

This article was downloaded by: [Universitaet St Gallen]

On: 28 December 2012, At: 04:43

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tepn20>

Entrepreneurship as in(ter)vention: Reconsidering the conceptual politics of method in entrepreneurship studies

Chris Steyaert ^a

^a Research Institute for Organizational Psychology, University of St Gallen, St Gallen, Switzerland

Version of record first published: 13 Feb 2011.

To cite this article: Chris Steyaert (2011): Entrepreneurship as in(ter)vention: Reconsidering the conceptual politics of method in entrepreneurship studies, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, 23:1-2, 77-88

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2011.540416>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Full terms and conditions of use: <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The accuracy of any instructions, formulae, and drug doses should be independently verified with primary sources. The publisher shall not be liable for any loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand, or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.

Entrepreneurship as in(ter)vention: Reconsidering the conceptual politics of method in entrepreneurship studies

Chris Steyaert*

*Research Institute for Organizational Psychology, University of St Gallen,
St Gallen, Switzerland*

In this article, I look into Bengt Johannisson's experiments with enactive research in the so-called Anamorphosis Project. This methodological experiment was based on the assumption that to understand entrepreneurship, researchers themselves must enact an entrepreneurial process and reflect upon it by engaging in auto-ethnography. By connecting aesthetics and politics, this experiment guides us in seeing methodologies as more than just tools – actually as in(ter)ventions or inventive forms of intervening *vis-à-vis* societal or community issues. By conceptualizing the performance of scholarship as involving practices of enacting and engaging, I suggest entrepreneurship scholars to take into account the ontological politics of method and to anticipate what can be called methodological experimentation. Drawing upon non-representational theory and actor-network theory, I flesh out the notion of in(ter)vention by emphasizing both its performative and participative dimension.

Keywords: intervention; invention; methodology; experimentation; enactment; performance

1. Scholarship as assemblage and bricolage

My first memories of meeting Bengt Johannisson were as a doctoral student at conferences in the early nineties. I do not remember all that much of these conferences but I do recall Bengt's lively interventions. They transformed the slow, quiet and even dull rhythm of these events into something more noisy, chaotic and unpredictable. People would look up, stop taking notes, and move to the edge of their chairs. If I usually felt out of place at these meetings and found myself wanting to go explore the city, his participation made me stay – not because he made me feel at home but because his presence affirmed that it was really an option to think and act differently, even if that meant standing out and disturbing what one would expect to experience at conferences.

Even if many people pretended that entrepreneurship research was wildly exciting and implied breath-taking conferences very different from those in other disciplines (Steyaert 2005), I thought most people acted conventionally, not the least in the trivial ideas they propagated and the grey ways they presented them. At that time, I was more convinced than ever that entrepreneurship studies should be conceived of entrepreneurially and that its scholars' interventions should be bolder and braver.

*Email: chris.steyaert@unisg.ch

And with Bengt in the room, my idle hopes became true, at least a little bit. Something changed the atmosphere; the room became coloured with wit, sharpness, and above all, energy and acceleration.

At these conferences, I always looked forward to the final evening and its obligatory gala dinner. If Bengt Johannisson attended, I knew I could distinguish at least one person in a room filled with grey or dark suits (as stiff dresses were in the minority at that time). His appearance would make it clear that there were other options than to dress in straight attire: a suit in velour with a motif of green squares and finished off with a dappled bow tie. He walked around the corridors of the conference, almost unreachable in his attempts at networking, carrying a beautiful-looking bag instead of the usual attaché case. During one break, in cold and snowy Budapest, he went out jogging with Olav Spilling.

If there was very little that was entrepreneurial about entrepreneurship conferences, Bengt showed us, by example, that it need not be that way, and that every presentation, every question, every comment, every handshake at a conference can have the feel of a memorable intervention, of a detailed and precise confrontation, of speaking out boldly and freely. In his academic performances, other kinds of symbols, concepts, materials and resources were assembled (Latour 2005). To constitute the entrepreneurial and the creative of research, this performance documented the craft of bricolage more than the art of eccentricity, long before bricolage became an accepted and researched idea in the entrepreneurship field (Baker 2007).

