

STUDY I

Parkkari, P. and K. Verduijn (forthcoming 2019), 'Introducing three academic conversations: Critical Entrepreneurship Studies, Entrepreneurship as Practice and a Radical Processual Approach to entrepreneurship', in Laveren, Eddy, Robert Blackburn, Ulla Hytti and Hans Landström (eds), *Rigour and Relevance in Entrepreneurship Research. Resources and Outcomes. Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.

Study I is accepted by Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. to be published later in 2019 in Rigour and Relevance in Entrepreneurship Research. Resources and Outcomes in the series Frontiers in European Entrepreneurship Research, edited by Laveren, Eddy, Robert Blackburn, Ulla Hytti and Hans Landström. ISBN: 978 1 78990 397 3, eISBN: 978 1 78990 398 0

Study I is a draft chapter and it is reprinted here with the kind permission of the copyright holders. The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further permission of the publisher, and is for private use only.

4. INTRODUCING THREE ACADEMIC CONVERSATIONS: CRITICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP STUDIES, ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS PRACTICE AND A RADICAL PROCESSUAL APPROACH TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Piritta Parkkari and Karen Verduijn

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship as a field of research has expanded in a number of directions, with a wide range of ontological, epistemological, methodological, theoretical and empirical variations existing alongside one another. This chapter provides an introduction to three recent conversations within the entrepreneurship research domain: 1) Critical Entrepreneurship Studies (CES), which seeks to question and challenge mainstream, taken-for-granted understandings and ways of researching entrepreneurship; 2) Entrepreneurship as Practice (EaP), which incorporates an interest in doing entrepreneurship as an everyday practice by utilizing social practice theories; and 3) a Radical Processual Approach (RPA) towards entrepreneurship (*entrepreneur-ing*, Steyaert 2007; Johannisson, 2011), which incorporates process philosophical premises to studying *entrepreneur-ing* as flux, as constant becoming.

As conversations diverging from ‘mainstream’, functionalist entrepreneurship research, these conversations offer novel, radical, complex and nuanced ways of understanding and researching entrepreneurship phenomena. Although at times used interchangeably, there is a need to gauge what specifically is addressed within each of them, to evaluate what sets them apart and what is their common ground. This will allow an appreciation of the specific value each conversation might bring to entrepreneurship research, together and separately – an effort that may offer guidance for any ‘newcomers’ to these emerging conversations within entrepreneurship research.

In order to go beyond simply ‘mapping’ the three conversations, we utilize a classic (Baron, 2004) question in entrepreneurship research: ‘Why do some people become entrepreneurs, and others don’t?’ We fabulate (Hjorth, 2013a) how studies within each of the three conversations would deal with this question. That is, based on our introduction to each of the conversations we use the question as an illustrative tool for bringing out the idiosyncratic foci and ways of asking questions within the conversations – we do not look into the conversations for answers *per se*.

CRITICAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP STUDIES

Critical Entrepreneurship Studies (CES) is a conversation that seeks to question and challenge the taken-for-granted norms and assumptions of 'mainstream' entrepreneurship research (for overviews see Tedmanson et al., 2012; Rehn et al., 2013; Verduijn et al., 2014; Verduyn et al., 2017; Essers et al., 2017). This includes the self-evidence and paradigmatic roots of entrepreneurship scholarship as a whole, including its (neo-liberal) ideologies and grand narratives (e.g. Martin, 1990; Ogbor, 2000; Ahl, 2004; Armstrong, 2005; Jones and Murtola, 2012b; Rehn et al., 2013). Critical studies tend to argue that the study of entrepreneurship promotes entrepreneurship as something positive and desirable in economies and societies (Rehn and Taalas, 2004; Calás et al., 2009; Jones and Murtola, 2012b; Rehn et al., 2013; Farny et al., 2016). Critical scholars consider this focus, on entrepreneurship as a desirable activity, obscures important questions such as those relating to the messy, heterogeneous and problematic nature of entrepreneurship (Tedmanson et al., 2012); and the hegemonic ideological underpinnings and effects of entrepreneurship discourse (cf. Costa and Saraiva, 2012; Kenny and Scriver, 2012).

For CES, the 'entrepreneur' is sooner a target of critique than the 'epitome of the autonomous [freely acting] individual' (Weiskopf and Steyaert, 2009, p. 188). Hence, studies have raised provocative questions that challenge pre-conceived notions of the 'entrepreneur' and 'entrepreneurship', such as 'Could Marquis de Sade could be considered an entrepreneur' (Jones and Spicer, 2009), in their attempt at 'uncovering' entrepreneurship as an 'empty signifier' (also see Jones and Spicer, 2005). CE studies have also illustrated and challenged the (re-)production of the archetype of a white, masculine, individualistic and heroic entrepreneur (e.g. Ogbor, 2000; Nicholson and Anderson, 2005; Hytti and Heinonen, 2013). For example, Essers and Benschop (2007) have investigated how the social categories of entrepreneurship, gender and ethnicity are negotiated in the construction of professional identities and how these identities are embedded in power relations.

