

Breaking or making institutions? – A closer look at (institutional) change agents

Friederike Welter, Jönköping International Business School, Sweden & TeliaSonera
Professorship at Stockholm School of Economics, Riga

Paper to the Rencontres de St-Gall 2012 “In Search of a dynamic Equilibrium: Exploring and
Managing Tensions in Entrepreneurship and SMEs”

Abstract

This paper takes a closer look at entrepreneurial behaviour in relation to contexts, exploring in which ways human agency can influence and is shaped by institutional, social and spatial contexts. The paper argues that the concept of institutional entrepreneurship does not appear to fully capture the complexities of the interplay between context and agents. Instead, “institutional change agents” may be a more appropriate concept to study the role of human agency in shaping its contexts. Moreover, current conceptualisation of institutional change behaviour do not account for unintended change as by-product of other actions, but assume a rational, intended, planned and linear process of institutional change. Nor do change agents act on their own. Here, the concept of “institutional bricolage” draws attention to the embeddedness of institutions in everyday lives and practices of agents, who then, consciously and unconsciously, contribute to their change. With regard to why some entrepreneurs become / are change agents and other are not, the evidence reviewed in this paper suggests contextual discontinuity and boundary crossing (both related to contexts as well as in relation to social roles) as enabling factors. The paper concludes by calling for more research which considers the intersections of multiple context dimensions with institutional change behaviour, when studying entrepreneurs as (institutional) change agents.

Debating points

1. Theorizing institutional change processes, behaviours and agency: The paper suggests institutional bricolage as a potential way forward to integrate the context and behavioural dimensions of institutional change. Are there other interesting concepts / theories to draw on?
2. Institutional change enacted both intentionally and as un-intended by-product of other actions: How to prevent over interpretation of observed behaviour?
3. Methodological choices for researching institutional change behaviour and change agents: qualitative only? Which unit of analysis? Currently, there is a pronounced bias towards qualitative, case-based and narrative studies of individuals or organizations.

1. Introduction

This paper takes a closer look at entrepreneurial behaviour in relation to contexts, exploring in which ways human agency can influence and is shaped by institutional, social and spatial contexts. The aim is to contribute to research arguing for context to play a larger role in studying entrepreneurship (Hjorth, Jones, & Gartner, 2008; Low & MacMillan, 1988; Ucbasaran, Westhead, & Wright, 2001; Welter, 2011; Zahra & Wright, 2011) as well as to the current discussion on the role of human agency in relation to institutional change (Battilana, Leca, & Boxenbaum, 2009; Koene, 2006). Already Polanyi (1957) and Granovetter (1985) stressed that economic behaviour cannot be understood outside the context of its social relations, and Granovetter (1992) emphasized the embeddedness of economic goals and activities in socially oriented goals and structures. But the endogenous and recursive nature of both contexts and behaviour poses a challenge, namely as to which extent and how exactly entrepreneurs can influence their contexts, while at the same time contexts influence their behaviour (Koene, 2006; Zafirovski, 1999). In relation to institutional change, for example, North (2005) points out the intentionality of players, concluding that their grip of the respective situation influences the development of the institutional environment. Just as contexts influence entrepreneurial behaviour by setting boundaries to actions, so too can entrepreneurial behaviour shape contexts because action develops in a “duality between agency and structure.” (Beckert, 1999: 789).

This paper, therefore, sets out to explore in more detail in which ways entrepreneurs can contribute to changing the contexts in which they are situated and embedded. Context refers not only to the business and industry context, but to social, institutional (regulatory and normative), spatial and temporal dimensions (Welter, 2011; Zahra & Wright, 2011). The next two sections discuss institutional change from a conceptual perspective, focusing on the role of the actors (section 2) and the strategies they use (section 3). Section 4 explores the

intersections of contexts and change behaviour. In section 5, the paper concludes with a short outlook.

2. Institutional entrepreneurship or institutional change agents?

Most research to date has studied how entrepreneurs or organizations can influence their institutional context, by analysing so-called institutional entrepreneurship. Institutional theory has been repeatedly criticized for the lack of consideration given to human agency (Dacin, Goodstein, & Scott, 2002). Therefore, researchers have put forward “institutional entrepreneurship” as a concept to consider agency and its role in institutional change (e.g., Battilana, 2006; Battilana & Casciaro, 2012; Battilana et al., 2009; Beckert, 1999, 2010; Pacheco, York, Dean, & Sarasvathy, 2010). This current discussion on institutional entrepreneurship is potentially relevant, because it seeks to explain the role of individual and organizational agents in institutional change.

