Bengt Johannisson's Prize Lecture:
Towards a Practice Theory of Entrepreneuring
*2008 Award Winner**

ABSTRACT
Adopting a process perspective on entrepreneurship, captured by the notion of "entrepreneuring", the emerging practice-theory approach in the social sciences is proposed as an appropriate frame of reference. Entrepreneuring as a practice is ontologically/epistemologically qualified by presenting "phronesis" as the relevant guiding intellectual virtue in the knowledge-creating process. A constructionist view invites different modes of coping with an ambiguous environment, including the use of analogizing and bricolage when enacting entrepreneuring by way of improvisation and personal networking. The notion of "organizing context" is introduced to grasp how collective support for entrepreneuring may be mobilized. Enactive research as an interactive way for doing field research is outlined and illustrated in order to complete the paradigmatic and theoretical arguments for a practice-theory approach to entrepreneuring with an adequate methodology.

Launching the Quest

Knowledge is a restriction of possibilities[1]
Introducing his seminal work on entrepreneurship and innovation, Drucker (1985) states that entrepreneurship is neither art nor science, but practice. Opposing this view we elsewhere propose that entrepreneurship may be art as well as science (Hjorth, Johannisson and Steyaert 2003). Imagination may be used to craft a venture and its emergence into a mature business by way of relational and concrete activities. As an emergent academic field of study entrepreneurship aspires to its own theories. The scientific literature is also flooded with different models which, according to their authors, provide the ultimate image of the entrepreneurial phenomenon. Academics are, however, not the only ones who theorize on entrepreneurial (inter)activity, but the entrepreneurs themselves do, too. If entrepreneurship is considered as (a field of) practice, the habits which guide entrepreneurs may very well be seen as designed by their cognitive maps or personal theories. As rooted in embodied

tacit knowledge these theories are, however, untouchable not only to outsiders but even to their originators. Keeping these obstacles in mind I here want to take seriously Drucker's advice, that entrepreneurship should rightfully be considered as (a) practice, and reflect upon what insights into entrepreneurship such a view may produce.

As stated by Kuhn (1996), anomalies trigger change in what is taken for granted within the academic community, that is in the ruling paradigm. Presumably, that works for individual professional researchers as much as for academic communities of practice. One intriguing experience is that (successful) entrepreneurs use their available time in a way that is in total contrast to what we associate with proper management. For a quarter of a century we have repeatedly asked demonstrably successful family-business entrepreneurs in Sweden about how they use the time they spend running their firms. More specifically we asked them, in interview settings as well as through surveys, how they as businesspersons allocated their time use among (1) concrete activities which provide immediate feedback on the outcome of the action taken, (2) planning with periodic feedback, and (3) visions whose outcome may appear only after several years (Johannisson 2008). Three major findings have come out of this field research. First, successful entrepreneurs spend more time on both concrete action and vision than on planning. A similar behavior is ascribed to successful intrapreneurs (Pinchot 1985) and leaders (Eccles and Nohria 1992). Second, over the years (1976–2002) repeated empirical research tells us that an increasingly larger share of the time budget is spent on concrete action, presumably also interaction, than on planning and vision. In an increasingly turbulent and complex world this makes sense – few dreams can be withheld and challenges have to be dealt with concurrently, cf. Sta-

* Växjö University and Jönköping International Business School, Sweden.
E-mail: bengt.johannisson@vxu.se.

[1] This aphorism and the four that follow are all written by Joseph Schumpeter and appear in Swedberg (1991, Appendix I).

cey (1996). Third, owner-managers are able to keep their concern for vision more viable than professional leaders. Presumably, the values and emotional commitment that the family institution adds to economic activity reinforces the belief that the environment after all is enactable.

These empirical findings are clearly in contrast to the image of entrepreneurship as an intentionally planned and dramatically staged activity that characterizes rationalistic approaches to entrepreneurship. They rather acknowledge the existence of irrationalities such as passion and emotion, immediacy and improvisation (Hjorth *et al.* 2003). Proposed "anomalies" like these do not arrive as Schumpeterian disturbances vocabulary but rather as the subsequent swarms that indicate that a fundamental change has already taken place, obviously unnoticed. This signals the need for a framework that acknowledges entrepreneurship as an (everyday) hands-on practice, including routines as well as improvisation in order to cope with coincidence (Steyaert 2004). Tacit knowledge and personal relationship seem to remain relevant also in current digital times when codified knowledge and formal partnerships dominate the public discourse on how to create sustainable development in firms and societies.

Taking on the Peircian notion of abduction, these "anomalies", which only seem to escalate and increasingly challenge the dominant scientific understandings of entrepreneurship, can be taken as a point of departure for proposing alternative ways of making sense of entrepreneurial behavior. For reasons already indicated I have a strong belief that practice theory offers a view that is able to deal with such a challenge. This approach seems to have replaced the linguistic turn in organization studies in general and the European entrepreneurship studies tradition in particular. Practice theory has also established itself as major framework in organization research where "[P]ractice theorists conceive of practices as embodied, materially mediated arrays of human activity centrally organized around shared practical understanding" (Schatzki 2001, p. 2). Thinking of entrepreneurship as ongoing creative organizing we consider the arrays of activities to include bundles of (personal) relations. Using this approach when inquiring into entrepreneurship means on the one hand that the idea of entrepreneurship as anything but genuinely social and collective is denounced, on the other hand that all human faculties, not just the cognitive but also the emotional ones, are recognized as instrumental in the enactment of new ventures, whether on the market or in other settings.

Practice theory sounds like an impossible combination, since practice is associated with coping with the local, the situated, specific, concrete and detailed, where words have to become deeds as soon as they are spoken. Theory as representational knowledge, in contrast, is ideally supposed to be global or universal, "above" the specific, abstract and generic. The passage from the verbal representation of the knowledge to its concrete application then becomes critical. Such differences between theory and practice vanish when a practice-theory view (of entrepreneurship) is adopted with its call for "actionable knowledge" (Jarzabkowski and Wilson 2006), that is knowledge that is appropriate for getting things done.

Pierre Bourdieu is perhaps the most prominent scholar associated with "practice", its constitution and theorizing. He sees "practical sense" as "…a quasi-bodily involvement in the world which presupposes no representation either of the body or of the world, still less of their relationship. It is an immanence of the world through which

the world imposes its imminence, things to be done or said, which directly govern speech and action." (Bourdieu 1992, p. 66). This direct connection between thought and action aligns well with our understanding of entrepreneurship as associated with spontaneity and immediacy.

Our purpose is to inquire into the understanding of entrepreneurship as a practice, a creative and social/collective organizing process that materializes a venture. Instead of reflecting upon what vocabulary is used to make sense of the emerging process, the practice approach focuses on actions and interactions, their source, pattern-making and outcomes. It is about getting things done. Practice theory must be scrutinized both with respect to its paradigmatic pillars and with respect to what methodologies to use to guide field research. Identified paradigmatic foundations must be aligned with the idea that knowledge is embodied and tacit, that "… no representation of the skills involved in performing appropriate human activity can be adequate" (Schatzki 2001, p. 8). The field research must apply a methodology that invites the subjects in a knowledge-creating process where their experientially gained insights are fully appreciated.

