AUTHOR(S): GADDEFORS, J. and ANDERSON, A.R.

TITLE: Entrepreneursheep and context: when entrepreneurship is greater than entrepreneurs

YEAR: 2017

Publisher citation: GADDEFORS, J. and ANDERSON, A.R. 2017. Entrepreneursheep and context: when entrepreneurship is greater than entrepreneurs. International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour and research [online], 23(2), pages 267-278. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-01-2016-0040

OpenAIR citation: GADDEFORS, J. and ANDERSON, A.R. 2017. Entrepreneursheep and context: when entrepreneurship is greater than entrepreneurs. International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour and research, 23(2), pages 267-278. Held on OpenAIR [online]. Available from: https://openair.rgu.ac.uk

Gaddefors, J. and Anderson, A.R., 2017. Entrepreneursheep and context: when entrepreneurship is greater than entrepreneurs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *23*(2), pp.267-278.

Entrepreneursheep and context: when entrepreneurship is greater than entrepreneurs

Introduction

It may seem radical to propose sheep as entrepreneurial; they are probably better known for their orthodoxy than their heterodoxy. Indeed, their behaviour is more often seen as followers rather than leaders. Moreover, our Swedish sheep look much like any other sheep and do much the same as sheep tend to do. There is not much outward sign of any existential angst about their identity as sheep or even as entrepreneurial. Yet we can't dismiss them as simply baanal. Our argument is not so much about the entrepreneurial characteristics of these sheep, intentions or even their entrepreneurial behaviour, but more about how context shapes what becomes entrepreneurial. This is fortunate because they don't look much like entrepreneurs either. Certainly they seem very friendly and they all wear nice sheepskin coats and seem to enjoy spending networking time with each other[1], however they do seem to flock about quite a lot. But then, we are not very sure about the semiotics of enterprise, and there seems to be some ambiguity about what entrepreneurs actually do. But setting aside all this typical entrepreneurial theorising, we want to explain how the context allows us to demonstrate that these sheep (re-)present entrepreneurship. We shall try to explain how the context makes our sheep entrepreneurial and the theoretical ram-ifications.

[1] No animals were at risk in this largely observational study. Several of the respondents however had lovely smiles.

To do this we need two things; first, a case including entrepreneurial sheep and second, some critical theorising about the nature of entrepreneurship and how we can understand it. Fortunately we have an interesting case involving sheep. We are engaged in a longitudinal ethnographic study of entrepreneurship in small Swedish rural town. Our tale of the entrepreneurial sheep is part of a longer story of entrepreneurship unfolding in place. Our motive was concern that entrepreneurship theorising had become narrow; individualised and driven by entrepreneurial events and overly focused on outcomes rather than process (Anderson, 2015). We convinced ourselves that a long ethnographic look at enterprising in place, and over time, was sufficiently novel to yield some insights about the nature of entrepreneurship. As Leitch, Hill and Harrison (2009) note, entrepreneurship is a multifaceted, complex social construct that is enacted in many different contexts by a variety of actors. Yet our understanding may be limited by how dominant paradigms (Berglund and Johansson, 2007) mute the complexity (McKelvey, 2004), or indeed the complications and enterprising dynamics of the social and place (Steyaert and Katz, 2004). We were especially interested in how context operates as an entrepreneurial domain and examining interactions between context and enterprise. This is a response to Chalmers and Shaw's (2015) call to theorize context rather than contextualising theory. We felt that a longitudinal study of enterprise in place could allow us develop a better appreciation of the role of context. This was because our ethnography actually starts with place and context, rather than treating it as a residual, or background category.

Our view was that the methodological individualism of the dominant paradigms (Dimov, 2007; Verduijn et al. 2014) doesn't leave enough explanatory room for the role of social context. Moreover, we regularly grumble about how variety in social constructions of the concept of entrepreneurship (Anderson and Starnawska, 2008) make defining entrepreneurship pretty pointless, largely because entrepreneurship is always about change. We see entrepreneurship broadly, simply as the creation or extraction of value (Alvarez and Busenitz, 2001; Diochon and Anderson, 2011) and thus propose a social ontology of relatedness. We argue the connections to, and between, processes, people and places help to explain entrepreneurship (Anderson,

Dodd and Jack, 2012). Entrepreneuring is always connecting, relational (Steyaert, 2007) and often codetermined with others and with other things. Consequently our socialized approach was informed by constructivist ontology and a relational epistemology (Karatas-Ozkan et al, 2014). Furthermore, a relational epistemology differs from the more typical subject–object epistemology where entrepreneurship can only emanate from an entrepreneur. Reifying entrepreneurs in this way excludes us from recognising that entrepreneurship is not only a thing in itself (Anderson, 2015b), but the means by which one thing becomes another. Indeed, Calás et al. (2009: 553) propose reframing entrepreneurship from "an economic activity with possible social change outcomes to entrepreneurship as a social change activity".