These memories provoke several questions. What can we learn from the ways Bengt performed scholarship in entrepreneurship studies? Will we miss out on this engaged, experimental and provocative way of intervening? Are other artistically crafted assemblages possible and needed in the performance of academic, entrepreneurial scholarship besides those that steer directly at and take form through journal rankings? Is academic scholarship anything if not what Foucault ([1983] 2001) called *parrhesia*, an art of speaking out freely and frankly in public debates?

I want, in this essay, to relate these questions on scholarship as intervention with a discussion of how we situate, conceptualize and practice method. I thus approach the politics of academic scholarship by discussing and breaking open the conceptual understanding of 'method' in entrepreneurship studies and by giving method an ontological stance in how we act and intervene as scholars. By speaking of the politics of scholarship, I am concerned with how we imagine that academic scholarship can and must be conducted and how our scholarly practices are reflexive about how we assemble and relate such classical distinctions as theory, method, practice, education and intervention. In order to reflect on academic scholarship, and the subject positions available (Curtis 2009), I will first draw upon Bengt's research practices and refer, in particular, to his Anamorphosis Project, which inspired him to write a monograph on the essence of entrepreneurship (Johannisson 2005). Second, I will describe how Bengt interpreted this intervention as a way to understand entrepreneurship through the term enactive research, which I will take up to point at its potential tautological dimension. Third, I will translate these critical reflections on Bengt's experience into a call to reconsider the conceptual politics of method and to undertake methodological experimentation that can guide research in entrepreneurship studies. Such experiments are based on combining invention and intervention, and thus on associating the aesthetic and the political. What was once 'simply' an

original and provocative public academic action, I thus re-interpret as indicative of possible practices of in(ter)vention or research creation (McCormack 2008) in the future enactment of entrepreneurship studies.

2. An experiment between science, aesthetics and society

Bengt's long profession included several pioneering activities that were related to participating in a specific community and that were launched with provocative intensity (see Hjorth 2011 (this issue); Steyaert and Landström 2011). I want to focus on one specific event Bengt set up with others at the end of the second millennium – an experience that might easily be missed in international reviews. In this public action Bengt experimented with the possibilities of his and our scholarship. What is particular about this experiment – which he called an enactment – is that he mostly wrote about it as a solo author (Johannisson 2002, 2004, 2005, 2011); this makes it more of an exception in his oeuvre, as he preferred to engage in writing with colleagues and doctoral students.

The jewel in this solo work is a single-authored, engaging and colourful monograph in Swedish, entitled *Entreprenörskapets väsen*, which can be translated as The Essence of Entrepreneurship. My choice to focus on this book written in Swedish is not unimportant: we rarely reflect upon the political consequences of academic translation (Janssens, Lambert, and Steyaert 2004). While Johannisson's publications in English are widely cited, the fate of this study is that it is little known internationally (for an exception, see Cairns and Sliwa 2008), let alone used. This is quite ironic if we consider what Bengt wrote in the book's preface: 'This book paints the most important adventurous journey of my life, why I took it on, what I experienced and the kind of stories it makes me tell' (7, my translation). This becomes even more significant when he adds: 'Never before in my long research career has the entrepreneurship phenomenon captured me so much...' Indeed: never before.

The so-called Anamorphosis Project that he initiated aimed to stimulate regional development by connecting artistic and scientific activities. The project consisted of organizing an event: an art exhibition embedded in a series of 30 seminars. This was done by a core team of 12 people, part of an extended network of artists, researchers and cultural organizers. As it connected Växjö University (which had then just received university status) with the local cultural scene, it joined scientific and artistic creativity to meet the region's need for transformation and innovation. Symbolic of the bridge between art and science were the so-called 'anamorphoses'. An anamorphosis is a distorted image of reality which requires the viewer to use special devices or occupy a specific vantage point to reconstitute the image. This technique, which already figured in the work of Leonardo da Vinci, was as much an artistic invention as a mathematical construction (Johannisson 2005, 15).