Alluding to Morgan's (1980) triptych guiding research into organizational phenomena – paradigm, metaphors and puzzle-solving – a practice-theory approach has to proceed in three steps. In the next section, thus, the paradigmatic foundations of a practice theory for studying entrepreneurship are provided, while the following section offers some theoretical fragments related to metaphors which capture critical features of the entrepreneurial phenomenon. Section 4 takes on the major contest to construct a methodology feasible for inquiring into entrepreneurship as a practice. The concluding section offers some lessons for academics and practitioners alike which, if adhered to, will in due course grant the proposed practice approach the necessary legitimacy.

Paradigmatic Pillars of a Practice Theory of Entrepreneuring

Planning means planlessness and waste
Academics and entrepreneurs alike, we all want to dramatize our deeds, academics by writing about radically new ways of approaching phenomena, entrepreneurs by telling us stories about critical moments in the venturing process. However, like any social activity, like any practice, everyday life actually is a flow of disturbances. Scholars are desperate about hiding such mess by way of modeling, thereby possibly demonstrating analytical brilliance but also escaping the real challenges to make sense out of the organizational untidiness that our co-existence creates. Even neat management is about "muddling through", possibly guided by some hope and then appearing as "logical incrementalism" (Quinn 1978). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) propose that managers are basically not in control but out of control. Yet, these scholars were doing research in organizations when times were assumed to be stable! Since then the world has only become more unknowable and chaos theory has been invited in the search for a vocabulary to articulate this staggering blow against the illusion that reality can be mastered (Stacey 1996). The only way out seems to be to make the best of the situation at hand. In this perspective the difference between the lives of business people and of busy housewives vanishes.

There are at least three more reasons for approaching entrepre-

neurship as the ongoing practice of creatively organizing people and resources according to opportunity. First, as entrepreneurship studies are now institutionalized and recognized as a discipline of its own and as an attractive partner in subject-area alliances such as entrepreneurial marketing and entrepreneurial strategy, it is time to take on new challenges.[2] Second, more turbulent and increasingly complex realities due to our digitalized world have triggered an academic concern for ontologies of becoming; cf. Chia (1995), Chia and Holt (2006). In parallel, process perspectives in studies of organizations in general (Van de Ven and Poole 1995, 2005) and entrepreneurship in particular (Steyaert 2007) have gained attention. Summarizing an excellent (historical) review of alternative process approaches to entrepreneurship, Chris Steyaert, inspired by Ian Macmillan, proposes the felicitous term "entrepreneuring" for entrepreneurial phenomenon as generically associated with movement, with process. Third, a practice turn is now showing up in the social sciences, recognizing knowledge as embodied and local (Schatzki 2001), and thus incorporating emotional forces, such as affect and intuition in a framework for inquiry into entrepreneurship. The notion of entrepreneuring will be used wherever appropriate in the text that follows.

For a number of reasons practice-oriented research approaches to entrepreneuring have been rare so far. First, inquiries into entrepreneuring within the academic community (of practice), aiming at giving the field legitimacy as a discipline, have rather been concerned with presenting entrepreneurship studies as being closely associated with established social sciences such as economics with its rationalistic assumptions taken from the "hard" natural sciences. Second, when acknowledging the irrational features of entrepreneuring, entrepreneurship research has, not the least in European academic circles, been inspired by the linguistic turn, reducing "practice" to the use of creative vocabulary. For sure, words may become deeds, or even be deeds (Gartner 1993), but practice goes beyond speech. Third, parallel to the separation of decision as a mental activity and implementation as a hands-on in management studies, the theorizing and practicing of entrepreneuring have been kept apart. Fourth, since entrepreneuring as a human activity at its creative height leaves nobody untouched, its practice is kept away from the research arenas. It becomes marginalized, mainly appearing in the form of stories being told by entrepreneurs, re-appearing as "anecdotal evidence" provided during dinner speeches at research conferences. When personally experienced/practiced by researchers, it is usually silenced. This separation of "science" and story-telling and of theory and practice reflects the intellectual inability to reconcile the different understandings that logic-analytical and intuitive-holistic insights provide. The moral dilemma of reconciling professional and private life practices is simply overwhelming. This suggests that entrepreneurship affects those getting close to it, whether they practice it or study it.

These lessons suggest that only if we go beyond the taken-for granted understanding of what (scientific) knowledge is will our intellectual scope become broad enough to invite appropriate academic approaches to the study of entrepreneuring. Flyvbjerg (2001) has brought new life to Aristotle's three intellectual virtues: *episteme, techne* and *phronesis.* While episteme appears as the foundation for science in the Kuhnian sense and techne for artisan work, phronesis is, according to Flyvbjerg, proposed as an appropriate paradigmatic

platform for the social sciences. Phronesis is, Flyvbjerg argues, usually associated with "practical wisdom", adding that "[t]he person possessing practical wisdom (*phronimos*) has knowledge of how to behave in each particular circumstance that can never be equated to knowledge of general truths. Phronesis is a sense of the ethical practical rather than a kind of science" (Flyvbjerg 2001, p. 57, italics in original). Phronesis thus adds judgment in both an intellectual and a moral sense to statements about reality as socially constructed, thereby producing insights about a world which is situated and knowledge (about that world) which, accordingly, is local in time and space.

Making phronesis a shared concern for scientific inquiries into entrepreneuring as well as for its practice invites the bridging between phronesis and episteme on one hand and between phronesis and techne on the other. This view is only reinforced if entrepreneuring is decoded with the help of practice theory. As regards the linking between phronesis and episteme in the academic realm, the case approach is already well established in narrative entrepreneurship research, cf. Hjorth and Steyaert (2004), and Gartner (2007). Trading upon the linguistic turn in organization studies these scholars and their associates have provided fruitful contributions to our understanding of entrepreneuring. With respect to the connection between phronesis and techne the work by Sarasvathy (2001), using pragmatism as a paradigmatic platform, provides a distinct framework for an instrumental approach to entrepreneuring. Similar connections to pragmatism are outlined in practice-theory views in strategic management (Jarzabkowski and Wilson 2006, Johnson *et al.* 2007). My intention is, with the help of practice theory, to supplement these two lines of research with one that makes phronesis less dependent on partnerships with episteme and techne, respectively.

I see three major reasons for associating phronesis as an intellectual virtue both with entrepreneurship itself representing concrete venturing as a practice and with an appropriate rule-book for researchers who inquire into entrepreneuring as a mundane way of life. First, phronesis puts the searchlight on the very details which combine into everyday practices, on the specifics of the concrete situation, on the fact that not only is every entrepreneurial venture as an outcome unique. The detailed patterning of activities in the very emergence of entrepreneurial processes is matchless as well. This means that entrepreneuring as a spectacular phenomenon is played down and that practicing entrepreneuring is recognized as a generic human faculty making details matter, most clearly unveiled among children in their everyday play. Second, phronesis helps liberating entrepreneuring from a narrow-minded association with economic activity alone. Connecting entrepreneuring with producing utility in creative new ways towards new ends makes phronesis an appropriate paradigmatic standpoint for inquiring into entrepreneuring as a means of creating a new way of life (Spinosa, Flores and Dreyfus 1997). In addition, entrepreneuring as existential venturing aiming at crafting one's own identity calls for a value base that certainly reaches beyond instrumental action alone and for sure beyond the market as an arena for competitive forces. Entrepreneuring is even more about collaborative efforts in order to enact new realities, reflected in the importance that practitioners ascribe to personal net-

---

[2] For a recent account of the status of entrepreneurship research, see the special issue of *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 32, Issue 2, 2008.

working. The personal network is to the entrepreneur what the stick is to the blind (wo)man.