Philosophies aside, we were simply interested in the dynamics of people and places from an entrepreneurial perspective. We were guided by simple questions about what goes on here; what changes; how is it changed and who changes things. We wondered if entrepreneurship is a noun or a verb (Weick, 1979); and should we be examining entrepreneur*ing*, rather than entrepreneurship (Goss et al, 2010)? Of course in practice our philosophical statements are mainly post-hoc and largely based on what we know now. But such is the indeterminacy, and the advantage, of a fruitful interpretative encounter with social situations. Unlike a laboratory experiment, or even a survey, we learned what we ought to know in the processes of learning about the situation itself. Philosophy does not guide what people or sheep actually do, but rather it guides what we see and can learn. Hence a relational, interpretative framework seemed an appropriate framework for our ethnographic enquiry into the role of our context.

Reviewers of an early version of this paper were critical of our repetition of what they generously described as well rehearsed arguments. Nonetheless, we are mindful of Tedmanson et al's (2012) comment that reflexive analyses that focus on illuminating the messy, heterogeneous and problematic nature of entrepreneurship are not always well received. Consequently we feel obliged to explain our logic, if only to justify our approach (McDonald et al, 2015) and to situate it in the literature.

Change and Context

Guided by our open theoretical framework, we were curious about (social) processes of change within our context. We argue that change is *the* entrepreneurial milieu (Bruyat and Julien, 2001). In an entrepreneur centric view such as Drucker's (1985:42), "the entrepreneur always searches for change, responds to it, and exploits it as an opportunity", emphasis is upon the agential role in change (a subject–object epistemology). This processual view serves us well for understanding entrepreneurs, but less well for understanding entrepreneurship. We know that entrepreneurship is produced in (social) interactions (Chell, 2000); that entrepreneurship uses change as opportunity and that it creates change (Jack et al, 2008). Hence change is simultaneously both input and output of entrepreneurial processes. However, the momentum for change lies outside the entrepreneur. Giddens (1984) theorises this as structuration (Sarason et al, 2006), the dynamics of structure and agency where structure influences what agents do; but in turn agents modify structure (Dodd and Anderson, 2007). But structure is represented by context (Steinerowski and Steinerowska-Streb, 2012) and thus is party to the entrepreneurial process. As Bouchikhi (1993:558) said "the entrepreneur cannot be isolated from the context"; context may form an explanatory key (Greenman, 2013). We talked earlier about an entrepreneurial milieu; for us changing context is this milieu. But context is vague; it might be the economic or the social context or even the institutional context. Understandably, most research tends to focus on only a single aspect of context (Holmquist, 2003).

Yet these are academic distinctions and categories, not naturally occurring contexts. Entrepreneurial processes arise within, are formed through social, economic and cultural processes which are manifest in place as the context (McKeever, Anderson and Jack, 2014). For us place embodies context because places are lived in and experienced *in toto.* Economics, social norms, values, culture, entrepreneurs and even sheep all coalesce in a totality and entity of place; place is the nexus of contexts. Kibler et al (2015) argue that it is only in theory that entrepreneurship is ever 'placeless'. In contrast, Korsgaard et al (2015) see 'place' as a set of material

and social practices that enact a location. Although we readily agree with Welter's point that context stands for weaving together or making connections, we adopt a different, stronger, view of context. For her (2011; 167) context is "circumstances, conditions, situations, or environments that are external to the respective phenomenon and enable or constrain it". For us context is not exogenous, but part of the entrepreneurial process. Place is not just a site for entrepreneurship, but the operand through which enterprise become entrepreneurship. Place thus became our unit for analysis, because place offers us a bounded container in which to observe what goes on over time. Furthermore, rural places are small and relatively transparent but characterised by concentrated interactions (Korsgaard and Müller, 2015). It becomes easier to trace out interaction, effects, processes and consequences in the bounded entity of a rural place (Glover, 2010).

Towards theoretically resolving the entrepreneurship problematic?

Our review thus far has suggested that we may be too enamoured with entrepreneurs, rather than entrepreneurship. Perhaps entrepreneurship is actually a dynamic of change, but we treat it as an objective thing that entrepreneurial agents do? Certainly, Day and Steyaert (2012) describe the transformative capabilities of (social) entrepreneurship. Perhaps we have mistakenly objectified this splendid change process (Jones and Spicer, 2005) and in consequence have inadvertently set it up as a thing to be admired? If so, perhaps we have looked for entrepreneurship in the wrong places and for the wrong thing? Moroz and Hindle seem to suggest we should be investigating (2011; 272) "the temporal dynamics of the process and the socio-spatial contexts in which it is performed". Entrepreneurship is thus surely action (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006) and consequently a verb, and not a noun.