In Sweden, the artist Hans Hamngren is considered the best known representative of this art form, which he applied in paintings, objects and graphics. Around his work, an art exhibition was organized in the Italian Palace in Växjö: this space, which literally lies between Växjö's urban cultural life and the academic life on campus, symbolized the newly created bridge between science, art and society. The activities related to this event ran through most of the month of September 1999, and the ambition was to stimulate what was called, with a wink, the

region's metamorphosis. Indeed, the programme was announced under the title 'from artistic anamorphosis to regional metamorphosis'.

While this event forms the practice of entrepreneuring, the book is supposed to be its 'theoretical' pendant, a possibility to enact an alternative form of knowledge creation concerning the essence of entrepreneurship. In *The essence of entrepreneurship*, Bengt connects entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship research as a practice of creative organizing. The story of this event is told in five chapters. After an introductory chapter, chapter two offers a conceptual understanding of entrepreneurship sketched in the form of foundational thoughts. Chapter three tells the history and chronology of the project's enactment: first its mobilization, and then its performance. Chapter four zooms in on various scenes of this creative process through seven reflective narrations. Chapter five deepens out and conceptualizes the reflections of this entrepreneurial experience: enacting entrepreneurship is the creative organizing that is both produced by and results in an event. Meanwhile, entrepreneurship as event combines what I interpret as three different layers: (1) the event as a stage, which brings a happening and entertainment and leads entrepreneurship into the experience economy; (2) the event as performance, a dramatized and dramaturgical scene that creates self-insight and identity through dialogue with oneself and others; and (3) the event as becoming an embodied creation process which, as in nomadic life, unfolds in genuine time.

As event, the Anamorphosis Project was materialized simultaneously as stage, performance, and becoming. The venturing process has been nothing less than an artistic (ad)venture, where entrepreneurial and research creation are seen to be constituted by similar practices of invention and intervention. In the next few paragraphs, I will discuss how Bengt used this experiment to reflect upon methodological practices, which he described in the book's appendix. However, rather than give particular value to enactive research and auto-ethnography (Fletcher 2011 (this issue)), I would like to interpret what Bengt did as a metamorphosis of method itself, something that can be aligned with current discussions on how to re-think method in an ontological rather than an epistemological realm (Law 2004; Law and Urry 2004). Therefore, I use this experiment to reflect upon the conceptualization of method, to think of methods as forms of engagement, where invention and intervention meet. The particular research creation is an assemblage, where method is no longer situated as the (sole) link between the conceptual and the empirical; thus method is situated not within the realm of technique but in the realm of practice, where it connects reflexivity (science), affect (art), and new possibilities (society).

3. Experimenting with methods: Enactive research as tautology?

In his own methodological legitimation of the art event, Johannisson (2002, 2004, 2005) emphasizes that enactive research is an interactive approach to conducting research, compared to other forms of researching, such as interpreting, developing, mobilizing and provoking (Table 1, Johannisson 2004; see also Johannisson 2005, 389).

What distinguishes enactive research from these other forms is that it begins in movements initiated by a researcher and culminates in an event. The researcher-becoming-entrepreneur combines participation and involvement

Table 1. Alternative interactive approaches: an overview.

Research approach	Objective	Role of researcher	Basic characteristic	Outcome of research
Interpreting	Insight	Visitor	Reflexivity	Narrative
Developing	Reform	Broker	Local dialogue	Agenda
Mobilising	Emancipation	Advocate	Bottom-up initiative	Resurrection
Provoking	Awareness	Provocateur	Friction – negotiation	Awakening
Enactive	Movement	Initiator	Experiment	Event

with taking distance and exercising reflexivity. Even if interactive approaches seem to be taking on different degrees of responsibility, this trend plays out at its extreme in enactive research: What more could (entrepreneurship) researchers do than take on entrepreneurial activities themselves? In enactive research, therefore, the researcher takes on complete responsibility: both to create the situation and to investigate it.