The increasing concern for social and societal issues in the context of entrepreneurship studies, cf. Steyeart and Katz (2004), is an explicit confirmation of this broader scope of entrepreneuring. Phronesis, as reflecting value rationality, suggests that actions are not taken with what they produce in mind but because they themselves are means as well as ends in the making of a better world. Accordingly, the entrepreneurial identity appears as a hybrid between *homo oeconomicus*, the self-focused person, and *homo curans,* the caring person, a constellation which, by also inviting *homo ludens* to care for creativity and playfulness, completes a multi-facetted personality. Third, as entrepreneuring appears in different shapes according to the concrete situation, no universal laws can be produced by scientific inquiry. What then remains are storied examples communicating local insights to others, to practitioners as well as fellow researchers, to be fed into their ever-expanding repertoire of understandings of the entrepreneurial phenomenon.

Metaphorizing Insights into Entrepreneuring

Art is but a technique to bring out our vision from a heap of rubbish
Structuring different approaches to scientific inquiry in the social sciences as either objectivist or subjectivist, Burrell and Morgan (1979), besides considering different ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies, also include contrasting views on human nature, whether being a free agent or caught in social structures. A constructionist view invites a third image of the existential conditions for us as human beings. Confronted with an ambiguous world we can perceive and treat it in two contrasting ways. One option is to apprehend it as messy and impossible to conceive, ever more to control, on the edge of chaos or perhaps even beyond. Alternatively we approach such a world as mouldable, possible to craft according to our own design. Instigating and orchestrating a venturing process under either perceived condition means that every shortcut to save time and resources as well as every stabilizer and enforcement of self-confidence will be needed. Given this image of entrepreneuring as human venturing, three contributions to a metaphorized vocabulary come forth. The first one is "analogizing" as a generic way of coping. Next, the use of "bricolage" as a way of balancing the need for both change and stability is introduced. As a third contribution to a vocabulary we propose the notion of an "organizing context" as a way of building self-confidence and making (further) environments enactable.

Considering our indebtedness to Gareth Morgan (1980, 1986) for suggesting the use of metaphors as guidelines for theorizing, our contribution to a vocabulary thus begins with "analogizing" as an operating mode. Analogy then means similarity as regards relational features rather than superficial resemblance reflected in properties of objects as signaled by metaphors. The management literature has been concerned with analogy and analogizing as a way of coping with a risky and uncertain environment, see, e.g., Gentner and Holyoak (1997) and Nilsson (1998). However, for two major reasons it is different to use analogies in the context of entrepreneuring than in that of management. First, while analogizing in management focuses on cognitive and communicative aspects of organized activities, we are here concerned with (also) taking advantage of the emotional energy and embodied concrete practices, which may become

(cross-)appropriated from one context to another. Second, while the management application of analogizing is concerned with problem-solving, analogizing in the context of entrepreneuring has to do with the creation and exploitation of opportunities that an ambiguous/equivocal environment invites to, not primarily with reducing risk and uncertainty.

For a number of reasons analogizing, not only as a cognitive but also as a practical/physical feature, appears as a major enactive device in entrepreneurial processes/entrepreneuring:

1. The pressure for constant change and creative responses as time goes by makes it impossible to analytically construct strategic and original solutions to problems or to mobilize tactically from below. Intuitive action triggered by emotional forces as well as by cognitive capabilities then becomes dependent on analogizing for appropriate execution in every specific situation. Thereby one's own experience and that of others are activated, expanding the available repertoire of solutions.

2. Analogizing means creative imitation implying that something that is of one's own and new is added to what already exists and is copied, transformed to a new setting. This "translation" process, including identity-making as part of self-making (Weick 1995) dissolves the paradox associated with the presumably "independent" owner-managed family businesses as a major arena for entrepreneuring: a need to preserve their self-identity but also for (social) learning. Practicing analogizing means recognizing (the experience of) others but also contributing with own imaginization.

3. Analogizing provides the means for coping with change in entrepreneuring/ entrepreneurship as a process, both the need to keep up with the continuous flow of time (chronos) and to take advantage of the "right moment" (*kairos*) when it appears. Since analogizing means referring to others, it creates legitimacy and helps building instant or "swift" trust (Meyerson, Weick and Kramer 1996) originating in fitting "personal chemistry", which is indispensable in an environment in constant flux.

4. Analogizing feeds ongoing improvisation and venturing as bricolage with a needed repertoire of discursive and concrete construction material.

5. Using analogies as part of a learning process means contributing to the creation of a community of practice, a "school" (paradigm) in sciences, a genre in fine arts, and a spatial or professional community in business, thereby adding to shared resources and legitimacy.

The two last-mentioned features will be further elaborated upon. – Considering on one hand the rationale for analogizing, on the other the importance of relating in entrepreneuring, the notions of improvisation and bricolage may be appropriated. Improvisation appears as an indispensable principle in any creative organizing effort with a moving agenda, whether modern jazz or entrepreneuring; cf. Barrett (1998). Considering what makes improvisation into a practice the "matter" that is organized by way of improvisation comes to the fore. This invites the notion of bricolage. Originally brought to the social sciences by Levi-Strauss (1966), bricolage rather concerned bringing existing artifacts to new use, instigated by a specific need, in (artisan) business settings the demand of a customer. However, expanded to become a more generic organizational feature (Baker and Nelson 2005), bricolage means bringing arrays of existing social activity, or practices, to new use. The sociality of bricolage becomes especially obvious when entrepreneuring is called

for in everyday life (de Certeau 1984), for example when a natural disaster hits a community (Johannisson and Olaison 2007). This suggests that personal networking is not just used to bring (social) resources to an envisioned (Starr and MacMillan 1990) or emergent (Sarasvathy 2001) venture. Networking also means linking (fragments of) existing social practices into new patterns according to what the situation calls for. This enforces the relevance of recognizing entrepreneuring as creative organizing (Hjorth *et al.* 2003).

