



Permission to hustle: Igniting entrepreneurship in an organization

Greg Fisher^{a,*}, Regan Stevenson^b, Devin Burnell^c

^a Larry and Barbara Sharpf Professor, Associate Professor of Entrepreneurship, Kelley School of Business Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

^b Assistant Professor of Entrepreneurship, Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA

^c Doctoral Student in Entrepreneurship, Kelley School of Business, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA



ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Hustle
Entrepreneurial action
Ethnography
Corporate entrepreneurship
Crisis response

ABSTRACT

Perceived institutional barriers, especially in existing organizations, often impede entrepreneurial action in the face of crisis and uncertainty. Understanding how collective entrepreneurial action occurs despite deeply institutionalized mindsets is important to advance entrepreneurship theory. We report on an autoethnographic account of an entrepreneurship professor and several colleagues who gave themselves *permission to hustle* to overcome perceived institutional barriers to entrepreneurial action. As the findings reveal, a permission to hustle mindset provided a platform for the group of professors to act entrepreneurially in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. In a matter of several days, the group acted under uncertainty to create a new “idea blitz” program which attracted over 150 participants from around the world. We argue that permission to hustle is an important sense-breaking device that ignites and sustains entrepreneurial action by breaking taken-for-granted assumptions about institutionalized practices and redirecting attention toward urgent and creative action, especially in existing organizations where institutional barriers are perceived to impede such action.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship is about acting to bring forth novel ideas and concepts that create value (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). To do this, entrepreneurs often act with urgency, in unorthodox ways, so as to address their immediate challenges, and generate opportunities amidst uncertainty (Fisher et al., 2020). Leaders in existing organizations and institutions often want their employees to be entrepreneurial and innovate (Morris and Jones, 1999; Shankar and Shepherd, 2019). They encourage employees to generate opportunities, to address immediate challenges in novel, unorthodox ways, and to act with urgency to create new value for the organization and its stakeholders (Hitt et al., 2011). This idea that employees of existing organizations can act in entrepreneurial ways is sometimes referred to as corporate entrepreneurship, intrapreneurship or strategic entrepreneurship and is seen as a means to enhance the competitiveness and sustainability of an organization (Hitt et al., 2011; Honig, 2001; Morris et al., 2010).

But being entrepreneurial in an existing organization or institution is often difficult, especially within fields with a long history and strong institutional and normative pressures (e.g., universities; Kraatz and Zajac, 1996). Prior research has highlighted that fostering entrepreneurial behavior among employees often clashes with other explicit or implicit organizational norms and processes (Kuratko et al., 2014). These normative processes and routines maintain and are maintained by interpretive schema, which “operate as shared, fundamental (though often implicit) assumptions about why events happen as they do and how people are to act in different situations” (Bartunek, 1984, p. 355). Schema are built from routinized behavioral episodes that provide meaningful information to orient action

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: fisherg@indiana.edu (G. Fisher), rstev@indiana.edu (R. Stevenson), dsburnell@iu.edu (D. Burnell).

and help actors make sense of and interpret the organizational world (Daft and Weick, 1984; Gioia and Chittipeddi, 1991). Creative action is often constrained by normative processes that provide limited alternative schemas to orient action (Ford, 1996). When few schematic options are available, employees seeking to act entrepreneurially often concede to these existing norms and processes, especially during crisis events that evoke anxiety (Ford, 1996). When this happens, entrepreneurship within the organization is quelled (Morris and Jones, 1999). This in turn reduces the competitive, sustainable, and innovative actions that are necessary for modern day organizations, especially in times of crisis (Williams and Shepherd, 2016).

Yet in these times of unprecedented change driven by crisis, it is more important than ever for organizations to empower employees to generate ideas, pursue opportunities, innovatively solve problems and create new value (Kuckertz et al., 2020). But what does it take to do this? What are the subtle cultural dynamics that can make a big difference as individuals and teams in existing organizations seek to act entrepreneurially in response to crisis? How do organizations respond to societal threats given the perceived debilitating institutional barriers that impede entrepreneurial action?

Here we provide an autoethnographic account of an entrepreneurial response to the COVID-19 pandemic within a setting with strong institutional and normative pressures. We identify and describe how *permission to hustle* – a simple yet powerful mechanism – was used to prompt individuals and teams to break through institutional constraints and act entrepreneurially in the face of socially constructed bureaucracy and perceived organizational inertia.