Entrepreneurship's transformative capacity is almost alchemy; the poor can become rich, the weak can become strong and fame follows these celebrity alchemists. Entrepreneurial technologists become wizards with their magical gadgets (Löfgren, 2003) and entrepreneurial heroes are made. In a seemingly universal pursuit of a more entrepreneurial economy (Dodd and Anderson, 2001), it is hardly surprising

that the sublime objective becomes objectified (Jones and Spicer, 2005: Dodd and Anderson, 2007). Little wonder too that the transcendental qualities of entrepreneurship have been reified. But have we become so mesmerised by these glorious outcomes that we overlook the key point; that entrepreneurship is simply a magnificent dynamic of change – entrepreneurship is actually the connecting (Anderson et al, 2012); the creating by recombining (Schumpeter, 1934) that constitutes the entrepreneurial process? Objectification treats entrepreneurship as an objective thing (Ogbor, 2000), but entrepreneurship exists as a phase of a change in process. The "being", the actuality of entrepreneurship is entirely dependent on change. Indeed entrepreneurship is always about becoming; although (like our sheep) we can certainly establish where it has been. For us, this accounts for why the concept is so difficult to pin down convincingly in a universal definition. Entrepreneurship is not just contingent (Korsgaard, 2011), nor even conditional, but is actually formed within change processes.

Seen in this way some conceptual problems become a little clearer. We can for example, see why talking about enacting entrepreneurship make so much sense. Indeed the idea of engaging in entrepreneurship captures the momentum of process. It is not so much what entrepreneurs do, but the *doing* itself. Entrepreneurship exists as a change mechanism. Clearly it operates *through the entrepreneur;* entrepreneurs are thus change agents. This is why we can so confidently state – "she is an entrepreneur". We can point out the outcomes of entrepreneurial change; it may be a new product, a better service or the improved welfare of a community. We believe this viewpoint helps to answer Gartner's (1998) critical question - how can we know the dance from the dancers? We also argued that context was an important element of entrepreneurship, and not just as a theatre for entrepreneurial performances. Consequently we propose that this idea of context may be an appropriate locus to investigate the nature of entrepreneurship.

To discover more about entrepreneurship, we may need a radical rethink about our units for the analysis of entrepreneurship. The scale for analysis has opened up from

a narrow individualism of entrepreneurs to a much broader appreciation of the entrepreneurship as formed by and from social factors. As overly individualistic accounts for entrepreneurship have been challenged (Dodd and Anderson, 2007), methodological individualism has given way to convincing socialised explanations. This is not to deny the centrality of the entrepreneur as an agent of change. However such an approach may force us to treat context as background, or in more enlightened analysis, context as some way configuring enterprise. Thus context is treated either as a precedent (*why in this place*), a bundle of environmental factors (*entrepreneurship in places*) or as an entrepreneurial outcome (*entrepreneurship that happens to places*). In either case it is relatively disconnected from the entrepreneurial process. As Scott and Rosa (2002) pointed out, if we only look at firms as our unit of analysis, all we will see will be entrepreneurship in firms. The boundaries of enquiry have been contained, preset by precedence and acquired an internal logic and path dependency.

It is always easy to be critical but a little harder to offer better solutions, especially for an entrenched paradigm. What we propose here is to push the argument a little further to propose that we consider context as the unit *for* analysis. We are concerned that although we know entrepreneurship always happens in places, too often we see only entrepreneurs and outcomes. This is in line with Aldrich and Zimmer (1986), in that an element of the dynamic process is place. Place and all its characteristics and attributes are "resources" that are connected by entrepreneurship; places thus contextualise entrepreneuring. We shall try to explain how context shapes what becomes entrepreneurial, how the context makes our sheep entrepreneurial.