However, I suggest that the very notion of enactive research may be tautological, even if it is clear what Bengt means with his use of the notion – because, as I will argue, all research is enactive. Bengt’s invention of a genre called enactive research would imply that other research cannot be considered enactive. But could we not say that all research and the way it performs itself through and with methods (and other ‘actants’ such as financing, colleagues, institutions, offices, research fashions, technology, etc), is productive and enactive to a certain degree? This is the point that Law and Urry (2004, 390) made when they wrote that ‘social research and its methods are productive; they (help to) make social realities and social worlds. They do not simply describe the world as it is, but also *enact* it’ (my italics). Research is formed through social practices that form and materialize (another part of) the social world. For Law and Urry (2004, 391), the social sciences – and this is where I would situate entrepreneurship studies (Swedberg 1999) – are ‘in the business of ‘ontological politics’ as they are involved in the co-production of worlds. Social sciences are relational or interactive as they ‘*participate in, reflect upon,* and *enact* the social in a wide range of locations’ (392, italics in original). Law (2004, 159) clarifies that enactment refers to ‘the claim that relations, and so realities and representations of realities (or more generally, absences and presences) are being endlessly or chronically brought into being in a continuing process of production and reproduction, and have no status, standing, or reality outside these processes’.

One implication of this understanding is that the social sciences are urged to re-imagine themselves, their methods and their ‘worlds’. Even if Law and Urry do not explicitly emphasize it, in my view this means we must connect the inventive side of research with its interventionist side. That is, ‘... [i]f social investigation makes worlds, then it can, in some measure, think about the worlds it wants to *help* to make’ (391; italics in original). In this view, methods are considered performative: methods matter. That means that ‘they have effects; they make differences; they enact realities; and they can help to bring into being what they also discover’ (393). The performativity of methods does not mean that we can enact the world as we

want it, as social reality is ‘produced with considerable effort, and it is much easier to produce some realities than others’ (396). The production of reality is seen in an understanding of ontology that is compatible with the idea of events, of novelty, of creativity. While Law and Urry (2004) refer to actor-network theory and complexity theory, there is a broad range of theoretical alternatives within a creative process view (Steyaert 2007). What this especially means is that methods are not just a matter of epistemology but also of ontology. Alternating between different methods is not just a matter of changing perspectives but also of enacting different worlds. Methods can be imagined and developed so that they strengthen particular realities while they erode others.

Consequently, I see Bengt’s experiment as a reply to the question posed by Law and Urry: how to imagine methods that try to bring particular realities into being rather than letting go of other ones. The more specific variation that Johannisson offers is a rather radical form of social experimentation that connects the aesthetic with the political, but it is important to realize that this one variation is part of a broader arena of enactive research that Law and Urry point at.

Furthermore, let me stress that method is not a technique; instead it forms one of the possible instigators that, in connection with other research elements, constructs what Law (2004) terms a ‘method assemblage’. Method assemblages enact relations through which certain things are made present; meanwhile, other things are made manifestly absent (as that which is represented), or are made absent ‘as a hinterland of indefinite, necessary, but hidden Otherness’ (14). While Law emphasizes the dynamics between presence, absence and otherness in method assemblage, to understand the process of research creation as assemblage requires much more than thinking about methods, rules and criteria; it requires us to consider research creation as an aesthetico-political in(ter)vention. The hinterland of research combines such things as ‘tacit knowledge, computer software, language skills, management capacities, transport and communication systems, salary scales, flows of finance, the priorities of funding bodies, and overtly political and economic agendas’ (Law 2004, 41). Indeed, ‘[t]he list is endless’ (41), and the assembling itself is not necessarily methodical or coherent. Rather it is, according to McCormack (2008, 1), a ‘loosely concatenated set of associations between habits of thinking, research techniques, and ethico-political orientations’. It has the *ad hoc* contingency of connecting incompatible components into ‘a tentative and hesitant unfolding’, a ‘recursive self-assembling’ (41–2).

With regard to the kinds of interventions Law and Urry anticipate, they draw on Haraway’s notion of interference, and refer to social science method and its practices as a system of interference. Indeed, interference points at these practices through which research meddles in the production of social realities somewhere between invention and intervention. Actually, the notion Haraway (1997) stresses is diffraction; this is probably an interesting visual pendant to the idea of anamorphosis, as diffraction is equally based on and illustrated through the work of a painter. In writing her book, *Modest_Witness* (which has an email address as its full title), Haraway worked with the painter Lynn Randolph to develop various images and connections with her own writings. In the following quote, Haraway (1997, 16) situates what she wants to articulate with the notion of diffraction:

My invented category of semantics, *diffractions*, takes advantage of the optical metaphors and instruments that are so common in Western philosophy and science.