2. Approach and context

2.1. Methods

To generate the research insights delivered here, we utilized an organizational ethnography perspective. This research process usually involves a researcher entering an organization from an “outsiders” perspective to observe the cultural meanings that members co-construct (Van Maanen, 2011). By immersing oneself in the organization and closely examining the experience of being an organizational member, an organizational ethnographer can capture and reveal hidden or concealed meaning-making processes (Yanow et al., 2012). These experiences and observations are then reported in a way that places both the author and reader at the scene, through actor-centered and context-sensitive analysis (Ybema et al., 2009). Ethnographers usually focus in on a few key insights relevant to the context that are then shared and explained using “thick descriptions” (Geertz, 1973), or clear stories that convey important meaning, involve sensory experiences, and often use informants’ language. These insights then become the foundation of important theoretical advances that are accurately grounded in a phenomenon (Fine and Elsbach, 2000; Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Recently Davidsson identified that ethnographic approaches are an under-utilized, yet highly promising perspective for understanding the nuances of entrepreneurial processes and practices (Davidsson, 2017). Research papers using an ethnographic approach have enjoyed success in major management and organizational journals (e.g., Barley and Bartunek, 1996; de Rond et al., 2019; Ranganathan, 2018), but the method has only been utilized to a limited extent by the entrepreneurship research community (Gupta et al., 2020). Recently, Mauksch (2017) used an ethnographic approach to study the discursive expansion of social entrepreneurship as a fashionable model for social transformation; to do this she embedded herself in a social entrepreneurship incubator as a participant observer. Ethnographic techniques, such as participant observation allow entrepreneurship researchers to understand culturally embedded action (Hammersley, 2013) and as such, it affords a unique and valuable way to better elaborate entrepreneurship theory. By adopting an ethnographic approach, scholars can observe entrepreneurial action as situated within the context of organizational and field norms, beliefs, and institutions.

Unique to our methodology, we were able to capture these actions from a first-person account of a researcher already embedded within a community before the project began. Doing so allows us to leverage an “insider’s” pre-existing and tacit understanding of institutional norms and leverage an *autoethnographic* experience to build theoretical insight (Anderson, 2006). Autoethnography is a form of ethnography in which the researcher uses self-reflection and writing to explore anecdotal and personal experience and connects this autobiographical story to wider cultural, political, and social meanings and understandings (Ellis, 2016). Leveraging this first-person perspective allowed us to capture the reflexive experience of an organizational insider responding to crisis. Specifically, the first author wrote fieldnotes (Emerson et al., 2011) to capture observations from within an organization, revealing the cultural event that led to resilient entrepreneurial action.

2.2. Context

It was the third week of March, 2020. The faculty and students at our university had very recently been asked to stay home due to lockdown restrictions in place to prevent the spread of the COVID-19 virus. At the time, most professors were experiencing a high level of uncertainty about the future of the school year along with administrative pressures to rapidly alter their existing classes from classroom to online experiences. The university administration was at the time highly focused on crisis mitigation, primarily concerned with ensuring immediate staff and student safety and canceling existing events.

Late on the evening of March 16th, 2020, one of the professors in our group, sent out an email to members of our department saying we should explore what we can do to rapidly respond to the crisis situation. He provided a call to action and asked a group of professors to join him on a Zoom call the following morning to discuss entrepreneurial actions that the group could take. The next morning, nine faculty members assembled on a Zoom call to discuss options; we wanted to do something positive and *impactful* to address the crisis. Recent suggestions from university administration centered on helping out the university community by banding together to provide personal services such as shopping and grocery delivery for colleagues in need. While these micro-actions were certainly important for

those in immediate need, there was a general sense from the professor that called the meeting that there was a lot more we could and should be doing in response to this rapidly emerging crisis, given the depth of educational and professional experience within the department.

