

Future Matters: Futures Known, Created and Minded  
University of Cardiff  
September 4-6<sup>th</sup> 2006

Theme: Creating Futures (mainly)

### **Entrepreneurship: economic and social embedding of the production of futures**

Ted Fuller  
Professor of Entrepreneurship and Strategic Foresight  
Teesside Business School  
University of Teesside  
Middlesbrough  
TS1 3BA

[ted.fuller@tees.ac.uk](mailto:ted.fuller@tees.ac.uk)

Tel: +44 1642 342905

*Note this is a working paper. Please refer to the author before citing.*

#### **Abstract**

Entrepreneurship, the practice of creating new economic enterprises through innovation that are sustained by economic performance, is, theoretically, an individualistic account of socio-economic change. If new enterprises and new economies are created by entrepreneurship then to what extent does this activity harbour prescience and to what extent does its creative destruction carry moral responsibility?

Although entrepreneurship is socially constructed as an individualistic account of the production of new patterns of organisation, theories of entrepreneurship span a number of ontologies, i.e. individual motives, new firm formation, socially beneficial activity, the production of networks and multi-organisational forms, and even of micro economies.

The paper discusses the conception entrepreneurship as a set of socially constructed processes which together produce futures at multiple ontological levels, and seeks to identify relationships between this body of knowledge and anticipating, creating and 'minding' futures.

## **Introduction**

I will suggest that the historical account of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship has given them a central role in the development of capitalism and in the utilization of natural, human and technological resources for public consumption. I will argue that political, economic and academic discourse has widened the context of entrepreneurship, and that the meaning of entrepreneurship is likely to evolve further in these discourses. Thus entrepreneurship is a powerful force in the creation of futures, and it is important to understand the relationship between entrepreneurship and the future.

The nature of society is interlocked with the nature of entrepreneurship – there is an historical perspective to this and a contemporary perspective and a futures perspective (Fuller 2003). Entrepreneurship is consistent with a reflexive ‘risk’ society as a way of creating self identity and moreover, a sense of control over one’s future.

Entrepreneurship is both a response to and a creative force in complex, non-equilibrium economy, it produces greater complexity, though constructed on extant patterns, such as standards in technologies and practice. The ‘creative destruction’ of entrepreneurship can only be understood in relation to stable patterns.

Entrepreneurship is the label society gives to performances that lead to the production of novelty and value. The focus is very much on individualistic orientation to the production of the future. The meaning of entrepreneurship and its social value is socially constructed, i.e. society has a performative role and a governance role.

Entrepreneurship, empirically analysed, does not involve prescience, mainly it involves experimentation along with sensing, identity formation and then the shaping of regularities of patterns. Thus perspective implies a conception of future time that is reduced to ‘next’. In this short-term pragmatic world, is it possible for entrepreneurship to create a ‘better’ future? Is there a particular moral or ethical compass? In a reflexive and complex society, is entrepreneurship ‘social’ foresight, and if so how does an ethical and morally ‘better’ future evolve?

## **Entrepreneurship**

One day when Christopher Robin and Winnie-the-Pooh and Piglet were all talking together, Christopher Robin finished the mouthful he was eating and said carelessly: “I saw a heffalump today, Piglet.”

“What was it doing?” asked Piglet.

“Just lumping along,” said Christopher Robin. “I don’t think it saw me.”

“I saw one once,” said Piglet. “At least I think I did,” he said. “Only perhaps it wasn’t.”

“So did I,” said Pooh, wondering what a Heffalump was like.

“You don’t often see them,” said Christopher Robin carelessly.

“Not now,” said Piglet.

“Not at this time of year,” said Pooh.

in “Winnie the Pooh” (Chapter V) A.A. Milne 1926

“They all claim to know about the Entrepreneurial Heffalump but no one has ever captured one, and "they disagree on his particularities" (Kilby 1971).

### **Embedded meanings**

The political, social and economic meaning of entrepreneurship is culturally embedded. Its historical conception in western discourse is grounded in classic liberal values of freedom and self-regarding actions drawn from the works of John Locke (1690) and promulgated by Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, David Ricardo, Jeremy Bentham (Smith 1805) (Mill 1869 (1859); Mill 2002).

