

The Ugly Duckling of Organizing - On Entrepreneurialism and Managerialism

Daniel Hjorth

SIRE, Växjö University/Lund University

Vaxjo, Sweden

Phone: +46-470-708-513 Fax: +46-470-821-23 e-mail daniel.hjorth@ehv.hv.se

Bengt Johannisson

Växjö University/Lund University

Abstract

Although scholars in the field seem to agree that entrepreneurship is about uniqueness and emergence, the research still lacks constructive understanding in both the academic setting and in the world of practice. Entrepreneurship is perceived as alien and stranger to those who believe in a manageable world. Juxtaposing management and entrepreneurship also reveals a number of differences with respect to images of the individual, the organization, and the context. The gap between the two practices is however not cognitive but ideological and thus favors management. A number of ways to cope with this ideological conflict without making "entrepreneurialism" submit to "managerialism" are available. Several of these strategies are dependent upon a more critical way of reflection concerning both management and entrepreneurship.

1. The Setting

Now, at the end of the twentieth century, entrepreneurship and small business is firmly on the political agenda. Even in national cultures impregnated with labor and employee values, as is the Swedish society, all politicians rhetorically acknowledge the need for entrepreneurship and the contributions of the small-firm community toward renewal and employment. However, little concern is shown for the persons and processes initiating change and creating jobs. Both ideological disagreements and general ignorance with regard to the sector stand in the way. Instead of recognising the small-business sector as a collective contributor to renewal and jobs, small firms are looked upon critically and as isolated economic units. The majority of them are, for good reasons, accused of being neither capable of nor interested in innovation and growth.

The small-business sector is however only one arena for entrepreneurship. Since we, with e.g. Gartner et al. 1992, Chia 1995, associate entrepreneurship with emergence and becoming, we believe that entrepreneurship is needed in many settings in the present turbulent society. The corporate context is an obvious arena for entrepreneurship; also this

context is itself today rising out of structures of inertia into a processual perspective on organizing. While many small firms lack both entrepreneurship and professional management, many entrepreneurial firms neglect management and many corporations deny the need for entrepreneurship. Other modes of reducing uncertainty are adopted. The search for uncertainty reduction preoccupies both the corporate business community and the academic scene. Firms are recommended to grow or merge, or at least build partnerships, in order to cope with complex environments. In organization research transaction cost and institutional theories have thrived during the last decade. In the light of emergent complexity theories this desperate search for a safe domicile appears to be pathetic, cf. Stacey 1992.

Entrepreneurship, being an anarchic and creative process, is usually renounced by those practitioners who believe they can and should firmly control, i.e. manage also genuine change processes. When innovation and organizational change are addressed by researchers it is without reference to entrepreneurship. Cf. e.g. Pettigrew and Whipp (1991), Stacey 1996. By way of their education the belief in institutions and organizational structures is very firm also among social researchers. Few of them are "intellectual entrepreneurs" in the university setting, cf. Chia 1996.

Thus, the dominating belief among both practitioners and researchers is that change, however radical, can and should be carefully managed. Training then appears as the most obvious way for activating and controlling entrepreneurship. While Peter Drucker's *Entrepreneurship and Innovation* is probably the most distinct exponent of this view, much of the literature on corporate entrepreneurship have a similar image of the phenomenon. Cf. e.g. Burgelman 1983, 1985, Pinchot 1985, and Stopford & Baden-Fuller 1995 for illustration and e.g. Hjorth & Johannisson 1994 for a critical comment.

The lack of recognition of the unique features of entrepreneurship - personal commitment, intentional (inter)action, creativity - seems to be partially self-inflicted. The lack of a distinct definition of entrepreneurship creates in turn identity problems in the academic community. It is not justifiable to use the notion of entrepreneurship interchangeably with either commercialisation of scientific unique findings or the small shop keeper. Our own view on this issue is, with Gartner, Stevenson and others, that entrepreneurship should be associated with the emergence of new ventures and how these are organized, how the creation of organization is accomplished. This implies that all firms during the creation period are entrepreneurial, even the new local shop, but also that very few remain so throughout the overall life cycle, not even firms originating in an innovation. This is obvious from a processual view, where the point is not the search for possible eternal characteristics of entrepreneurship. That search represents an "entitative" approach (Chia 1995) which has made much promising research into quasi-positivistic reports on the static.

