STUDY 3

We're the biggest student movement in Finland since the 1970s!': a practice-based study of student Entrepreneurship Societies

Piritta Parkkari and Krista Kohtakangas

INTRODUCTION

Focusing on student Entrepreneurship Society (ES) organizations in Finland, this chapter follows the practice-based studies approach in order to gather a better understanding of organizations that work to promote entrepreneurship. The few studies done on these organizations have portrayed them as extracurricular, informal, non-accredited, student-led organizations that aim to promote entrepreneurship by arranging various activities around entrepreneurship (Pittaway et al., 2011; Pittaway et al., 2015). The first ES was established in Finland around 2008; by 2017, there were already close to 20 such organizations spread across the country (StartupFinland, 2017), with at least one in nearly all cities containing a higher education campus (Viljamaa, 2016). Previous research has noted that Finnish ESs reflect the growing interest in start-up entrepreneurship and start-up companies, a trend that began in the late 2000s (Lehdonvirta, 2013). These organizations have been portrayed as representatives of growth entrepreneurship, bringing the spirit of California's Silicon Valley to Finland (Mannevuo, 2015). They have even gained the reputation of being a student-led entrepreneurship movement engaged in a wider cultural change reflecting national attitudes towards start-up activities and entrepreneurship in general (Graham, 2014).

Researchers (Johannisson, 2011; Steyaert, 2007) have called on entrepreneurship research to adopt the practice theory approach (Schatzki et al., 2001). The emerging stream of Entrepreneurship as Practice has focused on utilizing practice theories to understand what entrepreneurs do and how they do it (Anderson and Ronteau, 2017), ultimately producing several reconceptualizations of entrepreneurship. These new concepts include seeing entrepreneurship as an unfolding of everyday practices (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009) or as an everyday, hands-on, ongoing practice of creatively organizing people and resources (Johannisson, 2011). Entrepreneurship as Practice scholars have applied different practice theories, particularly those by Giddens and Bourdieu, to topics such as transnational entrepreneurs (Terjesen and Elam, 2009; Patel and Conklin, 2009), legitimation (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009), context (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017), resourcing (Keating et al., 2013) and growth (Anderson et al., 2010). The studies have shed light on various aspects related to engaging in entrepreneurship, but there is a lack of studies that utilize real-time, naturally occurring data (Chalmers and Shaw, 2017; Johannisson, 2011) while focusing on the phenomenon of entrepreneurship beyond individuals labelled as entrepreneurs practising entrepreneurship.

We aim to understand the meanings constructed for Entrepreneurship Society organizations in Finland and the ideals that emerge as these organizations come together to work on their cooperation. Studying this phenomenon is important because such investigation opens up discussion regarding the effects of activities done *around* entrepreneurship in terms of (re-)producing the meanings of entrepreneurship. Theory-wise, we draw upon practice-based studies (PBS) (Corradi et al., 2010; Gherardi, 2011, 2012, 2015; Nicolini, 2009, 2012). PBS is one way to engage with the general social scientific 'practice turn' (Schatzki et al., 2001), which emphasizes the power of practices in producing the social world. PBS sees social life as an ongoing production: situated, everyday actions are consequential in the production of social life (Corradi et al., 2010; Feldman and Orlikowski, 2011; Gherardi, 2009, 2012). As such, we experiment with how much can be understood about

organizations working to promote entrepreneurship (ESs) based on a single get-together event. Even a single event can be meaningful, allowing insight into how different practices intertwine and produce a variety of effects when practitioners carry practices into a particular setting (Reckwitz, 2002). Having briefly introduced the research, we now turn to outlining the PBS approach to entrepreneurship before presenting our empirical study and results. The chapter concludes with a discussion of our findings.

THE PRACTICE-BASED STUDIES APPROACH TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Within PBS, the term *practice* can denote the object of empirical analysis or even reflect a common-sense definition of 'what people really do' or 'being closer to reality' (Gherardi 2009; Corradi et al., 2010). We adopt another understanding: practice as a way of seeing, an epistemology (Gherardi, 2011, 2015). We approach practice as the locus for the production and reproduction of social relations and focus our research on the emergence of relations through ongoing interaction (Corradi et al., 2010; Gherardi, 2011). We believe that social reality consists of practices and thus is brought into being through everyday activity (Feldman and Orlikowski, 2011).

Practices include several interconnected elements: 'forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, "things" and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding, know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge' (Reckwitz, 2002, p. 249). Individuals carry out practices, but they also serve as carriers of practices (Reckwitz, 2002), which means that practitioners carry various practices even into ephemeral occasions. However, it is important to note that practices are not individual property – they are always social practices (Nicolini, 2009, 2012). They are institutionalized, but only exist to the extent to which they are enacted and re-enacted (Nicolini, 2012).