For many of its political advocates, entrepreneurship still sits at the pinnacle of ‘free society’. (Kirzner 1982; Machan 2000). Modern Liberal descriptions of responsibility involve:

“taking care of one's own welfare, bearing the consequences of one's own actions, not ignoring the larger interest, involving oneself and participating in public affairs.”<sup>i</sup>

<http://www.liberalsindia.com/introduction/liberalpositionpapers/liberalpositionpapers8.php>, accessed August 30<sup>th</sup> 2006.

Richard Cantillon (1755) is credited with introducing the term entrepreneur as the "agent who buys means of production at certain prices in order to combine them" into a new product. J.B. Say: an entrepreneur leads by bringing other people together in order to build a single productive organism (Say 1803).

Joseph Schumpeter developed a different conception in the 1930s and 1940s. For him the essential difference between entrepreneurs and speculative managerial capitalists was that entrepreneurs were innovators; creating “new combinations”, and therefore people producing capitalism's "perennial gale of creative destruction" (Schumpeter 1946). Capitalists speculate on such new combinations. A lack of entrepreneurship results in stagnation of the economy.

The reinterpretation of entrepreneurship in economic contexts has continued, for example:

- Edith Penrose (1959); entrepreneurial activity involves identifying opportunities *within the economic system*.
- Harvey Leibenstein (1968); the entrepreneur fills market deficiencies
- Israel Kirzner (1982); the entrepreneur recognizes and acts upon market opportunities
- Kent, Sexton et al (1982) the entrepreneur as the agent of change

- Bill Gartner (1988; 1989); Entrepreneurship is the creation of new organizations (new ventures)
- Scase and Goffee (1987): entrepreneurs are people who run their own business
- Kuratko and Hodgetts (1998): entrepreneurship as catalyst of economic growth

Discourses on entrepreneurship reflect their times. Attempts have been made at scientific theories of entrepreneurship<sup>ii</sup>. One reason that these have failed is that entrepreneurship has been culturally imbued with meaning, and so attempts to extricate entrepreneurship from this attachment are bound to fail. As a colleague pointed out, it is theoretically possible to propose that serial killers and entrepreneurs have similar psychologies<sup>iii</sup>.

Many people do not subscribe to classic liberal values. Not everyone agrees that entrepreneurship, in the sense of establishing and building up a successful business is an unqualified *good thing*. Entrepreneurship is synonymous with capitalism, wealth, profitability and exploitation; words which are all heavily value-laden.

The popular meaning of entrepreneur is synonymous with successful self-developed business leadership. It is also synonymous with publicly recognisable business celebrities. Students tend to identify people such as Richard Branson and Anita Roddick as their image of an entrepreneur. Entrepreneurship is synonymous with individual celebrity, brand identity and successful business. Indeed, it seems that part of the task of being a successful entrepreneur is the self-promotion of an entrepreneurial identity.

Meanings of entrepreneurship are grounded in descriptions, contexts and underlying values. Contemporary descriptive definitions of entrepreneurship centre on the discovery and exploitation of opportunities<sup>iv</sup> (Shane and Venkataraman 2000) These descriptions are of performances, not of ideas and visions. The discourse, about *how, by whom and with what effects*, is not about running a businesses or any other enterprise. It is about the process of innovation in the Schumpeterian sense of creating new patterns and forms which, for whatever reasons, are attractive enough for others to engage with<sup>v</sup>.

The contexts of entrepreneurship have widened. One reason for this is the spread of neo-liberal values in the wider discourse of globalisation. The promotion of liberal values; of open markets and the freedom to act, favour capitalism. The dominant structure in globalisation is capitalism, and its co-evolving partner, consumption.

I would argue that corporatism is not entrepreneurship, nor vice versa. Also, that capital markets and corporate organisation create structural barriers to entrepreneurship below certain thresholds of scale or power. Some entrepreneurs evolve in corporate contexts. Therein lies the path to managerial talent and risk capital of such a magnitude and such lemming qualities that the lucky, plausible or successful entrepreneur's efforts can be hugely amplified. Other entrepreneurs get their *identity* from corporatism. Take energetic campaigner Anita Roddick for

example. Her identity is a paradoxical one of anti-corporatism, as much as a campaigner for human rights.