Reflexivity has been much recommended as a critical practice, but my suspicion is that reflexivity, like reflection, only displaces the same elsewhere, setting up the worries about copy and original and the search for the authentic and the really real. Reflexivity is a bad trope for escaping the false choice between realism and relativism in thinking about strong objectivity and situated knowledges in technoscientific knowledge. What we need is to make a difference in material-semiotic apparatuses, to diffract the rays of technoscience so that we get more promising interference patterns on the recording films of our lives and bodies. Diffraction is an optical metaphor for the effort to make a difference in the world.

I would indeed consider an anamorphosis a possible diffraction even if some might emphasize the assumption that a viewer who takes on a different angle will come to a 'true' view of the painting. However, there are several kinds of diffractions and interferences. Crucial in the feminist and activist epistemology of Haraway is that the image is not approached as a representation but as a possibility to make a difference, and especially to create a different subject position. Indeed, if methods are no longer about reflection – that is, about shifting the same elsewhere – but are instead about getting in the way of reality-production and deflecting it into a different direction, then research practices should make a difference, especially if the method is no longer innocent (Steyaert and Bachmann 2010).

4. Conceptual politics of method and methodological experimentation

Wrapping up, then, not only did Bengt Johannisson's methodological experiment introduce a new and rather rare form of (inter)action research, in my view it also made an opening to engage with the conceptual politics of method *tout court*. Not only is there enactive research (as Johannisson practised it in a singular way), more importantly there is enacting research: research that enacts worlds. Method that is mostly situated on a level of epistemology and knowledge production is re-invented and extended by pointing at what Law (2004) and Mol (1999) call its ontological politics, the kind of worlds we take part in, (re)produce and amplify.

Bengt's opening, and the interpretation I gave to it, are crucial because they can disrupt the narrow method discussions in entrepreneurship studies with a conceptual discussion on method that goes 'against method' (Feyerabend 1975), 'beyond method' (Morgan 1983) and 'after method' (Law 2004). We have come a long way from the time when people had to argue for the value of using qualitative methods in entrepreneurship studies (Gartner and Birley 2002; Steyaert 1998) or adopting interpretive (Steyaert and Landström 2011), narrative and/or discursive frameworks (Hjorth and Steyaert 2004). Today we find not just handbooks of qualitative methods (Neergaard and Ulhoi 2008), but also innovative (qualitative) methodology books (Hine and Carson 2007). While such handbooks make it legitimate to use qualitative research and even to open it up for methodological variation and originality, they sometimes refrain from being reflexive about the enactments that result from researching and instead emphasize the tool-like character of method. For example, Hine and Carson (2007, 319) say '[i]t is important for researchers to have at their disposal a range of techniques in their research arsenal (or toolkit) to employ', as they draw their book on innovative techniques to an end. Instead, methodological approaches are seen less as instruments of control and more as possibilities to experiment with. So, my initial argument about the Anamorphosis Project was not that we need creative methods as such (even if there is no intervention without

invention), but that we must understand, reflect upon and indeed experiment with the kind of method assemblages we can develop. That is, invention and intervention are mutually constitutive.

I want to emphasize two interwoven elements of such conceptual politics of method in the practice of in(ter)vention: a performative dimension and a participative dimension of in(ter)vention. I draw these aspects from Bengt's experimentation as it anticipated the idea that (entrepreneurship) research is an aesthetic performance with a public orientation and broad relevance. This anticipation figures towards a turn of entrepreneurship (research) that connects aesthetics with politics (Hjorth and Steyaert 2006, 2009; Steyaert and Hjorth 2002).

First, the performative dimension of in(ter)vention documents that research is always research creation (McCormack 2008) that is more than disciplinary and that follows a non-representational investment. This model of enactive research relates to the upcoming 'new' understanding of theory and knowledge as non-representational (Thrift 1999; McCormack 2008). Such a non-representational modus counters the idea that research can extract a representation of the world from the world 'because we are slap bang in the middle of it, co-constructing it with numerous human and non-human others' (Thrift 1999, 297). Theories (and methods, writings, and other research practices) cannot represent becomings – such as the process of entrepre-
neuring – and do not exist just to enable us to see the world better. Instead, they (per)form practices themselves. They are practical means of going on (Thrift 1999) and adding to the world (Massumi 2002); in short, they are performative.

