
Introduction: entrepreneurship in organisational contexts

Daniel Hjorth

BACKGROUND: WHY FOCUS ON ORGANISATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP?

The year 2011 is significant. Not because most of this book was materialising within that time-space. Instead, there are other events that have operated as strange attractors¹ on my, and perhaps others' thinking, leading up to the suggestion and agreement to make this book. Events that have been directing its becoming to some extent. I refer to 2011 as an anniversary. One hundred years ago, some texts with significant influence on this book's becoming were published: Schumpeter's *Theorie der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung*, and Taylor's *Principles of Scientific Management*. I note this not as an example of megalomania or hubris, implying some kinship between this volume and those impressive oeuvres. Rather, they are emblematic of an era, and style of thinking, that have influenced our understanding of management, entrepreneurship and organisation in a most profound way. The era – industrial society and economy – is gradually coming to an end. This does not happen in an evident or easily detectable way. Indeed, many are the prophets that gesture towards various symbols or signs of such an end, gestures that certainly have sold many books. A more correct description would instead talk about the many, no doubt myriad, of small endings that gradually transform us and makes it plausible to one day refer to the present as postindustrial.

This might be a matter of genealogical sensibility, where gradual changes in the landscape, are picked up only by a travelling cartographer. The genealogist knows something through how it has and is becoming; knows by watching the movements. We're *becoming* postindustrial, but more importantly, this is a *postindustrial* becoming.

What style of thinking is then interrupted and gradually coming to an end? Various versions of answers to this question are of course found in the boardrooms of GM, in the memories of Lehman Brothers, in the visions of Google, Facebook and Twitter entrepreneurs. But also on the streets of London (riots in August 2011), Cairo, Tripoli, Damascus, Manama, Hara, Sanaa, Ammam and all the dynamic centres of the so-called Arabic

2 Handbook on organisational entrepreneurship

Spring of 2011 (not limited to spring, nor to 2011), for which the Facebook and Twitter entrepreneurs' products have been instrumental (Stepanova, 2011). In research, this becoming-postindustrial (popularised already by Bell, 1974) is investigated throughout multiple disciplines and fields of research, the coverage of which represents too vast a task even to be captured in a rough overview. Suffice to say that philosophy, humanities and art, as many times before, are fields from where we are provided with early signs, diagnostics, and descriptions (e.g., Benjamin, 1936[1968]). This in itself indicates that the changes are fundamental and have complex effects for systems, institutions, communities, organisations and people embodying those on a daily basis. Societies are not organised as in the industrial era (Bell, 1974; Toffler, 1980), nor are economies (Mills and Lefton, 1988). More importantly, the *becoming* of societies and economies is a different process now. More correctly – which is why it is postindustrial becoming – the multiple becomings of societies and economies bring about a new dynamic. Organisations accordingly achieve being through different processes and practices (Hedberg et al., 2002). Work–life is a different life and career (Florida, 2002); educations and dreams and desires are different too (Weinberg, 2009). Organisational Entrepreneurship stands in the middle of it all.

Entrepreneurship, as we have argued before (Steyaert and Hjorth, 2003, 2006) belongs to society and not simply to economy (Steyaert and Katz, 2004; Dey and Steyaert, 2010). Entrepreneurship is movement – a force that provides impetus to bodies' transition from passive to active – and an intensity that moves people to creative action (Hjorth and Steyaert, 2009; Hjorth and Gartner, this volume). Entrepreneurship does not add a new piece to the puzzle. That is incremental innovation (Ettlie et al., 1984). Entrepreneurship makes new orders achieve being (differentiation), orders that do not fit into the puzzle, but, by being different, require new organisation. Entrepreneurship is 'organisation-creation' (cf. Gartner, this volume) in the sense that it affirms the new – rather than what *is* – and therefore makes necessary new organisation in order for the new to work (add superior value). We can understand organisation-creation as interactions-in-the-making, i.e., relations (Massumi, 2002: 9), that prepare the world for receiving and affirming the greater value of the new:

Invention (creativity, the new idea) x entrepreneurship (organisation-creation) = innovation (of the more radical kind; new practices in which the value of the new is disclosed).