Methods and muddles, how our entrepreneursheep escaped the paradigm

Our ethnography has already spanned ten years and we have seen a great many interesting processes in Skoghem, this small rural town in the middle of northern Sweden. In part the enormous volume of data was a result our beginnings, when we did not know what we saw, far less what we wanted to do. We had attended many

meetings, interviewed anyone who stood still for long enough, and observed changes over time. The primary event that had drawn us to Skoghem was the building of a garden and we had wondered if this was entrepreneurship in an untypical guise. We are now convinced that it is, but that is another paper. What was striking, in hindsight, about our ethnographic muddle was not just the volume of data, but the sheer number processes we could identify. Of course, analysing these with methodological rigour to make a contribution, proved much, much harder. Presenting these convincingly is even more difficult. We decided to treat our entrepreneurial sheep as a story. Thus fits with ethnographic practices of thick description of context validity, but lets readers decide for themselves about the merits of our explanations. We invite readers and critics to see this as a tale (Smith and Anderson, 2004) which is part of a larger unfolding story about entrepreneurship in Skoghem. We see a story as a way of organising our muddle of data, it pulls together threads to weave an interpreted fabric. Of course, we leave it to others to decide whether to cut this cloth into a frock of their choice. Without much modesty, we liken this process to Chaucer's Canterbury Tales, where each wee story carries a message, but together they help form a stronger theoretical whole. Ahl (2007) nicely describes the message as the implications for research, policy and practice.

Put formally, we chose to shift methodological emphasis from data collection (Huber and Van de Ven, 1995) and interpretation techniques (Silverman, 1993), towards how we as authors present the case (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2000). The story is a central element in research for interpretation (Geertz, 1988). Thus, we followed Alvesson and Sköldberg (2000: 168) when they argue "…a certain experimentation with style is encouraged". To question and play with the more conventional realist mode of presentation downplays our authority as authors (Van Maanen, 1988) especially in our interpretation. Nonetheless narratives can carry extraordinary explanatory power (Johansson, 2004). Moeover, we were able to map change in time, instead of backwards (Shane 2000) as is often the case when we begin with the outcome of entrepreneurship.

The empirical work behind our simple story is in a traditional sense solid (Huber and Van de Ven, 1995). We conducted ten years of field studies in Skoghem. Four researchers have been doing ethnographic work including interviews, participating in meetings and shadowing, often focusing on different subprojects over time. This has given us a sense of place, an underpinning of knowledge that has developed into points of departure for our emerging new understandings of what is taking place. We transcribed a lot, took many field notes and used NVivo to try to organise and manage the mountain of data. Language, words, however provide an unstable foundation for theorising (Czarniawska, 1997). We turn this weakness of words to advantage and have recrafted words into a story.

Stories are less than narratives, a simpler format but also more open for alternative interpretations (Boje, 2001). As boldly argued by Alvesson (2002: 60), "the point of social science is not to get it right but to challenge guiding assumptions, fixed meanings and relations, and to reopen the formative capacity of human beings to others and the world". Our argument is that our story has some of that capacity, to question established assumptions and relations, at least the story had that effect on us. Therefore we want to include the 'co-authoring' dimension of our story. The conversation (Czarniawska, 1997) or co-authorship (Berglund et al 2015) of empirics began between the authors, but flowed into an engaging discussion with the editors and reviewers. We hope it doesn't end when the authors submit and leave the paper, but will, we hope, continue in conversations with the readers (Alvesson, 2002).

Although we have only begun applying this alternative unit for analysis it has already up some pretty radical explanations about the nature and processes of entrepreneurship. Some may have some theoretical purchase, entrepreneurship as energy (Gaddefors and Anderson, 2015); others seem to border on the nonsensical. Nonetheless this different unit for analysis throws up some remarkable findings and ideas. Entrepreneurial sheep is probably a pretty woolly concept, but we know that extreme cases can use the absurd to shine light on the reasonable.

We offer the case of Skoghem as an example of the potential of using context as the unit for analysis. No one really knows how this case started. (In itself, this uncertainty about the origin problematicises the individualism of entrepreneurship) Someone said it was the butchers idea, another referred to a municipality driven project, a third thought it was someone from the local school, a fourth mentioned the gardener, a fifth said it was his idea. However, when the sheep came to town the municipality officials were happy they could call on the refugees from Ethiopia for help. They had a very long history of tending and guarding sheep and some of them had the time, so they took on the task of fencing and guarding the herd. To build in some local knowledge about the place for the shepherds, a number of long-term unemployed were engaged. Feeding the sheep brought another lucky coincidence into play. The municipality's shrinking budget meant that many local lawns and roadsides were untended. In order to pick the most fitting places and to not break any laws two gardeners were asked to help the shepherds. Everything worked out well and the sheep were very content with how their summer developed.

The gardeners and shepherds decided the first pasture should be outside the local school. The sheep liked the attention from the children and they got to play leading roles when the teachers used them as for example counting devices for teaching the youngest kids about maths and the older pupils about the wool, skin and meat you could get from sheep. The sheep did a good job and when they were out of grass the shepherds moved the fence to a roadside close to the train station. There were bushes and brushwood to eat, but soon they moved the pasture to the river close by the municipality old folks home. This was a nice place, quiet and with plenty to eat. In the beginning no one except the shepherds called, but after a while the older people started to visit. They didn't stay long, but they came every day. One of the nurses working at the elder care told the shepherds how the old people eventually had a reason to get out of bed – to see how the sheep were doing. It had given them all something to talk about and even the employees appreciated that.

