

The Territoriality of Entrepreneurship: Perspectives and Challenges for Cultural Entrepreneurship

A Territorialidade do Empreendedorismo: Perspectivas e Desafios para o Empreendedorismo Cultural

Joyce Neri dos Reis Neves¹

Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8974-4732>

Eduardo Paes Barreto Davel²

Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0610-6474>

Resumo

Encontramos pesquisas que relacionam o empreendedorismo com questões territoriais e espaciais. Todavia, desconhecemos pesquisas que pensem o empreendedorismo cultural em relação a essas questões. Ora, no contexto das economias culturais e criativas, sustentadas e dinamizadas pelas forças empreendedoras, pensar sua relação com as questões territoriais e espaciais não seria um caminho para tornar o desenvolvimento mais enraizado, político, distinto e robusto? O objetivo desta pesquisa é elaborar e discutir perspectivas e desafios para uma concepção territorial do empreendedorismo cultural. A pesquisa é teórico-conceitual, baseada em uma revisão sistemática das pesquisas acadêmicas publicadas sobre empreendedorismo, empreendedorismo cultural e territorialidade. Os resultados da pesquisa fornecem (a) uma visão integrada de como os conceitos territoriais são utilizados no campo do empreendedorismo, (b) perspectivas espaciais para reorientar novas pesquisas sobre empreendedorismo cultural e (c) uma discussão sobre essa reorientação.

Palavras-chave: empreendedorismo; empreendedorismo cultural; territorialidade.

Abstract

Despite the relevant number of studies relating entrepreneurship to spatial and territorial aspects, research on cultural entrepreneurship in relation to these issues is unknown. In the context of cultural and creative economies, sustained and energized by entrepreneurial forces, wouldn't thinking about their relationship with territorial and spatial aspects be a way to make development more rooted, political, distinctive, and robust? As such, this theoretical-conceptual systematic review is based on literature about entrepreneurship, cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality. The purpose is to presents and discuss perspectives and challenges for a territorial conceptualization of cultural entrepreneurship. The results provide (a) an integrated view of how territorial concepts are used in the field of entrepreneurship, (b) spatial perspectives for reorienting further research on cultural entrepreneurship, and (c) a discussion of this reorientation.

Keywords: entrepreneurship; cultural entrepreneurship; territoriality.

¹ Escola de Administração, Universidade Federal da Bahia - Núcleo de Pós-graduação em Administração – NPGA. E-mail: joyce.nrn@gmail.com

² Escola de Administração, Universidade Federal da Bahia - Núcleo de Pós-graduação em Administração – NPGA. E-mail: davel.eduardo@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Although studies on entrepreneurship are not recent, when we focus on the relationship between entrepreneurship and culture within cultural entrepreneurship, research remains scarce (DAVEL; CORA, 2016; HAUSMANN; HEINZE, 2016; MARINS; DAVEL, 2020b). As a concept, cultural entrepreneurship can be defined through several understandings of culture: culture as symbolic discourse, culture as symbolic creation, or culture as symbolic consumption (DAVEL; CORA, 2016). Among these various conceptual possibilities, we understand cultural entrepreneurship as the creation and pursuit of innovative ideas by those engaged in artistic and cultural activities, who apply, share, and distribute creative works (ELIAS *et al.*, 2018).

The topic of cultural entrepreneurship is a constant in research, on a national and global level, thanks to its singular character, different from that of traditional entrepreneurship (MARINS; DAVEL, 2020b). Creative economies combine the most intimate levels of personal identity and expression of social actors with global-scale cultural systems. More than economics and technology, culture is the main foundation of creativity; but this cultural dimension still lacks due attention from research on cultural entrepreneurship (HARTLEY *et al.*, 2015).

Such scarcity in robust and in-depth studies on the phenomenon of cultural entrepreneurship is worse when we focus on the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality. Within the vast field of entrepreneurship studies, research on the relationship between culture and territoriality is virtually non-existent. Despite the scarce discussion, territoriality is inevitable in characterizing a cultural enterprise. Even knowing that cultural entrepreneurship requires the interaction between lived experiences and personal

beliefs and an environment (ELIAS *et al.*, 2018), this environment is not studied based on spatial and territorial theories. In the context of cultural and creative economies, sustained and energized by entrepreneurial forces, wouldn't thinking about their relationship with territorial and spatial aspects be a way to make development more rooted, distinctive, and robust?

