



Citation for published version:

Crawford, GC, Dimov, D & McKelvey, B 2016, 'Realism, empiricism, and fetishism in the study of entrepreneurship', *Journal of Management Inquiry*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 168-170.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492615601506>

DOI:

[10.1177/1056492615601506](https://doi.org/10.1177/1056492615601506)

Publication date:

2016

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Realism, Empiricism, and Fetishism in the Study of Entrepreneurship

G. Christopher Crawford¹

Dimo Dimov²

Bill McKelvey³

Keywords

entrepreneurial phenomena, entrepreneurial discovery, entrepreneurial creation, falsifiable theory, empirical research, epistemology, realism, fetishism

Forthcoming in Journal of Management Inquiry.

Corresponding author

G. Christopher Crawford, Ohio University, College of Business, Copeland Hall 304, Athens, Ohio 45701, USA. Tel. +1 513-295-8717, Email: crawforg@ohio.edu.

¹ Ohio University, USA

² University of Bath, UK.

³ UCLA Anderson School of Management, USA.

There have been persistent attempts to portray arguments about the ontological nature of opportunities as a core issue for building theory about entrepreneurship. A “discovery” view of opportunities as “objective phenomena that are not known to all parties at all times” (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000, p. 220) is contrasted with a “creation” view of opportunities as “created endogenously by the actions of entrepreneurs” (Alvarez, Barney, & Anderson, 2013, p. 3). The unsettled debate between these perspectives has become taken for granted and morphed into a philosophical discourse around the meaning of “objective.” A recent critique suggests that opportunities are not ontologically objective, but “merely” epistemologically so due to the impossibility of the former claim to “make contact with the world somewhere, typically by means of a test, however indirect” (Alvarez, Barney, McBride, & Wuebker, 2014, p. 228).

As tempting as it is to indulge in such debate, we argue that this dialogue does not help scholars build falsifiable theory and, moreover, amounts to theoretical “fetishism” that is detached from empirical reality. We appreciate that behind the dialogue lies a motivation to make research on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial opportunities more theoretically robust. Indeed, it is important for scholars to understand their own philosophical lens and be aware of its limitations. Realism calls for explanations of entrepreneurial phenomena, whether: (1) entrepreneurially relevant phenomena ontologically exist before an entrepreneur creates a new idea or product; (2) an entrepreneur first creates an idea that later becomes ontologically real; or (3) elements of both occur. Needless to say, either of the processes that lead to (1) the discovery of ontologically existing phenomena that allow a new idea to become reality; or (2) the creation of an ontologically new entity that did not exist until an entrepreneur created it needs to be understood via effective entrepreneurial research. In fact, to be considered effective and valid, entrepreneurship researchers’ methods should offer clear evidence of sensitivity to all three kinds of phenomena: discovery, creation, and or both.

However, we question whether the adoption of a creation view makes any difference. Both the discovery and creation views identify opportunities as something that can be specified (referred to) and simply vary in their focus: the former view focuses on its final state, the latter view on the process through which this state comes about. But just as it is easy to challenge a discovery theorist on whether what one pursues is really an opportunity, so it is easy to challenge a creation theorist on whether someone who acts and interacts is really an entrepreneur. If entrepreneurship is defined as the pursuit of opportunities (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), then knowing that something is an opportunity would make the person pursuing it an entrepreneur; and vice versa, knowing that someone is an entrepreneur would make what they are pursuing an opportunity. However, since we agree with Gartner (1988) that “who is an entrepreneur?” is the wrong question, so is the question of “what is an opportunity?” For entrepreneurship, a domain struggling for legitimacy and practitioner relevance (Shane, 2012), we feel that focusing on these quarrels makes it even more difficult for the field to build theory.

