On Cultural Entrepreneurship

Tracing the discourse(s) of a term

by

Philip Jantsch

530073

16th June, 2021

On Cultural Entrepreneurship

Tracing the discourse(s) of a term

by

Philip Jantsch

ABSTRACT Cultural Entrepreneurship as a field of study is still in a nascent, immature state. In the last two decades, it has gained traction from a broad variety of disciplines, evidently addressing a phenomenon of relevance and interest to a range of academic discourses. In the social sciences, language is the tool-box, and words and concepts are the tools with which scholars work. The various disciplines claim the term, without showing awareness of parallel conversations on similar phenomena. This partially results from and partially perpetuates the ambiguous nature of the concepts that make up the term: 'culture' and 'entrepreneurship'. In the current state, 'cultural entrepreneurship' is inadequately grounded, attenuating its use as theoretical concept and analytical tool. Associations concerning entrepreneurship, a term firmly situated in economic disciplines, skews the conversation and inhibits the discourses' interdisciplinary potential. Therefore, an alternative term, "cultural gardening", is suggested. This term more clearly reflects the recent conversation on 'meaning cultivation' and cultural change as a procedural, societal conversation. The term shifts the emphasis away from entrepreneurialism, in order to distinguish the discourses on meaning cultivation from those on entrepreneurship within the creative and cultural industries. This thesis provides an interface for the various parallel discourses to interact through, opening up for more diverse, interdisciplinary research.
Keywords: cultural entrepreneurship, change, cultural-creative industries, meaning cultivation, culture

Contents

What has been will be again, and what has been done will be done again; there is nothing new under the sun.
Ecclesiastes 1:9

1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

What is Cultural Entrepreneurship? Who is the Cultural Entrepreneur? Joining the programme was motivated by these questions, which ultimately remained unanswered during my studies; I soon realised that there is not yet 'an answer out there'. As is often the case when you zoom into something, it becomes increasingly blurry. Not only that - the questions seemed even more pertinent and urgent than before.

I asked Claire Bishop, after a lecture on political timing in art, if she would ascribe the term 'cultural entrepreneur' to the examples of art activists who are able to exploit the occasion - opportunity? - in order to make their point, and ride the wave to realize their intentions; she saw what I meant, but replied that entrepreneurship has something inherently 'opportunistic' about it that sets it apart from these artists who are not motivated in those terms.

I have been wondering: does entrepreneurship imply something opportunistic, something 'selfish'? In which case, should this opportunism be interpreted in strictly monetary nature? If entrepreneurship was once exclusively used within economic analyses, as an explanation to why market equilibrium is not arrived at and as a suggestion where 'growth' comes from, do those economic notions remain embedded in the term? Are they remnant within novel uses? Or is it possible to use the term in a new context, disassociating it from older connotations? But why, then, use the term? If financial profit is not inherent in cultural entrepreneurship, but it is in entrepreneurship, then is the term not misleading?

Another question I grappled with was why it seemed so important to me to address terms and their meaning? Why did it irk me so that I sensed that the meaning surrounding 'cultural entrepreneurship' was ill defined; where did this insistence on clarity, on the idea that it should mean something come from? And that we should be able to agree upon its meaning. If we can't, I asked myself, does the term fail itself? Does it lead to misunderstanding, rather than understanding? Whereupon the pragmatist in me asked: so why has the term asserted, established itself? Perhaps it does allow us to address a phenomenon productively that required this term? In which case: what is this phenomenon?

I had a vague premonition that it did contain such a phenomenon. My attention towards the term began with the idea of an 'aesthetics of the cultural entrepreneur'. I started to perceive a certain 'type' behind the cultural entrepreneur, derived from Schumpeter's depiction of the entrepreneur as a man of action, courageous, reflexive, self-determined and so on: a hero, the ultimate individualist.

Enhuber (2014), in an article on Damien Hirst, differentiates between economic and cultural

entrepreneur. Trying to understand whether Hirst is an economic or cultural entrepreneur, the article finally admits that it is unclear whether "he became a businessman rather than remaining a cultural entrepreneur" which finally shows "how difficult it is in practice to draw a line between artistic, cultural or social activities in the creative economy" (Enhuber, 2014, p. 17). Why the 'either, or' opposition, is being a 'businessman' and a 'cultural entrepreneur' not compatible? And is 'business' best described as a 'social activity'? While a cultural entrepreneur is one who realizes value within the social sphere, the argument goes, the economic entrepreneur is one who realizes value within the market sphere (Klamer, 2011). The traits required are similar, ultimately derived from Schumpeter. In practice, this difference is difficult to observe: the artistic success coincidentally is also a commercial success. Is it a coincidence? Other cultural entrepreneurs mentioned in the article are Jeff Koons and Andy Warhol; Warhol is depicted as "one of the first of his kind, the American cultural entrepreneur [...]" (Enhuber, 2014, p. 14). In the article, the cultural entrepreneur is inherently inter-linked with the cultural-creative industries and urban-economical development: Hirst is understood as an essential driver of the regeneration of London's East End (Enhuber, 2014). The cultural entrepreneur is seemingly a sub-type of the family 'creative class', developed by Florida (2002, 2004) as the crucial labour of the quaternary knowledge and information economy: scientists and researchers, designers, communication specialists, cultural, social and economic entrepreneurs. The city is where the future is determined, and the creative class the segment of the (world) population that will shape this future. Attracting these people is a major task of the city that wishes to be successful (Florida, 2002; A. J. Scott, 2006; Van der Borg, Russo, Lavanga, & Mingardo, 2005). If the economic and cultural entrepreneur are seemingly different types: can you be a successful cultural entrepreneur and simultaneously be economically unsuccessful? In which case: are you still appealing to the creative cities?

I started to wonder about historical examples: who would fit the term 'cultural' entrepreneur? If it was indeed simply about realizing value within the social sphere (Klamer, 2011), was not any artist that is not fully solipsistic and autopoietic a 'cultural entrepreneur'? And why *entrepreneur*? I was curious if there was, for example, something inherently entrepreneurial with the personalities of Gabriele D'Annunzio and Ernst Jünger, artists who combined their artistry and aesthetic idea(l)s with real-life, societal impact.

D'Annunzio was an Italian artist active in the late 19th and early 20th century; his later life was dominated by politics. Indeed, in terms of translating aesthetic ideals into the 'real world', he is an interesting example: he lead the secession of a small part of Italy called Fiume (today Rijeka in Croatia), creating an autonomous city with 'music' as its constitution. It maintained independence and functioning for a over a year. His aesthetics were influenced by the Decadence movement, and politically he was inspired by ultra-nationalist ideas.

Ernst Jünger was a rather prominent and accomplished philosopher, working throughout the 20th century. His earliest works influenced Heidegger, who saw in Jünger a personification of modernity (Heidegger, 2004). Is it a coincidence that Jünger, too, was coveted by the ultra-nationalists of his time, remaining a controversial rallying figure of conservatives in Germany during his lifetime? Indeed, the attributes that Jünger develops of the activist-society of 'worker-warrior-scholars' and the rejection of leisure in favour of sacrifice and action (Hoffman, 2004; Jünger, 2008), on the one hand echoes Schumpeter's entrepreneurial spirit (somebody that does not give in to leisurely consumption, but disruptively makes capital productive), and on the other hand the scholar, the creative intellectual. Not quite a 'cultural entrepreneur', but perhaps nascent?

Finally, the break with traditions. Schumpeter sought such a break by (re)introducing the entrepreneur, thus breaking with traditional economic theory. Simultaneously, it is the breaking with traditions that connects the entrepreneur with the avant-garde artists, whose primary intention

was to break with old traditions (Dekker, 2018). Another important thinker of the 20th century, Hannah Arendt, also understood the 'break with traditions' to be a fundamental occurrence in the 20th century; for Arendt, the totalitarian governance systems, and their consequences, 'shattered' historical ties, disjointing history and creating a 'before' and 'after' (Villa, 2018). Cultural, religious, philosophical ideas would not lend themselves to understanding the contemporary world anymore. This break with traditions seems to be a crucial operation of the 20th century, of modernity, and for Arendt (1998, p. 323), it is "the capacity for action [...] in the sense of the releasing of processes" that separates the 'animals laborans', the merely "automatic functioning" people who need do nothing but let their individuality go and be "submerged in the over-all life process of the species" (Arendt, 1998, p. 340) from those "privileged few [...] who still know how to act" and thus are able to navigate, live self-determined in a world without anchor. But these few have also "become one of the most potent power-generating groups in all history" (Arendt, 1998, p. 324). For Arendt, these are the scientists; but even the action of the scientists lack the "revelatory character of action as well as the ability to produce stories and become historical, which together form the very source from which meaningfulness springs into and illuminates human existence" (Arendt, 1998, p. 324); are these features not somehow combined in the cultural entrepreneur: the storytelling individual of action, creating narratives which make a dent in history.

These associations, and this image of the entrepreneur, made me consider the rise of nationalism today in connection with a certain, at least in my view, 'idealisation' of the entrepreneur in general, and the cultural variation of the entrepreneur in particular. And could this, I wonder, have anything at all to do with the rise of the so-called 'strongmen' in politics recently? What about both Trump and Berlusconi's relationship to the media and 'showbiz'? And what about the conspiracy theories, narratives that somehow have an infectious attribute, resonating with a disparate variety of people, making them allies over seemingly incongruous, fictional explanations of reality?

By employing rhetoric and aesthetic devices to inspire and animate, these individuals strike a chord with their times, and so reinforce and nudge the unfolding of history into a particular direction, aligning it with their self-interested utility-pursuit. Substracting the economic dimension, these are individuals with Schumpeterian attributes and as such, are they 'cultural entrepreneurs'? As I mentioned, this was a premonition. While there are multiple domains where I could search for answers, my current circumstance, being enrolled at an University, induced me explore the academic discourse of the term.

1.2   Research Problem

Academia is increasingly asked to address current societal issues, and to argue for the relevance of their research (Hoffman et al., 2015; Wowk et al., 2017). This is an attempt to make all stakeholders of society contribute, and ensure the 'return-on-investment' of the tax-payer. Students, on the other hand, desire practical skills, knowledge that is transferable into the 'real world', applicable (da Costa & Silva Saraiva, 2012).

However, it may also be problematic when scholars become caught up in fads and fashions; the strength of scholarly work lies in its analytic rigour, in the ability to abstract and reflect, perceiving commonalities and trends, and finally in the scientific integrity. Indeed, the pressure put on academia to be 'useful' is also perceived as an endeavor to instrumentalize higher education in order to 'reproduce' a population which is affirmative with regards to prevailing political, economic and ideological models (da Costa & Silva Saraiva, 2012).

The boundaries of a concept, and value-judgement of what counts as significant when studying it, governs research. When it comes to the studies of cultural entrepreneurship, it is therefore vexing that most authors using the term do not clearly explain what they mean by the term "cultural entrepreneur/ship" (Albinsson, 2017). This imprecision blunts its analytical precision, as well as risks to unintentionally reinforce and disseminate biases and assumptions. Terminological ambiguity is detrimental for critical reflexivity; preliminary agreement on the definition and boundary of a term is advisable to be able to productively discuss it. Indeed, it is in discourse and conversation, through the processes of externalisation and objectification (by articulating an experience or perception), confirmation (by reaching and agreeable conclusion with the discursive other) and internalization (accepting this agreed-upon judgement), that people construct and maintain their reality (H. J. Ahl, 2002).

Therefore, I introduce the two terms that make up the term in question below. Subsequently, I describe previous attempts to 'map' the academic discourse on cultural entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship studies are a relatively new discipline. Their relevance to understanding economic development and growth has promoted its status in policy discourses, permeating into various aspects of social life, assumed to be beneficial (Tedmanson, Verduyn, Essers, & Gartner, 2012).

While much older, the term really became relevant in economic scholarship through the seminal work of Schumpeter (1961) in the first half of the 20th century. He emphasized the psychological traits of the entrepreneur who experiences joy and satisfaction in shaping and creating, in contrast to those who act and labour purely out of necessity. The question behind intrinsic motivation has also been the focus of much research on artists and other creative activity (B. S. Frey & Jegen, 2001; Frey, 1994). Employing the entrepreneur as an economic agent was stimulated by the lack for a theoretical explanation of change, growth or process in economic theories (Veblen, 1909).

In the 1980's, coincidentally aligned with a political trend of market de-regulation and attempts to revitalize the economy, the 'entrepreneur' (re)emerged as a scholarly subject: a "great gold rush decade of entrepreneurship studies" (Hjorth & Steyaert, 2009, p. 1). One important endeavor as the discipline was established was to identify the boundaries of the concept, and its place in business schools. The entrepreneur was studied as an economic actor, and was conceptualized and described as such: "Entrepreneurship is a mechanism through which temporal and special inefficiencies in an economy are discovered and mitigated" (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 219); subsequently, organizational studies integrated some of these insights, shifting its emphasis: communication barriers, reflections on risk, innovation, creativity and decision-making within firms were addressed in the conversation (da Costa & Silva Saraiva, 2012). Overall, the disciplines have internalized an affirmative position toward entrepreneurship, positioning it "as a positive economic activity" (Calás, Smircich, & Bourne, 2009, p. 552). Entrepreneurs are the engines that drive change in capitalistic society, and entrepreneurship studies the study "of *sources* of opportunities, the *process* of discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities; and the set of *individuals* who discover, evaluate, and exploit them" (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000, p. 218).[1] Dominant assumptions, methods and epistemology remain largely undisputed (Tedmanson et al., 2012). Scarcity in self-examination leaves things obscured, such as who can (or cannot) be an entrepreneur, how entrepreneurship performs as an ideology and how it perpetuates inequalities and power relations (Essers, Tedmanson, & Verduyn, 2017). Finally, the individualized, disruptive

---

[1]emphasis in original

notion of the entrepreneur as positive for the economy suggests that other, "more collective forms of organization and exchange are somehow problematic" (Tedmanson et al., 2012, p. 532).

'Cultural' Entrepreneurship

Culture is being employed rather carelessly; Albinsson (2017, p. 366), in a semi-systematic review of the concept 'cultural entrepreneurship' interprets the interest in the term since the early 2000's to mirror "the rapidly growing importance of the 'quaternary sector of the economy,' i.e. knowledge-based industries, including culture.". Assessing the literature, Albinsson (2017, p. 384) arrives at two overarching uses of the concept: an "anthropologist's and institutional economist's use" and an "arts development use". Culture is divided in the understanding of an economic field where artistic artifacts are produced on the one hand, and culture as "something permeating all societal activities and all economic sectors" on the other. In both cases cultural entrepreneurship is targeted on, and employs culture in the service of, driving economic development and societal change.

The more all-encompassing, permeating understanding of culture touches upon the idea of culture as something shared by a people, a collective moral guideline, a framework to understand the environment and consequently make decisions. In general entrepreneurship studies, the conceptualization of culture suggested by Hofstede (1984) is often used. In this widely disseminated and cited book, Hofstede (1984) operationalises culture by identifying five socio-cultural value dimensions that can be measured; correlating these with professions, for example, has been one of the main ways to approximate culture as a function of entrepreneurship. These dimensions are Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance and Long-term Orientation.

Much more recently, Soublière and Lockwood (2018, p. 1), for the purpose to shed a light on 'culture' in the context of cultural entrepreneurship, understand it to be a "set of symbolic elements by which collective modes of behaviour and outlook develop". They posit that culture so far has been conceptualised statically, readily available to be 'deployed'. Instead, they segment it into a topology of four themes: time, emotion, language, and time.

In the study of the entrepreneur within the cultural-creative industries, culture is often understood as the cultural sector, within which cultural products are generated (Ellmeier, 2003; Bürger & Volkmann, 2020). This kind of culture is often observed within the city, and Zukin (1995, p. 156) identifies the restaurant owner as one of the architects of the 'symbolic economy': a "cultural synthesis of the artist, the entrepreneur, and the social organizer. The restaurant itself is both theater and performance." Indeed, the cultural entrepreneur, arts entrepreneur, creative entrepreneur and other such terms are happily interchanged (Chang & Wyszomirski, 2015). This makes it particularly frustrating, when the two uses of 'cultural' are used in the same text: it is hard to distinguish what is meant when. For example, in a predecessor for a lot of work on cultural entrepreneurship, (Dimaggio, 1982) discusses the emergence of organisational institutions to control and govern the performing arts of Boston in the 19th century. These 'cultural entrepreneurs', as they are called in nothing but the title (the term does not appear again in the whole body of text), have been interpreted to be 'cultural' because of the sector, namely the arts, that they influenced, or 'cultural' in the sense that they informed the organisational culture of future arts institutions. It seems that this ambiguity brought forward the two meanings Albinsson (2017) distinguished. This leads to difficulties in 'talking across the aisle', interacting in a shared 'reality production'.

1.3 Studying "Cultural Entrepreneurship" as a field

Only very recently has academic scholarship begun to pause, take stock and reflect upon entrepreneurship studies as a field (da Costa & Silva Saraiva, 2012; Tedmanson et al., 2012; Essers et al., 2017; Chandra, 2018; Sassmannshausen & Volkmann, 2018). With the increase of scientometric studies, research on the institutionalisation, legitimacy and maturity of scientific disciplines have become central for better understanding of the past and possible future of a scholarly field (Chandra, 2018). These are done in tandem with more qualitative, but unsystematic literature reviews of academic fields.

Asking where the 'character' of the cultural entrepreneur emerged from in the last two decades, Dallaire (2020) comes to the conclusion that it is to a large extent a political construct, driven by the increasing interest from policy makers in the cultural and creative industries as part of the knowledge-based industries. The 'cultural entrepreneurs', in this view, are the agents who bring the artistic experimentation of the subsidised "R&D" sector of the arts, so-called "'research laboratories'" (Dallaire, 2020, p. 49), to the profitable, market-segment of the cultural-creative industries, developing commercially viable products.

With a different term as their point of departure, but inspecting a similar confusion, Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) try to understand the definitions and development of 'arts entrepreneurship'. Identifying eight scholarly journals and examining articles published between 2003 and 2013, they encounter a 'plethora of meanings and definitions', wherein 'cultural entrepreneurship' is seemingly an interchangeable, but rather European terminology. In the U.S., arts and culture are not substitutable terms, as they to some extent are in Europe. This study selected journals that might contain articles on arts entrepreneurship: three journals based on a previous study on the same subject and thus including two arts management journals, one cultural economics and one cultural policy journal. General entrepreneurship and management, and non-profit marketing journals constitute the other two groups. Notable is the lack of economic geography, urban development or other journals that might approach the cultural entrepreneur from the city-perspective.

Hausmann and Heinze (2016) study the field of entrepreneurship in the cultural creative industries by the way of a systematic database search. The authors operationalise 'culture' as interchangeable with 'arts' and 'creative' and define cultural entrepreneurship as "entrepreneurial activities of the cultural and creative industries as a whole" (Hausmann & Heinze, 2016, p. 10). Looking at 50 articles from peer-reviewed journals, they find that the term 'cultural entrepreneurship', while one among many, is the most commonly employed term within the field. While the earliest article in their studied set is published in 1996, the substantial amount of articles are published after the year 2000. Moreover, they find that the term is applied more broadly than 'arts entrepreneurship', capturing a wider variety of activities. Rather than looking at journals, they employ a research database study, and categorize articles in four main research fields: intrapreneuerial management, success factors for cultural entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship education, and finally, 'creative cities'.

Bürger and Volkmann (2020) observe the apparent 'potpourri' that is the cultural entrepreneurship discourse. They argue that by the time of their writing, no study on the static nor dynamic state of the field has been undertaken. The authors also define the cultural entrepreneur as an economic agent within the cultural, creative and arts sphere; these spheres are delineated by occupational and industrial definitions of work (Bürger & Volkmann, 2020), rather than the all-permeating 'culture' of the anthropologist . They find that, and this may explain my initial bewilderment, the field suffers a "severe and persistent lack of internal orientation" (Bürger & Volkmann, 2020, p. 217).

But beyond the amount of variations in terminology, there is a certain issue in research design when it comes to the study of the academic field. Sassmannshausen and Volkmann (2018), in a scientometric study of social entrepreneurship, find that almost half of the most cited titles in the field are published in books. A similar verdict is made by Bürger and Volkmann (2020) in regards to cultural entrepreneurship. This raises doubts to the accuracy and comprehensiveness of literature reviews which focus on published work in journals.

