



AUTHOR(S):

TITLE:

YEAR:

Publisher citation:

OpenAIR citation:

Publisher copyright statement:

This is the _____ version of a work originally published by _____
(ISBN _____; eISBN _____; ISSN _____).

OpenAIR takedown statement:

Section 6 of the "Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-students/library/library-policies/repository-policies>) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will consider withdrawing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for any other reason should not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with the details of the item and the nature of your complaint.

This publication is distributed under a CC _____ license.

ANDERSON, A. R. 2015. The economic reification of entrepreneurship: re-engaging with the social. In Fayolle, A. and Riot, P. (eds.) *Rethinking entrepreneurship: debating research orientations*. Abingdon: Routledge, chapter 4, pages 44-56.

The economic reification of entrepreneurship; re-engaging with the social

Alistair R Anderson

"Economics, in speaking of entrepreneurs, has in view not men, but a definite function" (Mises 1966:246)

Introduction

Growth and development at personal, firm and national levels are all, quite properly, attributed to entrepreneurship. However, the importance of these entrepreneurial outcomes has shaped how we perceive entrepreneurs and the entrepreneurial concept. The significance of these positive outcomes seems to imply that entrepreneurship is primarily an economic function. In consequence throughout history, the words 'entrepreneur', 'entrepreneurial' and 'entrepreneurship' have been associated with specific economic roles and phenomena (Hebert and Link 1982). Van Praag and Versloot (2007) go so far as to claim that almost without exception, academic studies on entrepreneurship are motivated by the economic benefits of entrepreneurship. In short, our perceptions of entrepreneurship have become functionalist. Economics has won the battle for theoretical hegemony in academia and society as a whole and such dominance becomes stronger every year (Ferraro et al, 2005). At the very least, as Minniti and Lévesque (2008) claim, many aspects of entrepreneurship and its implications have been studied taking the lens of neoclassical economics.

The problem is that this functionalist lens is narrow. Its necessary reductionism doesn't permit us to see enough of, or to take into account, the fine grain of context and circumstance, nor of the non-mechanistic behaviour, the sentient and the emotional entrepreneurial practices that characterise entrepreneurship. This is surprising, because entrepreneurship is always about novelty and newness, doing things differently and creating change. The qualities of context and idiosyncratic human behaviour are the very qualities that may provide this very novelty that makes things entrepreneurial. By confining entrepreneurship in an economic paradigm, our understanding is at risk of a procrustean trimming, a reductionism that offers poor explanatory justice. It also fails to give due explanatory weight to how entrepreneurship emerges from social and economic interactions (Anderson et al, 2012). Consequently, I want to argue that the economists focus on outcomes means that economic "explanation" has overwhelmed "understanding" (Anderson, 2014). The economic dominance of enquiries about **what** causes entrepreneurship are explanations of enterprise that have served us well in explaining aspects such as innovation. But they serve us poorly in understanding **how** such processes emerge.

Entrepreneurship has been put in this "economistic" black box and it does not fit very well. Too many important explanatory aspects have to be left outside the box, such that these socialised leftovers are seen as ancillary rather than at the core of the phenomenon. As Steyaert and Hjorth (2007) explain, entrepreneurship is currently reified as an economic occurrence. The problem identified here is that although we know entrepreneurship as a

concept is socially constructed, it is economically construed. Yet entrepreneurship is not just socially constructed, it is also socially enacted. To understand entrepreneurship, we need to begin with process, rather than try to read back, trying to explain from outcomes. We should not try to seek an elusive, impossible universality, but should examine how context uniquely shapes practice.

The economic reification of entrepreneurship

The evidence for pervasion of the economic perception of entrepreneurship is strong. Ireland et al (2005) showed how a survey of published entrepreneurship research in AMJ demonstrated that many papers are in some form grounded in the classic work of scholars such as Knight, Schumpeter and Kirzner. McDonald et al (2014) surveying 29 years of entrepreneurship publications in the top journals found that positivistic approaches continued to dominate the literature. Johansson (2004) analysed economics textbooks used for entrepreneurship PhD courses and found that entrepreneurship was largely absent. He points out that what is not written could be at least as telling as what is written. Indeed not much has changed since Stanworth and Curran (1976) noted that the consistent overall theoretical perspective which unites both the dominant and minor themes in current theorizing concerning growth in the small firm is a highly positivist one. The underlying paradigm for theoretical development is an idealized version of that used in the natural sciences, what Bygrave and Hofer (1991) called physics envy. The small firm is seen as a behaving entity whose elements are related in quantifiable, systematic and highly predictable ways and the object of theory construction is the generation of law-like propositions concerning the growth process. Karp (2006) attributes this, in part, to systems thinking and attempts to apply the method of natural science to human action. For him, most approaches to entrepreneurship are rationalistic. He is concerned that entrepreneurship may not be understood merely as an economic, but also as a social activity constrained by time and place.

