



## Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

Lenade Barreto, IFBA, Brazil<sup>1</sup>  
Suely Messeder, UNEB, Brazil<sup>2</sup>  
Jaqueline Gil, IFBA, Brazil<sup>3</sup>

### SUMMARY

In recent decades, the growing presence of entrepreneurial activity at a global level is notorious. However, in the theoretical field, more markedly in Brazilian productions, it is noticeable the little relevance that new contributions have achieved in the face of a reigning and persistent classical-hegemonic literature of studies on the subject. In this sense, this article, the result of an ongoing doctoral research, arises from the search for the composition of a theoretical belt that provides support for a research on the entrepreneurial activity of workers in the peculiarity of the context of Bahia. We focus our gaze on academic-theoretical propositions that propose ruptures and/or expansion of classical-dominant postulates. Regarding the methodological issue, As a result, we present five clusters, which we name approaches, namely: practice in entrepreneurship theory, context-focused entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship and identity, entrepreneurship and poverty reduction, feminist approach to entrepreneurship. It is hoped that this review will contribute to a new research and theoretical production agenda for the field of entrepreneurship.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship. Practice and Context. Identity. Poverty reduction. Feminist.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

It is a fact that in recent decades we have witnessed an increased and growing presence of the term entrepreneurship in different spheres of social life. The presence is not only in terms of massive detection of the lexicon, which is increasingly popular, but in practical terms. Dedicating to the so-called small, micro or nano business has resulted in an almost unique way of generating income for many people, including workers who have lost their employment ties.

---

<sup>1</sup> lenadebarreto@hotmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4157-9288>

<sup>2</sup> suelymesseder@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7609-1792>

<sup>3</sup> jaquelinegil\_644@hotmail.com, ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8566-383>

Barreto, L., Messeder, S., Gil, J.; Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management of Micro and Small Enterprises V.7, N°2, p.142-167, May/August. 2022. Article received on 05/08/2022. Last version received on 06/10/2022. Approved on 08/15/2022.

## Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

In fact, at a global level, entrepreneurial activity has experienced an accelerated increase in recent decades. Data from 2008 from the largest and most comprehensive study and monitoring of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial perceptions in the world – the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor – shows that there were about 133 million entrepreneurs in the world that year, equivalent to about 10.5% of the world population. About Brazil, the most recent report, from 2019/2020, shows that in 2019 the country achieved the second highest rate of total entrepreneurship, which denotes that 38.7% of the adult population was involved in some form of entrepreneurial activity. .

At the same time, in the theoretical field, it is noticeable the little relevance that new contributions have achieved here in our country in the face of a reigning and persistent classical-hegemonic literature of studies on the subject. In this regard, it is necessary to point out the distance between entrepreneurship theorists and post-structuralist postulates and, consequently, the so-called cultural studies.

We have seen in the last four decades that all areas of knowledge have given much attention and centrality to cultural issues, having them as an object of study and/or as a kind of methodological tool. In this trail, there was an expansion of everything related to culture, covering the role of context, ethnicity, race, gender, sexuality and religion, bringing to light a high and diverse range of studies and academic productions that brought such themes as an agenda.

However, studies, research and productions on entrepreneurship, especially in Brazil, for a long time paid little attention to themes and approaches that have become important for contemporary society. A more empirical perspective still persists, focusing on the search for understanding the means of discovering opportunities engendered by entrepreneurs, the difficulties and obstacles encountered by them (and overcoming them), calling for entrepreneurial genius.

In this article, we focus our attention on some academic-theoretical propositions that propose ruptures and/or expansion of classical-dominant postulates. The aim here is to bring a clipping of interesting points that have been produced by several authors, of different nationalities, and that we consider relegated to the penumbra of the theoretical bulge of entrepreneurship disseminated in the Brazilian academic field.

In more illustrative terms, with regard to the conceptual issue, the objective of this writing is to bring together some productions that emerged in the course of our research so that

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

they can support researchers who seek to relate specific and contextual entrepreneurial practices to a much broader theoretical scope. coherent and in line with their research proposals.

In practice, this article emerged from the search for the composition of a theoretical belt that would provide support for a research<sup>4</sup> on the entrepreneurial activity of male and female workers in the peculiarity of the baianidade context<sup>5</sup>. Our task was not easy and does not intend to be a single and generalizing proposal, since we are aware that the literature of new strands on entrepreneurship is widely fragmented (UCBASARAN et al., 2001 apud SARKAR, 2014) and many authors point out precisely the difficulty of densification, while they defend the libertarian idea that each researcher can present what he wants in his analysis of this area of study (STEWART, 1991; VENKATARAMAN, 1997; BYGRAVE, HOFER, 1991).

Regarding the methodological issue, this writing consisted of selecting and analyzing a vast production in three different languages (Portuguese, English and Spanish) in different bases of scientific articles, in portals and networks of international researchers. As a result, we present five clusters, which we name approaches, namely: the practical turn in entrepreneurship theory, context-focused entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship and identity, entrepreneurship and poverty reduction – three perspectives, the feminist approach to entrepreneurship.

Throughout the coming discursive development, we present and point out the main pillars and authors of each approach and end with our considerations.

## 2 METHODOLOGICAL TRACK

This article is the result of the search for a theoretical foundation for a doctoral research that is in progress. This thesis proposal has as its macro objective the understanding of the *modus operandi* of workers in precarious entrepreneurial activity conducted in the "puxadinhos"<sup>6</sup> from their homes, based on the context of Bahianity.

---

<sup>4</sup>This article is part of the qualification text of the thesis (in progress) of the doctoral student Lenade Barreto Santos Gil, entitled "Cacete-armado – entrepreneurship of the working class in the context of baianidade: the pulled as a locus of subsistence of workers in the city of Camaçari", who is a student of the Graduate Program in Knowledge Diffusion (PPGDC), at the Federal University of Bahia.

<sup>5</sup>The baianidade lexicon is often referred to as the identity of the people of Bahia. It is a narrative that proclaims attributes and peculiarities inherent to the Bahian way of being.