Research design or terminology, however, are not the sole reasons for the incoherence of the field. When looking at a qualitative review of the research on 'cultural entrepreneurship' by Gehman and Soublière (2017), we find ourselves immersed in a substantially different body of literature. While mentioning the discourse on the cultural-creative industry, the 'making culture' domain described by the article as 'cultural entrepreneurship 1.0' blends 'making' organizational forms and governance structures with cultural products: yet, no examples of 'products' are given. When considered closely, the literature attended to concerns itself with institutional and organisational logic, rather than cultural commodities or artistic products. As Gehman and Soublière (2017) move on to 'cultural entrepreneurship 2.0', we notice that it is one continuous conversation they address, which discusses entrepreneurship in its organisational facet: creating an organisation, structuring it, acquiring relevant resources and support and getting it running. This is the use that Albinsson (2017, p. 384) mentions almost as an afterthought, as the "cultural/artistic means [...] used to attract the capital necessary for the creation of financial success for start-up enterprises". What is no more than a side-note for one, is the centerpiece for another review of the concept.

Indeed, while Bürger and Volkmann (2020), Hausmann and Heinze (2016) and Chang and Wyszomirski (2015) look specifically at the discourse that addresses the production of cultural and artistic artifacts, Gehman and Soublière (2017) are more interested in the institutional economist's understanding that Albinsson (2017) mentions. In conjunction with the variance in research design employed in these 'systematic' reviews, it seems that they are addressing different topics. It is therefore not surprising that these reviews of the literature include a different set of 'seminal' articles. For example, while for Gehman and Soublière (2017, p. 6) "Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) inaugurated a second approach to cultural entrepreneurship", this paper is not mentioned by Bürger and Volkmann (2020).

However, it is not as easy as that they are two completely separate conversations. Gehman and Soublière (2017) depict articles that are decisively part of the cultural-creative entrepreneurship discourse, accompanied by those along the line of Lounsbury and Glynn (2001), as part of a single, multi-faceted conversation. Similarly, Hausmann and Heinze (2016) include the article of Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) as one of the exemplary, seminal articles of entrepreneurship within the cultural-creative industries. Lounsbury and Glynn (2019), in an almost 100 page long 'element' in which they recapitulate two decades of the research programme they helped 'inaugurate', describe the academic conversation on entrepreneurship within the cultural-creative industries to be a "substantively important activity", that is part of the broader discourse on cultural entrepreneurship. To them, this discourse is an effort to develop a

> scholarly idea that accounts for a wider variety of socioeconomic processes and outcomes, including entrepreneurial efforts in high technology, in large, traditional bureaucracies, and in efforts aimed at generating social change. Favoring the development of more generalized claims and theory, our aim in advancing cultural entrepreneurship scholarship is not to focus on what is unique and special about the arts and creative fields, but to understand the commonality of entrepreneurial processes across very different kinds of contexts. (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2019, p. 10)

1.4 Aim, Scope and Limitations

My thesis finds itself, initially unknowingly (I encountered the above element during the data collection phase of the research), as part of this scholarly effort. Attempting to add to it, by conducting a comprehensive and qualitative study on the academic discourse of cultural entrepreneurship, I seek to understand how the term has been employed and developed in the last two decades. This seems to be the period during which this conversation emerged and was established. As I understand the academic discourse to be a socially constructed and constructing activity (H. J. Ahl, 2002), there is a need to move beyond the scientometric, positivist approaches to the research of the field already performed. Combining the qualitative features of an in-depth discourse analysis with a systematic approach and comprehensive ambition in its data collection, this study hopes to extend the knowledge-base in this study field, thus clarifying and connecting the seemingly disparate strands depicted above. The primary goal is the promotion of a shared foundation, in order to facilitate a productive, self-conscious and reflexive scholarly conversation in regards of the boundary, application and use of the term 'cultural entrepreneurship'.

For this purpose I decided to explore the application of the term 'cultural entrepreneurship' within the recent scholarly discourse. Consequently the following research question has been developed:

1. How has the use of the term 'cultural entrepreneurship' developed within the broader academic discourse of the last two decades?

The study is based on a qualitative method grounded in a constructivist perspective. To pursue the research question, a corpus of 200 academic publications sourced from the databases ProQuest, Web of Science and Google Scholar were collected. The corpus is divided in four segments, each spanning five years. This allows for a temporal sequencing of the analysis. Initial coding of the data was open and iterative to satisfy the exploratory nature of the study. Subsequently, a discourse analysis was conducted to inquire into the nature of the findings.

The iterative coding assisted me in distinguishing four sub-strands; describing these constitute the bulk of the data presentation and analysis. Those four strands are:

1. The discourse on entrepreneurship within the cultural-creative industry (the CCI discourse)

2. The cross-cultural entrepreneurship discourse (the CCE discourse)

3. The discourse on "Organisational Imprinting"

4. The discourse on "Societal Imprinting"

I furthermore divided the first two discourses into two segments:

1. The CCI discourse:
   - the general conversation
   - the creative city conversation

2. the CCE discourse
   - the geographical distinction
   - the contextual distinction

The thesis limits itself to the academic titles available at the time of data collection, as well as to the 50 highest cited titles sourced in each segment. Because of the lack of internal orientation within the field, this may mean that important and meaningful papers are not included. Moreover, in contrast to a scientometric analysis, this study cannot show statistical relationships such as co-citation factors, and cannot accurately depict relationships of journals or authors to the published literature and relationships among texts. It furthermore limits itself to English publications from the years 2000 - 2020. Finally, because of the nature of the thesis, the traditional inter-coder reliability that is provided by multiple, independent coders, was not established.

1.5 Contribution

By conducting a systematic, qualitative study on the scholarly field of cultural entrepreneurship, this thesis extends and enriches the knowledge already provided by prior scientometric and semi-systematic literature reviews. The study identifies four distinct yet interrelated conversations on cultural entrepreneurship. These conversations are to a large extent unaware of each other, or at least do not explicitly acknowledge their awareness. What connects these conversations is their shared interest in the process of collective meaning making, wherein economic entrepreneurship can be, but does not need to be, part of.

Moreover, I suggest an interpretation of the findings that highlights the four discourses interest in the concept of 'culture, 'change', as well as the collective sense-making processes observable in societal transformation. This subsequently points at a need to address the under-theorized problem of economic change and growth.

The seemingly unifying term 'cultural entrepreneurship' skews the understanding of the behaviour toward economically coloured interpretations. This distracts from the process of meaning cultivation, in addition to inhibiting the interdisciplinary potential of the various conversations to cross-fertilize and inspire each other. Instead, the intersection of the discourses could, for example, serve as a point of departure to address economic change and growth from the vantage point of other disciplines.

As such, the term in practice fails to serve as an unifying link. Therefore, an alternative term is suggested: 'cultural gardening'. This term distinguishes entrepreneurial behaviour within the cultural and creative industries and the act of starting business ventures, from the process of meaning cultivation that may be required in those acts of new venture formation, but is an inherently independent concept also observed within nation-building and other forms of collective identity formation. This is not meant as a replacement of the term 'cultural entrepreneurship', but rather a term that more clearly deals with the process of 'meaning cultivation', rather than economic activity. This would help distinguish the two processes, alleviating the ambiguity of what is meant when.

The study helps to anchor and give orientation to the various sub-fields, suggesting points of contact among them and finally establishes a data-set that can be employed as reference list for future studies of the field. As a nascent, emerging field, the 'cultural entrepreneurship' discourse is at a point where it must pause and take stock, reorganise and move forward more self-consciously. The thesis understands itself as part of this endeavour.

2

Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study's aim is to explore the ways the term 'cultural entrepreneur' has been used and developed in the recent two decades, 2000 - 2020. More specifically, this thesis focuses on the academic discourse around the term, rather than policy discourse, colloquial use or its use in educational institutions. To do this, the period has been segmented in four periods of five years each. Subsequently, a list of the 50 most cited titles of the respective period was established (included sources are: books, conference papers & proceedings, dissertations & theses, encyclopedias & reference works, scholarly journals and working papers). To establish these lists, three databases were used, with the purpose to secure a comprehensive list: Clarivate Analytics' Web of Science Core Collection database (henceforth WoS), a database commonly used in scientometric studies for the evaluation of scientific fields (Chandra, 2018), in combination with ProQuest and Google Scholar. Searches via ProQuest and Google Scholar allow me to include publications beyond the academic journals (Sassmannshausen & Volkmann, 2018); as noted above, in the field of 'cultural entrepreneurship' these publications constitute a substantial part of the scholarly discourse.

The frequency of citation is employed as a proxy for impact and influence in the academic discourse. This is a common practice in systematic reviews of scholarly work (Dobreva & Ivanov, 2020; Sassmannshausen & Volkmann, 2018; Chandra, 2018).

Because of a certain 'over-coverage', meaning that articles that merely employ the search terms in their bibliography would be included, in addition to the complications sometimes encountered with Google Scholar, the lists needed to be manually corrected. Furthermore, as I combined three different databases for higher reliability and less dependency on the algorithms of the various programmes / software, I had to manually correct for duplicates. In addition, I removed each title that I had no access to. Microsoft Excel was used to create a list of the 50 most cited, accessible works for each period. After the lists were established, during the first round of coding, articles which included the term within their text, but did not expand on them or do anything with them, were removed from the list. In total, I excluded 10 out of 200 titles. The full list can be found in the appendix.

Data-Bases, search-string, and inclusion-criteria

Using Google Scholar, while providing an impressively extensive database, comes with some issues. For one, its algorithm more easily detects articles that have been cited, and therefore the total number of titles it presents does not necessarily correspond to the number of published articles,

but rather on the number of cited articles; as such, the number will vary over time. Moreover, it is not a fully reliable search base, as depicted by Sassmannshausen and Volkmann (2018). Google Scholar may incorrectly show nonexistent titles, or provide the wrong publication year for a title. Moreover, its filter for inclusion or exclusion is not fully transparent, a function of its algorithm for 'relevance'. Following Sassmannshausen and Volkmann (2018), I used "Publish or Perish" (Harzing, 2007) for collecting the titles from Google Scholar. Similarly as with the field of social entrepreneurship, the limitation of only showing the 1000 most cited titles does not diminish its usefulness when studying the discourse on cultural entrepreneurship, as citation frequencies are not very high (Sassmannshausen & Volkmann, 2018). This means that even a single mention of the term will suffice to be shown by the software. Any influential paper, when influence is operationalised by citation frequencies, thus is included. Many non-relevant papers will also be included in the search; this is substantially the reason for the above mentioned over-coverage.

As "Publish or Perish" does not allow for the encompassing "cultural entrep*" code, I decided for the search-string: '"cultural entrepreneur" OR "cultural entrepreneurs" OR "cultural entrepreneurship" OR "cultural entrepreneurialism"'. Any hit in the abstract, title, keywords, or body of text would be included.

ProQuest is a data-base that includes academic publications such as books, book chapters, conference papers, conference proceedings, dissertations & theses, working papers along with scholarly journals. Here, I employed the search string "cultural entrep*" for uses within abstract, title, or body of text.

Web of Science is a data-base that is oriented towards scholarly journals, and is more rigorous and exclusive in its selection. The search-string used for WoS was the same as ProQuest: "cultural entrep*", and hits in body of text, abstract, author keywords or title were included. It is less comprehensive than Google Scholar, but commonly used in scientometric studies (Chandra, 2018). I employed it in combination with Google Scholar and ProQuest to certify the comprehensiveness of the resulting list(s).

In each period, I ended up including titles that were cited frequently enough to be part of the list, but only appeared in one out of the three data-bases. This confirms the choice of employing multiple data-bases.

Because of the resulting over-coverage, and because a limitation of access, I performed an initial manual control by first checking the access of the publication, and subsequently checking if the term is actually used within the text, and not just the bibliography, or in the title of an authors position, for example. This ended up excluding a substantial amount of the titles, once again confirming that Google Scholar in particular, while comprehensive, needs to be used with caution.

Finally, four lists of 50 titles each that use the term and were accessible by me at the time of data-collection was established on excel, forming the initial corpus that laid the foundation for further, in-depth coding and analysis.

2.2 Method Discussion

I understand social forces to fundamentally drive the emergence, establishment, development or stagnation of academic discourses. Moreover, scientometric studies have already been performed to inquire into the discourse of cultural entrepreneurship. To further deepen this knowledge, a qualitative approach is deemed suitable (Bryman, 2011). Such an approach is aligned with an existential perspective on behaviour, deeming it contextually contingent and therefore endorsing an interpretive approach to the world (Åsberg, 2001). This perspective conceptualizes truth(s) as

possible interpretations, and is therefore appropriate with the subject of the study, human discourse (Cresswell, 2009). An analysis does not provide insights in any 'underlying' or 'hidden' truths to be excavated or uncovered, but rather each analysis provides an interpretation, developed by the researcher, that contributes to the discursive sense-making and enriches our understanding of the subject (H. J. Ahl, 2002). Whilst quantitative studies give statistically relevant findings, these have already been pursued elsewhere, and this study is meant to explore the apparent potpourri that the scientometric, quantitative studies have diagnosed. This study, instead of rejecting positivist approaches to social sciences, understand them to be complementary to constructivist methods, each adding to the insights of the other.

2.3   Method of Analysis

Themes can be a useful way to relay the findings made by the researcher; themes are understood as something important about the data in relation to the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 82). An academic research always struggles to find its balance between nuance and intelligibility, and themes are an effective method of compressing and conveying data (Morgan & Nica, 2020). However, developing themes can also be part of the process of understanding the data itself, part of the analysis of the researcher. (Morgan & Nica, 2020).

Thematic content analyses have often been used in order to uncover topoi that reside in the data - instead, approaching themes from the Iterative Thematic Inquiry approach acknowledges the active role of the researcher in establishing themes (Morgan & Nica, 2020). In this view, themes, still understood as meaningful, recurring patterns, are developed by the researcher in order to understand the data and to subsequently convey the interpretations of the findings. This avoids the idea that themes exist objectively, merely waiting to be 'found' or to 'emerge from within' the data. Such an approach would not be congruent to the study's constructivist perspective.

The Iterative Thematic Inquiry, as a point of departure, suits the exploratory nature of this research. Themes are a tool for both developing and communicating the results, and thus I employed iterative coding in the process of developing the themes. This also means that the presented analysis is a preliminary proposition, not a final conclusion.

As coding and analysis were conducted by a single researcher, meaning me, and no intercoder reliability was established, the resulting findings are accordingly subjective. Hruschka et al. (2004) note that initial coding often produces very different results by different coders. However, because of the nature of the thesis, establishing intercoder reliability was not feasible.

Clearly defining coding-criteria for the descriptive layer partially rectifies this limitation. Grounding the analysis in iterative categorization, while a time-consuming activity, is another way to ensure reliability and validity of single researchers actions (Neale, 2016). This, while not amending the subjectivity of the analysis fully, enables the reader to follow the logic of reasoning to some extent in my effort to connect the described findings to broader societal as well as academic considerations.

In terms of coding, I pursued a purely inductive, exploratory approach. In order to stay as open as possible towards what might be found, I decided to refrain from deductive coding. Of course, any researcher has a certain set of preconceptions, ideas, and in my case, the 'premonition' mentioned in the introduction, with which I entered the corpus. This will always affect the coding and interpretation (Neale, 2016; Morgan & Nica, 2020). However, with the ambition to truthfully answer my own question, a conscious attempt to remain receptive during the coding process was observed.

I read and coded the title and abstract of each publication, as well as the paragraphs within which the term is embedded in order to understand its use and context.

In the first round of coding, very generous, wide-ranging and instinctive categorization was applied. In the second round, I classified articles into discourse-strands that were broadly identified in the first round of coding, as well excluding redundant codes, and consolidating relevant ones. A third round of coding was necessary to arrive at exhaustive, conclusive classifications of relevant discourses, and remove non-relevant articles from the corpus, such articles that ended up in a 'left-over' discourse of general entrepreneurship articles in the second coding round. These articles merely mention the term(s) 'cultural entrepreneur/ship', but do not really 'do' anything with it. Many titles, while using the term cultural entrepreneurship, do not have it as their focus, and very often tangent more than one of the delineated strands; the publication's focal subject serves as the determining factor for placement, as it allows me to understand the context and core purpose of the cultural entrepreneur.

The classifications and themes that shape the various discourses make up the descriptive layer of the analysis.

Discourse Analysis

While reading and re-reading the corpus and coding for descriptive criteria, I simultaneously coded for anything that caught my eye; anything I perceived as interesting and noteworthy. This coding process, in conjunction with the descriptive layers, provide the foundation for the more interpretive discourse analysis of cultural entrepreneurship: what I found the aggregate discourse can tell us, what the various strands share in their understanding of the cultural entrepreneur as an actor in society, and what this may mean.

While Foucault describes the classificatory function of terms, positing that they enable to group together texts, help to define their cohesive unity, and allow to contrast and differentiate between them (Foucault, 1984, p. 107), scholars have also highlighted limitations towards this view; such unity is criticized to be uncertain and manufactured (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010). As such, while the term 'cultural entrepreneur/ship' works as a binding link between the various titles in the corpus, it must be noted that the unity of the corpus is by and large 'constructed'; this is not to diminish the relevance of the discussion, but again highlights how communicative practices take part in shaping our understanding of the world (H. J. Ahl, 2002). While everyday conversation is the most basic form of such reality-creation and maintenance, public discourses are also such a practice, of which the academic discourse can be understood to be part of (H. J. Ahl, 2002). By discussing certain topics and terms, the academic discourse helps to create and establish those terms - and thus, makes new 'typifications of experience' possible (Berger & Luckmann, 1991, p. 53). This also circumscribes the possible narratives that allow to be told, for example around one's own identity. In its role in defining and maintaining the rules of scientific form and subject of communication, therefore, the academic discourse can on one hand be understood as 'agenda setting', and as 'meaning management' on the other (H. J. Ahl, 2002, p. 59-60). In the discussion I try to show why this not only makes a discourse analysis of a scholarly field relevant; it appears to be particularly interesting in understanding the behaviour, type, indeed identity, of the cultural entrepreneur.

3

Data Presentation

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. Firstly, it delineates and describes the four strands of discourse within which the term 'cultural entrepreneur/ship' is employed, and how they have developed during the studied period. Moreover, I propose an interpretation of the discourses, suggesting how they relate and diverge from each other. This lays the groundwork for the following chapter, where I discuss the findings.

3.1 Classification of discourses

Reading and coding the articles a first time, I identified number of seemingly distinct conversations. Therefore, in a second coding-round, I began to organize these discourses. I ended up arriving at four distinct strands. A perfectly clean delineation was difficult to establish. When presenting the four defined discourses, I attempt to reflect my decisions by more closely going into some hard-to-place examples. These four discourse-strands are:

1. The discourse on entrepreneurship within the cultural-creative industry (the CCI discourse)

2. The cross-cultural entrepreneurship discourse (the CCE discourse)

3. The discourse on "Organisational Imprinting"

4. The discourse on "Societal Imprinting"

The chapter is divided in the following way: I begin with the discourse on the cultural-creative industry (CCI), within which the cultural entrepreneur is an observed actor. The discourse is segmented into two parts. The general discourse approaches the cultural sphere from a more sociological, anthropological and historic vantage point, wherein the business-side of the cultural entrepreneur appears, but is not dominant. Conversely, in the creative city segment the cultural entrepreneur as business founder is emphasised, and the city is identified as the environment where this activity is most prevalent. Indeed, it is from the vantage point of the city that the cultural entrepreneur is perceived, trying to understand what the cultural entrepreneur does to the city.

Next, the cross-cultural entrepreneurship (CCE) discourse is presented. This discourse is more dominantly interested in entrepreneurship as an economic and business theory. The conversation on CCE is also segmented in two parts, just like the CCI discourse. The first segment of the CCE is interested in the geographical influence on patterns of behaviour and attitudes of people. Specifically, the attitude toward new venture creation is examined. The cross-contextual segment is more interested in contextual influences, such as the sector within which the entrepreneur is

active. The cultural-creative industry appears as a particular kind of economic sector, where entrepreneurial activity is conducted differently than other sectors.

The third identified conversation is the "Organisational Imprinting" discourse which examines the employment of 'cultural tools' in order to engender change in organisational or sector structures.