Enactive research, together with other forms of research, is committed to a form of fieldwork which explores 'how different techniques of experience and experiment work to animate and inflect thinking with the force of the nonrepresentational' (McCormack 2008, 2). This is compatible with what Johannisson in Swedish called 'rörelse' as the objective of enactive research. This word means movement as much as being moved (in feelings and affects), thus investing simultaneously in the aesthetic and the affective to create movement. Research creation is the researcher's enactment of a space based on his or her participation in order to become 'affected and inflected by encounters with and within distinctive kinds of thinking spaces – where thinking-space is *both* a processual movement of thought *and* a privileged site at which this movement is amplified and inflected by novel configurations of ideas, things and bodies' (2, italics in original). Here, ethnography or other forms of field work are not included under the argument of 'nearness', 'deciphering the exotic' or 'having been there'. According to a representational logic, nearness provides 'access' so we can better know, better represent and give thicker descriptions. Instead, for a non-representational model (Thrift 2008), the value in the experience of 'being and been there' is considered to lie in the experience of this experience, in its encounters, in (being able to engage with) its moves, sensations and affects. Field work is an engagement with the affects that cross a certain site, through which movements can be made visible or amplified and a new thinking space becomes possible.

Second, the participative component of in(ter)vention lies in the unfolding assemblage or actor network where a researcher is only one of the (both human and nonhuman) actors or what is called in actor-network vernacular 'actant' or anything that has the ability to act (Latour 2005). Turning to actor-network theory, I suggest working with a broad and different understanding of participation (Michels 2010) by reconceptualizing it as a heterogeneous assemblage that attracts, connects, attaches,

and involves all kinds of actants through translation. Participation is then not a special or normative case of organizing and relating; instead, it forms a basic point of departure as ‘no science of the social can even begin if the question of who and what *participates* in the action is not first of all thoroughly explored, even though it might mean letting in elements which, for lack of a better term, we would call non-humans’ (Latour 2005, 72; our italics). For instance, in the Anamorphosis Project, an assemblage is produced by connecting artists, aesthetic objects, students, architecture, colleagues and the citizens of a mid-sized city. It connects human and non-human actants and assembles them into a contingent combination to produce the locality of Växjö as a ‘new’ social space. In this intervention, the creative and rebellious anamorphic images are brought in as a way to create a different engagement and dialogue in the urban community of participants. The intervention is geared as much at involving and connecting various actants as disturbing their habitual unfolding.

In zooming in on the interconnection between invention and intervention, we can emphasize that creativity and imagination go along with disturbance and activism (Hjorth 2011). What is set up is not one of the usual debates on a region’s development that strengthens the dominant (economic) discourse on ‘strong’ or ‘creative’ regions; rather, it questioned the customary notion of regional development by replacing it with the richer concept of metamorphosis. Nor was this just a critical counter-activity. What the playful title of the project suggests is that by scratching out development the notion of metamorphosis is instead drawing attention to transformation and interruption. Metamorphosis, according to Nietzsche ([1886] 1969), is creative affirmation on the condition that it passes through and encompasses the culturally accepted and the critically negated (Weiskopf and Steyaert 2009). This project does, on the one hand, hone in on the reflexive and critical aspect of research that Johannisson invested in. Johannisson (1995) always reflected upon his own paradigmatic, ethical and political position of research, and also emancipation, as he indicated: ‘such lessons may be used by the entrepreneurs themselves to initiate self-organizing projects, i.e. the research may become an element within an emancipatory approach’ (Johannisson 1995, 229). On the other hand, enactment also follows an affirmative action-based logic. An element of diffraction sets in, a belief that something different can and should come out of this: a metamorphosis. And this is done in an affirmative sense that resembles the activism of an artist. Artists are then ethnographers when ethnography means relating to the affectivity of public spaces and intensifying and expressing them in new images (Steyaert 2009). The connection between the researcher Johannisson and the artist Hamngren exists to create a new image of the city and a new affect in the city.

