

Journal of Management Inquiry

The 'Tango-Argentino': a metaphor for understanding effectuation processes

Journal:	<i>Journal of Management Inquiry</i>
Manuscript ID	JMI-17-0021-E.R4
Manuscript Type:	Essays
Keyword:	Entrepreneurship, Creativity, Social Networks
Abstract:	<p>The authors' use the analogy of the Argentine Tango to illuminate entrepreneurial effectuation as a process of becoming. Drawing on the metaphor of dance, the authors highlight seven areas for theory development that could further a performative theory of effectuation. These include, the study of the micro-level movement and flow in the dance as 'intimate steps,' and understanding the interplay between entrepreneur and ecosystem as 'contextual rhythms.' They further propose that the study of changing leadership in the dance could illuminate how causal processes 'become' effectual and suggest a concept of 'attunement' to consider how inexperienced entrepreneurs learn contextual rhythms and therefore benefit for effectuation processes. Finally they posit that the intimate steps leading to creativity in the dance relative to different levels of proximity and distance between the dancers should be understood alongside the movements and flows through which dancers maintain their individuality during such intimate movements and flows.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Opening stance

This paper is concerned with illuminating effectuation processes with the use of metaphor and we seek to outline a route by which a performative theory of effectuation could be developed. We first note the reflections by Shane (2012, p. 14) in an earlier publication of which he was co-author (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000):

“We have little more understanding of the process by which people exploit opportunities within existing organizations than we had a decade ago. We also have advanced very little in our knowledge of how entrepreneurs identify opportunities, formulate business ideas, and evaluate them.”

A key function in the entrepreneurial act is “the process of creating or seizing an opportunity and pursuing it to create something of value” (Glassman et al. 2003, p. 354). It is considered to be the means by which entrepreneurs create new wealth-producing resources or bestow existing resources with wealth creating potential (Drucker, 2002). Discussion seems to have coalesced into two processual theories of entrepreneurship, effectuation and causation (Perry, Chandler, & Markova, 2012). In recent years, a processual view of entrepreneurship has also become the subject of discussion (See, Dodd & Anderson, 2007; Jack, Dodd, & Anderson, 2008; Moroz & Hindle, 2012; Steyaert, 2007; Steyaert, 2012) and it is to this developing stream of literature that we append our contribution. We take the position that effectuation processes are emergent and in a continuous state of becoming (Garud, Gehman & Tharchen, 2017; Steyaert, 2012; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002), created through collective endeavour. In opposition to appeals for somewhat individualistic and static cause and effect

1
2
3 modelling of effectuation, Garud and Gehman, (2016), and most recently Garud et al. (2017)
4 point to the need to better consider the performativity of effectuation. These authors discuss
5 performativity as an onto-epistemological challenge to the underlying assumptions in a body
6 of work, in this case work considering entrepreneurial opportunities.
7
8
9
10

11
12 One of the core problems with visualizing effectuation is the continuous process of
13 adaptation between entrepreneur and felicitous context (Sarason, Dean, & Dillard, 2006). To
14 help visualize the motion and flow between entrepreneurs and context we choose the
15 metaphor of dance as a lens to further problematize the literature on effectuation. Our
16 contribution therefore rests in the combination of performativity and the use of metaphor to
17 problematize the effectuation literature. As an onto-epistemological stance (Garud et al.,
18 2017) performativity allows us to challenge the dominant philosophical stance in the
19 effectuation literature –that it is intrinsically path dependent (Sarasvathy, 2008)). We attempt
20 to integrate the ongoing problematization of this literature which challenges the ‘real’ notions
21 of opportunity and the static visualization of effectuation (McMullen, 2015; Moroz & Hindle,
22 2012; Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016; Steyaert, 2007; Steyaert, 2012). The core novelty we offer
23 to this developing problematization is a more collective, spontaneous and improvisational
24 notion of effectuation processes. We choose here to advocate the Argentine Tango as a
25 similarly helpful metaphor to communicate effectuation as a spontaneous act, but better to
26 inculcate notions of co-creation, and further offering a potential sensemaking tool for
27 entrepreneurs in the unfolding enactment of opportunity creation. In furthering a discussion
28 of the performativity of effectuation theory, we attempt integrate the dialogical movements of
29 two or more dancers in an emergent performance in which the opportunity does not precede
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3 the dance, but indeed rests in the unrehearsed performative act. We consider all movements
4 in the dance are *performance* but not all movements are *performative*. This further enables us
5 to consider the felicitous context of the dancers such as the dance floor, the music and
6 rhythm, the choice and changing of partners, leadership in the dance and the closeness of
7 relations between the dancers – and how that affects the performance and the performativity
8 of the Tango Argentino. This allows us to respect Sawyer’s (2015) caution that an
9 improvisational metaphor must consider both freedom and structure. We offer a visualization
10 of the spontaneity and freedom of the entrepreneurs as dancers in the context of ecosystems
11 as dance floors.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Pertinently, in his famous 1989 article, Gartner asked, “how do we know a dancer from
24 the dance?” arguing that we cannot disassociate the performance from the performer;
25 similarly, we cannot understand ‘who’ the entrepreneur is without analyzing the ‘what’ and
26 ‘how’ of entrepreneurship. In this performance, the dancers are often in close proximity,
27 moving at times to distances that enhance the aesthetic of the dance, sometimes moving at
28 different paces and in different directions. Equally, the dance may also involve, reversals, re-
29 starts, changes of direction, collisions and falls (Gupta, Chiles, & McMullen, 2016).
30 However, many dances have formal recognized and rehearsed steps and movements,
31 conforming more to a process of causation – a series of recognized steps in the
32 entrepreneurial process. With our focus on effectuation, we therefore choose to offer a
33 corollary to the dance metaphor of the ‘Argentine Tango’, to better visualize the spontaneous,
34 emergent and adaptive movement between entrepreneur and context during the performance
35 of effectuation
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 The Argentine Tango is an improvisational dance characterized as a dialogue of two (or
4 more) bodies. It is a supra-individual ensemble, which requires instantaneous communication
5 and an enhanced sensitivity to one's partner's more-or-less immediate intentions (Kimmel &
6 Preuschl, 2016). Historically, Tango was used to bridge socio-gender interaction norms. In
7 the 19th century, Argentina *milonga*, a traditional Tango dance club, was the only place where
8 unmarried men and women could be physically close to each other in a socially acceptable
9 manner (Denniston, 2007). Close interaction is a defined characteristic of the Argentine
10 Tango, with its close grip between the dance partners. The dance is constructed and
11 configured around the tension between the partners, who are either following each other or
12 flowing in opposite directions, but always remaining in contact throughout, "when every
13 moment can be an invention" (Kimmel, 2009, p. 76). In the Argentine Tango, no gender role
14 is attached to the role of leader; both partners can lead or follow at various points within the
15 dance. Traditionally, Tango was taught in male and female-only schools, so partners were
16 fluent in both roles. The only co-educational dance was happening in *milongas*, regular dance
17 events (usually weekly), that often begin with dance classes and sometimes demonstration
18 dances (Denniston, 2007).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Whilst the Tango metaphor has been discussed in the specific context of entrepreneurship
39 (See, for example, Gaudet, 2013), those deploying the metaphor have not proposed a more
40 nuanced deployment that could be used to better understand causation and effectuation
41 processes. We will argue here that a processual approach to entrepreneurship research would
42 benefit from a more suitable metaphor and propose the 'Argentine Tango' as such a metaphor
43 to enhance our specific understanding of the performativity of effectuation. The research
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 question we therefore propose in this paper is: *How can the Argentine Tango metaphor*
4 *enhance our understanding of the performativity of effectuation processes?* In visualizing the
5 dance as a performance act, we must observe the motion and flow of the dance, the dancers,
6 the dance floor, we see the fashions of the dancers, the reaction of the audience, hear the
7 music, sense the atmosphere and are aware of our emotional reaction to the ensemble of
8 contextual influences – resembling a complex entrepreneurial ecosystem (Hoffman &
9 Devereaux Jennings, 2011; Stam, 2015). To better understand the effectuation process within
10 the felicitous context of an entrepreneurial ecosystem, we feel the Argentine Tango metaphor
11 is illuminating.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 The rest of the paper is structured as follows: we begin with *costumes and makeup*, (the
24 philosophical and semantic garb through which we problematize the effectuation literature).
25 We then explore *the opportunity in the performance* (performance as the ‘becoming’ of
26 opportunity). Next comes *let's dance – movement and rhythm, choose your partners, do you*
27 *mind if I lead, hold me closer, but don't cramp my style* – where we consider how the dance
28 develops in a felicitous context. The *final flourish* outlines the contributions of our paper,
29 whilst *save the next dance* outlines the paper's limitations, and outlines a future research
30 agenda. We now seek in this paper to visualize entrepreneurship processes as “enactments-
31 unfolding processes involving actors making choices interactively, in inescapably local
32 conditions, by drawing on broader rules and resource” (Tsoukas & Chia, 2002, p. 577).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 However, we must first prepare for our performance.