Finally, I call the fourth discourse "Societal Imprinting", which is similar to the "Organisational Imprinting" discourse, but attends to societal transformation on a regional, national, or international dimension.

Table 1. gives an overview of the discourses and the respective amount of articles found in each, showing the development of the various strands over time.

Table 1.				
	2000-2005	2006-2010	2011-2015	2016-2020
1A. CCI General	16	13	12	6
1B. CCI Creative City	8	6	4	6
2A. CCE: geographic	5	5	0	5
2B. CCE: context	6	1	5	7
3. Organisational Imprint	4	17	20	13
4. Societal Imprint	11	7	6	7
Excluded articles	0	1	3	6
Total	50	50	50	50

3.2 Cultural-Creative Industry Discourse

The CCI discourse is divided into two segments. Firstly, there is a strand that discusses the cultural sphere and its particular features in contemporary times. The creative city segment focuses on urban, or in one case rural, development and the role the CCI can play within such developments.

3.2.1 General Discourse

This segment of the CCI discourse is engaged in a variety of academic disciplines. Mostly, the publications find themselves somewhere within the arch of Cultural Studies and Sociology (such as cultural anthropology, - policy, - economics, or communication studies), but there are also some that appear in Urban Studies, Marketing, History, European Studies or even one in the Journal of Librarianship and Information Science. As such, it is a quite multi-faceted discourse.

In contrast to the creative city segment, these publications are either more individualised, zooming in on one individual, or more general, zooming out to take the birds view on a sector, or the cultural sphere in general. In the documents that constitute this strand, the cultural entrepreneur is a chess-piece in the larger game that structures the cultural sphere(s). These publications have a tendency towards sociological and anthropological approaches, and conceptualize the cultural sphere as a space where societal trends unfold. Culture, even though it is discussed in conjunction with the arts, is understood broader, more in the sense of the permeating ether rather than an industrial-professional sector. Artistic and cultural production are part of the symbolic conversation of society. One might understand culture as the operation of externalization-objectification-internalization that society collectively participates in; the cultural sphere is one of the main stages where this is played out. As such, the (im)material artifacts produced are part of, but do not exclusively constitute the conversation that is 'culture'. The cultural entrepreneur is an active, involved agent in this conversation.

For example, these dynamics are discussed through biographies of individuals that played a focal role in their respective discipline (DeFrantz, 2004; Rampersad, 2002; Foster, 2003). In these publications, such as the biography on Alvin Ailey by DeFrantz (2004), the authors make the argument that the art form (in this case dance) developed and popularized by the subject was societally impactful, and this is what makes them 'cultural entrepreneurs'. In the case of Alvin Ailey, DeFrantz (2004, p. 25) argues that "*Revelations* [a performance] challenged its dancers to pull together abstract dance technique and cultural memory to create archetypal black personae."[1] The huge, sweeping variety of the dance offered "something for everyone, [...]" forming "a seamless whole, an unprecedented site of entry for black dancers to concert performance". Not only was Ailey an impactful persona in the world of dance, but also on U.S. American cultural transformation during the Civil rights movement. Ailey, as a cultural entrepreneur, employed a broad variety of dance techniques into this "seamless whole" that found popular resonance; it found popular resonance because it articulated popular sentiments that existed, but had yet to be expressed in a coherent manner. The performance expressed it in a way that made sense to the audience.

Another approach to the general CCI discourse is a birds eye look at a certain cultural sector, and the cultural entrepreneur as an actor within this space. For example M. Scott (2012) analyses the music scene of New Zealand, and understands the music producers to employ Bourdieusian capital transformation to sustain themselves within the sector, allowing them to continue to produce and perform music as cultural entrepreneurs. In my interpretation the focus of the article is contemporary music production in general, exemplified by the music scene of New Zealand; cultural entrepreneurship is a perspective applied to interpret and explain the behaviour of the actors within it. This 'case-study' approach is also observed in "The Salt Merchants of Tianjin" by Kwan (2001). In this study the influence of merchants on urban cultural life is described. The merchants, acting as cultural entrepreneurs, offered a balancing-pole against the centralized imperial influence on cultural expression, fostering and sponsoring local, popular forms of art. Here, too, a Bourdieusian framework can be observed in the division of art in high- and low-brow, and the way merchants employ financial capital to purchase cultural capital, in order to subsequently gain political influence and thus sustain their mercantile activities.

"Fashioning the Future" (Langevang, 2017) is an example where the border between the Societal Imprinting and CCI discourse is permeable. In this article Langevang (2017, p. 895) argues that fashion designers in Ghana, Uganda and Zambia are employing, and simultaneously shaping, a 'New Africa' narrative in their practices. We can see that the cultural, national and regional identity is being deployed as a strategy, but also that this strategy feeds into, and is part of an aggregate that in combination with other actors, co-narrates and produces this new identity. The focus of the study, however, is the fashion industry in these regions and how it is subject to entrepreneurial forces that shape it.

Banks (2006) is interested in the 'cultural turn' of the economy, and the city is a space where this is taking place. Banks (2006) sees societal transitions to be impacting, and simultaneously to be negotiated and embodied with/in the cultural-creative industries, and thus societal transformation is shaping and being shaped by the CCI. As in many cases of this discourse, the cultural entrepreneurs are understood as key actors of the cultural life, one of the leading operators that shape their cultural domain, and also embody a certain societal transformation; manifestations of change and therefore indications of a future present.

A sociological point of departure can be observed in "Classification as Culture" (Lena & Peterson, 2008). In this paper, genre-making and genre-development is studied by looking at symbolic classification as a collective exercise of structuring. The study discusses how music-genres are gen-

---

[1]emphasis in original.

erated, how they become institutionalized and what the various genre-trajectories can look like. This is a case that I locate at the border of the Organisational Imprinting and the CCI discourse. I choose to place it in the latter as the focus of the research is the music sector and the forces that shape it. The cultural entrepreneurs in this article are early adopters and popularizers of new genres that are the counter-balancing forces to isomorphic institutional pressures. The focus of the study is on the dynamics of a cultural sphere, rather than on formal organisations within the sector. As a comparison, Roy and Dowd (2010) study the organisational governance structures that drove the hierarchical positioning of genres and thus also what ended up being performed, and by whom. But more on that below, in the part on organisational imprinting.

Finally, an important theme of this discourse is the labour-aspect of the CCI, the theme that most specifically focuses on the cultural entrepreneur as such. The book "The independents" (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999) partially engendered the labour/employment discourse of the CCI; in it, they discuss the emergence of the cultural-creative industries as a relevant economic sector for the UK, and the labour conditions they contain.

Exemplary approaches for this theme within my corpus are provided by Klamer (2011) and Ellmeier (2003). Ellmeier (2003) describes the new relationship between the arts, cultural work and employment conditions in the wake of a post-industrial, service-oriented economy wherein labour policies understand entrepreneurial activity as a way out of unemployment, and the CCI as an economically potent growth-sector. This perspective approaches the subject from a more material perspective. The cultural worker - now entrepreneur - is simply a result of these new market conditions, marked by high competition, new organisational flexibility, the emergence of project-work-contracts and portfolio-careers. Indeed, to some extent the music producer described by M. Scott (2012) is this individual; fully adapted to the new conditions, the cultural worker has become an entrepreneur who, out of a lack of financial capital has found a different sort of capital within themselves to be employed. Klamer (2011), instead, is approaching it from a more conceptual and theoretical point of departure. While describing the same individual, the entrepreneurial cultural worker, Klamer (2011, p. 141) weaves a narrative of progressiveness and emancipatory hopefulness into this "new character in town". Indeed, the Schumpeterian individual that Ellmeier (2003, p. 3) sees emerge from the new market conditions is conceptually conjured up by Klamer (2011, p. 155): the alert, creative, passionate, persuasive, courageous, prudent individual who puts faith and hope into their actions. In "Good work - rethinking cultural entrepreneurship" Oakley (2013), half of the duo that published "The Independents", reflects upon this conversation and introduces the concept of 'forced entrepreneurship'. This kind of entrepreneurship can be observed in "The Missing Producer" (Whitson, Simon, & Parker, 2018), where the intermediary role of linking the creative work of game developers to the market, a role that used to be the responsibility of producers, has been distributed among the game developers themselves, thus 'forcing' them to become entrepreneurial managers of relational labour and cultural intermediation.

In general we can see that this discourse studies the actors and dynamic of the cultural-creative industry: who is part of it, how they behave, why, and what this means for the art and culture that is consequently produced. Indeed, reading this analysis backwards, the discussion traces the societal backdrop which is reflected within the cultural expressions, and thus shows, to some extent at least, how culture practically 'reflects its time'.

3.2.2 Creative City Discourse

This discourse is engaged predominantly within Urban/Regional Development Studies, but a few titles are also published in Sociology or Anthropology journals.

Part of the cultural-creative industry discourse, yet with a distinct focus, this strand of the corpus focuses on the living environment of people, and the role the CCI plays within it.

"The Independents" (Leadbeater & Oakley, 1999) also influenced the subsequent conversation on the creative city. The book looked at the actors within the UK's cultural-creative industry, and in these stories, the cities often play a leading role. As such, on the one hand, a conversation on the labour ensued, but also a conversation on the city. One of the seminal yet controversial additions to this conversation, while not explicitly mentioning the cultural entrepreneur, was the development of the creative class by Florida (2002, 2004). Florida posited that, for a city to be successful, it must be able to compete on the global market for capital, financial and human. These two are intertwined, but one strategy to attract human capital was to design attractive living conditions that would appeal to skilled, highly valued individuals.

Whilst earlier titles in this segment broadly explored what it meant that the cultural-creative industries started to gain importance and traction within cities, studying the phenomenon of clustering and how the CCI becomes politically and economically interesting (i.e. Mommaas (2004); Bovone (2005); Binnie and Skeggs (2004)), later articles became more instrumental and 'practical' in their pursuit (i.e. Ratten (2017); Kim (2016); Richards (2017)).

The difference between the creative city segment and the general conversation can be exemplified with the article "Moral Economy and Cultural Work" (Banks, 2006). Banks (2006) studies the cultural industry by way of interviews with cultural entrepreneurs in Manchester. Indeed, Manchester is an early and popular example for studying the CCI and the creative city (i.e. Binnie and Skeggs (2004); Van der Borg et al. (2005); Adams and Tiesdell (2010); Roodhouse (2006)). However, in contrast to the articles that focus on the city and the role the CCI inhabits within it, as a vehicle for development and upgrading of the urban fabric for example, Banks (2006) is interested in the 'new economy'. The impact that the increasing relevance of the quaternary economic sector has on society can be observed within the city. But the study is not focused on regional development or how this affects the city, but rather how it affects the cultural sphere and society in general. This is why "Moral Economy and Cultural Work" (Banks, 2006) is situated in the general segment of the CCI discourse.

Early in the segment on the creative city, there are reports studying the economic and social potential of fostering the CCI within cities, exemplified by the extensive study by Van der Borg et al. (2005, p. 25) with multiple case studies and the conceptualization of the cultural entrepreneur as the new model of cultural workers: replacing the "enlightened cultural managers in fine arts and traditional state-subsidised organisations" would be the "young, aggressive 'creative entrepreneurs' with the organising capacity and the ambition to break through the dominant 'cultural paradigm' by establishing a local brand which is strongly associated to the 'place culture', and as such, totally expendable in the city marketing discourse."

However, other authors, such as Binnie and Skeggs (2004, p. 49-50), asked what it meant when sexuality and marginalised communities would be commodified in the service of city marketing and the competitiveness of a city in the global market for urban tourism. Less critical is Bovone (2005) who explores the Ticinese neighbourhood of Milan that emerges as a fashion-quarter and cultural cluster. The subject becomes a vehicle to explore the post-industrial service-economy, where meaning rather than material is produced, and where fashionable consumption and lifestyle of its inhabitants can become economically productive for the city as an export as well as an attraction for tourists and highly skilled labour. In these investigations, authors investigate the transformation of the city from industrial to post-industrial space, studying and attempting to explain why the cultural-creative industries have become such an important field and what the processes of value-creation entail for the contemporary and future city.

Later on, the creative city discourse begins employing those insights in more 'practical' terms. The insights of the early conversation have become internalized, and now the productive, applied aspect of social sciences prove their worth: not so much studying, but explicating how the creative city can be designed becomes the focus of the conversation. Etzkowitz (2014) illuminates how the place-making of cultural festivals can harness creativity and how successful festivals can be employed in conjunction with Universities in order to create a 'humanities town', in the hope that dynamics such that produced Silicon Valley could be spatially replicated. Another example is Kostopoulou (2013), who explains how urban waterfronts can be re-deployed, transforming their now redundant use as ports into attractions for cultural-creative labour and tourists, thus importing valuable human and economic resources. Other examples include Patterson (2012, p. 3292), studying the role of architectonic flagship projects in the "global competition over producing the best architectural icons", and how cultural entrepreneurs independently and privately regenerate a previously neglected area in Seoul, South Korea (Kim, 2016). An interesting development of this discourse is the study by Sá, Casais, and Silva (2019), who extend the ideas of the creative city conversation into rural areas, thus moving beyond the 'urban' focus of such regeneration efforts and exploring their applicability in other environments.

All in all, this sub-strand of the discourse addresses the quaternary sector's role in the city and how value is now added not through material manufacturing, but through a manufacturing of 'meaning'. This 'meaning' is performed, in the way of consumption behaviour and lived relationships that can be used as a template to be spatially replicated by others. The cultural entrepreneur inhabits the lead-role in this performance, acting as an 'avant-garde consumer' whose consumption-patterns and lifestyle trajectory serve as replicate-able molds expendable for city-branding purposes.

3.3 Cross-Cultural Discourse

Just like the cultural-creative industry discourse, I decided to segment this discourse into two parts as well.

Some of the publications in the corpus use the CCI as a backdrop, in which context the cultural entrepreneur is mentioned. In these cases the CCI is described as a fruitful space to study new venture creation as a sector with a high density of MSE's (mini and small enterprises). At first, I considered these to be part of the CCI discourse. However, I realised that it was not as simple as that. Indeed, some of the titles are rather studying the difference that context makes, its influence; the cultural sector serves as a particular space understood as different to other sectors. I finally decided to group these articles into the cross-cultural entrepreneurship discourse. The CCE discourse studies how culture influences or affects entrepreneurship, trying to categorize and deduce entrepreneurial traits that are universal, and those that are context-dependent. Indeed, the same can be said about those publications that study the difference of culture in terms of sector, rather than geographical region or political entity (i.e. nation/country). As such, the CCE discourse is constituted by a cross-geographical as well as cross-sectoral strand.

Unlike the CCI discourse, which focuses on the cultural-creative industry within which the entrepreneur is an actor, the CCE discourse studies entrepreneurship, within which cultural context is a factor. In fact, except for the CCI discourse, no strand of the combined cultural entrepreneur/ship conversation is particularly interested in the cultural sphere as such. While the cross-contextual entrepreneurship conversation does (occasionally) find itself in that environment, it is not of focal importance; the interest in the cultural sector is a function of the insights that can be derived

from it in terms of entrepreneurial behaviour, characteristics and personality traits. Following a programme called "Cultural Economics and Entrepreneurship", this struck me: realising that the particular kind of cultural entrepreneurship I have encountered has never been dominant, and is losing in prominence (while 23 out of 50 articles found themselves in the CCI domain between 2000 - 2005, only 11 did between 2016 - 2020).

3.3.1 Cross-Geographical Discourse

This discourse is mostly engaged in journals of business management, entrepreneurship and regional development.

When I began this study I was aware of the "cross-cultural entrepreneurship" strand as a distinctive field, related to the cultural entrepreneurship discourse by a stretch. It turned out that, while not dominant, this strand is not negligible, and there is a point of interface with the other discourses that seems to be little acknowledged and potentially of interest for the field of entrepreneurship. It should be noted that what I here call "cross-geographical entrepreneurship" is termed "cross-cultural entrepreneurship" in the academic discourse. However, as culture in this particular strand largely denotes a geographically defined people and their attitudes, norms and behavioural patterns, I find the term 'culture' misleading; it is often operationalised with cultural dimensions of Hofstede, and thus a two-dimensional measurement of their compatibility with entrepreneurship.

An early, straight forward example of this strand is the paper by Ardichvili and Gasparishvili (2003). Here, based on Hofstede's cultural values framework, the difference between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs, and between Russians and Georgians is studied. A major motivation for this study was to study how entrepreneurialism manifested itself and was observable in post-USSR countries.

Another good example is the study on the status of entrepreneurship by Malach-Pines, Levy, Utasi, and Hill (2005, p. 541). Here, an Israeli national narrative that apparently elevates the entrepreneur as a "cultural hero and role model" is used as a point of departure to understand to what extent such narratives influence the disposition of MBA students to become entrepreneurs themselves. This is done by a comparative study with MBA students in the USA and Hungary; we can note that again, Hungary is employed as the post-communist 'other', and more specifically, the economic success of the Israeli high-tech sector is set in relation to their high proclivity toward entrepreneurship, and it is finally proposed that "[e]ducators at all levels of the educational system can also highlight traits that characterize successful entrepreneurs such as commitment, initiative, optimism, creativity, independence and love of challenge and create 'young entrepreneurs' programs that encourage students to be entrepreneurial. Once again, some programs of this type can already be seen in Israel and the USA." (Malach-Pines et al., 2005, p. 552).

Indeed, one of the major themes in early cross-geographical entrepreneurship studies is the comparison of 'cultural' values with 'entrepreneurial' values, how these are inter-related, and finally how entrepreneurial behaviour can be fostered as it offers "the promise of growth, new jobs, increased trade, and innovation for a new millennium" (Mitchell, Smith, Seawright, & Morse, 2000, p. 989). The economic potential of nurturing entrepreneurship is the leading motivation for this research field. The improved status of the entrepreneur is one way to realise this (i.e. Mitchell et al. (2002); Malach-Pines et al. (2005); García-Cabrera and García-Soto (2008)). National culture is understood as a mediating factor of entrepreneurial dispositions, and thus a potential level of intervention: if it can be understood how cultural differences affect entrepreneurial proclivity, "mechanism promoting cultural similarities such as the educational and law systems, as

well as language" (Engelen, Heinemann, & Brettel, 2009, p. 178) can be employed to nurture entrepreneurialism. Interesting is also the understanding that national culture is most fully reflected within new entrepreneurial ventures (NEVs) rather than in larger, older organisations, as a "lower degree of formalization can be found" (Engelen et al., 2009, p. 178). Not only does this mean that entrepreneurialism can be fostered through national policies and discourse, but that national cultural values can be diffused through the nurturing of NEVs.

Another interesting aspect of the cross-geographical entrepreneurship research is the diaspora-phenomenon: even though only two out of the four diaspora articles are part of the CCE discourse (the other two are more focused on societal imprinting, part of the fourth strand of the cultural entrepreneur/ship discourse), this field of study looks at how international relations are partially weaved through entrepreneurial activities within diaspora-communities, and how these entrepreneurs employ their 'cross-cultural identity' to broker this interface. Here, too, the cultural differences are studied and how cultural difference affects entrepreneurial behaviour. Stoyanov, Woodward, and Stoyanova (2018, p. 285) look at how "cross-cultural entrepreneurial competences of the kind possessed by diaspora businessmen assist them in recognizing international business opportunities", and Elo (2016, p. 129) studies how the "[d]iaspora produces enablers for business, as they carry an 'immigrant effect' in their activities; they perceive, compare and analyse opportunities and threats differently from the way in which mono-cultural entrepreneurs do". We can see that in the later stages of the cross-geographical entrepreneurship discourse, rather than exploring how the post-USSR countries (Stoyanov et al. (2018) studies Bulgarian, Elo (2016) Uzbekistan entrepreneurs) could become more entrepreneurial, a light is being shone on the entrepreneurialism engendered by a certain marginalisation.

A more critical and slightly different example of the employment of difference in an entrepreneurial way comes from Morgan (2004), who studies language teaching: it is observed that an international identity "risks being *commoditised*, perceived by new teachers as a 'value-adding' set of socio-pragmatic skills for cross-cultural entrepreneurship" (Morgan, 2004, p. 177).[2]

Looking at the exact opposite of employing kinship networks or 'strategically commodifying' identity, but still observing the marginalised perspective, Yetim (2008) studies female entrepreneurship as well as the difference between migrant and non-migrant entrepreneurs; one insight is that the migrant entrepreneurs, by way of their break with kinship and other traditional ties, need to resort to their own abilities of creating and maintaining social capital, in terms of social ties, solidarity and trust (Yetim, 2008, p. 875).