Reflecting on processes, we can see how the sheep acted entrepreneurially when they created new value in the small town. They connected municipality departments

that seldom meet or had cooperated before. They created new jobs, even a sense of purpose, for refugees and long-term unemployed people. They helped out at school introducing innovative teaching methods on different levels. They took care of the brushwood down at the station. They gave the employees at the old folks home something to talk about, and gave the older people a reason to get out of bed in the morning. There were even reports of healthier employees and less medicine to the elders. We might say the outcome of these sheep driven events was very good. We could explain the process by showing how the sheep connected resources and people in innovative ways by using local resources in combination with old tradition and knowledge. The importance of embeddedness is obvious and the way the sheep connected with people opened new doors for developing their entrepreneurial venture. From a theoretical point of view our short story sheds light on the outcome of entrepreneurship and how this happened, the process.

Theorising and (ac)counting sheep

Instead of scrutinising the sheep's behaviour, looking for success factors or even their entrepreneurial orientation; even elaborating on how to collect and measure the outcomes of what the sheep did, we will look into the circumstances for explanations. It would be possible to describe the context in our case by making a list of who, what, why, where and the outcome of particular activities. That would clarify the variables building the context. However, we want to do more than mapping, explaining variance or even the fit of our sheep's Rs squared.

As is common when studying entrepreneurship it is difficult to tell when and how it all started. We can of course identify the day a new firm is registered or when the sheep arrived, or we can be seduced by reasonably realistic, but still fascinating narratives describing the plot behind fabulous outcomes (Dodd and Anderson, 2007; Berglund et al, 2015). But such an approach makes it difficult to give proper credit to the context, the small details, influences from previous experiences as well as other people's expectations or take into consideration the way people tend to rationalize what happened in their past. This seems to indicate that trying to attribute

entrepreneurship to some significant trigger, or even to identify the source, is likely to be pretty arbitrary. It seems more likely that entrepreneurship is an event in a flow of changing circumstances.

Our difficulties of finding the starting point of entrepreneursheep in Skoghem fits with the idea of entrepreneurship as becoming, allowing us focus on the doing in itself. This conceptualisation allows entrepreneurship to emerge in social processes, sometimes develop into dominating trajectories, and sometimes fading away. In our case for example, if someone makes arrangements for having a herd of sheep grazing some of the lawns in small community: does that really qualify as entrepreneurship? Probably not, it has turned into one of the regular parts of city farming. We have seen it in the city centre of Stockholm for years. (There may be good reasons why it is less common in Glasgow). However, when the Ethiopian refugees and the long term unemployed were engaged it wasn't just about cutting grass. The processing of the events started to grow in unexpected directions; the refugees and the unemployed had something useful to do, to become involved; different departments at the municipality started to work together, the children at school learnt about sheep and maths, new pedagogical practices were developed by the teachers, the elders had a reason to get out of bed in the morning, less medicine was prescribed at the eldercare, sick leave amongst employees at the eldercare went down. We could see how all these outcomes were evolving and overlapping over time out of "the doing" in the sheeps' project. At some point last summer people started to talk about the sheep as something more than environmentally friendly lawn movers and acknowledge the unexpected and fascinating outcome as entrepreneursheep.

We have dodged around the question of what is entrepreneurship. This is not only because we don't know. It is because entrepreneurship is inherently about change. Like Proteus, it takes it shape from what it encounters and indeed, from how it encounters the elements of context. It comes to be in its becoming!

So where can we find entrepreneurship? The location for our case was a number of lawns in a small town in the middle of Sweden. Besides the grazing by the sheep (the function, for the functionalists), we saw how different departments at the municipality office engaged with each other in a new way trying to create new jobs for people that for different reasons had difficulties in getting a job. At the local school, we saw how teachers started to engage with each other and with the pupils in new ways. Down at the eldercare the elders and the people working there started to interact in new ways and developed new habits. The only connection between the municipality, the school and the eldercare were the sheep. Does that make the sheep the entrepreneurs? We might say the sheep connected three institutions; municipality, the school and the eldercare, but they also connected people; municipality officials, teachers, elders and children. All this connecting emerged into an entrepreneurial production. This then is why we propose context to be an appropriate locus to investigate the nature of entrepreneurship.