46 47 48 **Costumes and makeup** 49

1
2
3 We first attempt to establish our philosophical position in relation to our subsequent
4 discussion. We see this as the philosophical ‘garb’ of our discourse. Performativity has been
5 argued to be an onto-epistemological stance (Garud et al., 2017) which, in effect,
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

We first attempt to establish our philosophical position in relation to our subsequent discussion. We see this as the philosophical ‘garb’ of our discourse. Performativity has been argued to be an onto-epistemological stance (Garud et al., 2017) which, in effect, problematizes the underlying assumptions in a body of work (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011). The notion of ‘critical’ performativity in critical management studies has been argued to be a “subversive intervention into management discourses” (Spicer, Alvesson & Kärreman, 2016, p. 226). A review of the performativity literature reveals different endeavours in its use, including ‘doing things with words’ (Gond, Cabantous, Harding & Learmonth, 2016). However, Garud et al. (2017) are concerned about the reduction of all things to words, and suggest performativity can be used to contest the power of words alone. In contra-distinction to the work identified by Gond, et al. (2016) which views performativity as a simple ‘measure of efficiency’, Garud et al. (2017, p. 3) suggest that performativity is the “relational-temporal effects constitutive of unfolding journeys” and conducted in the presence of felicitous conditions. We adopt this conceptualization of performativity in this paper, and thus move our analysis from outcomes to emergence. These felicitous contextual conditions could include, for example, various combinations of technology, partners, networks and ecosystems. We note, as Gond, et al. (2016, p. 3) comment in their review, that there have been attempts to deploy performativity in order to ‘bring theory into being’, such as that by Gehman, Trevino, and Garud (2013). Thus, we identify here the opportunity to use further metaphorical garb to advance the problematization of the effectuation literature and to develop a performative theory of effectuation – thus helping to bring a performative theory of effectuation into being.

1
2
3 A number of years ago, Morgan (1996) illustrated how metaphors can aid our
4 understanding of organizations and organizational issues in theory and in practice. He
5 argued that all theory is metaphorical and generates different ways of seeing and thinking
6 about organizational life. In his early work (Morgan, 1980; Morgan & Ramirez, 1984) he
7 identified a number of organizational metaphors (such as machine, culture and psychic-
8 prison) which were deployed by different paradigms in the social sciences and organization
9 theory. He argued that different metaphors can open up new possibilities by questioning the
10 traditional assumptions guiding our understanding of a phenomenon. A metaphor involves
11 information being transferred from a familiar domain (the 'source domain') to a new, yet
12 unknown domain (the 'target domain') (Tsoukas, 2009). In this sense, metaphor can be a
13 useful facilitator of problematization although the recognition of such potential at present
14 seems limited. There are two main theories addressing how metaphors work, the
15 *correspondence* theory and the *domain interaction* theory (Alvesson & Spicer, 2011) – and
16 the former predominates. Central to this approach is finding a good 'fit' or correspondence
17 between the formulated metaphor and the phenomenon. The latter theory sees metaphor
18 theorizing as a creative act which generates new meanings through the connection and
19 interaction between the source and target domains, on the assumption that metaphors not
20 only *describe* reality but actually *constitute* reality (Tsoukas, 2009).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Entrepreneurial narratives are embodied in metaphors (Duncan & Pelly, 2016). Metaphors
43 are powerful tools for sense-making, sense-giving and the development of theory (Latusek &
44 Vlaar, 2015). Metaphors emphasize a particular aspect of what we want to describe and
45 downplay other aspects, those which do not fit the metaphor (Jackson & Carter, 2007).
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 However, a problem with metaphors is that they tend to focus more on similarities rather than
4 contradictions (Oswick, Keenoy, & Grant, 2002), and the use of a metaphor often gives the
5 impression of capturing the essence of a process rather than one possible image of the
6 phenomenon (Alvesson & Spicer, 2011). A further problem with metaphors is that ‘bad’
7 metaphors with strong rhetorical attractiveness rather than theoretical value can distort our
8 understanding of a phenomenon (Alvesson & Spicer, 2011; Pinder & Bourgeois, 1982),
9 including through a process of fallacious reification (Oswick et al., 2002). A metaphor can
10 therefore be both costume and makeup that enhances a dance, or provides a distraction from
11 the substantive quality of the movements.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Notwithstanding the concerns expressed above, our view is that there are a number of
24 advantages in using metaphors in exploration of entrepreneurial phenomena. They help us
25 communicate ideas about complex social phenomenon, encourage us to view familiar
26 phenomenon from different perspectives, and to critically question our assumptions about
27 them (Alvesson & Spicer, 2011). The entrepreneurship literature contains a number of
28 examples of metaphors being used to explain the entrepreneurial construct (Clarke, Holt, &
29 Blundel, 2014; Cornelissen, Clarke, & Cienki, 2012; Tidd, 2012). We note that metaphors
30 have been utilized in three main ways:
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 First, a number of studies have focused on identifying metaphors used by entrepreneurs
42 (Clarke & Holt, 2010) and non-entrepreneurs to describe entrepreneurship (Dodd, Jack, &
43 Anderson, 2013; Henry, Warren-Smith, Martin, Scott, & Smith, 2014; Hyrsky, 1999;
44 Lundmark & Westelius, 2014). Metaphors have been used to describe sets of behaviours
45 (Nicholson & Anderson, 2005), for example, Koiranen (1995) found descriptions of
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 entrepreneurs as 'warrior', 'superman', 'explorer', 'mother', 'marathon runner', 'lion',
4
5 'whirlwind', 'magnet' and 'captain'. Such action-orientated metaphors typically show the
6
7 entrepreneur as a heroic figure in a performance, displaying attributes such as strength,
8
9 bravery and authority. Here, the entrepreneurial metaphor helps to perpetuate the popular
10
11 notion of the entrepreneur in a solitary individual performance. The metaphors are
12
13 predominantly and stereotypically male, referring to the entrepreneur as 'conqueror', 'the
14
15 lonely hero' and 'the patriarch' (Wee & Brooks, 2012). The entrepreneurs themselves
16
17 generally prefer processual and emotionally- charged metaphors for describing their
18
19 performance (e.g. 'iconoclasm', 'parenthood', 'war', 'journey'), and do not use the
20
21 mechanistic metaphors used in academic discourse (Dodd, 2002).
22
23

24
25 A second stream of research has reviewed and critically reflected upon the root metaphors
26
27 underlying the academic discourse on entrepreneurship (Alvesson & Spicer, 2011; Langley,
28
29 Smallman, Tsoukas, & Van de Ven, 2013). Dodd and Anderson (2007) posit that early
30
31 approaches to entrepreneurship research focused on behaviours such as trait theory, have
32
33 generally been discarded in favour of a broader conception that embraces more sophisticated,
34
35 socio-psychological approaches. These include cognition theory (See, for example,
36
37 Yamakawa, Peng, & Deeds, 2015) and socio-economic approaches, such as networking
38
39 (Huggins & Thompson, 2015), or population ecology theory (Aldrich & Wiedenmayer,
40
41 1993). Langley et al. (2013) refer to a review of process conceptualizations of organizational
42
43 change and development by Van De Ven (1992), noting that most representations of
44
45 organizational processes appear to either draw on life cycle metaphors that attempt to predict
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 linear progressions or on teleological models focused on developing normative ‘step-by-step’
4
5 guides.
6
7

8 These narratives posit the entrepreneurial performance as a series of choreographed steps,
9
10 or in a teleological approach, as having a defined start and end point but which may have
11
12 several routes between the two points. Langley et al. (2013) point to the central role of
13
14 tension, contradiction, paradox, and dialectics in driving patterns of change. Alongside life-
15
16 cycle and teleological theories of process, Van de Ven and Poole (1995) also speak of
17
18 dialectic approaches to theory which seem to have been underexplored through metaphor.
19
20