Imprecise differentiation between small business and entrepreneurship also makes us inattentive to cultural differences with respect to entrepreneurship. In-depth research is not necessary to state that independent business - one important arena for entrepreneurship -

appears in Europe in the form of a stable family business firmly rooted in a region and in the USA setting as an evasive venture with founders as footloose as their creations. It may be that entrepreneurship in the European setting is more associated with other arenas than the small-business sector, e.g. the corporate and public ones. Entrepreneurship reflects (national) contexts much the same as cultural phenomena do.

Entrepreneurship research and education still have a low academic status, possibly because it is the business subdiscipline which diverts the most from existing university norms. Not only does it pretend to be able to introduce aesthetic values and creative action as a research field. Its ontological and epistemological foundations and the methodologies used challenges the still dominating positivistic paradigm in research. Entrepreneurship, disrespectful of any barrier, also invites practitioners to the academic reserve, not just as contributors to inductive theorizing. The experiential learning mode, both as an object for and feature of researchers themselves, is watched with suspicion by other disciplines. The fact that in both Europe and the USA money for establishing chairs and funding research is flooding only seems to increase the criticism from other disciplines. The art of entrepreneurship (as the creation of organization) does not allow itself to be grasped by the legitimizing language, as the science of management has. The modernist perception of rationality is then used to emphasise the need for effectiveness and control (Cooper and Burrell 1988, Law 1994).

The above arguments offer some explanation to the fact that entrepreneurship as both a concrete phenomenon and an academic discipline is being neglected, each in its context. There may yet be another explanation. As will be elaborated below, entrepreneurship and management are different in kind. This means that entrepreneurship is perceived as an alien and stranger to all those believing in a brave manageable world. This conflict seems to have escalated during the past few years due to the increasing public concern for entrepreneurship and small business. We therefore argue, later in the text, that entrepreneurship and management represent two different ideologies which compete on both the academic arena and in the business world. This proposition is the base for the rest of the paper.

We open the next section by providing idealized and juxtaposed profiles of management and entrepreneurship as organizing for stewardship and renewal respectively. In a second subsection we adopt a critical perspective and elaborate on the political dimensions of the two approaches to organising. We argue that only if managerialism and entrepreneurialism are recognised as ideologies will it be possible to understand the representations of both empirically, not the least as discursive constructs that are reproductive. In Section 3 we review different modes of coping with the two ideologies without denying the unique features of entrepreneurship. By this we mean to keep the discussion open, i.e. to close the conversation on the subject would be the destruction of a creative tension. In the last section we outline instead some contributions to the creative destruction of stigmatised stereotypes that threaten to close the debate.

2. Management and Entrepreneurship as Ideologies

2.1. Modes of Organising - Juxtaposing Management and Entrepreneurship

It is not fair, at least in some respect, to parallel management and entrepreneurship. The former has been around as a "social discourse" for so much longer than the latter. Management as a societal phenomenon, as an operationalization of rationality in the positive-technical sense, carries its root back to the Machivavellian days (1513), when the prince had to be guided into successful control of his people. "The Prince" is probably not the first but perhaps the most influential text on the subject of management. Influential in the sense that it starts a discourse of order that today, in its normality and neutrality, escapes reflection (cf. Deetz 1992). Management as a general way of handling matters and representing ideas on behalf of a principal has later drawn inspiration from the Enlightenment with its emphasis on the emancipation of the rational subject, cf. Lyotard's discussion (1984) on meta-narratives. Management is a norm, implemented as a normal, i.e. neutral, mode of organizing, cf. Hjorth 1996a, which makes it an ideology. Herbert Simon, the only winner of the Nobel award in the economic sciences who is not a full-blooded economist, made it possible for the administrative man to populate both academic textbooks and the business community.

Obviously the conflict between management, and entrepreneurship becomes most evident in the case of "corporate entrepreneurship" (the management perspective) or "intrapreneurship" (a variant of entrepreneurship). The intersection between entrepreneurship and organization as a field of study is far less studied than that between management (as a practice) and organization. Some research has nevertheless been reported, cf. Burgelman 1983, 1985, Strategic Management Journal 1990, Hjorth & Johannisson 1994, Stopford & Baden-Fuller 1995, and Hjorth 1996b.