Practices constitute the horizon within which all discursive and material actions are made possible and acquire meaning (Nicolini, 2009). Thus, we approach entrepreneurship as a discursive, social and material phenomenon, gaining different meanings and forms in and through various practices. Practices cannot be understood in isolation because they are interconnected, forming unique 'textures' of practice' (Gherardi, 2012, p. 156). One practice can serve as a resource for another. Meanwhile, certain practices might anchor, control or organize others, exerting more power and endurance in shaping or constraining social arrangements (Gherardi, 2012).

ENTREPRENEURSHIP AS PRACTICE

Entrepreneurship as Practice research utilizes a variety of interpretations when it comes to practice and theoretical traditions. Previous studies have highlighted some of the benefits of practice theories. For example, structuration-oriented studies (Jack and Anderson, 2002; Chiasson and Saunders, 2005; Sarason et al., 2006) highlight a key point of practice theories: that human action is guided by structure and that structure is created by action. Such research has been shifting our understanding of entrepreneurship away from a decontextualized activity towards an acknowledgment of its social embeddedness. For their part, Bourdieusian studies (De Clercq and Voronov, 2009; Anderson et al., 2010; Terjesen and Elam, 2009; Patel and Conklin, 2009) highlight that whilst practices are hard to change and have strong effects on individuals, practice theories do indeed leave space for individual initiative, creativity and improvisation (Nicolini, 2012, p. 4).

To date, other practice theories have gained less attention in Entrepreneurship as Practice research; nonetheless, a few important studies have taken novel approaches to practice theory research. For

example, Chalmers and Shaw (2017) built a framework based upon insights from ethnomethodology, conversation analysis and broader 'practice turn' in organization studies in order to analyze the endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts. Keating et al. (2013) drew on Schatzki's practice theory and adopted a practice-based perspective as an epistemological stance to resourcing. Bruni et al. (2004) also applied practice as epistemology, considering how gender and entrepreneurship are culturally produced and reproduced in social practices. These studies have helped dismantle entrepreneurship as a heroic economic activity, focusing more on entrepreneuring as social action (Johannisson, 2011). We build on these studies by adopting practice as epistemology, aiming to understand the phenomenon of Entrepreneurship Society organizations. In particular, we rely on the works of Silvia Gherardi and Davide Nicolini to augment the theoretical variety used in empirical studies within Entrepreneurship as Practice. By utilizing real-time, naturally occurring, ethnographic empirical material that illustrates what goes on around entrepreneurship, our approach seeks to answer calls for studies that focus on phenomena that are actually done and that treat even single episodes of *in situ* practice as important (Johannisson, 2011, 2014; Chalmers and Shaw, 2017).

METHODOLOGY

Our study is based on an ethnography (Cunliffe, 2010; Van Maanen, 2011) of an Entrepreneurship Society organization (StartingUp, pseudonym) and its network in Finland, conducted by the first author between September 2013 and December 2016. This ethnography primarily focused on StartingUp's activities, but it also included the first author's attendance at ten events, where representatives from multiple ESs gathered to work on their cooperation or met each other as part of a start-up related event. Here, we focus on one such event: a weekend-long get-together organized by StartingUp in Finland in 2015. There, people from 12 out of the almost 20 Finnish ESs came together to work on their cooperation and spend time together. The event had about 40 participants (around 30 men and ten women), who were aged between 20 and 30. One man was over 50. Most of the participants were Finnish, but there were six nationalities present altogether. The official language of the event was English, and thus, the quotations used here are in their original form. This gathering was the second time the yearly event was organized. The first author took part in the first event and knew that the get-together would provide interesting glimpses into the phenomenon of ESs.

Our empirical material consists of photographs (taken by both the first author and a photographer taking part in the event), audio recordings, video recordings, documents and field notes constructed by the first author (see Table 9.1). As the first author was responsible for many of the event's practical matters, few field notes were taken during the event itself. However, notes were written up and gaps filled immediately following the event. The extensive audio-visual material compensates for shortcomings in the field notes.

Type of empirical material	Number/length
Photographs	298
Video recordings	Approximately one hour
Audio recordings	Approximately eight hours
Notes	Handwritten field notes, 11 pages of written-up notes right after the event
Documents	Facebook event, organizers' planning documents, PowerPoint slides, drawings and writings from workshops

Table 9.1   Empirical material

Johannisson (2014) argues that the researcher needs to be familiar with the context of the practices under study in order to make sense out of the experiences. When the event took place, the first author briefly explained to participants that she was performing three roles, serving as one of the main organizers of the event (the host), as the former president of the board of StartingUp (the association organizing the event), and as a researcher documenting the event. The event participants considered her as 'one-of-us' (Cunliffe and Karunanayake, 2013) – and so did she. Her roles affected the way the event proceeded, but the insider position guaranteed access to the private event and allowed the collection of rich, real-time empirical material. Because of her organizer and ES activist role, she could understand the event from the point of view of the studied communities' practices, which is valued in PBS (Gherardi, 2012; Nicolini, 2012). The second author was given access to recorded material, and she examined the material more inductively as an 'outsider', also helping the first author to distance herself from the empirical material.