21
22 A third research stream has proposed new metaphors in order to deepen our understanding
23
24 of entrepreneurial processes as a more emergent performance. A number of studies have
25
26 introduced collective and relational metaphors, for example ‘entrepreneurial village’ (Danes,
27
28 2013) ‘parenthood’ (Cardon, Zietsma, Saporito, Matherne, & Davis, 2005), ‘co-evolution’
29
30 (Clarke et al., 2014), ‘theatre’ (Anderson, 2005). Others have introduced new metaphors in
31
32 order to highlight entrepreneurial behaviour as a creative process rather than an economically
33
34 rational and linear one, such as ‘quilting’ (Campbell, Hjorth, & Steyaert, 2004), ‘making
35
36 cakes’ (Harper & Endres, 2010), ‘curating’ (Litchfield & Gilson, 2013), and ‘bricolage’
37
38 (Senyard, Baker, Steffens, & Davidsson, 2014). The ‘kaleidoscope’ metaphor aims to
39
40 communicate the way creative imagination works (Chiles et al., 2013). In a similar vein
41
42 Steyaert (2012) suggests ‘dance’ as a metaphor in order to emphasize entrepreneurial
43
44 processes as constant movement. Such metaphors would seem most adeptly deployed to
45
46 explain evolutionary process theories – those without defined start and end points (Van de
47
48 Ven & Poole, 1995).
49
50

1
2
3 None of the existing entrepreneurial metaphors, with the possible exception of theatre
4
5 (Anderson, 2005), help us to understand co-created performativity in effectuation processes.
6
7 The most common metaphors underpinning the three research streams we have identified
8
9 (heroic, root and performance) have been criticised for not being able to account for the
10
11 relational, collective, paradoxical and emotional aspects of entrepreneurship (Cardon et al.,
12
13 2005; Chiles, Elias, Zarankin, & Vultee, 2013; Clarke, et al., 2014). Hence, within these
14
15 metaphors lie some distinctions between choreography, agency and spontaneity, which
16
17 broadly seem to conform to the dialectic between entrepreneurship as causation or
18
19 effectuation. However, for Steyaert (2012, p.160) the dance is an agreed upon choreography
20
21 where “dancing is the continual creation of space, a trace of trace-making” and, although he
22
23 invites us to consider entrepreneurship as a processual dance, his interpretation of the
24
25 metaphor does not account for the improvisational nature of effectuation which, we agree, is
26
27 supported more effectively by our Argentine Tango metaphor.
28
29

30
31
32 It is to the second and third approaches that we append our metaphorical approach. Our
33
34 Tango metaphor extends our understanding of entrepreneurial processes as “unfolding
35
36 journeys” (Garud et al., 2017, p. 3) by offering an emergent process view that can be used to
37
38 highlight how effectuation takes place between entrepreneurs, and between entrepreneurs,
39
40 stakeholders and their felicitous contexts. It combines both a dialogic and evolutionary take
41
42 on process (Van de Ven & Poole, 1995). We seek to illuminate effectuation processes as a
43
44 co-created, spontaneous and emergent phenomena, much like the performance of the
45
46 Argentine Tango. In this conceptualization, the choreography does not precede the dance, and
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 the opportunity is embedded in the dance. We must first highlight the theoretical garb and the
4
5 underlying philosophical assumptions in that work.
6
7

8 **The opportunity in the performance** 9

10
11 Having settled on the philosophical garb of metaphor, we must further extrapolate our
12
13 theoretical costumery. The relationship between the entrepreneurial person and opportunity is
14
15 a central theme in the entrepreneurship literature (Autio, Kenney, Mustar, Siegel, & Wright,
16
17 2014; Shane, 2003). Two schools of thought have emerged in relation to entrepreneurial
18
19 opportunities, the ‘discovery’ school and the ‘creation’ school. The opportunity discovery
20
21 school that assumes that opportunities are objective phenomena that can be discovered by
22
23 individuals with more information and better cognition (Shane, 2000). This debate has led to
24
25 a further discussion as to whether opportunities therefore preexist their recognition (Alvarez
26
27 & Barney, 2013; Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016). One take on this debate is that opportunities can
28
29 be created in the very performance of the entrepreneurial act – that they are in fact an
30
31 emergent property of the performance and therefore the performance is the ‘becoming’ of the
32
33 opportunity. Effectuation theory was developed by Sarasvathy and colleagues and introduced
34
35 as an alternative decision-making logic used by entrepreneurs in creating opportunities
36
37 (Sarasvathy, 2001a, 2008) in contraposition to a more deterministic notion of opportunity
38
39 identification as a process of causation (Martin & Wilson, 2014; Perry et al., 2012).
40
41 Sarasvathy (2001b, p. 6) articulates an approach to the performance of actions within
42
43 entrepreneurship processes based on the principles of affordable loss, strategic partnerships
44
45 and leveraging contingencies, each of which is reliant on the underlying logic of effectual
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 reasoning which states, “to the extent that we can control the future, we do not need to predict
4
5 it.”
6
7

8 Recently Garud et al. (2017) discuss the dichotomy between opportunity discovery and
9
10 opportunity creation, capable of being bridged by a performative theory of entrepreneurial
11
12 opportunity. They point, however, to a tendency in both theories to see the entrepreneurial
13
14 context as ‘real’ and ‘out there’, but with a greater tendency in the discovery school to see
15
16 opportunities as pre-existing entrepreneurial awareness of them. There seems, therefore, to be
17
18 significant scope to elucidate how a spontaneous and improvised opportunity creation and its
19
20 underlying effectuation processes, emerges. They also elucidate how such a performative
21
22 theory of effectuation might include consideration of felicitous context in the performance of
23
24 the opportunity. In this endeavour, Bhowmick (2011) has helpfully described effectuation as
25
26 a dialectic mechanism that recognizes the agency of multiple stakeholders (including the
27
28 entrepreneur) in the formation of the opportunity. An effectual process is dialectic because
29
30 the process is led by the entrepreneur but dependent on the commitment and engagement of
31
32 other stakeholders.
33
34
35
36

37 In contrast to the rational and linear logic of causation, the effectual approach is based on
38
39 three logics using the available means as a process for creating new goals and means: (1)
40
41 Who you are: the logic of identity, as opposed to the logic of preferences, (2) What you
42
43 know: the logic of action, as opposed to the logic of belief, and (3) Whom you know: the
44
45 logic of commitment, as opposed to the logic of transaction (Sarasvathy & Dew, 2005). The
46
47 first logic, the identity perspective, makes it possible for us to construct preferences in
48
49 situation when we do not have any; we can experiment with preferences and play them
50
51

1
2
3 against each other. The second logic challenges the idea of calculating the probability of
4
5 success before you act and is based on the assumption that meaningful action will change the
6
7 circumstances and markets are artifacts created by this action not forces of nature. Through
8
9 action you learn. The last logic refers to interactions with stakeholders. In the effectual
10
11 approach the artifact is formed through the interaction with stakeholders that commit to the
12
13 project. They are not sought out in order to fulfil a particular aspiration, but are part of a new
14
15 network creating unpredictable outcomes through their involvement. In contrast to the
16
17 opportunity discovery theory that assumes that opportunities are objective phenomena that
18
19 can be discovered by individuals with more information and better cognition (Shane &
20
21 Venkataraman, 2000), effectuation theory is considered as a creative process view on
22
23 entrepreneurship because it is a non-teleological theory where the meaning and opportunities
24
25 are created by the human actors involved in the process (Steyaert, 2007).
26
27
28
29

30 We therefore seek to append our contribution to the developing problematization of the
31
32 entrepreneurial literature (McMullen, 2015; Moroz & Hindle, 2012; Ramoglou & Tsang,
33
34 2016;) challenging the underlying realist assumptions in the opportunity discovery literature.
35
36 We take a further step by further adding to the processual perspective on effectuation by
37
38 visualizing a spontaneous and improvised picture of effectuation in a felicitous context. In the
39
40 Argentine Tango, the performance does not follow a set pattern of predictable movements.
41
42 Rather the Tango represents a spontaneous and adaptive approach with movement between
43
44 entrepreneur and context reflecting the performativity of effectuation. Effectuation is
45
46 considered to be a creative process view of entrepreneurship because it is a non-teleological
47
48 theory where the meaning and opportunities are created by the human actors involved in the
49
50
51

1
2
3 process (Steyaert, 2007). In this sense, we consider that the improvisational nature of the
4
5 Argentine Tango creates a non-teleological quality quite distinct from other entrepreneurial
6
7 metaphors. The logic of effectuation suggests that control (of the dance) can be maintained
8
9 through taking small steps in one direction instead of working towards long-term goals that
10
11 often have unpredictable (non-teleological) outcomes. By approaching effectuation in this
12
13 way, the dancer, through the performance of the dance, is able to negotiate new goals and
14
15 means whilst avoiding investing time, energy and/or money they are not actually willing to
16
17 lose. The logic of effectuation also embraces the principle of entering into collaborations and
18
19 strategic partnerships. Like the Argentine Tango, this approach emphasizes the value of
20
21 prioritizing different types of partners willing to commit to the moment, rather than seeking
22
23 out potential partners who might not be available or motivated. This principle is based on the
24
25 understanding that when engaging new partners with different and unanticipated
26
27 perspectives, the dancer must be open to changes of direction as a result of new partners and
28
29 partnerships. Detours and mistakes are inevitable elements of the effectuation process, and
30
31 the dancers must learn to work with them and identify opportunities for development that
32
33 might arise in such situations. Having adorned our philosophical and theoretical garb, we turn
34
35 next to begin our dance and expose the potential performativity of effectuation.
36
37
38
39