This article also highlights how the cross-geographical strand is inter-linked with the cross-contextual strand: not only the geographical difference, but female-ness or a migration-background are understood as contextual differences that can be studied in order to understand entrepreneurship better. While Yetim (2008) looks at the Turkish context in particular, and thus still falls into the cross-geographical entrepreneurship discourse, the article serves a natural bridge to the other side of the coin.

3.3.2   Cross-Contextual Discourse

This segment is dominantly found in the disciplines of entrepreneurship, marketing, business and management studies.

As mentioned above, I initially did not consider this sub-strand; many of the articles that I ended up placing here, I in the first round of analysis mentally placed in the last, 'redundant' strand: the general discourse on entrepreneurship. However, it dawned on me that in fact there is

---

[2]emphasis in original

an essential difference between them, while there is an essential similarity between the publications finally placed in the cross-contextual discourse and those in the cross-geographical one. This similarity is the focus on the conditions that influence entrepreneurship. While the above described sub-strand focuses on the regionally determined difference in behaviour and attitudes of people, this segment looks at the differences determined by other factors than physical proximity: largely, this is in terms of industry sector, and this is very often how the cultural entrepreneur is employed: entrepreneurs within the CCI, who, on account of the sector they find themselves in, behave differently, and display different attitudes and rationales than entrepreneurs in other sectors.

An early example of such a study is the article by Raffo, Lovatt, Banks, and O'Connor (2000), who find that, while the CCI is rife with micro and small enterprises (MSEs), the sector is so different to other sectors in which entrepreneurial activity is found, that teaching entrepreneurship must be adapted. Another such article is authored by Wilson and Stokes (2004). They study the relationship between marketing and legitimation strategies of entrepreneurs within the CCI. This article is particularly interesting for my research, as its focus on legitimation practices and financial acquisition in connection with the term cultural entrepreneurship, makes the omission of a reference to Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) particularly surprising. However, this can possibly be explained by the fact that Wilson and Stokes (2004) use the term differently, namely as 'conventional' entrepreneurs within the CCI, while for Lounsbury and Glynn (2001), cultural entrepreneurship is a quite specific type of entrepreneurial activity. I will return to this below, but we can already see that the employment of the term creates issues on a substantial level, as it becomes hard to discuss both aspects simultaneously: entrepreneurs in the cultural industries, and entrepreneurs as 'cultural operators'.

Indeed, the lack of awareness of other conversations in regards to cultural entrepreneurship is very apparent across the different discourses: Newth (2018) proposes to use ethnographic research methods in order to explore the contextual conditions and influence on entrepreneurial behaviour, as well as institutional pressures that shape entrepreneurial possibilities; this, according to the author, is a 'missing gap' in the research field. Newth (2018) does not mention the cross-geographical discourse mentioned above, nor the Organisational Imprinting discourse I will attend to next, even though both these conversations explicitly tend to the 'missing gap' Newth (2018) addresses. The inability to speak to across the aisle is to some extent understandable when it comes to the CCE and the Organisational Imprinting discourses, as a key term is employed differently and thus communication is hampered. But that the cross-contextual strand barely acknowledges the cross-geographical discourse is surprising. An exception is Lindsay (2005). However, as Lindsay (2005) studies the difference between 'indigenous' and 'non-indigenous' entrepreneurs and conceptualizing culture in Hofstede's dimensions, the study finds itself in the company of the cross-geographical strand, and in fact I had placed it there at first, only later realising that it, by my criteria, is better suited to this strand. While this is not a scientometric study, and the exact distance of the two discourses cannot be definitely determined here, what can be established is an apparent lack of resonance between the different discourses, even though they appear to approach the same subject, and could most likely learn substantially from each other.

For example, when Hoyte (2019, p. 616) asks "[w]hether artisan entrepreneurs share common personality traits with other entrepreneur groups", it is a similar question to the one Ardichvili and Gasparishvili (2003) asked, almost two decades earlier, in terms of Georgian and Russian entrepreneurs. Similarly, when Pollard and Wilson (2014) inquire about the 'entrepreneurial mindset' in the CCI, they echo Mitchell et al. (2000) who studied the 'cognitional' variations observed in countries, in relation to venture creation decisions.

In general, the two apparently partite strands both study the 'cultural' influence on en-

trepreneurial activity and new venture creation, and to what extent context and external conditions affect and shape entrepreneurship. While the cross-contextual discourse is more embedded in the entrepreneurship scholarship, the cross-geographical discourse does not seem to be acknowledged; simultaneously, the cross-contextual discourse struggles in integrating insights from the Organisational Imprinting discourse, which I will turn to next, possibly out of the divergent employment of the cultural entrepreneur.

3.4 Organisational Imprinting Discourse

Finally, the two remaining discourses use the cultural entrepreneur similarly, and the main difference is the level of analysis; one is looking at formal organisations and how institutional change happens within them, or within a sector/market. The term 'formal' attempts to point at the artificial character of such organisations, in contrast to more 'organic' organisations such as religious, ethnic or otherwise 'grown'-together communities or societies. While a nation of course is also a legal and formal construction, these organisations cannot be 'founded' and 'ended' the same way a company or enterprise can. As such, this 'societal' dimension is the level of analysis in the final strand, where the cultural entrepreneur is also understood as an agent of institutional change, but the institutions are societal and/or social ones.

The Organisational Imprinting conversation is situated in quite varied fields of study, such as sociology, management, economic geography, but it is dominated by organization studies.

While an earlier paper by Ingram and Clay (2000) teased the emergence of this distinct neo-institutionalist conversation on cultural entrepreneurship, it is the paper by Lounsbury and Glynn (2001) that has dominated this discourse for the last two decades; in fact, in 2019 they published a couple of papers attempting to re-calibrate, and perhaps rejuvenate, the discourse they helped bring forth (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2019; Lounsbury, Gehman, & Ann Glynn, 2019; Lounsbury, Cornelissen, Granqvist, & Grodal, 2019). In the original paper, Lounsbury and Glynn (2001, p. 545) define cultural entrepreneurship "as the process of storytelling that mediates between extant stocks of entrepreneurial resources and subsequent capital acquisition and wealth creation.". In this paper, they theorize how storytelling and narration of entrepreneurs facilitate the institutional legitimation of new ventures by rhetorically positioning the enterprises at an 'optimally distinctive' distance from other organisations within the sector. This aroused a conversation on institutional change in general. Like economists needed a force that explained why market equilibrium was never achieved, institutional theorists needed an agent that explained why the 'iron cage' was not so solid, after all. The isomorphic pressures that institutional logic often exerts does not result in all organisations within a sector to be completely homogeneous, and in fact, the logic itself changes. The Organisational Imprinting discourse argues that market/sector and inter-organisational institutional change emanates from the cultural entrepreneur. In a way, the isomorphic pressures can be compared to the economic pressures toward market equilibrium; the final balance that would make change redundant is a never (yet) achieved state. Entrepreneurship could be seen as a kind of societal resistance towards economic entropy. Cultural entrepreneurship is the institutional counterpart - the mechanism by which individuals, or groups of individuals, exploit a 'cultural' arbitrage, an 'inefficient' habit, perceiving a way to 'do' things differently, and understanding how to popularize their way. Indeed, this echoes the 'break with traditions' that seemingly the entrepreneur embodies.

I mentioned this strand previously, distinguishing other discourses from it. For Lena and Peterson (2008), in their study on the classification of musical genres that is located in the general

CCI strand, the cultural entrepreneurs are agents of institutional change. This would be an indication for the Organisational Imprinting discourse. However, it is one effect of their behaviour, rather than their defining feature.

In addition, the focus on the cultural workers in the general CCI discourse and the professional roles that exist, or do not exist, within the cultural sector tie back into the organisational imprinting of the sector, and thus illustrate their relationship. These discourses diverge in the sense that in the general conversation on the CCI, the cultural entrepreneur is a result of organisational and structural change within the cultural-creative industries, while in the Organisational Imprinting discourse, the cultural entrepreneur is the driver of such change.

Distinguishing this discourse from the next strand, the Societal Imprinting discourse, is the level of analysis. While not perfectly clean, this delineation seems appropriate as it effectively separates articles whose focus is on a broader, societal level from those that focus on a 'meso' market level and the organisations that constitute it. Curiously, while the meso-level analyses perceive organisations (often new ventures) to be engines of institutional change, the micro (intra-organisational) and macro (societal, often national or international) level analyses often see individuals to be those engines. 'Societal' needs an explanation: depending on the market, institutional change within a sector, say, the cultural-creative industry, may be broad enough to be felt societally, and induce ripple-effects that can be argued to have societal dimensions; Hajjar (2014, p. 121) discusses how post-modernity affects the US military culture, and how cultural entrepreneurs "create essential new tools and simultaneously help the organization to strike a balance among many discordant cultural orientations and skill sets as the military confronts and accomplishes dynamic, fluid, and challenging contemporary missions.". One might argue that the military is such a big part of the US society[3] that institutional change within it is change on a societal dimension; for me, the level of analysis remains on the organisation, and thus I place it in this discourse.

There is a certain interface between the CCI discourse and this one which carries potential for confusion, especially because the lineage of this strand is often connected to Dimaggio's seminal study on the cultural scene of 19th century Boston (Dimaggio, 1982), where he studies the emergence of classical music organisations. The 'cultural' part of this strand of the discourse does not denote the sector, however, but the 'storytelling' strategy of the entrepreneurs, as well as the organisational 'culture' of the sector. It does not help that Johnson (2007) in another seminal paper studying organisational imprinting used the organisational structure of the Paris Opera as a case study. The argument in the Organisational Imprinting discourse goes that the institutional logic, or 'culture', that is established at the time of the inauguration of an organisation, such as the Paris Opera, may last beyond the term of the architects of the structure, the 'entrepreneurs' that establish the new venture. Dimaggio argues that the non-profit structure that satisfied the interests of the cultural entrepreneurs who aimed to institute their vision of high-brow culture in 19th century Boston defined the organisational structure of the sector well into contemporary days, and Johnson argues that the interests of the founder of the Paris Opera, in conjunction with the interests of the then-king Louis XIV have defined the organisational structure of the Opera until today.[4]

---

[3]15 - 20% of US budget spending in the last decade (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_budget_of_the_United_States)

[4]We are reminded here of the idea that national values and norms are most plainly reflected in new ventures; what does it mean for a society that has a high frequency of new ventures - and perhaps also shorter duration of their existence? -, does it reflect a greater mutability of values, or does it engender it? With long lasting institutions side-by-side with new ventures, a certain diversity of institutional logics exists; will this diversity increase, or diminish? Far from wanting to support the institutional logic of the Swedish Academy that has been so rattled recently, it does make me consider the isomorphic pressures in society - do they ebb or flow? And the attempt of the CCE discourse not only to study the difference, but to utilize the knowledge of what 'type' of entrepreneurship

While some of the publications in this discourse look at the cultural sector (i.e. Andersson and Getz (2009); Ivey (2008); Dimaggio (2006); Roy and Dowd (2010)), cultural entrepreneurship can be employed in any type of sector: in the US higher education system (Lounsbury & Pollack, 2001), establishing a new governmental welfare program (Covaleski, Dirsmith, & Weiss, 2013), a service platform in the healthcare sector (Ticona & Mateescu, 2018), or a label in the food sector, such as 'fair trade' (Sassatelli & Davolio, 2010; Nicholls, 2010). It does not have to be sector-specific; legitimising a new resource acquisition strategy, i.e. crowd-funding (Frydrych, Bock, Kinder, & Koeck, 2014) or work culture, such as co-working spaces (Merkel, 2015) are also conceptualized as processes of cultural entrepreneurship.

Indeed, one interesting inter-connection with the CCE discourse is the idea of entrepreneurship as an institutional logic. Early on, Yamada (2004, p. 307) argues that "[f]or regional economic re-vitalisation, multi-dimensional entrepreneurship, which includes civic, social, and cultural factors, must be positively implanted in the regional context.", and this idea reappears later on with Khoury and Prasad (2016, p. 935) who discuss how "institutional constraints within LDCs ['less developed countries'] acutely challenge local entrepreneurs, and (b) illustrates how entrepreneurs survive extreme settings through bricolage and cultural entrepreneurship strategies.". Finally Ratten (2020, p. 510-511) views culture "as a way to understand shared meaning systems in terms of how they enable entrepreneurship." Another interesting example of the connection between the two strands is Faulconbridge (2008); the study conceptualizes managers in transnational law firms as cultural entrepreneurs who "drive change in institutionalized cultures of work in different international subsidiaries" (Faulconbridge, 2008, p. 498), and re-connects this to reciprocate understanding of business-culture and "national and/or regional norms as TNCs ['transnational corporations'] act as vectors for the spread and reproduction of Anglo-American business practices in different societies." (Faulconbridge, 2008, p. 514). Redressing the lack of communication between for example the diaspora-discourse mentioned above and the Organisational Imprinting discourse exemplified here, could be of benefit for both conversations.

One major point of discussion within the Organisational Imprinting discourse relates to the 'conflict' of external and internal pressures. For Golant and Sillince (2007, p. 1164), cultural entrepreneurship serves "to align the new organization with the interests and values of key constituents". For Holt and Macpherson (2010, p. 20) rhetorics can be a strategy of cultural entrepreneurs to create and sustain novelty "within, or against well-established market environments." However, while the early articles focus more on the intent and resolve of the cultural entrepreneurs attempting 'get their story across' (i.e. Ingram and Clay (2000); Lounsbury and Glynn (2001); Lounsbury and Pollack (2001)), later studies begin to look at the "inescapably collective nature of the cultural entrepreneurship involved in any instance of organizational imprinting" (Johnson, 2007, p. 100-101). And as this ensues, the organisational imprinting mechanism is widened to integrate the emergence of a novel institutional logic, or 'collective identity' (Wry, Lounsbury, & Glynn, 2011, p. 450): "efforts to gain the attention of, and be validated by, external audiences require a form of active and strategic cultural entrepreneurship". This process allows non-established entrepreneurs to collaborate, in some sense constructing their own market with 'optimal distinctiveness' to other markets. Synchronizing stories "will avoid audience ambiguity and increase NV's chances of acquiring resources" (Überbacher, 2014, p. 682). In the nascent identity formation, cultural entrepreneurship is conceptualized as a mediating, controlling and coordinating process (Byrkjeflot, Pedersen, & Svejenova, 2013).

Another approach toward the "dialectics between agency and structure" comes from Seo (2016,

---

is appropriate in which context in order to more effectively teach, disseminate it: if we consider entrepreneurship to be an institutional logic, is such research in fact isomorphic pressure in action?

p. 265), who looks at the identity-construction of consumers who attempt "to express themselves by legitimizing new market practices or delegitimizing extant ones" (Seo, 2016, p. 265). Such agency is professed by Ansari, Fiss, and Zajac (2010, p. 78) who claim that "[d]uring initial stages of the diffusion process, conformity pressures are essentially absent [...]". Seo (2016, p. 265), in contrast, argues that "unless prosumers manage to acquire significant power and capital within their fields, they will typically face limited success in sustaining the identities for which they strive." This 'dialectic' between structure and agency is played out on all levels - intra-organizational (i.e. Covaleski et al. (2013), Besharov and Smith (2014)) and within industries or markets (Nicholls, 2010; Navis & Glynn, 2010; Byrkjeflot et al., 2013). And, according to this discourse, it is the cultural entrepreneur who is the engine for this dialectic contestation.

While the cultural entrepreneur is the apparent agent of change, the how has remained an insistent blackbox and of focal attention: it is "the pervasive efforts of actors to combine and recombine cultural elements within and across institutional logics [that] is conceptualized as cultural entrepreneurship" (Thornton, Ocasio, & Lounsbury, 2015, p. 4). This skill to handle cultural elements makes the cultural entrepreneurs "skilful cultural operators, adept at mobilizing 'cultural tools' for strategic purposes" (Überbacher, 2014, p. 672). Indeed, the cultural operator handling tools is the most incessant metaphor of this cultural entrepreneurship discourse, stretching from the early beginnings (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001) to the very recent papers (i.e. Hajjar (2014); Gehman and Soublière (2017); Lounsbury, Gehman, and Ann Glynn (2019)). It is their ability to employ seemingly disparate symbols, previously disassociated cultural elements, and weave them into a coherent, convincing story. However, 'convincing' often ends up being described as knowing how to employ the cultural toolkit in order to appropriately align the idea or venture to the key stakeholders, while still arguing that it is not the 'same old': by rhetorical methods of talking and acting 'as if' and "recover[ing] settled meanings" (Holt & Macpherson, 2010, p. 24), reconfiguring or aligning change to a solid ideal-type identity of an organisation (King & Whetten, 2008), "[distancing] themselves from their original, but now stigmatized, low-quality, mass production logic, by telling stories that selectively and creatively depicted their historical origins." (Lounsbury & Boxenbaum, 2013, p. 13) in the end, it all serves a "recalibration of exchange markets" (Nicholls, 2010, p. 244), and ultimately "opening up access to new capital and market opportunities" (Marquis & Raynard, 2015, p. 313).[5] These actors who deploy all these strategies have a reflective capacity and are able to innovate and provoke change, but how: "Through communicating, [entrepreneurs] provide order and familiarity to previously unordered things in a way that illuminates a value proposition" (Pollack, Rutherford, & Nagy, 2012, p. 918). However, "entrepreneurial storytelling matters more in certain institutional environments than in others" (Martens, Jennings, & Jennings, 2007, p. 2007). Connecting the various strands of the cultural entrepreneurship discourse in order to illuminate what it is that allows some stories to be effective, what context is conducive, what the traits of such organisational imprinters are, could be a way to understand why sometimes

---

[5]This idea of cultural entrepreneurship, while coming from a different point of departure, shines a fresh light unto the cross-cultural entrepreneurship studies: are those who encourage entrepreneurship themselves cultural entrepreneurs, and is the institutional change championed a push for access to new capital and markets? But more importantly, are the skillful cultural operators merely driven by the pressure toward market equilibrium, and would this not make them 'cultural dupes' after all? Is it in the end an intricate, evolutionary process, and is the destination balance? Or perhaps, chaos: constant change, but in 'no direction', with no order or structure. Depending on the scale, a system is perceived as either closed or open. We often see the planet earth to 'balance itself', a complete circle, within which life and death is simply part of the regenerative process. However, the sun is perpetually introducing energy to this system; the milky-way is another system, etc. If the system is seen to be closed, it cannot change; it remains the same, and thus, 'growth' is not possible. A system must be open, something must be added for change to be possible, and it must come from 'somewhere'.

'communicating' is enough, and what the conditions and contents of successful communication are. If Johnson (2007, p. 122) is right, and it is the entrepreneurs who stamp the organisations with the "signs of their founding times", and thus "contribute to the making of the social worlds inherited by their successors" (p. 123), we are advised to start connecting the dots.

And with this cue, I will move on to the Societal Imprinting discourse, which has some similarities with the Organisational Imprinting one, particularly in the person of the cultural entrepreneur, but is a conversation that brings forth the societal relevance of better understanding these dynamics.

3.5   Societal Imprinting Discourse

The Societal Imprinting discourse is also a quite a varied conversation. The publications are a compound of disciplines: history, sociology, economy, media studies, anthropology, human geography, political science and more. From their various vantage points, they look at how beliefs, norms and preferences are shaped, shape-able, and therefore, look at the conditions of societal transformation. The sources of these documents are to some extent books, some extent edited anthologies, and mostly, but not as dominantly as in the other strands, journals. Journals include the "Journal of Modern African Studies", the "Annual Review of Sociology", "Language in Society", and later on "Europe-Asia Studies", "Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies", but also management, business and economy journals such as the "Journal of Management Inquiry", the "Scandinavian Economic History Review" and the "Journal of Business Ethics". The topics range from sexuality in Botswana (Helle-Valle, 2004) to studies on how popular music shapes collective memories (Bennett & Janssen, 2016). We can see that the range is broad. Curious is the early employment of the term, as early as 2001 (Harrell, 2001; Kaufman, 2001). Also interesting is the complete lack of economic or business management influences in the early conversation on this type of cultural entrepreneurship. While the publications of the previous strands provide ideas of academic lineage, such as Dimaggio (1982) in the Organisational Imprinting strand, where from the cultural entrepreneur comes from in this strand is less apparent. What connects this discourse to the others is its attention to how entities, mostly individuals but not always, act to shape their environment and affect the course of collective identity formation.