<sup>6</sup>The entry refers to a very common form of self-construction in Brazil. It is the expansion of the house, traditionally, to house a relative, a son or daughter who got married and cannot afford the cost of a home of their own; or to supply the need for another room for some other destination, such as a pantry or a study space (among so many other possibilities). In the thesis in progress, the pull appears as a space for the development of the entrepreneurial activity of male and female workers.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

It is, therefore, a study proposal that articulates and focuses on the entrepreneurship of precariousness and unemployment, as well as guides an action of deconstruction of hegemonic postulates of the theory of entrepreneurship that prescribe and point out a series of rites and conditioning qualifications for an entrepreneurial practice. In this path, theoretical proposals that escape from classic models and that pay attention to models more rooted in the reality of life and with an eye towards the bodies that make entrepreneurship were our driving motto.

It was made, in the mainstay of the semantic web that involves (linked data, vocabularies, search and inference), a bibliographic survey in Portuguese, English and Spanish in different databases of scientific articles, in portals and networks of international researchers, with emphasis on Scielo, Anpad/Spell, CAPES Periodicals, Google Scholar, Sage Publications, Research Gate, Web of Science, Routledge, Library of Congress, Emerald, Academy of Management, Elsevier, Jstor, EBSCO.

It is important to highlight the effort made since some bases are paid and have a high cost for access. The central strategy was based on a profuse textual search with semantic bulge extraction, mobilizing the application of centrality to the nuclear descriptors “entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship”. This initial moment, despite the science of the breadth that would result from this first search, was an important step to have an overview and confirm the immense production on the subject. After this first stage, we started a funneling process with a view to achieving greater precision, as our point of interest advocated at the beginning of this section.

Thus, terms such as practice, context, identity, poverty, feminism (in English and Spanish as well) were added to the core descriptors. The addition of these lexicons was based on a low phrasal customization and took place with the use of only one stop word, the additive conjunction “and” (y/and). The choice was made in order to reduce the pollution of the results and provide better performance of the search algorithms of the different databases consulted.

The result of the search revealed articles, research, books, authors and academics that deal with and guide entrepreneurship in perspectives that are much less universal and much more applicable to specific realities. Despite recognizing the risk of categorizations and historical separations regarding the literature on entrepreneurship, as pointed out by Sarkar (2014), the approaches presented here are not closed, they dialogue with each other and bring as a characteristic a multidisciplinary inherent to the perspective of cultural studies.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

In addition, the approaches listed here, as they are, represent our reading, our view and do not aim at a hegemonic categorical-theoretical crystallization – something that would be a great contradiction for us. Next, we present the findings.

### **3 PRACTICE IN THE THEORY OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

The studies that proposed the so-called practical turn in the theory of entrepreneurship emerged as a criticism of the discourses and productions that insist on reifying entrepreneurial activity in generalized and generalizing conceptual models, making them empirically unspecified, universalized and distant from the daily life of those/those. that undertake.

Indeed, the practical turn in entrepreneurship is supported by the tradition of social science practice that touts the notion that practices and their connections are highly relevant to the ontological question of all social phenomena (SCHATZKI; KNORR-CETINA; SAVIGNY, 2000). ; ROUSE, 2006).

Despite the fact that theories of practice are based on the post-Cartesian philosophies of Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty and Wittgenstein and, more recently, Dreyfus, Taylor, Giddens, Foucault, Garfinkel, Lyotard, Pickering, Scollon, Rouse, Schatzki ( THOMPSON; VERDUJIN; GARTNER, 2020), there is a notable inspiration in Bourdieu's praxiology and, in fact, his postulates have been used in different productions.

Specifically, in the scope of self-employment and entrepreneurship, taking these as a macro framework, Bourdieu's theoretical basis has been used to explore the phenomenon of migration (NOWICKA, 2013; VERSHININA et al., 2011), of class ( ANDERSON; MILLER, 2003), gender (MARLOW; CARTER, 2004; VINCENT, 2016), learning (KARATAŞ-ÖZKAN, 2011) and rural economies (SUTHERLAND; BURTON, 2011).

Undoubtedly, the Bourdieusian framework is widely applicable to studies on entrepreneurship because it allows the deconstruction and reconstruction of the social world via central concepts: fields or social configurations of different textures; capital, namely the economic, cultural, social and symbolic resources of value within these settings; and the “habitus that produces practices” (BOURDIEU, 1994, p. 65). All of these concepts, in turn, affect agency within fields.

Theorists who base their research on Bourdieu's praxiology understand that no description or explanation of the characteristics of entrepreneurial life - such as recognizing,

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

evaluating and exploring opportunities - is possible without the description, analysis and explanation of how entrepreneurial life is actually lived: in the and through practices (GROSS; CARSON; JONES, 2014; KEATING; GEIGER; MCLOUGHLIN, 2013).

In this way, practice is not a conceptual category devoid of meanings, but comes from a comprehensive construction of meanings, identity formation and order of production of actions carried out by entrepreneurs located in specific historical conditions (CHIA; HOLT, 2006; NICOLINI, 2009).

Scholars of the practical turn are focused on the processes concerning a given entrepreneurial activity (MATTHEWS; CHALMERS; FRASER, 2018; WHITTINGTON 1996) and take into account the fact that the social and the material or technological, aspects inherent to the entrepreneurial activity, are inseparable elements, without determined limits that emerge in a nexus of practices of a culture (GHERARDI, 2016; HARAWAY, 1991).

Adopting the logic of practice means aligning oneself with the notion that the nexuses of practices are related to more lasting social orders (markets, sectors, institutions, culture, gender, etc.) embodied and improvised (CHALMERS; SHAW, 2017; GROSS; GEIGER, 2017; KEATING; GEIGER; MCLOUGHLIN, 2013).