As Hjorth puts it, economics has become a common denominator to be employed in all theorising process (2004). Granovetter (1992) refers to this as economics' imperialism. For, Hirshleifer (1985), economics has become a universal grammar of entrepreneurship. Indeed, Keynes (1936) pointed out that the ideas of economists, both right and wrong, are more powerful than commonly understood.

Interestingly, there is also evidence of economic thinking in the language of entrepreneurship, of how we talk about enterprise. Language is important because as Chell (2000) shows, language guides our sense of social reality, by framing, filtering and creation to transform the subjective into a more tangible reality. Words are not passive vessels of meaning, but active forms of meaning creation. Clark and Dear (1984: 84) explain, "language is used to construct or reconstruct social reality". As Austin (1962) puts it, we do things with words, we engage in a performance with words. Words are performative, (Downing, 2005). We talk of opportunities, and describe how they must be seized and exploited. Moreover such opportunistic behaviour is geared to produce competitive advantage, to win some battle by bettering our competitors. Competition itself, an economic rallying cry and leitmotif of enterprise, projects fighting for ascendancy implying only one winner and many losers. It ignores the cooperation (Street and Cameron, 2007) and the socialised networks that characterise entrepreneurship (Anderson et al, 2010). We describe the entrepreneurial process as creative destruction with as much emphasis on destroying rather than as creating. We ignore how most innovation results from collaborative knowledge (Harbi et al, 2009). We describe markets as functional, but they are as much arenas of social exchange,

where there is a mutual dependency between buyers and sellers. Relationship marketing is far from an oxymoron in entrepreneurship practice (Zontanos and Anderson, 2004). These images drawn out from language are hardly benign, nor very accurate. They draw a picture of ruthless exploitation of resources and competitors; a Hobbesian landscape of one against all and a zero sum game. They overlook the emancipatory empowerment evoked by enterprise. They don't seem to capture the social embeddedness of the entrepreneurial process, nor the collaborations that characterise small business (Jack et al, 2008). They seem to ignore community (Johannisson, 1990) and what society values in enterprise (Anderson and Warren, 2011; Korsgaard and Anderson, 2011). Social entrepreneurship, where social welfare and wellbeing are both process and outcome, is deemed some sort of hybrid of business and society (Diochon and Anderson, 2009, 2011). Worst of all in this image building is the seeming feckless consumption, even destruction of our limited natural resources (Dean and McMullen 2007).

Sarasvathy (2010) is also very critical of the vocabulary of economics, similarly proposing that it imposes severe limitations on how we can understand entrepreneurship. Amongst others, she offers the vivid example of success or failure as a 0-1 variable. Here we can see my earlier argument about economics obsession with outcomes rather than process highlighted. She points out, with lots of examples, that "success" is most often a combination of many small failures. To that we might add that the very notion of success is highly subjective experience. For some, what I deem a failure, by say profit level, may be celebrated as a success because they have achieved an ambition to be independent (Anderson and Ullah, 2014). It seems then that the language of economics imposes meanings that do not, and cannot reflect, the nuances and variety of what it means to be entrepreneurial. By focusing on what can be measured, we may lose sight of what actually occurs.

These words, these images, have impact. Studies of young peoples' attitudes towards the appeal of entrepreneurship (Drakopoulou Dodd et al, 2013a; Anderson et al, 2009) asked for metaphors to describe their understanding of entrepreneurship. No social metaphors were offered, but economic or natural competitive metaphors (red in tooth, parasite, vulture and lion) prevailed. Similarly, a study of Tunisian student's attitudes demonstrated how they dwelled on the economic benefits of enterprise (Harbi et al, 2009). This study did, nonetheless, socially situate the role of gender in entrepreneurial opportunity. So meaning, as well as theory, is thoroughly permeated with an economic appreciation of entrepreneurship. Language affects what people see, how they see it, and the social categories and descriptors they use to interpret their reality (Ferraro et al, 2005). It shapes what people notice and ignore and what they believe is and is not important. In this sense, entrepreneurial reality is socially constructed (Berger and Luckmann, 1966) and language plays an important role in such constructions.

