

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a preprint version which may differ from the publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/181888>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-01-27 and may be subject to change.

1 Critical entrepreneurship studies

A manifesto

*Caroline Essers, Pascal Dey, Deirdre Tedmanson
and Karen Verduyn*

This edited collection on critical entrepreneurship studies aims to explore, and thereby expand our understanding of entrepreneurship by elaborating on this popular and widely invoked discourse using different critical perspectives. The reason to write (and read!) this book is at least twofold. First, even though entrepreneurship is a very diverse, multifaceted and contested phenomenon, and regardless of the fact that entrepreneurship research has become increasingly more hospitable towards alternative theoretical influences and methodological procedures, it is fairly uncontroversial to say that the majority of entrepreneurship research is still functionalist in nature (Perren and Jennings 2005). Research in this tradition is mainly interested in entrepreneurship as a purely market-based phenomenon: a ‘special’ trait or set of behaviours which drive venture creation and which precipitate economic growth. Hence, one reason why we deem this edited collection to be important relates to the observation that aside from a ‘few exceptions, the extensive literature on entrepreneurship positions it as a positive economic activity’ (Calas *et al.* 2009, p. 552). This focus on entrepreneurship as a ‘desirable’ economic activity, perceived unquestioningly as positive, obscures important questions about who can sensibly be considered an entrepreneur and who can not (Jones and Spicer 2009); how entrepreneurship works ideologically to conceal the true state of reality (Armstrong 2001; Costa and Saraiva 2012) or to make people do things they would not otherwise do (Dey and Lehner 2016); or how entrepreneurship fuels inequality and perpetuates unequal relations of power (Curran and Blackburn 2001; Kenny and Scriver 2012). Second, although critical approaches may still inhabit a marginal position in the broader academic discourse on entrepreneurship, we assert that critical research has gained noticeable traction over the past decade. Various contributions have been discussed at the influential and important platform of critical management studies conferences, as well as at the annual meetings of the Academy of Management.

In light of the ongoing dominance of functionalist approaches as well as recent signs of change towards more critical and nuanced perspectives, we offer this book as a collection of critical narratives which render visible diverse examples of non-traditional entrepreneurship as well as usually overshadowed

aspects of ‘traditional’ entrepreneurship. The chapters in this book interrogate entrepreneurship from a range of differing perspectives. They each reveal how extant research has tended to privilege entrepreneurship as a distinct field of economic action and an exclusive activity for distinct groups of people, while at the same time illustrating examples of other, more collective and value-based forms of entrepreneurial organising and exchange. Accordingly, the book takes issue with and exposes some of the dominant ideologies, intellectual traditions and prevailing assumptions which bind entrepreneurship within the dictum of profit maximisation and wealth creation (Görling and Rehn 2008; Rindova *et al.* 2009). At the same time, the book assumes a proactive stance in seeking to position entrepreneurship as an activity, behaviour or process which can be linked to new ethical and political possibilities. Together, the chapters give voice to unheard stories, places and potentialities of entrepreneurship which are usually left out of existing research (Steyaert and Katz 2004). In this book, entrepreneurship is reconceptualised as a social change activity that moves against the grain of orthodoxy in order to realise spaces of freedom and otherness (Dey and Steyaert 2016; Hjorth 2004; Verduyn *et al.* 2014; Essers and Tedmanson 2014).

It is our explicit hope that this edited collection will further the momentum for alternate analyses of entrepreneurship within the field of critical scholarship. We have chosen to include illuminating chapters that aim to explore how political and socio-cultural factors influence entrepreneurial processes, identities and activities, and have sought to extend entrepreneurship research horizons by highlighting new critiques and contexts that challenge existing orthodoxies.

The book is divided into five thematic parts. In Part I, we contest the neo-liberal aspects of entrepreneurship discourse by showing other meanings of entrepreneurship, including social entrepreneurship initiatives. In Chapter 2, Karin Berglund uses three examples of social entrepreneurship from the Swedish context – a green self-reliant community, a case of supporting women’s entrepreneurship, and a project that combines artistry and entrepreneurship – as a vehicle to, through the concept of the precariat, discuss how social entrepreneurship may be political. Through the discussion of standing, the chapter addresses questions such as: Where is social entrepreneurship headed and what does it bring with it? Is social entrepreneurship a path toward sustainability in its ambition to criticise capitalism and non-sustainable society, and to offer more socially, environmentally and culturally sustainable solutions? Or does it indicate, rather – like the precariat – a fragmentation of society which contributes to political exclusion?