Although very interesting for peripheral and specific realities, Thompson; Verdujin and Gartner (2020) point out that the theory of practice in entrepreneurship remains marginalized in favor of a predominant ontological individualism that focuses on the behavior of the ideal type of entrepreneur. The theory of practice challenges this ontological individualism by pointing out that entrepreneurship is not a single individual behavior, a state or event that must be uniformly observed and homogeneously theorized (THOMPSON; VERDUJIN; GARTNER, 2020).

Entrepreneurship studies from a tradition of practice treat the nexus of practices as the focus to be studied: the nature of entrepreneurship, the diversity of its occurrences, its transformations and its effects (many of which are unintended).

#### **4 ENTREPRENEURSHIP FOCUSED ON THE CONTEXT**

It may seem like an opulent truism, especially for those of us in the humanities and linguistics, but entrepreneurial phenomena, and all that is inherent to them, occur within contexts: each human being thinks and acts within certain social, linguistic and material

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

contexts, and human beings are not disembodied spirits, but consist of flesh and blood, living in certain concrete times and places (WELTER, 2011).

Contexts are very relevant to entrepreneurial action and a contextual approach to entrepreneurship clearly takes us away from forms of inquiry that claim to detach from context – such as personality traits and human capital approaches, classically speaking.

Several authors have been signaling the need for a theoretical scope that is more guided by real issues, including attention to the context and avoiding assumptions that are too abstract and universalizing (STEYAERT; KATZ 2004; WELTER, 2011; ZAHRA, 2014; WELTER; GARTNER, 2016). ; STAM, 2016). A recurring point in these new productions is the sign of an unjustified inattention of those who theorize entrepreneurship about the importance of local knowledge (GEERTZ, 1989), situated in a given reality, a given social context.

The idea guided by the authors is to stimulate a research agenda that is not limited to notably hegemonic scenarios and that varies between broader and narrower scenes, promoting the displacement of the analyzes of entrepreneurial activity in multidiscursive spaces and expanding the details of everyday sociability. that make up the entrepreneurial processes.

For Steyaert and Katz (2004), when connecting entrepreneurship to the social context, a political understanding of the context emerges in the form of a geopolitics of everyday entrepreneurship and, consequently, in a geopolitics of the knowledge produced, thus contributing to a broader theoretical enrichment. .

The argument of Johnstone and Lionais (2004) seems to us to be very interesting when it comes to the importance of focusing on the context. They argue that, in places where capitalist relations are less robust, such as poor and/or peripheral communities, the entrepreneurial process can adapt and manifest itself differently, specifically, due to social reality.

The authors point out that areas without capital power demand, provoke and create entrepreneurial responses to this condition. Some recent research, which explored peripheral contexts, highlights liberating discourses, structures and practices carried out by marginalized entrepreneurs.

As an example of this, Georgiou (2013 apud Dodd; Pret; Shaw, 2016) conducted research in which he found resistance entrepreneurship in his study of post-colonialism and entrepreneurial networks, where cultural hybrids emerged that both imitate and resist dominant forces. . Entrepreneurship, then, can act as a vehicle for the marginalized to represent the

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

creativity involved in moving between various cultural structures and in resisting the colonizer, interrupting the imposition of their knowledge and practices (FRENKEL, 2008).

Marginality, the position of powerlessness, can then be deployed as a resource, allowing for a special kind of “liberated entrepreneurship” (Dodd, Pret, and Shaw, 2016, p. 124). Resistance entrepreneurship transforms the place of the margin into a space of freedom, a space of play. The means available in this marginalized context are not typically economic, but they are perhaps even more influential for this reality.

In the hands of the underprivileged, cultural, social and symbolic resources can become creative tools of resistance to dominant entrepreneurial dictates. This is not an easy path: the acute scarcity of resources and the exclusion imposed by an economic hegemony combine to create a very difficult context for entrepreneurship. However, a strength of marginalized entrepreneurs, who are excluded from or deliberately resist orthodox habitus, is that they can provide an alternative social construction of entrepreneurship to challenge dominant postulations (DODD; PRET; SHAW, 2016).

In order to reach a theoretical scope attentive to contexts, it is important that studies on entrepreneurship work with other disciplines such as anthropology, sociology and linguistics that have some of the essential tools to explore the variety, depth and richness of specific contexts. (ZAHRA, 2007; WELTER, 2011; STEYAERT, 2016). In this sense, the focus on context within the theory of entrepreneurship clearly dialogues with the practical turn presented earlier.

## **5 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND IDENTITY**

First of all, it is important to clarify that we treat identity and the identity agenda in a perspective that assumes the non-crystallization of imposing and prescriptive-exclusive characteristics of the self. We defend that there is no possibility of escaping the identity path that, even admitting a continuous movement of changes, advances and retractions in a diachronic line, has its possibility of delineation in synchronous temporal landmarks. This differs, importantly, from the conservative identity movement that is supported by right-wing extremist discourses. From this perspective, we were impelled to seek productions that filled a gap that emerged when dealing with the theoretical perspectives presented so far, especially the



Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

practical turn of entrepreneurship and the relevant finding that the context matters a lot for entrepreneurial practice.

In the context of research on entrepreneurship, as researchers Nielsen and Lassen (2011) point out, there is a growing interest in aspects involving the issue of identity as an aspect of the entrepreneurial process, a fact that can be observed in the works of Downing (2005), Down and Warren (2008); Shepherd and Haynie (2009) and Hoang and Gimeno (2010).

However, Akerlof and Kranton (2000) are credited with introducing the concept of identity in studies of economic theory. Although they have not specifically entered into entrepreneurship, it is important to briefly refer to the authors. By opposing the standard economy that is based on a kind of methodological individualism, they argue that not all decision-making and individual considerations are isolated points, but rather are linked to a social desirability resulting from the vision that the individual has of himself and of himself. who he or she is from social interactions, resulting in endogenous norms and prescriptions that affect social behavior.

Falck, Helblich and Luedemann (2009) speak of a felt absence of the theme of identity in studies on entrepreneurship and point out that work in this field owes a great debt to Schumpeterian seminal contributions. For these authors, Schumpeter, despite a somewhat romanticized view, gave a kind of start in the field by seeing the entrepreneur as that person who has important attributes, such as the ability to innovate, the recognition of a good opportunity and acceptance of a certain degree. of risk, that is, it is evident that for them Schumpeter's entrepreneurial spirit has identity nuances.

