frame, we have been able to expose key processes, structures, and relationships within qualitative entrepreneurship authorship. These offer four types of practical outcomes: guidance for good practice; insights into emotional aspects of authorship; warnings of potentially dysfunctional practices; and a celebration of our successes. Guidance for good practice includes deploying multiple cognitive and physical practices, engaging with people and text, and narrowing iterations through a vortex. Other findings offer less tangible support, but instead show that the emotional side of authorship is a regular part of the process and combines both the shared joys and passions, as well as the inherent frustrations and worries. A third set of findings may act as a warning to qualitative authors, by highlighting practices with the potential to become dysfunctional, such as our unwillingness to acknowledge and discuss the inherent messiness of much qualitative analysis and authorship, and our incipient text-worship. Finally, we have found much to celebrate, as a generative grammar of passionate engagement makes tractable the complexities of entrepreneurship strongly enough for this heterodox, slightly maverick approach to be deserving of ever more scholarly acclaim.

As Table 7 summarizes, the study has shown that, for qualitative entrepreneurship scholars, writing-up is an inherently analytic practice, which deploys a combination of physical and cognitive practices. We found an uneasiness of talking about the messiness of practice, which contrasted with a delight in the inherent relational-praxis of our habitus, characterized by passionate engagement, with entrepreneurs, fellow scholars, and text. The knowledge-gains of qualitative scholarships were found to be partnered with another very valuable capital, the personal benefits to the researcher of joy, personal growth, and fulfillment. We found doxic traces of the quantitative paradigm, which may explain the perceived resistance of journal editors and reviewers to qualitative writing. Equally, the journal article form may not be best suited to the exposition of qualitative work. There is also a cheerful willingness to challenge the illusio of mainstream entrepreneurship scholarship and an

awareness of a possible coalescing heterodox subfield.

What we have not argued for is the creation of a distinctive school of qualitative entrepreneurship research. One of the strengths of the subfield of entrepreneurship is its inclusivity and tolerance and its ability to recognize and value difference of approaches. As we have suggested, there is a healthy dialogue between entrepreneurship scholars. Equally, "authors and editors are in a mutually dependent, symbiotic relationship, in which each depends on the successful work of the other to advance entrepreneurship" (Pearce 2012, p. 203). Of course there are may be biases against qualitative work, just as there may be for quantitative work. Indeed, some of the respondents in this paper have suggested these barriers are perhaps more difficult to pass through for qualitative scholars.

De Clercq and Voronov have argued that the role of entrepreneur is to simultaneously stand out *and* fit in. Our findings seem to show a similar strategy being deployed by qualitative scholars of entrepreneurship. That is, there was a strong impression of qualitative entrepreneurship scholars standing out, being categorically and consciously divergent from the dominant incumbents in our field, in several ways. These included openness with regard to methodology and epistemology, an insistence upon grounded interaction with people and text, an explicit rejection of positivism, and a passion for the philosophy and practice of engagement.

Table 7: Summary of Findings Bourdieu's Frame and Qualitative Entrepreneurship Research

Practice	Habitus	Capital	Doxa	Illusio	Field
Writing-up is an inherently analytic practice Deploying a combination of physical and cognitive practices	Generative grammar: passionate engagement	Knowledge-capital gains: multifaceted and intertwining complexities	Quantitative paradigm and journal format "fit" "Messiness" aspect of qualitative work makes it unspeakable	Just a little maverick.	Which field are we in? Does engagement with the field of entrepreneurial praxis undermine participation in the field of entrepreneurship scholarship?
Iterations involve narrowing through a vortex Uneasiness with describing practice	Learning to play the game: engagement with people and text	Personal benefits: engagement, joy, enrichment, fun, love, self-understanding	Text worship of the hetero-doxa		Ever-more evident heterodox subfield of critical entrepreneurship

On the other hand, we also found quite a strong indication that entrepreneurship scholars strive to "fit in" with the field's dominant players: the illusio continues to work its magic. For example, scholars worried about the generalizability of their findings. The suppression of acknowledgment of methodological contingency and messiness also seems to be related to legitimacy accounts that show us "fitting in" with the rest of the field. We suggest that it is now the time to celebrate the creative crafting of qualitative work and to resist pressures to conform to methodological and textual rigidity. If we are to genuinely challenge the ortho-doxa, and question the illusio, then a move is need from acceptable to *un*acceptable deviancy.

Our major reservation about the study is our use of a survey instrument to collect data; we are only too well aware of the irony of having sent out a questionnaire to a well-structured sample. Nevertheless, we wanted very much to contact as many leading entrepreneurship scholars globally as we could and to gather their insights in a fairly consistent format. Almost all our questions were open and exploratory in nature, and the data set reads very much as an epistolary conversation among friends; there is a certain pleasing symmetry to asking colleagues to write about their writing.