Conclusion

We have described what Spilling (1996) called an entrepreneurial event, but the unlikely source was sheep. So even sheep can be entrepreneurial if the context is right? Our problem was that even in viewing entrepreneurship as a social process, albeit with economic outcomes, that our current approaches don't seem to be very good at taking account of the dynamics of entrepreneurship. But especially in neglecting how entrepreneurship varies and changes over time and place.

Nonetheless, opportunity was created and certainly created value; for the children, the elders and the Ethiopian shepherds; and in conditions of uncertainty. Opportunity was created by these entrepreneurial sheep, but the entrepreneurship was formed from the context itself. Rather than being individual or social, entrepreneurship appeared simultaneously to be both. Entrepreneurship can and does exist in multiple states regardless of the observer and the observation.

Let's not bleat about the bush here, context configured this as entrepreneurship, but not simply the context in itself. Instead, as we see it was the things that were going

on in the context. Entrepreneursheep simply connected them and created the raft of changes. Did we find a different form of entrepreneurship? Probably not, but our new unit for analysis didn't recreate the usual objectification of entrepreneurship which thus allowed us to discuss the becoming of entrepreneursheep. We have illustrated how context is more engaged in the entrepreneurial process than most entrepreneurship theory acknowledges. Moreover, we hope that we have convincingly explained how the context made our sheep entrepreneurial.

Narrating entrepreneurship is not radical nor new, but to let it unfold partly as a fable is at least unusual. We wanted to display our ethnographic material carefully collected over a number of years as a short fable with the purpose to illustrate complex change processes. Bringing in the sheep provoke some of the gravity connected to our field and perhaps open up unchallenged faculties of our way of think and problematise entrepreneurship.

References

Ahl, H., 2007. Sex business in the toy store: A narrative analysis of a teaching case. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *22*(5), pp.673-693.

Aldrich, H. and Zimmer, C. (1986), "Entrepreneurship through social networks", In Sexton, D. L. and Smilor, R. W. (Eds), *The art and science of entrepreneurship.* Ballinger, Cambridge, MA*,* pp. 3-23.

Alvarez, S.A. and Busenitz, L.W., 2001. The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of management*, *27*(6), pp.755-775.

Alvesson, M. (2002), *Postmodernism and Social Research*, Open University, Buckingham.

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

Anderson, A. R., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. and Jack, S. L. (2012), "Entrepreneurship as connecting: some implications for theorising and practice", *Management Decision*, Vol. *50* No. 5, pp. 958-971.

Anderson, A.R. (2015), “Conceptualising entrepreneurship as economic 'explanation' and the consequent loss of 'understanding'”, *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 145-157.

Anderson, A.R. (2015), “The economic reification of entrepreneurship”, *Rethinking Entrepreneurship: Debating Research Orientations*, p. 44.

Anderson, A.R. and Gaddefors, J. (2016), “Entrepreneurship as a community phenomenon; reconnecting meanings and place”, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, forthcoming.

Anderson, A.R. and Starnawska, M. (2008), “Research practices in entrepreneurship Problems of definition, description and meaning”. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol *9* No 4, pp. 221-230.

Anderson, A.R. and Starnawska, M., 2008. Research practices in entrepreneurship Problems of definition, description and meaning. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, *9*(4), pp.221-230.

Anderson, A.R., 2015b. The economic reification of entrepreneurship. In *Rethinking Entrepreneurship: Debating Research Orientations*, eds. Fayolle, A. And Riot, P. p.44-56, Routledge

Berglund, K. and Johansson, A.W., 2007. Constructions of entrepreneurship: a discourse analysis of academic publications. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, *1*(1), pp.77-102.

Berglund, K., Gaddefors, J. and Lindgren, M. (2015), “Provoking identities: entrepreneurship and emerging identity positions in rural development”, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 8 No 1-21, pp. 76-96.

Boje, D.M. (2001), *Narrative Methods for Organizational & Communication Research*, Sage, London.

Bruyat, C. and Julien, P.A. (2001), “Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship”, *Journal of business venturing*, Vol. *16* No. 2, pp. 165-180.

Calás, M., Smircich, L. and Bourne, K. (2009), “Extending the boundaries: reframing “entrepreneurship as social change” through feminist perspectives”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 34, pp. 552-569.

Chalmers, D.M. and Shaw, E., 2015. The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts: A practice-based perspective. *International Small Business Journal*, p.0266242615589768.

Czarniawska, B. (1997), *Narrating the Organization - Dramas of Institutional Identity*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Davidsson, P. and Wiklund, J. (2001), "Levels of analysis in entrepreneurship research: Current research practice and suggestions for the future", *Entrepreneurship, Theory & Practice*, Vol. 25 No 4, pp. 81-100.