However, entrepreneurship no longer is situated *only* in the domain of business. It is not so much that entrepreneurship is spreading to the public and civic domains, but that the public and civic domains are becoming increasingly synonymous with neo-liberal ideologies and the discourse of globalisation, leading Paul du Gay to suggest an “entrepreneurial reversal” is taking place: that *societies serve economies* not the other way round<sup>vi</sup>. Robert Pinker used the phrase the “Enterprise Society” when he wrote of the changing nature of social work in the late 1980s (Pinker 1990).

Or as the Guardian Newspaper commented on reporting a speech from the Chancellor Gordon Brown:

“It is not many years since the promotion of enterprise was the preserve of rightwing thinktanks. Now it is mainstream Labour party thinking. Innovation is the name of the game - for everyone.” (Guardian Leader Column, January 17<sup>th</sup> 2004)

The meaning of entrepreneurship in public service is different from the meaning in the corporate world because the values are different and the structures in which enterprise takes place are significantly different<sup>vii</sup>. However, the discourses appear to be similar. Notions of enterprising behaviour, such as self-reliance, personal responsibility, ownership and willingness to take risks in the pursuit of goals etc. are regarded as virtuous and to be encouraged.

Perhaps the fastest growing aspect of public entrepreneurship is social enterprise. Social enterprise is a remix of voluntary services and the outsourcing of public services.

The liberal political and academic discourse surrounding social enterprise is of *social entrepreneurship* and the *enterprise society*

“Just as entrepreneurs will drive the development of our industrial base to compete in the next century, social entrepreneurs will create social change, and reinvent the public and non-profit sectors, particularly in an era of new challenges, decreasing government support and limited philanthropic support.”

(Stanford Graduate Business School Public Management Initiative)

<http://www.gsb.stanford.edu/pmp/initiatives/pmi/seinaction.html>

In the UK the School for Social Entrepreneurs, initiated by Lord Young of Dartington, has been running for over 7 years. In 2004 the chief executive stated that the aim of the institute was:

“to equip participants with the tools and confidence to be doers and learners in the driving seat of their own development and that of their projects” <<http://www.sse.org.uk/people/rowena.young>>, accessed March 2004.

## **Entrepreneurial identity in a complex reflexive society**

The rise and spread of entrepreneurship is consistent with the reflexive, 'risk' society. By 'reflexive' I mean how people meaningfully regard their actions, and how their identities and interpretations of the external world are constructed and reconstructed from their continuing experiences of that world (Garfinkel 1967). Interactions between participants in a reflexive society create unpredictable and unknowable outcomes. The conditions that facilitated the development of modern industrial society have become problematic and institutions increasingly struggle to cope with the global insecurity of life (Beck, Giddens et al. 1994)

“In a world where one can no longer simply rely on tradition to establish what we do in a given range of contexts, people have to take a more active and risk-infused orientation to their relationships and involvements”. (Giddens and Pierson 1998:> 210)

In a reflexive and diverse society, the meaning we construct about ourselves, i.e. *who we are*, becomes a reflexive project. Our choices over what we consume and how we live our lives - our *life-style* - are indicative of identity. Personal identities are in flux and open to a self-conscious re-formulation. Identities are formed in social contexts through the interactions with, *and recognition by*, others.

“In the network of linguistic interaction in which we move, we maintain an ongoing descriptive recursion which we call the “I”. It enables us to conserve our linguistic operational coherence and our adaptation in the domain of language (Maturana & Varela, 1987, p. 231).

Given the centrality of identity to meaningful activity, it is notable that by and large entrepreneurial actors do not easily identify themselves with ideological notions of entrepreneurs or entrepreneurship; to quote Anita Roddick:

“Nobody talks of entrepreneurship as survival, but that's exactly what it is and what nurtures creative thinking.”