There is a vein of critical entrepreneurship research aiming at rearticulating entrepreneurship in light of issues related to freedom and emancipation, and societal production (Verduijn et al., 2014). Such contributions posit entrepreneurship as a 'society-creating force' (cf. Spinosa et al., 1997; Steyaert and Hjorth, 2006; Calás et al., 2009; Al-Dajani and Marlow, 2013; Hjorth, 2013b; Daskalaki et al., 2015), challenging and destabilising existing knowledge in order to open up new and different understandings that may change society for the better, thus seeking to critique in order to create (Weiskopf and Steyaert, 2009). Studies have asked us to reframe entrepreneurship as social change instead of entrepreneurship as (positive) economic activity (Calás et al., 2009). Hence, they have offered views of how entrepreneurial initiatives can be (re)aligned to (matters of) the common good

(as a way out of neoliberalist capitalist economic systems), and how this productive potential results in social realities that are less distorted by oppressive, asymmetrical relations of power.

Put like this, CES can be thought of as a promising, double movement: one that critically engages with the mainstream understanding of entrepreneurship to open it up so that novel possibilities, be they practical or conceptual, can materialize.

Exploring the illustrative question: A Critical Entrepreneurship Studies approach

A Critical Entrepreneurship Studies take on the question of ‘Why do some people become entrepreneurs whereas others don’t?’ would probably start by a critical scrutiny of the question itself, rather than taking it at face value and looking for ways to answer it. It would look at what assumptions the question entails, on what premises it builds. For example, one might ask what valuations are placed upon entrepreneurship by posing such a question, what is meant by ‘an (non-)entrepreneur’, what is accepted as entrepreneurship and who as a (legitimate) entrepreneur. From this, one might problematize such valuations and start to ask further questions regarding whether becoming or not becoming an entrepreneurship is a ‘good thing’ – individually, socially, societally, culturally, politically and economically. Critical studies are not interested in finding a definite answer to the question of who the entrepreneur is, but they do take issue with the way for example the stereotypical, excluding images of entrepreneurs are reproduced in doing research. In doing so, the questions push and probe the limits of what and who we accept as legitimate entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs, and what dynamics of inclusion and exclusion are at play as some people might be encouraged, forced to, discouraged, or even prevented from becoming entrepreneurs.

We now turn to the second conversation: Entrepreneurship as Practice (EaP). We start with a general introduction, and then move on to how we think this approach would deal with our illustrative question.

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS PRACTICE

Recently, entrepreneurship scholars have started to respond to pleas (Steyaert, 2007; Johannisson, 2011) for bringing the general social scientific ‘practice turn’ (Schatzki et al, 2001; Feldman and Orlikowski 2011; Nicolini, 2012) into entrepreneurship research. For Entrepreneurship as Practice, as the name suggests, the interest is in *practices*, as organized constellations of collaborative activities (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009; Anderson et al., 2010; Johannisson, 2011), and in understanding the constitution and consequences of specific entrepreneurial practices in specific settings.

Whilst Entrepreneurship as Practice is united by a theoretical interest in practice theories, there is no unitary ‘practice theory’. Interest in ‘practice(s)’ can be traced back to the legacy of such thinkers as Wittgenstein, Derrida, Heidegger, Lyotard, Giddens, Bourdieu and Foucault and it is fair to say that there is a variety of theoretical positions gathering in the practice turn (Nicolini, 2012). Different practice theories can be seen to unite in their interest in the activity patterns that constitute daily life (Schatzki et al., 2001). That is, relational, material accomplishments of everyday life (Nicolini, 2012) are objects of interest.

EaP scholars share an agreement about the primacy of a relational and dynamic understanding of entrepreneurship, such that the unit of analysis is not the organization (venture, business, start-up), nor the individual entrepreneur, but real-time, jointly performed practices (Fletcher, 2006). EaP shifts the focus from individual entrepreneurial action (Gartner, 1988), towards wanting to understand the joint activities that constitute entrepreneurial activity (Anderson and Ronteau, 2017; McKeever et al., 2014).

Entrepreneurship as Practice adopts multiple practice theories, with Giddens (e.g. Jack and Anderson, 2002; Chiasson and Saunders, 2005; Sarason et al., 2006) and Bourdieu (e.g. De Clercq and Voronov, 2009; Terjesen and Elam, 2009; Anderson et al., 2010; Spigel, 2013) being among the first and most prominent ones to have been taken up. Other contributions take their inspiration from such practice theorists as Schatzki (e.g. Keating et al., 2014), and Engeström (activity theory, cf. Holt, 2008; Jones and Holt, 2008). There are also studies interested in entrepreneurial practices without explicit reference to certain practice theories or to a certain ontological position (e.g. Drakopoulou Dodd, 2014; Engstrom, 2012; Fletcher, 2006; Goss et al., 2011; Imas et al., 2012; Tobias et al., 2013).