The history of entrepreneurial enquiry helps explain why this economic reification has come about. Indeed, Bjerke (2013) suggests that for 250 years only economists were interested in entrepreneurship. Holcombe (1998) explained how the earliest of entrepreneurial scholars, Cantillon, (1755), Smith (1776), Malthus (1798) and Ricardo (1821) all focused, albeit differently, on how growth occurred. For example, Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) attribute early interest in entrepreneurship to Ricardo's focus upon the economic role of the entrepreneur, rather than the individual who performs such a role. Redlich (1949) argued that following Say's (1767-1832) definition, entrepreneurship began to be considered as an economic phenomenon. It seems then that early functionalist thinking about entrepreneurship was economically informed and shaped and that this view has become

entrenched. For example, McMullen and Shepherd (2006) argue that a recurring theme in the literature is the health of the economy and how the economic system functions. But Holcombe (1998) argues economists are more ready to attack problems that fit into a general equilibrium model of the economy rather than those that are more difficult to parameterize. Certainly, Grant and Perren (2002) demonstrate the dominance of the functionalist paradigm that pervades the leading entrepreneurship journals.

Of course, despite my critique about understanding rather than explaining, we cannot ignore the substantial contribution of this economic thinking. As Minniti (2005) explains the methodological subjectivism of the Austrian Economic School (Kirzner, Schumpeter and Knight) has demonstrated the power and usefulness of concepts such as innovation and opportunities. Economic thinking is responsible for us seeing how innovation as a quintessential property of enterprise (Drucker, 1985). More recently, we see how context manifest as institutions is recognised by economists to shape forms of entrepreneurship (Harbi and Anderson, 2010). Moreover, the evolutionary economic perspective shows us how the aggregation of new business formation is akin to a great experiment, as those who get it right succeed and those who don't, fail (Anderson et al, 2012). This sort of economic perspective shows us a system, and how it is coordinated to produce economic outcomes. It reflects what Wohl (1954) argues is the economist's "entrepreneurial" problematic: discovering how the diverse and separate activities of a multitude of firms can explain the development of a nation.

Problems and gaps in the economic view

Foss et al (2008) argue that the classic contributions to the theory of entrepreneurship economists tend to portray entrepreneurial activity as an individual endeavour, and neglect how entrepreneurial judgment and the recognition and enactment of opportunities may be derived from social processes, such as dynamic interactions. Drakopoulou Dodd and Anderson (2007) make the same point about entrepreneurship as a socialised activity. Pittaway and Rose (2006) question the individualism in entrepreneurship, whilst Jones and Conway (2000) deconstruct the myth of the entrepreneur as a heroic individual. Nijkamp (2003) noted that the idea of the individual entrepreneurial hero had permeated the SME literature, but suggests that in more recent developments the social embeddedness has challenged the position of the 'entrepreneurial hero'. Importantly, Samuels (1990) reminds us that economics is a discourse in itself, one bound up with specific ideologies. Hence the idea of autonomous entrepreneurial individuals fits well with particular ideologies. But in turn this highlights the problem identified by Bruyat and Julien (2001) of an epistemological rupture between the general meaning of the words and their scientific meaning.

Economists give analytical primacy to environmental factors in a systems approach (Bouchikhi, 1993) that prioritises outcomes rather than process. McMullen and Shepherd (2006) argue that this system level approach is concerned primarily with how the economic system functions. Lipman (2003) explains how economics attempts to explain social institutions as regularities deriving from the optimisation of certain functions. However, Minniti (2005) emphasises how economic variables have failed to fully explain entrepreneurial variations and suggests that to better understand entrepreneurial behaviour one must look at the importance of the local social environment (Jack and Anderson, 2002). Thus, actual or potential economic conditions cannot be the entire story (Welter, 2011). Anecdotally, Zhara (2007) comments that when reading entrepreneurship papers, one rarely gets a sense of the substance, magnitude or dynamics of the research context. Furthermore, this systems approach ignores the importance of human emotions (Goss, 2005). Pain and

passion, perhaps even love; joy and despondency, all play a role in entrepreneurship process and practices; but they sit uneasily as a utility function or as an economic variable. Economistic thinking thus seems to miss out the human and contextual contingency Sarasvathy (2001) that enables entrepreneurship to create the future (Drakopoulou Dodd et al, 2013).