Innovation management, we know, at least since Burns and Stalker (1962), can handle *incremental* innovation for which organising (Weick, 1979)

Table I.1 Organisational forms and modes of organising

Organisational forms \ Modes of organising	Mechanic	Organic	Entrepreneurial (which means <i>forming</i> as much as form)
Organisation (emphasis on hierarchy, functionalism, monologue)	Management and administration	Change management (1980s theme, see e.g. Quinn et al, 1990; Pettigrew and Longshore, 1990)	Spin-off; Management buy-outs (leaving more rigid organisational structures; e.g. Walter et al., 2006)
Organising (emphasis on holism, adaptability, dialogue)	–	Innovation management (1990–present; e.g. Drucker, 1985)	Corporate entrepreneurship (1980–1990; from ‘autonomous’ strategic initiatives e.g. Burgelman, 1983a; Stopford and Baden-Fuller, 1994)
Organisation creation (emphasis on intensity, potentiality, movement)	–	–	Organisational entrepreneurship (collective; affective; inventing the new and new practices for disclosing the value of the new; e.g. Spinosa et al., 1997)

mechanically or organically, are enough. For more creative responses (Schumpeter, 1947 [1962]), or ‘doing things that are not generally done in the ordinary course of business routine’ (Schumpeter, 1949: 259), distinct from administration and management (*ibid.*), organisation-creation (entrepreneurship) is needed. If we read progress into Burns and Stalker’s mechanic–organic metaphorisation, in the sense that it attributes to the latter an enhanced capacity for more radical innovation, we might then add ‘entrepreneurial’ (see Table I.1 above).

One example could illustrate the relationship between entrepreneurship and organisation. Organisation (as the Latin *organum* and Greek *organon* suggest) is a concept describing a relational composite: parts, organs

and the body in which they work, and by which the body is working. Organisation creation (entrepreneurship) would then include new parts as well as a new composition of the whole. Newness in both cases would result in a newness of the whole: new parts mean new relationships to other parts and a qualitatively different whole. For example: a mobile phone was once a new product. It changed our relationship to phoning, but also to other people, practices and to everyday life as a whole. The part (phone) meant new relationships to other parts (home, work, family . . .) which changes the whole – how to communicate, relate, work, live. Organisational entrepreneurship is thus somewhat of a tautology. Entrepreneurship is always organisational as the new order it creates (new product, service, solution) always takes place in an organisational context, which becomes different with the new order. Forming and form are thus never meaningfully separated; that would be thinking ‘digitally’, which will always miss the movement (cf. Massumi, 2002: 136–7). Forming, like movement, is becoming. Form is a stop, a position. This is why ‘entrepreneurial’ is different from ‘organic’; the question is not about the dynamics of a form, but about the emergence of becoming other, differentiation, *forming*.

This volume is both a form – handbook – and forming a field of research – organisational entrepreneurship. This means that it adds to what organisational entrepreneurship is understood to be, and, by also asking new questions, hopefully makes it become other, and makes it emerge differently. The book gathers a highly interesting collection of prominent researchers of organisational entrepreneurship. This means that they have all focused on various aspects of the relationship between entrepreneurship and organisation, not necessarily on organisation creation. Such a focus represents a specific scope, but is effective as delimitation mainly in an analytical sense. That is, our common concepts are those of entrepreneurship and organisation, but such a conceptual focus can of course house a vast number of empirical problems and objects of analysis. This means emphasis is sometimes on the organisational aspects of entrepreneurship, while at other times it is on the entrepreneurial aspects of organisation. Both are true to the analytical delimitation and underline the need to address the *relationship*. This relationship is in turn what has become more central – I will argue – in the postindustrial economy, as the primary challenge and opportunity for facilitating processes of collective creativity and innovation (cf. O’Donnell and Austin, 2008; Lindenberg and Foss, 2011). It is this shift, from the management – organisation relationship as primary, towards the entrepreneurship – organisation relationship as primary, which is characteristic for the many small changes we might refer to as signalling the dawn of the postindustrial.

From the perspective of this framing, Taylor and Schumpeter's central place is understandable. Admittedly, 1911 has too violent/rough an impact on what is included/excluded in this elaboration, positioning of the handbook. Several others should be mentioned as central for making the management–organisation relationship into the primary one in the industrial era. Not least, Elton Mayo, who in 1911 became the 'foundation lecturer' in mental and moral philosophy at the new University of Queensland, Australia (where he also held a chair in philosophy between 1919 and 1923). This was 11 years before he left for the United States, and 15 years before his labour turnover studies attracted the interest of Harvard School of Business Administration (where he was an associate professor 1926 and professor in 1929). Curiously enough, this is about the time (1927/28) Schumpeter held a visiting professorship at Harvard (where he became professor in 1932). The transition from Taylor's work – described by Mayo as pioneering the work he himself believed to be extending (Mayo, 1924: 258; O'Connor, 1999a) – to Mayo's, represents an important step in the move from a history of disciplinary oriented management thinking and practice, towards a control-oriented management thinking and practice. Mayo's psychological and philosophical studies made him focus on the workers' minds and develop theory for the proper constitution of the worker's self as auto-controlling. Studies in governmentality (governmental rationality; Burchell et al., 1991; Dean, 1999; Miller and Rose, 2008) have problematised this control-society with inspiration primarily from Michel Foucault's philosophy of power/knowledge and technologies of the self (Martin et al., 1988). From our focus on organisation (which often means contexts of formal business organisations), Taylor and Mayo accelerated the culmination of a control tied to the manager and central to organisational work (March and Simon, 1993: 57).