Studies have for example investigated how early venture entrepreneurs engage in socially embedded practices to resource their firm (Keating et al., 2014); how transnational entrepreneurs navigate multiple institutional environments (Terjesen and Elam, 2009) and how networking practices of growing entrepreneurial firms are deployed and with whom (Anderson et al., 2010). They have also asked how newcomers entering a field gain legitimacy (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009). Other studies have wondered how gender and entrepreneurship are enacted as situated practices (Bruni et al., 2004) and how insights from the ‘practice turn’ can be brought together with ethnomethodology and conversation analysis to offer new perspectives on the situated nature of entrepreneurial practices (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017). Goss et al. (2011) even combine a practice theory perspective with a reflexive and critical outlook on entrepreneurial practice, in providing a detailed understanding of the complex dynamics involved in the ‘doing’ of power and resistance in entrepreneurship.

Exploring the illustrative question: An Entrepreneurship as Practice approach

For the practice approach, interest is in the social and material accomplishment of practices (Nicolini, 2012), which means that Entrepreneurship as Practice would think of ways to reframe the question of ‘Why do some people become entrepreneurs and others don’t?’ so that it could be re-thought in terms of practices. This approach implies stepping away from asking questions about what individuals *as such* are or do and away from looking for explanations resulting from reified entities.

At the simplest, EaP would ask questions about ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ as a practice: what routinized ways of doing, talking and feeling (Reckwitz, 2002) are involved; how does one (not) accomplish becoming an entrepreneur materially and discursively; what shared understandings, rules, norms and meanings, and various artefacts and (bodily) competences are involved; how does someone become seen as a competent practitioner (entrepreneur) within a certain field; how are ‘entrepreneurs’ constructed in and through practices and practicing? Asking these questions would imply that such practices cannot be studied in isolation though, since practices are always interconnected (Gherardi, 2012; Nicolini, 2012).

Practice theories see motivations, wants, needs, and feelings not as individual property, but as part of practices (Reckwitz, 2002). This means that ‘mental’ activities such as (not) desiring to be an entrepreneur should be considered as elements and qualities of a constellation of practices, not as qualities of the individual (*ibid.*). This is important if studies were to approach ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ as a matter of identity and ‘wanting to become one’. Adopting a practice approach entails reframing the example question by asking how practices recruit practitioners (Shove et al., 2012). Practices might ‘produce’ entrepreneurial practitioners, where it can be viewed upon as an empirical task to consider what are the practices within which it even makes sense to understand be(com)ing an entrepreneur. From this angle, it might be that studies in other fields, such as consumption or volunteering, may produce compelling insights into when, where and how practices instilling ‘becoming an entrepreneur’ emerge as something that makes sense. Furthermore, to understand if and how entrepreneurship emerges from and affects social relations and arrangements would mean to study how bundles and complexes of practices form, persist, and disappear (Shove et al., 2012), thus exceeding such ‘immediate acts’ as registering a venture or writing a business plan.

In moving on to the third conversation in this chapter, we once again start by a general introduction, followed by offering ideas on how this approach would tackle the illustrative question.

RADICAL PROCESSUAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP STUDIES

‘Traditional’ attempts at theorizing entrepreneurial processes present ‘the’ entrepreneurial process predominantly as one that involves starting up a (new) venture as an intentionally planned activity, a linear trajectory (Steyaert, 2007). Most such conceptualizations assume that the development of a new venture proceeds through (identifiable) sequences of stages or steps – a road towards a pre-defined goal (Churchill and Lewis, 1983; Carter et al., 1996). The Radical Processual Approach to entrepreneurship diverges from this understanding of process. The conversation claims that entrepreneuring cannot ‘be captured in plain predictions, complete deterministic schemes or pre-existing patterns’ (Steyaert, 2004, p. 19).

This conversation sees that, traditionally, ontological assumptions are predicated on the premise of there being a ‘world’ consisting of fixed things (rather than processes), with an inclination to ‘treat’ ‘an abstraction as if it were real’ (Demir and Lychnell, 2015, p. 87). A processual approach implies ‘a major shift in one’s perception of the world’ (ibid, p. 87). Indeed, the *radical* processual approach is a conversation interested in a shift in ontology. Such a processual approach (also: process metaphysics (Chia, 1999)) finds its roots in the works of philosophers such as Whitehead (1929), and Heidegger (1971). It entails abandoning linear conceptualizations of process, rather viewing upon ‘the world’ as being in continuous flux, with change being the standard, and not the exception (Tsoukas and Chia, 2002). For radical processual theorists, movement becomes the primordial quality (Nayak, 2008) in theory development. Radical processual theorists thus criticize ‘thingification’, or reification (cf. Rescher, 1996), the thinking about phenomena in terms of things and (stable) entities.

As said, there is a budding conversation taking up radical processual insights in understanding entrepreneurship (or in the conversation’s words, *entrepreneuring*), incorporating a process view that is predicated on an ontology of becoming. Instead of conceptualizing the entrepreneurial process in terms of stages, and (sequential) steps, this conversation would view any emergent ordering – ‘fixity’ (Hjorth, 2017) – as a social achievement, precariously achieved, indeterminate, always remaining open to further becoming (Verduyn, 2015). The radical approach sees entrepreneurial activity as organization-creation, a creative mode of becoming that intervenes with well-instituted organizational settings (Hjorth et al., 2015). As Hjorth et al. (2015) assert, from a radical processual point of view, entrepreneuring is to be seen as an act of ‘disclosing that which is not yet fully known’ (p. 600).