5. Conclusion

This, then, is the hypothesis (or the memo for the next millennium): to extend method into research creation, a form of in(ter)vention that combines invention and intervention, performance and participation. In(ter)vention is where aesthetics and politics meet to enact studies of entrepreneuring. What I have assembled here to explain in(ter)vention – a conceptual route after method that configures research creation as method assemblages producing interferences and diffractions – requires

that in the years to come entrepreneurship studies engage with methodological experimentation, in search of ‘a broader and more generous sense of method’ (Law 2004, 4). As methods and their practices ‘not only describe but also help to produce the reality that they understand’ (Law 2004, 5), we must reflect, simultaneously, upon the aesthetics and the politics of our methods as we go on to actively and practically expand them. To take the practice turn in entrepreneurship studies (Johannisson 2011; Steyaert 2007) also means looking upon our own research endeavours as everyday practices. After all, research creation is something that is practised; it is enacted in and through practices that can be explained through the idea of ‘crafting’: ‘To talk of enactment, then is to attend to the continuing practice of crafting. Enactment and practice never stop, and realities depend upon their continued crafting – perhaps by people, but more often (...) in a combination of people, techniques, texts, architectural arrangements, and natural phenomena (which are themselves being enacted and re-enacted)’ (Law 2004, 56).

If, in the years to come, we want to develop these practices of crafting, my sense is that entrepreneurship studies will have to go beyond epistemological discussions of combining quantitative and qualitative studies and invest in methodological experimentation and consider various options through which experimenting can be practised. In these research practices, aesthetic forms, design set-ups, and research techniques will have to be simultaneously experimented with, altered and brought together. Such methodological experimentation can increasingly be observed in the social sciences: consider how action research turns to creative arts and photography (Lykes 2001) or performance (Mieczkowski and Morgan 2001), how some are experimenting with non-representational method practices (Latham and McCormack 2009; Thrift 2008) and mobile methods (Büscher and Urry 2008), and how ethnography is turning to visual analysis (Knoblauch et al. 2009; Pink 2008). While it would require another paper to even begin discussing these various explorations, for now let me emphasize that these ontological understandings of method and these experimentations will enable entrepreneurship studies to become truly part of the social sciences; that is performative, participative, in short, enactive.

References

- Baker, T. 2007. Resources in play: Bricolage in the Toy Store(y). *Journal of Business Venturing* 22, no. 5: 649–711.
- Büscher, M., and J. Urry. 2008. Mobile methods and the empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory* 12, no. 1: 99–106.
- Cairns, G., and M. Sliwa. 2008. The implications of Aristotle’s Phronesis for organizational inquiry. In *The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization*, eds. D. Barry and H. Hansen, 318–28. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curtis, R. 2009. Inter-views or a view from nowhere? An experiment in method. Paper presented at the 6th Critical Management Studies conference, Warwick.
- Feyerabend, P. 1975. *Against method*. London: New Left Books.
- Fletcher, D. 2011. A curiosity for contexts: Entrepreneurship, enactive research and autoethnography. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 23, nos. 1–2: 65–76.
- Foucault, M. [1983] 2001. *Fearless speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Gartner, W.B., and S. Birley. 2002. Introduction to the special issue on qualitative methods in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing* 17: 387–95.