As for ethical considerations, we orally requested the event participants' permission to conduct research at the beginning of the event, and many participants were already familiar with the first author's research, having served as subjects. The participants were sent a draft version of this chapter during the research. To protect the participants and their anonymity, we have given them pseudonyms. Because many participants were inebriated during the evenings, video and audio recordings focused on the daytime programme. However, the practice of getting drunk is very common in the context of Finnish student activities and is largely accepted. We will later interpret the studied event as a cottage weekend, and drinking alcohol is often an important part of that practice, too.

ANALYSIS

Our analysis process included multiple rounds of both authors examining the material separately before coming together to watch and listen to the empirical material and discuss interpretations. The first author provided the second researcher with more details and background stories to frame the observations because she had ethnographic understandings of the studied organizations. These understandings were discussed – and challenged – during the collaborative analysis. For example, she held a preconception that ES organizations in Finland work to promote entrepreneurship – in particular growth-seeking, team-based and technology-oriented start-ups – as a viable career choice for students and other young professionals. However, she came to see that sometimes entrepreneurship is just a good excuse for ES people to come together (and often get drunk); thus, the idea of 'entrepreneurship' can produce a sense of belonging and togetherness within ESs. She realized that the people involved are interested in entrepreneurship to varying degrees, and only some of them have their own companies.

Practice-based approaches view the basic unit of analysis as practices, not individuals (Nicolini 2012, p. 7). According to Nicolini (2012, p. 219), practice theoretical studies must start by zooming in on the details of how a practice is accomplished in a specific place. Following this procedure, we first looked for what was going on during the get-together event: who was present and why, what they did and what kinds of settings and artefacts were apparent. From the broad focus on how the event was discursively and materially accomplished, we moved to a narrower focus on two key practices enacted during the event: 'being a student' and 'being part of the start-up scene'. We analysed how the meanings of ESs were constructed as these practices became intertwined and what ideals emerged. In our results, we first set the scene by showing how the event enacted the practice of having

a cottage weekend and by illustrating the practices exercised at the event by participants. Then, we deepen our analytical gaze to show how the meanings and ideals were constructed.

RESULTS

Accomplishing a Get-Together Event

When we look at the sayings and activities of people attending the get-together event, we see that they were carrying out (Reckwitz, 2002) the Finnish practice of having a cottage weekend. The participants themselves described the event as a cottage weekend. Per the norm at a cottage venue, there was a common space for working and lounging, and most importantly, there was also a sauna, used in the evenings with women going first and men afterwards. The event included a relaxed atmosphere, and people broke into laughter easily. Like many corporate cottage weekends, the event also included some formal sessions: presentations, workshop-style group work and community discussions on Saturday and Sunday morning. The get-together event lasted from Friday evening until Sunday morning, a common time frame in the practice of a cottage weekend, giving the event an ephemeral sense. Generally speaking, cottage weekends allow at least partial detachment from everyday life and offer opportunities for developing cooperation and spending time together without interruption.

Only certain people are invited to join a cottage weekend: particular friends or specific members of an organization who often occupy an elite position within it. Invitations for the get-together event stated the following: 'We invite all ES-actives and people interested in becoming active members of the Finland-wide Entrepreneurship Society family' (event's Facebook event page). However, only three participants from each ES in Finland could attend due to space restrictions. There were 12 different ESs present, and most participants were either on the board of their ES association, or at the very least, active members. Thus, the cottage-weekend event constructed the participants as having 'elite' positions within the ES network. Some people already knew each other from previous events and happenings where 'ES-people' (field notes) had met each other. When participants first encountered one another, they began by asking about what was happening in the other's ES, such as the events they had lined up.

When we further consider who attended the event and what they were doing, we see that they also exercised other practices within the setting (Reckwitz, 2002). Because the participants were members of their local ES organizations, they engaged in the practices and ideals of their communities. Most notably, the participants practiced 'being a student' through their young bodies, clothing and ways of being. The participants appeared to be competent students as they quietly listened to the presentations, made comments at appropriate moments and participated in group work with ease. They were either higher education students or graduates. Most of them were business students, but a few were studying IT or social sciences. Some also had begun their working lives. The difference between students and non-students only emerged in certain conversations, such as when Mathias said, 'Our people come from a small group of 3000 students.' Keith, the only older participant (from a different ES) responded, 'You're actually students; in our case we're business people and so on.' Although the ESs are mainly student organizations, it seems that actual student status is not required to join. Nonetheless, within the event, one must enact practices related to 'being a student', such as drinking, rough humour, group work and talking about changing the world. The one older man did not stand out from the crowd; he engaged in the drinking, group work and discussions actively.