40 **Let's Dance**

41
42
43 We visualize the dance as beginning with a choice of dance partners and we choose to see the
44
45 dance floor as crowded, with multiple dancers aesthetically enhancing the overall
46
47 performance of the dance on the dance floor.
48
49
50

Movement and rhythm

We have proposed earlier that entrepreneurship processes be conceptualized as an act of becoming (Steyaert, 2012; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). In proposing the idea of performativity, Garud and Gehman, (2016, p. 546) propose that an effectual act is “continually constituted by sociomaterial entanglements rather than independent objects with given boundaries and properties” – in essence advocating that the entrepreneurial act be considered as a performance enacted in time and space (after Tsoukas & Chia, 2002). To truly understand the entrepreneurial act as a process of becoming, we suggest considering process at the micro-level of movement in the performance, and at its most intimate. We propose that processual studies should focus on the steps of the performance through which an entrepreneur adapts to the movements of their partnership and the felicitous rhythms of the specific context in which they are performing. Entrepreneurial motion and flow should, through this route, be captured as attuned to contextually specific rhythms, each entrepreneurial ecosystem thus having a distinct rhythm.

We suggest that an understanding of 'entrepreneurial ecosystems', which has recently emerged (Autio et al., 2014; Spigel, 2015; Stam, 2015) can also be enhanced by consideration of the Argentine Tango metaphor. In our conceptualization, ecosystems are the dance floors; an increasingly pertinent metaphor, we argue, to the burgeoning use of 'platform' ecosystems as foci for co-creativity (Adner, 2017) founded on entrepreneurial interactions that build social capital (Anderson & Jack, 2002). Engel, Kaandorp and Elfring (2017, p. 37) theorize about the importance of effectual networking under conditions of uncertainty. Ecosystems are complex networks with high degrees of complexity and studies of such systems are

1
2
3 encumbered by high levels of causal ambiguity. They suggest that effectual networking
4
5 “requires a more altruistic approach to interpersonal interactions and openness to unexpected
6
7 contingencies as networking activities stimulate serendipitous goal formation and
8
9 transformation”. Countering what they perceive to be the dominant *causal* logic of
10
11 entrepreneurial networking studies, rather than effectual networking leading to
12
13 entrepreneurial action, they propose that networking *is* entrepreneurial action. Such a
14
15 processual viewpoint is analogous with the Argentine Tango metaphor, in that the dancers,
16
17 must adopt a more altruistic approach to interpersonal interactions, or movements within the
18
19 dance, enabling them to remain open to unexpected contingencies associated with
20
21 serendipitous movements on the dancefloor. They note that uncertainty can form the very
22
23 basis of contextual boundary judgments. Indeed, the Argentine Tango enables us to gain
24
25 insight into aspects of effectuation that have been overlooked by previous studies that have
26
27 also adopted a processual view of effectuation. The spontaneous and unplanned nature of the
28
29 Argentine Tango dance helps reveal how spontaneous and unintended partnerships emerge
30
31 between the dancers.
32
33
34
35

36 Entrepreneurial interactions might be considered as movements in the performance of the
37
38 steps of the Tango dance through which an entrepreneur adapts to the rhythms of the specific
39
40 context in which they are performing. Both the movement and the rhythm of the dancers
41
42 aesthetically enhancing the overall performance of the dance. Each dance floor has a rhythm
43
44 and the choice of partners may be the next crucial decision to maximize creativity in the
45
46 dance. The movements and flows of inexperienced co-located entrepreneurs will initially be
47
48 less in tune with these rhythms, and will initially tend to follow a series of prescribed steps to
49
50 find opportunities. Dancing with multiple partners on the dance floor enables novice
51
52

1
2
3 entrepreneurs, who might not be able to improvise, to become attuned to their environment
4 and move way from predictive logic (Dew et al. 2009). Thus, the Argentine Tango metaphor
5 can aid our processual understanding of how novice entrepreneurs become expert
6 entrepreneurs, moving from predictive to effectual logic. However, we propose that more
7 experienced dancers can improvise – they can create new steps due to their attunement with
8 contextual rhythms, gaining increasing confidence over time. The advantage of using the
9 Argentine Tango metaphor in exploring the performativity of effectuation is thereby focusing
10 upon both the time and space dimensions of the performance and the micro-level movements
11 taken within that space. Particularly, spaces denote specific contextual rhythms and one could
12 explore how inexperienced entrepreneurs ‘become’ attuned to the rhythms of particular dance
13 floors. Such attunement includes choices of partners, the proximity to other influential
14 stakeholders, leadership and individual creativity, which we move to discuss.

30 **Choose your partners**

31
32
33 Engel, et al. (2017, p. 41) recently note that little is known about the “behavioral interaction
34 element of effectual processes”. Partner choice should therefore also be considered carefully
35 in the dance.
36
37
38

39
40 Sarasvathy (2001b) argued that entrepreneurs also use an alternative logic when the means
41 are known to them, but the goals are not. They have goals for the future, but more
42 importantly, they consider what they can do with their prior knowledge (what they know),
43 their identity (who they are) and their social networks (who they know). They start out with a
44 general aspiration for the future, but the actual product or service developed is the result of
45
46
47
48
49
50

1
2
3 their interaction with stakeholders who are willing to commit to the venture. Through this
4 interaction they create new goals and means together. The tendency to return to the individual
5 entrepreneur has been pointed out by a number of researchers, including those who argue for
6 a processual orientation (Bygrave & Hofer, 1991; Gartner, 1989; Sarasvathy, Kumar, York &
7 Bhagavatula, 2014). As new stakeholders commit to the venture the goals and means
8 continue to grow as these new partners have other abilities, knowledge and networks. The
9 interactions result in new ideas, products and markets that could not have been foreseen at the
10 beginning. At the heart of this process is the principle that entrepreneurs do not need to
11 predict the future with traditional market analyses because they control it through strategic
12 alliances with multiple partners. It would be necessary to consider the notion of spontaneous
13 and unplanned adaptation in the dance as the dance unfolds.

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 Investment in new ideas is also based on the principle of affordable loss, i.e. the
28 entrepreneur only commits to an investment that she/he can afford to lose, and the
29 entrepreneurial process has to be adapted to this. Sarasvathy (2008) has formulated this as
30 five principles: (1) The Bird-in-the-Hand principle: starting with means and creating new
31 effects, (2) The Affordable-Loss principle, (3) The Crazy-Quilt principle, (4) The Lemonade
32 principle, and (5) The Pilot-in-the-Plane principle: non-predictive control. In order to further
33 conceptualize the entrepreneurial process as social practice rather than the product of
34 individual cognition, Fletcher and Watson (2008, p. 151) have utilized the relational
35 dimension of entrepreneurial processes, in order to give “primary emphasis to the joint co-
36 ordinations through (and by) which entrepreneurial opportunities are brought into being and
37 realized.”

1
2
3 Such ‘conjoint’ collaboration comes from the combination of and interaction between two
4
5 or more entrepreneurs, each bringing different capabilities to the co-creative process and
6
7 different and ongoing pressures to adjust and adapt to each other. Tidd (2012) identifies three
8
9 mechanisms that contribute to entrepreneurial interactions: i) complementary capabilities that
10
11 combine the productive use of entrepreneurs’ skills, experience, aptitude, insight, and
12
13 circumstance; ii) creative conflict that arises due to differences in personalities, creative and
14
15 cognitive style, domain-specific knowledge and experience, and iii) adjacent networks where
16
17 entrepreneurs can collect the resources they require through a complex network of
18
19 relationships. The Argentine Tango metaphor helps us visualize the adaptive effectual
20
21 interactions that take place between the actors involved in the co-creative entrepreneurial
22
23 process and improve our understanding of endogenous processes where the goal develops
24
25 through adaptive interaction, and the leadership and control are simultaneously or at different
26
27 points in time, shared by different stakeholders. In the Argentine Tango, the performance
28
29 may be considered as more than the entanglement of two dancers, but instead the interaction
30
31 of multiple dancers within the defined space but changing over time. The performance is also
32
33 the sum of multiple performers and the ecosystem of the dance (costumes, makeup, lights,
34
35 music, and rhythms). We suggest entrepreneurial promiscuity as a term to be further explored
36
37 as a dialectic process in the early stages of opportunity creation processes. Whilst
38
39 entrepreneurs are thought to rely earlier on existing networks – in essence, the dancer arrives
40
41 and chooses initially a known partner with whom to dance, promiscuity on the dancefloor
42
43 may lead quickly to new dance partners. We must next consider the principle of leadership
44
45 in, and of the dance.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Do you mind if I lead?