Definitions of what constitute so-called institutional entrepreneurs vary widely. Organizational sociologists such as DiMaggio (1988: 14) interpret institutional entrepreneurs as “organized actors with sufficient resources” that see in new institutions “an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly”. In the context of an emerging market economy, namely China, Daokui et al. (2006) see institutional entrepreneurs as those agents who destroy prevailing market institutions during business start-up or expansion because otherwise their own business would fail. In other words, while the activities of these entrepreneurs are intentionally, triggered by profit-oriented goals, the change they initiate may have been unintended, it is external to the business and has a wider impact on the whole economy. In this vein, Douhan and Henrekson (2010) suggest a distinction between business and institutional entrepreneurship, where the latter reflects actions of agents to “exploit institutions to one’s economic advantage” (Douhan and Henrekson 2010: 641), in contrast to

business entrepreneurs who realize profits based on, for example, patents or market niches. This implicitly refers back to Fligstein (1997) who already acknowledged that institutional entrepreneurs are not necessarily business owners, but also could be politicians. Battilana et al. (2009) add yet another layer, arguing that for agents to qualify as institutional entrepreneurs they not only would have to initiate changes that break with the existing institutional framework, but also actively participate in implementing those, although they (the institutional entrepreneurs) may not be successful in implementing institutional changes. Moreover, the authors acknowledge that institutional entrepreneurship can be both intentional and a by-product of other (entrepreneurial) actions.

So far, the concept of institutional entrepreneurship does not appear to fully capture the complexities of the interplay between context and agents, nor does it suggest an adequate conceptual underpinning for exploring agency within institutional theory (Aldrich, 2010). Therefore, whilst the concept draws attention to the “lived experiences” of actors (Lawrence, Suddaby, & Leca, 2011: 52), its application to entrepreneurship remains questionable, in particular because the embeddedness and dynamics of entrepreneurial actions are neglected respectively conceptualised in a rather static way. Clegg (2010: 5) gives a voice to these concerns, stating that “(...) Yet it [the institutional entrepreneur] is an answer that focuses overly on a few champions of change and neglects the wider social fabric in which they are embedded. Nelson Mandela may have been an institutional entrepreneur in South Africa, but without the long struggle, armed resistance, and civil disobedience campaigns of the ANC, he could not have achieved much.” Furthermore, Weik (2011: 472) criticizes that many of the studies on institutional entrepreneurship neglect both the reflexivity of agents and the messiness of institutional change, by portraying “heroes and successes in a linear time line”.

Thus, if the aim is to understand how human agents can initiate institutional change despite existing institutional constraints on their behaviour, then a more appropriate concept

may be that of *institutional change agents*, whether this is intended or a by-product of other actions. Such institutional change agents may be business entrepreneurs, but this concept may also be extended to include social movements, collective and community entrepreneurship, political entrepreneurship and other organizational actors such as academicians.

3. How entrepreneurs can initiate or contribute to institutional change

This section explores institutional change behaviour, reviewing from a conceptual perspective *how entrepreneurs do or contribute to institutional change*. Oliver (1991) was one of the first to discuss behavioural responses to the institutional framework. Her five types of strategic responses can be distinguished by the extent to which entrepreneurs conform to institutional settings (acquiesce, compromise) or do not conform (avoidance, defiance, manipulation); each strategic response comes with three tactics (Table 1). While acquiescence represents a more passive form of conforming behaviour, compromise indicates a more active strategic response. Similar, avoidance refers to more passive tactics of concealing, buffering or escaping through changes at micro (organizational) level, while defiance and manipulation strategies reflect more active forms of resistance to institutional pressures. For example, defiance includes actions which ignore, attack or openly challenge institutional rules. This especially happens in situations where there is low potential for external enforcement as is frequently the case in turbulent and hostile business environments (Smallbone & Welter, 2009). Manipulation includes active attempts to change the institutional environment. Whilst a lack of legitimacy and power may be a hindrance for many entrepreneurs to apply manipulation, this differs where entrepreneurs are well-connected. Here, research in emerging market economies has illustrated how well-connected individuals can draw on 'guanxi' or 'blat' networking relations to influence institutions in their favour (Batjargal, 2010; Voszka, 1994).