Most of the participants engaged in heavy drinking; when people first arrived on Friday, they were given beer and cider. People began opening their bottles again on Saturday afternoon, some even in the morning. There were drinking games, which are popular at student parties, and with these antics came crude jokes. Participants took beers and ciders along with them to the sauna on both nights. Attending the event required quite a bit of stamina, given that the nights went on till late and Saturday included a full day of work. Saturday's first speaker, Kaisa, started her presentation by saying, 'I hope all of you have slept for more than three hours, since I haven't. Luckily, I don't know if I'm still drunk or hungover.'

The participants' visible clothing and artefacts during the event show us that they also exercised practices related to 'being a member of the Finnish start-up scene'. We saw jeans, t-shirts and logoed hoodies of different ESs and Slush, the major Finnish start-up and technology conference. Many people also had start-up related stickers on their laptops and notebooks. The participants referred to the 'start-up scene' and 'start-up ecosystem' in Finland and talked about start-up related events. In the evenings, the participants engaged in 'pitching karaoke'. Silicon Valley, the 'Mecca of start-ups', popped up multiple times during the event; early on, someone came up with the idea of sending the board presidents from each ES on a trip to Silicon Valley, one of the ideas that the community decided to continue with after the event. Thus, Silicon Valley emerged as an ideal location to go to and learn. A few attendees challenged the hegemonic role of Silicon Valley and suggested visits to India or other alternative places, but these suggestions did not receive much support.

By looking at the practices enacted during the event, we come to understand that the practice of having a cottage weekend forms a 'horizon' (Nicolini, 2009) for interpreting the actions and interactions that take place. This practice intertwines with 'being a student' and 'being a member of the Finnish start-up scene'. Of course, multiple other practices were enacted during the event, but we interpret the aforementioned practices to be the most meaningful for understanding the ESs.

The Meanings of the Entrepreneurship Societies

During her presentation, Kaisa began to talk about the network of Finnish ESs as a student movement, 'You are a part of the biggest student movement since the 70s. I really think that this is true. Finland hasn't seen this kind of a student movement in national or even in like a local level in decades.' Other participants described the ES network as a movement as well, discussing ways of developing their movement and getting it noticed. Wanting to share the movement with the whole country emerged as an important objective when, for example, Mathias answered a question about why the ESs seek to do large-scale events together. He stated major events are important 'because we want to share kind of to the whole nation there's this movement going on'. Our interpretation holds that, within the get-together event, the ESs are constructed as a student-led social movement. In referring to themselves as a (student) movement, the ESs compare themselves with the student movements of the 1960s and 1970s that were political in nature. Thus, they seem to draw upon a political agenda and the notion of enacting social change. The discussions construct an image that now, in the late 2010s, the ESs are emerging after a long period of nothing noteworthy happening amongst students – and it is entrepreneurship that is on their agenda. Talking about the ESs as a movement is also a rhetorical tactic that presents the group as a serious, large-scale collective actor and not 'just' students fiddling around.

During Sunday's concluding discussion, Pekka commented that 'ESs have a purpose, and they are a tool for change, and if we can make the change happen, we don't need any ESs.' However, he did not specify the change to be brought into fruition. The first author asked the participants, 'Do you

guys think ESs should do something in order to help start-ups, help new entrepreneurs? (. . .).' 'Why?' Jane replied, 'There's a lot of us – There's something but you don't really know what it is. We bring it out of people, bring out the spirit.' It seems that having a gut feeling about what the ESs do is sufficient for many participants to feel as though they are participating in an important change. We interpret that the urge to make a change in the world is an integral part of 'being a student': students are expected to want to be different than previous generations and to want to change the world for the better. Thus, talking about making a change – even if the actual 'change' is unclear – is important in enacting being a student. Making a change discourse is also present in the start-up culture as entrepreneurs talk about changing the world rather than doing business (Egan-Wyer et al., 2017).

Change also seems to be inherent in the ESs themselves, because when it comes to being involved in ES activities, Kaisa noted that 'none of us should get stuck and do this for like more than three years'. Most of the event's participants had been involved in ES activities for less than two years, and those staying active longer were considered veterans on the scene. This feature constructs the ESs as ideally ever-changing communities; like being a student, ESs represent a transitory phase in their lives. Therefore, rather than staying engaged until the desired change is achieved, people involved in the 'ES movement' are expected to be briefly active before becoming engaged with other issues and allowing new active people to join the ES community.

Students emerged as the movement's main target group when Anton asked, 'But who are we showing it to? I think what we need is more exposure to students, like young students, who don't know about the option of becoming an entrepreneur.' This idea came up again in Mikko's comment:

> One idea we had in [our ES] as our mission is to get people to think about entrepreneurship as a real possibility. Since when you ask about students (. . .) what do you want to do when you grow [up], a really few people say they want to be entrepreneurs (. . .). But target group [for ESs] could be like higher education students who aren't erm, they are entrepreneurial, but they don't know it yet.