[http://www.thebodyshop.com/bodyshop/company/index.jsp?cm\\_re=-\\_Footer-\\_About\\_Us](http://www.thebodyshop.com/bodyshop/company/index.jsp?cm_re=-_Footer-_About_Us)  
accessed August 31<sup>st</sup> 2006

Elizabeth Garnsay, who has tracked many of the technological entrepreneurs around Cambridge UK, has a similar view. She talks about “artists under pressure producing masterpieces” She characterises her subjects as those who lack resources, resist dependence, detect opportunities and favour action to produce marketable capacity under pressure – and are thus compelled to innovate. Similarly few self employed people or owners of small business think of themselves as entrepreneurs, virtually no voluntary sector project manager would identify themselves with entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship is socially constructed in political, public and academic discourses in ways that, to date, do not resonate strongly with the actors about whom such meaning is constructed. Never-the-less, as discussed below, it seems that that the

assimilation of entrepreneurship as part of self-image and self identity is growing. An increasing interest in entrepreneurship at universities and in corporate and public domains

Flores and Gray (Flores and Gray 2000) suggest that the nature of work and employment in the 'wired' global economy is reducing losing the stabilising effect of the career. "The career, as an institution, is in unavoidable decline... Instead of making a life long commitment to a profession, vocation or mode of working, wired people simply run with any of their several talents or inspirations... In the wired form of life, spontaneity in responding to the current situation, rather than continuity of projects and relationships, becomes the test of person authenticity."

They suggest that an entrepreneurial life is one in which the individual creates self identity and recognition through assuming "a defining commitment [and responsibility] to develop an ignored practice that will resolve a disharmony on a small or large scale". Such entrepreneurial practice constructs an individual's identity, giving that individual a sense of direction, authenticity and control over their futures.

Within this explanation, context, scale and values are asserted. The context is that experienced by the individual in which disharmony occurs (and which needs to be improved). Scale is not material, though the actions to resolve a disharmony may be scalable. Values are quite explicit, i.e. personal authenticity and commitment to others for the purpose of the resolution of a disharmony<sup>viii</sup>. Examples of this in the rhetoric of recognised entrepreneurs might be Stelios Haji-Ioannou's commitment to low cost services or Anita Roddick's commitment to human rights and the power of business to do good.

### **Entrepreneurship making emergent futures**

A central theme to the above discussion on the nature of entrepreneurship in contemporary society is that of producing value through novelty. The motivation for doing so lies inherently in the individual's social performances to produce order and stability that are, in some sense, an improvement on what exists. This is relativistic, in terms of being relative to extant practice and relative to the values of the individual entrepreneur and the networks of stakeholders with which they engage. Novelty is not produced by individuals but through relationships with others. What emerge from these interactions are unpredictable outcomes.

Emergent behaviour is not predictable because the possible variations of interactions are effectively infinite. However, both empirically and experimentally, complexity research identifies that the behaviour of inter-acting agents settles into temporary patterns of regularised activities and structures. Regularised patterns are a feature of societies, but the interaction of multiple agents within those regularised patterns can disrupt and change those same patterns, leading to the emergence of novel structures. The emergence of a risk society is a case in point. The key point is that such shifts in patterns are caused by, and arise *from within*<sup>ix</sup>. If this is the case, is it possible to anticipate outcomes from such interactions?

Looking ahead in time and preparing for the future is a natural activity. Squirrels store nuts for the winter, primitive humans invested time in creating tools, and teenagers spend hours in the bathroom on Friday evenings before venturing out. To prepare for the future, we need an idea of what might happen. There is an increasing recognition that the natural complexity of the world means that accurate prediction of any non-trivial event or change in pattern of social behaviour is impossible. It is not a matter of better and better models and more powerful computers. If there were a “theory of everything” it would be that life is unpredictable (so eat dessert first).

“The Future - that period of time in which our affairs prosper, our friends are true and our happiness assured”. (Bierce 1958:47)

Many organisations, businesses and communities are making genuine attempts to understand the environment in order to maintain and develop their relative fitness, They seek to understand changes going on in the world, to anticipate changes, to prepare for possible shocks, to identify risks, to identify unwanted consequences. In a complex and reflexive society, such purviews need to engage a wide set of constituents. No one has a monopoly on making the future, no one on their own makes the future, its the interconnections and relationships between people and organisations that make the future.