According to Down and Warren (2008), in line with what we pointed out in the introduction of this section, in the fields of Sociology and Social Psychology, there is a growing consensus that identity is not a stable unit of the individual, but, rather, it is constituted through continuous interactions between individual resources and contextual discourses. Still, much research on identity in the context of entrepreneurship can be characterized by a modernist psychological view of the self, which emphasizes that identity is a relatively stable core that determines behavior (Nielsen and Lassen, 2011).

Indian professor Sara Sarasvanthy, in her effectuation theory, which has been referenced in some research on entrepreneurship (GOEL and KARRI 2006; READ et al. 2009), points out that the entrepreneurial process is shaped from a set of given means that can be combined in a range of different possible effects. She postulates the renowned teacher that individual identity

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

is traditionally perceived as one of the preconditions, or means, that give rise to the entrepreneurial movement.

Thus, in the entrepreneurial process, identity is perceived as a relatively stable precondition, which influences the way entrepreneurs organize their preferences and make decisions in the uncertain and ambiguous situation of entrepreneurship (SARASVATHY; DEW, 2005). In this way, the effectuation theory suggests that from the beginning of the entrepreneurial process, individuals maintain a relatively clear and coherent perception of who they are and, based on this, act and make decisions (SARASVATHY, 2001).

According to Nielsen and Larsen (2011), the effectuation theory, however, also implicitly opens up to the idea that identity can change during the entrepreneurial process, as the individual interacts with new people, obtains access to new opportunities and obtains gain new features.

## **6 ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND POVERTY REDUCTION**

Although still very fragmented, a group of scholars, many from emerging and peripheral countries, has been advocating entrepreneurship as a critical means of reducing poverty. The studies start from the principle that entrepreneurial action should, in fact, seek to positively influence the lives of people who are in poverty, socially excluded, thus promoting the economic and non-economic well-being not only of individuals, but of entire communities. According to Sutter, Brutton and Chen (2018), it is possible to identify three perspectives in this line: the perspective of remediation, the perspective of reform and the perspective of revolution.

The remediation perspective posits that poverty reduction occurs when resource scarcity is addressed. This perspective often focuses on providing scarce resources, such as finance or training, as central to poverty alleviation (BERGE et al., 2014; CHLIOVA; RINGOV, 2017; VALDIVIA, 2015).

The remediation perspective assumes that markets will prosper as entrepreneurial activity is unleashed and that entrepreneurship among the poor will result in a win-win that benefits all social participants (LONDON, 2009; KHAVUL, 2010).

The reform perspective posits that poverty is the result of social exclusion and that poverty reduction through entrepreneurship occurs as the institutional or social context changes

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

(GHANI et al., 2014; SCOTT et al., 2012). For example, rather than exploring how to provide women with the funding they need to participate in markets, the reform perspective would ask what social structures prevent such participation and how that structure can be changed to be more inclusive.(MAIR et al., 2012).This perspective generally assumes that markets are the main drivers of poverty reduction, although they need restructuring to be more inclusive (GEORGE et al., 2012; SUTTER et al., 2018). Since the reform perspective focuses on the need for social change, this literature does not necessarily assume that poverty reduction will always result in a win-win situation in which all parties benefit. Instead, power struggles can result in short-term losses for previously privileged groups (AL-DAJANI; MARLOW, 2015; KENT; DACIN, 2013). Finally, the reform perspective also goes beyond positivism by paying attention to the socially constructed realities of the poor and thus implicitly embracing other epistemological and ontological stances, such as critical realism (DATTA; GAILEY, 2012).

The revolution perspective advocates that poverty reduction occurs when entrepreneurship presents alternatives to capitalism, in the way it is currently constituted. They question some of the basic assumptions of capitalism, such as self-interest, efficiency and an individualistic orientation (CALAS et al., 2009; PEREDO; CHRISMAN, 2006). Rather than perpetuating the neoliberal social structure through entrepreneurship, the revolution perspective suggests that entrepreneurship can lead to different ways of economically organizing individuals and communities (RINDOVA et al., 2009).

The distinction between the perspective of reform and revolution is more of a continuum than a dividing line. However, at its core, the reform perspective suggests ways in which social and institutional change can help to incorporate the poor into more inclusive markets, while the revolution perspective questions the very essence of capitalist markets (LDS; VANSANDT, 2011). .

The revolution perspective also pays attention to how power is exercised to reproduce the existing social order and how power can be challenged (LEVY, 2008; SHAKYA; RANKIN, 2008). This perspective generally assumes that the ultimate goal of reducing poverty through entrepreneurship should be to increase social equity, which implies that economic outcomes, such as economic efficiency, are secondary considerations (CALAS et al., 2009).

## **7 THE FEMINIST APPROACH TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

Along with other postulates presented so far, we bring the feminist approach as an interesting theoretical support in the mainstay of the theoretical scope of feminism (CALAS; SMIRCICH; BOURNE, 2007; GREER; GREEN, 2003; HURLEY, 1999; MIRCHANDANI, 1999; STEVENSON, 1990; ). It is important to point out the feeling we have regarding relevant differences between what is conventionally called female entrepreneurship, with a production started in the last decades of the last century and in the first decade of this century, both internationally (SCHWARTZ, 1976; SEXTON; KENT, 1981, SMITH; MCCAIN; WARREN, 1982; NEIDER, 1987; ALDRICH; REESE; DUBINI, 1989; FAGENSON, 1993; SEXTON; BOWMAN-UPON, 1990; WHITE; COX, 1991, CROMIE, BIRLEY, 1992; CARTER, 1989; LEE—GOSSELIN; GRISÉ, 1990; FISHER, REUBER AND DYKE, 1993), as well as at the national level (STROBINO, TEIXEIRA, 2014; CRAMER et al., 2012, JONANTHAN, 2011; VALE, SERAFIM, TEODÓSIO, 2011; LIMA, FREITAS, 2010; AXE; WETSEL; RODRIGUES, 2008; JONATHAN; SILVA, 2007) and what we bring here as a flourishing field of study in the field of entrepreneurship.