The Radical Processual Approach has been taken up in various (but limited) contributions (e.g. Steyaert, 1997; Hjorth, 2003; 2013a; 2014; 2017; Chia, 2008, Styhre, 2008; Hjorth et al., 2015; Verduyn, 2015). Processual entrepreneurship studies form an attempt at moving beyond a reductionist

understanding of the entrepreneurship phenomenon. This understanding appeals to how entrepreneurship inadvertently varyingly provokes and appropriates existing 'orders' (cf. Steyaert, 2007; Nayak and Chia, 2011). Scholars have been asking questions such as how processual thinking of subjectivity could be applied to study of 'becoming entrepreneur' (Hjorth, 2013) and how the 'hesitant entrepreneur' could be used as an exemplar of radical processual thinking (Nayak and Chia, 2011). They have also sought to understand spatio-temporal rhythm of the creation of organization that makes the entrepreneurial venture emerge (Verduyn, 2015) and to adopt process metaphysics to generate a view on the nature of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning that requires 'peripheral vision' rather than focal awareness (Chia, 2008).

We feel that we need to stipulate that even if the radical processual promise has been taken up in various (but, as said (still) limited) contributions, the focus in them is predominantly conceptual. For example, calling for how such an approach has merit in offering *deeper* processual analyses (Nayak and Chia, 2011), or in offering an attempt at taking it up to offer a further conceptualization of how this might play out.

Exploring the illustrative question: A Radical processual approach

A processual approach to understanding the question of 'Why do some people become entrepreneurs whereas others don't?' would evidently take the *becoming* in the question seriously. In the process approach that is based on ontology of becoming, 'to be' becomes 'to become' (Cloots, 1968 in Steyaert, 1997). This means that any act, event or 'decision' is seen as temporary, prone to further becoming. On rejecting the way 'becoming' is implied in the illustrative question, the radical processual approach would move on to reframe the question to emphasise the provisional of/in entrepreneurship: the 'entre', the in-between, where actually anyone always already 'is' and 'is not' (to be seen as) an entrepreneur. The approach would start to ask novel questions regarding the nature of the processes in and through which such (relational) events come about, where they stem from, and how they are interwoven with 'what is already there', changing directions, eroding 'fixities' (Hjorth, 2017), finding ways to establishing temporary 'new' arrangements. Questions would be geared toward entrepreneuring as world-making (Spinoza et al., 1997), and the consequences and impact(s) this may or may not create (Verduyn, 2015).

The radical processual approach would object to the (reified) use of 'entrepreneur' in the illustrative question. The ontological position of becoming rejects 'becoming or not becoming an entrepreneur' as a matter of some *final* entity or identity. According to the radical processual approach, entrepreneuring cannot be reduced 'to a quality of a mind [...], a quality of human beings

[...] or a skill' (Hjorth et al., 2015, p. 607). From a processual approach, questions would not be asked in a way that makes a divide, whereby 'to be an entrepreneur' is a different category from 'not being one'.

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, we have presented three conversations: Critical Entrepreneurship Studies, Entrepreneurship as Practice and the Radical Processual Approach (for a summary, see table 1.1).

<INSERT TABLE 1.1 ABOUT HERE>

Although at times used interchangeably, we have signalled a need to gauge what specifically is addressed within each conversation, so as to be able to evaluate what sets them apart and to comprehend what is their common ground. All three share an interest in stepping away from individualized, overtly economized, deterministic accounts of entrepreneurship and advocating an interest in the mundane, the everydayness of entrepreneurship. The practice approach shares with the radical processual approach the interest in how certain practices change the order of things just going as they go, invading everyday life. Furthermore, they share a non-entitative stance, where *entrepreneurship* is posited as unfinalized/open-ended and scholars are wary of such words as 'essentially' and 'really'. EaP and RPA are both processual in their outlook, albeit EaP not being a 'radical' processual approach. To understand the intricacies of each conversation, and to work toward appreciating each of them, we now postulate tentative ideas on how insights from each conversation could inform future research.

Firstly, Entrepreneurship as Practice studies could benefit from a critical 'attitude' in not losing sight of the politicality in and of the intricate practice constellations being materialized in doing entrepreneurship and in order to avoid entrepreneurship research's general 'hegemony of the positive' (Farny et al., 2016). In other fields, the practice approach has been mobilized explicitly from a critical position (for example Gherardi, 2009; Geiger, 2009; Corradi et al., 2010) and EaP could follow such examples.

On the other hand, the practice approach could provide additional theoretical resources for CES that could be utilized to ask for example how both problematic and emancipatory aspects of entrepreneurship are being materialized and kept in existence in and through constant repetition of (mundane) practices. Furthermore, EaP could be insightful for CES studies engaging in *affirmative* critique (e.g. Weiskopf and Steyaert, 2009; Hjorth, 2013a; Tobias et al., 2013; Dey and Steyaert,

2018). The guiding idea of critique as affirmation (Braidotti, 2011, 2013; MacLure, 2015; Raffnsøe, 2016) is that critique should transform the object of critique. EaP theorizing can help in making oppressive practices *visible* in order to *change* them. That is, the practice approach can assist in arriving at a nuanced understanding of ‘how things are done’ (before rushing to change them).