In what sense, then, is entrepreneurship imbued with foresight? Joseph Schumpeter said of entrepreneurs that they have “the capacity of seeing things in a way which afterwards proves to be true, even if it cannot be established at the moment” (Schumpeter 1934:85). With co-researchers, I am investigating the futures orientation of entrepreneurs. If they are so important in the creation of novelty, of potentially new structures and activities and value in society, then to what extent do they have prescience?

The analysis from one longitudinal case study of a brokerage business in the air industry provides some interesting insights.

At 29 years old Paul Argyle set up Flight Directors Limited on 1st July 1984. Paul had a passion for the air industry. At 18 he had been offered but failed to complete a pilot training Scholarship with British Airways. The business has gone through many turning points. It is significantly different to when it started, indicating considerable agility and entrepreneurship. To give you an idea; on Sept 11 2001 (9/11) the business was leasing 2 x 737 aircraft and was handling 60,000 overspill calls a month for half a dozen major airline customers.

In our analysis of the founder’s narrative and analysis of the firm’s history, we looked for evidence of foresight and anticipation of changes. Some examples of what we looked for, and what we found, are in Figure 1. The analysis is documented in other publications (Fuller and Warren 2006; Fuller and Warren 2006, in press).



<b>Classic Foresight approach</b>	<b>Use in entrepreneurial firm</b>
Strategic awareness – [the entrepreneur’s] ability to project into the future the consequences of [the SME’s] present actions and think strategically about these.” (Gibb and Scott 1985)	Not apparent
A set of clearly articulated and maintained scenarios (Slaughter 1995) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- consequences of actions</li> <li>- detecting and avoiding problems</li> <li>- present implications of future events</li> <li>- envisioning desired future(s)</li> </ul>	CEO had done one-off exercise for himself in 2000.
Strategic Intent, which requires a “highly visible vision of the future”, (Prahalad and Hamel 1990:80)	Not articulated
Pathfinding. - the corporate competence to identify, crystallise and articulate achievable new directions for the firm (Turner and Crawford 1994:253).	Not undertaken
A structured process of planning or of the “rhythmic, time-paced transition processes” suggested by Brown and Eisenhardt (1997)	Episodic and unstructured
The capacity of seeing things in a way which afterwards proves to be true, even if it cannot be established at the moment” (Schumpeter 1934:85)	Unproven

**Figure 1. Use of foresight methods in an entrepreneurial firm**

To understand the way that the future of this business has been created and hence its claim to foresight, one needs a different set of concepts. The central concept is that rather than being planned from some forward vision (in a teleological sense - design and purpose –) the business has become what it has become.

But this becoming is not random<sup>x</sup>. The explanation can be found in the history of the business when seen at different levels, i.e. the level of the entrepreneur’s own identity, the level of the firm’s recursive behaviour, the firm’s non-recursive behaviour and the relationship with the external environment.

The emergent or ‘becoming’ future of the business was based on:

- a) the reflexive construction of identity; the identity of the owners – as being ‘**in the airline industry**’, and of a gradual evolution of self identity with regards to role
- b) **experiments**; at any point in time there were a number of small scale experimental activities going on, some of which were successful and some of which were not. The business today is based on some of these experiments
- c) **sensitivity to conditions**; while the owners of the business were well aware of the changing conditions in which they were working, their lack of sensitivity to these changes sometimes created difficulties

- d) **organising domains**; the creation of new routines and recursive practices around scaled-up experiments became everyday practices

The process of becoming is both cognitive and manifest in the operational patterns, language and relationships (discourses and structures) of the firm. Entrepreneurial foresight exists there as a commitment to a particular identity, changing reflexively through the everyday performance of doing business. This commitment has taken the enterprise through times when its normal behaviour patterns are disrupted by external or internal events.

Organisationally, foresight is performed as a series of experiments whose success becomes the temporary dominant logic, or organising domain, of the business.