In considering the principle of leadership, at a dyadic level, one partner leads, and one partner follows, at the level of a triad, a buyer or consumer judges the value of the interaction. An attraction of the Argentine Tango metaphor is the gender neutrality in terms of leadership, and that either partner can lead at any time. At the level of network are lead firms that determine the rhythms in an ecosystem. Such lead firms could be small, medium, and large commercial or public sector organizations that have forward and/or backward commercial linkages with significant numbers of micro, small, or medium scale enterprises (MSMEs) who are often key innovators in their ecosystems (Lusby, 2008). There is a requirement for lead firms to develop the appropriate capabilities to support the inter-firm activities they deploy (Perks & Moxey, 2011).

Thus, we propose that lead firms play an essential part in helping build performative entrepreneurial ecosystems that nurture effectuation processes. Constantly changing leadership is an integral part of the Argentine Tango. The metaphor helps us understand how lead firms manage the changing of stakeholders or dance partners (including scientists, brokers, collaborators, co-investigators, policy-makers, and industry and civil society stakeholders and funders) and changes of leader within the dance, those dancing in the spotlight and those at the periphery, but constantly being drawn centre stage, and under the spotlight. Created during the dance is an original combination of movements, resulting in a new dance every time. Similarly, business enterprises and the activities of entrepreneurs and others are always emergent, in a process of becoming (Steyaert, 2012).

Hold me closer

Sawyer (2015) discusses the need for an improvisational metaphor of creativity to consider the tension between freedom and structure. Our conceptualization has so far given fair consideration to the freedom of the dancers, but we must further consider how proximity might offer some notion of constraint to improvisation. Close interaction and intimacy between the dance partners is a defining characteristic of the Argentine Tango. Visualizing the dance floor as a complex ecosystem enables us to observe the co-proximity of the dancers in their performance and to develop a deeper understanding of the conditions by which partners change and knowledge is transferred between dancers. Partners occupying the dance floor can observe the movement and flow of the other dancers, and copy some of their moves, and potentially build on them to an extent that they are more greatly appreciated by the audience. We observed earlier that the theory of effectuation was most popularly associated with experienced entrepreneurs, but in understanding the spaces between entrepreneurs on a dance floor, the process of learning can be better visualized. For the dancers, being familiar with the contextual rhythms of the dance in each ecosystem aids knowledge transfer- this we see as a metaphor for cognitive proximity (Gubbins & Dooley, 2014), which denotes similarities in the way people perceive, interpret, understand and evaluate situations (Huber, 2012). At the same time, the dancers remain separate, maintaining cognitive distance that yields opportunities for novel combinations that generate new ideas (Nooteboom, Van Haverbeke, Duysters, Gilsing, & Van den Oord, 2007).

Cognitive distance can also result in falls and failures (Gubbins & Dooley, 2014) within the dance, but, when successful, leads to original steps and movements being created. We

1
2
3 noted earlier that the dance may also involve, reversals, re-starts, changes of direction,
4 collisions and falls (Gupta et al., 2016). In outlining the theory of effectuation, Sarasvathy
5 (2001b) spoke of entrepreneurs accepting ‘affordable loses’. Garud et al. (2017, p. 3) discuss
6 the problem of using pejorative terms such as ‘misfires’ and ‘failures’ and suggest that in
7 advancing a theory of entrepreneurial performativity the term ‘overflows’ is preferred. In the
8 motion and flow of a performative theory of effectuation, we therefore advocate that it be
9 considered as the constitution, de-constitution and re-constitution of opportunity. Hence, not
10 only are the dialectic ‘overflows’ of the dancers to be treated as essential in the performance,
11 but the proximity of other dancers on the same dancefloor to the overflows allows them to
12 absorb the lessons learned – such knowledge becomes structural within the ecosystem. In this
13 sense the felicitous conditions in an ecosystem are diachronically enhanced. Indeed, such
14 overflows may have intertemporal effects, in that the overflow, whilst infelicitous in the
15 present, might be asynchronously felicitous in the future. Even when the dancers step from
16 the stage, those who retain knowledge of the overflow due their proximity to the event may
17 call on that knowledge in the future. In time, knowledge of these overflows becomes part of
18 the rhythms of the ecosystems and is a further means of entrepreneurial attunement.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 The challenge then is for the dancers to remain separate entities, but with a polyphonic
39 voice, maintaining sufficient cognitive distance to generate new knowledge, but not so distant
40 as to preclude the sharing of existing knowledge or to learn from overflows. Diversity is an
41 important condition for creativity in organizations (Amabile, 1998; Amabile & Khaire, 2008),
42 and thus it helps if the dance floor contains people with a diversity of expertise and
43 backgrounds. The dance floor is a heterotopia (Hjorth, 2005) – a space where diversity comes
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 about across firm and industry/sector boundaries through the sharing of ideas, knowledge,
4 expertise, and opportunities (Miles, Miles, & Snow, 2005; Pattinson, Preece, & Dawson,
5 2016). The challenge for the leaders of the dance is to bring together disparate groups of
6 individuals facing common problems (Ramirez & Li, 2009). In this sense the dancers are a
7 collective of diverse influences involved in co-creativity, where achieving a state of
8 becoming (Steyaert, 2007) is necessary in order to move the focus to the *social* of the creative
9 processes.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Diversity tends to create conflict and convoluted processes, and therefore it may be
20 tempting for some managers to put together homogeneous groups of individual dancers
21 whose success depends on both their internal stability and their capacity to develop
22 behavioural norms and protocols to stimulate creativity (McKinlay, 2002). This raises an
23 important question regarding how organizations manage the constant change of dance
24 partners, which we now explore.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **But don't cramp my style!**

34
35

36 Constant communication between the dancers is required in order to have a creative dialogue
37 rather than a merged couple performance. Thus, the tension between dancers has an
38 important role here in allowing for and building upon multiple perspectives. Research on
39 organizational entrepreneurship has shown the benefits of working with polyphonic spaces in
40 the context of effectuation processes (Alexandersson, 2015; Hjorth & Steyaert, 2004). Only
41 as distinct entities can the dancers reveal the potential of each movement and produce
42 unexpected outcomes. A recent adaptation of the Tango metaphor is to point out that it does
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 not take two, but actually three (or sometimes more) to Tango (See, for example, Buch,
4
5 Dysvik, Kuvaas, & Nerstad, 2015; Greiner, 2002). Gaudet (2013, p. 178) points out that “in
6
7 the heat of Tango, multiple dancing partners...mobilize” in effectual processes. Gaudet (2013)
8
9 does not discuss, however, how we might use this observation to help develop a '3 (+)
10
11 dancers' metaphor. Although the Tango is usually a dance between two partners, the
12
13 effectuation processes of organizations are largely dependent on the interaction and
14
15 intertemporal creative tension that emerges among multiple partners (as well as multiple
16
17 leaders), both inside and outside the firm (Pisano, 2006). The Argentine Tango metaphor is
18
19 valuable here because it allows us to consider the multiple interactions of diverse individuals
20
21 occurring on a ‘dance floor’, where the dancers are so focused on their individual dance
22
23 partner that they might fail to recognize or take into account the wider contexts within which
24
25 this action is occurring, and which might challenge or enhance their effectiveness.
26
27
28

29
30 We must also consider that dances might end. Partners, for reasons of creative tension may
31
32 leave the partnership and find new partners, a partner may leave the dance floor in favour of a
33
34 venue with a more conducive rhythm, or indeed partners may become one single entity. As
35
36 such, matters such as geographic relocation, merger, acquisition and venture dissolution may
37
38 be better understood by considering the process of becoming in the dance.
39
40

41 **Final flourish**

42
43
44
45 The central research question explored in this paper has been; *how can the Argentine Tango*
46
47 *metaphor enhance our understanding of the performativity of effectuation processes?* Using
48
49 both performativity and metaphor, the paper has offered a challenge to the underlying
50
51