Thus, without this being explicitly part of a headline in any chapters included in this volume, the question of power and organisational politics is inevitable when the entrepreneurship–organisation relationship is in focus. The move from a disciplinary form of power, relying on the ideas of a Sovereign (Hobbes' work on citizenship, e.g., *Leviathan*, 1651 [1968]) as absolute and external authority, but also drawing on pastoral forms of power (exemplified in the Catholic Church's institutionalisation of hierarchical order), to a control form of power, is central to modernity (Foucault, 1980; Burchell, 1999; White and Hunt, 2000). What Taylor did is that he designed the manager–worker relationship from the imperatives of the production process. Control was moved from the manager to the machine (solving some of the problems of personal authority), the tempo of the machine. Time was thus economised, and normalisation of work, rather than supervision, was made into the control-mechanism that was

supposed to secure productivity (Donzelot, 1988). Economic efficiency will then have to guide the kind of control needed, at the price of a passive subject to be managed. The human is reduced to the human *factor*, and optimum adaptability to the rationality of the economic system of production is then what follows from Taylor's 'principles' of management. Individual judgment and worker agency was replaced by a system of technologies of control, standards, mechanism through which management was to become 'scientific', and this way legitimise its authority over workers (legitimacy of management was thus Taylor's problem). Scientific quickly meant efficient because it is predictable and thus controllable. The Ford and Carnegie Foundations report on higher education for business and University College programmes in business administration, respectively (Gordon and Howell, 1959; Pierson, 1959) further pushed business school education towards becoming more scientific. Herbert Simon was quick to respond to this need, and what was subsequently referred to as the Carnegie School of Decision-making was richly funded accordingly (by the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations, as well from military budgets as Simon turned to problem-solving while the cold war was 'intensified'; Crowther-Heyck, 2006; Sent, 2000).

Mayo, a reader of Freud and Janet in particular, timed a major uprising in the United States (1919), where some 4 million American workers went on strike; the first US general strike was in Seattle; the Boston Police Force walked out after 3 days of looting as consequence; and inflation rose to 29 per cent in the United States (O'Connor, 1999b: 118). In this year, Mayo published *Democracy and Freedom*, and the new HBS Dean (Wallace Donham) started to build up and position the strength of the educational institution. Rockefeller, who had experienced problems with striking workers (the Ludlow disaster ended with deaths; 10 men, 2 women and 12 children), had then identified Mayo and supported his work with money that followed Mayo to the HBS (*ibid.*). Mayo called democracy "a socialist theory" which "assumes that all authority derives from the State" (Mayo, 1919, quoted in O'Connor, 1999b: 126). It is lack of successful adaptation to the conditions of industrial life that is the cause of labour motivation and productivity problems, Mayo claimed (1923). The cure against the outcomes (in Mayo's world: Socialism, Syndicalism, Bolshevism) of such lack of adjustment is, according to Mayo, based on a psychological understanding. 'Following Freud, Mayo wrote that civilisation was based on the "sublimation" of primitive instincts' (1922: 28; quoted in O'Connor, 1999b: 128). 'Heightened capacity for self-control' (*ibid.*: 128) and reduction of psychological agitation was the cure. The counselling interview, a central technique in what was to become HRM, was at the core of this cure (O'Connor, 1999a). Mayo moves control from

the machine–worker relationship, from economised time (where Taylor had placed it) to the worker him/herself and the question of normalisation (Townley, 1993). This is when subjectification is made the primary object of concern for management knowledge and practice: how to make up productive employee subjectivities, governable workers?

This elaboration of the background indicates why the shift from an industrial to a postindustrial time demands new ways of approaching, studying and analysing organisations. In particular, it makes quite evident that the manager–organisation relationship no longer can occupy our centre of attention, but will have to share this place with the entrepreneur–organisation relationship. The most important problem in postindustrial organisation is how its potential for innovation, how its capacity for collective creativity can be facilitated and nurtured (Austin and Devin, 2003; Hjorth, 2003a). This, we have gradually come to realise, is not primarily a problem of managerial control. It is a problem of organisational creativity. From the perspective of this book, this also means it is a challenge of organisational entrepreneurship.

Managers and managerial control has a place and time in such creation-processes, contributing to innovation, but it is more secondary than history suggests. We can imagine innovation processes as driven by entrepreneurial and managerial modes of organising. Various innovation-clouds, i.e., temporary assemblages of people and resources organised by attention to the different needs of the process, are driven by the entrepreneurial and managerial responses to those needs. The former operates primarily as active responses (affirming what allows for creation of the new), whereas the latter is primarily a reactive response (directed by the primacy of control and limitation). Organisational entrepreneurship is an achievement, the result of finding ways to make the active response prevail over the reactive for as long as it takes to prevent the new from collapsing under the weight of normalising procedures. In the context of business, this means responding with regards to what resources are already invested (reactive), or responding with regards to what potentialises the collective capacity for creation, and prepares the world for the new. Such preparation centres on organisation-creation, where the value of the new is inseparable from the new practices (style) needed for appreciating this value (cf. Spinosa et al., 1997). We will develop this in a later chapter when we discuss what entrepreneurial leadership could be from the perspective of this understanding of the dynamics of postindustrial organisation and its subsequent focus on the organisation–entrepreneurship relationship (see Chapter 20, Hjorth and Gartner, this volume).

ORGANISATIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: OPENING A RESEARCH AGENDA

That there is a break indicating the end of the dominance of an industrial economy and the beginning of a more complex multiplicity, with the postindustrial economy at its centre, does not mean there is an exact date or decisive event. Searching for such an event is an impossible and uninteresting task. Social change is more realistically described in discursive terms. The answer to how it happens is a question of genealogy and genealogical sensitivity. One has to diagnose broadly, draw a map that includes cultural, societal, historical, technological, commercial (and so on) forces shaping the topology; the social/cultural/political/economic landscape. There are various forms of 'seismic activities' that herald the fault scarp: the centre of gravity of the global economy is moving east; higher levels of unemployment have persisted in more European economies than what historically has been the case (Eurostat 1); major financial and corporate structures in the United States have collapsed or have been saved by the government; we see a managerial class that seems to work less and less for salaries and more and more for bonuses or 'compensations' (as the language preferred by the Lehman Brothers would have it; see Richard Fuld explaining: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-cifEkRXc4>). Virtual value and 'long tails' are becoming more and more important, and the building and maintaining thereof is an increasingly mediated business in itself (Anderson, 2004).

The shift of ground is happening as a series of events throughout societies and, as the ICT-facilitated 'Arab Spring' of 2011 illustrated, when technology radically enhances networking communities' capacity for generation and circulation of information, this has important implications for all. When desire to become other is drastically increased by belonging, facilitated by the connectivity that ICT brings, the productive capacity of the assemblage, the multitude, is multiplied accordingly. ICT powers up the relational capacity of people, and the organisational capacity is enhanced accordingly. This provides additional arguments for the importance of organisational entrepreneurship; collective creativity as an active response to the state of things. The break (gradual, dispersed, multiple) with the dominance of the industrial style (basis for practices, meaning) of organising signals a transition, and opens towards it by questioning the continuity of habitual practices (cf. base of pyramid economics; long tail economics; social entrepreneurship; open innovation; Hart and London, 2005; Anderson, 2004; Leadbeater, 1997; Chesbrough, 2003). For students and practitioners of business, this transition marks a simultaneous change in the landscape of practicing and thinking management, leadership and

entrepreneurship in organisations, and in the study of those practices and styles of thinking.

I would like to see this volume as located in this transitional zone, in the gap, looking into the landscape of the postindustrial, trying to provide new perspectives, approaches, concepts and stories both for the future of organisational–entrepreneurial practices and for the future of studying those. Of course, our primary focus is on entrepreneurship: entrepreneurship in the context of organisation. However, focusing on entrepreneurship in organisational contexts makes a non-relational understanding of entrepreneurship – related to management and leadership – impossible. Indeed, this recognition is in itself what makes practicing a contextual approach necessary and meaningful. Acknowledging that organisational entrepreneurship takes place somewhere, at some time, and is thereby part of a world where management and leadership provide most of the conditions for what can/cannot be done, makes our studies more realistic and useful. In addition, entrepreneurship is a form of organisational creativity. This makes it complex. As a process of creating new products, resources (or combinations of), logics of practice, rationales, organisations or even industries, entrepreneurship is difficult to grasp, describe, study and analyse. This book brings together examples – and I believe really exciting examples – of the scope of such study. It also manifests the multiplicity of entrepreneurship studies, when focused on organisational contexts.

The chapters in this book will all, in various ways, substantiate what the field of organisational entrepreneurship is about (as study and as practice). Before I move on to provide a short description of the book's content by relating to the various chapters, I would like to provide a framing of organisational entrepreneurship as I understand this research. Admittedly, this is offered in the spirit of what we previously have referred to as a European School of Entrepreneurship Research (Hjorth et al., 2008). Central to it is what I have emphasised already: understanding entrepreneurship contextually and a focus on creativity as the differentiating factor. Let me develop and expand on this shortly, before I turn to the chapter preambles.

The world becomes in multiple and polymorphous ways. Organisations need to respond to this. In postindustrial times, speed, flexibility and creativity are keys to building and sustaining innovation capacity as a primary competitive basis. However, for historical reasons (Taylor and Mayo as decisive 'events' in this history), the manager has acquired preferential right of interpretation when it comes to responding to those multiple and polymorphous ways. In addition, they have authorship privileges when it comes to narrating the organisation's worldview and guide to moving ahead in the landscape – the strategy. A strategy would then be

a narrativisation (in the genre of management) of life-to-come that is composed and communicated for the purpose of controlling (people and resources), so as to make predictable the becoming of that life.