Formal organization as an arena for practices is in the literature associated with structure, standardization, routine and, ultimately, bureaucracy. Practices as arrays of activities and bundles of relations are well known from the literature on organizations which are assumed to use standard or routinized ways – read practices – of dealing with a complex world. Elaborated on by Cyert and March (1963) and empirically extensively researched by the Aston group in the 1970s and 1980s standard procedures were extensively studied as a way of maintaining efficiency and reducing uncertainty for mana-

is unthinkable without (social) relating (Granovetter 1985). Nevertheless, in the dominating economic literature transactions between agents, i.e., the building blocks of relations, are intrinsically associated with costs (Williamson 1979). However, if episodic exchange across organizational boundaries is embedded in a relational dialogue, it does not just enable the materialization of routine operations. Such interrelating also provides seedbeds for creativity and innovative change. Repeated transactions, which sediment into trust relations (Macneil 1980), bring a number of other benefits, including learning opportunities, pleasure in socializing and the power to realize potentialities. Since relations are of fundamental use to the firm, they should be associated with "benefits" and not just with "costs". Recognizing "transaction benefits" means acknowledging that in order to make a new (social) world enactable, (social) relating is indispensable. This becomes especially obvious in everyday life in localized economic activity. This is absent in (economic) academic modeling, which usually lends itself to overly functional,

Table 1   Transaction Costs and Transaction Benefits – Contrast Resourcing and Entrepreneuring

Feature	Transaction costs	Transaction benefits
Objective	Guaranteeing the supply and efficient management of (existing) resources	Feeding the entrepreneurial process with coincidences and the desire to turn these into opportunities to become actualized
Identifying a transaction partner	Minimizing search costs for finding the optimal supplier	Searching for a partner as an adventure and learning experience, guided by a belief in serendipity
Establishing a relationship	Negotiating a contract in order to safeguard against deceit	A mating process aiming at enforcing one's own identity while solving practical problems
Administering the relationship	Controlling for opportunistic behavior and considering exit in order to reduce opportunity costs	Enjoying socializing, enhancing learning and exploring new openings in "polylogue"

Source: Johannisson (2007, Table 1, p. 11).

gement. In entrepreneuring, we propose, such standards and practices are appropriated and recycled to become building blocks in the ongoing creative construction of ventures as patchwork quilts of pieces from one's own and others' lived experiences. "Creative" is thus rather associated with putting existing standards/practices/fragments together in new relational patterns than with radical innovative activity. The need for legitimacy, as well as for resources, makes such creative imitation especially important during the early phase in the venturing process (Stinchcombe 1965).

A relational perspective is close at hand when approaching entrepreneuring as an organizational phenomenon, whether the entrepreneurial processes concerned originate in individual initiatives or emerge as a collective social effort. The proposed relational approach may be deeply anchored in ontological/epistemological reflections originating in a social-constructionist view (Gergen 1999), or in a pragmatic social-network view that recognizes the instrumentality of human relations (Sarasvathy 2001). Elsewhere we have proposed the notion of "personal network" as an attempt to relate networking both to the initiating individual and to her/his emerging venture, which means that we acknowledge both the existential and instrumental features of networking (Johannisson 2000).

As a genuinely (economic) human activity, entrepreneuring, thus,

rationalistic reasoning (Johannisson and Lindholm Dahlstrand 2008). Researchers seem to agree that the (economic) potential of regions is more associated with the quality of the relationships between their firms and institutions than with the internal characteristics of the individual actors. Metaphors such as "untraded interdependencies" (Storper 1995), "learning regions" (e.g., Maskell *et al.* 1998) and "loose coupling" (Weick 1976) have been used to state that a coping capability in a turbulent and interconnected society, as the one Castells (1996) envisions, means that the co-existence of autonomy and interdependence, reflected in mutual relating, must be acknowledged.

As much as transaction costs are associated with finding a partner, negotiating a contract and controlling the agreement, transaction benefits are gained from the arousal when searching for a partner, the enjoyment of mating and the mutual learning by means of dialogue, once the relationship is established. *Table 1* juxtaposes the main message of the transaction-costs approach, a robust theoretical framework, indeed, and a tentative image of proposed "transaction benefits". As the table indicates, the transaction-costs approach is embedded in the neo-classical view in economics where markets, prices and needed resources are given and where performance equals (cost) efficiency. Thus, while the awareness of transaction costs ma-

kes management administer existing resources more intelligibly, a "transaction-benefits" approach is congruent with our understanding of entrepreneuring as creative (social) organizing. If the coincidences of casual encounters are going to be turned into opportunities which are subsequently enacted, relating and associated exchange do not appear as expensive inconveniences but as attractive necessities.

While the transaction-cost view proposes that the hierarchy is the ideal corporate and interorganizational structure, the high-density network is the ideal within a "transaction-benefits" framework. Imagine a set of 73 people whose actions have to be co-ordinated. Given a span of control of eight, a three-tier hierarchical structure containing 72 asymmetric relations will suffice to bring about a hierarchical order that is capable to carry out routine operations. However, if self-organizing creative processes are going to be instigated, variety is called for. 73 people may theoretically create 2,628 (73 x (73–1)/2) symmetric (personal) relations which build a completely networked community (of practice). Spontaneous personal relating acknowledges other faculties than rational thought, such as emotions and intuition, as means for human projecting. The mutual commitments on which personal networking is built and the im-

rically and culturally embedded, manifests and reforms itself by way of personal, face-to-face exchange.

2. As the members of the OC participate in everyday local life they gain the overview needed to trade upon the variety of opportunities and resources that the OC produces as a collective.

3. In the OC the physical, social and mental spaces that the members of the OC occupy coincide to a significant extent, cf. Hernes (2003). This means that the OC appears as a refuge for reproduced local values and behavioral patterns and also as a translator of external influences into refined local knowledge and practices. The outcome is a multiple and evolving collective identity and elaborate community of practice (Wenger 1998).

4. The OC offers its members "ontological security " (Giddens 1991), that is a sense of meaning. The self-confidence thus created opens up "potential spaces " (Winnicott 1971) that the OC member can use to acknowledge her/his own creativity and practice playfulness.

5. The OC as a "heterarchy" (Grabher 2001) has a potential for self-organizing, which means that its ability to deal with challenges is secret, hidden in the very interaction between its members. Casual encounters and spontaneous (inter)action craft the unique ever

Figure 1

The Organizing Context – The Focal Arena for (Inter)action,
Learning and Control in Entrepreneuring

Source: Johannisson *et al.* (2002, Figure 1, p. 299).

mediacy that accompanies personal relating provide people with the courage needed to take action to try out emerging ideas on others.

A practice-theory approach puts the searchlight on sense-making and, consequently, on identity-crafting (Weick 1995). Since entrepreneurs and similar leaders are sense-givers (Smirchich and Morgan 1982, Czarniawska-Joerges and Wolff 1991), they have to be concerned with their own sense-making. Recognizing the everydayness of entrepreneuring and its collective features, the place where for practical reasons they spend most of their daily life becomes very important in the sense-making process. If a local community is approached as a relational space that acknowledges the many different sources of transaction benefits its potential as an arena for entrepreneurial processes becomes visible. Individual initiatives are encouraged to unfold into collective endeavors that use the social embeddedness offered by the local setting as a take-off for global venturing. We propose that a (local) arena with such potentialities should be addressed as an "organizing context" (OC) (for venturing processes). Tentatively the following features are ascribed to an OC (Johannisson 2000, 2007):

1. The OC is an interactively enacted shared reality which, histo-

emerging development path of the OC.

6. In the OC the languages of public discourse and concrete action coincide, thus rooting the context deeply in everyday local life. Visionary ideas are paralleled with concrete measures that promote resolute (inter)action (Eccles and Nohria 1992).

7. In the OC different forms of control, such as premise control, action control and output control co-exist. Historically sedimented values and norms qualify premise control, while physical, technological and social proximities build action control and facilitate output control.