Table 1: Selected classifications of behavioural responses to institutional settings

	Conforming behaviour		Non-conforming behaviour		
Strategic responses to institutional processes (Oliver, 1991)	<p>Acquiesce:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • habit - following invisible, taken-for-granted norms • imitate: mimicking institutional models • comply: obeying rules and accepting norms 	<p>Compromise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • balance: balancing expectations of multiple constituents • pacify: placating and accommodating institutional elements • bargain: negotiating with institutional stakeholders 	<p>Avoidance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conceal: disguising nonconformity • buffer: loosening institutional attachments • escape: changing goals, activities or domains 	<p>Defiance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dismiss: ignoring explicit norms and values • challenge: contesting rules and requirements • attack: assaulting sources of institutional pressure 	<p>Manipulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • co-opt: importing influential constituents • influence: shaping values and criteria • control: dominating institutional constituents and processes
Entrepreneurship typology (Henrekson & Sanandaji, 2010)	<p>Abiding entrepreneurship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • self-perpetuating, legitimising and strengthening existing institutions • implicitly contributing to institutional change in case of innovative, disruptive entrepreneurial activities 		<p>Evading entrepreneurship: alters impact of existing institutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exploiting institutional holes and imperfections: productive where new (legal) businesses emerge, unproductive where illegal actions abound 		<p>Altering entrepreneurship: changing institutional set-up and rules of the game through political or market-based entrepreneurship</p>
Strategies to reduce institutional uncertainty in emerging markets (Tracey & Phillips, 2011)	<p>Institutional brokering: managing uncertainty by creating ventures that reduce risks for others</p>		<p>Spanning institutional voids: entrepreneurs exploit undeveloped institutional space and create value, by creating proto-institutions.</p>		<p>Bridging institutional distance: transferring and translating institutions into emerging markets</p>

Source: Based on Henrekson and Sanandaji (2010), Oliver (1991), Tracey and Phillips (2011).

Similar to the initial classification by Oliver (1991), the behavioural responses of other classifications also can be grouped along a continuum of conforming to non-conforming behaviour. In Henrekson's and Sanandaji's terminology (2010), abiding refers to conforming actions, while altering constitutes the opposite end of non-conforming behaviour, where entrepreneurs actively attempt to reform the existing institutions. For entrepreneurs in uncertain institutional environments, such as emerging market economies, Tracey and Phillips (2011) suggest institutional brokering, spanning institutional voids and bridging institutional distance as strategies contributing to reducing institutional uncertainty. Institutional brokering refers to entrepreneurs setting up ventures which reduce institutional uncertainty for other actors, thus emphasizing the new organizational form or business model implemented in the emerging market context as institution, rather than a new rule of the game. In spanning institutional voids, entrepreneurs search for creative solutions to institutional deficiencies. Bridging institutional distance refers to transposing and adapting institutions (either organizational forms or practices) to a new country context.

A common feature of these classifications is their focus on purposeful and also opportunistic actions of human agents, with the various strategies representing "increasingly active levels of resistance to given institutional demands and expectations." (Oliver 1991: 157). In other words, the classifications recognise that agents maintain institutions, have an active role to play in changing them, and do so through acting strategically and intentionally (Weik, 2011). At a first glance, it is generally non-conforming behaviour which triggers and drives institutional change. Actions such as tax evasion or semi-legal, but frequently tolerated behaviour such as informal entrepreneurship (Welter & Smallbone, 2009, 2011; Xheneti, Smallbone, &

Welter, 2012) challenge existing institutions and weaken their effectiveness, thus contributing to change, even if in a longer-term perspective (Douhan & Henrekson, 2010). Martin (2010) emphasizes processes of gradual institutional evolution, by adding new procedures or structures (layering), they are reoriented towards new purposes (conversion) or recombined (recombination). Applying this to the repertoire of actions outlined in Table 1, one can conclude that it is not only non-conforming behaviour which might contribute to institutional change, but rather any entrepreneurial behaviour which either openly questions existing institutions (through evasion or manipulation), or, by conforming, contributes to gradual change over time as suggested by Martin (2010). For example, even if conforming to the general institutional settings, entrepreneurs can trigger institutional change through disruptive innovations such as the introduction of new technologies (Kalantaridis, 2007) or by introducing new organizational forms and business models (Tracey & Phillips, 2011).

Weik (2011: 472) argues that most institutional entrepreneurship literature to date, when discussing the actions individuals and organizations take to change institutions, has a bias towards a “managerialist view of the creation and destruction of institutions where individuals found institutions in the same way and for the same reasons as they found companies.” She claims that even more recent studies on collective institutional entrepreneurship (e.g., Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009) draw on this same managerial bias, portraying institutional change behaviour as rational, planned, intended and linear. However, institutional change also could result as an unintended consequence of behaviour which occurs in an institutional context that “never reaches equilibrium but instead continually develops through cumulative reinterpretation.” (Carstensen, 2011: 160).

4. Exploring the intersections of contexts and change behaviour

In this regard, the interplay of context dimensions with behaviour can provide additional insights into the range of actions entrepreneurs draw on to deal with institutions, how that may trigger or support institutional change, and also insights into why some individuals or communities may become change agents and others may not. Therefore, this section looks at (empirical) research which has explored the intersections of context and institutional change behaviour.