### **Foresight and entrepreneurship at multiple levels to produce what kind of futures?**

“New technology based firms “are business experiments, founded on conjectures that may or may not turn out to be valid. Their fortunes are inherently unpredictable...” ((Metcalf 2000:7) cited in (Garnsey and Heffernan 2003)

The present of society and the futures of society are linked together by the actions of its constituents. The structures of society are increasingly mutable and diverse. The actions of ‘big government’ are emasculated by the globalisation discourse. Leadership is performed through symbols, e.g. thought leadership, visions, share prices, league tables.

However, *performance* is grounded in the everyday lives of people. The emergence of better lives comes through what people do and the social norms that guide what they do. Just as the futures of an entrepreneurial business are based on the success or failure of its own experiments created within a framework of purpose and relationships, so in a reflexive society, the everyday practices of people leading entrepreneurial lives, in every context, are the experiments that shape the future. Some fail, some succeed. Some become significant features of our lives. Without such experiments, society loses its power to transform itself, and loses the power to create, and chose from alternative futures.

Entrepreneurship can lead to harmful effects as well as good. Entrepreneurship in society operates in a de facto context of principles, moral frameworks and governance.

I have alluded to some of the values associated with entrepreneurship, namely individual freedom, self-regard and a sense of wealth creation by the formulation and exploitation of novelty and innovation. What “value” does society give to the act of breaking symmetries in existing patterns by creating new ones (Cf. Schumpeter: creative destruction)? Such acts are in marked contrast to repetitive or recursive activity that fuels corporations, and for which most managers and skilled persons are

trained. We are more efficient and productive when we can repeat what we do. Many superior ideas (e.g. technologies) fail in the market because existing patterns or structures cannot or will not assimilate them. Venture capitalists, before they invest in a new business, ask the simple question; how big is the market? That is, how many times can the 'business model' be recursively repeated? The value of innovation is thus measured by the degree to which it can be exploited on a wide scale through standardization. *As such* entrepreneurship is a tool of capitalism.

Is that it? Is the connection to the future simply that entrepreneurship produces the seeds of next year's consumed life-style and working practice? And are these likely to be dominated by powerful global corporations? The widening discourse on entrepreneurship seems locked into neo liberal values, globalisation and the corporatist regime, but it need not be so.

The capabilities used to create a profitable good or service, which is a distinct improvement on what exists, has much wider value. In particular, entrepreneurship is:

- not scale dependent
- not context dependent
- not dependent on one particular set of values

In what ways can entrepreneurship create a better society? In venturing into this moral territory one can ask, in what ways can entrepreneurship have regard for others? To be morally good, entrepreneurship cannot be *indifferent to others*, nor rest at the point of *doing no harm* to others. To work for better futures, entrepreneurship needs a positive kind of freedom. To what extent does society enable individuals to act out entrepreneurial lives that are committed to resolve disharmony in a social and moral sense. Has the power of consumerism and corporatism cut off the possibility of entrepreneurial performances that do not add to the hegemony of those institutions? It should be possible for society, for us, to recognise when the performance and commitments of an entrepreneurial life are good, and to support them. It is possible to provide social governance at the local level. This is a far safer way towards the future than, for example, dealing with the assertion of fundamentalist or monopolistic powers.

## **Summary**

This is a working paper of ideas that link entrepreneurship and foresight to the minding and creating of futures. Its central thesis is that in societies where there is considerable individual freedom to perform, and that such performances are recognised and rewarded by society, the conditions for creating 'better futures' exist by virtue of the reflexive capability of the individual as producer and the social governance of the individual as consumer and through the dynamic structures that govern everyday behaviour. The inter-dependency between the relatively powerless individual producer and society is capable of producing an effective moral context. As such entrepreneurship can be understood as social foresight.