However, as we connected, there was a sense of ambivalence within the group about the notion of taking entrepreneurial action in response to an emergent crisis within the university context. These mixed feelings and contradictory perspectives stemmed from a strong positive sentiment among the group of colleagues about each other. Many had worked on research projects and other educational initiatives before; there was a notion that these were people that could get things done. On the other hand, there was also the awareness, recognition and strong perception that doing anything quickly, and taking a few risks, within the university context was usually impossible, as several layers of approval were often necessary in order to receive endorsement on new initiatives. The bureaucracy and risk-averse culture of a university could easily slow good ideas and stifle any type of innovation. We were hopeful something would come from the call, but truthfully, some of us were highly skeptical. The idea of being nimble and highly responsive in the university context just did not fit the schema we had established from prior experience.

3. Findings and insights

3.1. Thick description of ensuing discussion and action

The group of professors discussed how we might host some sort of design thinking workshop, startup weekend or innovation accelerator, where we would bring together students, practitioners, faculty and other community members in a virtual environment to collaborate on solving problems. We wondered aloud, “Could we facilitate a structured weekend, where diverse teams work together remotely to develop innovative solutions that solve big problems brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic?”

Even though most professors on the call were entrepreneurship faculty – meaning that we teach our students to be agile, to move fast, to test ideas quickly and to overcome hurdles in novel ways – we soon found ourselves bogged down, discussing how to navigate university bureaucracy and seeking to achieve perfect and predictable outcomes in order to move forward. We talked for over 70 minutes about getting buy-in from the Business School Dean and the University Provost, seeking grant funding for resources to support our efforts, navigating a variety of different university and community stakeholders, and developing a decision support process to optimize decisions. We were clearly becoming entwined in the bureaucratic, drawn out and politically sensitive approach typical of university decision making. This was indicative of the institutional norms taking over, exerting their influence on a few well-meaning entrepreneurship professors. Yet, with this approach, we felt a collective sense of dread and frustration; the motivation and excitement for what we were attempting to do was draining from the group.

This was all until, out of the blue, one of the professors on the call (the second author) said something to the effect of “we’re entrepreneurship professors, we know how to teach this stuff, but now it’s time for us to *do it*. This is a time to act like entrepreneurs, we need to *hustle* if we are going to make this happen.” A number of people on the call study entrepreneurial behavior under conditions of uncertainty, and from our research we have derived the concept of entrepreneurial hustle, defined as “*an entrepreneur’s urgent, unorthodox actions that are intended to be useful in addressing immediate challenges and opportunities under conditions of uncertainty*” (Fisher et al., 2020).

The point at which this concept of entrepreneurial hustle was forcefully mentioned on the call, the sentiment of the group changed. There appeared to be a clear sense that by invoking this concept we were giving ourselves permission to act differently from the perceived institutional norms, to act more in way that entrepreneurs act rather than as university administrators. By bringing this up, we gave ourselves permission to hustle, and this changed the perspective and actions of the group from that point forward. We were now in hustle mode.

Instead of discussing how we might optimize our decisions and processes within the university system, we focused on how we would just get things done (in the short time frame); we set a lofty goal of building a landing page and publicizing what we were doing within 24 hours to host what we were now calling an Idea Blitz in three days’ time (see Bacq et al., 2020).¹ In the context of university decision making, timelines like these are perceived as ridiculous. But because we shifted to a *hustle orientation*, suddenly it seemed to us like it might be possible. We were no longer focused on developing and deploying what we viewed as a perfect solution, we instead focused on just making something happen, overcoming the immediate challenge in front of us before moving onto the next challenge. We were happy to do things imperfectly just to get them done and create momentum for the project.

This shift in the group’s orientation toward entrepreneurial hustle manifested in a number of specific ways. First, we wrote shorter, more direct, to the point and action orientated emails to one another. We avoided formalities and niceties in the service of getting things done. Second, we no longer tried to schedule formal meetings to discuss and resolve things, we just quickly jumped onto the telephone or Zoom when we needed to clarify or decide on issues. The notion of trying to ‘find a time’ and ‘send out an invite’ for a meeting had been replaced by more direct and specific communication between parties as needed. Third we adopted sub-optimal but immediately accessible technology solutions. We did not spend time evaluating multiple options and weighing up complicated pros and cons of different technology alternatives, we instead just made use of what was understandable and immediately available; even if such a solution might be sub-optimal in the long term, it filled an important need in the short term. Fourth, we crudely and quickly distributed work between the team, without carefully considering who wants to do what and whose feelings might be hurt based on tasks assigned