Here, the main goal of ESs is constructed as promoting entrepreneurship as a viable career option for higher education students. Through this comment, entrepreneurship becomes understood as something latent within an individual that can be awoken through different activities. Waking up these entrepreneurial latencies then emerges as the role of ESs. Whilst participants might have uttered different opinions about what kinds of events to organize and whose attention they wanted to attract, they agreed on the basic premise that entrepreneurship should be promoted. This tacit agreement reproduces the prevalent belief in the goodness of entrepreneurship.

During a discussion on the Finnish ES's shared webpage, participants shared the kinds of events and activities put on by their ESs, illustrating differences between the organizations. Tuomas, from an ES that has been operating for over five years, noted that they organize activities producing high-quality new companies, such as hackathons, workshops and a summer start-up accelerator programme. Mathias, from a newer ES commented, 'I see our role as more inspirational, showing them first steps towards becoming an entrepreneur, trying to give them the skills. I don't think we need to start to create a bigger network to facilitate early stage start-ups (. . .).' Here, Mathias departs from the usual student lingo and uses the language of the start-up scene when he mentions 'facilitating early stage start-ups'. Some of the ESs engage in more structured ways of helping new entrepreneurs, such as organizing start-up accelerator programmes; nonetheless, the meaning of ESs generally is constructed as serving as an inspiration for others interested in entrepreneurship – not a pragmatic tool for actual guidance or resources.

During the cottage weekend, Kaisa's presentation constructed the rationale for ESs' activities:

> Start-ups can have an economic impact. From my point of view, this is not why you do stuff. You don't do this [activities of ESs] for media or society. You do this for yourselves, start-ups and entrepreneurially minded folks. (. . .) You're not doing this because people need to have jobs, you're doing this because it's fun (. . .) [You] get connections, learn stuff you wouldn't have possibilities to do elsewhere.

Currently in Finland, media and politicians are placing a great deal of hope in start-ups when it comes to producing economic growth and new jobs (Lehdonvirta, 2013). Here, Kaisa's comments depart from the discourse on entrepreneurial outcomes, with enjoyment and learning emerging as reasons for participating in ESs. The ESs emerge as being there *for* students *by* students, but also as serving start-ups and 'entrepreneurially minded people'. The ultimate aim here is not to produce jobs or economic growth, but to engage in ESs because they are fun. This line of thinking seems to depoliticize the 'ES movement' as personal gains are portrayed as more important than making a change.

Negotiating Cooperation: Emerging Ideals

ES organizations in Finland do not officially form a network: they are all independent associations working alone, and there is no larger organization behind them. However, they do have a common website and a Facebook group that is hidden from the public and only available to key members of each ES. The purpose of the cottage weekend was stated in the event's Facebook invitation: 'to strengthen our nationwide network of Entrepreneurship Societies' and 'to work on and challenge what ESs are about and what we can do together'. During the event, participants agreed on a few positive actions: seeing each other more often, having some common platforms for sharing information, attracting attention to the whole movement and organizing or at least coordinating common events.

During his presentation and discussion on the shared website for the ESs of Finland, Matti said the following:

> Now is a good time to start collaborating on things with others. (. . .) Since the focus [has] been on local ESs, we could make it a nationwide, and we could make it an official movement. I'm not speaking about like some head organization, generating some higher-level institution, no nothing like that. It's more just working together more.

The sense of wanting to work together and formalize cooperation to gain more attention for the student movement emerges here, but it is immediately countered by the clarification that Matti is not suggesting some 'head organization'; that is, he wanted to make sure that his proposal would not be viewed as too formal and bureaucratic. A similar discussion emerged again during an ideation exercise when Nhat suggested an idea to brand the ESs as one society with many branches. Maija responded, 'Oh, be like [a major student organization] and have like different guilds?' Ville reacted, 'Yeah. That's not very radical, but it's, plus I don't like centralized organizations, sounds very un-startuppy.' Here 'startuppy' is used as an antidote to reject ideas that sound too 'bureaucratic'. We interpret that ideals such as striving to be non-hierarchical and agile have roots in the start-up culture (Egan-Wyer et al., 2017) and values like sharing resources, looking for a structure for cooperation

and constantly learning reflect 'being a student'. It seems that contradictions are important in producing meanings for the ESs because these kinds of conversations recur frequently: ESs emerge as simultaneously searching for practices through which to formalize their cooperation while rejecting formal cooperation practices, such as having an umbrella organization.