In Chapter 3, by drawing upon Gibson-Graham’s work, Isaac Lyne illustrates the resistance to homogenising notions of ‘community’ conveyed by the discourse of social enterprise. He applies critical resource flow analysis to draw out meaningful claims on resources, the way resources come to be mobilised, and how ‘surplus’ is generated and distributed not only through social enterprise but also through religious festivities and non-monetary

1 exchanges. In Chapter 4, Gerard Hanlon investigates the relationship between
2 entrepreneurship and contemporary capitalism. Taking its cue from the work
3 of Kirzner, Hanlon's contribution suggests that the essence of entrepreneur-
4 ship is increasingly characterised by the capture of value and not, as common
5 sense has it, creation, innovation and production. Specifically, Hanlon points
6 out that entrepreneurship is increasingly engaged in the use of property rights
7 as a means of capturing value produced beyond the corporation through 'free'
8 labour and the enclosing of skills and knowledge developed elsewhere. In
9 doing so, it encourages a society based in secrecy and mistrust. This contribu-
10 tion concludes that entrepreneurship plays an eminent ideological role in how
11 it justifies a new regime of accumulation. This regime is more unequal; it
12 appears to be increasingly located in rent as opposed to the search for profit-
13 driven efficiencies within the production process and, somewhat unexpect-
14 edly, is characterised by capital's growing uninterest in the how or where of
15 production.

16 In Part II, we aim to show how an ideological dichotomy has been con-
17 structed in what we perceive to be hegemonic entrepreneurship research, and
18 between notions of entrepreneurship, economic development and self-
19 employment. We focus here on entrepreneurship for self-employment in
20 non-Western contexts. In Chapter 5, Alia Weston and Miguel Imas expand
21 their theoretical ideas on the barefoot entrepreneurs (i.e. people who dwell at
22 the margins of our society) by exploring them as a reflection of decolonial
23 practices founded on art-resistance and socio-economic principles of a trans-
24 formative humanistic kind. They discuss these ideas in order to give these
25 entrepreneurs voice and a platform to engage with the ongoing struggles,
26 lives and experiences of marginalised and forgotten communities. These dis-
27 enfranchised communities have been deprived of a voice by neoliberal capi-
28 talist practices that invoke entrepreneurial activity. The entrepreneurial
29 activity imposed by this economic system legitimises their exploitation and
30 marginalisation, continuing to colonise their discourses, identities and daily
31 lives. Critically in this chapter, they question this neoliberal practice in order
32 to further decolonise and expose its exploitative nature. By decolonising, they
33 seek two things: first, to reconstruct entrepreneurship as an emancipatory cre-
34 ative activity that build solidarity among all communities; and second, an
35 entrepreneurship that redistributes economic power and helps communities
36 on a sustainable path.

37 In Chapter 6, Deirdre Tedmanson and Michelle Evans explore how entre-
38 preneurship research is largely bound by Western organisational discourses.
39 The purpose is to call into question the hegemonic performativity of conven-
40 tional discourse about heroic (white male) styles of leadership in entrepreneur-
41 ship. Tedmanson and Evans explore Indigenous leadership subjectivities to
42 reveal new ways in which order and leadership is enacted in cultural contexts
43 through participation and inclusivity, rather than top-down command (Peredo
44 and Anderson 2006; Spiller *et al.* 2011). The contradictions and tensions inher-
45 ent in assumptions which idealise Western hierarchical understandings of

power and authority are deconstructed. Using contemporary empirical research, relational forms of collective and collaborative leadership are explored in the context of Indigenous entrepreneurship in Australia. The chapter focuses on the social transformation occurring in the development of Indigenous entrepreneurship driven by community connectedness rather than by any simplistic reproduction of ‘homo-economicus’ (Evans 2012; Tedmanson *et al.* 2012). Writing from an Indigenous worldview and standpoint (Foley 2008; Moreton-Robinson 2003), the authors explore leadership as the creation of a ‘space of belonging’ and critically analyse how the co-creation of entrepreneurial effort strengthens Indigenous community efficacy (Tedmanson 2014; Evans 2012).

Part II ends with Peter de Boer and Lothar Smith’s contribution (Chapter 7), in which they explore the role of the so-called Warung restaurants. The fundamental question they ask is whether these restaurants, characteristic of the informal economy, support the endeavours of cities aspiring to be part of the global economy. Basing their findings on research conducted among owners and customers in the city of Yogyakarta as well as various government agencies concerned with their existence, they conclude that these Warungs are strongly intertwined with the formal economy. Fundamentally they are an efficient way of providing the lowest classes of the city with an affordable, decent meal. However, in a more subtle manner these Warungs also provide a certain social fabric to the city; they are places that give meaning to the lives of the urban poor. Hence, this case also shows the importance of (informal) small business ownership, an economic activity often seen as ‘marginalised’ and less ‘real’ entrepreneurially in mainstream entrepreneurship literature.