The problem we see with the case for a creation view is the rationalist nature of its logic. In contrast to an empiricist (one who focuses on the collection and analysis of data to build and test theory), a rationalist embarks on theory development as a creative writing exercise, focusing efforts on “deconstructing prior theory” instead of acknowledging “challenges from contradictory phenomena” (Suddaby, 2014, p. 408). As evidence, Alvarez, et al. (2014) completely dismiss decades of qualitative and quantitative empirical research about entrepreneurship when saying “...opportunities have objective metrics in support of their viability ex ante the entrepreneurial action, which, of course, is false” (p. 228). The authors continue with “[objective opportunities] could mean that many others have the same venture idea, but that would be false, as well” (p. 228). Can two (or more) individuals have the exact same idea to open a new restaurant when they see an opportunity that has a “Business for Sale”

sign in the window? Are pharmaceutical companies not racing/competing for the same opportunity to develop a cancer-curing drug? Data from more than fifteen years of empirical research on representative samples of nascent entrepreneurs identify that, when founders are asked why they formed their venture, the majority reply, “I saw an opportunity” (Davidsson & Gordon, 2012).

Is this an *objective* metric? No doubt, it is probably a more *subjective* view. However, in essence, the above arguments suggest to practicing entrepreneurs who founded a business based on a recognized opportunity that they are wrong. This logic borders on theoretical “fetishism,” which Suddaby (2014) identifies as “self-absorbed” and “detached from the empirical world” (p. 34). With arguments like these, it should be no surprise that much of our organizational research is viewed as irrelevant to practitioners (McKelvey, 2006). Indeed, if theory, as Suddaby suggests, “signals the values upon which knowledge is built” (2014, p. 407), then the creation view of entrepreneurship theory signals that the domain does not value the empirical reality of entrepreneurs.

Is there a way to draw a meaningful demarcation between opportunities and entrepreneurs? After all, opportunities comprise elements—customers, suppliers, production, money, information, and other resources—that are both tangible and separate from the entrepreneur. Let’s consider the simple analogical example of a building. Before it is built, it exists only as a blueprint—in the mind of the builder or formally drawn; but, once built, it is separate from the builder and made of objective materials. A pile of bricks is not a building; it needs to be perceived as having a function. Similarly, a collection of people and resources is not an opportunity; they have to be arranged so as to function. The builder does not create the materials; s/he simply creates the functional relationships among them. In a like manner, an entrepreneur does not create the materials of which the opportunity is made; instead, s/he creates the

functional relationships among them (e.g., production and consumption). Therefore, both buildings and opportunities can be viewed as emergent structures—the former physical, the latter social. These structures are emergent because they have ontologically real components, possess epistemologically real functional relationships, and require real human actions and interactions to come to fruition.

This interplay between components and relationships can be readily seen in the example of the iPhone, which can easily trigger arguments about whether Apple *created* people's needs for the iPhone or simply *discovered* an already existing opportunity. Reality before the iPhone was invented and manufactured was that: cellphone towers already existed; people already were using cellphones; people could connect with their friends, stores, restaurants, hotels, and transport services, etc., via the Internet and had access to all the other information available on the Internet; the app-making software was available before the iPhone was produced. In fact, all the technology Apple used to create the iPhone already existed in the real world before the iPhone came to market in June 2007. The story was the same with the steam engine, Ford's Model T, Wright brother's airplane, the ice-cream cone; the first computer, and on and on.... Apple's success lied in making the existing ingredients work together in the most compelling way, by building strong functional relationships among them. In this sense, there is no opportunity without the relationships and, equally, no opportunity without the ingredients.

As well, these structures are emergent because the efficacy of the final product can be directly linked to the quality of the materials, the strength of the functional relationships, and the skill with and order in which the actions are completed. Consequently, for both theory and practice, arguing about the ontological nature of opportunities serves no substantive purpose. As Dimov (2011) argues, developing theory about opportunities should focus on their articulation as ideas, expression in purposeful actions, and institution in market relationships, as well as involve

both variance (e.g., differences in resources and capabilities) and process (e.g., path-dependent evolution) perspectives.