Moreover, the logic of economics is self-interest. (Sen, 1997:317) claims “The first principle of economics is that every agent is actuated only by self interest”. But the socialised practices of entrepreneurship seem to contradict this argument (Anderson and McAuley, 1999). Moreover entrepreneurial practices, even entrepreneurs themselves, are only socially “approved” when they are deemed to be acting morally (Anderson and Smith, 2007). This notion then of the primacy of entrepreneurial self-interest appears flawed, yet has arisen within the constrained logic of economic theorising. Alvey (2000) suggested that the economic detachment from moral concerns is a 20th Century phenomenon and attributes it to the “scientification” of economics. Historically, Banks (2006) points out that in the classical political economy portrayed by Adam Smith during the Enlightenment, economic activities were seen as embedded in non-economic social relations and shaped by moral values other than instrumental rationality. In modernity notions of the economy developed as an autonomous sphere with its own internal market logic, inducing a break between economic rationality and society. Solow, the Nobel Prize winning economist, (1997) claims that by 1940, economics had become a technical subject whereby efficiency was prioritised over other values. However, it is these very same values, but especially social concern, often manifest as cultural and social capital, that drive social enterprise and also help configure entrepreneurship more generally (Fuller and Tian, 2006).

Entrepreneurship and economics; the paradox

Inherent in the economistic perception of entrepreneurship is a paradox. Entrepreneurship is not part of mainstream economics. Klein (2008) notes how it is largely absent from contemporary economic theory. Ironically, although we see lots of attempts to explain entrepreneurship by economic thinking, we see little economic thinking about entrepreneurship! Classically Baumol (1968) explains, the theoretical firm is entrepreneurless- the Prince of Denmark has been expunged from the discussion of Hamlet. He explains the entrepreneur is a shadowy entity in economic theory without clearly defined form or function. Moreover, that economic theory is unlikely to develop a formal illuminating analysis of entrepreneurship. Wennekers and Thurik (1999:32) “The neo-classical model, with its production function, the internal logic of rational choice and perfect information, leaves no room for an active entrepreneur. As neo-classical economics became more formalized and as the mathematics of equilibrium theory became more important, references to the entrepreneur receded from the micro textbooks. The model left no room for aspects like initiative, charisma, stubbornness and the struggle with new ideas and uncertainty. The entrepreneur disappeared from microeconomic theory (Barreto 1989).

Recently, Bianchi and Henrekson (2005) asked if neo-classic economics remains entrepreneurless. They found that entrepreneurship remains defined narrowly and cannot capture the wide-ranging and complex functions suggested outside mainstream economics. They conclude that rather than providing an exhaustive theory, the economic contributions should be viewed as pieces of a complex puzzle. They conclude that an individual real-world entrepreneur, even if highly stylized, cannot be modelled in mainstream economics, since she eludes analytical tractability. In this sense, the neoclassical entrepreneur is (still) not entrepreneurial. It seems then that economic theory is hardly a comprehensive lens to

understand entrepreneurship. It follows then that it is paradoxical that it has so profoundly shaped entrepreneurial theorising and our methodological approaches to entrepreneurship.

Towards a more socialised conception of entrepreneurship

I want to argue that it may be better to try to understand entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon, albeit one with economic outcomes. I have tried to demonstrate that economic ways of looking at the phenomenon tell us very little about how entrepreneurship emerges. In “explaining” entrepreneurship through components and variables, economic thinking misses the importance of context and contingency in understanding the process. Economic explanations carry with them the loss of understanding of how entrepreneurship is planted strongly in life *tout court* (Steyaert and Katz, 2004) rather than simply in economic life (Hjorth et al. 2003). Indeed, entrepreneurship can be viewed as an expression of the interaction among individuals, social communities and the whole of society (Ebner, 2005). For Zafirovski (1999) this indicates the inadequacy of a 'pure' economic theory of entrepreneurship.