1
2
3 assumptions body of work discussing entrepreneurial opportunities. Through this
4
5 problematization approach, the paper has made a more fine-grained contribution to the
6
7 effectuation school of thought. The contribution builds on criticisms of effectuation as
8
9 lacking a fine grained understanding of its emergence. With resort to the metaphor of the
10
11 Argentine Tango we have been able to offer new concepts into the discussion of effectuation
12
13 such as contextual rhythms, attunement and promiscuity – which if empirically explored may
14
15 offer further insight into the motion and flow of effectuation processes. By combining ideas
16
17 from performativity with a metaphorical lens we have also contributed to the visualization of
18
19 effectuation as a spontaneous, improvisational and serendipitous processes of constitution,
20
21 de-constitution and re-constitution of relations conducted in a felicitous context. By offering,
22
23 reversals, re-starts, changes of direction, collisions as being infelicitous overflows but which
24
25 may be intertemporally felicitous, we have offered a way of understanding acceptable losses
26
27 from an emergent perspective. The consideration of the dancer and the dancefloor we have
28
29 offered a means to moderate the tension between spontaneity and structural context. In sum,
30
31 our contribution offers a challenge to static and individualistic views of entrepreneurial
32
33 opportunity recognition underpinned by realist ontological foundations. Our contribution also
34
35 offers a route to gaining insight into uncertainty as the very basis of boundary setting
36
37 conditions.
38
39
40

41
42
43 Whilst the analogy between entrepreneurship and the Tango is not new, the metaphor
44
45 itself has not been systematically applied to empirical analyses to effectuation processes, nor
46
47 has it been conceptually developed as a research framework. We have shown how the
48
49 specific metaphor of the ‘Argentine’ Tango acts as a rhetorical device that helps us explore
50
51

1
2
3 entrepreneurial effectuation process as ‘becoming’. Our view is that, in considering the
4 Argentine Tango metaphor, we draw attention to micro-level insights that can be particularly
5 useful when analysing situations where diverse perspectives and complex networks of
6 ecosystems of multiple partners work together. Such consideration is also heuristic (Gagnon,
7 2008) and could aid the exploration of creative dialectic tensions in a variety of
8 organizational settings. This process contributes to the construction of multiple perspectives
9 and supports the capture of the polyphonic voice of collective endeavour in which tension
10 between various entrepreneurs encourages effectual process. Consideration of the Argentine
11 Tango metaphor has allowed us to propose the following research agenda to enhance the
12 performativity of effectuation.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 25 **Save the next dance** 26

27
28 We propose the following agenda for empirical study of the ideas advanced in this conceptual
29 paper.
30
31

32
33
34 First, to more fully understand effectuation as an act of becoming, we should study the
35 activities of entrepreneurs in context as a series of micro-level movement’s – as ‘intimate
36 steps’ in the dance. This would seem to require longitudinal, real time study in the manner of
37 a panel of judges immediately adjacent to the dance floor observing the intricacy of the
38 moves of the dancers as they unfold. Case analysis and eventual cross-case analysis may
39 therefore lead to transferable performative theory of effectuation. Its product would be a
40 series of micro-level steps or moves that could be taken towards enhanced creativity.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

1
2
3 With such processual intent in mind, we propose further that, second; the notion of
4
5 'contextual rhythms' should be considered in order to better understand the link between
6
7 entrepreneurial person and context. Research examining the contextually bounded notion of
8
9 entrepreneurial ecosystems could be furthered by addressing rhythm synchronicity in the
10
11 collective flows of entrepreneurship. Given high levels of contextual specificity in different
12
13 ecosystems, a 'synchronicity' approach may have far more to offer than attempts at broad
14
15 generalizability in entrepreneurial ecosystem research. Such an approach could employ
16
17 interpretative phenomenological analysis (Hefferon & Gil-Rodriguez, 2011) to explore
18
19 synchronicity experiences by interviewing a purposive sample of co-located or co-interacting
20
21 entrepreneurs about how they make sense of their experiences. The outcomes of this research
22
23 may append itself well to the principle of dynamic capability (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997).
24
25 A further outcome of this approach may be to identify which rhythms work on which
26
27 different dance floors, thereby holding the promise of informing the movement of
28
29 entrepreneurs and ventures between different contexts.
30
31
32
33

34 Third, the issue of partner choice is worthy of further study. Given that entrepreneurs often
35
36 favour existing networks when exploring opportunities, the concept of promiscuity between
37
38 dancers and the dialogic tension between them seems an important source of further
39
40 investigation and may offer an interesting contrast to a significant focus on loyalty, trust and
41
42 commitment in relational interaction. The Argentine Tango metaphor seems helpful to
43
44 visualize this dialogic interplay and in exploring how effectual networking unfolds.
45
46
47

48 Fourth, the core of the Tango-Argentino analogy is the closeness of interactions, changing
49
50 leadership and creative tension which provide a framework for the effectuation process.
51

1
2
3 Close interaction between partners allows for a dialogue to emerge without the need to
4 develop a single integrated approach. Changing leadership provides opportunities for the
5 partners to lead different phases of the process, rather than consider leadership as a fixed,
6 individual or even formal hierarchical function. Creative tension describes situations of close
7 interaction, but with the partners providing distinctively different inputs, perspectives or
8 approaches. It allows for the creation of a new 'product' or other output from the creative
9 tension generated by a clash of separate standpoints. Understanding the motion and flow of
10 these interaction can surely only aid an understanding of the performativity of effectuation.
11 We suggest that adopting a multi-level analysis approach would be appropriate to furthering
12 the study of close interaction between individual entrepreneurs (micro), teams of
13 entrepreneurs (meso), or at the level of the entrepreneurial ecosystem (macro). This would
14 also enhance the study of changing leadership and creative tensions.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Fifth, given the association of effectuation theory with experienced entrepreneurs, how
31 inexperienced entrepreneurs learn the 'contextual rhythms' that seem so essential for
32 effectuation to happen, particularly with the aid of experienced entrepreneurs, seems an
33 outstanding task in understanding how causation processes 'become' effectual. We propose
34 the term of 'attunement' as appropriate to this endeavour. Further successful study of this
35 phenomenon might be achieved by employing cognition theory or socio-economic
36 approaches, such as networking, or even a communities of practice framework, to explore
37 how novice entrepreneurs become expert entrepreneurs.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Sixth, the study of distance and creativity should be studied as a process of becoming.
49 Judges should focus on how the process of proximity and distance enhances creativity in the
50

1
2
3 dance and how the motions of flow of the dancers, in tune with the rhythms lead to enhanced
4
5 creativity in their dance and in the creativity of other dancers on the same dance floor. A
6
7 subjunctive of this task would be study the intertemporal effects of reversals, re-starts,
8
9 changes of direction, collisions and falls and how proximity allows such knowledge to be
10
11 contextually retained. Visualizing this diachronicity by entrepreneurs might enhance their
12
13 understanding of losses as acceptable in more than a synchronous measure.
14
15

16
17 Finally, seventh, how the process of individuality is maintained in the dance. Whilst we
18
19 conceptualize the dance as a social act, there is a likelihood that as a social act, the dance
20
21 becomes routinized. Whilst this routinization may be felicitous and become part of contextual
22
23 attunement processes, there seems a need to further study how entrepreneurial individuality is
24
25 maintained. This dialectic would seem to be captured in changes of leadership, changes of
26
27 partners in the dance, etc. Equally, a study of the motions that lead to individual dancers
28
29 leaving the dance floor will aid understanding of the motivations for venture dissolution.
30
31 Such an understanding might lead to an appreciation of when and why dancers change their
32
33 dance floors and choose to move to learn other rhythms. Concerted micro-level study of
34
35 partner choice, leadership of the dance and exit from and entry to different dancefloors
36
37 relative to individual creativity seems to us to be an important endeavour and may also lead
38
39 to an understanding of the degradation of entrepreneurial ecosystems, or indeed their failure
40
41 to move from the embryonic.
42
43
44

45
46 We therefore propose seven areas where deployment of the Argentine Tango metaphor
47
48 could lead to the enhanced performativity of effectuation and hope that empirical study of the
49
50 dance will commence.
51

References

- Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as structure an actionable construct for strategy. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 39-58.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Wiedenmayer, G. (1993). From traits to rates: An ecological perspective on organizational foundings. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, 1(3), 145-196.
- Alexandersson, A. (2015). Incubating businesses. Retrieved from <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A923536&dswid=-9876>
- Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2013). Epistemology, opportunities, and entrepreneurship: comments on Venkataraman et al. (2012) and Shane (2012). *Academy of Management Review*, 38(1), 154-166.
- Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 247-271.
- Alvesson, M., & Spicer, A. (2011). *Metaphors we lead by*. In: London: Routledge.
- Amabile, T. M. (1998). *How to kill creativity*. *Harvard Business Review*, 76, 77-87 .
- Amabile, T. M., & Khaire, M. (2008). Your organization could use a bigger dose of creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 86, 101-109.
- Anderson, A. R. (2005). Enacted metaphor the theatricality of the entrepreneurial process. *International Small Business Journal*, 23(6), 587-603.
- Anderson, A. R., & Jack, S. L. (2002). The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks: a glue or a lubricant?. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14(3), 193-210.