¹ See www.virtualideablitz.com for details on the event that was organized. A summary of the event is also published in Business Horizons (Bacq et al., 2020).

or not assigned. Political wrangling within the team was replaced by a strong desire to get things done. Fifth, we decided to just move forward without explicit permission from the Dean's Office; we adopted the attitude of "asking for forgiveness rather than permission." Sixth, we rapidly developed our messaging and a crude landing page website to share what we wanted to do; we immediately shared it with an "early adopter" target audience to see how they would react. Seventh, we iterated and changed things as we moved forward. We updated messaging, changed the design and specifications of the event, altered the content and deliverables, shifted technology tools as required and reached out to people for help as needed.

Beyond just making things happen and creating momentum to pull off a significant event in almost no time, by giving ourselves "permission to hustle" we also engineered an excuse (for ourselves and others) when mistakes were made, or errors uncovered. For example, when we first released the landing page publicizing the event, it contained a few grammatical and spelling errors. Someone on Facebook noticed this and notified us via a Facebook comment. Our response was something to the effect of: "Thanks for the help, this is what happens when you hustle, we have fixed the errors." With the 150+ participants and 30+ mentors that took part in the weekend Idea Blitz, we also repeatedly told them that things would not be perfect as we were hustling to make this happen. So, our hustle orientation created a built-in buffer for errors. By feeling that we had permission to hustle, we also by extension gave ourselves permission to make mistakes and having permission to make mistakes was important for creating momentum.

The permission to hustle served an emancipating function, freeing us from perceived constraints and expectations; it empowered us to take action under uncertainty, which created momentum for the project. The momentum and resourceful action taken attracted more stakeholders to the project. More mentors and investors became interested in what we were doing, and university administrators began to explicitly support our efforts. Additionally, some individuals looked for ways to contribute to the event. One individual offered to rebuild and professionalize the website; another took on the task of making and editing video of the event. Overall, we observed that the hustle behavior that we engaged in attracted the attention and interest of external stakeholders such that they were then willing to explicitly or implicitly support the effort.

3.2. Outcome

In the end, the virtual idea blitz was a success beyond what we had imagined in the initial meeting that started this journey. 95 ideas were submitted, 22 teams were formed, consisting of more than 150 participants and guided by more than 30 mentors. At the end of the event, which took place from a Friday evening on March 20th to Sunday evening March 22nd, 22 videos depicting innovative new ideas to address problems brought on by the crisis were submitted. Many of these ideas were carried forward into real initiatives that have already had a positive impact in response to the crisis. For instance, one of the participating teams, #RealHeroesNeedMasks (<https://www.realheroesneedmasks.com/>), has partnered with key influencers from around the globe to launch a social media campaign to raise awareness about PPE (Personal Protective Equipment) shortages and mobilize public action to get desperately needed PPE into the hands of those who need it most—front line healthcare professionals who are the "real heroes." In a span of three weeks following the Virtual Idea Blitz, the Real Heroes Needs Masks team facilitated the donation of over 33,000 masks. Similarly, another team, ReScaleMed (<http://www.rescalemed.org/>), has partnered with volunteer critical care specialists doctors and medical device technologists to beat COVID-19 by increasing the number of medical personnel available to setup ventilators and manage patients on ventilators. They are currently curating key training medical content to quickly scale available frontline medical resources worldwide. There continue to be ongoing efforts from a number of other teams seeking to scale their efforts to have the maximum impact; other ideas have been terminated. The week following the event, the university issued press releases and published coverage on the event and its outcomes on its news homepage. The university also issued the organizers a \$20,000 grant, which was to be awarded to the social ventures that emerged from the event.