Through its emphasis on sociomateriality, the practice approach could also be a further source of inspiration in moving from human-centric critique in entrepreneurship, at the favour of moving toward acknowledging the challenges we are faced with today (Braidotti, 2013; Gherardi, 2017; Ergene, Calás and Smircich, 2017). Combining practice theoretical insights with the alternative-seeking, affirmative critique type of CES research could guide interest toward new ways of organizing that are called for to enable living on our finite planet (cf. Houtbeckers (forthcoming), who calls for research that would focus on everyday practices perceived as ‘post-growth organizing’).

The radical processual approach can provide insights for CES relating to *how* theorizing is done. Some CES research seems to be postulated on universal principles (‘we should reduce oppression’, ‘we should reduce inequality’, ‘emancipation is possible’). The radical processual approach reminds us to avoid moulding insights into (fixed) categories. Thus, it can help let go of the notion of there being universal principles and instead stipulate the inherent movement in and of understanding (social) phenomena. Process studies remind us that when theorizing things, we should not ‘stop’ phenomena to comprehend them, thus losing sight of their processual dynamics. Likewise, RPA could urge critical research to reconsider the ‘duality’ found in many critical contributions (cf. ‘male-female’, ‘oppression’-‘emancipation’).

The same applies to what RPA may remind EaP of: that when we theorize, we try to fix and ‘hold’ things. It might critique practice studies for ‘showing’ (understanding of) certain practices, and then pausing the analysis, resulting in a ‘fixing’ of understanding the world which in fact is actually (still) constantly going on. The radical processual approach may act as a reminder for practice theories to embrace processual understandings of the world and not to present practices as some deterministic external entities that ‘float above people’.

Given that the radical processual approach apparently faces challenges in operationalizing its ontological ideas in empirical work, it may mean that EaP’s ‘toolset vocabulary’ (Nicolini, 2012) can further the radical processual conversation in making the radical processual promises more ‘concrete’.

This chapter has provided a brief overview of three conversations in entrepreneurship research, a mere thought exercise to learn more about the idiosyncrasies and interrelations between these discussions. As a conclusion, we would like to acknowledge that contemporary entrepreneurship research hosts a wonderful array of ‘different’ approaches in term of meta-

theoretical assumptions, theories and methods. The three conversations covered here offer just a minor glimpse into what is going on in the field. Generally, we call for continuing to embrace conversations going on in the humanities and social sciences to help understand the entrepreneurship phenomenon. A fruitful task for future research would be to continue to add conversations, to be looked at side-by-side without the intention to argue for the superiority of one approach over another. A trap that may occur with having these conversations is that they may tend to start producing boundaries (deciding what is 'in', and what is 'out'), and thus run the risk of becoming encapsulating, rather than opening up. We call for fluidity of current and future conversations, thus keeping them 'alive'.

REFERENCES

- Ahl, Helene (2004), *The Scientific reproduction of gender inequality: a discourse analysis of research texts upon women's entrepreneurship*, Copenhagen: CBS Press.
- Al-Dajani, H. and S. Marlow (2013), 'Empowerment and entrepreneurship: A theoretical framework', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **19**, 503–524.
- Anderson, A.R., S. Drakopoulou Dodd and S. Jack (2010), 'Network practices and entrepreneurial growth', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **26** (2), 121–133.
- Anderson, A.R. and S. Ronteau (2017), 'Towards an entrepreneurial theory of practice; emerging ideas for emerging economies', *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, **9** (2), 110–120.
- Armstrong, Peter (2005), *Critique of Entrepreneurship: People and Policy*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Baron, R.A. (2004), 'The cognitive perspective: A valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic "why" questions', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **19**, 221–239.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2011), *Nomadic Theory: The Portable Rosi Braidotti*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi (2013), *The posthuman*, Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Bruni, A., S. Gherardi and B. Poggio (2004), 'Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices. Gender, Work and Organization', **11** (4), 406–429.
- Calás, M.B., L. Smircich and K.A. Bourne (2009), 'Extending the boundaries: Reframing 'entrepreneurship as social change' through feminist perspectives', *Academy of Management Review*, **34** (3), 552–569.
- Carter, N., W.B. Gartner and P. Reynolds (1996), 'Exploring start-up event sequences', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **11**, 151–166.
- Chalmers, D. M. and E. Shaw (2017), 'The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts: A practice-based perspective', *International Small Business Journal*, September, **35** (1), 19–39.
- Chia, R. (1999), 'A 'rhizomic' model of organizational change and transformation: Perspective from a metaphysics of change', *British Journal of Management*, **10**, 209–227.
- Chia, R. (2008), 'Enhancing entrepreneurial learning through peripheral vision', in Harrison, Richard T. and Claire Leitch (eds), *Entrepreneurial Learning. Conceptual Frameworks and Applications*, London, UK: Routledge, pp. 27–43.
- Chiasson, M., and C. Saunders (2005), 'Reconciling diverse approaches to opportunity research using the structuration theory', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **20** (6), 747–767.