I mentioned the societal influence of the cultural individuals that was illustrated in some titles of the general CCI discourse. The difference to the publications that constitute this discourse, is that the societal dimension is the main subject. A certain ambiguity in segmentation can be observed: art and culture, by their nature, reflect on and influence the cultural life and identity of the people whence it emerges. Therefore, the differentiation of the general CCI and Societal Imprinting is artificial and merely accentuates the point of departure; simultaneously, this admittance illustrates the mutual interest of those discourses.

The early conversation on cultural entrepreneurship in this strand addresses community-building, either as 'ethnic' or 'national' collective, and often intertwined (i.e. Kaufman (2004); Harrell (2001)). Only later on do economists and management scholars get interested in the idea of cultural entrepreneurship in their role on societal discourses (i.e. Mokyr (2013, 2016); Shiller (2017))

Even though the level of analysis is always on a societal dimension in this discourse, it can take multiple forms. First of all, the cultural entrepreneur is conceptualized as an actor who takes part in shaping general attitudes toward a subject, such as the taboo around tattooing, or environmental change (Kosut, 2006; Turney, 2003).

Or else, it can be on the scale of small communities, i.e. diasporas, where the cultural en-

trepreneur is an agent that is influential in shaping its collective identity, such as moral and ethical norms, behaviours and beliefs (Byford, 2012). Indeed, for Byford (2012, p. 726) diaspora-building becomes "an entrepreneurial activity in its own right and an important means for generating social capital". But cultural entrepreneurship can also involve 'producing' nascent communities that are not necessarily geographically defined, such as trans-local diasporas that identify with each other over certain narratives which the cultural entrepreneurs substantially construe. This is not always 'neutral' - one such imprinting of trans-local identity is by diaspora-radicalisation (Conversi, 2012).

In this strand the cultural entrepreneur is a 'cultural operator', who in Mokyr's terminology puts new items unto the 'cultural menu' individuals of a community can choose from (Mokyr, 2013, 2016). Sometimes the cultural entrepreneur even proposes a whole new set of cultural items, or a full 'cultural menu' in itself.

These individuals are able to generate a fresh narrative that resonates with a broad set of the population. However, they cannot conjure a rabbit out of thin air - rather, they are exceptionally good at articulating notions already existing into a coherent, cohesive idea.[6] This kind of imprinting then allows actors, such as politicians, to employ manufactured narratives for their own goal (i.e. Brubaker and Feischmidt (2002); Yavuz (2016); Zubrzycki (2016)). Sometimes the cultural entrepreneur and politician is understood as the same individual, but the dynamic remains the same (Elchardus & Spruyt, 2016). This kind of concept, but less political, is also picked up by economists, such as Shiller (2017) who employs the cultural entrepreneur in order to understand the economics of narratives. To Shiller (2017) the cultural entrepreneur is the agent who generates 'new' narratives. Entrepreneurship can be understood as such a narrative, popularized within contexts through cultural entrepreneurship in order to economically develop those contexts (Bhatt, Qureshi, & Riaz, 2019).[7]

Often, but not always, the cultural entrepreneur is also very directly embedded in a cultural sector: as publishers, journalists, as importers of new cultural products, thus broadening the 'cultural menu' within the 'internal' boundary, however defined. Sometimes, they are intermediaries who work on platforms that allow new voices to enter the 'cultural dialogue', for example empowering marginalised voices to enter a particular sector (i.e. Everett (2007); Wagner (2009)). This, in turn, allows the whole population to draw on a whole new set of 'cultural menus'.

Cultural entrepreneurship can also be driven by nations or political entities, as a form of soft power (i.e. Brooks and Stanley (2007); Sun (2009)). In this understanding, these political entities are intentionally attempting to 'shape' the attitude towards them.

In the end, it is the shaping of 'cultural menus' that are structured by, and structure the future transformation of a community; it allows people to share a collective identity by providing a narrative that resonates with a previously disparate set of peoples, thus forming a community. It is important to note that these narratives cannot be derived out of thin air - rather, the cultural entrepreneur is a skilled articulator of a cohesive set of ideas, or an ideology. By creating a solid scaffolding which people can use as a sort of 'analytical framework' in order to interpret the world: a shared moral and ethical compass. Of course, most cultural entrepreneurs make very small dents and changes to the 'cultural menu', but some have greater influence: Mokyr (2016) employs the term for individuals such as Karl Marx, Adam Smith, Isaac Newton and Francis Bacon.

---

[6] We are here reminded of Alvin Ailey of the general CCI discourse

[7] Perhaps this is also true in the case of "cultural entrepreneurship"?

3.6　Summary

To summarize: I began with the discourse on the CCI discourse, which is further segmented into two parts. The general discourse approaches the cultural sphere from sociological, anthropological and historic points of departure. Here the business-side of the cultural entrepreneur appears, as the commercial activities play an increasing role in the cultural fields, but this is not the focal subject. Conversely, the publications in the creative city segment emphasise and focus on the behaviour of commencing new commercial ventures within the cultural-creative industries. The city is identified as the prevalent environment of this activity. Indeed, these publications' point of departure is an examination of the city, and the cultural entrepreneur appears as a leading influence on the urban fabric.

Next I presented the conversation on cross-cultural entrepreneurship. This discourse is predominantly interested in economic entrepreneurship. I likewise segment this discourse into two parts, as with the CCI discourse. The first segment is interested in how geographically dependent cultural norms, patterns of behaviour and attitudes of people affect their propensity toward entrepreneurship. Instead, the cross-contextual segment is interested in contextual environment, such as a sector or industry, within which entrepreneurial activity is observed. The cultural-creative industry appears to be a distinctive kind of economic sector, and therefore traditional entrepreneurship theories need to be adjusted to understand venture creation in these markets.

The Organisational Imprinting discourse is the third distinctive conversation. It examines how 'cultural tools' are handled to influence and to engender transformations in organisational or sector structures.

Finally, fourth discourse is Societal Imprinting. Societal Imprinting attends to societal change, where culture is understood as a collective interpretive framework, a kind of shared 'soft-ware'. By re-arranging the set of 'items' that are part of this framework, attitudes, norms and consequently behaviour of people can be influenced, thus generating cultural shifts and transitions.

4

Discussion

I will here discuss the themes that were developed during the coding and analysis process. As such, this chapter performs the role of an interpretive layer, where I attempt to interweave the four strands of cultural entrepreneurship. First, the term 'culture' is addressed, an attempt to understand and discuss what this concept means for the discourses, and what divides or conversely unifies them on this subject.

Then I turn my attention to the idea of 'change', and the entrepreneur as the agent of change. More specifically, I am interested in the concept of change and growth within economics, as the problem around change and growth engendered the entrepreneur in the first place. In preference to the cultural entrepreneur, I arrive at an alternative term: the cultural gardener. I posit that this term better reflects the interest in cultural transition, change, and meaning cultivation.

By tending to the two concepts of culture and change, I develop an interpretation of the unifying aspect of the collected data. This allows for an extrapolation of how the future discourses on cultural, economic and societal change may advance, and what pursuits might be fruitful. Not only does it have implications on the discourse on cultural entrepreneurship as a distinct field, but additionally it may tie back to research within the various disciplines that engage with the cultural entrepreneur. Articulating what unites the four discourses provides an interface by which these conversation may intersect, and start conversing interdisciplinary.

4.1 Culture

Culture is an unyieldingly difficult concept to define. When it is operationalised, authors tend to focus and zoom in on one of the many meanings it contains. This leads to the divergence of conversations, as different operationalisations produce different discourses, which, because they lack a 'shared reality' when it comes to the term culture, struggle to communicate with each other and work interdisciplinary.

Having navigated the academic discourse(s) on cultural entrepreneurship, the unspecific use of 'culture' has become increasingly apparent, employed for organisational work-'culture', religiously informed moral values, historically contingent national identities, attitudes related to professions, and the list goes on. To a degree, it is by the operationalisation of culture that the various strands diverge. Albinsson (2017) accurately notes the two ideas - the anthropologist's or institutional economist's perspective of culture, employed in the cross-geographical segment of the CCE discourse, the Organisational and the Societal Imprinting discourses, and the arts development use, which is more prevalent in the CCI discourse and the cross-contextual segment of the CCE discourse. This is not a clear delineation - sometimes the boundary becomes indistinct, such as when

cultural production is understood as a part of the societal-symbolic conversation that negotiates 'culture'. In those publications where such intersection appears, this connection is implicit and assumed, addressed only in passing, if at all. Or else, culture is simultaneously used to address professional and organisational norms within a sector, as well as the arts sphere within which these norms are prevalent. In both cases, the different meanings are not clearly distinguished, diminishing the interpretive clarity.

In particular the general conversation on the cultural-creative industry finds itself on this boundary of culture as collective conversation, and culture as a product; the publications do not usually state this explicitly, but through their attempts to understand what the forms of 'doing' culture in the cultural industry or sector may mean for society in general, the publications try to elicit the relationship(s) between the two.

This can be seen as a result of the disembedding of 'culture' from an all-encompassing life as totality. Delineating culture by profession is only possible once cultural life has been disembedded from the everyday life of the community. When cultural expressions are communal rituals that are embedded in the life-cycle of everybody, these are handed down traditions practiced as a collective, and cannot be understood as apart from other segments of life, nor as expressions of an individual. We can observe this in seasonal harvest rituals, rituals connected to birth and death of members of the community, religious celebrations and so on. It is a 'break with traditions' that Arendt notes is the pivotal, decisive occurrence of the 20th century (Villa, 2018); traditions and culture were disjointed from a natural part of life, becoming something abstract, to be studied, made available for 'handling'. Zygmunt Bauman (2000) similarly describes the disembedding of 'labour' during the industrial revolution which enabled farmers to re-arrange their lives, disentangling their identities from traditional agricultural trajectories and thus freeing up their labour for new activities, such as the urban, industrial work. Disjointing one aspect of life from others on the one hand engenders a specific term for it, distinguishing 'it', giving it contours and boundary; it also allows for combination and re-combination of 'aspects of life'. The diversity of combinations accordingly increases. Just like labour, disembedding 'culture' and then further departmentalising it allows for specialization and professionalization of it. In addition, when both these concepts have been disembedded, 'freed' from the constraints of a fixed context, culture and labour are open for combination. Consequently, a professional career can be imagined in the 'cultural sector', and 'cultural economics' becomes a reasonable field of study. It also enables culture and its sub-categories to be 'handled' like tools. Soublière and Lockwood (2018), for example, segment culture into four 'carriers' of culture: material, language, emotion and time. This can be understood as a suggestion of the 'tools' to be used by the cultural entrepreneurs. We can understand the study of cultural entrepreneurship in all its varieties to be attempts to examine this segmentation and categorisation, as it tries to articulate how practitioners are 'using' culture for a variety of activities.

The CCI discourse studies the specialization of the production of cultural artifacts and performances. The general segment examines how this affects and is affected by other societal trends. In some sense it observes the process of 'disembedding culture'. The creative city segment on the other hand studies how cultural production is employed and how this shapes urban, and since very recently, rural living environments.

The Organisational Imprinting discourse examines how communication in various ways is employed by individuals to create new ventures. In their communication the entrepreneurs strategically employ cultural symbols and signals with the aim to convince others in their venture or enterprise.

Similarly, the CCE discourse studies how norms and attitudes influence the behaviour of indi-

viduals that create new ventures, trying to disjoint, specify and name the aspects of 'culture' that affect these behaviours.

The Societal Imprinting discourse looks at similar phenomena, but on a broader scale; by 'breaking up' a solid cultural menu into a set of items which can be added or removed, collective identity can now be understood by loosely combined sets of cultural items. Thus, change is the creative (re)arrangement and combination of these cultural items.

Cultural entrepreneurs in all their facets are the 'skillful' operators of culture. They are perceptive individuals, identifying opportunities for re-arrangement and able to expertly handle their cultural tools to do this.

4.2   Entropy

Change, as I have alluded to earlier in this thesis, is quite difficult to account for. This makes growth theoretically difficult, because it is a type of change. I will begin this segment with a brief description of the concept of entropy; I find it to be insightful when discussing the concept of change.

In thermodynamics, entropy is the only process where time matters - matter always tends toward disorder; what this means is that, in a closed system, the enclosed entities drift toward maximal even dispersion. If the system is attached to another system and movement between the two is possible, the substance will begin to spread itself out in the new space. This drive toward maximum disorder can be compared to classic economic theory of market equilibrium. If a market is at equilibrium, there is no reason for it to change - however, as soon as it is out of balance, economic forces will pressure the market towards equilibrium. While the system is closed, there is no reason for it to change course toward a certain state of equilibrium. Once it has arrived at equilibrium, it will remain so. The trend may be disrupted by opening or redrawing the boundary of the system. This means that only while there are multiple, closed systems can change continue to occur.

The entrepreneur was integrated into economic thought and theory as a suggestion as to how and why change, disruption or growth occurs. Traditional economic entrepreneurs are inventors and innovators who invent a novel process, system, or gadget, and subsequently disseminate its use. This would result in society being able to produce more with the same amount of resources. Indeed, growth means that, rather than using less to produce the same, we use the same to produce more. When technological change drives economic growth, it is by making processes more efficient, and/or tapping into a previously unemployed, more potent resource. This allows us to produce more with the same input, and/or increase the available input.

There are other such processes of 're-arrangement', such as violent dispossession, or through gifting. In the end, change in a closed system cannot bring forth growth; for growth there must be multiple closed systems that are available to be opened and connected. Once opened, the subsequently combined system is disrupted, re-calibrating toward a new market equilibrium. It is possible to make that process more efficient, but it is not possible for a closed system to grow.

So how does the economy grow? This is what the field of entrepreneurship studies examines. It conceptualises economic growth to derive from individuals who perceive and exploit 'opportunities' (Kirzner, 1997; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). This has led to the question of the ontology of 'opportunities'; are they 'discovered' or 'created' (Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016)? Indeed, the idea that it requires perception to identify and initiative to subsequently act in order to actualize said opportunity implies that they (the opportunities) are there to be found like a treasure on an island.

Does this mean that there is an amount of dispersed opportunities, waiting to be found? Is this number infinite, or finite? What engenders an opportunity, does it have a life-cycle, does it cease to exist after a while?

Conversely, Sarasvathy (2001, p. 9) in a seminal paper on effectuation, proposes that entrepreneurial individuals are people who "believe in a yet-to-be-made future". Rather than trying to predict the future, it can be shaped (Sarasvathy, 2001). This means that opportunities are not to be 'found', but created - but how, then, are they made? Most of the time, the answer is found in the (re)combination of already existing products or ideas and their actualization through entrepreneurial sense-making (Wilson & Martin, 2015). Something pre-existing is re-framed, 'named', given a new meaning.

Change in the economy is also suggested to be an evolutionary process (Koppl, Kauffman, Felin, & Longo, 2015). In this line of thought, change is not made through singular events, but rather is a string of small changes, embedded within a more or less conducive environment of novel intermediaries (Koppl et al., 2015). A large aggregate of small changes slowly but steadily produce systemic, paradigmatic change. Not those with the ideas or the inventors are emphasized in this perspective, but those who facilitate the encounter between a diverse set of people, thus heightening the probability for a successful 'match' of ideas at the right time. They, in other words, shape the "'enabling constraints' [of the] system's adjacent possible" (Koppl et al., 2015, p. 8). For Koppl et al. (2015, p. 7), this process drives a trend toward increased 'cambiodiversity', meaning the number of traded goods. While the enabling constraints produce opportunities in the adjacent possible, this explanation merely shifts the problem of the ontology of opportunities into the adjacent reality, rather than addressing it head on.

These questions are still debated, and the epistemological dispute within entrepreneurship studies originate, among others, from imprecise, trivializing linguistic practices (Ramoglou, 2021). Indeed, Ahl and Marlow (2012) argue that the entrepreneurship studies are approaching an epistemological dead-end, unless they branch out and begin to more seriously consider the ontological and epistemological basis for who can be an entrepreneur, which activities entrepreneurship accommodates, and finally, what the concept of an 'entrepreneurial opportunity' entails. In an attempt to address this issue, Ramoglou (2021) departmentalizes opportunities, in order to clarify and de-trivialize the use of the term, suggesting a list of 'opportunity ingredients'; an echo of the cultural menu metaphor.

When considering the insights of from thermodynamic entropy, the discussion on what opportunities are boils down to - where does the input come from? Are we making processes more efficient, thus 'creating' growth (we do not need more of something, but we get more out of it[1]). Or are we 'discovering' new input to exploit? This relates to the cultural entrepreneur: how does cultural change engender economic growth? What is the type of change the cultural entrepreneur drives - does it create or discover?

Soublière and Lockwood (2018) posit: if cultural entrepreneurs would merely 'deploy' pre-existing meanings, this would be indistinguishable from a variety of management strategies. Their (Soublière & Lockwood, 2018) 'cultivation' metaphor resonates with the evolutionary strand, yet still puts the agency into the hands of the entrepreneur. They, the cultivators, or gardeners, are in charge of the well-being of their seeds and plants.

I interpret the cultural entrepreneur to re-draw boundaries and create channels between previously closed-off systems. By understanding the features of the different systems, they understand to what extent they can be intersected. Culture, as described above, is the 'software' that societies

---

[1]Does it mean we move 'faster' toward the equilibrium?

and individuals employ to understand things, make judgments, and act upon them. These cultural frameworks are becoming increasingly broken down into smaller components; this decreases the size and increases the amount of various cultural 'systems' existing. Subsequently, the recombination and intersections of systems becomes more varied, increasing the possibilities. The propensity for change is heightened. This does not necessarily mean 'growth' - it can mean a redistribution, since it depends on the scale one looks at: what can seem like 'growth' from the perspective of the human eye, is a mere redistribution in terms of natural resources on the planet; we are extracting and exploiting stored energy. But it can mean growth, or even de-growth, when the rearrangement means a more (or less) efficient application of resources, such as cultural change toward less extractive resource-exploitation.[2] Or by changes in the work-culture of a sector or profession, which may subsequently change the labour-conditions. This may increase or decrease efficiency, in terms of getting more or less work done in a day, or it may simply change the terms of how the produced resources are redistributed.

Finally, the combination of the 'economic' system with the 'cultural' system can also be understood as a disruption on a bigger scale, opening up the various sub-components of 'culture' and 'the economy' for combination and re-arrangement. This, to some degree, is the precondition for the academic field of 'cultural economics'.

In closing, by conceptualizing change in this way, I concur with Soublière and Lockwood (2018) who understand the work of cultural entrepreneurs to be one of cultivation of meaning, or as I described it, boundary drawing. This resonates with (Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016) who understand opportunities to be budding seeds that require to be nurtured in order for their unactualized propensities to flourish.

However, it also sheds a light on what 'sense-making' may mean - meaning in this way is understood as a select experience or impression that would be interpreted or decoded in a similar way within a closed system. While the system is closed, the amount of possible interpretations remain constrained by the existent interpretive frameworks. These systems can be adjacent, such as religious and scientific rationales maintained by the same person. To dislodge a phenomenon from the regular context, for example by trying to examine it with another framework, first requires it to be 'named', seen on its own rather than a natural, self-evident part of a larger whole. The cultural entrepreneur 'disembeds' it from its system, making it autonomous from its previously defining context. Consequently, a concept is unlocked for recombination; this allows it to 'mean something' within a new setting. Spinning the metaphor of cultivation further, it is an activity of 'disembedding' the seeds or plants from their natural habitat, and replanting them in a chosen space, where they need special care until they can grow by themselves; until they are embedded in their new 'natural' environment. They are 'made sense' within it, given meaning, naturalized.

I propose therefore to shift away from the term 'entrepreneur' when discussing such behaviour, as it trivializes the activity into one of simply identifying and exploiting opportunities, and associates it too strongly with purely economic and business activities. A conversation that is imbued with another terminological genealogy may engender completely different perspectives. It would shift the idealization of the Schumpeterian individual whose residues are still strongly embedded within all cultural entrepreneurship discourses I studied. While entrepreneurship may illuminate behaviour of business venturing and the study of nascent markets, these theories are not simply extendable into other scholarly domains; studying entrepreneurship within the cultural and creative industries is just that - the entrepreneurial activity within that economic sector. Using the term entrepreneurship for other purposes creates dissonance between related discourses, rather than enabling them to resonate with each other, cross-fertilize and work interdisciplinary.