Dey, P., and Steyaert, C. (2012), "Social entrepreneurship: critique and the radical enactment of the social", *Social Enterprise Journal*, Vol. 8 No. 2, pp. 90 – 107.

Dimov, D., 2007. Beyond the single-person, single-insight attribution in understanding entrepreneurial opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *31*(5), pp.713-731.

Diochon, M. and Anderson A.R. (2011), "Ambivalence and ambiguity in social enterprise; narratives about values in reconciling purpose and practices", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal,* Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 93-109.

Diochon, M. and Anderson, A.R., 2011. Ambivalence and ambiguity in social enterprise; narratives about values in reconciling purpose and practices.*International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *7*(1), pp.93-109.

Dodd, S.D. (2002), "Metaphors and meaning: A grounded cultural model of US entrepreneurship", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. *17* No. 5, pp. 519-535.

Dodd, S.D. and Anderson, A.R. (2007), "Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. *25* No. 4, pp. 341-360.

Dodd, S.D. and Anderson, A.R., 2007. Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur. International Small Business Journal, 25(4), pp.341-360.

Dodd, S.D., and Anderson, A.R. (2001), "Understanding the enterprise culture: Paradigm, paradox and policy", *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 13-26.

Dodd, S.D., Jack, S. and Anderson, A.R. (2013), "From admiration to abhorrence: the contentious appeal of entrepreneurship across Europe", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *25* No. 1-2, pp. 69-89.

Dodd, S.L.D. (2014), "Roots radical–place, power and practice in punk entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *26* No. 1-2, pp. 165-205.

Drucker, P. (1985). Innovation and Entrepreneurship. New York: Harper and Row.

Gaddefors, J. (2005), "Creating context–entrepreneurial opportunities in a consumer market setting", *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, Vol. *13* No. 3, pp. 199-224.

Gaddefors, J. and Anderson, A.R. (2015), "Entrepreneurial energy; a novel concept to explain the revival of place", paper presented at the ISBE Conference, November 11-12, Glasgow, UK.

Gartner W.B (1988), ""Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question", *American Journal of Small Business,* Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 11–32.

Geertz, C. (1988), *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.

Giddens A (1984) The Constitution of Society. Cambridge: Polity Press

Glover, J. (2010) Capital Usage in Adverse Situations: Applying Bourdieu's Theory of Capital to Family Farm Businesses. Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 31 (4), pp. 485-497.

Goss, D., Jones, R., Betta, M. and Latham, J. (2011), "Power as practice: A micro-sociological analysis of the dynamics of emancipatory entrepreneurship", *Organization Studies*, Vol. *32* No. 2, pp. 211-229.

Greenman, A. (2013), "Everyday entrepreneurial action and cultural embeddedness: an institutional logics perspective", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *25* No. 7-8, pp. 631-653.

Holmquist, C. (2003) Is the medium really the message? Moving perspective from the entrepreneurial actor to the entrepreneurial action. In: Steyaert C and Hjorth D (eds) New Movements in Entrepreneurship. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp.73–85.

Huber, G.P. and Van de Ven, A.H. (1995), *Longitudinal Field Research Methods: Studying Processes of Organizational Change,* (Eds), Sage, London.

Jack, S., Dodd, S.D. and Anderson, A.R., 2008. Change and the development of entrepreneurial networks over time: a processual perspective. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 20(2), pp.125-159.

Johansson, A.W., 2004. Narrating the entrepreneur. *International small business journal*, *22*(3), pp.273-293.

Jones, C. and Spicer, A. (2005), "The sublime object of entrepreneurship", *Organization*, Vol. *12* No. 2, pp. 223-246.

Karatas-Ozkan, M., Anderson, A.R., Fayolle, A., Howells, J. and Condor, R., 2014. Understanding entrepreneurship: Challenging dominant perspectives and

theorizing entrepreneurship through new postpositivist epistemologies.*Journal of Small Business Management*, *52*(4), pp.589-593.

Kibler, E., Fink, M., Lang, R. and Muñoz, P., 2015. Place attachment and social legitimacy: Revisiting the sustainable entrepreneurship journey. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *3*, pp.24-29.

Korsgaard, S. (2011), "Entrepreneurship as translation: Understanding entrepreneurial opportunities through actor-network theory", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *23* No. 7-8, pp. 661-680.

Korsgaard, S., Ferguson, R. and Gaddefors, J. (2015), "The best of both worlds: how rural entrepreneurs use placial embeddedness and strategic networks to create opportunities", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *27* No. 9-10, pp. 574-598.

Korsgaard, S., Ferguson, R. and Gaddefors, J., 2015. The best of both worlds: how rural entrepreneurs use placial embeddedness and strategic networks to create opportunities. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*,*27*(9-10), pp.574-598.