- Churchill, N. and V. Lewis (1983), 'The five stages of small business growth', *Harvard Business Review*, **61**, 30–50.
- Corradi, G., S. Gherardi and L. Verzelloni (2010), 'Through the practice lens: Where is the bandwagon of practice-based studies heading?', *Management Learning*, **4** (3), 265–283.
- Costa, A.S.M. and L.A.S. Saraiva (2012), 'Hegemonic discourses on entrepreneurship as an ideological mechanism for the reproduction of capital', *Organization*, **19** (5), 587–614.
- Daskalaki, D., D. Hjorth and J. Mair (2015), 'Are entrepreneurship, communities, and social transformation related?', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **24**, 419–423.
- De Clercq, D. and M. Voronov (2009), 'Toward a practice perspective of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial legitimacy as habitus', *International Small Business Journal*, **27** (4), 395–419.
- Demir, R., and L.O. Lychnell (2015), 'Mangling the process: A meta-theoretical account of process theorizing', *Qualitative Research*, **15** (1), 85–104.
- Dey, Pascal and Chris Steyaert (eds) (2018), *Social Entrepreneurship: An Affirmative Critique*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S.L. (2014), 'Roots radical – place, power and practice in punk entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **26** (1-2), 165–205.
- Engstrom, C. (2012), 'An autoethnographic account of prosaic entrepreneurship', *Tamara. Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*, **10**, 41–54.
- Ergene, S., M.B. Calás and L. Smircich (2017), 'Ecologies of sustainable concerns: organization theorizing for the Anthropocene', *Gender, Work & Organization*, **25** (3), 222–245.
- Essers, C. and Y. Benchop (2007), 'Enterprising identities: Female entrepreneurs of Moroccan or Turkish origin in the Netherlands', *Organization Studies*, **28** (1), 49–69.
- Essers, Caroline, Pascal Dey, Deirdre Tedmanson and Karen Verduyn (2017), *Critical Perspectives on Entrepreneurship: Challenging Dominant Discourses*, Abingdon, Oxon, New York, NY: Routledge.
- Farny, S., S. Hedeboe Frederiksen, M. Hannibal and S. Jones (2016), 'A CULTure of entrepreneurship education', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **28** (7-8), 514–535.
- Feldman, M.S. and W.J. Orlikowski (2011), 'Theorizing practice and practicing theory', *Organization Science*, **22** (5), 1240–1253.
- Fletcher, D.E. (2006), 'Entrepreneurial processes and the social construction of opportunity', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **18** (5), 421–440.
- Gartner, W.B. (1988), "'Who is an entrepreneur?' Is the wrong question', *American Journal of Small Business*, **12** (4), 11–32.
- Geiger, D. (2009), 'Revisiting the concept of practice: Toward argumentative understanding of

- practicing', *Management Learning*, **40** (2), 129–44.
- Gherardi, S. (2009), 'Introduction: The critical power of the 'practice lens'', *Management Learning*, **40** (2), 115–128.
- Gherardi, Silvia (2012), *How to conduct a practice-based study. Problems and methods*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Gherardi, S. (2017), 'Sociomateriality in posthuman practice theory', in Hui, Allison, Theodore Schatzki and Elizabeth Shove (eds), *The Nexus of Practices*, London, UK: Routledge, pp. 50–63.
- Goss, D., R. Jones, M. Betta and J. Latham (2011), 'Power as practice: A Micro-sociological analysis of the dynamics of emancipatory entrepreneurship', *Organization Studies*, **32** (2), 211–229.
- Heidegger, M. (1971), 'The nature of language', in Hertz, Peter D. (ed), *On the Way to Language*, New York: Harper & Row, pp. 57–110.
- Hjorth, Daniel (2003), *Rewriting Entrepreneurship: for a new perspective on organisational creativity*, Malmö/Copenhagen/Oslo: Liber/CBS Press/Abstrakt.
- Hjorth, D. (2013a), 'Absolutely fabulous! Fabulation and organization-creation in processes of becoming-entrepreneur', *Society and Business Review*, **8**, 205–224.
- Hjorth, D. (2013b), 'Public entrepreneurship: Desiring social change, creating sociality', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **25**, (1-2), 34–51.
- Hjorth, D. (2014), 'Sketching a philosophy of entrepreneurship' in Baker, Ted and Friederike Welter (eds), *The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship*, London, UK: Routledge, pp. 41–58.
- Hjorth, D. (2017), 'Critique Nouvelle – an essay on affirmative-performative entrepreneurship research', *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, **16** (1), 47–54.
- Hjorth, D., R. Holt and C. Steyaert (2015), 'Entrepreneurship and process studies', *International Small Business Journal*, **33** (6), 599–611.
- Holt, R. (2008), 'Using activity theory to understand entrepreneurial opportunity', *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, **15** (1), 52–70.
- Houtbeckers, E. (forthcoming), 'Framing social enterprise as post-growth organising in the diverse economy', *Management Revue*.
- Hytti, U. and J. Heinonen (2013), 'Heroic and humane entrepreneurs: Identity work in entrepreneurship education', *Education + Training*, **55** (8/9), 886–898.