4.1. Contexts and change behaviour

Kalantaridis (2007) points to localised interpretations of institutions, which result in differing micro-level solutions and which, in the long run, also may contribute to institutional diversity at macro level. Thornton and Flynn (2005) indicate the social and institutional boundaries of place, where cultural rules and shared meanings contribute to defining local neighbourhoods and communities. In this regard, some research has explored the role of entrepreneurship, both individual and community activities, as leverage for social change (Johannisson, 1990; Johnstone & Lionais, 2004; Welter, Trettin, & Neumann, 2008).

In relation to gender, Berg (1997: 265) argues that for women entrepreneurs place oftentimes triggers a “breaking out of the norms” of, in this case, female behaviour. Empirical evidence for post-Soviet countries illustrates two behavioural patterns of women entrepreneurs which can trigger institutional change over time (Welter & Smallbone, 2008, 2010): They openly break out of societal norms which ascribe traditional gender roles in relation to sector choices or related to family life; and they frequently defy the male norm of entrepreneurship by playing with gender

stereotypes. Bruno (1997: 63-64) shows how women entrepreneurs re-interpret the predominant male image of entrepreneurship by emphasizing “their ‘natural’ feminine attitudes when engaging in business and turning them into the central principle behind their work activities”. Educational levels, together with previous professional experience, both of which might also reflect their social standing (Battilana, 2006) appear to be enabling factors for those women who voluntarily defy traditional gender roles and values and are even proud of their “outsider status”.

Change agents do not act in a vacuum. Weik (2011) points to that even powerful individuals have to rely on others to follow their newly established actions and behavioural patterns, which refers back to the multiple contexts in which institutional change agents are embedded and which they, in turn and together with other actors, change (also cf. Delbridge & Edwards, 2008). Some authors have studied the interplay between governments and individuals, indicating that the former often creates the conditions which in turn enable individuals to become change agents. Bika (2012) demonstrates this interplay for Greece: During its period of military dictatorship, in rural areas entrepreneurial sons from farming families were enabled to break away from traditional patriarchal structures which gave the family father all decision power and control over their lives. In an attempt to modernize Greece, the military regime introduced new farming methods, which, together with cheap credit and improved infrastructure, changed village life and farm families, emphasizing individuality, consumerism and entrepreneurship.

Such interplay across contexts and actors also contributes to explaining unintentional change behaviour as illustrated by Haggard and Nolan (2010) for North Korea. During the famine in the 1990s, the North Korean government failed to provide

its citizens with food. This in turn resulted in entrepreneurial coping behaviour of the population, much of it illegal, to overcome food shortages. In this case, state failure led to unintended and to some extent also unwanted institutional changes, with managers, entrepreneurs and workers taking up market activities, initially out of necessity, later because of opportunities, but in any case “well beyond the permission and reach of the state.” (Haggard & Nolan, 2010: 151). Similarly, Rehn and Taalas (2004) have emphasized how entrepreneurship, often illegal but tolerated, flourished in the daily lives of individuals during the Soviet period, as people struggled to cope with material shortages.

Institutional voids, in other words an institutional and business environment, which is deficient, also may trigger institutional change. This can happen, paradoxically, by initially enabling actors to exploit such voids. Some do so in order to make profit, as in the case of a business service provider in the Ukraine (Smallbone, Welter, Voytovich, & Egorov, 2010): In the Ukraine of the 1990s, rapid and frequent changes in laws and overly excessive business regulations created a demand for consultants who could solve particular operational problems, such as taxation or accounting issues, as well as a demand for assistance in obtaining licences, permits and planning permissions required for starting or expanding a business, including contacts and connections to administrations. An innovative business service provider exploited this institutional void by offering “full service” packages which included the necessary connections to officials. Temporal-historical contexts, in the form of a legacy of economies of favours from Soviet times (Ledeneva, 2006), contributes to explaining why such entrepreneurs may be successful in exploiting such institutional loopholes. Other actors use their activities to directly fill institutional voids, often with a social

motivation. This has been illustrated by Mair and Marti (2009) for the example of a non-governmental organisation in Bangladesh, aiming at alleviating poverty and empowering the poorest of the poor.