During a discussion on events that individual ESs and their network could organize, Mikko suggested having an event related to the upcoming parliament elections. Antero interrupted him and said, 'Why do we need some kind of f***ing politics?' Mikko tried to explain that they 'make all the rules', but Antero interrupted again to say, 'That's f***ing with bureaucracy; we don't have time for that.' Thus, while Mikko tried to explain that politicians are the ones making the rules and laws that affect entrepreneurs, Antero discredited it as 'bureaucracy', something that the ESs do not want to deal with. Matti, too, followed by saying, 'But I don't want to get really deep into politics; that's something I would like to personally keep my hands off. (. . .) And they're [politicians] not really relevant to us either, since that's so long their stuff and they get so little done in my opinion.' Here, politicians are diminished for not getting enough done, which constructs 'getting things done' – and getting them done fast – as the ideal for ESs. Furthermore, 'politics' emerges as a swear word and antithetical to what the ESs want to do. In essence, 'politics' seems to be understood just as party politics. Refraining from politics is interesting given that they talk about themselves as a 'movement' and compare themselves to the student movements of 1970s. Such comparisons produce the network as political, but here, all things political are rejected. Of course, one could argue that the act of rejecting politics is in itself a political act and that the actions of the ESs could be seen as political.

During Kaisa's presentation, Alice commented, 'I can honestly say I haven't learned sh*t from school, I've learned everything from [ES], from doing the work.' Here, higher education is referred to in derogatory terms, and the vague 'doing' emerges as the alternative appreciated by participants. Valuing 'doing stuff' reproduces the canonical understandings of entrepreneurship as doing something, not just talking. The ability to get things done also is valued by the people who join ES organizations. When talking about 'the sh*tty mistakes ESs make' during her presentation, Kaisa claimed, 'You're all associations so it's all democratic, but I don't see ESs should be so democratic, that everyone gets an equal share. You should get depending on how much you do, get noted for hard work or potential.' This comment shows that the ES organizations are operating as registered associations, which for Kaisa, comes with democratic practices. She counters them by constructing 'earning one's worth' as the ideal to follow. She reaffirmed that people taking part in the get-together fit this ideal by saying, 'I think all of you who are here are talented, have a strong learning curve, are passionate; that's why you are here and that's what you should require from people that get involved. Your only capital here is people. If people are rotten, aren't passionate, don't work their asses off, what do you have?' Here, an entrepreneurial stereotype emerges as an ideal ES actor: one who has lots of potential, 'gets things done' and demonstrates passion.

DISCUSSION

This chapter has engaged with the practice-based studies approach (Corradi et al., 2010; Gherardi, 2011, 2012, 2015; Nicolini, 2009, 2012) to gather a better understanding of organizations that work to promote entrepreneurship. We argue that if we are interested in entrepreneurship as a practice, it is not just the practices of people labelled as entrepreneurs that matter. The PBS approach allows us to interpret how the discursive and material accomplishment of doing things around entrepreneurship, such as having Entrepreneurship Society organizations, contributes to the meanings and roles that entrepreneurship assumes in different social arenas with varying effects.

Through an ethnographic study, the chapter focused on student Entrepreneurship Society organizations in Finland. It sought to illuminate the meanings constructed for these organizations and the ideals that emerge when they come together to work on their cooperation. By drawing on the PBS approach, we were able to use empirical material from just a single event to uncover the nuances of the ES phenomenon. We cannot generalize and assume that we know everything there is to know about the studied ES organizations. However, our study provides insight into how the intertwining of various practices produces meanings for organizations that promote entrepreneurship while reproducing understandings of entrepreneurship. Our study 'zoomed in' (Nicolini, 2009, 2012) on the discursive and material accomplishment of a single event, which is of course only part of what the practice theoretical approach could do. We suggest that future Entrepreneurship as Practice studies utilize Nicolini's suggestion to also 'zoom out' (Nicolini, 2009, 2012) in order to see either how practices related to entrepreneurship are enacted elsewhere or to see their interconnections to other textures of practices, thus demonstrating how the local contributes to the generation of broader effects.

The few studies done on student Entrepreneurship Societies and clubs have classified them as extracurricular, informal entrepreneurship education. They have argued that people's main motivation for engaging in them is to enhance their curricula vitae and prospects for employment even though these organizations are generally known for raising awareness about starting businesses. Furthermore, researchers emphasize that ESs simulate important aspects of entrepreneurial learning, such as learning by doing (Pittaway et al., 2011, 2015.) Our research affirms that we can recognize the studied organizations as student- and other volunteer-led communities that promote entrepreneurship by organizing events and activities around entrepreneurship. However, we paint a more nuanced picture of ESs. We move beyond personal motivations and learning experiences to the manifold meanings of the organizations themselves and what they can tell us about entrepreneurship.