4. Discussion

We conjecture that none of this would have happened if we had not given ourselves "permission to hustle." Building off the research that defines entrepreneurial hustle as "*an entrepreneur's urgent, unorthodox actions that are intended to be useful in addressing immediate challenges and opportunities under conditions of uncertainty*" (Fisher et al., 2020), we experienced that giving ourselves "permission to hustle" changed our perception of the self-imposed barriers and restrictions we had created, allowing us to act entrepreneurially in an environment that is traditionally not very entrepreneurial. We propose that this type of permission could work effectively in other organizations or contexts where entrepreneurial behavior and action is not the norm, yet intrapreneurs are looking to bring new ideas into being. It is a simple, yet effective approach, that is easy to implement and can have significant impact in overcoming perceptions that restrict individual and team behavior. It builds off the emerging research on entrepreneurial hustle (Fisher et al., 2020) yet highlights a unique application of the concept in a context that is different from where the idea of entrepreneurial hustle initially emerged. The notion of "permission to hustle" has implications for research, for entrepreneurial practice and for managers and leaders.

4.1. Implications for research

Entrepreneurial behavior research seeks to explain why some individuals are more likely than others to pursue opportunities (e.g., Begley et al., 1987; Shane, 2000; Shaver and Scott, 1992) and considers how entrepreneurs act in pursuance of their entrepreneurial endeavors (e.g., Alvarez and Barney, 2007; Baker and Nelson, 2005; Fisher, 2012; Sarasvathy, 2001). In this article we build on the construct of *entrepreneurial hustle* and explain how this action-tactic was deployed by entrepreneurial actors within an institutional environment. While past work identifies the importance of entrepreneurial hustle for addressing immediate business challenges in

startup ventures (Fisher et al., 2020), our paper highlights that entrepreneurial hustle need not be confined to startups. Moreover, we explain in this article how *permission to hustle* can free entrepreneurial actors from the perceived constraints or limitations that they typically face in their day-to-day work environments.

Granting permission to hustle can free individuals and empower action under uncertainty, reducing perceived constraints and normative expectations. Within organizations, there is often an element of taken for granted, routinized, activity and structures that employees mostly don't question. The permission to hustle, that may be self-generated or granted from higher up in the organizational hierarchy, has the effect of shaking people awake to realize perhaps that such barriers and constraints are largely self-imposed, and that they actually have more latitude and opportunity to make things happen than generally perceived. This is akin to the Ethiopian proverb that "*Fish discover water last*" suggesting that because fish are in an environment of water, the only way they will discover water is if they are jolted out of their default perspective (Vakhil, 2018). People are very similar when it comes to their organizational environments; they are so immersed in their organizational environment, that it takes a definitive change in perspective to see an alternative path forward (Vakhil, 2018; Wallace, 2005). We suggest here that adopting a "permission to hustle" orientation can provide such a change in perspective. At least that was how we experienced it. A change in perspective toward permission to hustle can alter "awareness of what is so real and essential, so hidden in plain sight all around us ..." (Wallace, 2005). We provide additional implications for entrepreneurs and managers below.

4.2. Implications for entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teams

Entrepreneurial ventures "do not happen simply because markets exist ... they require a driver" (Kuratko and Morris, 2013: xvi). We discuss in this article how entrepreneurial hustle represents a tactic used by entrepreneurs to take action and launch new ventures. Underpinning the concept of entrepreneurial hustle is the recognition that entrepreneurs inevitably face significant challenges, but it is how they act in response to those challenges that may help them navigate the uncertainty associated with pursuing an entrepreneurial endeavor. Entrepreneurs should seek to empower their teams to approach challenges in a similar way. In cases where entrepreneurs want to prioritize urgent action, they may be well served by explicitly signaling to their teams that they would like to grant them permission to hustle. Where entrepreneurs are blind to this, advisors and mentors may prompt them into this type of self-reflection by asking questions about their level of urgency, unorthodoxy, and direction in response to entrepreneurial challenges and in doing so, will help them think through how they act when faced with challenges in the future.

4.3. Implications for managers and leaders

As alluded to earlier in this article, entrepreneurs and institutional actors are not the only potential beneficiaries of hustle behaviors. Indeed, large and established organizations benefit when their employees act entrepreneurially and adopt the role of an intrapreneur (Morris and Jones, 1999; Shankar and Shepherd, 2019). We view "permission to hustle" as a key enabler and antecedent of intrapreneurship and corporate entrepreneurship in organizations. Leaders that seek to foster intrapreneurs and innovators within their organizations would likely benefit from giving employees 'permission to hustle.' This will likely foster more entrepreneurial activity within an organization and also make innovation and corporate entrepreneurship programs more effective, thereby creating more intrapreneurs and innovative activity (Honig, 2001).