We see this issue as a problem manifest in our thinking about entrepreneurship, in that current economic theorising seems unable to cope very well with how entrepreneurship is practiced and presented. It seems the economic lens focuses too much on entrepreneurial economic outcomes and consequently neglects processes and inputs. An economist's lens is good for looking at entrepreneurial outcomes, but it provides us with poor explanations of the socialised inputs, or the precedents of entrepreneurship. In contrast, a social lens gives explanatory power to context, the nature of society and the qualities of society that allows us to understand how these things come together, the self and the entrepreneurial context (Anderson, 2000). A social lens enables us to see both how and why people are motivated to become entrepreneurial. Rather than crudely categorising entrepreneurship as desirable opportunity entrepreneurship, or dismissing it as necessity entrepreneurship, a social lens shows us how context shapes what is desirable and what is possible and helps to explain the contingency of entrepreneurship. Of course motivation can be economic, but for every entrepreneur I have ever spoken to, financial considerations are pretty low in the ranking of motivation. They may want to make a difference, they might want to be successful, but they don't just want to make money.

The importance of a more socialised view

Following Gartner (2001:27), it is important in entrepreneurship to examine and articulate the “assumptions we make about this phenomenon”. Lindgren and Packendorff (2009) identify this as a problem because the lack of explicit discussion on underlying basic assumptions in entrepreneurship research implies an un-reflective attitude to the hidden claims and perspectives. The assumptions that were challenged earlier all related to an economic view of the entrepreneurial world. As an economic phenomenon, the entrepreneur is undersocialised and the concept too embedded in ideological individualism. In contrast, we claim that entrepreneurship is enacted socially, using socially informed actors to engage within a milieu that can be understood socially. Furthermore, entrepreneurship processes have social outcomes that may well be just as important as the economic outcomes. Thus, we argue that the social plays a role at several different levels of entrepreneurial analysis. At the very least, enacting entrepreneurship engages in the social and produces some social outcomes.

This dominance of economistic thinking is important because scholarship tends to follow to the path that is illuminated by that light (Steyaert and Katz, 2004). Aldrich and Martinez (2002) warn that paradigms (such as the economic paradigm) serve as a siren song, tempting new generations of researchers to follow, regardless of any serious methodological problems. There are isomorphic pressures and deep-seated temptations to imitate. Consequently this issue of the domination of economics in entrepreneurship is neither trivial nor arcane, but of significant importance.

Conclusion

One effect of the dominance of the reductionist economic view is in how it has percolated into and shaped broad awareness of entrepreneurship. There has been a conceptual overflow from the dominant economic paradigm, such that how we present, how we appreciate and how we perpetuate our popular grasp of entrepreneurship has been afflicted by this economic mode of thinking. Words are how we communicate meaning, but there is an economic, individualistic bias in entrepreneurial words that masks other ways of understanding entrepreneurship.

The social as configuring entrepreneurial process is most evident in the embedded literature (Aldrich and Zimmer, 1985). Almost as a response to the undersocialised entrepreneur, this growing volume of literature shows how social values configure entrepreneurial practices. In this view entrepreneurship arises in a social context and is shaped, enabled or constrained by the social context. Seen in this way, entrepreneurship is anchored in the social. A closely related theme is that of social capital. Social capital is seen as a social resource that usually enables enterprise (Jack et al, 2010). Social capital can be seen as a relational artefact (Anderson et al, 2007) and as inhering in social relationships. Networks are a forum for, and probably of, social capital. Importantly, the network literature demonstrates how entrepreneurship is a socialised practice.

Finally we cannot ignore the number of calls to recognise the concept of entrepreneurship as a social construction (Fletcher, 2006, Anderson and Starnawska, 2008). The underpinning argument is that entrepreneurship is to be understood as a universal and that different members of society, in different roles in society, understand it differently. Moreover, Aldrich and Martinez (2002; 387) are firm believers in the social in entrepreneurship, "in a fundamental sense, then, entrepreneurship involves the social construction of new social entities". So we have made some progress in that the economic discourse and paradigm are not hegemonic, but nonetheless remain pervasive.