Our results show that the studied get-together event for developing the cooperation between Finnish ESs was enacted within the practices of 'being a student' and 'being a part of the start-up scene' while also engaging in the practice of having a cottage weekend. In and through the enactment of these practices, the ES organizations were constructed as a student movement that aims to wake up entrepreneurial latencies within students. The participants of the event described themselves as a student movement, but whether the ESs *are* a social movement is a matter beyond the scope of this chapter. Contradicting ideals emerged within the studied get-together event as the practices became intertwined. The intertwining of different practices is not always harmonious (Gherardi, 2012) and while we noticed tensions about which ideals to follow, it seems that the co-existence of varying ideals is part and parcel of the dynamic phenomenon of ESs. Egan-Wyer et al. (2017) too showed how the meanings of entrepreneurship and making sense of entrepreneurial life in a start-up culture were actually made possible through tension and contradiction, an idea that supports our findings: it is not a matter of choosing one ideal, but productively drawing on many.

Multiple contradictions are important in constructing the meanings of ESs. The ES organizations are constructed as a serious movement seeking to change the world, but at the same time, they are more about having fun and developing oneself. The event itself embodies having fun by enacting student practices, such as getting drunk and doing inspiring group work. In fact, doing things around entrepreneurship also comes across as a positive 'excuse' for bringing young people from all around the country together to have fun and feel a part of something important and bigger than themselves. Based on this event, starting new ventures appears to be a part of being a student – at least that is the idea that ESs are trying to get across to peers. The ideal actor who takes part in ESs implicitly is capable of performing 'being a student', while being an entrepreneurial person who 'gets things

done'; such individuals have potential and passion – they are not just seeking great employability, as claimed by previous research (Pittaway et al., 2011). Though 'doing stuff' is appreciated, the ESs position themselves as promoting entrepreneurship by inspiring people rather than explicitly providing help or resources for nascent entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurial 'doing' emerges as the way one should and could make a change, although what 'doing' and 'getting things done' mean is not delineated fully. In fact, little space is given to negotiating the meaning of entrepreneurship, allowing the concept to emerge as self-evident: it should be promoted, and it is something inherent in people, in need of being brought out.

The participants talking about themselves as a student movement reflect a political connotation and a social change agenda. At the same time, they denounce anything overtly 'political'. Bureaucracy and hierarchy are portrayed as unwanted, too, but at the same time, the ESs are looking for ways to improve their cooperation. Within the studied event, the participants emerge as a group of young (or young-minded) people that are disillusioned by politics, but who still wish to change the world. Valuing 'doing' implies a belief that by focusing on entrepreneurial spirit, one can circumvent the power of existing practices like 'politics', 'bureaucracy' and 'hierarchy'. 'Politics' has become a swear word, which seems to reflect that being a student in today's world is not about seeking to change society through political activity. ES people won't likely be organizing protests or manifestations; rather, they will work through unspecified entrepreneurial 'doing'. Because the ESs aim to inspire students in entrepreneurship, it seems that the ideal way of 'doing' is through new ventures, in particular those seen as start-ups. Within the ESs, start-ups are seen as high-growth, innovative, technology-oriented ventures led by a team, as the first author's larger ethnography has shown.

For us, the belief in entrepreneurial doing and business activity over political activity indicates how the entrepreneurship discourse and ideology (Jones and Spicer, 2009; Kenny and Scriver, 2012) is gaining ground in Finland. In fact, because the ESs enact practices such as pitching competitions, accelerator programmes and entrepreneur speeches, they seem to be important actors in further dispersing this discourse and ideology. Similarly, Costa and Saraiva (2012) noted how entrepreneurship discourse operates within Brazilian student-led Junior Enterprises to uphold the hegemony of capitalism. Potential future research could study how the entrepreneurship discourse operates (Kenny and Scriver, 2012) and travels amongst different practices and textures of practices (Gherardi, 2012) in order to understand, for example, how promoting entrepreneurship is emerging as an important issue worth considering in new contexts. The ESs themselves raise important questions related to different aspects of the entrepreneurship phenomenon: how, why and with what consequences are students themselves producing entrepreneurship education? How do they realize their aim of promoting entrepreneurship in and through their everyday practices? How is the demarcation between 'politics' and 'doing' done within ESs and with what consequences? What is the relationship between these kinds of organizations, the capitalist system and neoliberal ideology? We leave these questions for future research and encourage the adoption of practice theories in a wide array of empirical settings.

REFERENCES

Anderson, A.R., S.D. Dodd and S. Jack (2010), 'Network practices and entrepreneurial growth', *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **26** (2), 121–33.
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), 110–20.

Bruni, A., S. Gherardi and B. Poggio (2004), 'Doing gender, doing entrepreneurship: An ethnographic account of intertwined practices', *Gender, Work and Organization*, **11** (4), 406–29.

Chalmers, D.M. and E. Shaw (2017), 'The endogenous construction of entrepreneurial contexts: A practice-based perspective', *International Small Business Journal*, **35** (1), 19–39.

Chiasson, M. and C. Saunders (2005), 'Reconciling diverse approaches to opportunity research using the structuration theory', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **20** (6), 747–67.