This is even more critical during times of crisis. In response to COVID-19, several organizations demonstrated how a permission to hustle could be effectively deployed to foster innovative, intrapreneurial behavior. General Motors represents one such example. In response to COVID-19, General Motors quickly converted their plant in Kokomo, Indiana. The company rapidly called back previously furloughed employees and converted their assembly line to make ventilators instead of automobiles. The conversion happened in only a few weeks and it started with a permission to hustle declaration. In mid-march, the United States government issued a call to action urging private companies to adapt their manufacturing capabilities to fill critical needs for products such as masks and ventilators. To speed up innovation, the government also relaxed typical regulatory requirements (CPAP/VOCSN minimum specifications for ventilators for example), signaling the government's priority on rapid innovations and effectively granting private businesses *permission to hustle*. On March 18, General Motors began to dialogue with Ventec Life Systems, a respiratory care innovator based on the West Coast, and within days a collaboration was formed. By mid-April General Motors had produced more than 30,000 ventilators representing close to half a billion dollars in sales.

The nature of crisis described here (COVID-19) may make the importance of providing a permission to hustle even more critical. Urgency for action is extremely high in such scenarios given that a lack of action is likely to result in loss of human life. It is critical that the default tactical position is flipped toward a bias toward action rather than a preference for structured planning and following lethargic, self-imposed institutional rules.

5. Conclusion

This paper adopts an autoethnographic approach to uncover and reflect on a single, significant instance of individuals within an organization giving themselves *permission to hustle*. While we don't intend for this reflection to provide robust generalizable evidence that this concept will have the same effect to wherever it is applied, we do believe that it is a very interesting and relevant concept that is worthy of further study. It is particularly relevant in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic where individuals and teams within organizations are being forced to innovate, pivot and respond in creative ways; yet the organizational culture dictates less entrepreneurial responses. Permission to hustle gives everyone the opportunity and perspective to act in entrepreneurial ways.