In Part III, we demonstrate how traditional entrepreneurship research furthers an archetype of the white, Christian entrepreneur – which marginalises ‘Other’ ethnic entrepreneurs. The contributors critically discuss how ‘Other’ entrepreneurs construct their entrepreneurial identities in relation to their ethnic identities, and how this challenges public discourses about ethnic minorities. In Chapter 8, Ram, Jones and Villares-Varela draw particular attention to the importance of context when examining ethnic minority businesses. They problematise prevailing tendencies to view entrepreneurship as an unfettered route to social mobility for ethnic minority and immigrant groups. They argue that the conceptualisation of ethnic minority entrepreneurship needs to recognise the diverse economic and social relationships in which firms are embedded. This signifies a weakening of ethnicity as an explanatory factor implied for the anatomy of immigrant and ethnic minority enterprise. Ethnic minority entrepreneurs do not necessarily opt for entrepreneurship because they essentially have more entrepreneurial ‘genes’ than other ethnicities, but start businesses for a variety of reasons. Their surrounding structures have an impact on their motivations and possibilities, and it is important to scrutinise these surroundings when theorising ethnic minority entrepreneurship – seeing it in a less essentialist way – and to analyse how

1 different groups of ethnic minority entrepreneurs seek agency through these
2 structures to enterprise. In Chapter 9, while drawing on De Clercq and
3 Voronov (2009), Thoelen and Zanoni investigate the narrative use of ethnic
4 minority identity for constructing legitimacy through ‘fitting in’ and ‘standing
5 out’. By doing so they aim to bridge individual and organisational levels of
6 inquiry to understand how ethnic minority entrepreneurs’ identities may be
7 used as an asset for business achievement. Based on in-depth interviews with
8 ethnic entrepreneurs in the creative industries, they identify four types of use
9 of the ethnic minority background: the ‘ethnic’ creative strategy, the ‘hybrid’
10 creative strategy, the ‘heroic’ creative strategy and the ‘neutral’ creative
11 strategy. The study contributes to the stream of literature approaching ethnic
12 minority entrepreneurs as agents instead of structural ‘dopes’, by highlighting
13 the heterogeneous ways in which ethnic minority identity and background
14 can be deployed for business strategies and how they construct these identities
15 in relation to the public discourse on ethnic minority entrepreneurs. The
16 objective of the final chapter of this section (Chapter 10) is to scrutinise a
17 particular group of entrepreneurs, namely migrant female entrepreneurs with
18 a Turkish or Moroccan background (a group usually and typically excluded
19 in not only popular discourse but also in mainstream entrepreneurship liter-
20 ature) within a typical Western society, one that firmly ascribes to individual-
21 ism. Verduyn and Essers combine the stories of female ethnic entrepreneurs
22 with Dutch institutional stories to see on what premises these women, and
23 these institutions, base their stories, and if and how they show overlap or
24 contrast. Since centre–margin positionalities are central to our investigations,
25 deconstruction analysis is used as an inspirational source for the analysis. It
26 reveals that the institutional stories resonate strongly with the hegemonic,
27 positive discourse on entrepreneurship, whereas these women’s stories are
28 more ambivalent, and in many ways resist the institution’s point of view.

29 Part IV discusses the way entrepreneurship is traditionally constructed
30 around discourses of a masculine, male subject. Using various feminist lenses,
31 the authors explicate how gender and *entrepreneuring* come together to
32 generate different experiences of *entrepreneurship*. In Chapter 11, Marlow
33 and Al-Dajani argue how an important facet of the feminist critique of con-
34 temporary entrepreneurship has been the increasing focus of the influence of
35 gender upon women’s experiences of business ownership; analyses of how
36 women have been excluded from the dominant entrepreneurial discourse, or
37 are positioned in deficit and lack as entrepreneurial subject beings (Ahl 2006;
38 Ahl and Marlow 2012). Indeed, feminist theory has emerged as a convincing
39 theoretical critique to expose the limiting gendered bias within the current
40 entrepreneurial project (Calas *et al.* 2009). Yet this stance in and of itself is
41 now recognised as constrained by presumptions of gender as generic and also
42 in being premised upon a US/European-centric stance (Al-Dajani and
43 Marlow 2010). To advance feminist critiques of entrepreneurship, the chapter
44 argues that it is now imperative to develop analyses which recognise how
45 institutional influences arising from differing cultures, contexts and locations