---

[2]The 'energy' comes from somewhere - ultimately from the sun, in our case.

Instead, I propose the term "cultural gardening". It might not be a sexy term, but it echoes the ideas of cultivation, of patience, of paying attention to the environment. You cannot force a plant to grow where the environment is not suited. Plants are part of a complex ecology that coordinates and collaborates, just as it entails competition. It also reverberates more with the idea that we have of culture - we want a vibrant, a flourishing, a diverse culture. Not necessarily a growing, large, or efficient cultural life. A conversation on 'cultural gardening', the cultivation of change and meaning-making which in this way works against the pressures of cultural entropy would, I posit, better reflect the diverse activities extant in the current discourse on cultural entrepreneurship. It would moreover offer a different vantage point to approach the idea of change and growth. It sounds 'odd', perhaps; we have become increasingly used to the idea of economic terms being integrated into other linguistic domains and combined with other aspects of life, but it is not inherently more odd to integrate ideas of agriculture, which has been so important for human civilization. It is in fact often argued that farmers were the original 'entrepreneurs' (Albinsson, 2017); maybe, instead, entrepreneurs are a sub-type of horticulturists - the enterprising one. I suggest that the cultural entrepreneur is actually an enterprising cultural gardener.

4.3   Concluding Remarks

The various discourse strands discussed in chapter three can be seen as analyses of the process of 'boundary-(re)drawing' between closed off systems in various domains and scopes. It can be on the neighbourhood or city-level, re-combining 'industrial' with 'creative'; it can be on the organisational level, re-arranging the identity of an organisation, or elaborating it in its creation-phase, imbuing it with a novel combination of identity-'items'; it can be on the market or sector level where organisations coordinate stories of collective identity to attract an audience, and finally it can be on the national, regional and international level, for example as geo-political soft power, or as nation-building strategies. These levels clearly interact with each other, and the process is not one of singular boundary-drawing by an individual cultural entrepreneur. The amount of empirical case studies described in the data-set show that there is a multitude of cultural gardeners, working in parallel or in collaboration. The overall change that can be identified in hindsight is an aggregate of all those individuals' actions, and many more. However, if we accept the evolutionary perspective that emphasises process over single disruptions, some questions must be tended to: firstly, in biology, the evolutionary determinants are functions of the success of a 'species', often 'operationalised' by the a distinctive gene-pool. Thus, the larger and more diverse the total gene-pool of a species, the better its chances for subsisting. This can lead to perverse results for the individuals carrying the gene: one may cynically say that for cows, the human meat-industry is 'beneficial' - never have there been more bovines on the planet, and while the industry growths the gene-pool will grow as well. Secondly, the individuals have no agency when it comes to evolutionary processes; their desires and intentions are irrelevant.

Consequently we must ask ourselves: in the economic or cultural evolutionary trend towards increased diversity, cambio- or otherwise: who benefits? And what shapes this process?

The overall discourse on cultural entrepreneurship is asking these questions, predominantly implicitly. More emphasis should be directed toward articulating the underlying assumptions on culture, change / growth, and the actors who, in the end, carry out the processes that unfold.

First of all, making them explicit would enable a 'shared reality' to develop, if not a completely homogenous and solid one, then at least one that allows discussion. One of the major flaws of the aggregate discourse is that the various strands seem oblivious of each other, and a reason for this

may be the divergent operationalisations of core concepts such as culture.

That is not all, however. Some assumptions in terms of purpose neglect conceptual issues that should be tended to in order for future progress of the discourse on cultural entrepreneurship to be productive within the various strands. For example, economic growth and entrepreneurial activity is often given as a self-explanatory purpose for entrepreneurship studies ("entrepreneurial activity equals economic growth equals societal benefit"). This neglects the confusion(s) surrounding the underlying theoretical foundation of economic change, growth, and the role of 'opportunities' within this. While these questions may not be definitively answered anytime soon, acknowledging and referring to them would be a first step to accentuate the importance of them, bringing necessary attention to them. It would also highlight the shared subject and interest in how change occurs; recognizing a shared interest, subject, and problem would be a fruitful advance in diversifying the conversation by inviting other similarly-interested to join in. Therefore, shifting the terminology from an entrepreneurial focus may be helpful to accentuate the mutual interest in the cultivation of meaning, the question of agency of individuals within this process, and the constraints of the structure and environment. Naming it 'entrepreneurship' regrettably over-emphasises economic and business motifs in lieu of alternative aspects. Instead, I propose to call this process 'cultural gardening', which would open up a fresh vantage point, and better reflect the variety of activities and processes discussed in the study of the cultivation of collective meaning-making. The term addresses the complexity of the ecological balance that needs to be maintained, and allows new perspectives and epistemological advances to be made when it comes to the question of change and growth within an ecosystem, in this case for the economico-cultural interpretive framework within which cultural economics and entrepreneurship studies currently understands itself. It also invites the field to branch out, embracing an interdisciplinary approach that sees economic theories to be an additional asset, rather than a defining constraint. The study of cultural boundary-drawing and meaning cultivation should shed its constraining entrepreneurship-skin in order to advance into a more fertile epistemological landscape.

5

Limitations, Conclusion, and ways forward

Cultural entrepreneurship is still in an early stage of its development as a scholarly field. It is plagued by a severe lack of internal coordination, and is spread too thinly across the disciplines and across its various definitions. Even so, it has gained traction in the last two decades, and is clearly addressing a phenomenon that resonates with a broad array of scholars. I find that the term itself is poorly chosen, as it signals connotations which skew the conversations. Terms, words and concepts are the tools that scholars use in the social sciences. Indeed, much of the work scholars do is trying to find the appropriate words that describe a certain new, yet significant, observation and phenomenon. The term is then defined by the use of examples or empirical cases. With regards to cultural entrepreneurship, the various disciplines employ the term without showing awareness of parallel conversations on similar phenomena. Subsequently cultural entrepreneurship, as it gains in variance of definitions, attenuates in sharpness and clarity. Partially, this is a result from the concept of culture, ill-defined and obtusely difficult to capture. Moreover, entrepreneurship, while firmly grounded in economic theory, has been used in increasingly diverse conversations, beginning to lose its contours. In combination, the term cultural entrepreneurship not only carries this ambiguity within itself, but also perpetuates it.

Therefore, I suggest an alternative term for the phenomenon of meaning cultivation by individuals, as part of the collective process of cultural and societal transformation and change. This is not meant as a replacement of the term 'cultural entrepreneurship', but rather as an addition, which allows more clarity and specificity. 'Cultural gardening' on the one hand tends to the procedural aspect of this phenomenon, but also contains a different perspective toward growth: rather than the trivializing idea of an 'identifying and exploiting of opportunities' that captures profits from previously over-looked in-efficiencies, growth in regards to gardening is part of a complex process of decomposition and rejuvenation, firmly embedded in an ecological system. While it may initially 'feel strange' to use the term gardening, we may remember that the application of economic terminology in other domains of life is perhaps currently more naturalized, yet in no way inherently more natural than other terminology. This once again shows how terms, their associations, connotations and the various discourses they are part of heavily influence how we understand and perceive our world. Terms are in no way 'neutral'. As such, more attention needs to be given to scholarly terminology in social sciences, and how these terms are used and developed. It would be fruitful to better understand the process of term diffusion within academic discourses. What are the dynamics that lead to one term being established rather than another? One way to pursue this could be by embracing linguistic research knowledge to understand how people react to words

and navigate language. Acknowledging that Ramoglou (2021) notes that the linguistic terminology trivializes entrepreneurial phenomena, and Soublière and Lockwood (2018) articulate language to be a focal meaning-carrier, attention should be directed at how language is used in the field that is currently encompassed by the umbrella-term 'cultural entrepreneurship' and which spans many disciplines and a broad variety of topics. My thesis is a preliminary contribution towards this direction.

By studying the term 'cultural entrepreneur/ship' over a time span of two decades, systematically exploring the disciplines that use it and the ways it is applied, this thesis found itself part of of the research programme that endeavors to account "for a variety of socioeconomic processes and outcomes, including entrepreneurial efforts in high technology, in large, traditional bureaucracies, and in efforts aimed at generating social change." (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2019, p. 10). By the way of an in-depth qualitative discourse analysis of the term's usage, I propose an interpretation of two main concepts which are important and unify the texts that constitute the corpus: 'culture' and 'change'. This leads me to suggest that one way to advance this field in its development to "more generalized claims and theory" (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2019, p. 10) would be to employ an alternative term, 'cultural gardening', which would enable the conversation to move beyond the economically skewed perspective on social change. This alternative term better reflects the attention toward those two focal concepts, as well as the recent discussions within the studied discourses on processes of meaning cultivation.

It should be noted that qualitative, in-depth iterative coding and discourses analyses are time-consuming, and as no intercoder reliability was established, inherently subjective. Therefore, this study should be understood as a preliminary suggestion, limited by the scope of the project and by my subjectivity. Further studies in the same direction would be advisable to advance the study on societal change and collective meaning cultivation.

References

Adams, D., & Tiesdell, S. (2010, June). Planners as Market Actors: Rethinking State–Market Relations in Land and Property. *Planning Theory & Practice*, *11*(2), 187–207. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14649351003759631` doi: 10.1080/14649351003759631

Ahl, & Marlow, S. (2012, September). Exploring the dynamics of gender, feminism and entrepreneurship: advancing debate to escape a dead end? *Organization*, *19*(5), 543–562. doi: 10.1177/1350508412448695

Ahl, H. J. (2002). *The making of the female entrepreneur: a discourse analysis of research texts on women's entrepreneurship* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Jönköping International Business School [Internationella handelshögsk. i Jönköping], Jönköping. (ISBN: 9789189164369 OCLC: 186127721)

Albinsson, S. (2017). What Is so "Cultural" About Cultural Entrepreneurship. *Essays in Economic & Business History*, *35*(1), 365–390. Retrieved 2021-05-24, from `https://www.ebhsoc.org/journal/index.php/ebhs/article/view/55` (Number: 1)

Andersson, T. D., & Getz, D. (2009, December). Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between private, public and not-for-profit festivals. *Tourism Management*, *30*(6), 847–856. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0261517708002136` doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.008

Ansari, S. M., Fiss, P. C., & Zajac, E. J. (2010, January). Made to Fit: How Practices Vary As They Diffuse. *Academy of Management Review*, *35*(1), 67–92. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amr.35.1.zok67` (Publisher: Academy of Management) doi: 10.5465/amr.35.1.zok67

Ardichvili, A., & Gasparishvili, A. (2003, January). Russian and Georgian Entrepreneurs and Non-Entrepreneurs: A Study of Value Differences. *Organization Studies*, *24*(1), 29–46. Retrieved 2021-05-07, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840603024001679` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd) doi: 10.1177/0170840603024001679

Arendt, H. (1998). *The human condition* (2nd ed ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Banks, M. (2006, June). Moral Economy and Cultural Work. *Sociology*, *40*(3), 455–472. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0038038506063669` doi: 10.1177/0038038506063669

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge, UK : Malden, MA: Polity Press ; Blackwell. (OCLC: ocm44157073)

Bennett, A., & Janssen, S. (2016, January). Popular Music, Cultural Memory, and Heritage. *Popular Music and Society*, *39*(1), 1–7. Retrieved 2021-05-21, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/03007766.2015.1061332` doi: 10.1080/03007766.2015.1061332

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality: a treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Harmondsworth: Penguin. (OCLC: ocm41042255)

Besharov, M. L., & Smith, W. K. (2014, July). Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(3), 364–381. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amr.2011.0431` doi: 10.5465/amr.2011.0431

Bhatt, B., Qureshi, I., & Riaz, S. (2019, February). Social Entrepreneurship in Non-munificent Institutional Environments and Implications for Institutional Work: Insights from China. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *154*(3), 605–630. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10551-017-3451-4` doi: 10.1007/s10551-017-3451-4

Binnie, J., & Skeggs, B. (2004, February). Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualized Space: Manchester's Gay Village. *The Sociological Review*, *52*(1), 39–61. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00441.x` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd) doi: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00441.x

Bovone, L. (2005, December). Fashionable Quarters in the Postindustrial City: The Ticinese of Milan. *City & Community*, *4*(4), 359–380. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6040.2005.00143.x` doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6040.2005.00143.x

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualita- tive Research In Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Brooks, R., & Stanley, E. A. (Eds.). (2007). *Creating military power: the sources of military effectiveness.* Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press. (OCLC: ocm77575047)

Brubaker, R., & Feischmidt, M. (2002, October). 1848 in 1998: The Politics of Commemoration in Hungary, Romania, and Slovakia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *44*(4), 700–744. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/comparative-studies-in-society-and-history/article/1848-in-1998-the-politics-of-commemoration-in-hungary-romania-and-slovakia/FDDEDB94F2FE11F8864723C1931BF022` (Publisher: Cambridge University Press) doi: 10.1017/S0010417502000336

Bryman, A. (2011). *Samhällsvetenskapliga metoder.* Stockholm: Liber.

Byford, A. (2012, June). The Russian Diaspora in International Relations: 'Compatriots' in Britain. *Europe-Asia Studies*, *64*(4), 715–735. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09668136.2012.660764` doi: 10.1080/09668136.2012.660764

Byrkjeflot, H., Pedersen, J. S., & Svejenova, S. (2013, March). From Label to Practice: The Process of Creating New Nordic Cuisine. *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, *11*(1), 36–55. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15428052.2013.754296` doi: 10.1080/15428052.2013.754296

Bürger, T., & Volkmann, C. (2020). Mapping and thematic analysis of cultural entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, *40*(2), 192. Retrieved 2021-05-22, from `http://www.inderscience.com/link.php?id=107752` doi: 10.1504/IJESB.2020.107752

Calás, M. B., Smircich, L., & Bourne, K. A. (2009, July). Extending the Boundaries: Reframing "Entrepreneurship as Social Change" Through Feminist Perspectives. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*(3), 552–569. (Publisher: Academy of Management)

Chandra, Y. (2018, January). Mapping the evolution of entrepreneurship as a field of research (1990–2013): A scientometric analysis. *PLOS ONE*, *13*(1), e0190228. Retrieved 2021-02-14, from `https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0190228` (Publisher: Public Library of Science) doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0190228

Chang, W. J., & Wyszomirski, M. (2015). What is Arts Entrepreneurship? Tracking the Development of its Definition in Scholarly Journals. *Artivate*, *4*(2), 33–31. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.4.2.0011` (Publisher: University of Arkansas Press)

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (2010, September). Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies: Towards an Integrationist Methodology: Critical Discourse Analysis in Organizational Studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, *47*(6), 1213–1218. Retrieved 2021-05-28, from `http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00883.x` doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00883.x

Conversi, D. (2012, November). Irresponsible Radicalisation: Diasporas, Globalisation and Long-Distance Nationalism in the Digital Age. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *38*(9), 1357–1379. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1369183X.2012.698204` doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2012.698204

Covaleski, M. A., Dirsmith, M. W., & Weiss, J. M. (2013, July). The social construction, challenge and transformation of a budgetary regime: The endogenization of welfare regulation by institutional entrepreneurs. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, *38*(5), 333–364. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0361368213000561` doi: 10.1016/j.aos.2013.08.002

Cresswell, T. (2009). Discourse. In N. Thrift & R. Kitchen (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography (Vol* (Vol. 3, pp. 211–214). Oxford: Elsevier.

da Costa, A. d. S. M., & Silva Saraiva, L. A. (2012, September). Hegemonic discourses on entrepreneurship as an ideological mechanism for the reproduction of capital. *Organization*, *19*(5), 587–614.

Dallaire, G. (2020). The Figure of the Cultural Entrepreneur: A Political Construct. *International Journal of Arts Management*, *22*(2), 39–51. Retrieved 2021-02-15, from `http://search.proquest.com/docview/2434412827/abstract/E067D9D46A494A6FPQ/1` (Num Pages: 39-51 Place: Montréal, Canada Publisher: Management International Section: Cultural Entrepreneurship)

DeFrantz, T. (2004). *Dancing revelations: Alvin Ailey's embodiment of African American culture*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Dekker, E. (2018, June). Schumpeter: Theorist of the avant-garde: The embrace of the new in Schumpeter's original theory of economic development. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *31*(2), 177–194. Retrieved 2020-11-01, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11138-017-0389-9` doi: 10.1007/s11138-017-0389-9

Dimaggio, P. (1982, January). Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America. *Media, Culture & Society*, *4*(1), 33–50. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/016344378200400104` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd) doi: 10.1177/016344378200400104

Dimaggio, P. (2006). Nonprofit organizations and the intersectorial division of labor in the arts. In *The nonprofit sector: A research handbook* (pp. 432–461).

Dobreva, N., & Ivanov, S. (2020, October). Cultural entrepreneurship: a review of the literature. *Tourism & Management Studies*, *16*(4), 23–34. Retrieved 2021-05-22, from `https://tmstudies.net/index.php/ectms/article/view/1338` doi: 10.18089/tms.2020.160402

Elchardus, M., & Spruyt, B. (2016, January). Populism, Persistent Republicanism and Declinism: An Empirical Analysis of Populism as a Thin Ideology. *Government and Opposition*, *51*(1), 111–133. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/S0017257X1400027X/type/journal_article` doi: 10.1017/gov.2014.27

Ellmeier, A. (2003, March). Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relationship between the arts, culture and employment1. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *9*(1), 3–16. Retrieved 2021-02-17, from `https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000069158a` (Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/1028663032000069158a) doi: 10.1080/1028663032000069158a

Elo, M. (2016, March). Typology of diaspora entrepreneurship: Case studies in Uzbekistan. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *14*(1), 121–155. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10843-016-0177-9` doi: 10.1007/s10843-016-0177-9

Engelen, A., Heinemann, F., & Brettel, M. (2009, September). Cross-cultural entrepreneurship research: Current status and framework for future studies. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, *7*(3), 163–189. Retrieved 2021-05-07, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10843-008-0035-5` doi: 10.1007/s10843-008-0035-5

Enhuber, M. (2014). How is Damien Hirst a Cultural Entrepreneur? *Artivate*, *3*(2), 3–20. Retrieved 2021-06-01, from `https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.3.2.0003` (Publisher: University of Arkansas Press)

Essers, C., Tedmanson, D., & Verduyn, K. (2017). Critical Entrepreneurship Studies: a manifesto. In *Critical Perspectives on Entrepreneurship: challenging dominant discourses in Entrepreneurship.* London: Routledge.

Etzkowitz, H. (2014). Making a humanities town: knowledge-infused clusters, civic entrepreneurship and civil society in local innovation systems. *Triple Helix*, *2*(1), 1. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1186/s40604-014-0012-z` doi: 10.1186/s40604-014-0012-z

Everett, A. (Ed.). (2007). *Learning race and ethnicity: youth and digital media.* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. (OCLC: ocn159919409)

Faulconbridge, J. R. (2008). Negotiating cultures of work in transnational law firms. *Journal of Economic Geography*, *8*(4), 497–517. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://academic.oup.com/joeg/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/jeg/lbn013` doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbn013

Florida. (2002, January). Bohemia and economic geography. *Journal of Economic Geography*, *2*(1), 55–71. Retrieved 2020-01-21, from `https://academic.oup.com/joeg/article/2/1/55/924231` doi: 10.1093/jeg/2.1.55

Florida. (2004). *The rise oft the creative class: and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life.* New York, NY: Basic Books. (OCLC: ocm54065465)

Foster, R. F. (2003). *W.B. Yeats: a life.* Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). What Is Enlightenment? In *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Frey. (1994, July). How Intrinsic Motivation is Crowded out and in. *Rationality and Society*, *6*(3), 334–352. Retrieved 2021-06-02, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/1043463194006003004` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd) doi: 10.1177/1043463194006003004

Frey, B. S., & Jegen, R. (2001, December). Motivation Crowding Theory. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, *15*(5), 589–611. Retrieved 2020-10-03, from `https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-6419.00150` doi: 10.1111/1467-6419.00150

Frydrych, D., Bock, A. J., Kinder, T., & Koeck, B. (2014, July). Exploring entrepreneurial legitimacy in reward-based crowdfunding. *Venture Capital*, *16*(3), 247–269. Retrieved 2021-05-07, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13691066.2014.916512` doi: 10.1080/13691066.2014.916512

García-Cabrera, A. M., & García-Soto, M. G. (2008, September). Cultural differences and entrepreneurial behaviour: an intra-country cross-cultural analysis in Cape Verde. *En-*

trepreneurship & Regional Development, *20*(5), 451–483. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08985620801912608` doi: 10.1080/ 08985620801912608

Gehman, J., & Soublière, J.-F. (2017, January). Cultural entrepreneurship: from making culture to cultural making. *Innovation*, *19*(1), 61–73. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2016.1268521` (Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2016.1268521) doi: 10.1080/14479338.2016.1268521

Golant, B. D., & Sillince, J. A. (2007, August). The Constitution of Organizational Legitimacy: A Narrative Perspective. *Organization Studies*, *28*(8), 1149–1167. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0170840607075671` doi: 10.1177/0170840607075671

Hajjar, R. M. (2014, January). Emergent Postmodern US Military Culture. *Armed Forces & Society*, *40*(1), 118–145. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0095327X12465261` doi: 10.1177/0095327X12465261

Harrell, S. (2001). The Anthropology of Reform and the Reform of Anthropology: Anthropological Narratives of Recovery and Progress in China. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, *30*(1), 139–161. Retrieved 2021-05-21, from `https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.139` (_eprint: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.30.1.139) doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.30 .1.139

Harzing, A.-W. (2007). *Publish or Perish (Windows GUI Edition).* harzing.com/resources/publish-or-perish.