When actors engage in change activities, they may face not only institutional voids, but also contradictory institutional logics. This again emphasizes the temporal dimension of change behaviour. A typical example are situations where new institutions are not yet legitimized in economy and society (Beckert, 1999) as frequently happened in post-Soviet economies, where governments may have already introduced market-based legal frameworks but where individuals continued to draw on behaviour governed by Soviet norms such as legacies of non-compliance (Feige, 1997). Such “negative” path-dependent behaviour has been shown to constrain institutional change, in particular that of normative institutions (Greif & Laitin, 2004; Peng, 2003). Recently, studies on institutional change also started to acknowledge “positive path-dependent informality” such as revived entrepreneurship traditions in Poland, Hungary, China, together with innovative informal rules (Chavance, 2008), whose development often was (unconsciously) initiated by entrepreneurs searching for solutions to contradictory institutional logics (Smallbone & Welter, 2009; Stark, 1996). Such innovative institutions could be both detrimental to further change as is the case with corruption and law evasion or ambiguous as in the case of labour hoarding or barter (Chavance, 2008).

Bjerregaard and Luring (2012) illustrate in more detail how entrepreneurs manage institutional tensions, working around and brokering contradictory institutional logics. In their case it is the tensions between the requirements of a modern market economy and a traditional, rural culture, where extended family is both a resource as

well as hindrance to entrepreneurship and witchcraft still informs individual actions. One of the two entrepreneurs they studied is quite effective in “bridging institutional contradictions” (Bjerregaard & Luring, 2012: 31), by distancing himself from local traditions and thus openly bringing in new values, while the other entrepreneur draws heavily on traditional normative patterns to ensure legitimacy for his entrepreneurial activities. Thus, a new institutional logic emerges less from a break with existing institutions, but is more of an incremental process, a “co-mingling containing changed, reused and new templates” as suggested by Stål (2011). Here, the concept of “institutional bricolage” (Cleaver, 2002; Merrey & Cook, 2012) may offer a way forward to integrate the context and behavioural dimensions of institutional change. It emphasizes that institutional change emerges from collective actions, social identities and social relationships, thus drawing attention to the embeddedness of institutions in everyday lives and practices of those agents, who then, consciously and unconsciously, contribute to their change.

4.2. Why are some entrepreneurs change agents, and others not?

Kisfalvi and Maguire (2011) argue that *thinking and feeling*, as reflected in the individual background, personal experiences and emotions, have a decisive influence how institutional entrepreneurs see their world, subsequently shaping their change behaviour. Using a psychodynamic approach to explore the life of Rachel Carson, the great environmentalist, the authors highlight the importance of vision and passion as drivers for institutional change agents, together with independence, comfort with marginality, a desire to perform and a sense of agency and duty.

As factors that enable social community change, Johnstone and Lionais (2004) emphasized both local embeddedness as well as an ability and willingness to connect to the outside world. In their study, this was reflected in formal (non-entrepreneurship related) positions the business leaders hold prior to their community business, which contributed to respect and authority within their communities, in other words, their social standing (Battilana, 2006), together with their ability to step outside their accepted roles, thus challenging the perceptions communities hold of them; and with formal education acquired outside their community, which allowed them to draw on external and international networks.

This refers to *contextual discontinuity* and *boundary crossing* as potentially important elements of a change agent's background and experiences, as suggested by Mutch (2007). Both may result in individuals being insiders in some contexts and outsiders in others, which seems to enable them to act as change agents. The author illustrates his point drawing on the story of Sir Andrew Barclay Walker, who pioneered directly managed pubs in England during the late 19th century. Because of his Scottish background, Walker was able to see beyond existing and taken-for-granted managerial practices and organizational models such as the tied tenancy system still prevailing at that time in England. This allowed him to introduce a novel and innovative business model, thus contributing to changes in the brewery and pub industry.

Other instances where contextual discontinuity enables entrepreneurs to become change agents can be found in cross-border, diaspora or transnational entrepreneurship, with entrepreneurs acting as boundary-spanners across several diverse contexts (e.g., Terjesen & Elam, 2009; Xheneti et al., 2012). Riddle and Brinkerhoff (2011) present the fascinating case of Thamel.com, founded by a Nepali diaspora

entrepreneur (<http://www.thamel.com/>). Not only is this the story of humble beginnings (returning after his studies in the US, the entrepreneur started out as a street-trader) as stepping stone towards a substantial and successful e-business, but also the story of someone who introduced a new business model (e-commerce) to Nepal and its diaspora, and thus contributed to changing several Nepali institutions. Amongst changes in the formal institutional framework, this includes the Nepali government's role in creating an enabling business environment (the entrepreneur today advises the Nepali government); rules concerning the role of commerce in diaspora-homeland social rituals; new rules concerning consumer expectations of product and service quality as well as the responsiveness of producers to their demands (Riddle & Brinkerhoff, 2011: 677). Thamel.com also contributed to changes to the norms and values of Nepali society. For example, its prestige encourages both employees and customers to interact with lower caste individuals, thus influencing changes in those rules which governed inter-caste social interactions. All this did not happen overnight, but appears to have been a slow and incremental process, supported by the legitimacy, credibility and reputation the entrepreneur had earned in his host and home society (Riddle & Brinkerhoff, 2011).