In reviewing the explanatory power of the economic the paper has tried to show the importance of the social in understanding entrepreneurship and for explaining enterprising practices. Entrepreneurship is too deeply enmeshed with society to allow us to stand sufficiently outside to view it only as economic. Entrepreneurship is much too profoundly engaged in society to allow us to neglect the social. A pure economic view simplifies, but yet insulates our theorising from the complex and dynamic meshing of the entrepreneur in the society in which she operates and within which enterprise is drawn and formed. The laudable outcomes of entrepreneurship are undoubtedly amenable to economic forms of measurement, but the processes that create these outcomes are profoundly social. Too often our views, our understanding and our appreciation of the nature of entrepreneurship are prejudiced towards a narrow economic approbation. A social ontology of entrepreneurship is required.

References

- Aldrich, H., Zimmer, C. (1986). Entrepreneurship through social networks. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.
- Aldrich, H.E., Martinez, M. (2002), Entrepreneurship as social construction: a multi-level evolutionary approach, in Acs, Z.J., Audretsch, D.B. (Eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Kluwer, Norwall, MA.
- Alvey, J. E. (2000). An introduction to economics as a moral science. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 27(12), 1231-1252.
- Anderson, A. R. and Smith, R., (2007). The moral space in entrepreneurship: an exploration of ethical imperatives and the moral legitimacy of being enterprising. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(6), pp. 479-497.
- Anderson, A. R., McAuley, A, (1999) Marketing landscapes: the social context, *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 2 (3), 176-188
- Anderson, A. R., Dodd, S. D. Jack, S.L., (2010), Network practices and entrepreneurial growth. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 26(2), pp. 121–133
- Anderson, A. R., Dodd, S. D. Jack, S.L., (2012) Entrepreneurship as connecting: some implications for theorising and practice, *Management Decision*, 50(5), pp.958 – 971
- Anderson, A.R. (2000) The Protean entrepreneur: the entrepreneurial process as fitting self and circumstance, *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 8, pp. 201–234
- Anderson, A.R., (2014) Conceptualising entrepreneurship as economic “explanation” and the consequent loss of “understanding”, *International Journal of Business and Globalisation*, forthcoming.
- Anderson, A.R., Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Jack, S.L. (2009) Aggressors; winners; victims and outsiders: European schools' social construction of the entrepreneur, *International Small Business Journal*, Vol.27 No.1 pp126-36
- Anderson, A.R., Park, J., Jack, S. (2007) Entrepreneurial social capital: conceptualising social capital in new high-tech firms, *International Small Business Journal*, 25(3) pp. 243-67
- Anderson, A.R., Starnawska, M., (2008), Research practices in entrepreneurship; problems of definition, description and meaning, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 9(4), pp. 221-230
- Anderson, A. R., and Warren, L. (2011). The entrepreneur as hero and jester: Enacting the entrepreneurial discourse. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(6), 589-609.
- Anderson, A. R., and Ullah, F. (2014). The condition of smallness; how what it means to be small deters firms from getting bigger. *Management Decision*, 52(2), 8-8.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). How to do things with words. Wm. James lectures. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Banks, M., 2006 Moral economy and cultural work, *Sociology*, 40(3), 455-472
- Barreto, H. (1989) *The Entrepreneur in micro-economic theory: disappearance and explanation*. New York: Routledge.
- Baumol, W. J. (1968). Entrepreneurship in economic theory. *The American Economic Review*, 58(2), 64-71.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth.
- Bjerke, B. (2013). *About Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bianchi, M., & Henrekson, M. (2005). Is neoclassical economics still entrepreneurless?. *Kyklos*, 58(3), 353-377.
- Bruyat, C., & Julien, P. A. (2001). Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship. *Journal of business venturing*, 16(2), 165-180.