In our mind any organizing endeavour needs interpretation and reflection concerning the notions, the "individual", the "organizational", and the "contextual". While our choice of the individual and the organization is obvious, the notion of "context" needs a comment. It does not refer to an untouchable and abstract environment. Instead we relate the context to what is concrete to the individual, i.e. within the lifeworld frame (Schütz 1964, Habermas 1984, 1995) influencing the individual and thereby the organization, through its partially dogmatic presence *for* (taken-for-grantedness) but also through the reflexive influence *of* the individual. The relation between the context and the individual is one of mutual creation (cf. Thompson & McHugh 1995).

Table 1 Featuring¹ Management and Entrepreneurship: a touch of romanticism

FEATURE	MANAGEMENT - Organizing of Stewardship	ENTREPRENEURSHIP - Organizing of Renewal
INDIVIDUAL		
Focal person Mission	Manager Agent and intermediary	Entrepreneur/intrapreneur Creator and actor
Interpersonal relationship Human conduct	Propagandistic (influence) Behavior	Pedagogical (dialogue) (Inter)Action
ORGANIZATIONAL		
Attention to Organizing through	Structure Task/role hierarchy	Process Personal networking
Outer regulation Realization	Formal boundaries Plan	Perforated boundaries Enactment
CONTEXTUAL		
Image of setting Time perspective	Institutional cage The existing	Potential space The becoming
Economic achievement Knowledge achievement	Return on Investment Common-sense enforcement	Cash surplus Sense making

¹We use featuring here understood as: "to picture or portray in the mind: IMAGINE" (Webster's collegiate dictionary, tenth edition)

In Table 1 above we feature "Management" and "Entrepreneurship" as relational constructs which uncover their differences on the three levels of analysis. Since we perceive the outcome of organizing in context as the impetus for individual action the circle becomes closed. As in play, the point is neither the subject taking part nor the play as a result, but the playing that is the simultaneous result of individuals' interaction and that which constructs the interaction as playing (cf. the parallel in hermeneutics: Gadamer 1975, Warnke 1987). Management represents organizing for administration of '*what is*' while entrepreneurship is organizing for renewal, i.e. of '*what could be*', the becoming (Gartner et al. 1992, Chia 1995).

Management is personified by the manager while entrepreneurship, as has been indicated above, encompasses both entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship (as this mutually creative relation makes clear, entrepreneurship is contextual, here indicated by the different 'names'). Nevertheless our point is that the two concepts overlap: entrepreneurship is generally associated with the creation and renewal of organizations, i.e. with organizing. Pinchot (1985) defines the intrapreneur as an entrepreneur who is operating within a firm. It is a witty phrasing yet misleading - no intrapreneur can operate only within a corporation. It is not the institutional ground but the enacted reality in entrepreneurial processes that decides the room for entrepreneurship. The context is thus not a spatial reference, but a lifeworld reference (cf. above). What is concrete to the individual contextualizes her/him in the process of creation.

The functions of the managerial and the entrepreneurial differ. The mission of the manager as a collective is to represent the board, and ultimately the owners. In such an intermediary position the individual manager controls without any personal direct involvement in the substantive operations. The entrepreneur, as any genuine creator, personally triggers concrete action - the creation is an outcome of the actions per se.

The manager organizes by taking advantage of the power attached to her/his position and uses this influence to implement orders. The entrepreneur initiates a dialogue guided by mutuality and equity, i.e. is as much concerned with the other party's gain and learning experience as with the own. The manager and the entrepreneur are both dependent on others to realize the venture, yet the ways to accomplish the task differ considerably. As a representative for the organization (and its owners) the manager behaves according to the expectations associated with the role. The entrepreneur, in contrast, takes intentional own initiatives or re-acts consciously to others' initiative and to external events. Interaction becomes the generic entrepreneurial mode of conduct.

Turning to organisational features, managers pay attention to structures as constructs established by the interests they serve. This is supported by a hierarchical way of organising and contractual control. Entrepreneurship itself is process, emergence. Any predestined structure, hierarchical in particular, is considered to be a hindrance to the successive moulding of a venturing career. Trust and empathy initiates and perpetuates exchange.

Where social and business concerns and existential and professional commitments combine, personal networking appears as a generic organising mode, cf. above and Johannisson 1992.