References

- Alvarez, S.A., Barney, J.B., 2007. Discovery and creation: alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strat. Entrepren. J.* 1 (1-2), 11–26.
- Anderson, L., 2006. Analytic autoethnography. *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.* 35 (4), 373–395.
- Bacq, S., Geoghegan, W., Josefy, M., Stevenson, R., Williams, T.A., 2020. The COVID-19 Virtual Idea Blitz: marshaling social entrepreneurship to rapidly respond to urgent grand challenges. *Bus. Horiz.*
- Baker, T., Nelson, R.E., 2005. Creating something from nothing: resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 50 (3), 329–366.
- Barley, S., 1996. Technicians in the workplace: ethnographic evidence for bringing work into organizational studies. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 41 (3), 404–441.
- Bartunek, J.M., 1984. Changing interpretive schemes and organizational restructuring: the example of a religious order. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 29 (3), 355–372.
- Begley, T.M., Boyd, D.P., 1987. Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and smaller businesses. *J. Bus. Ventur.* 2 (1), 79–93.
- Daft, R.L., Weick, K.E., 1984. Toward a model of organizations as interpretation systems. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 9 (2), 284–295.
- Davidsson, P., 2017. Musings on the prospects of entrepreneurial ethnography. In: *Proceedings of the Princeton Kauffman Conference 2017*. Princeton University, pp. 1–12.
- de Rond, M., Holeman, I., Howard-Grenville, J., 2019. Sensemaking from the body: an enactive ethnography of rowing the amazon. *Acad. Manag. J.* 62 (6), 1961–1988.
- Ellis, C., 2016. *Revision: Autoethnographic Reflections on Life and Work*. Routledge.
- Emerson, R.M., Fretz, R.L., Shaw, L.L., 2011. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fine, G.A., Elsbach, K.D., 2000. Ethnography and experiment in social psychological theory building: tactics for integrating qualitative field data with quantitative lab data. *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* 36 (1), 51–76.
- Fisher, G., 2012. Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: a behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research. *Enterpren. Theor. Pract.* 36 (5), 1019–1051.
- Fisher, G., Stevenson, R., Nubert, E., Burnell, D., Kuratko, D.F., 2020. Entrepreneurial hustle: navigating uncertainty and enrolling venture stakeholders through urgent and unorthodox action. *J. Manag. Stud.*
- Ford, C.M., 1996. A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 21 (4), 1112–1142.
- Geertz, C., 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Basic Books.
- Glaser, B., Strauss, A., 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Wiedenfeld and Nicholson, London.
- Gioia, D.A., Chittipeddi, K., 1991. Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strat. Manag. J.* 12 (6), 433–448.
- Gupta, P., Chauhan, S., Paul, J., Jaiswal, M.P., 2020. Social entrepreneurship research: a review and future research agenda. *J. Bus. Res.* 113, 209–229.
- Hammersley, M., 2013. *What's Wrong with Ethnography?*. Routledge.
- Hitt, M.A., Ireland, R.D., Sirmon, D.G., Trahms, C.A., 2011. Strategic entrepreneurship: creating value for individuals, organizations, and society. *Acad. Manag. Perspect.* 25 (2), 57–75.
- Honig, B., 2001. Learning strategies and resources for entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. *Enterpren. Theor. Pract.* 26 (1), 21–34.
- Kraatz, M.S., Zajac, E.J., 1996. Exploring the limits of the new institutionalism: the causes and consequences of illegitimate organizational change. *Am. Socio. Rev.* 61 (5), 812–836.
- Kuckertz, A., Brändle, L., Gaudig, A., Hinderer, S., Reyes, C.A.M., Prochotta, A., et al., 2020. Startups in times of crisis—a rapid response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *J. Bus. Ventur. Insights*.
- Kuratko, D.F., Morris, M.H., 2013. *Entrepreneurship and Leadership*. Edward Elgar Pub. Limited.
- Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S., Covin, J.G., 2014. Diagnosing a firm's internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship. *Bus. Horiz.* 57 (1), 37–47.
- Mauksch, S., 2017. Managing the dance of enchantment: an ethnography of social entrepreneurship events. *Organization* 24 (2), 133–153.
- McMullen, J.S., Shepherd, D.A., 2006. Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 31 (1), 132–152.
- Morris, M.H., Jones, F.F., 1999. Entrepreneurship in established organizations: the case of the public sector. *Enterpren. Theor. Pract.* 24 (1), 71–91.
- Morris, M.H., Kuratko, D.F., Covin, J.G., 2010. *Corporate Entrepreneurship & Innovation*. Cengage Learning.
- Ranganathan, A., 2018. The artisan and his audience: identification with work and price setting in a handicraft cluster in Southern India. *Adm. Sci. Q.* 63 (3), 637–667.
- Sarasvathy, S.D., 2001. Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 26 (2), 243–263.
- Shane, S., 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organ. Sci.* 11 (4), 448–469.
- Shane, S., Venkataraman, S., 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Acad. Manag. Rev.* 25 (1), 217–226.
- Shankar, R.K., Shepherd, D.A., 2019. Accelerating strategic fit or venture emergence: different paths adopted by corporate accelerators. *J. Bus. Ventur.* 34 (5), 105886.
- Shaver, K.G., Scott, L.R., 1992. Person, process, choice: the psychology of new venture creation. *Enterpren. Theor. Pract.* 16 (2), 23–46.
- Vakhil, T., 2018. Fish discover water last – human beings discover their beliefs last. Accessed at: <https://www.tusharvakil.com/2018/04/25/911/>.
- Van Maanen, J., 2011. *Tales of the Field: on Writing Ethnography*. University of Chicago Press.
- Wallace, D.F., 2005. *This is Water*. Commencement speech to the graduating class at Kenyon College. Accessed at: <https://fs.blog/2012/04/david-foster-wallace-this-is-water/>.
- Williams, T.A., Shepherd, D.A., 2016. Building resilience or providing sustenance: different paths of emergent ventures in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake. *Acad. Manag. J.* 59 (6), 2069–2102.
- Yanow, D., Ybema, S., Van Hulst, M., 2012. Practising Organizational Ethnography. *Qualitative Organizational Research: Core Methods and Current Challenges*, pp. 351–372.
- Ybema, S., Yanow, D., Wels, H., Kamsteeg, F.H. (Eds.), 2009. *Organizational Ethnography: Studying the Complexity of Everyday Life*. Sage.