The theoretical scope, called female entrepreneurship, had a very strong focus on empirical-quantitative issues and was limited to data collection without promoting debates that would further tension the issues of subordination of the female gender. As pointed out by professors Gomes, Santana, Araújo and Martins (2014), many of these studies were restricted to describing, in a fragmented way, small segments of the population of women entrepreneurs and did not advance in the application and development of theories. Much of the production of this scope reinforces discursive practices that reproduce female subordination, recreating the idea that companies managed by women play a secondary and less significant role when compared to those led by men,

On the other hand, the feminist approach to entrepreneurship is still very little studied, is somehow fragmented and suffers a felt marginalization in a dominant literature largely produced by men. The production of Calás and Smircich (1996; 2006; 2007; 2011) deserves special mention. The authors' work is pioneering and they have become the main reference for this approach that is very important to us.

The landmark of the research is the release in 1996 of the article entitled “From 'the woman's point of view': feminist approaches to organization studies”, which brings a fabric between feminist approaches and organizational studies. Since then, an interesting production,

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

very little disseminated, especially here in Brazil, has been giving volume to a highly relevant theoretical body in the field of studies on entrepreneurship, in the light of gender studies.

As is easy to predict and as already evidenced here, the feminist approach starts from a critique of a dominant literature on entrepreneurship. Feminists point out that there is a framing of the ontological and epistemological orientation of the dominant perspectives in the logic of economic rationality. Such an understanding hides much more than what entrepreneurship is and does.

The criticism of the dominant literature starts from the human representations that permeate the main theoretical and research frameworks – that is, who and why is included and who and why is outside. In carrying out a literature that articulates the uniqueness of entrepreneurship as a universal phenomenon based on opportunities arising from the market, a major conceptual gap emerges as many of the contextual dynamics that make entrepreneurial activity relevant to specific people, in specific places and for specific reasons are ignored by the normative premises of conventional literature (CALÁS; SMIRCICH, 2006).

The fundamental question raised by the feminist current is not whether the dominant theoretical constructs are able to incorporate different groups (such as women, black people, immigrants or people from emerging economies) in their scope (BRUSH; CARTER; GATEWOOD; GREENE; HART). , 2004; WALDINGER; ALDRICH; WARD, 2000), but rather, in the economic emphasis behind these constructions. In fact, traditional perspectives on entrepreneurship aim to reproduce a specific economic system – market capitalism – and to spread almost allegorically that it will benefit everyone. For feminists, a simplistic positive view of entrepreneurship – something common in traditional perspectives – is meaningless. It is necessary to analyze entrepreneurship as a more complex phenomenon than allowed by its narrow formulation, reductionist, limited and limiting as an economic activity. Thus, they advocate for an entrepreneurship that actually promotes a process of social change without being tied to economic or managerial logic (HJORTH; STEYAERT, 2004; JONES; SPICER, 2005; STEYAERT, 1997, 2005; STEYAERT; HJORTH, 2007; STEYAERT; KATZ, 2004).

Social change is on the agenda, at the center of feminist theorizing and, when it comes to entrepreneurship, it would be no different. It starts from the assumption that gender is fundamental in the structuring of society, with women historically disadvantaged. Feminist theorizing critically analyzes social change agendas in these terms. However, the meaning of social change varies according to the basic ontological and epistemological assumptions of each

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

major theoretical approach within feminism (CALÁS; SMIRCICH, 2006; EVANS, 1995; GREWAL; KAPLAN, 1994; JAGGAR, 1983; TONG, 1998). ). Very important for the entire feminist current, the production of knowledge that is being developed is also relevant in this approach. In this sense, it is defended the expansion of works on entrepreneurship with a feminist analytical lens.

The researchers Calás, Smircich and Bourne (2007) point out two major groups within feminist theorization to reformulate entrepreneurship as an economic activity and as an important scope of research. The first group is a liberal, psychoanalytic, and radical feminist theorizing that posits that there is a realistic ontological position on men and women and a stratified social structure, where entrepreneurship is an aspect of that social structure. The desired changes include the elimination of barriers to women's access to public life, the recognition of women's different experiences as valuable contributions to society, and even the contemplation of a women-centered structuring of society as the only possibility to counteract the structuring of society. patriarchal.

The second group is a transnational socialist, poststructuralist and feminist theorizing that advances a social constructionist ontology that favors point-of-view epistemologies and, in some cases, advances anti-ontological arguments that favor postmodern epistemology. Rather than assuming binary and essentialist notions of "women" and "men", the focus is on gender relations - as productive processes in the ongoing structuring of society. A focus on gender relations draws attention not only to the sex of participants as embodied actors, but to the cultural production of their subjectivities and the material production of their social lives.

From these processes emerge social terrains loaded with power, contested and in constant change, where different interests act. How entrepreneurship as a social process is involved in these gender processes and practices is a question that permeates everything that involves entrepreneurial activity.

## **8 CONSIDERATIONS**

The findings show an attempt to break with postulations that are hegemonically perpetrated, regarding which prevails the idea that entrepreneurship is the process of creating businesses that are backed by innovation and that are the result of the identification of opportunities for such. In turn, entrepreneurs are geniuses who generate or respond to

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

opportunities that arise, practitioners of innovation, developers of great businesses, creators of innovative organizations or networks of organizations, aiming at profitability or growth without fear of risk – in short, they are the providers of social change. and economic development.

The approaches identified in our literature review movement and presented here show the importance of paying attention to the fact that in contemporary times no area of study is departmentalized, isolated and relegated to intraconceptual monologues in front of the mirror. The contributions of the different areas of investigation of knowledge, as well as the attention to different social demands, can only enrich a given study. An integrationist approach, which involves different perspectives, means respect for an area of study that is (and should be) dynamic by nature.