(Welter 2011) influence women's entrepreneurial activities. Following this, Banu Ozkazanc-Pan, in Chapter 12, explores how many entrepreneurship advocates herald the potential of enterprise to bring empowerment to women, particularly in non-Western and 'Third World' contexts. This is also the case in nations that are in the midst of transition from state-controlled to neoliberal economic arrangements. Within this context, both national and supranational organisations have collectively advocated for an increase in women's entrepreneurship as a means to boost GDP, increase women's employment and provide income to women. Using the exemplar of Turkey, a transition middle-income economy, Ozkazanc-Pan suggests that advocating for women's entrepreneurship without the necessary structural and socio-cultural shifts cannot yield empowerment. Through a postcolonial feminist lens, she suggests that meaningful social change with regard to women's empowerment can only take place through entrepreneurship that is culturally contextualised across differences of ethnicity, religiosity and class. In the final chapter of Part IV (Chapter 13), Huriye Aygören further elaborates on how entrepreneurship has become a favoured instrument wherever there is poverty, unemployment and other socio-economic issues. However, it is only recently that entrepreneurship scholars have started to discuss whether entrepreneurship may be a means towards emancipation and social change, or may rather bracket inequalities and lead to societal exclusion especially for those disadvantaged groups. Hence, little focus is given to ongoing processes which bring about different societal outcomes. Aygören puts forward the view that these questions might be powerfully tackled by combining the insights of feminist organisational studies with Bourdieusian cultural sociology on social inequalities. Analysing the life stories of migrant women entrepreneurs with a Turkish background living and working in Sweden, she contributes to discussions of inequality, examining the impact of capital development processes in maintaining and transforming market and non-market conditions and positions of (in)equality via women's access and take-up of particular subject positions in the context of entrepreneurship. Her focus on life stories reflects her interest in opening and complicating the category of entrepreneur subject and subject formation in intersectional contexts.

By applying techniques from deconstruction and critical discourse analysis, the authors in the final part of this book 'unveil' the many taken-for-granted assumptions embedded in the field of entrepreneurship. In Chapter 14, Marsh and Thomas examine the process of transformation in Poland from a communist regime to a neoliberal economy. They focus on the discursive formation of the neoliberal project and the move from a simple 'imaginary' to a fully operationalised social formation. In their approach to transformation they understand it not as a purely objective process that automatically produces a particular outcome, but as a strategy for achieving and stabilising a new 'fix' between a regime of capital accumulation and a regime of political regulation (Jessop 2004, cited in Fairclough 2007, p. 52). Drawing upon critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999; Fairclough

2003, 2005), they explore the ways in which discursive resources are articulated together in order to bring about social change. They examine how these discursive resources have played a part, not only in concealing the social cost of neoliberal transformation, but also in naturalising and legitimising policies. They analyse how a discourse of enterprise (Platforma Obywatelska 2001; Rokita and Kawalec 2005) has been fostered and promoted in Poland, seen as a necessary step away from the past and its planned economy and state intervention. Their analysis of the nodal discourse of entrepreneurship goes beyond its importance as a tool of disciplining individuals as they also demonstrate its role in legitimisation of the self-reproduction of the former ruling class via a deliberate way of orchestrating the expropriation of the common. Meanwhile, in Chapter 15, Annika Skoglund elaborates on the concept of 'ecopreneurship', which is supposed to provide answers to ecological problems by the enhancement of sustainable development. Ecopreneurship thus brings policy discourse closer to everyday engagement with the green environment. In the form of non-profit or profit ventures, ecopreneurship is recognised as an important step towards the establishment of an eco-economy. Uncritically, ecopreneurs thus propose to bring us all closer to a full inclusion in the social-ecological system. However, we know very little about the basic assumptions that underpin such an inclusion. What qualities are embraced as sustainable and which practices are promoted to erase those qualities deemed unsustainable? Such oppositional issues are investigated by a deconstruction of the ecological reasoning that may be found within examples of ecopreneurship, ranging from academic literature to various ventures. Skoglund pays specific attention to how 'vulnerability' and 'compassion' are deployed, to unravel the function of counter-concepts, such as 'invincibility' and 'indifference'. This complements our understanding of how an alternative form of entrepreneurship emerges on the surface of oppositional categorisations of people. Such a deconstruction can also teach us how political subjectivity is inhibited and limited, in the complex adaptive system that ecopreneurship cultivates.

All the individual chapters in this book engage critically with the dominant discourse of entrepreneurship in order to challenge the inflated perception of entrepreneurship as an unequivocally positive economic activity (see also Calas *et al.* 2009). While each chapter summons a distinct set of theoretical premises and concepts to challenge common knowledge, and to rethink entrepreneurship in fresh and inspiring ways, together they are united by a critical and reflexive spirit which refuses to accept prevailing ideas and functionalist ideals (Grant and Perren 2002), economics (Sarasvathy and Venkataraman 2011), individual heroism (Williams and Nadin 2013), masculinities (Calas *et al.* 2009) and instrumental reason (Gibson-Graham 2006). This spirit allows the contributors to this book to unveil the uglier and more sombre side of entrepreneurship (Olaison and Sorenson 2014; Jones and Murtola 2012). Isaac Lyne's investigation, for example, questions whether social enterprise is always such a straight-forward, uncontested and ideology-free activity

as Western common sense would lead us to believe. The key insight of Lyne's investigation is that social enterprise, just like any other form of entrepreneurship, is, first and foremost, a political event predicated on a distinct set of contingent socio-cultural relations which often create unanticipated (Dey and Marti 2016), and at times downright negative effects (Scott and Teasdale 2012). *In extremis*, social enterprises set out to solve wicked problems, but – despite the best of intentions – can end up perpetuating rather than solving them (Edwards 2008). In a similar way, Gerard Hanlon notes that entrepreneurship is sometimes driven more by the capture of value produced by others than by creation and innovation, thus operating as a key ideological justification of a new form of capital accumulation (Jones and Murtola 2012).