8. As *Figure 1* below illustrates, the environment of the OC as identified by its members is collectively "enacted" (Weick 1995, cf. also Smircich and Stubbart 1985) as much as the OC itself. The boundaries between the OC and its environment are fuzzy. According to what issue is dealt with the boundary between the OC and the enacted environment is reconsidered.

9. The OC makes it obvious that entrepreneuring is a genuinely collective phenomenon – it is their very social embeddedness that grants success to both individual firms and sets of localized firms.

10. The OC offers a take-off arena for generic "glocal" strategies

which combine global and local (inter)action and reflection.

We thus argue that the OC should not just be perceived as an "arena" that its members use as a casual meeting-place or where policy makers can implement proposed measures. Using the vocabulary proposed by Brunsson and Sahlin-Andersson (2000), the organizing context appears as a fully-fledged (spatial) organization with goals, structure and identity. Its goals are, however, integrated into shared norms rather than stated explicitly, its structure is organic and networked rather than formal and hierarchical, and its identity embedded in local stories rather than stated publicly. Local economic development will in this perspective be enacted in places where local knowledge is shared, acknowledged and used for generic social creativity, i.e., not just for organizing within the market but travelling between different spheres of society.

Introducing the OC responds to the challenge to find an image of entrepreneuring that recognizes any human being's need for both stability and change. In its regulative role the organizing context shares several characteristics with the notion of *habitus*, that is "….the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations [that] produces practices which tend to reproduce the regularities immanent in the objective conditions of the production of their generative principle, while adjusting to the demands inscribed as objective potentialities in the situation, as defined by the cognitive and motivating structures making up the habitus" (Bourdieu 1977). It is important to state that although the habitus/organizing context is beyond the control of its individual members, it helps these to control the boundaries of the enacted/enactable environment.

From the point of view of those involved in entrepreneurial processes the organizing context provides both the core of the warp and the main bulk of the weft in entrepreneuring as a weaving process.[3] Here the weaving metaphor uses the emerging personal network embedding the initiator and her/his associates in the venturing process as a warp and contextual practices and further activities as a weft. As indicated, the ultimate pattern of the venturing process appears as a web that includes parts that reflect contemporary practices, and its order appears both as an array of activities and as casual fragments produced by serendipitous encounters, altogether producing a unique pattern.

There is, however, not just a spatial dimension to entrepreneuring as practice but a temporal one as well. Bourdieu (1992, p. 81) states that "… practice is inseparable from temporality, not only because it is played out in time, but also because it plays strategically with time and especially with tempo." This is also recognized in management (theories) as reflected in the notion of "speed management". These views, however, remain in an understanding of time associated with chronological time or *chronos*. Entrepreneuring, in contrast, is also associated with timing, or with identifying the proper time for somebody's own initiative/action, or what is associated with *kairos*. This means not only reacting to an external event once it has appeared but also having a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu 2001, p. 66) or "sensing" the emergent course of external events, making prospective synchronizing possible. Entrepreneuring, as much as art/handicraft, means enacting a practice that can be taught only by example; cf. Polanyi (1974) and Schön (1983, 1986). However, while an artisan learns embodied skills from a master in a closed physical space, the skills of entrepreneuring as creative organizing through personal networking, getting a feel for "the right time" to act or interact, can only be learnt by own involvement in personal networking.

Thus, serendipity is not a gift given from inside or from above but reflects that part of a socially constructed world where alert and experienced citizens are invited to coincidences which may be turned into opportunities. In the making of everyday business the borderline between chronos and kairos dissolves as action in the face of urgency becomes a necessity. "Practical evaluative use of knowledge deals with the ability to "get things done" within the particular contingencies and demands of the here and now" (Jarzabkowski and Wilson 2006, p. 360). Studying collective entrepreneurship on the shopfloor Stewart (1989) experienced that spontaneous organizing and improvisation peeked when the production team was "running hot", calling for emergency entrepreneurship (cf. Johannisson and Olaison 2007).

Methodology for Inquiring into Entrepreneuring as Practice – Enactive Research

What matters to man are his illusions

In a research approach guided by phronesis interactive methodologies inviting the subjects to co-construct situated knowledge immediately present themselves. In interactive research, see for example Aagaard Nielsen and Svensson (2006), ambition goes beyond that of action research which primarily aspires to practice democracy in research, see, e.g., Reason and Bradbury (2001). Including those concerned in a joint venturing aiming at knowledge creation will produce insights otherwise not available to researchers as outsiders. As regards entrepreneurship research this ambition presents a huge challenge. Since the phenomenon concerns initiating a process, only an invitation that coincides with the very instigation of the process will be appropriate. Making this happen is, however, wishful thinking – only in stories two people are hit by the same thought at the same time. Thus two options remain for the researcher. One is to be content with a case study where the initial phase is retrospectively studied and the remaining process shadowed, possibly co-created, as it unfolds in real time. The other option, which makes the research genuinely interactive, is that the researcher her/himself instigates an entrepreneurial process and practices autoethnography or self-ethnography. Here I will outline the latter methodology – addressed as "enactive research". It originates in research that has been more extensively reported in Johannisson (2005).

When this author presented the enactive approach at the 2007 ICSB conference in Turku, Finland, Alf Rehn, now at the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, commented that to him the proposed methodology communicated an ethical positioning as much as a mode of scientific inquiry. His reflection rightfully suggests that enactive research is a venture into the promised land of phronesis. To get there, close to where "no representation of the skills involved in performing appropriate human activity can be adequate" (Schatzki 2001, p. 8), only personal involvement on the part of the researcher will do. The following features are associated with enactive research as applied by Johannisson (2005):

First, the research approach means initiating a change in a context that is well known to the initiator-researcher, preferably part of her/

---

[3] See Bowen and Steyaert (1990) for a similar use of the metaphor.

his own habitus (Bourdieu 1977, 1992) in order to explore an adjoining, yet unknown territory. The researcher takes charge both with respect to the initiation itself and to the "enactability" of the venture by experientially expanding her/his embodied knowledge.

Second, enactive research means recognizing reality as structured, institutionalized, yet as a potential arena for human agency. A non-dualistic view proposes that the environment is enacted by imaginative and interacting individuals (Smircich and Stubbart 1985). By dissolving the boundary between the researcher and the acting subject such meaning-creation is studied from the actor's point of view, merging the emic/etic views and performative/ostensive vocabularies.

Third, as in the context of a planned experiment, enactive research means recognizing the researcher's own pre-conceptions in the domain being researched. In order to avoid turning case studies within enactive research just into theory-testing (Yin 1994), this pre-understanding has to be explicated retrospectively only and then used for further systematic reflection.

Fourth, adopting a (social) constructionist view an ad(venture) emerges interactively as an outcome of both intentional actions and unexpected external events. Since the outcome of the process is sensitively dependent on its initial conditions (Stacey 1996; Fuller and Warren 2006), including the visions of the initiator at the time, it is crucial to track the very emergence of the event back into the researcher's own biography.

Fifth, enactive research is about orchestrating and making intelligible the very emergence, the symbolic and material construction, of a ventured reality. This means studying organizing closely, providing detailed accounts of one's own actions, external events and casual encounters, successively making sense of what has been experienced and actualized accordingly (Weick 1995).