Organisational creation and entrepreneurship need to operate in such a strategised reality. It operates in an organisational context appropriated by an ostensive story. A story – strategy – that has delineated and appropriated a place of its own. Managerial responses to the multiple becomings of the world are attentive to the traces of previous investments. There are economic reasons for responding this way, since it means that maintaining a capacity for control is thereby supported (as traces can be used to generate statistics that help predict and forecast, i.e., financial economics is used to make management more ‘scientific’). Again, this is how the reactive prevails over the active.

Organisational entrepreneurship instead operates by the logic of potentiality and intensity. Not what has been done, but what could become is the (un-)reason to act (cf. Gartner et al., 1992). Reason, in the industrial era, has been occupied by economic rationality, limiting the normal and right to what is controllable via statistics based on traces. This works well for management, primarily oriented towards control. On this theme, Drucker (1985) pointed out that there is a tendency in organisations to ‘feed yesterday and starve tomorrow,’ which would make decision makers deaf and blind to the broader complexity of human creativity, central to understanding and organising entrepreneurship (cf. Steyaert and Hjorth, 2003; Rindova et al., 2009). This, very much business school based, direction of attention to the economy of entrepreneurship prevents us from understanding the full organisation of entrepreneurship.

The problem is that creativity or entrepreneurship as organisation-creation cannot emerge from opposing the reactive, economically rational response to the world’s multiple becomings typical of trace-oriented management. This will only generate opposition on the basis of the needs to maintain control and economic efficiency. There are no good arguments against such needs in business organisations. Indeed, since Taylor, such behaviour is easily represented as irrational, as wasting time and trying the useless – attempting to change the ‘machine’ and the structure it makes necessary according to the time–economy link Taylor established. Neo-institutional theory (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983) has shown that institutionalised and rationalised concepts are the primary sources of formal organisational structures (Townley, 2002). We should, however, also acknowledge the paradoxical nature of institutional theory (Czarniawska, 1997), i.e., that institutional processes also set rules of rationality (Scott, 1995). One cannot legitimise organisational creativity–entrepreneurship– ‘against’ these structures of

organisations. Formal structures support control and economic efficiency understood as using resources on the basis of data provided by traces: ‘costs usually depend mainly on the foregone value of the time spent on these investments’ (Becker 1993: 43).

Space for creation cannot be achieved *against* management, as this will only generate stronger opposition (cf. Aldrich, 1999: 52) with reference to further trace-based ‘evidence’. Instead, acknowledging a world with multiple rationalities suggests that affirming creative forces is how you make the new happen. Rationalities in Weber’s sense – practical, theoretical, substantive and formal – are always tied to ‘value spheres’ in which certain patterns of actions and styles of living become rational; cf. Weber, 1978: 85–107; Townley, 2002). Organisational entrepreneurship has therefore a history of incubation, after dark work, skunk-work, moon-shining and creative ways to make space for the new (Hjorth, 2005). In such spaces, the ‘normal’ continuation of institutionalised rationalities is postponed or interrupted. The economically rational agent is driven by adjusting to the world as it is, central to rationality in human capital theory:

[That] is any conduct which is sensitive to modifications in variables of the environment and which responds to this in a non-random way, in a systematic way, and economics can there be defined as the science of the systematic nature of responses to environmental variables. (Foucault, 2008: 269)

Entrepreneurship, as form of creativity, is rather understandable as driven by a world that could become actualised. Potentiality, desire to move beyond the limits of present capacities, rather than optimal adjustment (desire based on lack of fit with rationality dictated by traces and ‘foregone value’ of time spent), is the driver. Subsequently, narrative, rather than traditional scientific arguments (of the kind that uses calculation and statistics, i.e., rests on traces) are the primary ways of making space for organisational creativity. The social field is potentialised by the use of *intensive* images, convincing because they generate effects that transform people. People are moved, become-active, when a narrative of potential is produced for them (cf. Aldrich and Fiol, 1994; Lounsbury and Glynn, 2001; Hjorth, 2007). Now, there are reactive responses to the world, focused on opportunities as found or discovered, which still are described as ‘entrepreneurship’. I have suggested this be called managerial entrepreneurship, since the style is reactive and dominated by the trace, and economy of ‘what is’, and calculative rationality. It operates by realising discovered opportunities. What I have proposed here as organisational entrepreneurship is rather active responses, an economy of ‘what could become’, creation of opportunities, potentialising of creative forces. This operates by actualising created opportunities. Relations, desires,

bodies and stories – those are the resources of the world becoming new. Subjectivities such as ‘entrepreneur’ are shaped, temporarily, in relations, through storytelling: ‘Imagination is the mode of thought most precisely suited to the differentiating vagueness of the virtual. [. . .] postinstrumental and preoperative’ (Massumi, 2002: 134).