Management thrives in hierarchical structures which encourage introversion with respect to thought and resource control ("centripetal organizing", cf. Hjorth and Johannisson 1994). The outer boundaries become demarcation lines and ownership of resources is important. The ambition to control resources internally gives management the illusion that change may be rationally planned. Entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs in contrast perceive boundaries as lighthouses to guide own initiatives into the unknown. Thus the boundaries are perforated and resources needed flexibly controlled by their trust, associated with personal networking, not with ownership ("centrifugal organising", *ibid.*). Entrepreneurship is about enactment, i.e. committing oneself and others in such a way that objectives almost become self-fulfilling, cf. e.g. Starr & MacMillan 1990, Gartner et al. 1992.

Managers perceive the context of their operations as institutionalized wherein strong forces, such as the need for legitimacy and professionalization, streamline organizations, cf. e.g. DiMaggio & Powell 1983. Managers live in the present. Where no freedom of action exists there is little reason to be concerned about anything but what has been and what is. Entrepreneurs in contrast, look upon the context as a field of opportunities which have not yet been occupied. Entrepreneurs are constantly projecting new ventures - the becoming is theirs.

As agents for the corporate owners, managers have to be concerned about return on investment (ROI). This is the generic criteria by which their principals evaluate their performance. Managers are themselves triggered by outperforming others, adopting industry recipes, and seeking guidance in benchmarking. To the entrepreneur the only thing that matters is to have enough cash to finance emerging new projects. Entrepreneurs are personally challenged by literally making sense of equivocal settings.

Nonetheless, the stereotyped version of two different identities is perhaps not the result of a fruitfully organized attention. We suggest that the focus is shifted from the individual to the ideological, to the normative discourses by which - through different modes of construction - individuals are subjectified (Foucault 1982) as "managers" and as "entrepreneurs" (Hjorth 1996b). We problematize the background to the "given" dimensions above as ideologies manifesting themselves through individuals in organizing.

2.2 Managerialism and Entrepreneurialism - Two Ideologies

Management and entrepreneurship, as presented above, appear as two contrasted rationales concerning how to operate in the market. However, management has a status of

ideology, i.e. a normative discourse that constructs the subject as manager (Foucault 1982, Deetz 1992) and makes her/him a representative, a performer of managerialism. What is important here is of course that the management ideology is not a detached, extreme, movement but represents a set of norms which are taken for granted also outside the management profession, i.e. not just on the market but in society at large.

The hegemony of managerialism is certainly not matched by the history of entrepreneurship (therefore the unfair parallelism mentioned above). The characteristics of entrepreneurship, as described above, are not internalized and assimilated as normal. This lack of recognition is as obvious as the fact that entrepreneurship in its broader sense has provided us with many of the creations which we today take for granted. One interesting reason why entrepreneurship does not match the discursive 'qualities' of management is found e.g. in the writings of Hirschman (1977) where the 'fight' between passion and interest in Western thought is described. "Repress the passions!" was heard and the construction of the center and the periphery came into being. This means that the passionate, the intuitive, the spontaneous, the female, and the entrepreneurial were placed in the margins where we find them ever since, cf. Scott 1985, O'Connor 1996, Hjorth 1996a.

The very location in the margins makes it difficult for entrepreneurship to initiate a social discourse which has to be public in order to make entrepreneurship legitimate and acquire the position as a second viewpoint, as an alternative to managerialism. The marginalization of entrepreneurship is directed by managerialism. We here find the seductive myth, part of the core of western thinking since the days of Homeros, that has constructed the margins so as to be romantic, somewhat unattainable, and lonely. We find Horatio Alger in the core of American myths (Reich 1987), strengthened by the hollywoodistic genre of cowboyism (John Wayne rated as the most appreciated male actor almost 20 years after his death!). Also in modern narratives on the screen the lonely stranger keeps a position as savior and liberator. This implies that entrepreneurship as a marginalized phenomenon gets its ideology through the negation of managerialism or through the taboos of managerialist logic. In this perspective entrepreneurialism appears as an ideology of the outcasts. The entrepreneur becomes a hero to be called upon when the dominating mode of organizing - managerialism - can use her/him.