Sixth, enactive research invites the whole bandwidth of human capabilities – our senses, feelings, capacity for thinking and action repertoire – into the construction of a new reality. Intuitive hunches, spontaneous actions and reflected measures following experiments are all incorporated into the making of the venture. Instead of trying to consciously "bracket" previous experiences, the researcher has to submit to unconditioned genuine involvement.

Seventh, enactive research calls for multiple writings, suggesting that realist and impressionist tales become embedded in a confessional tale (van Maanen 1988)

Recognizing entrepreneurs as co-constructors of both venture and (the organizing) context means accepting human willpower, belief and responsibility as input into social projecting. Ideas originating in pragmatism, existentialism and phenomenology therefore contribute to making this image of the entrepreneurial phenomenon, and how to research it, intelligible. According to pragmatism, truth is what can be made suitable or instrumental in practice; cf. Sarasvathy (2001) for applying such thoughts to entrepreneuring. Pragmatism supports the image of entrepreneuring as believing in an idea and using that belief to guide concrete and affirmative action. Its adherents are carried by anti-skepticism and argue that "doubt" in scientific inquiry requires justification just as much as belief (Putnam 1995, p. 20). Doubt is a driving force within pragmatism as well but then as a motivator for intensifying the ongoing conversation with the situation in order to enforce/enact original beliefs.

Existentialism brings entrepreneuring beyond trivial instrumental, let alone pecuniary, motivation and relates it instead to man's generic need to constantly create and recreate his own identity by using his freedom to take responsible action (Macquarrie 1972). While the (inter)action orientation of pragmatists is instrumental, existentialists socialize as authentic beings in order to cope with the generic anxiety that accompanies human existence. The intrinsic motivation of entrepreneurs, the need to position themselves as creators, possibly establishing a dynasty, reflects such an existential challenge. Both pragmatism and existentialism tell us that as human beings we have a responsibility to get involved in society and that appropriate knowledge is created by participation and not by observation.

Phenomenology supplements the constructionist view with an elaborated concern for reality construction from the individual actor's point of view. (Personal) experiencing means integrating new encounters into the social context (*Erlebnisse*) with our overall experience (*Erfahrung*). This supports the view that "entrepreneuring" means continuous learning and sense-making. The interface between phenomenology and pragmatism, thus, provides a platform for understanding the entrepreneurial vision as a tentative personal theory about reality and how that image may be enacted. Phenomenology offers views rooted in existentialism as a methodology for how to inquire into (others') lived experience, a methodology that is, however, quite challenging to non-experts; cf. Massarik 1983. Ethnography then appears as a more accessible route to insight.

Mainstream ethnography seems to be geared towards understanding the outcome of human construction in terms of cultures, rules and institutions, that is of "normalities" in human and social life. This concern has presumably crafted the role of the researcher in the field as a considerate but not too close observer. Then the confidence needed to uncover "local knowledge" by way of reflective observation can be built (Geertz 1983). Entrepreneuring, in contrast, concerns enacting "abnormalities", anomalies, in social settings. This means that it is not enough to be closely acquainted with dominating, institutionalized sense-making processes. Such routines just provide a context for and, as indicated above, building material in entrepreneurial processes.

Self-ethnography or auto-ethnography offers a way to overcome these limits to classic ethnography when studying entrepreneuring. It organizes reflections about everyday life as experienced by the researcher herself over a long professional or private career. That is, the researcher reflects upon a phenomenon that s/he has lived through and therefore is familiar with and has gained tacit knowledge about. While self-ethnography mainly draws upon an inside but semi-detached understanding of structures and processes, auto-ethnography is concerned with what insight the interdependencies between the phenomenon and the researcher's self may generate (Alvesson 2003). The boundary between the observing researcher and the acting subject that in traditional social-science research is heavily defended is in either case boldly crossed. Space for reflection on the raw, yet personal and genuine, experience must be created, as the course of events is also the outcome of one's own actions. The research objective and the empirical context decide what methodological and ethic considerations the approach will trigger. If the auto-ethnography concerns everyday professional life, the research can be systematically planned and practiced and ethical concerns, accordingly, carefully reflected upon (cf. Hayano 1982, Young 1991). If on the other hand the study is triggered by an event that is not at all controlled by the researcher, reflections may become too introvert and

made into a story that remains very personal (Ellis 1995).

Whether self- or auto-ethnographic by design, the research aims at revealing intimate details about what kind of processes existing structures or external events produce and (possibly) vice versa. The proposed enactive research into entrepreneuring, in contrast, is about intentionally giving birth to a new project but accepting its emergence as a partially uncontrolled outcome of interactive processes, incorporating existing structures as well as external events. Inquiry into entrepreneuring has, accordingly, to adopt a different methodology than the one offered by auto-ethnography in institutionalized settings. The enactive methodology proposed here uses the whole bandwidth of human capabilities, including feeling and acting that are associated with an authentic being. Since the boundary between business and private lives cannot be upheld, the researcher/entrepreneur has to accept time involvement beyond traditional working hours. This inconvenience, possibly one of the reasons why social researchers maintain that "going native" should be avoided at all costs, is not negotiable if the process features of entrepreneuring as a practice are to be caught.

The concrete venturing/research project that this author launched concerned an attempt to stimulate regional development by bridging between art and science. A networked team that organized an art exhibition on this theme as well as 30 seminars was set up. The venturing process lasted for nine months, attracted a huge audience and made a small profit. Its reflected practice enforced the understanding of entrepreneuring as crafting identity and the ability of the process to seduce new participants to become and stay involved in its creative and improvised organizing procedures. Another lesson is that the major threat to entrepreneuring is not overt resistance but indifference, since no cues for people's own (inter)action and sense-making are provided. Also, accepting entrepreneuring as an experimental process means that failed trials do not erode the belief in overall success but are turned into experiences which energize the continuation of the process. This means that the venturing, once launched, seduces those involved to become increasingly committed.

Summarizing the case for enactive research, we argue that the uniqueness that we associate with entrepreneuring can only be revealed if its initiation and unique development trajectory is tracked by a researcher who is present throughout the process. Accounts of its cognitive and emotive as well as its material manifestations must be captured in the very context in which they are experienced. Reconstructions of the process from the outside in an academic language, cf. Mintzberg and Waters (1982), or narratives carried by a language furnished with metaphors originating in (non-) fiction literature, run the obvious risk of rather revealing the practices of the researchers' communities of practice than the practices which constitute entrepreneuring.

Some Lessons for Further Enactments

It is our mind that looks for simplicity, not nature
The proposed approach to entrepreneurship, or rather entrepreneuring, as reflected in everyday practices – framed by an ontology of becoming, supported by phronesis as an intellectual virtue and realized by way of an enactive methodology - brings important messages to the research community. It plays down entrepreneuring by associating it with everyday life and not with heroic achievements,

only to re-establish it as a fundamental human activity, central in man's ongoing quest for identity and meaning of life. Phronesis as a mode of knowledge creation associated with both subjects in entrepreneurial processes and their students addresses fundamental aspects of being human by calling for the ripeness of judgment; cf. Flyvbjerg (2001, p. 57). You cannot expect a young inexperienced researcher to respond to the call for enactive research that these challenges announce. What is more, phronesis as an intellectual virtue also includes responsibilities for doing well, in their own community of practice as well as in society at large. This implies that senior researchers, not the least professors with tenure, should not only pay more attention to bringing concrete examples into research and education, but also examples which encompass their own involvement in entrepreneuring that benefits society.