On the other hand, the approaches presented will support our research (in progress), since the entrepreneurship of male and female workers in the peculiarity of the Baianidade context is disconnected from classic prerogatives and requires a detailed look, drastically refuting the alignment with any universalizing pillar. .

In a movement of intertwining our objective with the approaches presented, we can list that the entrepreneurial activity with which we deal is contextual, based on practice, brings an identity agenda (Baianidade), aims to overcome the precariousness of life and takes into account the need of looking at gender issues since there are clear and stratified social differences between the entrepreneurial exercise of a worker and a female worker.

Finally, we understand that the result of this review represents the need for a new research and theoretical production agenda for the area of entrepreneurship. What has been outlined here is a contribution to a new, necessary and desired epistemology.

## REFERENCES

- Akerlof, GA; RE Kranton. (2000). Economics and Identity. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 105(3), 715–53.
- Al-DajaniL, H.,. Marlow (2015). Empowerment, place and entrepreneurship: Women in the global south. In: Baker, T.; & WELTER, F. (eds) *The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship*. New York: Routledge, pp. 343–357.
- Anderson, AR; Miller, CJ (2003) Class matters: Human and social capital in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, vol. 32, no. 1, p. 17–36.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

- Aldrich, H.; Reese, PR; Dubini, P. (1989) Women on the verge of a breakthrough?: networking among entrepreneurs in the United States and Italy. In: VESPER, KH (Ed.) Frontiers of entrepreneurship research. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Babson College, p. 560-574.
- Berge, LIO; Bjorvatn, K.; Tungodden, B. (2014). Human and financial capital for microenterprise development: evidence from a field and lab experiment. *management Sci.* 61, 707–722.
- Bourdieu, P. Outline of a Theory of Practice. (1994) In: Ortiz, Renato (Org.). Pierre Bourdieu's sociology. São Paulo: Editora Ática, n. 39, p. 46-86. Great Social Scientists Collection.
- Brush, CG; Carter, N.; Gatewood, E.; Greene, P.; Hart, M. (2004) Clearing the hurdles: Women building high growth businesses. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Financial Times Prentice-Hall.
- Bygrave, WD, Hofer, CW (1992) Theorizing about entrepreneurship. *enterp. Theory Practice.* 16, 13–22.
- Cálas, MB; Smircich, L. (1996). From “the woman's” point of view: feminist approaches to organizations studies. In: CLEGG, S. et al. Handbook of organization studies. London: Sage.
- Cálas, MB; Smircich, L. (2006) From the "woman's point of view" ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In: Clegg, S.; Hardy, C.; Lawrence, T.; Nord, W. (Eds.). Handbook of organization studies: 284-346. London: Sage.
- Cálas, MB; Smircich.; Bourne, KA (2007). knowing Lisa? Feminist analyzes of gender and entrepreneurship. In: Bilimoria, D.; pry SK (Eds.). Handbook on women in business and management. 78-105. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- Cálas, MB; Smircich.; Bourne, KA (2009). Extending the boundaries: reframing “entrepreneurship as social change” through feminist perspectives. *Academy of Management Review* 34, 552–569.
- Carter, S. (1989). The dynamics and performance of female-owned entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Organizational Change Management.* Bradford. v. 2, no. 3, p. 54-64.



Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

- Chalmers, DM; Shaw, E. (2017) The Endogenous Construction of Entrepreneurial Contexts: A Practice-based Perspective. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship* 35 (1): 19–39.
- Chia, R.; Holt, R. (2006). Strategy as Practical Coping: A Heideggerian Perspective. *Organization Studies* 27 (5): 635–655.
- Chliova, M.; Ringov, D. (2017). Scaling impact: template development and replication at the base of the pyramid. *academy management perspective* 31 (1), 44–62.
- Cramer, L. et al. (2012). Female representations of entrepreneurial action: an analysis of the trajectory of women in the business world. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management, São Paulo*, v.1, n.1, 53-71, Jan./April.
- Cromie, S.; Birley, S. (1992). Networking by female business owners in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Business Venturing, Amsterdam*. v. 7, no. 3, p. 237-251, May.
- Datta, PB; Gailey, R. (2012). Empowering women through social entrepreneurship: a case study of a women's cooperative in India. *enterp. Theory Practice*. 36, 569–587.
- Dodd, SD; Pret, T.; Shaw, E. (2016). Advancing understanding of entrepreneurial embeddedness: forms of capital, social contexts and time. In: Welter, F; Gartner, WB *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Down, S.; Warren, L. (2008). Constructing narratives of enterprise: clichés and entrepreneurial self-identity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior*, 14(1), 4–23.
- Downing, S. (2005). The social construction of entrepreneurship: narratives and dramatic processes in the co-production of organizations and identities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(2), 185–204.
- Evans, J. (1995). *Feminist theory today*. London: Sage.
- Fagenson, EA (1993). Personal value systems of men and women entrepreneurs versus managers. *Journal of Business Venturing, Amsterdam*. v. 8, no. 5, p. 409-430, Sept.
- Falck, O.; Heblich, S.; Luedemann, E. Identity and entrepreneurship: Do school peers shape entrepreneurial intentions? *Small Business Economics*. 2009
- Fischer, EM; Reuber, AR; Dyke, LS A theoretical overview and extension of research on sex, gender, and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing, New York*, v. 8, no. 2, p. 151-168, Mar. 1993.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