3. Opening the Duck Pond

There are different ways to approach the conflict between entrepreneurialism and managerialism. One is to accept it as a permanent tension basically because *entrepreneurialism and managerialism condition* each other. Entrepreneurs, and even more so intrapreneurs, are dependent upon (management) structures and other institutions in order to establish their own identity. Without managerialism no entrepreneurialism, and vice versa. Entrepreneurs can argue that too much administration will choke the organization

while managers may argue that there has to be some order if the creative action launched by entrepreneurs is going to benefit the organization (effectively).

Juxtaposing entrepreneurship and management brings up another contradiction. The complaints by entrepreneurs and owner-managers in general about inadequate legal frameworks and lack of understanding have become a ritual. The struggle for independence and venture success becomes more focused and in that respect easier inasmuch as the enemy is obvious. This kind of "*pragmatic symbioses*" can also be found in the former Eastern European countries, where the formal (and planned) and informal sectors support each other.

The struggle between entrepreneurialism and managerialism can also be approached by considering them *embedded in each other*. In the innovative, successful medium-sized family business there is a need for an efficient administration which will nevertheless have to subordinate itself to the entrepreneurial logic. In the corporate setting, in contrast, institutionalizing processes will give the management ideology hegemony. This means that intrapreneurial processes will have to continuously fight for space.

It may also be argued that the fact that the management and entrepreneurial ideologies *take turns in leading on the organizational scene*. The often quoted stage model suggests that when the venture is launched entrepreneurial values and norms of behavior should dominate (Czarniawska-Joerges & Wolff 1991). Continued growth calls for planning and administration and, as the need for revitalization comes, for entrepreneurship being looked for again. However, this image seems to disregard the inherent conflicts between the two rationales. We argue a consensus approach only reflects the fact that reasoning is caught within managerialism.

Even if we associate entrepreneurship with complex and unbounded organizing, the development of personal theories and double-loop learning, there are limits to reflections in and after focused action. In order to realize the benefits of each, management and entrepreneurship, and thus challenge the dominating managerialism, unique capabilities are needed. We may find them among intellectuals who have characteristics similar to those of entrepreneurs - being unattached, using wide networks, and having a critical view (Ezioni 1968). In addition, due to the reflective practice and access to different constituencies, they can disclose and therefore handle managerialism (and other ideologies). Elsewhere we suggest that "*intellectual entrepreneurs*", i.e. entrepreneurs combining an interest for intellectual and commercial affairs, are especially able to cope with complex challenges (Johannisson et al. 1997).

Yet another way of coping with managerialism and entrepreneurialism may be identified if focus is shifted from individuals and other subjects of action to the *linkages between acting subjects*. Such a relational approach elaborates the notion of entrepreneurship as organizing. Whether we then consider individuals or collective units is

secondary. There is an increasing concern for partnerships both within firms and between firms. Inside firms this may mean that an entrepreneur and administrator join forces simply because they compensate for each others' deficiencies. Outside firms "strategic alliances" are arranged to create a competitive unity.

However, there are even more intriguing cases on the relational theme according to previous own research. This suggests that *entrepreneurship mainly appears as a collective/relational phenomenon*, that search for viable entrepreneurship should focus the very linkages between person/firms. With respect to interpersonal structures one of the cases of intellectual entrepreneurship reported by Johannisson et al. 1997 clearly indicates that the venture would have been impossible without the unique combination of an intellectual, an entrepreneur, and a caretaker. In the industrial districts we have studied, which undoubtedly are extremely entrepreneurial as a collective, most individual firms are traditional. Nevertheless, due to self-organising processes they become jointly entrepreneurial when challenged (Dandridge & Johannisson 1996).

Let us finish these discussions by introducing the need for reflexivity in the study and analysis of organization. This need takes us further into a second round of the circle of understanding the phenomenon under discussion. We now shift the focus from a more epistemological-theoretical level to an ontological-reflexive one, following a recent discussion on that theme within postmodern approaches to the analysis of organizations (e.g. Cooper & Burrell 1988, Alvesson 1995, Alvesson & Deetz 1995, Law 1994). We suggest that the world view we enact in the study of entrepreneurship is important to uncover in a move of creative destruction. If we stick to the Permenidean world of monism, fitting the positivistic project with language to mirror nature well (Rorty 1980), we might be less fair to entrepreneurship as an art of creation. Neither the polyphony of voices in the field, nor the bricolage of a pluralistic world, a result of individuals believing in their ability to create their realities interactively, is then surviving our scholarly representations.