Albeit enactive research especially lends itself to studying entrepreneurial phenomena, there seems to be a general need in the social sciences for approaches which recognize interactive methods and (quasi-)experimental research designs. Once the long but also fragile Chinese defense wall against other understandings of knowledge than the formal and codified ones worshiped in academia is broken through in a sufficient number of places, there will be a general call for situated knowledge originating in dialogues between academics and reflective practitioners. Such interaction will not only benefit further insights on the part of members of the academic community but also make virtuoso practicing entrepreneurs and professional experts realize that there is no limit to learning. Dreyfus and Dreyfus (1986) seem to propose such a limit; however, let us use a story told by the presumably most well-known and respected contemporary Swede, IKEA's founder Ingvar Kamprad. Having invited him to give a speech to the students at Växjö University close to his 75th birthday, this author asked him how he was going to celebrate it. "I had in mind to give a big party in Switzerland [where Kamprad lives] but this would only give passing pleasure. Therefore I donated the amount such an event would cost to a children's home in Ukraine and instead spent the day talking to employees on the shop floor about everyday business-making at one of our outlets in Germany close to where I live" was the answer. Ingvar Kamprad's deep involvement in the everydayness of venturing guided by a strong vision epitomizes Polanyi's image of connoisseurship as applied to entrepreneuring: "the pouring of ourselves into the subsidiary awareness of particulars, which in the performance of skills are instrumental to a skilful achievement, and which in the exercise of connoisseurship function as the elements of the observed comprehensive whole." (Polanyi 1974, p. 64). Again the message for us in academia is that senior researchers have a special responsibility to demonstrate unbroken curiosity throughout their career. The message for practicing entrepreneurs is that once they stop taking on new challenges their entrepreneuring will end. Whether this means becoming more or less successful in the traditional sense is a different question.

A practice turn in entrepreneurship research invites other styles for gaining an insight into the phenomenon. The parallel linguistic turn in contemporary academic research may be incorporated as concern for just a kind of "verbal" practice where performative definitions build bridges between speech and action and verbal statements, depending on when and where uttered by whom become actions; cf. Gergen (1999). In a world of entrepreneuring and tacit knowledge, not only are words deeds. Deeds also become words (Gartner 1993).

Both the linguistic turn and the practice-theory approach use metaphors and other tropes to catch hidden features of entrepreneuring. However, just as we can learn from the children to set curiosity and playfulness free, we can use them as role models for bringing action, speech and learning as and for entrepreneuring together. Not only are children natural born entrepreneurs (indeed, here a proposed personality is adequate!), they also create their emerging world out of an authentic interplay between words and deeds: "In the case of primary learning, the child learns at the same time to speak the language (which is only ever presented in action, in his own or other people's speech) and to think *in* (rather than with) language" (Bourdieu 1992, p. 67, italics in original). This foundation of entrepreneuring in the human being, while still young and inexperienced, but also in her play liberated from the disciplining powers of explicit socialization and institutionalization to come, signals what may be achieved if we bring it from the margins into our managed adult life. A similar challenge is there for entrepreneurship/entrepreneuring as a still young discipline to accept. While more established academic communities of practice may have difficulties in making phronesis into a guiding star and enactive research the road to insight, entrepreneuring to its inquirers appears as both an obvious object and an evident means for such an adventure. The magnetizing power of stories told about entrepreneurial events, as effective on practitioners as on academics, reveals that entrepreneuring is close, very close to our understanding of and thus existence in the world.

References

Aagaard Nielsen, Kurt and Lennart Svensson, eds. (2006), *Action and Interactive Research. Beyond Practice and Theory.* Maastricht: Shaker Publishing.

Alvesson, Mats (2003), "Methodology for Close-up Studies – Struggling with Closeness and Closure." *Higher Education* 46(2), 167–193.

Baker, Ted and Reed Nelson (2005), "Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50(3), 329–366.

Barrett, Frank J. (1998), "Creativity and Improvisation in Jazz and Organizations: Implications for Organizational Learning." *Organization Science* 9(5), 605–622.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977), *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1992), *The Logic of Practice.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bouwen, René and Chris Steyaert (1990), "Construing Organizational Texture in Young Entrepreneurial Firms." *Journal of Management Studies* 26(6), 637–649.

Brunsson, Nils and Kerstin Sahlin-Andersson (2000), "Constructing Organizations: The Example of Public Sector Reforms." *Organization Studies* 21(4), 721–746.

Burrell, Gibson and Gareth Morgan (1979) [1988], *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis.* Aldershot: Gower.

Castells, Manuel (1996), *The Rise of the Network Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

de Certeau, Michel (1984), *The Practice of Everyday Life*. London: University of California Press.

Chia, Robert (1995), "From Modern to Postmodern Organizational Analysis." *Organization Studies* 16(4), 579–604.

Chia, Robert and Robin Holt (2006), "Strategy as Practical Coping: A Heideggerian Perspective." *Organization Studies* 39(2), 635–655.

Cyert, Richard M. and James G. March (1963), *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Czarniawska-Joerges, Barbara and Rolf Wolff (1991), "Leaders, Managers, Entrepreneurs on and off the Organizational Stage." *Organization Studies* 12(4), 529–546.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Stuart E. Dreyfus (1986), *Mind over Machine. The Power of Human Intuition and Expertise in the Era of the Computer.* New York: The Free Press.

Drucker, Peter F. (1985), *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper & Row.

Eccles, Robert G. and Nitin Nohria (1992), *Beyond the Hype. Rediscovering the Essence of Management.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Flyvbjerg, Bent (2001), *Making Social Science Matter. Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fuller, Ted and Lorraine Warren (2006), "Entrepreneurship as Foresight: A Complex Social Network Perspective on Organisational Foresight." *Future 2006* 38(10), 959–971.

Gartner, William B. (1993), "Words Lead to Deeds: Towards an Organizational Emergence Vocabulary." *Journal of Business Venturing* 8(2), 231–239.

Gartner, William B. (2007), "Entrepreneurial Narrative and a Science of the Imagination." *Journal of Business Venturing* 22(5), 613–627.

Ellis, Carolyn (1995), *Final Negotiations. A Story of Love, Loss, and Chronic Illness.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Geertz, Clifford (1983), *Local Knowledge.* New York: Basic Books.

Gentner, Dedre and Keith J. Holyoak (1997), "Reasoning and Learning by Analogy." *American Psychologist* 52(1), 32–34.

Gergen, Kenneth J. (1999), *An Invitation to Social Construction.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Giddens, Anthony (1991), *Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Grabher, Gernot (2001), "Ecologies of Creativity: The Village, the Group, and the Heterarchic Organisation of the British Advertising Industry." *Environment and Planning* 33(2), 351–374.

Granovetter, Mark (1985), "Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness." *American Journal of Sociology* 91(3), 481–509.