Other limitations of the study might include the classification of these writers as "qualitative scholars." We note that, as we explicitly asked scholars about their qualitative work, then it is reasonable to assume that, while sharing their stories with us through the survey, that this is the role they perform. We acknowledge that several of the authors have also published work of a quantitative nature (as indeed did Bourdieu himself). Because the patterns we identified in the data were so consistent, nuanced, and mutually interrelated, we feel comfortable that what we have presented is indeed a strong picture of "qualitative scholarship" in entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, it would have been instructive to develop a similar data set for quantitative scholars, so as to be able to contrast the two.

Future Research

In our analysis, we have suggested that qualitative scholars who have editorial experience may have a different understanding of the process of publishing qualitative scholarship. This raises the question of whether their edito-

rial roles add different, or even just extra layers, of habitus. As it stands, our data cannot address this question as there are so few editors among our respondents, and of these, most have answered our questions as researchers rather than as editors. In order to capture any such differences between the qualitative-scholar-as-author and the qualitative-scholar-as-editor, a different theoretical sampling strategy would be required, which deliberately targeted journal editors who have published qualitative work, either within the entrepreneurship literature, or in the management literature more broadly. Given the salience of these roles in building (hetero)doxa and protecting and distributing capital in entrepreneurship research, this issue would be an excellent subject for further research that could build on and extend the work presented here.

The scholars included in this research study have had work published in a 20-year period that has seen the growth of entrepreneurship research into a large and vibrant community of scholars. Within that community, the heterodox voice of qualitative scholarship has also grown over this period. It would be interesting to return to these research questions once another 20 years have passed in order to see whether the role of qualitative scholarship has changed its position in the field of entrepreneurship research.

References

Ahl, H. (2007). "Sex Business in the Toy Store(y): A Narrative Analysis of a Teaching Case," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 673–693.

Aldrich, H. E., and T. Baker (1997). "Blinded by the Cites? Has There Been Progress in Entrepreneurship Research?," in *Entrepreneurship 2000*. Eds. D. L. Sexton and R. W. Smilor. Chicago, IL: Upstart Publishing, 377–400.

Anderson, A., S. Drakopoulou-Dodd, and S. Jack (2010). "Network Practices and Entrepreneurial Growth," *Scandinavian Journal of Management* 26(2), 121–133.

Alvesson, M., and K. Sköldberg (2000). *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.

Baker, T. (2007). "Resources in Play: Bricolage in the Toy Store(y)," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 694–711.

Batjarga, B., and M. Liu (2004). "Entrepreneurs' Access to

Private Equity in China: The Role of Social Capital," *Organization Science* 15(2), 159–172.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, 2003 ed. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

——— (1988). *Homus Academicus*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

——— (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

——— (1999). "Understanding," in *The Weight of the World: Social Suffering in Contemporary Society.* Ed. P. Bourdieu. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 607–626.

——— (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., and L. J. D. Wacquant (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago, IL and London: University of Chicago Press.

Brush, C. G., T. S. Manolova, and L. F. Edelman (2008). "Separated by a Common Language? Entrepreneurship Research Across the Atlantic," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 32(2), 249–266.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chandler, G., and D. Lyon (2001). "Issues of Research Design and Construct Measurement in Entrepreneurship Research: The Past Decade," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 25(4), 101–113.

Cope, J. (2005). "Researching Entrepreneurship Through Phenomenological Inquiry: Philosophical and Methodological Issues," *International Small Business Journal* 23(2), 163– 189.

Coviello, N., and M. Jones (2004). "Methodological Issues in International Entrepreneurship Research," *Journal of Business Venturing* 19(4), 485–508.

Dana, L., and I. Light (2011). "Two Forms of Community Entrepreneurship in Finland: Are There Differences Between Finnish and Sámi Reindeer Husbandry Entrepreneurs?," *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development: An International Journal* 23(5–6), 331–352.

Dana, L. P. (1995). "Entrepreneurship in a Remote Sub-Artic

Community," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 20(1), 57– 72.

Davidsson, P., and B. Honig (2003). "The Role of Social and Human Capital among Nascent Entrepreneurs," *Journal of Business Venturing* 18, 301–331.

De Clercq, D., and B. Honig (2011). "Entrepreneurship as an Integrating Mechanism for Disadvantaged Persons," *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development: An International Journal* 23(5–6), 353–372.