- 1
2
3 Autio, E., Kenney, M., Mustar, P., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial
4 innovation: the importance of context. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1097-1108.
5
6
7 Bhowmick, S. (2011). Effectuation and the dialectic of control. *Small Enterprise Research*,
8
9 18(1), 51-62.
10
11 Buch, R., Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B., & Nerstad, C. G. L. (2015). It takes three to tango:
12 Exploring the interplay among training intensity, job autonomy, and supervisor
13 support in predicting knowledge sharing. *Human Resource Management*, 54(4), 623-
14 635.
15
16
17
18
19 Bygrave, W. D., & Hofer, C. W. (1991). Theorizing about entrepreneurship.
20 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 13-22.
21
22
23
24 Campbell, K., Hjorth, D., & Steyaert, C. (2004). Quilting a feminist map to guide the study of
25 women entrepreneurs. *Narrative and Discursive Approaches in Entrepreneurship*,
26 194-209.
27
28
29
30
31 Cardon, M. S., Zietsma, C., Saporito, P., Matherne, B. P., & Davis, C. (2005). A tale of
32 passion: New insights into entrepreneurship from a parenthood metaphor. *Journal of*
33 *Business Venturing*, 20(1), 23-45.
34
35
36
37 Chiles, T. H., Elias, S. R., Zarankin, T. G., & Vultee, D. M. (2013). The kaleidic world of
38 entrepreneurs: Developing and grounding a metaphor for creative imagination.
39 *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*,
40 8(3), 276-307.
41
42
43
44
45
46 Clarke, J., & Holt, R. (2010). The mature entrepreneur: A narrative approach to
47 entrepreneurial goals. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(1), 69-83.
48
49
50
51

- 1
2
3 Clarke, J., Holt, R., & Blundel, R. (2014). Re-imagining the growth process:(co)-evolving
4 metaphorical representations of entrepreneurial growth. *Entrepreneurship and*
5 *Regional Development, 26(3-4), 234-256.*
6
7
8
9 Cornelissen, J. P., Clarke, J. S., & Cienki, A. (2012). Sensegiving in entrepreneurial contexts:
10 The use of metaphors in speech and gesture to gain and sustain support for novel
11 business ventures. *International Small Business Journal, 30(3), 213-241.*
12
13
14
15 Danes, S. M. (2013). Entrepreneurship success:“The Lone Ranger” versus “It Takes a
16 Village” approach? *Entrepreneurship Research Journal, 3(3), 277-286.*
17
18
19
20 Denniston, C. (2007). *The meaning of tango: The story of the Argentinian dance: Anova*
21 *Books.*
22
23
24 Dew, N., Read, S., Sarasvathy, S. D., & Wiltbank, R. (2009). Effectual versus predictive
25 logics in entrepreneurial decision-making: Differences between experts and novices.
26 *Journal of Business Venturing, 24(4), 287-309.*
27
28
29
30
31 Dodd, S. D. (2002). Metaphors and meaning: A grounded cultural model of US
32 entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, 17(5), 519-535.*
33
34
35
36 Dodd, S. D., & Anderson, A. R. (2007). Mumpsimus and the mything of the individualistic
37 entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal, 25(4), 341-360.*
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Duncan, R. & Pelly, M. (2016). The story of captain baby face and the coffee maker: An
4
5 entrepreneurial narrative perspective on corruption. *Journal of Management Inquiry*,
6
7 26(4), 390-405.
8
- 9 Engel, Y., Kaandorp, M., & Elfring, T. (2017). Toward a dynamic process model of
10
11 entrepreneurial networking under uncertainty. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(1),
12
13 35-51.
14
- 15 Fletcher, D., & Watson, T. (2008). Entrepreneurship, shifting life orientations and social
16
17 change in the countryside. *Entrepreneurship as Social Change: A Third New*
18
19 *Movements in Entrepreneurship Book*, 3, 145.
20
- 21 Gagnon, S. (2008). Compelling identity: Selves and insecurity in global, corporate
22
23 management development. *Management Learning*, 39(4), 375-391.
24
25
- 26 Gartner, W. B. (1989). Some suggestions for research on entrepreneurial traits and
27
28 characteristics. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14(1), 27-37.
29
30
- 31 Garud, R., Gehman, J., & Tharchen, T. (2017). Performativity as ongoing journeys:
32
33 Implications for strategy, entrepreneurship, and innovation. *Long Range Planning*,
34
35 Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.02.003>
36
- 37 Garud, R., & Gehman, J. (2016). Theory evaluation, entrepreneurial processes, and
38
39 performativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 544-549.
40
- 41 Garud, R., Gehman, J., & Giuliani, A. P. (2014). Contextualizing entrepreneurial innovation:
42
43 A narrative perspective. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1177-1188.
44
45
- 46 Gaudet, J. (2013). It takes two to tango: knowledge mobilization and ignorance mobilization
47
48 in science research and innovation. *Prometheus*, 31(3), 169-187.
49
50
51

- 1
2
3 Gehman, J., Trevino, L.K., & Garud, R. (2013). Values work: A process study of the
4 emergence and performance of organizational values practices. *Academy of*
5 *Management Journal*, 56(1), 84-112.
6
7
8
9 Glassman, A. M., Moore, R. W., Rossy, G. L., Neupert, K., Napier, N. K., Jones, D. E., &
10 Harvey, M. (2003). Academic entrepreneurship views on balancing the Acropolis and
11 the Agora. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12(4), 353-374.
12
13
14
15 Gond, J.P., Cabantous, L., Harding, N., & Learmonth, M. (2016). What do we mean by
16 performativity in organizational and management theory? The uses and abuses of
17 performativity. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 18(4), 440-463.
18
19
20
21 Greiner, L. (2002). Steve Kerr and his years with Jack Welch at GE. *Journal of Management*
22 *Inquiry*, 11(4), 343-350.
23
24
25
26 Gubbins, C., & Dooley, L. (2014). Exploring social network dynamics driving knowledge
27 management for innovation. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(2), 162-185.
28
29
30
31 Gupta, V. K., Chiles, T. H., & McMullen, J. S. (2016). A process perspective on evaluating
32 and conducting effectual entrepreneurship research. *Academy of Management Review*,
33 41(3), 540-544.
34
35
36
37 Harper, D. A., & Endres, A. M. (2010). Capital as a layer cake: a systems approach to capital
38 and its multi-level structure. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 74(1),
39 30-41.
40
41
42
43
44 Hefferon, K., & Gil-Rodriguez, E. (2011). Interpretative phenomenological analysis. *The*
45 *Psychologist*, 24(10), 756-759.
46
47
48
49
50
51