The rose-tinted view of entrepreneurship as a panacea for all (Tedmanson *et al.* 2012) is further challenged by those chapters which look more closely at how entrepreneurship is enacted in the context of marginalised groups. Specifically, they explore how self-employment either empowers the most vulnerable and needy people in society, or, as Karin Berglund's investigation suggests, advances a new class of precarious workers. In this age of individualism and neoliberalism, we believe it is especially important to study the often forgotten entrepreneurial subjectivities and communities, to give voice and an international platform to entrepreneurs who are struggling against colonised, ethnocentric and phallogocentric practices and norms. It is important to share such stories, and to start a broader discussion of how entrepreneurship may possibly become an emancipatory activity that redistributes economic power and helps communities grow sustainably. As Alia Weston and Miguel Imas show us in their discussion of barefoot entrepreneurs, this speaking back by community-based entrepreneurs reflects more than just a form of survival for the poor and the marginalised; it is often fundamentally liberationist in orientation.

This book shows how the heroic, white masculine style of leadership in entrepreneurship still prevails, but it also brings to the fore that there are other interesting models of entrepreneurial leadership. Banu Ozkazanc-Pan discusses feminist entrepreneurship from a postcolonial perspective, while Huriye Aygören details the particular struggles of resistance and power within immigrant women's experiences as entrepreneurs. In their analysis of ethnic minority entrepreneurs 'fitting in' and 'standing out' in the creative industries, Annelies Thoelen and Patrizia Zaroni show how being 'othered' can also be converted from deficit to attribute. Similarly, Peter de Boer and Lothar Smith's dynamic discussion reveals the vibrancy of micro-enterprise in Indonesia as an example of entrepreneurship which challenges the dominant large-scale capitalist trends in major urban centres.

Through the stories we have carefully selected, we also demonstrate how 'Other' entrepreneurs in Western contexts construct their multiple identities, intertwining their ethnic identities with their entrepreneurial ones, and how this actually challenges public discourses on ethnic minorities whose outlook is often pejorative. In their critical analysis of Indigenous community-based

1 entrepreneurship in Australia, Tedmanson and Evans reveal how organisation,
2 order and leadership are enacted through participation, reciprocity and inclu-
3 sivity, whereas Monder Ram, Trevor Jones and Maria Villares-Varela elabo-
4 rate that it is not so much their specific 'ethnicity' that urges or 'pushes'
5 ethnic minorities into entrepreneurial careers, but rather their surrounding
6 structures. This makes the phenomenon of migrant entrepreneurship less an
7 individual choice made by 'Them', but rather a latent potentiality of society
8 which should not be exoticised and played down as a topic, which is often
9 the case in mainstream entrepreneurship scholarship. It is much more inter-
10 esting to see how migrants are working increasingly in what may be deemed
11 'sophisticated' sectors such as the creative industries, and less in 'lower end
12 markets'. Yet, as Annelies Thoelen and Patrizia Zanoni sophisticatedly show,
13 they are still considered outsiders by their stakeholders, and they have to both
14 'fit in' and 'stand out' if they want to gain entrepreneurial legitimacy. Doing
15 so, they may be seen as very agentic entrepreneurs.

16 Susan Marlow and Haya Al-Dajani, and Karen Verduyn and Caroline
17 Essers explore how entrepreneurship is traditionally constructed as a mascu-
18 line, male subject, which still excludes many women from the dominant
19 entrepreneurship discourse, or at least puts them in the 'second-best' box. We
20 need to go beyond this already accepted theoretical dichotomy of gender and
21 entrepreneurship; it is time we specifically study how different cultures, con-
22 texts and locations impact upon the way women can be(come) entrepreneurs.
23 This is particularly important today, as policy makers seem to have found the
24 'egg of Columbus' by propounding entrepreneurship as 'the' recipe for the
25 empowerment of women in the Third World. However, without provision
26 of the necessary structural and socio-cultural conditions, this egg may be an
27 empty shell with not much to offer these women, or, even worse, lead to
28 their further structural exclusion.

29 The conjunction of entrepreneurship and the emergence of neoliberalism
30 in Poland is traced by Dorota Marsh and Pete Thomas who help us to under-
31 stand how the 'homo sovieticus' has been replaced by the 'homo entrepre-
32 neurus', a development that is giving rise to a new capitalist class that has
33 come to appropriate the nation's productive capacity. Similarly, deconstruc-
34 tion has been employed by Skoglund to nuance the popularised and heroised
35 image of the 'ecopreneur', ironically brought to life to erase some of 'regular'
36 entrepreneurship's downsides (such as depleting biodiversity).