## References

- Beck, U., A. Giddens, et al. (1994). *Reflexive Modernisation; politics, tradition and aesthetics in the modern social order*. Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bierce, A. (1958). *The Devil's Dictionary*. New York, Dover Publications.
- Brown, S. L. and K. M. Eisenhardt (1997). "The art of continuous change: Linking complexity theory and time-paced evolution in relentlessly shifting organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 42(1): 1-34.
- Cantillon, R. (1755). *Essai sur la nature du commerce en general*. London, Fletcher Gyles.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Delmar, F. (2000). The Psychology of the Entrepreneur. *Enterprise and Small Business; Principles, Practice and Policy*. S. Carter and D. Jones-Evans. Harlow, Prentice Hall.
- du Gay, P. (2000). "Enterprise and Its Futures." *Organization* 7(1): 165-183.
- Flores, F. and J. Gray (2000). *Entrepreneurship and the wired life*. London, Demos.
- Fuller, T. (2003). "Small business futures in society." *Futures* 35(4): 297-304.
- Fuller, T. and L. Warren (2006). "Entrepreneurship as foresight: A complex social network perspective on organisational foresight." *Futures, Journal of Policy, Planning and Futures Studies* 38(7): in press.
- Fuller, T. and L. Warren (2006, in press). Complex Explanations of Order Creation, Emergence and Sustainability as Situated Entrepreneurship. *RENT XVIII Anthology 2005: Managing Complexity and Change in SMEs: Frontiers in European Research*. P. R. Christensen and F. Poufelt, Edward Elgar.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall.
- Garnsey, E. and P. Heffernan (2003). Growth Setbacks in New Firms. Cambridge, Centre for Technology Management, University of Cambridge: 25.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question." *American Journal of Small Business* 12(4): 11-32.
- Gartner, W. B. (1989). "Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the Wrong Question." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 13(4): 47-68.
- Gibb, A. A. and M. G. Scott (1985). "Strategic Awareness, Personal Commitment and the Process of Planning in the Small Business." *Journal of Management Studies* 22(6): 597-625.
- Giddens, A. and C. Pierson (1998). *Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity*. Cambridge, Polity.
- Grosz, E. A., Ed. (1999). *Becomings : Explorations in Time, Memory and Futures*. Ithaca, Cornell UP.
- Kent, C. A., D. L. Sexton, et al. (1982). *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1977). "The entrepreneurial personality: a person at the crossroads." *The Journal of Management Studies* 1: 34-57.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1985). "The dark side of entrepreneurship." *Harvard Business Review*(November-December): 160-167.
- Kilby, P. (1971). Hunting the heffalump. *In Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. New York, Free Press: 27-40.

- Kirzner, I. M. (1982). The theory of entrepreneurship in economic growth. *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton and K. H. Vesper. Engelwood Cliffs, NJ, Printice Hall.
- Kuratko, D. F. and R. M. Hodgetts (1998). *Entrepreneurship; a contemporary approach*. Fort Worth, The Dryden Press.
- Leibenstein, H. (1968). "Entrepreneurship and Development." *American Economic Review*, 58: 72-83.
- Machan, T. R. (2000). "Entrepreneurship and ethics." *International Journal of Social Economics* 26: 596-609.
- Maturana, H. R. and F. J. Varela (1980). *Autopoiesis and cognition: the realization of the living*. Dordrecht, Holland ; London, D. Reidel.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1987). "Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs." *Journal of Creative behavior* 21(3): 219-233.
- McKenna, S. D. (1996). "The darker side of the entrepreneur." *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 17(6): 41-45.
- Metcalf, J. S. (2000). Restless Capitalism, Experimental Economies. *New Technology-Based Firms at the Turn of the Century*. W. Daring, R. Oakey and M. Kipling. Amsterdam, Pergamon/ElsevierScience: 4-16.
- Mill, J. S. (1869 (1859)). *On liberty*. London., Longman, Roberts & Green.
- Mill, J. S. (2002). *On liberty*. Mineola, NY, Dover Publications.
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). *The theory of the growth of the firm*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Pinker, R. (1990). *Social Work in an Enterprise Society*. London, Taylor and Francis.
- Prahalad, C. K. and G. Hamel (1990). "The core competence of the corporation." *Harvard Business Review* May-June: 79-91.
- Prigogine, I. (1980). *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*. San Francisco, W H Freeman & Co.
- Say, J. B. (1803). *Traite d'economie politique: ou, simple exposition de la maniere don't se forment, se distribuent et se consomment les richesses, Translation: Treatise on Political Economy: On the Production, Distribution and Consumption of Wealth*. New York, Kelley 1964 (1st edition: 1827).
- Scase, R. and R. Goffee (1987). *The real world of the small business owner*. London and New York, Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development: An inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest and the Business Cycle*. Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1946). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York, Harper and Bros.
- Shane, S. and S. Venkataraman (2000). "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research." *Academy of Management Review* 25(1): 217-226.
- Slaughter, R. A. (1995). *Futures Tools and Techniques*. Melbourne, Australia, Futures Study Centre.
- Smith, A. (1805). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. London, Greenland and Norris.
- Turner, D. and M. Crawford (1994). Managing Current and Future Competitive Performance: The Role of Competence. *Competence Based Competition*. G. Hamel and A. Heene. Chichester, John Wiley and Sons.