4. Conclusion: Pounding the Stereotypes - a Plea for Polyphony

We will then send some messages as we finish this text. The reporting herein also concerns our own writing. The stereotypes that we have used easily claim their space in any discussion on entrepreneurship, to a less extent on management. We hope to have succeeded in pounding these into the writing through the kind of creative destructive approach we have suggested. This destruction can be described as kicking in two directions (Horkheimer 1968) since it is directed toward textual constructs - such as this paper - as well as the constructor(s) - ourselves. This is the first message that we are sending: *writing on entrepreneurship needs reflexivity in the sense that the author has to be visible in the text*. The need for empirical studies (within our young art of practice) should then address the

question of a multiple authorship as a result of careful attention to the voices in the field, the storytelling that enables us to perpetuate entrepreneurship in dialogic relations (Steyaert 1996).

How things come to be constitutes what they are (as the processual rule goes) and thus we need to discuss the background leading up to the first message. In doing this, we send the second message, already mentioned above: *the need to reflect upon the world-view-in-use*. Chia (1995, 1996) has creatively described the shift from modern to postmodern organizational analysis, and the need for reflexivity in the latter. The difference between the Permenidean and the Heracleitean world views are here used to show how a perception of a monistic one world organizes our attention toward the static, structures, nouns, and being. These focuses include the relation between language and reality (as Gartner 1993 has discussed, see also Hjorth & Johannisson 1997) and the ontological level of life. The Heracleitean world view, seeing the 'world as many', organizes our attention towards the dynamic, the processes, the verbs, and the becoming. When studying entrepreneurship as a phenomenon defined as the creation of organisation, the Heracleitean world view makes us avoid the 'entitative' (Chia 1995) approach, i.e. the focusing on things, entities, and not relations. If we do not avoid this, we miss the essential tension that is unique for the unique (Bygrave 1989, Gartner 1993).

We hope to have opened the organization-creation question through this discussion of different modes of organizing, for stewardship and for renewal. Placing these within the frame of a temporarily used dichotomy, we were able to deconstruct stereotypes and through this bring the need for reflexivity into the study of entrepreneurship and management. The ideological dimension of these practices was necessary in order to apply a polyphonic approach to the world (see Bachtin 1991). Finally, the question of writing and authorship was briefly reflected upon. The ontological background to the need for multiple voices and for the escape from entitative approaches were touched upon. We see many interesting subjects for further research in almost closed problem area. We invite colleagues to join in the endeavor.

References

- Alvesson, M 1995, "The Meaning and Meaninglessness of Postmodernism: Some Ironic Remarks", *Organization Studies*. Vol.16, No. 2.
- Alvesson, M & Deetz, S 1995, "Critical Theory and Postmodern Approaches to Organizational Studies". In Clegg, Handy and Nord (Eds.): *Handbook of Organization Studies*.
- Bachtin, M 1991 (1963), *Dostojevskijs poetik*. Uddevalla: Anthropos.
- Burgelman, R A 1983, "Corporate Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management: Insights from a Process Study", *Management Science*, Vol. 29, pp. 1349 - 1364.