Hayano, David M. (1982), *Poker Faces. The Life and Work of Professional Card Players.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hernes, Tord (2003), "Organization as Evolution of Space." In Barbara Czarniawska and Guje Sevón, eds., *Northern Light - Organization Theory in Scandinavia.* Malmö: Liber, 267–289.

Hjorth, Daniel, Bengt Johannisson and Chris Steyaert (2003), "Entrepreneurship as Discourse and Life Style." In Barbara Czarniawska and Guje Sevón, eds., *Northern Light - Organization Theory in Scandinavia.* Malmö: Liber, 91–110.

Hjorth, Daniel and Chris Steyaert, eds. (2004), *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jarzabkowski, Paula and David C. Wilson (2006), "Actionable Strategy Knowledge. A Practice Perspective." *European Management Journal* 24(5), 348–367.

Johannisson, Bengt (2000), "Networking and Entrepreneurial Growth." In Donald Sexton and Hans Landström, eds., *Handbook of Entrepreneurship.* London: Blackwell, 368–386.

Johannisson, Bengt (2005), *Entreprenörskapets väsen.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Johannisson, Bengt (2007), "Enacting Local Economic Development–Theoretical and Methodological Challenges." *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 1(1), 7–26.

_____ (2008), "The Social Construction of the Disabled and Unfashionable Family Business." In Vipin Gupta, Nancy Levenburg, Lynda L. Moore, Jaideep Motwani, and Thomas V. Schwarz, eds., *Culturally-Sensitive Models of Family Business in Nordic Europe: A Compendium Using the Globe Paradigm.* Hyderabad: ICFAI University, 125–144.

_____ and Åsa Lindholm Dahlstrand, eds. (2008), *Bridging the Functional and Territorial Rationales in Regional Entrepreneurship and Development.* Örebro: FSF.

_____ and Lena Olaison (2007), "The Moment of Truth – Reconstructing Entrepreneurship and Social Capital in the Eye of the Storm." *Review of Social Economy* 65(1), 55–78.

_____ , Marcela Ramirez-Pasillas and Gösta Karlsson (2002), "Institutional Embeddedness of Inter-Firm Networks: A Leverage for Business Creation." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 14(4), 297–315.

Johnson, Gerry, Ann Langley, Leif Melin and Richard Whittington (2007), *Strategy as Practice. Research Directions and Resources.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1996), *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Third edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Levi-Strauss, Claude (1966), *The Savage Mind.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Macneil, Ian R. (1980), *The New Social Contract: An Inquiry Into Modern Contractual Relations.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Macquarrie, John (1972), *Existentialism.* London: Penguin.

Maskell, Peter, Heikki Eskelinen, Ingajaldur Hannibalsson, Anders Malmberg and Eirik Vatne (1998), *Competitiveness, Localised Learning and Regional Development.* London: Routledge.

Massarik, Fred (1983), "Searching for Essence in Executive Experience." In Suresh Srivastva, ed., *The Executive Mind. New Insights on Managerial Thought and Action.* San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 243–268.

Meyerson, Debra, Karl E. Weick and Roderick M. Kramer (1996), "Swift Trust and Temporary Groups." In Roderick M. Kramer and Tom R. Tyler, eds., *Trust in Organizations.* London: Sage, 166–195.

Mintzberg, Henry and James A. Waters (1982), "Tracking Strategy in an Entrepreneurial Firm." *Academy of Management Journal* 25(3), 465–499.

Morgan, Gareth (1980), "Paradigms, Metaphors and Puzzle Solving in Organization Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 25(4), 605–622.

Morgan, Gareth (1986), *Images of Organization.* London: Sage.

Nilsson, Anders (1998), *The Analogy as a Management Tool.* Luleå: Luleå University of Technology.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey and Gerald R. Salancik (1978), *The External Control of Organizations.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Pinchot III, Gifford (1985), *Intrapreneuring.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Polanyi, Michael (1974), *Personal Knowledge. Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Putnam, Hillary (1995), Pragmatism. An Open Question. Oxford: Blackwell.

Quinn, James B. (1978), "Strategic Change: Logical Incrementalism." *Sloan Management Review,* Fall, 1–28.

Reason, Peter and Hillary Bradbury (2001), "Introduction." In Peter Reason and Hillary Bradbury, eds., *Handbook of Action Research. Participative Inquiry and Practice.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage, 1–14.

Sarasvathy, Saras D. (2001), "Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency." *Academy of Management Review* 26(2), 243–263.

Schatzki, Theodore R. (2001), "Introduction: Practice Theory." In Theodore R. Schatzki, Karin Knorr Cetina and Eike von Savigny, eds., *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory.* London: Routledge, 1–14.

Schön, Donald (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner. How Professionals Think in Action.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schön, Donald (1986), Educating the Reflective Practitioner. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Smircich, Linda and Gareth Morgan (1982), "Leadership: The Management of Meaning." *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science* 18(3), 257–273.

Smircich, Linda and Charles Stubbart (1985), "Strategic Management in the Enacted World." *Academy of Management Review* 10(4), 724–736.

Spinosa, Charles, Fernando Flores and Hubert Dreyfus (1997), *Disclosing New Worlds – Entrepreneurship, Democratic Action and Cultivation of Solidarity.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Stacey, Ralph D. (1996), *Complexity and Creativity in Organizations.* San Francisco, CA: Berret-Koehler.

Starr, Jennifer A. and Ian C. MacMillan (1990), "Resource Cooption via Social Contracting: Resource Acquisition Strategies for New Ventures." *Strategic Management Journal* 11(1), 79–82.

Stewart, Alex (1989), *Team Entrepreneurship.* London: Sage.

Steyaert, Chris (2004), "The Prosaics of Entrepreneurship." In Daniel Hjorth and Chris Steyaert, eds., *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship,* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 8–21.

Steyaert, Chris (2007), "Entrepreneuring as a Conceptual Attractor? A Review of Process Theories in 20 Years of Entrepreneurship Studies." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 19(6), 453–477.

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

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. (1965), "Social Structure and Organizations." In James G. March, ed., *Handbook of Organizations.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 142–193.

Storper, Michael (1995), "The Resurgence of Regional Economies, Ten Years Later: The Region as a Nexus of Untraded Interdependencies." *European Urban and Regional Studies* 3(2), 191–221.

Swedberg, Richard (1991), *Schumpeter. A Biography.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Van de Ven, Andrew H. and Marshall S. Poole (1995), "Explaining Development and Change in Organizations." *Academy of Management Review* 20(3), 510–540.

Van de Ven, Andrew H. and Marshall S. Poole (2005), "Alternative Approaches for Studying Organizational Change." *Organization Studies* 26(9), 1377–1400.

Van Maanen, John (1988), *Tales of the Field. On Writing Ethnography.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Weick, Karl E. (1976), "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21(1), 1–19.

Weick, Karl E. (1995), *Sensemaking in Organizations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Wenger, Etienne (1998), *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williamson, Oliver E. (1979), "Transaction-Cost Economics: The Governance of Contractual Relations." *Journal of Law and Economics* 22(2), 233–261.

Winnicott, Donald W. (1971), *Playing and Reality.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Yin, Robert K. (1994), *Case Study Research. Design and Methods.* Revised edition. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Young, Malcolm (1991), *An Inside Job.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.