Narrative rationality (cf. Lyotard, 1979, on the contrast of narrative and scientific knowledge) allows for thought to participate in its own emergence. Sensation, intensity, effect, from such emerges imagination of how potential can be made to leap into the actual. We may call this entrepreneurial entrepreneurship. Managerial entrepreneurship calculates on possibilities, which is what instrumental reason is for. Nietzsche battled this tendency in human thinking to limit imagination or intuition to what experience serves us (cf. debate on Lachmann in entrepreneurship research). This only corresponds to the triumph of the negative or controlling will to power of ‘higher men’, as Nietzsche called them (Hjorth, 2010):

There are things that the higher man does not know how to do: to laugh, to play and to dance. To laugh is to affirm life, even the suffering in life. To play is to affirm chance and the necessity of chance. To dance is to affirm becoming and the being of becoming. (Deleuze, 2006: 170)

The response that can differentiate and create, is the one that can affirm and thereby become active. This, again, is not so much about individuals as about relations, desires, stories, potentialities and intensities. Process philosophy and its corresponding relational approaches in research (see Steyaert, 2007, for review of process theory in entrepreneurship studies) help us shift from ‘methodological individualism to a social ontology of relatedness’ (Steyaert, 2007: 456). My hope is that this book’s contribution to an opening of organisational entrepreneurship as a field of research will participate in making this shift.

CONTRIBUTIONS

I will not tread on the distinct voices provided by chapter authors. The concept of a *Handbook* indeed makes somewhat superfluous any editorial elaboration on chapter points and contributions. All chapters make contributions to organisational entrepreneurship as a burgeoning field of research, increasingly central to the postindustrial era. The simple structure of the *Handbook* – Part I focuses on approaches and perspectives, and Part II focuses on fields of research, practices and politics – is based on the following ideas. For this research field to develop, its antecedent ideas and relations to neighbouring fields of research need to be clarified.

Part I focuses on this while it simultaneously provides nuances to studies in organisational entrepreneurship. The different approaches and perspectives provide multiple entry points for students of organisational entrepreneurship, and contextualises problems in the traditions of other theoretical perspectives. Part II moves further into elaborating and demonstrating what organisational entrepreneurship is and how it is becoming something more. In addition, it tackles the questions of specific practice contexts, such as public organisations, art, the city, as well as the politics of organisational entrepreneurship. Part II, therefore, deals with contextualised problems and thereby, in many of the cases, invites the political challenges associated with creating the new.

Part I

William Gartner in many ways is a natural opener of this volume. His research, at least since the mid-1980s, has generated a number of ideas that have pointed towards this field of study (relating organisation and entrepreneurship). It is therefore an ‘opening chapter’ in several respects: written by an opener of this field; opening towards a more interdisciplinary study of entrepreneurship; and opening towards new problematisations (notably of organisation creation; and of a process view of entrepreneurship, see also Steyaert in this volume). Gartner tackles the recent focus on opportunity in entrepreneurship research, and uses a close reading of Karl Weick to argue that ‘organising’ subsumes both ‘discovery’ and ‘creation’ views. Organising here represents an ontological basis for entrepreneurship research; a basis that was side-tracked by the focus on opportunity.

Richard Swedberg inquires into Schumpeter’s theories of organisational entrepreneurship. Swedberg thus opens towards the possibility of several theories, and he shows how those can be found in *Theory of Economic Development* (1911), in *Business Cycles* (1939), and in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1942). Swedberg, in addition, affirms the need for new theories on organisational entrepreneurship as he goes on to show how one can theorise by the help of Schumpeter’s ideas on the business firm. In this way, the chapter develops into an entrepreneurial endeavour itself – making use, in new ways, of established ideas in order to create new possibilities for future scholars of organisational entrepreneurship.

Nicolai Foss, Peter Klein and Per Bylund’s chapter relate to Swedberg’s in also discussing the business firm, this time related to entrepreneurs. The chapter focuses on the lack of contact between the study of entrepreneurship and the study of economic organisation, and goes on to argue that entrepreneurship theory and the theory of the firm can be usefully

integrated. Focusing on entrepreneurship as judgement (providing a natural link to the theory of the firm), and as speculative, the authors ask to what extent the entrepreneur needs a firm. Understanding entrepreneurship as judgement, the case can be made that firms are needed, as judgement cannot be purchased on a market. Emphasising the importance of entrepreneurial imagination further strengthens the case that entrepreneurs need the firm as a vehicle for experimenting with imagined novel resource combinations and for realising imagined production structures.