- Haraway, D. 1997. *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium.FemaleMan ©_Meets_OncomouseTM*. New York: Routledge.
- Hine, D., and D. Carson. 2007. *Innovative methodologies in enterprise research*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Hjorth, D. 2011. On provocation, education, and entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 23, nos. 1–2: 49–63.
- Hjorth, D., and C. Steyaert. 2004. *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Hjorth, D., and C. Steyaert. 2006. American psycho/European schizo: Stories of managerial elites in a hundred images. In *Management education and humanities*, eds. P. Gagliardi and B. Czarniawska, 67–97. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Hjorth, D., and C. Steyaert. 2009. *The politics and aesthetics of entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Janssens, M., J. Lambert, and C. Steyaert. 2004. Developing language strategies for international companies: The contribution of translation studies. *Journal of World Business* 39: 414–30.
- Johannisson, B. 1995. Paradigms and entrepreneurial networks: Some methodological challenges. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 7, no. 3: 215–32.
- Johannisson, B. 2002. Enacting entrepreneurship: Using auto-ethnography to study organization creation. Paper presented at the conference Ethnographic Organizational Studies, St Gallen, Switzerland.
- Johannisson, B. 2004. Between arm's length research and policy practices: Interactive approaches in Entrepreneurship Studies. Paper presented at the 13th Nordic Conference on Small Business Research, Tromsø, Norway.
- Johannisson, B. 2005. *Entreprenörskapets väsen (The essence of entrepreneurship)*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Johannisson, B. 2011. Towards a practice theory of entrepreneuring. *Small Business Economics* 36, no. 2: 135–50.
- Knoblauch, H., B. Schnettler, J. Raab, and H.-G. Soeffner. 2009. *Video analysis: Methodology and methods*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Latham, A., and D.P. McCormack. 2009. Thinking with images in non-representational cities: Vignettes from Berlin. *Area* 41, no. 3: 252–62.
- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the social: An introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Law, J. 2004. *After method: Mess in social science research*. London: Routledge.
- Law, J., and J. Urry. 2004. Enacting the social. *Economy and Society* 33, no. 3: 390–410.
- Lykes, M.B. 2001. Creative arts and photography in participatory action research in Guatemala. In *Handbook of action research*, eds. P. Reason and H. Bradbury, 363–71. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Massumi, B. 2002. *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McCormack, D. 2008. Thinking-spaces for research-creation. *Inflexions* 1, no. 1 (May).
- Michels, C. 2010. Räume der Partizipation: Wie man ein Kunstmuseum inszeniert. Unpublished PhD diss., University of St Gallen.
- Mieczakowski, J., and S. Morgan. 2001. Ethnodrama: Constructing participatory, experiential and compelling action research through performance. In *Handbook of action research*, eds. P. Reason and H. Bradbury, 219–27. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mol, A. 1999. Ontological politics: A word and some questions. In *Actor network theory and after*, eds. J. Law and J. Hassard, 74–89. Oxford: Blackwell and the Sociological Review.
- Morgan, G., ed. 1983. *Beyond method: Strategies for social research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Neergaard, H., and J. Ulhoi, eds. 2008. *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Nietzsche, F. [1886] 1969. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. London: Penguin Books.
- Pink, S. 2008. *Doing visual ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Steyaert, C. 1998. A qualitative methodology for process studies of entrepreneurship: Creating local knowledge through stories. *International Studies of Management and Organization* 27, no. 3: 13–33.
- Steyaert, C. 2005. Entrepreneurship: In between what? On the “frontier” as a discourse of entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business* 2, no. 1: 2–16.
- Steyaert, C. 2007. Entrepreneurship as a conceptual attractor?: A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 19, no. 6: 453–77.
- Steyaert, C. 2009. Enacting urban ethnographies of artistic interventions in the entrepreneurial city. In *ParCITYpate – Artistic interventions and Urban Space*, eds. T. Beyes, A. Deuffhard, and S.-T. Krempf, 382–465. Sulgen: Niggli.
- Steyaert, C., and M. Bachmann. 2010. Far from innocent: Reconceptualizing method in entrepreneurship studies. Paper presented at the Workshop on Building capacity in the new European school of entrepreneurship, Newcastle.
- Steyaert, C., and D. Hjorth. 2002. ‘Thou art a scholar, speak to it’ – On spaces of speech. A script. *Human Relations* 55, no. 7: 767–97.
- Steyaert, C., and H. Landström. 2011. Enacting entrepreneurship research in a pioneering, provocative and participative way: On the work of Bengt Johannisson. *Small Business Economics* 36, no. 2: 123–34.
- Swedberg, R. 1999. *Entrepreneurship: The social science view*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thrift, N. 1999. Steps to an ecology of place. In *Human geography today*, eds. D. Massey, J. Allen and P. Sarre, 295–322. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Thrift, N. 2008. *Non-representational theory: Space, politics, affect*. London: Routledge.
- Weiskopf, R., and C. Steyaert. 2009. Metamorphoses in entrepreneurship studies: Towards an affirmative politics of entrepreneuring. In *The politics and aesthetics of entrepreneurship*, eds. D. Hjorth and C. Steyaert, 183–201. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.