De Clercq, D., and M. Voronov (2009a). "The Role of Domination in Newcomers' Legitimation as Entrepreneurs," *Organization* 16(6), 799–827.

——— (2009b). "Toward a Practice Perspective of Entrepreneurship Entrepreneurial Legitimacy as Habitus," *International Small Business Journal* 27(4), 395–419.

——— (2009c). "The Role of Cultural and Symbolic Capital in Entrepreneurs' Ability to Meet Expectations About Conformity and Innovation," *Journal of Small Business Management* 47(3), 398–420.

Down, S. (2006). *Narratives of Enterprise: Crafting Entrepreneurial Self-identity in a Small Firm*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

——— (2010) *Enterprise, Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. London: Sage.

Down, S., and J. Reveley (2004). "Generational Encounters and the Social Formation of Entrepreneurial Identity—'Young Guns' and

'Old Farts'," *Organization* 11(2), 233–250. Drori, I., B. Honig, and A. Ginsberg (2006).

Transnational Entrepreneurship: Toward a Unifying Theoretical Framework. Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings, Atlanta, GA, August.

Drori, I., B. Honig, and M. Wright (2009). "Transnational Entrepreneurship: An Emergent Field of Study," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33(5), 1001–1022.

Drakopoulou-Dodd, S. L., and A. R. Anderson (2007). "Mumpsimus and the Mything of the Individualistic Entrepreneur," *International Small Business Journal*

25(4), 341–360.

Eco, U. (1983). *The Name of the Rose*, trans Eco, U. and Weaver, W. London: Secker and Warburg.

Fletcher, D. (2007). "Toy Story: The Narrative World of Entrepreneurship and the Creation of Interpretive Communities," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 649–672.

Friedland, R. (2009). "The Endless Fields of Pierre Bourdieu," *Organization* 16(6), 887–917.

Gartner, W. B. (2004). "Achieving 'Critical Mess' in Entrepreneurship Scholarship," in *Advances in Entrepreneurship*. Eds. J. A. Katz and D. Shepherd. Greenwich, CT: Firm Emergence, and Growth, 199–216.

——— (2007). "Entrepreneurial Narrative and a Science of Imagination," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 649–672.

——— (2010a). "An Entrepreneurial Jeremiad," *ENTER* 1(1), 1–13.

——— (2010b). "A New Path to the Waterfall: A Narrative on a Use of Entrepreneurial Narrative," *International Small Business Journal* 28(1), 6–19.

Gartner, W. B., and S. Birley (2002). "Introduction to the Special Issue on Qualitative Methods in Entrepreneurship Research," *Journal of Business Venturing* 17(5), 387–395.

Georgiou, C., S. L. Drakopoulou-Dodd, C. Andriopoulos, and M. Gotsi (2013). "Exploring the Potential Impact of Colonialism on National Patterns of Entrepreneurial Networking," *International Small Business Journal* 31(2), 217–224.

Glaser, B. G., and A. L. Strauss (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine.

Golsorkhi, D., B. Leca, M. Lounsbury, and C. Ramirez (2009). "Analysing, Accounting for and Unmasking Domination: On Our Role as Scholars of Practice, Practitioners of Social Science and Public Intellectuals," *Organization* 16, 779–794.

Granovetter, M. (1973). "The Strength of Weak Ties," *The*

American Journal of Sociology 78(6), 1360–1380.

Grant, P., and L. Perren (2002). "Small Business and Entrepreneurial Research. Meta-theories, Paradigms and Prejudices," *International Small Business Journal* 20(2), 185– 211.

Hjorth, D. (2007). "Lessons from Iago: Narrating the Event of Entrepreneurship," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 712–732.

Jones, C., and A. Spicer (2005). "The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship," *Organization* 12(2), 223–246.

Karatas-Ozkan, M. (2011). "Understanding Relational Qualities of Entrepreneurial Learning: Towards a Multi-Layered Approach," *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 23(9–10), 877–906.

Karatas-Ozkan, M., and E. Chell (2010). *Nascent Entrepreneurship and Learning*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Kaufman, P. J., D. H. B. Welsh, and N. J. Bushmarin (1995). "Locus of Control and Entrepreneurship in the Russian Republic," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 20(1), 43–56.

Kyrö, P., and J. Kansikas (2005). "Current State of Methodology in Entrepreneurship Research and some Expectations for the Future," in *Entrepreneurship Research in Europe: Outcomes and Perspectives*. Eds. A. Fayolle, P. Kyrö, and J. Ulijn. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 121–149.

McDonald, S., B. C. Gan, and A. R. Anderson, (2004) Studying Entrepreneurship: A Review of Methods Employed in Entrepreneurship Research 1985–2004. Proceedings of RENT XVIII in Copenhagen.