Friederike Welter and David Smallborne focus on an institutional perspective on entrepreneurship. This chapter provides an important insight into the organisational context of entrepreneurship; the social embeddedness of entrepreneurial activity. We are introduced to institutional theory as applied in entrepreneurship research, and emphasis is placed on agency and institutional change.

Martha Martinez and Howard Aldrich relate evolutionary theory to entrepreneurship. Institutionalism is one link to the previous chapters; judgement/judging is another. Martinez and Aldrich provide a more relational and processual perspective on organisations. For entrepreneurship research, focus on organisational change is of particular interest, and this chapter centres on selection and variation to discuss the dynamics of evolutionary processes. This chapter also relates to Gartner's chapter as the authors understand entrepreneurs as people who succeed in creating organisations. Evolutionary theory – in this perspective – therefore provides a link between entrepreneurs and organisations. On the basis of their discussions, Martinez and Aldrich also assess methodological progress in research on evolutionary processes.

When Robert Hisrich and Claudine Kearney relate organisations, entrepreneurship and ethics, they base this on an overview of ethics and ethical practices of entrepreneurs and managers in the context of the current economic downturn. Particular focus is placed on codes of ethics, core values, corporate culture and corporate social responsibility of entrepreneurs and managers. The Credit Crisis provides an abundance of illustrations of the need to explore ethics and social responsibility of entrepreneurs and managers, and Hisrich and Kearney bring us into such a discussion.

Campbell Jones and Maria Murtola's chapter is related to Hisrich and Kearney's, as it also centres on crisis. This time, however, the crisis (and the concrete suffering it has brought) is the event they respond to with critique. Indeed, it is developing a critique of entrepreneurship – what it might look like and why it might matter – that forms the central challenge the authors take on. If entrepreneurship is to be sustainable, it needs to be subject to critique. Beyond a view of entrepreneurship as salvation,

relating entrepreneurship to crisis means that its role is investigated anew. How is entrepreneurship connected to the crisis tendencies of capitalism? How is Schumpeter's 'creative destruction' tied to this tendency? Jones and Murtola outline a programme for a critique of entrepreneurship today.

Helene Ahl's chapter operates with a critical examination of the relationships between gender, organisations and entrepreneurship. Pursuing work on feminism, Ahl is interested in the construction of gender and resulting gender/power orders, so as to provide value for men and women in their work for gender equality. Ahl's focus in this chapter is on the consequences for women of constructions of gender, organisations and entrepreneurship: how are women positioned and how is this related to women's opportunities to be entrepreneurial in organisations? Ahl convincingly shows how the question of women's opportunities to be entrepreneurial in organisations requires critical genealogical inquiry that challenges gendered norms.

Chris Steyaert takes on the challenge of discussing the possibilities of a process perspective by inquiring into how theorising and researching themselves are part of moving, moving us and making difference possible. Steyaert's performative chapter invites us to experiment with how process perspectives can change how we do theory, research, writing and intervention. We are invited to create concepts and invent connections, to act with theory rather than to apply it. We are invited to think beyond present limits, to take part in the creation of what does not yet exist as a solid field of research, the coming together of organisation and entrepreneurship under the heading of organisational entrepreneurship.

In the chapter that ends Part I, I work with processual thinking to create concepts for organisational entrepreneurship. Meaning that I seek to move beyond the limits of our present thinking, and draw some lines to follow in future research. How is organisational entrepreneurship possible? Organisations, in the industrial era, were set up to be eminently manageable. Postindustrialism represents different demands, and collective creativity (for innovation) is now the haunted capacity of organisations. Are the organisational conditions for entrepreneurship (as organisation-creation) thereby changed? How does process thinking help us describe and analyse its contextual conditions? More specifically, I address the problematic status of the agent (and agency) in processual thinking. Does creation (as in organisation-creation) demand that we think a creator? Becoming-entrepreneur is proposed as a process characterised as an 'art of the weak', an affirmative-tactical mode of making use for the purpose of transmuting.

Part II

Saras Sarasvathy is a bridge between Part I and II. Her chapter opens up another bridge – or ‘connective tissue’ – between theories of micro behaviour in organisations and the macro environments we live in. Her opening question – is the entrepreneurial firm an artefact resulting from markets, or are firms and markets artefacts from entrepreneurial creation of organisations? – receives a ‘both’ answer that suggests we have underweighted entrepreneurial creation of organisations. The future research agenda for organisational entrepreneurship is then proposed as one that is contextual, relational and transformational. Exaptation, used to describe how the entrepreneurial form relates to its environment, forms into a concept that bridges the micro- and meso-levels of analysis and relates this chapter to the previous one (where ‘tactically transmuting’ describes a similar mode of relating.)