- Ilmas, J.M., N. Wilson and A. Weston (2012), 'Barefoot entrepreneurs', *Organization*, **19** (5), 563–585.
- Jack, S. L. and A.R. Anderson (2002), 'The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **17** (5), 467–487.
- Johannisson, B. (2011), 'Towards a practice theory of entrepreneuring', *Small Business Economics*, **36**, 135–150.
- Jones, O. and R. Holt (2008), 'The creation and evolution of new business ventures: An activity theory perspective', *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, **15** (1), 51–73.
- Jones, C. and A. Spicer (2005), 'The Sublime Object of Entrepreneurship', *Organization*, **12** (2), 223–246.
- Jones, Campbell and André Spicer (2009), *Unmasking the Entrepreneur*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Jones, C. and A.-M. Murtola (2012a), 'Entrepreneurship and expropriation', *Organization*, **19** (5), 635–655.
- Jones, C. and A.-M. Murtola (2012b), 'Entrepreneurship, crisis, critique', in Daniel Hjorth (ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 116–133.
- Keating, A., S. Geiger and D. McLoughlin (2013), 'Riding the practice waves: Social resourcing practices during new venture development', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **38** (5), 1207–1235.
- Kenny, K. and S. Scriver (2012), 'Dangerously empty? Hegemony and the construction of the Irish entrepreneur', *Organization*, **19** (5), 615–633.
- Maclure, M. (2015), 'The 'new materialisms': A thorn in the flesh of critical qualitative inquiry?', in Cannella, Gaile S., Michelle Salazar Pérez and Penny A. Pasque (eds), *Critical Qualitative Inquiry: Foundations and Futures*, California: Left Coast Press.
- Martin, J. (1990), 'Organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations', *Organization Science*, **1** (4), 339–59.
- McKeever, E., S. Jack and A. Anderson (2015), 'Embedded entrepreneurship in the creative reconstruction of place', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **30**, 50–65.
- Nayak, A. (2008), 'On the way to theory: A processual approach', *Organization Studies*, **29** (2), 173–190.
- Nayak, A. and R. Chia (2011), 'Thinking becoming. Process philosophy and organization studies', *Philosophy and Organization Theory Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, **32**, 281–309.
- Nicholson, L. and A.R. Anderson (2005), 'News and nuances of the entrepreneurial myth and metaphor: Linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving',

Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, **29** (2), 153–172.

- Nicolini, Davide (2012), *Practice Theory, Work, and Organization*, Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ogbor, J. (2000), 'Mythicizing and reification in entrepreneurial discourse: Ideology-critique of entrepreneurial studies', *Journal of Management Studies*, **37** (5), 605–635.
- Raffnsøe, Sverre (2016), *Philosophy of the Anthropocene: The Human Turn*, London, UK: Palgrave Pivot.
- Reckwitz, A. (2002), 'Toward a Theory of Social Practices. A Development in Culturalist Theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, **5** (2), 243–63.
- Rehn, A., M. Brännback, A. Carsrud and M. Lindahl (2013), 'Editorial. Challenging the myths of entrepreneurship?', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **25** (7-8), 543–551.
- Rehn, A. and S. Taalas (2004), '“Znakomstva I Svyazi” (Acquaintances and connections) – Blat, the Soviet Union, and mundane entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **16**, 235–250.
- Rescher, N. (1996), *Process Metaphysics*, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Sarason, Y., T. Dean and F.J. Dillard (2005), 'Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual and opportunity: A structuration view', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **21**, 286–305.
- Schatzki, Theodore R., Karin Knorr-Cetina and Eike von Savigny (eds) (2001), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London, UK: Psychology Press.
- Shove, Elizabeth, Mika Pantzar and Matt Watson (2012), *The Dynamics of Social Practice: Everyday Life and How it Changes*, Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: SAGE.
- Spigel, B. (2013), 'Bourdieuian approaches to the geography of entrepreneurial cultures', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **25** (9-10), 804–818.
- Spinosa, Charles, Fernando Flores and Hubert L. Dreyfus (1997), *Disclosing New Worlds. Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action and the Cultivation of Solidarity*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Steyaert, C. (1997), 'A qualitative methodology for process studies of entrepreneurship: Creating local knowledge through stories', *International Studies of Management & Organization*, **27**, 13–33.
- Steyaert, C. (2004), 'The prosaics of entrepreneurship', in Hjorth, Daniel and Chris Steyaert (eds), *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship Studies*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 8–21.
- Steyaert, C. (2007), '“Entrepreneurship” as a conceptual attractor. A review of process theories in 20