37 So where does this leave critical entrepreneurship studies? Does it stop
38 with this book? Are we 'there' yet? Our answer would be an authoritative
39 'NO'. Although the contributors to this book have provided us with many
40 fresh and thought-provoking insights, we are convinced that we still have a
41 long way to go. Critical engagement with entrepreneurship must become an
42 unending endeavour, not least because mainstream renditions of entrepre-
43 neurship, the main target of this book, will not simply cease to exist. This
44 implies that we must become relentless and persistent in undoing what is
45 taken for granted about entrepreneurship, and the theoretico-ideological

assumptions upon which they are based (Dey 2007). In light of this, we see this collection as a beginning, a first step in what will hopefully become a continuous and growing movement which looks to a more communal sense of the economic rather than a purely individualistic nihilism (Tedmanson *et al.* 2015).

The task in front of us is, we believe, three-fold: to invite new theorising; to enquire into new topics; and to turn CES into a transnational, racially aware, postcolonial, ground-up and communally generative movement.

First, having attempted to collect timely and important contributions in CES, we are acutely aware that this book does not offer an exhaustive account of critical scholarship. Embracing recent calls to be more imaginative, daring and caring in our research (Steyaert *et al.* 2011), critical scholarship going forward must not only multiply CES (more of the same), but uncover and embrace critical theories and concepts which have hitherto remained outside of entrepreneurship studies. This may involve, for instance, composition studies, contemporary French pragmatism, actor network theory (and after), new materialism, to name but a few. Consideration of such new theoretical vistas permits us to recompose entrepreneurship from the rubble of critique, and to establish new links and connections which have not yet been made.

Second, since Routledge approached us to write this book, the world has changed tremendously, often unfortunately in ways less favourable to the publics with whom we engage. Many refugees have left their countries seeking better lives in Europe, Australia, across Asia, the UK and elsewhere. Such changes and developments in our societies call for a renewed critical scholarship which considers the topic of entrepreneurship within this context of major political, economic and social upheaval. We invite and encourage critical scholars to research how these new migrants on the one hand may use entrepreneurship to socially and economically integrate (or resist integration) into our societies. At the same time, the darker sides of such entrepreneurial activities need highlighting. We seek to further explore how the formal and informal economy intersects, and how this may give meaning to the lives of the urban poor. We argue that it is important to demonstrate the importance of (informal) small businesses and micro-enterprises as a form of economic activity, challenging what is often seen as ‘marginal’ and less ‘real’ in mainstream entrepreneurship literature. In this book, many authors argue that the context in which entrepreneurial activities take place is crucial. It is the very nature of a particular context that it shapes people’s entrepreneurship, their entrepreneurial identity and entrepreneurial behaviour. However, one book cannot cover all contexts. We encourage entrepreneurship scholars to divert from the mainstream path, and to explore the diverse contexts in which entrepreneurship takes place. Much more research needs to be done in the majority world – the so-called Third World – where entrepreneurship is being stimulated and carried out in ways that run counter to Western hegemonic thinking of entrepreneurship as something individualist, masculine and

1 'big'. Combining a consideration of context with an analysis of the behaviour
2 of entrepreneurs, or looking at the interaction of structure and agency, is
3 scholarship to be welcomed. This direction could be taken further; when
4 exploring the context for entrepreneurs with a migrant background, the
5 concept of translocational positionality, for example, could be used (Villares *et*
6 *al.* forthcoming). Such a theoretical and analytical lens would enhance our
7 understanding of the trajectories of migrant entrepreneurs. It would take into
8 account dimensions such as gender and ethnicity in both time and space,
9 while recognising the importance of connecting the resources and experi-
10 ences at both the country of origin and destination, as well as these entre-
11 preneurs' social positions in the ethnic economy, the labour market and
12 within family structures (see also Villares *et al.* forthcoming). This is also true
13 of transnationalist feminism, which aims to unsettle binary conceptions
14 between 'Us' and 'Them', and further aims to emphasise power, identity and
15 subjectivity for transnational populations across national borders (Kaplan and
16 Grewal 2002). Applying such a conceptualisation to entrepreneurship would
17 enable us to appreciate the entrepreneurship of migrant women as it is,
18 moving away from images of the 'Other' such as being uneducated, illiterate
19 and passive women, to that of educated, competent, active and socially aware
20 women. Furthermore, ongoing study of postcolonial feminism in relation to
21 entrepreneurship is much needed in CES research. How does Indigenous
22 communitarian feminism operate and how do Indigenous communities across
23 the world enact emancipatory practices in community and organisation?