Time adds another explanation to why some entrepreneurs can become change agents and others not, pointing at the dynamics and process of change behaviour. For example, women, through entering entrepreneurship, may learn over time to break out of norms of their society and place. This has been illustrated for the case of a young Uzbek woman living in a rural community who was forced, due to family circumstances, to start a traditional craft enterprise at home, and who, over time, started breaking out of the norms of her traditional culture which ascribed a house-bound role

to her (Welter & Smallbone, 2010). Using the example of two family-owned non-governmental organisations in India, which are involved in empowering women, Jakimow (2012) argues that women have to challenge existing gender and family norms, because otherwise they would not be able to take on leadership roles. Thus, where traditional societal norms come into conflict with modern practices such as those required to set up a business, this may trigger change behaviour regardless of the individual's experiences, background and intentions.

5. Outlook

This paper has explored in which ways human agency can influence and is shaped by institutional, social and spatial contexts. The paper argues that the concept of institutional entrepreneurship does not appear to fully capture the complexities of the interplay between context and agents. Instead, “institutional change agents” may be a more appropriate concept to study the role of human agency in shaping its contexts. Also, current conceptualisation of institutional change behaviour assume a rational, intended, planned and linear process of institutional change.

But, institutional change can happen intentionally and as an unintended by-product of entrepreneurial or organisational “path-dependent” behaviour. This implies that it is not only intentional behaviour which contributes to institutional change, but rather any entrepreneurial behaviour which implicitly or explicitly questions existing institutions. This has already been suggested by Giddens (1984) who pointed out that structures are generally quite stable, but when people ignore, replace or reproduce them differently, they can change them as an (un-)intended by-product of their actions. Moreover, change agents do not act on their own nor in a vacuum. Institutional change

results from individual and collective actions, it is embedded in multiple contexts as well as in everyday lives and practices.

Contextual discontinuity and boundary crossing, both related to spatial and cultural contexts as well as to social roles, appear to explain why some entrepreneurs become change agents and others do not. The evidence reviewed in this paper also indicates that in any situation where institutional logics are in conflict, it is not only the “exceptional” entrepreneurs or actors (e.g., those with broad experiences and background, and access to resources) who take up the challenge as change actor, but that these institutional tensions can be a trigger for others as well. Institutional change behaviour then is not limited to the chosen few, as generally implied in the concept of institutional entrepreneur, but it can be enacted by other groups as well.

Finally, Kalantaridis and Fletcher (2012) point to the need “to be cautious about being over attentive to the individual acts of institutional entrepreneurs”, instead arguing for research to consider the multiplicity of actors. The paper adds to this by calling for more research which considers the intersections of multiple context dimensions with institutional change behaviour, when studying (institutional) change agents.

References

- Aldrich, H. E. 2010. Beam Me up, Scott(ie)! Institutional Theorists' Struggles with the Emergent Nature of Entrepreneurship. *Research in the Sociology of Work*(21): 329-364.
- Batjargal, B. 2010. Network Dynamics and New Ventures in China: A Longitudinal Study. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(2): 139-153.
- Battilana, J. 2006. Agency and Institutions: The Enabling Role of Individuals' Social Position. *Organization*, 13(5): 653-676.
- Battilana, J., & Casciaro, T. 2012. Change Agents, Networks, and Institutions: A Contingency Theory of Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(2): 381-398.

- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. 2009. How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Annals*, 3: 65-107.
- Beckert, J. 1999. Agency, Entrepreneurs, and Institutional Change. The Role of Strategic Choice and Institutionalized Practices in Organizations. *Organization Studies*, 20(5): 777-799.
- Beckert, J. 2010. How Do Fields Change? The Interrelations of Institutions, Networks, and Cognition in the Dynamics of Markets. *Organization Studies*, 31(5): 605-627.
- Berg, N. G. 1997. Gender, Place and Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 9(3): 259-268.
- Bika, Z. 2012. Entrepreneurial Sons, Patriarchy and the Colonels' Experiment in Thessaly, Rural Greece. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4): 235-257.
- Bjerregaard, T., & Luring, J. 2012. Entrepreneurship as Institutional Change: Strategies of Bridging Institutional Contradictions. *European Management Review*, 9(1): 31-43.
- Carstensen, M. B. 2011. Paradigm Man Vs. The Bricoleur: Bricolage as an Alternative Vision of Agency in Ideational Change. *European Political Science Review*, 3(01): 147-167.
- Chavance, B. 2008. Formal and Informal Institutional Change: The Experience of Postsocialist Transformation. *European Journal of Comparative Economics*, 5(1): 57-71.
- Cleaver, F. 2002. Reinventing Institutions: Bricolage and the Social Embeddedness of Natural Resource Management. *European Journal of Development Research*, 14(2): 11.
- Clegg, S. 2010. The State, Power, and Agency: Missing in Action in Institutional Theory? *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 19(1): 4-13.
- Dacin, M. T., Goodstein, J., & Scott, W. R. 2002. Institutional Theory and Institutional Change: Introduction to the Special Research Forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 45-56.
- Daokui Li, D., Junxin, F., & Hongping, J. 2006. Institutional Entrepreneurs. *American Economic Review*, 96(2): 358-362.
- Delbridge, R., & Edwards, T. 2008. Challenging Conventions: Roles and Processes During Non-Isomorphic Institutional Change. *Human Relations*, 61(3): 299-325.
- DiMaggio, P. J. 1988. Interest and Agency in Institutional Theory. In L. G. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional Patterns and Organizations*: 3-22. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Douhan, R., & Henrekson, M. 2010. Entrepreneurship and Second-Best Institutions: Going Beyond Baumol's Typology. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 20(4): 629-643.
- Feige, E. 1997. Underground Activity and Institutional Change: Productive, Protective, and Predatory Behaviour in Transition Economies. In J. Nelson, C. Tilly, & L. Walker (Eds.), *Transforming Post-Communist Political Economies*: 21-34. Washington, D.C.
- Fligstein, N. 1997. Social Skill and Institutional Theory. *The American Behavioural Scientist*, 40(4): 397-405.
- Granovetter, M. 1985. Economic Action and Social Structure - the Problem of Embeddedness. *American Journal of Sociology*, 91(3): 481-510.
- Granovetter, M. 1992. Economic Institutions as Social Constructions - a Framework for Analysis. *Acta Sociologica*, 35(1): 3-11.
- Greif, A., & Laitin, D. D. 2004. A Theory of Endogenous Institutional Change. *American Political Science Review*, 98(4): 633-652.
- Haggard, S., & Noland, M. 2010. Reform from Below: Behavioral and Institutional Change in North Korea. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 73(2): 133-152.
- Henrekson, M., & Sanandaji, T. 2010. *The Interaction of Entrepreneurship and Institutions*. Stockholm: Research Institute of Industrial Economics.
- Hjorth, D., Jones, C., & Gartner, W. B. 2008. Introduction for 'Recreating/Recontextualising Entrepreneurship'. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 24(2): 81-84.
- Jakimow, T. 2012. A Site for the Empowerment of Women? The Clash of Patriarchal Values and Development Norms in a Family-Based Ngo. *Ethnography*, 13(2): 213-235.