- years of entrepreneurship studies', *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **19**, 453–477.
- Steyaert, Chris and Daniel Hjorth (2006), *Entrepreneurship as social change*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Styhre, A. (2008), 'Transduction and entrepreneurship: A biophilosophical image of the entrepreneur', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **24** (2), 103–112.
- Tedmanson, D., K. Verduyn, C. Essers and W.B. Gartner (2012), 'Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research', *Organization*, **19** (5), 531–541.
- Terjesen, S. and A. Elam (2009), 'Transnational entrepreneurs' venture internationalization strategies: A practice theory approach', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **33** (5), 1093–1120.
- Tobias, J.M., J. Mair and C. Barbosa-Leiker (2013), 'Toward a theory of transformative entrepreneuring: Poverty reduction and conflict resolution in Rwanda's entrepreneurial coffee sector', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **28** (6), 728–742.
- Tsoukas, H. and R. Chia (2011), 'Introduction: Why philosophy matters to organization theory', in Tsoukas, Haridimos and Robert Chia (eds), *Philosophy and Organization Theory (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 32)*, Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp.1–21.
- Verduyn, K. (2015), 'Entrepreneuring and process. A Lefebvrian perspective', *International Small Business Journal*, **33** (6), 638–648.
- Verduijn, K., P. Dey, D. Tedmanson and C. Essers (2014), 'Emancipation and/or oppression? Conceptualizing dimensions of criticality in entrepreneurship studies', *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **20** (2), 98–107.
- Verduyn, K., P. Dey and D. Tedmanson (2017), 'A critical understanding of entrepreneurship', *Revue de l'Entrepreneuriat*, **16**, (1), 37–45.
- Weiskopf, R. and C. Steyaert (2009), 'Metamorphoses in entrepreneurship studies: Towards affirmative politics of entrepreneuring', in Daniel Hjorth and Chris Steyaert (eds), *The politics and aesthetics of entrepreneurship. A fourth movements in entrepreneurship book*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar, pp. 183–201.
- Whitehead, Alfred North (1929), *Process and Reality*, New York: Free Press.

Conversation	Understanding of entrepreneurship	What the conversation focuses on	Example research questions/aims
Critical Entrepreneurship Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship as an (ideological) discourse • ‘Entrepreneurship is simultaneously both a political and economic category and one that rests on symbolic and ideological fantasies’ (Jones and Murtola, 2012a, p. 636) • Entrepreneurship is an empty signifier and as such it can be almost whatever one desires it to be, which makes it perennially attractive (Jones and Spicer, 2005, 2009) • All entrepreneurship activity can be seen as a process of social change (Calás et al., 2009) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and political connotations of entrepreneurship • Being wary of capitalist system • No a priori positive view of entrepreneurship • Interest in the ‘dark side’ of entrepreneurship, but also the affirmative side (means of emancipating, changing (society)) • Questioning who and what are represented within ‘mainstream’ research and who and what is left out; voicing ‘alternative’ subjectivities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the signifier ‘entrepreneurship’ function within the social context of economic crisis and with what consequences? (Kenny and Scriver, 2012) • How are the social categories of entrepreneurship, gender and ethnicity negotiated in the construction of professional identities and how are these identities embedded in power relations? (Essers and Benschop, 2007) • Entrepreneur[ial] stories of ‘barefoot’ entrepreneurs operating in marginal, poor and excluded places and contexts (Imas et al., 2012) • How can we develop critique of entrepreneurship? (Jones and Murtola, 2012b) • How does entrepreneuring release emancipatory possibilities by changing extant relations of power? (Goss et al., 2011)
Entrepreneurship as Practice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurship as an assemblage, an everyday hands-on practice and creative organizing (Johannisson, 2011) • Entrepreneurship as a set of practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest in <i>practices</i>, unit of analysis is practices • Understanding the constitution and consequences of specific entrepreneurial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘How are gender and entrepreneurship enacted as situated practices?’ (Bruni et al., 2004) • ‘How do early venture entrepreneurs engage in socially embedded practices to resource their firm?’ (Keating et al., 2014)

	<p>intrinsically intertwined with the very fabric of contemporary society; as an unfolding of everyday practices (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009)</p>	<p>practices in specific settings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding the joint activities that constitute entrepreneurial activity • Applying practice theories to the study of entrepreneurship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘How do newcomers entering a field gain legitimacy?’ (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009) • ‘How can the situated nature of entrepreneurial practices be understood?’ (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017)
<p>Radical Processual Approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entrepreneurial activity as organization-creation, a creative mode of becoming that intervenes with well-instituted organizational settings (Hjorth et al., 2015). • <i>Entrepreneurship</i> is to be seen as ‘the appearing and re-appearing of events’, as an act of ‘disclosing that which is not yet fully known’ (Hjorth et al., 2015, p. 600). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking an alternative ontological stance • Incorporating a process view that is predicated on an ontology of becoming into the study of entrepreneurship 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To adopt process metaphysics to generate a view on the nature of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial learning that requires ‘peripheral vision’ rather than focal awareness (Chia, 2008) • To apply processual thinking of subjectivity in the study of ‘becoming entrepreneur’ (Hjorth, 2013) • Exploring the ‘hesitant entrepreneur’ as an exemplar of radical processual thinking (Nayak and Chia, 2011) • Positing entrepreneurship as a form of ‘history-making’, opening up well-instituted organization settings, and appreciating entrepreneurial activity as the becoming of organization-creation (Hjorth et al., 2015) • How to understand the spatio-temporal rhythm of the creation of organization? (Verduyn, 2015)

Table 1.1: Summary of the three conversations