- Bygrave, W. D., Hofer, C. W. 1991. Theorizing about entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2): 13-22.
- Bouchikhi, H. (1993). A constructivist framework for understanding entrepreneurship performance. *Organization Studies*, 14(4), 549-570.
- Chell, E. 2000 Towards researching the 'opportunistic entrepreneur': a review and some theoretical developments, *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 9: 63-80.
- Clark, G.L., Dear, M. (1984). *State apparatus: Structures and language of legitimacy*. New York: Allen and Unwin Inc.
- Dean, T. J., & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(1), 50-76.
- Diochon, M., Anderson, A. R. (2009). Social enterprise and effectiveness: a process typology. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 5(1), 7-29.
- Diochon, M., Anderson, A. R., 2011. Ambivalence and ambiguity in social enterprise: narratives about values in reconciling purpose and practices. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7 (1), pp. 93-109
- Downing, S. (2005). The social construction of entrepreneurship: Narrative and dramatic processes in the coproduction of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 185-204.
- Drakopoulou Dodd S., Anderson A. R. (2007), Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic entrepreneur, *International Small Business Journal*, 25(4), pp. 341-360
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Anderson, A., & Jack, S. (2013). Being in time and the family owned firm. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*. 29 (1) , pp. 35-47
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S. D., Jack, S. and Anderson, A. R. (2013a) From Admiration to Abhorrence: The Contentious Appeal of Entrepreneurship Across Europe. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(1-2), pp. 69-89
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard business review*, 63(3), 67.
- Ebner, A., (2005), Entrepreneurship and economic development; from classical political economy to economic sociology, *Journal of Economic Studies*, 32(3) 256-274
- Ferraro, F., Pfeffer, J., and Sutton, R. I. (2005). Economics language and assumptions: How theories can become self-fulfilling. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(1), 8-24.
- Fletcher, D. E. (2006). Entrepreneurial processes and the social construction of opportunity. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 18(5), 421-440.
- Foss, N. J., Klein, P. G., Kor, Y. Y., and Mahoney, J. T. (2008). Entrepreneurship, subjectivism, and the resource-based view: toward a new synthesis. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(1), 73-94.
- Fuller, T., & Tian, Y. (2006). Social and symbolic capital and responsible entrepreneurship: an empirical investigation of SME narratives. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 67(3), 287-304.
- Gartner, W. B. (2001). Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 27.
- Goss, D. (2005). Entrepreneurship and 'the social': towards a deference-emotion theory. *Human Relations*, 58(5), 617-636.
- Granovetter, M. (1992). Economic institutions as social constructions: a framework for analysis. *Acta sociologica*, 35(1), 3-11.
- Granovetter, M. (1985) Economic action and social structure: the problem of embeddedness, *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3) pp. 481-510
- Grant, P. and Perren, L. (2002) Small business and entrepreneurial research: meta-theories, paradigms and prejudices. *International Small Business Journal* 20 (2), pp. 185-211.
- Harbi, S., Amamou, M., Anderson, A.R. (2009) Establishing high-tech industry: the Tunisian ICT experience, *Technovation*, 29 (6/7) pp. 465-81

- Harbi, S., Anderson, A.R. (2010) Institutions and the shaping of different forms of entrepreneurship, *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 39(3), pp. 436-444
- Harbi, S., Anderson, A.R., Mansour, N. (2009) The attractiveness of entrepreneurship for females and males in a developing Arab Muslim country; entrepreneurial intentions in Tunisia, *International Business Research*, 2 (3), pp. 47-53
- Hébert, R. F., and Link, A. N. (1989). In search of the meaning of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 1(1), 39-49.
- Hirshleifer, J., (1985) The expanding domain of economics, *American Economic Review*, 85, pp 53-68.
- Hjorth, D. (2005) 'Organizational entrepreneurship: with de Certeau on creating heterotopias (or spaces to play)', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(4), pp. 386–398.
- Hjorth, D. (2004). Creating space for play/invention—concepts of space and organizational entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 16(5), 413-432.
- Hjorth, D., Johannisson, B. and Steyaert, C. (2003) Entrepreneurship as discourse and life style, in Czarniawska, B. and Sevón, G. (eds), *Northern Lights* (Malmö : Liber) pp. 91–110.
- Holcombe, R. G. (1998). Entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 1(2), 45-62.
- Ireland, R. D., Reutzell, C. R., Webb, J. W. 2005. From the editors: Entrepreneurship research in AMJ: What has been published, and what might the future hold? *Academy of Management Journal*, 48: 556-564.
- Ireland, R. D., Webb, J. W. 2007. A cross-disciplinary exploration of entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Management*, 33: 891-927.
- Johansson, D. (2004). Economics without entrepreneurship or institutions: A vocabulary analysis of graduate textbooks, *Economic Journal Watch*, 1(3), 515–538.
- Jack, S. L., & Anderson, A. R. (2002). The effects of embeddedness on the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of business Venturing*, 17(5), 467-487.
- Jack, S., Anderson, A.R. Drakopoulou-Dodd, S., (2008), Time and contingency in the development of entrepreneurial networks, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 20 (2), pp. 125–159
- Jack, S.L., Moulton, S., Anderson, A.R., Drakopoulou Dodd, S. (2010) An entrepreneurial network evolving: patterns of change, *International Small Business Journal*, 28(4) pp. 315-37
- Johannisson, B. (1990), Community entrepreneurship - cases and conceptualization, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 2(1), pp. 71–88
- Jones, O., and Conway, S. (2000). *The Social Embeddedness of Entrepreneurs: A Re-reading of 'against the Odds'*. RP 0023, Aston Business School Research Institute. Birmingham
- Karp, T. (2006). The inner entrepreneur: A constructivist view of entrepreneurial reality construction. *Journal of Change Management*, 6(3), 291-304.
- Klein, P. G. (2008). Opportunity discovery, entrepreneurial action, and economic organization. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(3), 175-190.
- Korsgaard, S., and Anderson, A. R. (2011). Enacting entrepreneurship as social value creation. *International Small Business Journal*, 29(2), 135-151.
- Keynes, J.M. (1936) *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, London: Macmillan Press,
- Lindgren, M., Packendorff, J., (2009) Social constructionism and entrepreneurship: Basic assumptions and consequences for theory and research, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 15(1), pp.25 – 47