24 Third, we believe there is a need to coordinate our collective critical
25 endeavours, thus finding ways of transforming our individual research
26 endeavours into larger, more impactful, while still distinct, movements. Fol-
27 lowing Derrida,

28
29 [W]e must join forces to exert pressure and organize ripostes, and we
30 must do so on an international scale and according to new modalities,
31 though always while analyzing and discussing the very foundations of our
32 responsibility, its discourses, its heritage, and its axioms.

33 (Derrida 2003, p. 126)

34
35 We have been fortunate enough to have witnessed the beginning of such
36 events; the biannual Critical Management Studies Conference, as well as
37 other conferences, have served as spaces of inspiration for us where tentative
38 and 'dangerous' ideas (Steyaert and Dey 2010) can be shared in a collegial
39 environment. We are excited about being part of and contributing to pro-
40 spective CES events, and curious as to what the future holds in store for crit-
41 ical scholarship on entrepreneurship.

References

- Ahl, H. (2006), Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **30**(5), pp. 595–623.
- Ahl, H. and Marlow, S. (2012), Gender and entrepreneurship research: Employing feminist theory to escape the dead end. *Organization*, **19**(5), pp. 543–562.
- Al-Dajani, H. and Marlow, S. (2010), The impact of women’s home-based enterprise on marriage dynamics: Evidence from Jordan. *International Small Business Journal*, **28**(5), pp. 470–487.
- Armstrong P. (2001), Science, enterprise and profit: Ideology in the knowledge-driven economy. *Economy and Society*, **30**, pp. 524–552.
- Calas, M., Smircich, L. and Bourne, K. (2009), Extending the boundaries: Reframing ‘entrepreneurship as social change’ through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, **34**(3), pp. 552–569.
- Chouliaraki L. and Fairclough, N. (1999), *Discourse in Late Modernity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Costa, A.S.M. and Saraiva, L.A.S. (2012), Hegemonic discourses on entrepreneurship as an ideological mechanism for the reproduction of capital. *Organization*, **19**(5), pp. 587–614.
- Curran, J. and Blackburn, R.A. (2001), *Researching the Small Enterprise*. London: Sage.
- De Clercq, D. and Voronov, M. (2009), The role of cultural and symbolic capital in entrepreneurs’ ability to meet expectations about conformity and innovation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, **47**(3), pp. 398–420.
- Dey, P. (2007), *On the Name of Social Entrepreneurship: Business School Teaching, Research, and Development Aid*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Basel, Switzerland.
- Dey, P. and Lehner, O. (2016), Registering ideology in the creation of social entrepreneurs: Intermediary organizations, ‘ideal subjects’, and the promise of enjoyment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, doi: 10.1007/s10551-016-3112-z.
- Dey, P., and Marti, L. (2016), Studying crowdfunding through extreme cases: Cursory reflections on the social value creation process of a potato salad project. In O. Lehner (ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Social and Sustainable Finance*. New York: Routledge, pp. 325–341.
- Dey, P. and Steyaert, C. (2016), Rethinking the space of ethics in social entrepreneurship: Power, subjectivity, and practices of concrete freedom. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **133**(4), pp. 627–641.
- Derrida, J. (2003), Autoimmunity: Real and symbolic suicides. In G. Borradori (ed.), *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Edwards, M. (2008), *Just Another Emperor? The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*. New York: Demos.
- Essers, C. and Tedmanson, D. (2014), Upsetting ‘others’ in the Netherlands: Narratives of Muslim Turkish migrant businesswomen at the crossroads of ethnicity, gender and religion. *Gender, Work and Organization*, **21**(4), pp. 353–367.
- Evans, M. (2012), *Be: Longing – Enacting Indigenous Arts Leadership*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Melbourne University.
- Fairclough, N. (2003), *Analyzing Discourse*. London: Routledge.