Korsgaard, S., Müller, S. and Tanvig, H.W., 2015. Rural entrepreneurship or entrepreneurship in the rural–between place and space. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *21*(1), pp.5-26.

Leitch, C., Hill, F. M., & Harrison, R. 2009. The philosophy and practice of interpretivist research in entrepreneurship: Quality, validation and trust. Organizational Research Methods, 13, 67-84.

Löfgren, O. (2003), "The new economy: a cultural history", *Global Networks*, Vol. *3* NO. 3, pp. 239-254.

McDonald, S., Gan, B.C., Fraser, S.S., Oke, A. and Anderson, A.R., 2015. A review of research methods in entrepreneurship 1985-2013. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *21*(3), pp.291-315.

McKeever, E., Anderson, A. and Jack, S. (2014), "Entrepreneurship and mutuality: social capital in processes and practices", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *26* No. 5-6, pp. 453-477.

McKeever, E., Anderson, A. and Jack, S., 2014. Entrepreneurship and mutuality: social capital in processes and practices. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *26*(5-6), pp.453-477.

McKeever, E., Jack, S. and Anderson, A. (2015), “Embedded entrepreneurship in the creative re-construction of place”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. *30* No. 1, pp. 50-65.

McKelvey, B., 2004. Toward a complexity science of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *19*(3), pp.313-341.

McMullen, J.S. and Shepherd, D.A. (2006), “Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur”, *Academy of Management review*, Vol. *31* No. 1, pp. 132-152.

Moroz, P.W. and Hindle, K. (2012), “Entrepreneurship as a process: Toward harmonizing multiple perspectives”, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. *36* No. 4, pp. 781-818.

Ogbor, J. (2000), “Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 37 No. 5, pp. 605-635.

Rehn, A. and Taalas, S. (2004), “‘Znakomstva I Svyazi’ (Acquaintances and connections)– Blat, the Soviet Union, and mundane entrepreneurship”, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *16* N. 3, pp. 235-250.

Sarason, Y. Dillard, T. and Dean, J. (2006) Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual and opportunity; a structuration view, Journal of Business Venturing, 21, pp 285-305

Schumpeter, J. (1934), *The Theory of Economic Development,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Scott, M. and Rosa, P. (2002), “Has firm level analysis reached its limits? Time for a rethink”, *Entrepreneurship: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management*, Vol. *3* No. 4, pp. 29.

Shane, S.A. (2000), *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity Nexus*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Aldershot.

Silverman, D. (1993), *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Strategies for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction,* Sage, London.

Smith, R., & Anderson, A. R. (2004). The devil is in the e-tail: forms and structures in the entrepreneurial narratives. In D. Hjorth & C. Steyaert (Eds.), Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship (pp. 125-143). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Steinerowski, A.A. and Steinerowska-Streb, I., 2012. Can social enterprise contribute to creating sustainable rural communities? Using the lens of structuration theory to analyse the emergence of rural social enterprise. Local Economy, 27(2), pp.167-182.

Steyaert, C. (2005), "Entrepreneurship: in between what? On the" frontier" as a discourse of entrepreneurship research", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 2-16.

Steyaert, C. (2007), "'Entrepreneuring'as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies", *Entrepreneurship and regional development*, Vol. *19* No. 6, pp. 453-477.

Steyaert, C. and Katz, J., 2004. Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & regional development*, *16*(3), pp.179-196.

Styhre, A. (2008), "Transduction and entrepreneurship: A biophilosophical image of the entrepreneur", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. *24* No. 2, pp. 103-112.

Tedmanson, D., Verduyn, K., Essers, C. and Gartner, W.B. (2012) Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research. *Organization,* 19: 531-541

Thornton, P., Ocasio, W. and Lounsbury, M. (2012), *The Institutional Logics Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1988), *Tales of the Field*. *On Writing Ethnography,* Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Verduijn, K., Dey, P., Tedmanson, D. and Essers, C., 2014. Emancipation and/or oppression? Conceptualizing dimensions of criticality in entrepreneurship studies. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *20*(2), pp.98-107.

Watson, T. J. (2013), "Entrepreneurial action and the Euro-American social science tradition: pragmatism, realism and looking beyond 'the entrepreneur'", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. *25* No. 1-2, pp. 16-33.

Weick, K. (1979), *The Social Psychology of Organizing,* Reading, Addison-Wesley.

Welter, F. (2011), "Contextualizing Entrepreneurship, Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No. 1, pp. 165–184.

Zahra, S. A. (2007), "Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research", *Journal of Business venturing*, Vol. *22* No. 3, pp. 443-452.