- 1
2
3 Henry, C., Warren-Smith, I., Martin, L., Scott, L., & Smith, R. (2014). Images, forms and
4 presence outside and beyond the pink ghetto. *Gender in Management: An*
5 *International Journal*, 29(8), 466-486.
6
7
8
9 Hjorth, D. (2005). Organizational entrepreneurship with de Certeau on creating heterotopias
10 (or spaces for play). *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 14(4), 386-398.
11
12
13 Hjorth, D., & Steyaert, C. (2004). Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship: a
14 second movements in entrepreneurship book. *University of Illinois at Urbana-*
15 *Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference*
16 *in Entrepreneurship*.
17
18
19
20
21
22 Hoffman, A. J., & Devereaux Jennings, P. (2011). The BP oil spill as a cultural anomaly?
23 Institutional context, conflict, and change. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(2),
24 100-112.
25
26
27
28
29 Huber, F. (2012). On the role and interrelationship of spatial, social and cognitive proximity:
30 personal knowledge relationships of R&D workers in the Cambridge information
31 technology cluster. *Regional Studies*, 46(9), 1169-1182.
32
33
34
35
36 Huggins, R., & Thompson, P. (2015). Entrepreneurship, innovation and regional growth: a
37 network theory. *Small Business Economics*, 45(1), 103-128.
38
39
40
41
42 Hyrsky, K. (1999). Entrepreneurial Metaphors and Concepts: An Exploratory Study.
43 *International Small Business Journal*, 18(1), 13.
44
45
46 Jackson, N., & Carter, P. (2007). *Rethinking organizational behavior: a poststructuralist*
47 *framework*: Pearson Education.
48
49
50
51 Kimmel, M. (2009). Intersubjectivity at close quarters: how dancers of Tango Argentino use
52 imagery for interaction and improvisation. *Cognitive Semiotics*, 4(1), 76-124.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Kimmel, M., & Preuschl, E. (2016). Dynamic coordination patterns in Tango Argentino: A
4
5 cross-fertilization of subjective explication methods and motion capture. In *Dance*
6
7 *Notations and Robot Motion* (pp. 209-235): Springer.
8
- 9 Koiranen, M. (1995). North European metaphors of 'entrepreneurship' and an 'entrepreneur'.
10
11 *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, 10*, 203-216.
12
- 13 Langley, A., Smallman, C., Tsoukas, H., & Van de Ven, A. H. (2013). Process studies of
14
15 change in organization and management: unveiling temporality, activity, and flow.
16
17 *Academy of Management Journal, 56*(1), 1-13.
18
- 19 Latusek, D., & Vlaar, P. W. L. (2015). Exploring managerial talk through metaphor: An
20
21 opportunity to bridge rigour and relevance? *Management Learning, 46*(2), 2011-232.
22
- 23 Litchfield, R. C., & Gilson, L. L. (2013). Curating collections of ideas: Museum as metaphor
24
25 in the management of creativity. *Industrial Marketing Management, 42*(1), 106-112.
26
- 27 Lundmark, E., & Westelius, A. (2014). Entrepreneurship as elixir and mutagen.
28
29 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*(3), 575-600.
30
- 31 Lusby, F. (2008). Working with lead firms within the value chain approach. In: USAID
32
33 microREPORT.
34
- 35 Martin, L., & Wilson, N. (2014). Opportunity, discovery and creativity: a critical realist
36
37 perspective. *International Small Business Journal, 34*(3), 261-275.
38
- 39 McKinlay, A. (2002). The limits of knowledge management. *New Technology, Work and*
40
41 *Employment, 17*(2), 76-88.
42
- 43 McMullen, J. S. (2015). Entrepreneurial judgment as empathic accuracy: A sequential
44
45 decision-making approach to entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Institutional*
46
47 *Economics, 11*(3), 651-681.
48
49
50
51

- 1
2
3 Miles, R. E., Miles, G., & Snow, C. C. (2005). *Collaborative entrepreneurship: How*
4 *communities of networked firms use continuous innovation to create economic wealth:*
5
6 Stanford University Press.
7
8
9 Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory.
10 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 605-622.
11
12 Morgan, G. (1996). An afterword: Is there anything more to be said about metaphor.
13 *Metaphor and Organizations*, 227-240.
14
15 Morgan, G., & Ramirez, R. (1984). Action learning: A holographic metaphor for guiding
16 social change. *Human Relations*, 37(1), 1-27.
17
18 Moroz, P. W., & Hindle, K. (2012). Entrepreneurship as a process: Toward harmonizing
19 multiple perspectives. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 781-818.
20
21 Nicholson, L., & Anderson, A. R. (2005). News and nuances of the entrepreneurial myth and
22 metaphor: Linguistic games in entrepreneurial sense-making and sense-giving.
23 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 153-172.
24
25 Nooteboom, B., Van Haverbeke, W., Duysters, G., Gilsing, V., & Van den Oord, A. (2007).
26 Optimal cognitive distance and absorptive capacity. *Research Policy*, 36(7), 1016-
27 1034.
28
29 Oswick, C., Keenoy, T., & Grant, D. (2002). Metaphor and analogical reasoning in
30 organization theory: beyond orthodoxy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 294-
31 303.
32
33 Pattinson, S., Preece, D., & Dawson, P. (2016). In search of innovative capabilities of
34 communities of practice: A systematic review and typology for future research.
35 *Management Learning*, 47(5), 506-524.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

- 1
2
3 Perks, H., & Moxey, S. (2011). Market-facing innovation networks: How lead firms partition
4 tasks, share resources and develop capabilities. *Industrial Marketing Management*,
5 40(8), 1224-1237.
6
7
8
9 Perry, J. T., Chandler, G. N., & Markova, G. (2012). Entrepreneurial Effectuation: A Review
10 and Suggestions for Future Research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4),
11 837-861.
12
13
14
15 Pinder, C. C., & Bourgeois, V. W. (1982). Controlling tropes in administrative science.
16 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 641-652.
17
18
19
20 Pisano, G. (2006). Can science be a business. *Harvard Business Review*, 10, 1-12.
21
22
23 Ramirez, M., & Li, X. (2009). Learning and sharing in a Chinese high-technology cluster: a
24 study of inter-firm and intra-firm knowledge flows between R&D employees. *New*
25 *Technology, Work and Employment*, 24(3), 277-296.
26
27
28
29 Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2016). A realist perspective of entrepreneurship:
30 Opportunities as propensities. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 410-434.
31
32
33 Read, S., & Sarasvathy, S. D. (2012). Co-creating a course ahead from the intersection of
34 service-dominant logic and effectuation. *Marketing Theory*, 12(2), 225-229.
35
36
37
38 Sarason, Y., Dean, T., & Dillard, J. F. (2006). Entrepreneurship as the nexus of individual
39 and opportunity: a structuration view. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(3), 286-305.
40
41
42 Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001a). Causation and Effectuation: Toward a Theoretical Shift from
43 Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency. *Academy of Management*
44 *Review*, 26(2), 243-263.
45
46
47
48 Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001b). *What makes entrepreneurs entrepreneurial?* University of
49 Washington School of Business USA.
50
51

1
2
3 Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008). *Effectuation : elements of entrepreneurial expertise*. Cheltenham,
4
5 UK: Edward Elgar.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Sarasvathy, S. D., Kumar, K., York, J. G., & Bhagavatula, S. (2014). An effectual approach
12
13 to international entrepreneurship: overlaps, challenges, and provocative possibilities.
14
15 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(1), 71-93.
16
17

18 Sawyer, K. R. (2015). How organizational innovation emerges through improvisational
19
20 processes. In Graud, R., Simpson, B., Langley, A. & Tsoukas, H. (Eds.), *The*
21
22 *emergence of novelty in organizations* (180-215). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
23
24

25 Senyard, J., Baker, T., Steffens, P., & Davidsson, P. (2014). Bricolage as a path to
26
27 innovativeness for resource-constrained new firms. *Journal of Product Innovation*
28
29 *Management*, 31(2), 211-230.
30

31 Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*.
32
33 Edward Elgar Publishing.
34

35 Shane, S. (2012). Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: delivering on the promise of
36
37 entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 10-
38
39 20.
40

41 Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of
42
43 research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
44
45

46 Spicer, A., Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2016). Extending critical performativity. *Human*
47
48 *Relations*, 69(2), 225-249.
49
50

- 1
2
3 Spigel, B. (2015). The relational organization of entrepreneurial ecosystems.
4
5 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 49-72.
6
7 Stam, E. (2015). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional policy: A sympathetic critique.
8
9 *European Planning Studies*, 23(9), 1759-1769.
10
11 Steyaert, C. (2007). 'Entrepreneurial' as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories
12
13 in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*,
14
15 19(6), 453-477.
16
17 Steyaert, C. (2012). Making the multiple: theorising processes of entrepreneurship and
18
19 organization. In *Handbook on Organisational Entrepreneurship* (pp. 151-168):
20
21 Edward Elgar.
22
23 Tidd, J. (2012). It takes two to tango: Entrepreneurial interaction and innovation. *The*
24
25 *European Business Review*. Retrieved from:
26
27 http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/40349/1/TEBRSeptOct2012-It_Takes_Two_to_Tango-
28
29 [_Entrepreneurial_interaction_and_innovation.pdf](http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/40349/1/TEBRSeptOct2012-It_Takes_Two_to_Tango-)
30
31
32
33 Tsoukas, H. (2009). A dialogical approach to the creation of new knowledge in organizations.
34
35 *Organization Science*, 20(6), 941-957.
36
37 Tsoukas, H., & Chia, R. (2002). On organizational becoming: Rethinking organizational
38
39 change. *Organization science*, 13(5), 567-582.
40
41
42 Van de Ven, A. H. (1992). Suggestions for studying strategy process: A research note.
43
44 *Strategic Management Journal*, 13(5), 169-188.
45
46 Van de Ven, A. H., & Poole, M. S. (1995). Explaining development and change in
47
48 organizations. *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 510-540.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wee, L., & Brooks, A. (2012). Negotiating gendered subjectivity in the enterprise culture:
4
5 Metaphor and entrepreneurial discourses. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 19(6),
6
7 573-591.
8

9 Yamakawa, Y., Peng, M. W., & Deeds, D. L. (2015). Rising from the ashes: Cognitive
10
11 determinants of venture growth after entrepreneurial failure. *Entrepreneurship Theory*
12
13 *and Practice*, 39(2), 209-236.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60