- 1 Fairclough, N. (2005), Critical discourse analysis in transdisciplinary research. In R.
2 Wodak and P. Chilton (eds), *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory,*
3 *Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 53–70.
- 4 Fairclough, N. (2007), *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge.
- 5 Fairclough, N. (2013), *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*.
6 London: Routledge.
- 7 Foley, D. (2008), Does culture and social capital impact on the networking attributes
8 of Indigenous entrepreneurs? *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in*
9 *the Global Economy*, **32**(3), pp. 204–224.
- 10 Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006), *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis: University of Min-
11 nesota Press.
- 12 Görling, S. and Rehn, A. (2008), Accidental ventures: A materialist reading of oppor-
13 tunity and entrepreneurial potential. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, **24**(2),
14 pp. 94–102.
- 15 Grant, P. and Perren, L. (2002), Small business and entrepreneurial research, meta-
16 theories, paradigms and prejudices. *International Small Business Journal*, **20**,
17 pp. 185–211.
- 18 Hjorth, D. (2004), Creating space for play/invention – concepts of space and organisa-
19 tional entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **16**(5), pp. 413–432.
- 20 Hyndman, J. (2004). Mind the gap: Bridging feminist and political geography through
21 geopolitics. *Political Geography*, **23**, pp. 307–322.
- 22 Jessop, B. (2004), Critical semiotic analysis and cultural political economy. *Critical*
23 *Discourse Studies*, **1**(1), pp. 1–16.
- 24 Jones, C. and Murtola, A.M. (2012), Entrepreneurship and expropriation. *Organiza-*
25 *tion*, **19**(5), pp. 635–655.
- 26 Kaplan, C. and Grewal, I. (2002), Transnational practices and interdisciplinary fem-
27 inist scholarship: Refiguring women's and gender studies. In R. Weigman (ed.),
28 *Women's Studies on its Own*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 66–81.
- 29 Kenny, K. and Scriver, S. (2012), Dangerously empty? Hegemony and the construc-
30 tion of the Irish entrepreneur. *Organization*, **19**(5), pp. 615–633.
- 31 Moreton-Robinson, A. (2003), I still call Australia home: Indigenous belonging and
32 place in a white postcolonizing society. In S. Ahmed, C. Castaneda and A.M.
33 Fortier (eds), *Uprootings/Regroundings: Questions of Home and Migration*. New York:
34 Berg, pp. 23–40.
- 35 Olaison, L. and Sorensen, B.M. (2014), The abject of entrepreneurship: Failure,
36 fiasco, fraud. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **20**(2),
37 pp. 193–211.
- 38 Peredo, A.M. and Anderson, R.B. (2006), Indigenous entrepreneurship research:
39 Themes and variations. In C.S. Galbraith and C.H. Stiles (eds), *Developmental Entre-*
40 *preneurship: Adversity, Risk, and Isolation*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 253–273.
- 41 Perren, L. and Jennings, P. (2005), Government discourses on entrepreneurship:
42 Issues of legitimization, subjugation, and power. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Prac-*
43 *tice*, **29**(2), pp. 173–184.
- 44 Platforma Obywatelska (2001), *Program Platformy Obywatelskiej*. Warszawa. Available
45 at www.platforma.org.
- 46 Rindova, V., Barry, D. and Ketchen, D.J. (2009), Entrepreneurship as emancipation.
47 *Academy of Management Review*, **(34)**3, pp. 477–491.
- 48 Rokita, J. and Kawalec, S. (2005), *Państwo dla obywateli. Plan rządu 2005–2009*.
49 Warszawa: Instytut Państwa i Administracji.

- Sarasvathy, S.D. and Venkataraman, S. (2011), Entrepreneurship as method: Open questions for an entrepreneurial future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **35**(1), pp. 113–135.
- Scott, D. and Teasdale, S. (2012), Whose failure? Learning from the financial collapse of a social enterprise in ‘Steeltown’. *Voluntary Sector Review*, **3**(2), pp. 139–155.
- Spiller, C., Erakovic, L., Henare, M. and Pio, E. (2011), Relational well-being and wealth: Māori businesses and an ethic of care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, **98**(1), pp. 153–169.
- Steyaert, C. and Dey, P. (2010), Nine verbs to keep the social entrepreneurship research agenda ‘dangerous’. *The Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, **1**(2), pp. 231–254.
- Steyaert, C. and Katz, J. (2004), Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, **16**, pp. 179–196.
- Steyaert, C., Hjorth, D. and Gartner, W.B. (2011), Six memos for a curious and imaginative future scholarship in entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, **23**(1–2), pp. 1–7.
- Tedmanson, D., Verduyn, K., Essers, C. and Gartner, W. (2012), Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research. *Organization*, **19**(5), pp. 531–541.
- Tedmanson, D. (2014), Indigenous social entrepreneurship: Resistance and renewal?. In S. Grant and H. Douglas, *Social Innovation and Social Enterprise: Context and Theories*. Sydney: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tedmanson, D., Essers, C., Dey, P. and Verduyn, K. (2015), An uncommon wealth: Transforming the commons with purpose, for people and not for profit! *Journal of Management Inquiry*, **24**(4), pp. 439–444.
- Verduyn, K., Dey, P., Tedmanson, D. and Essers, C. (2014), Emancipation and/or oppression? Conceptualizing dimensions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, **20**, 98–107.
- Villares, M., Ram, M. and Jones, T. (forthcoming), Female immigrant global entrepreneurship: From invisibility to empowerment? In K. Lewis (ed.), *Handbook of Female Global Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.
- Welter, F. (2011), Contextualizing entrepreneurship – conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, **35**(1), pp. 165–184.
- Williams, C.C. and Nadin, S.J. (2013), Beyond the entrepreneur as a heroic figure-head of capitalism: Re-representing the lived practices of entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, **25**(7–8), pp. 552–568.