Nicolai Foss and Jacob Lyngsie bring us into the field of strategic entrepreneurship (SE), in itself an emerging area of research. This relates opportunity- and advantage-seeking under the central idea that these processes need to be considered together. Foss and Lyngsie want to explain how this field of research emerged, and their method is to investigate how it has responded to gaps in the two ‘sibling’ areas of research it connects. In addition, they want to describe the main tenets of SE theory, relate it to its neighbouring fields, and describe research gaps. Based on this review and description, they move on to open up SE towards a road ahead, focused on the need for micro-foundations for SE theory and linking it to organisational design theory.

Donald Kuratko’s chapter brings us into the field of corporate entrepreneurship. Emphasis on creativity is clear when Kuratko writes about firms that lead customers, create markets, change their environments and even the rules of the competitive game. Kuratko relates to the question of strategy and entrepreneurship – from the previous chapter – by asking what it means, in a theoretical sense, to have corporate entrepreneurship as a firm’s strategy. After describing the evolution of the field of corporate entrepreneurship, Kuratko focuses on how corporate entrepreneurship is configured as a strategy, the elements of an organisational architecture conducive to CE and the managerial roles within that architecture.

Ester Barinaga organises the emerging literature on social entrepreneurship into a conceptually oriented and a managerially oriented streams. On the basis of this, she argues for the need to develop a social approach to the study of the methods, strategies and notions used by social entrepreneurial initiatives working towards social change. Barinaga moves into this direction herself as she suggests a matrix (social change matrix) for analysing

how the social change aimed at by social entrepreneurial initiatives relates to the methods used to initiate them. In doing so, she remedies the imbalance caused by research oriented primarily towards the entrepreneurial side of social entrepreneurship.

Anne Kovalainen and Elisabeth Sundin approach the topic of public sector entrepreneurship in a multidisciplinary way. They open their chapter by noting the awkward relationship between the public sector and entrepreneurship, and go on to tackle this relationship in a more ‘positive’ manner. New public management represents an event in the history of the public sector – entrepreneurship relationship – and Kovalainen and Sundin deal with this as they work their way towards a new presentation of entrepreneurship in public sector organisations.

Shannon O’Donnell and Lee Devin also approach the question of entrepreneurship and collective creativity from a multidisciplinary perspective. Their focus is on the creativity of teams working iteratively to create. Drawing from their experience and expertise in theatre, they use the concept of ensemble to describe how teams collaborate to collectively create innovation. They describe an intensely relational, interdependent, social, iterative and contextual process of creation. O’Donnell and Devin develop a more refined language for describing, analysing and practicing such collective creativity, crucial for the study and practice of organisational entrepreneurship.

In Pierre Guillet de Monthoux’s chapter, the artistic element (introduced in the previous chapter) is even more prominent as the relationship – entrepreneur–artist – is analysed and discussed. In many ways, Guillet de Monthoux’s discussion centres on the boundary between artist and entrepreneur, and as we are brought into this investigation, the distinction is often blurred. In the new approach he suggests, the blurredness is affirmed, and the concept of artepreneur is born. The key skill of the artepreneur is her capacity to create organisation as she aesthetically reclaims a lost ‘sensus communis’, while reshaping the public realm through Deweyian ‘art as experience’.

The public realm is in focus in Timon Beyes’ study of the organisation of the entrepreneurial city. Urban entrepreneurialism and the cultural-consumption-centred emphasis on an ‘artistic mode of production’ is either hailed or critiqued, but Beyes offers a third option in his prosaic mode of narrating the entrepreneurial city. For this option, space and organisational creativity is central. Beyes sensitises us to different imaginations of urban life and the novel forms of organising that it holds.

Bent Meier Sørensen – like Beyes – also explores the darker sides of enterprise discourse’s emphasis on creative industries and (in this case) entrepreneurial employees. Sørensen practices a method of juxtaposition,

a form of image analysis; something like a careful unfolding of what images say and do, revealing forces, effects and affects that may well have passed unnoticed had we not been invited to this closer scrutiny. The study, operating within an aesthetic framework, brings us into a discussion that relates the dawn of creative industries' worker subjectivity to the dusk of management (as engaged in creating worker subjectivities and entrepreneurial selves.)

Daniel Hjorth and William Gartner's elaboration on 'entrepreneurial leadership' continues the conversation with art, aesthetics and philosophy that has characterised the second half of Part II. The dynamics between leader and led, between moving people and being moved, is in focus. Entrepreneurial leadership is defined as mobilising collective creativity in organisational contexts, and this novel conceptualisation is based on process philosophy. However, our method is not too different from Sørensen's juxtaposition as we explore Odysseus' encounter with the Sirens (receptivity and spontaneity) as well as Martin Luther's 95 theses event (breaking by affirming the creative potentials) as two images from which we can learn how to conceptualise entrepreneurial leadership.

NOTE

1. Strange attractor, a metaphor from complexity science, describes what makes a system or, in this case, thinking, bifurcate (qualitatively change, differentiate). It makes sense to think about Scientific Management and Entrepreneurship as systems that cause bifurcations when they collide.