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), 265–83.

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.

Cunliffe, A.L. (2010), 'Retelling tales of the field. In search of organizational ethnography 20 years on', *Organizational Research Methods*, **13** (2), 224–39.

Cunliffe, A.L. and G. Karunanayake (2013), 'Working with hyphen-spaces in ethnographic research: Implications for research identities and practice', *Organizational Research Methods*, **16** (3), 364–92.

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.

Egan-Wyer, C., S.L. Muhr and A. Rehn (2017), 'On startups and doublethink – resistance and conformity in negotiating the meaning of entrepreneurship', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 1–23.

Feldman, M.S. and W.J. Orlikowski (2011), 'Theorizing practice and practicing theory', *Organization Science*, **22** (5), 1240–1253.

Gherardi, S. (2009), 'Introduction: The critical power of the "practice lens"', *Management Learning*, **40** (2), 115–28.

Gherardi, S. (2010), 'Telemedicine: A practice-based approach to technology', *Human Relations*, **63** (4), 501–24.

Gherardi, S. (2011), 'Organizational learning: The sociology of practice', in M. Easterby-Smith and M. Lyles (eds), *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Malden, Oxford, Melbourne and Berlin: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 43–65.

Gherardi, S. (2012), *How to Conduct a Practice-Based Study. Problems and Methods*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.

Gherardi, S. (2015), 'How the turn to practice may contribute to working life studies', *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies*, **5** (3a), 1–13.

Graham, R. (2014), 'Creating university-based entrepreneurial ecosystems. Evidence from emerging world leaders', *MIT Skoltech Initiative*, June 2014.

Jack, S.L. and A.R. Anderson (2002), 'The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **17** (5), 467–87.

Johannisson, B. (2011), 'Towards a practice theory of entrepreneuring', *Small Business Economics*, **36** (2), 135–50.

Johannisson, B. (2014), 'The practice approach and interactive research in entrepreneurship and small-scale venturing', in A. Carsrud and B. Brännback (eds), *Handbook of Research Methods*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar, pp. 228–58.

Jones, C. and A. Spicer (2009), *Unmasking the Entrepreneur*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar.

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), 1207–35.

Kenny, K. and S. Scriver (2012), 'Dangerously empty? Hegemony and the construction of the Irish entrepreneur', *Organization*, **19** (5), 615–33.

Lehdonvirta, V. (2013), 'Helsinki spring: An essay on entrepreneurship and cultural change', *Research on Finnish Society*, **6**, 25–8.

Mannevuo, M. (2015), 'Affektitehdas. Työn rationalisoinnin historiallisia jatkumoita' ['Affect factory: rationalisation of labour in historical continuums'], doctoral dissertation, Annales Universitatis Turkuensis, ser. C., tom. 406, Turku: Turku University Press.

Nicolini, D. (2009), 'Zooming in and out: Studying practices by switching theoretical lenses and trailing connections', *Organization Studies*, **30** (12), 1391–418.

Nicolini, D. (2012), *Practice Theory, Work, and Organization*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Patel, P.C. and B. Conklin (2009), 'The balancing act: The role of transnational habitus and social networks in balancing transnational entrepreneurial activities', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **33** (5), 1045–78.

Pittaway, L., J. Gazzard, A. Shore and T. Williamson (2015), 'Student clubs: Experiences in entrepreneurial learning', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **27** (3–4), 1–27.

Pittaway, L., E. Rodriguez-Falcon, O. Aiyegbayo and A. King (2011), 'The role of entrepreneurship clubs and societies in entrepreneurial learning', *International Small Business Journal*, **29** (1), 37–57.

Reckwitz, A. (2002), 'Toward a theory of social practices. A development in culturalist theorizing', *European Journal of Social Theory*, **5** (2), 243–63.

Sarason, Y., T. Dean and J.F. Dillard (2006), 'Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual and opportunity: A structuration view', *Journal of Business Venturing*, **21** (3), 286–305.

Schatzki, T.R., K. Knorr-Cetina and E. von Savigny (eds) (2001), *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*, London: Psychology Press.

StartupFinland (2017), 'Societies', accessed 1 March 2017 at www.startupfinland. com/societies/.

Steyaert, C. (2007), '"Entrepreneuring" as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies', *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **19** (6), 453–47.

Terjesen, S. and A. Elam (2009), 'Transnational entrepreneurs' venture internationalization strategies: A practice theory approach', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **33** (5), 1093–1120.

Van Maanen, J. (2011) [1988], *Tales of the Field. On Writing Ethnography*, 2nd edn, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Viljamaa. L. (2016), 'Yrittäjyyden tukemisen hyvät käytänteet korkeakouluissa' ['Good practices in supporting entrepreneurship in higher education'], *Opetus- ja Kulttuuriministeriön Julkaisuja* [*Publications of the Ministry of Culture and Education*], **14**.