- Frenkel, M. (2008). The multinational corporation as a third space: Rethinking international management discourse on knowledge transfer through Homi Bhabha.. *Academy of Management Review*, 33 (4), 924–942.
- Geertz, C. (1989). *The interpretation of cultures*. Rio de Janeiro: LTC.
- George, G.; McGahan, AM; Prabhu, J. Innovation for inclusive growth: towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. *J. Manag. Study* 49, 661-683. 2012
- Ghani, E.; Kerr, WR; O'Connell, SD (2014). Political reservations and women's entrepreneurship in India. *J. Dev. economy* 108, 138–153.
- Gherardi, S. (2016). Sociomateriality in Posthuman Practice Theory. In: *The Nexus of Practices: Connections, Constellations, Practitioners*. edited by TR Schatzki, 38–51, Routledge London.
- Goel, S.; Karri, R. (2006). Entrepreneurs, effectual logic, and over-trust. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 477–493.
- Gomes, A.F; Santana, WG P; Araújo, U.P; Martins, CMF (2014). Female Entrepreneurship as a Research Subject. *RBGN – Brazilian Journal of Business Management*. Sao Paulo, v. 16, no. 51, p. 319-342, Apr./Jun.
- Greer, MJ; Greene, PG (2003). Feminist theory and the study of entrepreneurship. In: BUTLER, JE (Ed.). *New perspectives on women entrepreneurs*.1-24: Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Grewal, L.; Kaplan, C. (Eds.). (1994). *Scattered hegemonies: Postmodernity and transnational feminist practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gross, N.; Carson, D.; Jones, R. (2014). Beyond Rhetoric: Re-thinking Entrepreneurial Marketing from a Practice Perspective. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship* 16 (2): 105–127.
- Gross, N.; Geiger, S. (2017). Liminality and the Entrepreneurial Firm: Practice Renewal during Periods of Radical Change. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research* 23 (2): 185–209.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.
- Hjorth, D.; Steyaert, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Narrative and discursive approaches in entrepreneurship: A second movements in entrepreneurship book*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

- Hoang, H.; Gimeno, J. (2010). Becoming a founder: how founder role identity affects entrepreneurial transition and persistence in founding. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 41–53.
- Hurley, AE (1999). Incorporating feminist theories into sociological theories of entrepreneurship. *Women in Management Review*, 14: 54-62.
- Jaggar, A. (1993). *Feminist politics and human nature*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Johnstone, H.; Lionais, D. (2004). Depleted communities and community business entrepreneurship: revaluing space through place. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16 (3), 217–233.
- Jonathan, EG (2011). Entrepreneurial women: the challenge of choosing entrepreneurship and the exercise of power. *Clinical Psychology, Rio de Janeiro*, v. 23, no. 1, p. 65-85.
- Jones, C.; Spicer, A. (2005). The sublime object of entrepreneurship. *Organization*, 12: 223-246.
- Karatas-Ozkan, M. (2011). Understanding relational qualities of entrepreneurial learning: Towards a multi-layered approach. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, vol. 23, no. 9–10, p. 877–906.
- Keating, A.; S. Geiger; D. Mcloughlin. (2013). Riding the Practice Waves: Social Resourcing Practices during New Venture Development. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice* 38 (5): 1–29.
- Kent, D.; Dacin, MT (2013). Bankers at the gate: microfinance and the high cost of borrowed logics. *J. Bus. Venture* 28, 759–773.
- Khavul, S. (2010). Microfinance: creating opportunities for the poor? *academy management perspective* 24, 58–72.
- Lee-Gosselin, H.; Grise, J. (1990). Are women owner-managers challenging our definitions of entrepreneurship? An in-depth survey. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Dordrecht, v. 9, no. 4-5, p. 423-433, Apr./May.
- Levy, DL (2008). Political contestation in global production networks. *Academy of Management Review*, 33, 943–963.
- Lima, RCR; Freitas, AAF Entrepreneurial personality, personal resources, environment, organizational activities, gender and financial performance of informal entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

Journal of Public Administration, Rio de Janeiro, v. 44, no. 2, p. 511-531, Mar./Apr. 2010.

- Machado, RMC; Wetzel, U.; Rodrigues, ME (2008). The succession experience for heiresses of family businesses in Rio de Janeiro. EBAPE notebooks, Rio de Janeiro, v. 6, no. 3, p. 1-24, Sept.
- Mair, J., MAartí, I., Ventresca, MJ (2012). Building inclusive markets in rural Bangladesh: how intermediaries work institutional voids. *academy management J.* 55, 819-850.
- Marlow, S.; Carter, S. (2004) Accounting for change: Professional status, gender disadvantage and self-employment. *Women in Management Review*, vol. 16n. 1, p. 5–16.
- Matthews, RS; Chalmers, DM; Fraser, SS (2018). The Intersection of Entrepreneurship and Selling: An Interdisciplinary Review, Framework, and Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing* 33: 691–719.
- Mirchandani, K. (1999). Feminist insight on gendered work: New directions in research on women and entrepreneurship. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 6: 224-235.
- Neider, L. (1987) A preliminary investigation of female entrepreneurs in Florida. *Journal of Small Business Management*. Morgantown, v. 25, no. 3, p. 22-29.
- Nicolini, D. (2009). Zooming in and Out: Studying Practices by Switching Theoretical Lenses and Trailing Connections. *Organization Studies* 30 (12): 1391–1418.
- Nielsen, SL; Lassen, AH (2011) Identity in entrepreneurship effectuation theory: a supplementary framework. *Int Entrep Manag J.* 8:373–389.
- Nowicka, M. (2013). Positioning strategies of Polish entrepreneurs in Germany: Transnationalizing Bourdieu's notion of capital. *International Sociology*, vol. 28, no. 1, p. 29–47.
- Peredo, AM; Chrisman, JJ (2006). Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. *Academy of Management Review* 31, 309–328.
- Read, S.; Song, M.; Smit, W. (2009). A meta-analytical review of effectuation and venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 573–587.
- Rindova, V. et al. (2009). Entrepreneurship as emancipation. *Academy of Management Review*. 34 (3), 477–491.
- Rouse, J. (2006). “Practice Theory.” In *Handbook of the Philosophy of Science*, edited by DM Gabbay, P. Thagard, and J. Woods, 500–540. vol. 15. North Holland: Elsevier.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

Sarasvathy, SD (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of management Review*, v.26, n. 2, p. 243-263.

Sarasvathy, SD; Dew, N. (2005). Entrepreneurial logics for a technology of foolishness. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, vol. 21, no. 4, p. 385-406.

Sarkar, S. (2014). *Entrepreneurship and innovation*. Lisbon: Escolar Editora.