- Lipman, B. L. (2003). Language and economics, In Marcelo Basili, Nicola Dimitri & Itzhak Gilboa (eds.), *Cognitive processes and rationality in economics*, London: Routledge.
- Nijkamp, P. (2003). Entrepreneurship in a modern network economy. *Regional Studies*, 37(4), 395-405.
- Minniti, M. (2005). Entrepreneurship and network externalities. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 57(1), 1-27.
- Minniti, M., and Lévesque, M. (2008). Recent developments in the economics of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(6), 603-612.
- McDonald, S., Ching Gan, B., Fraser, S, Oke, A., Anderson, A.R. (2014), Towards a Multiple Perspective View of Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Behaviour and Research*, forthcoming
- McMullen, J. S. and Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 132-152.
- Pittaway, L., and Rose, M. (2006). Learning and Relationships in Small Firms Introduction to the Special Issue. *International Small Business Journal*, 24(3), 227-231.
- Samuels, W. J. (Ed.). (1990). *Economics as discourse: An analysis of the language of economists*. Kluwer Academic
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2010). Entrepreneurship as economics with imagination. *The Ruffin Series of the Society for Business Ethics*, 3, 95-112
- Sarasvathy, S.D. (2001) Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency, *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243-64
- Sen, A. (1997). Economics, business principles and moral sentiments. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 5-15.
- Solow, R. M. (1997). How did economics get that way and what way did it get?. *Daedalus*, 126(1), 39-58.
- Stanworth, M. J. K., and Curran, J. (1976). Growth and the small firm—an alternative view. *Journal of Management Studies*, 13(2), 95-110.
- Stevenson, H. H., and Jarillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management. *Strategic management journal*, 11(5), 17-27.
- Steyaert, C., Katz, J., (2004) Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16 (3), 179-196.
- Steyaert, C., & Hjorth, D. (Eds.). (2007). "Introduction: what is social in social entrepreneurship?", *Entrepreneurship as social change: A third new movements in entrepreneurship book*. Edward Elgar Publishing. pp. 1-18.
- Street, C. T., and Cameron, A. F. (2007). External relationships and the small business: A review of small business alliance and network research*. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45(2), 239-266.
- Van Praag, C. M., and Versloot, P. H. (2007). What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research. *Small Business Economics*, 29(4), 351-382.
- Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Scribners. [Original work published 1904–1905].
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165-184.
- Wennekers, S., & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small business economics*, 13(1), 27-56.
- Wohl, R. R. (1954). The significance of business history. *The Business History Review*, 128-140.

- Zafirovski, M. (1999). Probing into the social layers of entrepreneurship: outlines of the sociology of enterprise. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 11(4), 351-371.
- Zahra, S. A. (2007). Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(3), 443-452.
- Zontanos, G. and Anderson A.R. 2004. Relationships, marketing and small business: an exploration of links in theory and practice. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal* 7(3), pp. 228-236.