---

<sup>i</sup> Compare this with the original Mill text (1869:Ch1para13) “The only freedom which deserves the name, is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it.”

<sup>ii</sup> For example from the 1960s (e.g. McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, N.J., Van Nostrand. McClelland, D. C. (1987). "Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs." *Journal of Creative behavior* 21(3): 219-233, Delmar, F. (2000). *The Psychology of the Entrepreneur. Enterprise and Small Business; Principles, Practice and Policy*. S. Carter and D. Jones-Evans. Harlow, Prentice Hall. there have been attempts to crystallise the psychology of the entrepreneur through various scientific methods, in order to predict successful entrepreneurs.

What those attempts discovered is that (a) people we would label as entrepreneurs do not all share common traits (b) people not labelled as entrepreneurs have similar traits to entrepreneurs. (c) that tendencies to behave entrepreneurially are influenced by learning, experience and context.

<sup>iii</sup> The mainstream discourse of entrepreneurship is about economic success, not about alternative sides to entrepreneurial behaviour Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1977). "The entrepreneurial personality: a person at the crossroads." *The Journal of Management Studies* 1: 34-57, Kets de Vries, M. F. R. (1985). "The dark side of entrepreneurship." *Harvard Business Review*(November-December): 160-167, McKenna, S. D. (1996). "The darker side of the entrepreneur." *Leadership and Organization Development Journal* 17(6): 41-45.

<sup>iv</sup> or in the normative style of American writers the ‘discovery and exploitation of profitable opportunities’, there is no concept of failure in this definition.

<sup>v</sup> Such engagement may leads to, for example, purchasing or investment.

<sup>vi</sup> “Within the discourse of globalization the pursuit of national economic competitiveness and efficiency is the sine qua non of national security and well-being... This, after all, is the ‘entrepreneurial reversal’ that the ‘globalization’ hypothesis demands: societies serve economies, not the other way round. “ du Gay, P. (2000). "Enterprise and Its Futures." *Organization* 7(1): 165-183.

<sup>vii</sup> For example the market structures are synthetically created and highly centralised by government policy, they are not emergent and self-organising. Uncontrolled markets in public services lead to polarisation, e.g. sink schools, low grade hospitals etcetera.

<sup>viii</sup> Allan Gibb and Mike Scott talked about the importance of ‘Personal Commitment’ in their study of owner managers of growing businesses Gibb, A. A. and M. G. Scott (1985). "Strategic Awareness, Personal Commitment and the Process of Planning in the Small Business." *Journal of Management Studies* 22(6): 597-625..

<sup>ix</sup> Maturana and Varela coined the term **autopoiesis** to characterize those systems which (a) maintain their defining organization throughout a history of environmental perturbation and structural change and (b) regenerate their components in the course of their operation. Autopoietic systems realized in the physical space are living systems. Maturana, H. R. and F. J. Varela (1980). *Autopoiesis and cognition: the realization of the living*. Dordrecht, Holland ; London, D. Reidel.

<sup>x</sup> This development of a reflexive identity seems closer to the notions of becoming Prigogine, I. (1980). *From Being to Becoming: Time and Complexity in the Physical Sciences*. San Francisco, W H Freeman & Co, Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and Repetition*. New York, Columbia University Press, Grosz, E. A., Ed. (1999). *Becomings : Explorations in Time, Memory and Futures*. Ithaca, Cornell UP. than a rational teleological sense implied by strategic intent or pathfinding.