Hausmann, A., & Heinze, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship in the Cultural and Creative Industries: Insights from an Emergent Field. *Artivate*, *5*(2), 7–22. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.5.2.0007` (Publisher: University of Arkansas Press)

Heidegger, M. (2004). *Zu Ernst Jünger* (No. Bd. 90). Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.

Helle-Valle, J. (2004). Understanding Sexuality in Africa: Diversity and Contextualised Dividuality. In *Re-thinking sexualities in Africa* (pp. 195–210). Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet. (OCLC: ocm54973723)

Hjorth, D., & Steyaert, C. (Eds.). (2009). *The politics and aesthetics of entrepreneurship: a fourth movements in entrepreneurship book.* Cheltenham, Glos, UK ; Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Hoffman. (2004). Introduction. In *Storm of Steel.* Penguin Books.

Hoffman, Ashworth, K., Dwelle, C., Goldberg, P. K., Henderson, A. R., Merlin, L. A., . . . Wilson, S. J. (2015). Academic Engagement in Public and Political Discourse: Proceedings of the Michigan Meeting. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Retrieved 2021-06-16, from `https://www.ssrn.com/abstract=2965014` doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2965014

Hofstede, G. H. (1984). *Culture's consequences: international differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Holt, R., & Macpherson, A. (2010, February). Sensemaking, rhetoric and the socially competent entrepreneur. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, *28*(1), 20–42. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0266242609350822` doi: 10.1177/0266242609350822

Hoyte, C. (2019, June). Artisan entrepreneurship: a question of personality structure? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *25*(4), 615–632. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJEBR-02-2018-0099/full/html` doi: 10.1108/IJEBR-02-2018-0099

Hruschka, D. J., Schwartz, D., St.John, D. C., Picone-Decaro, E., Jenkins, R. A., & Carey, J. W. (2004, August). Reliability in Coding Open-Ended Data: Lessons Learned from HIV Behavioral Research. *Field Methods*, *16*(3), 307–331. Retrieved 2021-05-22, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1525822X04266540` doi: 10.1177/1525822X04266540

Ingram, P., & Clay, K. (2000). The Choice-Within-Constraints New Institutionalism and Implications for Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *26*(1), 525–546. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.525` (_eprint: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.525) doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.525

Ivey, B. J. (2008). *Arts, Inc: how greed and neglect have destroyed our cultural rights*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (OCLC: ocn173502767)

Johnson, V. (2007, July). What Is Organizational Imprinting? Cultural Entrepreneurship in the Founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, *113*(1), 97–127. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/517899` (Publisher: The University of Chicago Press) doi: 10.1086/517899

Jünger, E. (2008). *On pain*. New York: Telos Press Pub. (OCLC: ocn242559960)

Kaufman. (2001). *Modern hatreds: the symbolic politics of ethnic war*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Kaufman. (2004, August). Endogenous Explanation in the Sociology of Culture. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*(1), 335–357. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110608` doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110608

Khoury, T. A., & Prasad, A. (2016, September). Entrepreneurship Amid Concurrent Institutional Constraints in Less Developed Countries. *Business & Society*, *55*(7), 934–969. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0007650314567641` doi: 10.1177/0007650314567641

Kim, J. Y. (2016, July). Cultural entrepreneurs and urban regeneration in Itaewon, Seoul. *Cities*, *56*, 132–140. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0264275115300135` doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2015.11.021

King, B. G., & Whetten, D. A. (2008, September). Rethinking the Relationship Between Reputation and Legitimacy: A Social Actor Conceptualization. *Corporate Reputation Review*, *11*(3), 192–207. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1057/crr.2008.16` doi: 10.1057/crr.2008.16

Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process: An Austrian Approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, *35*(1), 60–85. Retrieved 2020-10-31, from `https://www.jstor.org/stable/2729693` (Publisher: American Economic Association)

Klamer, A. (2011, June). Cultural entrepreneurship. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, *24*(2), 141–156. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s11138-011-0144-6` doi: 10.1007/s11138-011-0144-6

Koppl, R., Kauffman, S., Felin, T., & Longo, G. (2015, March). Economics for a creative world. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, *11*(1), 1–31. doi: 10.1017/S1744137414000150

Kostopoulou, S. (2013, October). On the Revitalized Waterfront: Creative Milieu for Creative Tourism. *Sustainability*, *5*(11), 4578–4593. Retrieved 2021-05-07, from `http://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/5/11/4578` doi: 10.3390/su5114578

Kosut, M. (2006, January). Mad Artists and Tattooed Perverts: Deviant Discourse and the Social Construction of Cultural Categories. *Deviant Behavior*, *27*(1), 73–95. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/016396290950677` doi: 10.1080/016396290950677

Kwan, M. B. (2001). *The salt merchants of Tianjin: state-making and civil society in late Imperial China.* Honolulu: Univ. of Hawai'i Press. (OCLC: 247429725)

Langevang, T. (2017, August). Fashioning the Future: Entrepreneuring in Africa's Emerging Fashion Industry. *The European Journal of Development Research*, *29*(4), 893–910. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://link.springer.com/10.1057/s41287-016-0066-z` doi: 10.1057/s41287-016-0066-z

Leadbeater, C., & Oakley, K. (1999). *The independents: Britain's new cultural entrepreneurs.* London: Demos. (OCLC: 59362898)

Lena, J. C., & Peterson, R. A. (2008, October). Classification as Culture: Types and Trajectories of Music Genres. *American Sociological Review*, *73*(5), 697–718. Retrieved 2021-05-17, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240807300501` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc) doi: 10.1177/000312240807300501

Lindsay, N. J. (2005). Toward A Cultural Model of Indigenous Entrepreneurial Attitude. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, *2005*, 1. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.proquest.com/docview/200920143/abstract/77C1F754FDC643FFPQ/1` (Num Pages: 1 Place: Vancouver, United States Publisher: Academy of Marketing Science Review)

Lounsbury, M., & Boxenbaum, E. (2013, January). Institutional Logics in Action. In M. Lounsbury & E. Boxenbaum (Eds.), *Institutional Logics in Action, Part A* (Vol. 39 Part A, pp. 3–22). Emerald Group Publishing Limited. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://doi.org/10.1108/S0733-558X(2013)0039AB004` doi: 10.1108/S0733-558X(2013)0039AB004

Lounsbury, M., Cornelissen, J., Granqvist, N., & Grodal, S. (2019, January). Culture, innovation and entrepreneurship. *Innovation*, *21*(1), 1–12. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14479338.2018.1537716` doi: 10.1080/14479338.2018.1537716

Lounsbury, M., Gehman, J., & Ann Glynn, M. (2019, January). Beyond *Homo Entrepreneurus* : Judgment and the Theory of Cultural Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management Studies*, joms.12429.

Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001, June). Cultural entrepreneurship: stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, *22*(6-7), 545–564. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/smj.188` doi: 10.1002/smj.188

Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2019). *Cultural Entrepreneurship: A New Agenda for the Study of Entrepreneurial Processes and Possibilities* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/9781108539487/type/element` doi: 10.1017/9781108539487

Lounsbury, M., & Pollack, S. (2001, May). Institutionalizing Civic Engagement: Shifting Logics and the Cultural Repackaging of Service-Learning in US Higher Education. *Organization*, *8*(2), 319–339. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/1350508401082016` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Ltd) doi: 10.1177/1350508401082016

Malach-Pines, A., Levy, H., Utasi, A., & Hill, T. (2005, September). Entrepreneurs as cultural heroes: A cross-cultural, interdisciplinary perspective. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *20*(6), 541–555. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02683940510615460/full/html` doi: 10.1108/02683940510615460

Marquis, C., & Raynard, M. (2015, January). Institutional Strategies in Emerging Markets. *Academy of Management Annals*, *9*(1), 291–335. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/19416520.2015.1014661` doi: 10.5465/19416520.2015.1014661

Martens, M. L., Jennings, J. E., & Jennings, P. D. (2007, October). Do the Stories They tell

get them the Money They Need? The Role of Entrepreneurial Narratives in Resource Acquisition. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(5), 1107–1132. Retrieved 2021-05-20, from `https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/amj.2007.27169488` (Publisher: Academy of Management) doi: 10.5465/amj.2007.27169488

Merkel, J. (2015, January). Coworking in the city. *Ephemera*, *15*(2), 121–139. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from `http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/coworking-city` (Number: 2)

Mitchell, R. K., Smith, B., Seawright, K. W., & Morse, E. A. (2000, October). Cross-Cultural Cognitions and the Venture Creation Decision. *Academy of Management Journal*, *43*(5), 974–993. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/1556422` (Publisher: Academy of Management) doi: 10.5465/1556422

Mitchell, R. K., Smith, J. B., Morse, E. A., Seawright, K. W., Peredo, A. M., & McKenzie, B. (2002, July). Are Entrepreneurial Cognitions Universal? Assessing Entrepreneurial Cognitions across Cultures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *26*(4), 9–32. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from `https://doi.org/10.1177/104225870202600402` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc) doi: 10.1177/104225870202600402

Mokyr, J. (2013, March). Cultural entrepreneurs and the origins of modern economic growth. *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, *61*(1), 1–33. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03585522.2012.755471` doi: 10.1080/03585522.2012.755471

Mokyr, J. (2016). *A culture of growth: the origins of the modern economy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mommaas, H. (2004, March). Cultural Clusters and the Post-industrial City: Towards the Remapping of Urban Cultural Policy. *Urban Studies*, *41*(3), 507–532. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1080/0042098042000178663` doi: 10.1080/0042098042000178663

Morgan. (2004, April). Teacher Identity as Pedagogy: Towards a Field-Internal Conceptualisation in Bilingual and Second Language Education. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, *7*(2-3), 172–188. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667807` (Publisher: Routledge _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050408667807) doi: 10.1080/13670050408667807

Morgan, & Nica. (2020, January). Iterative Thematic Inquiry: A New Method for Analyzing Qualitative Data. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *19*, 160940692095511. Retrieved 2021-05-22, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1609406920955118` doi: 10.1177/1609406920955118

Navis, C., & Glynn, M. A. (2010, September). How New Market Categories Emerge: Temporal Dynamics of Legitimacy, Identity, and Entrepreneurship in Satellite Radio, 1990–2005. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *55*(3), 439–471. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.2010.55.3.439` (Publisher: SAGE Publications Inc) doi: 10.2189/asqu.2010.55.3.439

Neale, J. (2016, June). Iterative categorization (IC): a systematic technique for analysing qualitative data: Systematic technique for analysing qualitative data. *Addiction*, *111*(6), 1096–1106. Retrieved 2021-05-22, from `http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/add.13314` doi: 10.1111/add.13314

Newth, J. (2018, May). "Hands-on" vs "arm's length" entrepreneurship research: Using ethnography to contextualize social innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *24*(3), 683–696. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.emerald.com/`

insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJEBR-09-2016-0315/full/html doi: 10.1108/IJEBR-09 -2016-0315

Nicholls, A. (2010, April). Fair Trade: Towards an Economics of Virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *92*(2), 241–255. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010 -0581-3 doi: 10.1007/s10551-010-0581-3

Oakley, K. (2013, January). Good work? Rethinking cultural entrepreneurship. *Handbook of Management and Creativity*.

Patterson, M. (2012, November). The Role of the Public Institution in Iconic Architectural Development. *Urban Studies*, *49*(15), 3289–3305. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from http://journals .sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042098012443862 doi: 10.1177/0042098012443862

Pollack, J. M., Rutherford, M. W., & Nagy, B. G. (2012, September). Preparedness and Cognitive Legitimacy as Antecedents of New Venture Funding in Televised Business Pitches. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *36*(5), 915–939. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from http:// journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00531.x doi: 10.1111/j.1540 -6520.2012.00531.x

Pollard, V., & Wilson, E. (2014). The "Entrepreneurial Mindset" in Creative and Performing Arts Higher Education in Australia. *Artivate*, *3*(1), 3–22. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from https:// www.jstor.org/stable/10.34053/artivate.3.1.0003 (Publisher: University of Arkansas Press)

Raffo, C., Lovatt, A., Banks, M., & O'Connor, J. (2000, August). Teaching and learning entrepreneurship for micro and small businesses in the cultural industries sector. *Education + Training*, *42*(6), 356–365. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from https://www.emerald.com/insight/ content/doi/10.1108/00400910010353653/full/html doi: 10.1108/00400910010353653

Ramoglou, S. (2021, March). Knowable opportunities in an unknowable future? On the epistemological paradoxes of entrepreneurship theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *36*(2), 106090. Retrieved 2021-06-08, from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/ pii/S0883902620306984 doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2020.106090

Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. (2016). A Realist Perspective of Entrepreneurship: Opportunities As Propensities. *Academy Of Management Review*, *41*(3), 410–434.

Rampersad, A. (2002). *The life of Langston Hughes* (2nd ed ed.). Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press.

Ratten, V. (2017). *Entrepreneurship, innovation and smart cities* (No. 11). London ; New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

Ratten, V. (2020, September). Coronavirus (covid-19) and entrepreneurship: changing life and work landscape. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, *32*(5), 503–516. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/08276331 .2020.1790167 doi: 10.1080/08276331.2020.1790167

Richards, G. (2017, March). From place branding to placemaking: the role of events. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, *8*(1), 8–23. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from https:// www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJEFM-09-2016-0063/full/html doi: 10.1108/IJEFM-09-2016-0063

Roodhouse, S. (2006). *Cultural Quarters: Principles and Practice*. Intellect Books.

Roy, W. G., & Dowd, T. J. (2010, June). What Is Sociological about Music? *Annual Review of Sociology*, *36*(1), 183–203. Retrieved 2021-05-18, from http://www.annualreviews.org/ doi/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102618 doi: 10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102618

Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). What makes entrepreneurs entrepreneurial?

Sassatelli, R., & Davolio, F. (2010, July). Consumption, Pleasure and Politics: Slow

Food and the politico-aesthetic problematization of food. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *10*(2), 202–232. Retrieved 2021-05-13, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469540510364591` doi: 10.1177/1469540510364591

Sassmannshausen, S. P., & Volkmann, C. (2018). The Scientometrics of Social Entrepreneurship and Its Establishment as an Academic Field. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *56*(2), 251–273. Retrieved 2021-02-14, from `http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jsbm.12254` (_eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/jsbm.12254) doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12254

Schumpeter, J. (1961). *The theory of economic development.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Scott, A. J. (2006, January). Creative Cities: Conceptual Issues and Policy Questions. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, *28*(1), 1–17. Retrieved 2020-01-03, from `https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2166.2006.00256.x` doi: 10.1111/j.0735-2166.2006.00256.x

Scott, M. (2012, June). Cultural entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurship: Music producers mobilising and converting Bourdieu's alternative capitals. *Poetics*, *40*(3), 237–255. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0304422X12000198` doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2012.03.002

Seo, Y. (2016, January). Professionalized consumption and identity transformations in the field of eSports. *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(1), 264–272. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0148296315003306` doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.07.039

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000, January). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*, *25*(1), 217–226.

Shiller, R. J. (2017, April). Narrative Economics. *American Economic Review*, *107*(4), 967–1004. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://pubs.aeaweb.org/doi/10.1257/aer.107.4.967` doi: 10.1257/aer.107.4.967

Soublière, J.-F., & Lockwood, C. (2018, August). Cultural Entrepreneurship: Towards a Theory of Meaning Cultivation. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2018*(1), 11789. Retrieved 2021-06-10, from `https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMBPP.2018.20` (Publisher: Academy of Management) doi: 10.5465/AMBPP.2018.20

Stoyanov, S., Woodward, R., & Stoyanova, V. (2018, April). The Embedding of Transnational Entrepreneurs in Diaspora Networks: Leveraging the Assets of Foreignness. *Management International Review*, *58*(2), 281–312. doi: 10.1007/s11575-017-0336-9

Sun, W. (2009, December). Mission Impossible? Soft Power, Communication Capacity, and the Globalization of Chinese Media. *International Journal of Communication*, *4*(0), 19. Retrieved 2021-05-08, from `https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/617` (Number: 0)

Sá, E., Casais, B., & Silva, J. (2019, June). Local development through rural entrepreneurship, from the Triple Helix perspective: The case of a peripheral region in northern Portugal. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, *25*(4), 698–716. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJEBR-03-2018-0172/full/html` doi: 10.1108/IJEBR-03-2018-0172

Tedmanson, D., Verduyn, K., Essers, C., & Gartner, W. B. (2012, September). Critical perspectives in entrepreneurship research. *Organization*, *19*(5), 531–541.

Thornton, P., Ocasio, W., & Lounsbury, M. (2015). The institutional logics perspective. In *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An interdisciplinary, searchable and linkable resource* (pp. 1–22).

Ticona, J., & Mateescu, A. (2018, November). Trusted strangers: Carework platforms' cultural

entrepreneurship in the on-demand economy. *New Media & Society*, *20*(11), 4384–4404. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1461444818773727` doi: 10.1177/1461444818773727

Turney, J. (2003). *Lovelock and Gaia: signs of life.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Van der Borg, J., Russo, A. P., Lavanga, M., & Mingardo, G. (2005). *The impacts of culture on the economic development of cities* (Tech. Rep.). Rotterdam: Euricur.

Veblen, T. (1909, November). The Limitations of Marginal Utility. *Journal of Political Economy*, *17*(9), 620–636. Retrieved 2021-06-02, from `https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/251614` (Publisher: The University of Chicago Press) doi: 10.1086/251614

Villa, D. (2018). Totalitarianism, Tradition, and The Human Condition. *Arendt Studies*, *2*, 61–72. Retrieved 2021-06-02, from `https://www.jstor.org/stable/48511482` (Publisher: Philosophy Documentation Center)

Wagner, B. (2009). *Disturbing the peace: Black culture and the police power after slavery.* Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. (OCLC: ocn300462681)

Whitson, J. R., Simon, B., & Parker, F. (2018). The Missing Producer: Rethinking indie cultural production in terms of entrepreneurship, relational labour, and sustainability. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *24*(2), 606–627. Retrieved 2021-05-05, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1367549418810082` doi: 10.1177/1367549418810082

Wilson, & Martin, L. (2015, August). Entrepreneurial Opportunities for All?: Entrepreneurial Capability and the Capabilities Approach. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, *16*(3), 159–169. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.5367/ijei.2015.0189` doi: 10.5367/ijei.2015.0189

Wilson, & Stokes, D. (2004, January). Laments and serenades: relationship marketing and legitimation strategies for the cultural entrepreneur. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, *7*(3), 218–227. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://doi.org/10.1108/13522750410540227` (Publisher: Emerald Group Publishing Limited) doi: 10.1108/13522750410540227

Wowk, K., McKinney, L., Muller-Karger, F., Moll, R., Avery, S., Escobar-Briones, E., … McLaughlin, R. (2017, November). Evolving academic culture to meet societal needs. *Palgrave Communications*, *3*(1), 1–7.

Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011, April). Legitimating Nascent Collective Identities: Coordinating Cultural Entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, *22*(2), 449–463. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/abs/10.1287/orsc.1100.0613` doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0613

Yamada, J. (2004, April). A multi-dimensional view of entrepreneurship: Towards a research agenda on organisation emergence. *Journal of Management Development*, *23*(4), 289–320. Retrieved 2021-05-06, from `https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02621710410529776/full/html` doi: 10.1108/02621710410529776

Yavuz, M. H. (2016, November). Social and Intellectual Origins of Neo-Ottomanism: Searching for a Post-National Vision. *Die Welt des Islams*, *56*(3-4), 438–465. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://brill.com/view/journals/wdi/56/3-4/article-p438_8.xml` doi: 10.1163/15700607-05634p08

Yetim, N. (2008, November). Social Capital in Female Entrepreneurship. *International Sociology*, *23*(6), 864–885. Retrieved 2021-05-19, from `http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0268580908095913` doi: 10.1177/0268580908095913

Zubrzycki, G. (2016, January). Nationalism, "Philosemitism," and Symbolic Boundary-Making in Contemporary Poland. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *58*(1), 66–

98. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `https://www.cambridge.org/core/product/identifier/` `S0010417515000572/type/journal_article` doi: 10.1017/S0010417515000572

Zukin, S. (1995). *The cultures of cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Åsberg, R. (2001). *Ontologi.* uppl.) Göteborg: Institutionen för pedagogik och didaktik.

Überbacher, F. (2014, June). Legitimation of New Ventures: A Review and Research Programme: Legitimation of New Ventures. *Journal of Management Studies*, *51*(4), 667–698. Retrieved 2021-05-14, from `http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/joms.12077` doi: 10.1111/joms.12077

Appendix A

Below I have added the list of the publications sourced in the data-collection. The bold publications are those included in the final analysis, the italic publications are those excluded during the coding process.

Cites	Authors	Title	2000-2005
2323	Lounsbury, Glynn	Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and th	2001
1355	SJ Kaufman	Modern hatreds: The symbolic politics of ethnic war	2001
1065	Mitchell, Smith, Seawright	Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation de	2000
1000	H Mommaas	Cultural clusters and the post-industrial city: towards	2004
878	A McRobbie	Clubs to companies: Notes on the decline of political	2002
705	MB Holbrook	The millennial consumer in the texts of our times: Ex	2000
690	A Rampersad	The life of Langston Hughes: volume I: 1902-1941, I, t	2001
545	Mitchell, Smith, Morse	Are entrepreneurial cognitions universal? Assessing e	2002
526	P Ingram, K Clay	The choice-within-constraints new institutionalism an	2000
478	D Rae	Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptua	2005
455	M Banks, A Lovatt, J O'connor	Risk and trust in the cultural industries	2000
454	Z Acs, D Storey	Introduction: Entrepreneurship and economic develop	2004
432	J Binnie, B Skeggs	Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and con	2004
416	B Morgan	Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-interna	2004
339	S Patriarca	Numbers and nationhood: writing statistics in ninetee	2003
326	Zhang	A Chinese yuppie in Beijing: Phonological variation an	2005
260	A Ellmeier	Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relation	2003
249	D Rae	Entrepreneurial learning: a practical model from the	2004
240	Lindsay N	Toward A Cultural Model of Indigenous Entrepreneur	2005
228	RQ Mecham	From the ashes of virtue, a promise of light: the trans	2004

Cites	Authors	Title	2000-2005
2323	Lounsbury, Glynn	Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the	2001
1355	SJ Kaufman	Modern hatreds: The symbolic politics of ethnic war	2001
1065	Mitchell, Smith, Seawright	Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation dec	2000
1000	H Mommaas	Cultural clusters and the post-industrial city: towards	2004
878	A McRobbie	Clubs to companies: Notes on the decline of political c	2002
705	MB Holbrook	The millennial consumer in the texts of our times: Exp	2000
690	A Rampersad	The life of Langston Hughes: volume I: 1902-1941, I, t	2001
545	Mitchell, Smith, Morse	Are entrepreneurial cognitions universal? Assessing e	2002
526	P Ingram, K Clay	The choice-within-constraints new institutionalism an	2000
478	D Rae	Entrepreneurial learning: a narrative-based conceptua	2005
455	M Banks, A Lovatt, J O'conno	Risk and trust in the cultural industries	2000
454	Z Acs, D Storey	Introduction: Entrepreneurship and economic develop	2004
432	J Binnie, B Skeggs	Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and con	2004
416	B Morgan	Teacher identity as pedagogy: Towards a field-interna	2004
339	S Patriarca	Numbers and nationhood: writing statistics in ninetee	2003
326	Zhang	A Chinese yuppie in Beijing: Phonological variation an	2005
260	A Ellmeier	Cultural entrepreneurialism: on the changing relation	2003
249	D Rae	Entrepreneurial learning: a practical model from the c	2004
240	Lindsay N	Toward A Cultural Model of Indigenous Entrepreneur	2005
228	RQ Mecham	From the ashes of virtue, a promise of light: the trans	2004
226	E Strom	Converting pork into porcelain: Cultural institutions a	2002
223	J Kaufman	Endogenous explanation in the sociology of culture	2004
191	NC Wilson, D Stokes	Managing creativity and innovation: The challenge fo	2005
191	C Raffo, A Lovatt, M Banks, J C	Teaching and learning entrepreneurship for micro and	2000
182	J Wang	Culture as leisure and culture as capital	2001
162	TF DeFrantz	Dancing revelations: Alvin Ailey's embodiment of Afri	2004
152	K Healy	What's new for culture in the new economy?	2002
119	P Ngai	Subsumption or consumption? The phantom of consu	2003
116	M Lounsbury, S Pollack	Institutionalizing civic engagement: Shifting logics and	2001
107	S Guy, J Henneberry, S Rowle	Development cultures and urban regeneration	2002
103	J Yamada	A multi-dimensional view of entrepreneurship: Towa	2004
94	A Malach-Pines, H Levy, A Uta	Entrepreneurs as cultural heroes: A cross-cultural, int	2005
91	JD Kandeh	Sierra Leone's post-conflict elections of 2002	2003
90	A Ardichvili, A Gasparishvili	Russian and Georgian entrepreneurs and non-entrepr	2003
75	MB Kwan	The salt merchants of Tianjin: state-making and civil s	2001
75	M Santoro	What is a "cantautore?" Distinction and authorship in	2002
71	J Van der Borg, AP Russo, M L	The impacts of culture on the economic development	2005
71	J Helle-Valle	Understanding sexuality in Africa: Diversity and conte	2004
67	DE Omissi, AS Thompson	The Impact of the South African War	2002
66	R Brubaker, M Feischmidt	1848 in 1998: the politics of commemoration in Hung	2002
66	Harrell	The anthropology of reform and the reform of anthrop	2001
64	J Turney	Lovelock and Gaia: signs of life	2003
64	KB Halnon	Alienation incorporated:'F*** the mainstream music'i	2005
60	Green, GL	Marketing the nation: Carnival and tourism in Trinid	2002
58	NC Wilson, D Stokes	Laments and serenades: Relationship marketing and l	2004
58	RF Foster	WB Yeats: A Life II: The Arch-Poet 1915-1939	2005
56	KV Mulcahy	Entrepreneurship or cultural Darwinism? Privatizatior	2003
55	L Bovone	Fashionable quarters in the postindustrial city: The Ti	2005
52	S Baumann	Marketing, cultural hierarchy, and the relevance of cr	2002

52	S Hess	Authoring the self: Self-representation, authorship, ar	2005
			2006-2010
1645	PA Dacin, MT Dacin, M Matea	Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new th	2010
886	SM Ansari, PC Fiss, EJ Zajac	Made to fit: How practices vary as they diffuse	2010
804	C Navis, MA Glynn	How new market categories emerge: Temporal dynan	2010
769	M McGurl	The program era: Postwar fiction and the rise of creat	2009
695	ML Martens, JE Jennings	Do the stories they tell get them the money they nee	2007
609	D Getz	The nature and scope of festival studies	2010
464	V Johnson	What is organizational imprinting? Cultural entrepren	2007
413	*Steyaert, Hjorth*	*Entrepreneurship as social change: A third new movem*	*2008*
383	JC Lena, RA Peterson	Classification as culture: Types and trajectories of mu:	2008
381	BG King, DA Whetten	Rethinking the relationship between reputation and l	2008
380	D Chong	Arts management	2009
360	K Nurse	Culture as the fourth pillar of sustainable developmer	2006
343	SJ Kaufman	Symbolic politics or rational choice? Testing theories	2006
312	BD Golant, JAA Sillince	The constitution of organizational legitimacy: A narra	2007
306	L Karsten	Housing as a way of life: Towards an understanding ot	2007
251	R Sassatelli, F Davolio	Consumption, pleasure and politics: Slow food and th	2010
235	S Roodhouse	Cultural quarters: Principles and practice	2010
234	WG Roy, TJ Dowd	What is sociological about music?	2010
230	Janssen, Kuipers, Verboord	Cultural Globalization and Arts Journalism: The Intern	2008
222	TD Andersson, D Getz	Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between pri	2009
212	C Bilton, S Cummings	Creative strategy: reconnecting business and innovati	2010
211	M Banks	Moral economy and cultural work	2006
179	B Wagner	Disturbing the peace: Black culture and the police pov	2010
174	R Swedberg	The cultural entrepreneur and the creative industrie:	2006
164	D Adams, S Tiesdell	Planners as market actors: Rethinking state–market r	2010
156	R Holt, A Macpherson	Sensemaking, rhetoric and the socially competent ent	2010
150	R Galt, K Schoonover	Global art cinema: New theories and histories	2010
143	R Brooks	Creating military power: The sources of military effec	2007
136	W Sun	Mission impossible? Soft power, communication capa	2009
135	BM Sørensen	Behold, I am making all things new': The entrepreneu	2008
133	CM Rogerson	Creative industries and urban tourism: South African	2006
133	B Ivey	Arts, Inc.: How greed and neglect have destroyed our	2008
130	A Nicholls	Fair trade: Towards an economics of virtue	2010
128	N Yetim	Social capital in female entrepreneurship	2008
128	AM García-Cabrera, MG Garc	Cultural differences and entrepreneurial behaviour: a	2008
124	J Craik	Re-visioning arts and cultural policy: Current impasse:	2007
120	MM Mars, M Lounsbury	Raging against or with the private marketplace? Logic	2009
119	PA Woods, GJ Woods, H Gunt	Academy schools and entrepreneurialism in educatio	2007
112	A Engelen, F Heinemann, M B	Cross-cultural entrepreneurship research: Current sta	2009
101	P Duelund	Nordic cultural policies: A critical view	2008
93	N Yetim, U Yetim	The cultural orientations of entrepreneurs and emplo	2006
93	P Lugosi, D Bell, K Lugosi	Hospitality, culture and regeneration: Urban decay, e	2010
92	A Yue	Cultural governance and creative industries in Singap	2006
92	DJ McCarthy, SM Puffer	Convergence in entrepreneurial leadership style: Evid	2010
91	JR Faulconbridge	Negotiating cultures of work in transnational law firn	2008
90	F Van der Ploeg	The making of cultural policy: A European perspective	2006
88	M Kosut	Mad artists and tattooed perverts: Deviant discourse	2006

87	P DiMaggio	Nonprofit organizations and the intersectoral division	2006
85	A Everett	Learning race and ethnicity: Youth and digital media	2007
82	K Oakley, J Knell	London's creative economy: an accidental success?	2007

3870	PH Thornton, W Ocasio	The institutional logics perspective	2015
1497	FM Santos	A positive theory of social entrepreneurship	2012
976	ML Besharov, WK Smith	Multiple institutional logics in organizations: Explainir	2014
464	T Wry, M Lounsbury, MA Glyr	Legitimating nascent collective identities: Coordinatin	2011
408	D Frydrych, AJ Bock, T Kinder	Exploring entrepreneurial legitimacy in reward-based	2014
329	C Marquis, M Raynard	Institutional strategies in emerging markets	2015
294	AW Montgomery, PA Dacin, I	Collective social entrepreneurship: Collaboratively sh:	2012
275	J Merkel	Coworking in the city	2015
252	R Garud, HA Schildt, TK Lant	Entrepreneurial storytelling, future expectations, and	2014
233	M Scott	Cultural entrepreneurs, cultural entrepreneurship: M	2012
223	PD Jennings, R Greenwood, N	Institutions, entrepreneurs, and communities: A speci	2013
218	K Weber, MT Dacin	The cultural construction of organizational life: Introd	2011
216	JM Pollack, MW Rutherford	Preparedness and cognitive legitimacy as antecedent:	2012
202	A Klamer	Cultural entrepreneurship	2011
201	F Überbacher	Legitimation of new ventures: A review and research	2014
172	AA Gümüsay	Entrepreneurship from an Islamic perspective	2015
158	M Lounsbury, E Boxenbaum	Institutional logics in action	2013
154	L Varbanova	Strategic management in the arts	2013
150	ID Parkman, SS Holloway, H S	Creative industries: aligning entrepreneurial orientati	2012
132	D Hjorth, R Holt, C Steyaert	Entrepreneurship and process studies	2015
120	D Conversi	Irresponsible radicalisation: diasporas, globalisation a	2012
117	H Byrkjeflot, JS Pedersen	From label to practice: The process of creating new N	2013
101	AJ Hoffman	The BP oil spill as a cultural anomaly? Institutional co	2011
93	WJ Chang, M Wyszomirski	What is arts entrepreneurship? Tracking the developr	2015
89	V Pollard, E Wilson	The "entrepreneurial mindset" in creative and perfor	2014
86	K Oakley	Good work? Rethinking cultural entrepreneurship	2013
83	ED Konrad	Cultural entrepreneurship: The impact of social netwc	2013
83	RM Hajjar	Emergent postmodern US military culture	2014
82	Covaleski, MA, Dirsmith, MW	The social construction, challenge and transformation	2013
78	EY Zhao, M Ishihara, M Louns	Overcoming the illegitimacy discount: Cultural entrep	2013
77	JW Morris	Artists as entrepreneurs, fans as workers	2014
75	T Evens, L Hauttekeete	Challenges of digital preservation for cultural heritag	2011
72	K Main, GF Sandoval	Placemaking in a translocal receiving community: The	2015
64	T Buch, S Milne, G Dickson	Multiple stakeholder perspectives on cultural events:	2011
62	Kostopoulou, Stella	On the Revitalized Waterfront: Creative Milieu for Cr	2013
59	M Bassin, S Glebov, M Laruell	Between Europe and Asia: The origins, theories, and l	2015
54	A Byford	The Russian diaspora in international relations:'Comp	2012
54	*CK Volkmann, KO Tokarski, K E*	*Background, characteristics and context of social entre*	*2012*
53	GD Beckman, L Essig	Arts entrepreneurship: A conversation	2012
52	*N Wilson, L Martin*	*Entrepreneurial opportunities for all? Entrepreneurial c*	*2015*
51	M De Valck	Supporting art cinema at a time of commercialization	2014
51	N Schuermans, MPJ Loopman	Public space, public art and public pedagogy	2012
50	A Greenman	Everyday entrepreneurial action and cultural embedd	2013
47	H Etzkowitz	Making a humanities town: knowledge-infused cluste	2014
47	*Martinez-Canas, Ruiz-Palomin*	*Crowdfunding And Social Networks In The Music Indust*	*2012*

47	M Patterson	The role of the public institution in iconic architectura	2012
46	M Laužikas, R Mokšeckienė	The role of creativity in sustainable business	2013
46	J Mokyr	Cultural entrepreneurs and the origins of modern eco	2013
45	M Freeman	Transmedia Critical| Advertising the Yellow Brick Roa	2014
44	R Reitsamer	The DIY careers of techno and drum 'n'bass DJs in Vie	2011

			2016-2020
581	J Mokyr	A culture of growth	2016
477	Shiller	Narrative Economics	2017
236	*Bouncken, Reuschl*	*Coworking-spaces: how a phenomenon of the sharing ε*	*2018*
233	Elchardus, Spruyt	Populism, Persistent Republicanism and Declinism: Aι	2016
124	Y Seo	Professionalized consumption and identity transforma	2016
108	Theodoraki, Messeghem, Rice	A social capital approach to the development of susta	2018
107	Lukes, Stephan	Measuring employee innovation	2017
93	Elo	Typology of diaspora entrepreneurship: Case studies i	2016
87	Langley, Leyshon	Capitalizing on the crowd: The monetary and financia	2017
83	Boy, Uitermark	How to Study the City on Instagram	2016
81	Gehman, Soubliere	Cultural entrepreneurship: from making culture to cul	2017
80	Khoury, Prasad	Entrepreneurship Amid Concurrent Institutional Cons	2016
76	Richards	From place branding to placemaking: the role of even	2017
76	*Brüntje, Gajda*	*Crowdfunding in Europe*	*2016*
76	*M Gruber, IC MacMillan*	*Entrepreneurial behavior: A reconceptualization and ex*	*2017*
62	F Dufays, B Huybrechts	Where do hybrids come from? Entrepreneurial team l	2016
61	*R Garud, J Gehman*	*Theory evaluation, entrepreneurial processes, and perf*	*2016*
60	Ticona, Mateescu	Trusted strangers: Carework platforms' cultural entre	2018
52	Hausmann, Heinze	Entrepreneurship in the Cultural and Creative Industri	2016
48	M Lounsbury, MA Glynn	Cultural entrepreneurship: A new agenda for the stud	2019
44	Ferreira, Sousa, Gonçalves	Encouraging the subsistence artisan entrepreneurship	2019
38	Bhatt, Qureshi, Riaz	Social Entrepreneurship in Non-munificent Institution	2019
38	*Ríos-Carmenado, Ortuño, Rive*	*Private-Public Partnership as a Tool to Promote Entrep*	*2016*
38	Zhong, S	Artists and Shanghai's culture-led urban regeneration	2016
33	JR Whitson, B Simon, F Parke	The Missing Producer: Rethinking indie cultural produ	2018
32	Teixeira, Ferreira	Entrepreneurial artisan products as regional tourism ι	2019
31	Yavuz, MH	Social and Intellectual Origins of Neo-Ottomanism: Se	2016
30	*Heuser, Andreas*	*Charting African Prosperity Gospel economies*	*2016*
30	A McRobbie	Towards a sociology of fashion micro-enterprises: Me	2016
30	A Bennett, S Janssen	Popular music, cultural memory, and heritage	2016
29	V Ratten	Entrepreneurship, innovation and smart cities	2017
28	Pavlekovskaya, Urintsov, Star	The Impact of Digital Transformation of the Russian E	2018
28	Young	Game Changers: Everyday Gamemakers and the Deve	2018
27	J Blommaert	"Meeting of Styles" and the online infrastructures of ι	2016
26	Kim, JY	Cultural entrepreneurs and urban regeneration in Itae	2016
26	AA Gümüsay	Unpacking entrepreneurial opportunities: an institutio	2018
25	Sá, Casais, Silva	Local development through rural entrepreneurship, fr	2019
25	A Bennett	Conceptualising the relationship between youth, mus	2018
24	Hoyte	Artisan entrepreneurship: a question of personality st	2019
23	Chaney, Lunardo, Mencarelli	Consumption experience: past, present and future	2018
23	Thom, Marco	Crucial Skills for the Entrepreneurial Success of Fine A	2016
23	M Lounsbury, J Gehman	Beyond Homo Entrepreneurus: Judgment and the The	2019
22	M Lounsbury, J Cornelissen, N	Culture, innovation and entrepreneurship	2019

21	Pret, Cogan	Artisan entrepreneurship: a systematic literature revi	2019
21	Langevang, Thilde	Fashioning the Future: Entrepreneuring in Africa's Em	2017
21	V Ratten	Coronavirus (covid-19) and entrepreneurship: changin	2020
19	Newth, Jamie	"Hands-on" vs "arm's length" entrepreneurship resea	2018
19	Zubrzycki, Geneviève	Nationalism, "Philosemitism," and Symbolic Boundar	2016
19	B Singh, P Verma, MK Rao	Influence of individual and socio-cultural factors on e	2016
18	Stoyanov, Woodward, Stoyan	The Embedding of Transnational Entrepreneurs in Dia	2018