Schatzki, TR; K. Knorr-Cetin; E. (2001). *Savigny. The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.

Schwartz, EB (1976). Entrepreneurship: a new female frontier. *Journal of Contemporary Business*. Seattle, v. 5, no. 1, p. 47-76.

Scott, L.; Dolan, C.; Johnstone-Louis, M.; Sugden, K.; Wu, M. (2012) Enterprise and inequality: a study of Avon in South Africa. *enterp. Theory Practice*. 36, 543–568.

Sexton, DL; Kent, C., A. (1981). Female executives and entrepreneurs: a preliminary comparison. In: Vesper, KH (Ed.). *Frontiers of entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Babson College, p. 40-55.

Shakya, YB; Rankin, KN (2008). The politics of subversion in development practice: an exploration of microfinance in Nepal and Vietnam. *J. Dev. Study* 44.1214–1235.

Smith, NR; McCain, G.; Warren, A. (1982). Women entrepreneurs really are different: a comparison of constructed ideal of male and female entrepreneurs. In: Vesper, KH (Ed.). *Frontiers of entrepreneurship. Research*. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Babson College, p. 68-76.

Stam, E. (2016). Theorizing entrepreneurship in context. In: Welter, F; Gartner, WB A *Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Stepherd, D.; Haynie, MJ (2009). Birds of a feather don't always flock together: identity management in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 316–337.

Stevenson, L. (1990). Some methodological problems associated with researching women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9: 439-446.

Steyaert, C. 1997). A qualitative methodology for process studies of entrepreneurship. *International Studies of Management and Organization*. 27(3): 13-33.

Steyaert, C. (2005). Entrepreneurship: In between what? On the "frontier" as a discourse of entrepreneurship research. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and*

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

*Small Business*. 2:2-16.

Steyaert, C. (2016). After Context. In: Welter, F; Gartner, WB A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Steyaert, C; Hjorth, D. (2007). Entrepreneurship as social change. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Steyaert, C.; Katz, J. (2004). Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: Geographical, discursive and social dimensions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 16, 179-196.

Stewart, A. (1991). Team entrepreneurship. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Sexton, DL; Kent, C., A. (1991). Female executives and entrepreneurs: a preliminary comparison. In: Vesper, KH (Ed.). *Frontiers of entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Babson College, p. 40-55.

Sexton, DL; Bowman-Upton, N. (1990). Female and male entrepreneurs: psychological characteristics and their role in gender-related discrimination. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Amsterdam, v. 5, no. 1, p. 29-36, Jan.

Sud, M.; Vamsamdt, CV (2011). Of fair markets and distributive justice. *J. Bus. Ethics* 99, 131–142.

Strobin, MRC; Teixeira, RM (2014). Female entrepreneurship and the work-family conflict: a multi-case study in the construction material trade sector in the city of Curitiba. *Management Journal*, São Paulo, v. 49, n.1, p.59-76, Jan./Feb./Mar.

Sutherland, L.; Burton, R. (2011). Good Farmers, Good Neighbors? The role of cultural capital in social capital development in a Scottish farming community. *Sociology Ruralis*, vol. 51, no. 3, p. 239–255.

Sutter, CJ; Webb, J.; Kistruck, G.; Ketchen, DJ; Ireland, RD(2017) Transitioning entrepreneurs from informal to formal markets. *J. Bus. Venture* 32, 420–442.

Sutter, C.; Brutton, GD; Chen, J. (2018). Entrepreneurship as a solution to extreme poverty: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Venturing / Elsevier*.

Swedberg, R. (2000). The Social Science View of Entrepreneurship: Introduction and Practical Applications. In *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

- Thompson, NA; Verdujn, K.; Gartner, WB (2020). Entrepreneurship-as-practice: grounding contemporary theories of practice into entrepreneurship studies, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 32:3-4, 247-256.
- Tong, RP (1998). *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Valdivia, M. (2015). Business training plus for female entrepreneurship? Short and medium-term experimental evidence from Peru. *J. Dev. economy* 113, 33–51
- Vale, GMV; Seraphim, AC F; Theodosius, ASS (2011). Gender, immersion and entrepreneurship: weaker sex, strong bonds? *Journal of Contemporary Administration*, Curitiba, v. 15, no. 4, p. 631-649, Jul./Aug.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. In Katz, J. (Ed.) *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth*, Greenwich, CN: JAI Press, v. 3, p. 119-138.
- Vershinina, N; Barrett, R.; Mayer, M. (2011). Forms of capital, intra-ethnic variation and Polish entrepreneurs in Leicester. *Work, Employment and Society*, v. 25, no. 1, p. 101–117.
- Vincent, S. (2016). Bourdieu and the gendered social structure of working time: A study of self-employed human resources professionals. *Human Relations*, vol. 69, no. 5, p. 1163–1184.
- Waldinger, R.; Aldrich, J.; Ward, R. (2000). Ethnic entrepreneurs. In Swedberg, R. (Ed.). *Entrepreneurship: The social science view*. 356-388. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Welter, F. (2011) 'Contextualizing entrepreneurship – conceptual challenges and ways forward'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35 (1), 165–184.
- Whittington, R. (1996). Strategy as Practice. *Long Range Planning*. 29 (5): 731–735.
- Welter, F.; Gartner, WB (2016). Advancing our research agenda for entrepreneurship and contexts. In: Welter, F.; Gartner, WB *A Research Agenda for Entrepreneurship and Context*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- White, B.; Cox, C. (1991). A comparison of the characteristics of female managers and female entrepreneurs. *Women in Management Review*. Bradford, v. 6, no. two,
- Whittington, R. (1996). Strategy as Practice. *Long Range Planning*. 29 (5): 731–735.

Entrepreneurship: a literature review and the emergence of theoretical approaches consonant with the study of specific realities

Zahra, SA' (2007). Contextualising theory building in entrepreneurship research'. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 22, 443–452.

Zahra, SA (2014). Contextualization and the advancement of entrepreneurship research, *International Small Business Journal*, 32 (5), 479–500.