McDonald, S., B. C. Gan, S. F. Fraser, A. Oke, and A. R. Anderson (forthcoming) A Review of Research Methods in Entrepreneurship 1985–2013, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*.

McElwee, G. (2008). "Making Sense of the Interview Process: Reflection, Reflexivity and Recursivity," *Ethical Space* 5(3), 21– 33.

McElwee, G., and A. Atherton (2005). "Publication Trends and Patterns in Entrepreneurship," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 12(1), 92–103.

O'Conner, E. (2007). "Reader Beware: Doing Business with a Store(y) of Knowledge," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 649– 672.

Ogbor, J. (2000). "Mythicizing and Reification in Entrepreneurial Discourse: Ideology- critique of Entrepreneurial Studies," *Journal of Management Studies* 37(5), 605–635.

Özbilgin, M., and J. Tatli (2005). "Book Review Essay: Understanding Bourdieu's Contribution to Organization and Management Studies," *Academy of Management Review* 30(4), 855–877.

Patel, P., and C. Conklin (2009). "The Balancing Act: The Role of Transnational Habitus and Social Networks in Balancing Transnational Entrepreneurial Activities," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33(5), 1045–1078.
Pearce, J. A. (2012). "Revising Manuscripts for Premier Entrepreneurship Journals," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 36(2), 193– 203.

Shaw, E., J. Gordon, C. Harvey, and K. Henderson (2010) "Entrepreneurial Philanthropy: Theoretical Antecedents and Empirical Analysis of Economic, Social, Cultural and Symbolic Capital," paper presented at the Babson Conference 2010, Lausanne, June 2010.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Smith, R., G. McElwee, S. McDonald, and S. L. Drakopoulou-Dodd (2013). "Qualitative Entrepreneurship Authorship: Antecedents, Processes and Consequences," *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 19(4), 364–386.

Steyaert, C. (2005). "Entrepreneurship: In Between What?: On the 'Frontier' as a Discourse of Entrepreneurship Research," *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 2(1), 2–16.

Steyaert, C., and R. Bouwen (1997). "Telling Stories of Entrepreneurship. Towards a Narrative—Contextual Epistemology for Entrepreneurial Studies," in *Entrepreneurship and SME Research: On Its Way to the Next Millenium*. Eds. R. Donckels and A. Miettinen. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 47–62.

Steyaert, C., and D. Hjorth (Eds.) (2003). *New Movements in*

Entrepreneurship. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Steyaert, C., and J. Katz (2004). "Reclaiming the Space of Entrepreneurship in Society: Geographical, Discursive and Social Dimensions," *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 16(3), 179–196.

Swartz, D. L. (2008). "Bringing Bourdieu's Master Concepts into Organizational Analysis," *Theory and Society* 1(37), 45–52.

Terry, A. (2007). "A Toy Store(y)," *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 628–636. Tersejen, S., and A. Elam (2009). "Transnational Entrepreneurs' Venture Internationalization Strategies: A Practice Theory Approach," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33(5), 1093–1120.

Van Auken, H. E., and T. Holman (1995). "Financial Strategies of Small, Public Firms: A Comparative Analysis with Small Private Firms and Large, Public Firms," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 20(1), 29–41.

Van de Ven, A. H. (2007). *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Westhead, P. (1995). "Survival and Employment Growth Contrasts Between Types of Owner-Managed Technology Firms," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 20(1), 5–27.

Williams, S. (2010) "A Rhetorical Theory of Transformation in Entrepreneurial Narrative: The Case of The Republic of Tea," *ENTER* 1(1), 15–31.

[i] In terms of recognizing our own doxa, we—the four authors—wonder if we may be in danger of perpetuating this heroic cycle by using Bourdieu's framework allied to a narrative turn in eulogizing qualitative scholarship as a quest.

[ii] Patel and Conklin, in particular, have a very clear exposition of Bourdieu's theory of practice, complete with glossary and illustrations (2009, p. 1049).

[iii] *Small Business Economics*, an obvious omission from this list of

leading entrepreneurship journals, was excluded given the desire to represent both U.S. and European journals, as well as the journal's more specialist nature

[iv] More practical analysis of the entrepreneurial authorship process has been carried out in other work emanating from this study (Smith et al., 2013), which sets out findings relating to the antecedents, process, and consequences of qualitative authorship in entrepreneurship. Staying open, engaging in multiple iterations, embracing disorder, grounding oneself and one's research in the narrative, and maintaining absolute integrity emerged as the key practical implications of the study