We urge an end to the current fetishism in entrepreneurship theory. Instead of creating untenable assumptions that dichotomize scholarly inquiry, we propose that the field embark on a more formal approach to building theory, one that can use the strengths of *both* discovery and creation assumptions, as well as variance and process perspectives, to build computational models that generate emergent outcomes *in silico*. In complement to mathematical proofs and formal logic—which are often based on faulty assumptions about human behavior (Read, 1990), Adner et al. (2009) explain that agent-based computational simulations can be used to build more precise and falsifiable theory in a manner that is logically consistent and epistemologically agnostic, and does not require the successful emergence of “real” new ventures. In contrast to other formal methods, simulation models permit the use of repeated Monte Carlo experiments—where only one parameter of the model is changed to demonstrate cause-effect relationships. These experiments can demonstrate how micro-level interactions among heterogeneous agents might be sufficient to generate empirically observed macro-level outcomes of interest. Here, opportunities could be represented by either resources available in the environment that can be recombined (a discovery view) or emerge as hierarchies that result from agent interaction (a creation view). In models like this: transparent theoretical assumptions can satisfy the rationalists; validation of parameter inputs and emergent outcomes with extant data can satisfy the empiricists; all while avoiding the fetishism that discounts the empirical reality of practicing entrepreneurs.

References

- Adner, R., Pólos, L., Ryall, M., & Sorenson, O. 2012. The case for formal theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(2), 201-208.
- Alvarez, S., Barney, J., McBride, R., & Wuebker, R. 2014. Realism in the study of entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2), 227-231.
- Davidsson, P., & Gordon, S. 2012. Panel studies of new venture creation, a methods-focused review and suggestions for future research. *Small Business Economics*, 39(4), 853-876.
- Dimov, D. 2011. Grappling with the unbearable elusiveness of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 57-81.
- Gartner, W. 1988. "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11-32.
- McKelvey, B. 2006. Van de Ven and Johnson's "Engaged Scholarship": Nice try, but... *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 822-829.
- Read, D. 1990. The utility of mathematical constructs in building archaeological theory. In A. Voorrips (Ed.), *Studies in modern archaeology* (Vol. 3, pp. 29-60). Bonn: Helos.
- Shane S. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: Delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37, 10-20.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Suddaby, R. 2014. Editor's comments: Why theory? *Academy of Management Review*, 39(4), 407-411.

Author Biographies

Christopher Crawford is an Assistant Professor of Strategic Management at Ohio University. He received his Ph.D. in Entrepreneurship from the University of Louisville in 2013. His dissertation, “Causes of Extreme Outcomes in Entrepreneurship” was awarded a Kauffman Dissertation Fellowship. Dr. Crawford’s research interests include: new venture growth; behavioral and business strategy; and understanding the mechanisms that generate power law distributions and outliers in social systems. His work has been published in *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Small Business Economics*, *Best Paper Proceedings of the Academy of Management*, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, *Journal of Organization Design*, and *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*.

Dimo Dimov is Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship at the School of Management, University of Bath. Prior to joining the school in 2012, he was on the faculties at Newcastle University, University of Connecticut, and IE Business School. Dimo holds a Ph.D. in Entrepreneurship from London Business School. Dimo’s research focuses on understanding the entrepreneurial process, from initial idea to viable venture. He examines how potential entrepreneurs and investors think, act, and interact in the face of its uncertainty and how these interactions give rise to exciting new phenomena. His work is consistently published in world leading journals.

Bill McKelvey—MIT PhD 1967. Professor Emeritus UCLA Anderson School of Management. His book, *Organizational Systematics* (1982) remains a definitive treatment of organizational evolution. Chaired the Building Committee that produced the \$110,000,000 Anderson Complex. Co-founded UCLA’s Inter-Departmental Program, Human Complex Systems & Computational Social Science. Has articles in *ASQ*, *AMR*, *Org. Science*, *Leadership Quarterly*, *Journal(s) of Bioeconomics*, *Behavioral Finance*, *Int. Business Studies*, *Economics & Org. Behavior*; among many others. Coedited the *SAGE Handbook of Complexity and Management* (2011). Editor of Routledge Major Work: *Complexity Concepts: Critical Concepts* (2013; 5-volumes, 2447 pgs.). Has 80+ papers about organizational complexity since 1997.