- Burgelman, R A 1985, "Applying the Methodology of Grounded Theorizing in Strategic Management: A Summary of Recent Findings and their Implications", *Advances in Strategic Management*, Vol 3, pp. 83 - 99.
- Bygrave, W D 1989, "The Entrepreneurship Paradigm (1): A Philosophical at Its Research Methodologies", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Fall, pp. 7 - 26.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B & Wolff, R 1991, "Leaders, Managers, and Entrepreneurs: On and Off the Organizational Stage." *Organization Studies*. Vol. 12, No. 4.
- Chia, R 1995, "From Modern to Postmodern Organizational Analysis2. *Organization Studies* .Vol. 16, No 4, pp. 579-604.
- Chia, R 1996, "The Problem of Reflexivity in Organizational Research: Towards a Postmodern Science of Organization". *Organization*. Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 31-59.
- Cooper, R & Burrell, G 1988, "Modernism, Postmodernism and Organizational Analysis: An Introduction". *Organization Studies*. Vol. 9, pp. 91-112.
- Dandridge, T & Johansson, B 1996, "Entrepreneurship and Self-Organising: Personal Networks in Spatial Systems of Small Firms. " In Zineldin, M (Ed.) *Strategic Relationship Management*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. Pp. 219-238.
- Deetz, S A 1992, *Democracy in an Age of Corporate Colonization: Developments in Communication and the Politics of Everyday Life*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Foucault, M 1982, "The Subject of Power", in Dreyfus, H and Rabinow, P (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*, Sussex: Harvester.
- Dimaggio, P J & Powell, W 1983, "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*. Vol. 48, pp. 147-160.
- Ezioni, A 1968, *The Active Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Gadamer, H-G 1975, *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed & Ward
- Gartner, W 1993, "Words Lead to Deeds: Towards an Organizational Emergence Vocabulary", *Journal of Business Venturing*. No 8, pp. 231 - 239.
- Gartner, W, Bird, B J & J A Starr 1992, "Acting as if: Differentiating Entrepreneurial from Organizational Behaviour", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practise*, Spring.
- Habermas, J 1984, *The Theory of Communicative Action Vol 1*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J 1995, *Kommunikativt handlande: Texter om språk, rationalitet och samhälle*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Hirschman, A O 1977, *The Passions and the Interests*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hjorth, D 1996a, "The Kamikaze-Pilots of Organising". Paper presented at the *14th SCOS-conference*, L.A, CA, July 1996.
- Hjorth, D 1996b, "Intrapreneurship as a Mode of Organising - a Critical Ethnographic Approach". *Seminar paper*. Lund: Lund University.

- Hjorth, D & Johannisson, B 1994, "Between Corporate Strategy and Individual Initiative - Shifting Perspective on Corporate Entrepreneurship as a Course for Business Renewal", Halmstad, *SIRE Working Paper 1994:1*.
- Hjorth, D & Johannisson, B 1997, "Training for Entrepreneurship - Playing and Language-Games. An Inquiry into the Swedish Education System". Paper submitted to the 42 *ICSB Conference*, San Francisco, California, June.
- Horkheimer, M (1968) 1995, *Critical Theory*, New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
- Johannisson, B 1992, "Entrepreneurship - The Management of Ambiguity". In Polesie, T & Johansson, I-L (Eds.) *Responsibility and Accounting - The Organizational Regulation of Boundary Conditions*. Lund: Studentlitteratur. Pp. 155-179.
- Johannisson, B & Kwiatkowski, S & Dandridge, T 1997, "Intellectual Entrepreneurship - Emerging Identity in a Learning Perspective." Paper submitted to the 42nd *ICSB Conference*. San Francisco. June 21-24 1997.
- Law, J 1994, *Organizing Modernity*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Liotard, J-F 1984, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report of Knowledge*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Machiavelli, N (1513) 1992, *The Prince*. New York: Collier & Son Company.
- O'Connor, E 1996, "Lines of authority: Readings of Foundational Texts on the Profession of Management", *Journal of Management History*.
- Pinchot, G III 1985, *Intrapreneuring*, New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row New York Press.
- Reich, R 1987, "Entrepreneurship Reconsidered: The Team as a Hero", *Harvard Business Review*. May-June.
- Rorty, R 1980, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Scott, W G 1985, "Organizational Revolution: An End to Managerial Orthodoxy"., *Administration & Society*. Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 149-170.
- Schütz, A 1962, *Collected Papers 1: The Problem of Social Reality*. Haag: Nijhoff.
- Stacey, R D 1992, *Managing the Unknowable*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stacey, R D 1996, *Complexity and Creativity in Organizations*. San Francisco: Berlett-Koehler.
- Starr, J A & MacMillan, I C 1990 "Resource Cooptation Via Social Contracting: Resource Acquisition Strategies for New Ventures." *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 11. Special Issue on Corporate Entrepreneurship. Pp 79-92.
- Steyaert, C 1996, *Perpetuating Entrepreneurship through Dialogue. Dissertation*. Leuven, Belgium.
- Stopford, R D & Baden-Fuller, C W F 1994, "Creating Corporate Entrepreneurship". *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 521 - 536.
- Thompson, P & McHugh, D 1995 (2nd ed.), *Work Organisations - A Critical Introduction*, London: MacMillan.
- Warnke, G 1987, *Hans-Georg Gadamer - Hermeneutik och tradition*. Göteborg: Daidalos.