- Johannisson, B. 1990. Between Territory and Function- on the Interfaces between Small Business, Large Business and Communities. In R. Donckels, & A. Miettinen (Eds.), *New Findings and Perspectives in Entrepreneurship*: 16-32.
- Johnstone, H., & Lionais, D. 2004. Depleted Communities and Community Business Entrepreneurship: Revaluing Space through Place. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16(3): 217-233.
- Kalantaridis, C. 2007. Institutional Change in Post-Socialist Regimes: Public Policy and Beyond. *Journal of Economic Issues*, XLI(2): 435-442.
- Kalantaridis, C., & Fletcher, D. 2012. Entrepreneurship and Institutional Change: A Research Agenda. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(3-4): 199-214.
- Kisfalvi, V., & Maguire, S. 2011. On the Nature of Institutional Entrepreneurs: Insights from the Life of Rachel Carson. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(2): 152-177.
- Koene, B. A. S. 2006. Situated Human Agency, Institutional Entrepreneurship and Institutional Change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 19(3): 365-382.
- Lawrence, T., Suddaby, R., & Leca, B. 2011. Institutional Work: Refocusing Institutional Studies of Organization. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 20(1): 52-58.
- Ledeneva, A. V. 2006. *How Russia Really Works : The Informal Practices That Shaped Post-Soviet Politics and Business*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Low, M. B., & MacMillan, I. C. 1988. Entrepreneurship: Past Research and Future Challenges. *Journal of Management*, 14(2): 139-161.
- Mair, J., & Marti, I. 2009. Entrepreneurship in and around Institutional Voids: A Case Study from Bangladesh. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5): 419-435.
- Martin, R. 2010. Roepke Lecture in Economic Geography - Rethinking Regional Path Dependence: Beyond Lock-in to Evolution. *Economic Geography*, 86(1): 1-27.
- Merrey, D. J., & Cook, S. 2012. Fostering Institutional Creativity at Multiple Levels: Towards Facilitated Institutional *Bricolage*. *Water Alternatives*, 5(1): 1-19.
- Mutch, A. 2007. Reflexivity and the Institutional Entrepreneur: A Historical Exploration. *Organization Studies*, 28(7): 1123-1140.
- North, D. C. 2005. *Understanding the Process of Economic Change*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Oliver, C. 1991. Strategic Responses to Institutional Processes. *Academy of Management Review*, 16(1): 145-179.
- Pacheco, D. F., York, J. G., Dean, T. J., & Sarasvathy, S. D. 2010. The Coevolution of Institutional Entrepreneurship: A Tale of Two Theories. *Journal of Management*, 36(4): 974-1010.
- Peng, M. W. 2003. Institutional Transitions and Strategic Choices. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2): 275-286.
- Polanyi, K. 1957. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (9. pr ed.). Boston: Beacon.
- Rehn, A., & Taalas, S. 2004. 'Znakomstva I Svyazi' (Acquaintances and Connections) – Blat, the Soviet Union, and Mundane Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16(3): 235-250.
- Riddle, L., & Brinkerhoff, J. 2011. Diaspora Entrepreneurs as Institutional Change Agents: The Case of Thamel.Com. *International Business Review*, 20(6): 670-680.
- Santos, F. M., & Eisenhardt, K. M. 2009. Constructing Markets and Shaping Boundaries: Entrepreneurial Power in Nascent Fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(4): 643-671.
- Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. 2009. *Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development in Post-Socialist Economies*. London: Routledge.
- Smallbone, D., Welter, F., Voytovich, A., & Egorov, I. 2010. Government and Entrepreneurship in Transition Economies: The Case of Small Firms in Business Services in Ukraine. *Service Industries Journal*, 30(5): 655-670.

- Stark, D. 1996. Recombinant Property in East European Capitalism. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(4): 993-1027.
- Stål, H. 2011. Examining the Relationship between Emerging and Prevailing Institutional Logics in an Early Stage of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Change Management*, 11(4): 421-443.
- Terjesen, S., & Elam, A. 2009. Transnational Entrepreneurs' Venture Internationalization Strategies: A Practice Theory Approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(5): 1093-1120.
- Thornton, P. H., & Flynn, K. H. 2005. Entrepreneurship, Networks, and Geographies. In Z. J. Acs, & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol. 1: 401-433: Springer US.
- Tracey, P., & Phillips, N. 2011. Entrepreneurship in Emerging Markets. *Management International Review*, 51(1): 23-39.
- Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P., & Wright, M. 2001. The Focus of Entrepreneurial Research: Contextual and Process Issues. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 25(4): 57.
- Weik, E. 2011. Institutional Entrepreneurship and Agency. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 41(4): 466-481.
- Welter, F. 2011. Contextualizing Entrepreneurship-Conceptual Challenges and Ways Forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1): 165-184.
- Welter, F., & Smallbone, D. 2008. Women's Entrepreneurship from an Institutional Perspective: The Case of Uzbekistan. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*(4): 505-520.
- Welter, F., & Smallbone, D. 2009. 15. The Emergence of Entrepreneurial Potential in Transition Environments: A Challenge for Entrepreneurship Theory or a Developmental Perspective? *Entrepreneurship and growth in local, regional and national economies: frontiers in European entrepreneurship research*: 339.
- Welter, F., & Smallbone, D. 2010. The Embeddedness of Women's Entrepreneurship in a Transition Context. In C. G. Brush, A. De Bruin, E. Gatewood, & C. Henry (Eds.), *Women Entrepreneurs and the Global Environment for Growth: A Research Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK, and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Welter, F., & Smallbone, D. 2011. Institutional Perspectives on Entrepreneurial Behavior in Challenging Environments. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1): 107-125.
- Welter, F., Trettin, L., & Neumann, U. 2008. Fostering Entrepreneurship in Distressed Urban Neighbourhoods. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4(2): 109-128.
- Voszka, É. 1994. The Revival of Redistribution in Hungary. *Acta Oeconomica*, 46(1): 65-78.
- Xheneti, M., Smallbone, D., & Welter, F. 2012. Eu Enlargement Effects on Cross-Border Informal Entrepreneurial Activities. *European urban and regional studies*.
- Zafirovski, M. 1999. Probing into the Social Layers of Entrepreneurship: Outlines of the Sociology of Enterprise. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 11(4): 351-371.
- Zahra, S. A., & Wright, M. 2011. Entrepreneurship's Next Act. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(4): 67-83.