Cultivating the arts and cultural entrepreneurship allows the creative economy to flourish and grow in cities, regions, and countries due to the constant identification of opportunities and the organization of cultural activities (KUHLKE *et al.*, 2015). Art and cultural entrepreneurship are already being understood as devices to help address societal concerns, as a way to foster the sustainability of the arts, as a source of independence for individuals within the creative economy, and as a key to develop creative cities (KUHLKE *et al.*, 2015).

Creative and cultural economies should be discussed from a territorial perspective, as they take place in territories such as neighborhoods, cities, regions and countries. Since cultural entrepreneurship is fundamental to understand and boost the creative economy, territoriality needs to be understood as a vital part of cultural entrepreneurship. In fact, studies on entrepreneurship have established connections with different territories, at different levels, seeking to understand how they develop and become places of economic and industrial development, centers of innovation and creativity, arenas for creative professionals and for minorities (STEYAERT, 2004). Nonetheless, analyses about the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and territory remains incipient in current research (KUHLKE *et al.*, 2015; HARTLEY *et al.*, 2015; ELIAS *et al.*, 2017).

As such, this theoretical-conceptual systematic review is based on literature about entrepreneurship, cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality. The

purpose is to presents and discuss perspectives and challenges for a territorial concept of cultural entrepreneurship. Carried out in national and international databases (SPELL, SCIELO, Sage Publications, Routledge, CAPES Periodicals, JSTOR, EBSCO, Library of Congress, Emerald, Academy of Management, Amazon, Virtual Bookshelf), the literature search used the following keywords (in both English and Portuguese): entrepreneurship, entrepreneur, space, territory, community, culture, cultural. From an initial selection (consistent and coherent productions) and subsequent analysis of this material, we manually screened their references in search of other relevant productions (articles, books, book chapters, theses, dissertations, etc.) using a snowball method, that is, we ended the search when no new and relevant reference emerged. We found and selected twenty-five scientific articles addressing territoriality-related entrepreneurship. No studies relating cultural entrepreneurship to territoriality were found.

From the systematic analysis of all selected papers, we develop and propose a new perspective on the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and the

fields of territoriality, identity and experience, based on territoriality as an identity experience. We seek to contribute to the advancement of knowledge on the territorial dimension of cultural entrepreneurship by providing (a) an integrated view of how territorial concepts are used in the field of entrepreneurship, (b) spatial perspectives for reorienting further research on cultural entrepreneurship, and (c) a discussion of this reorientation.

CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND TERRITORIALITY: A NECESSARY RELATION

Territoriality in Entrepreneurship Research

Research that addresses territoriality, from different territorial categories, in its relation to specific types of entrepreneurships (Table 1) focus primarily on economic, social and environmental issues. These studies are not aimed at cultural entrepreneurship, but at more general approaches to entrepreneurship or other non-cultural approaches (e.g., social entrepreneurship).

Table 1 – Territoriality in Entrepreneurship Studies

Types of entrepreneurships	Territorial category	Territorial relevance of entrepreneurship
Native entrepreneurship	Native territory	Territory is understood as a space to be sustainably exploited. Territorial entrepreneurship is a means to generate income and solve social problems (AWATERE <i>et al.</i> , 2017; PEARSON; HELMS, 2013; KOKKRANIKAL; MORRISON, 2002; APRIL, 2008).
Community entrepreneurship	Community	Territory is understood as a place of economic and social development. Territorial entrepreneurship is a tool to lessen the poverty context of marginalized communities, helping to solve social problems ignored by the government (LONDON; MORFOPOULOS, 2009; PEREDO; CHRISMAN, 2006; IMAS <i>et al.</i> , 2012; QUEIROZ <i>et al.</i> , 2014; LOBO <i>et al.</i> , 2016; BARRAGAN; AYAVIRI, 2017; WANG; MORRELL, 2015).
Urban entrepreneurship	City, neighborhood	Territory is understood in a geopolitical perspective, where entrepreneurship emerges as a tool to solve problems caused by unfair provision of goods and services, such as environmental and socioeconomic issues. The territory serves as a living laboratory for the entrepreneur (MUÑOZ; COHEN, 2015; MUÑOZ; COHEN, 2016; COHEN <i>et al.</i> ,

		2016; CARVALHO <i>et al.</i> , 2017; CALVET-MIR; MARCH, 2019).
Rural entrepreneurship	Rural space	Territory is understood as a source of income and development for the rural economy, through tourism (GORBUNTSOVA <i>et al.</i> , 2018). Focus on the economic aspect of entrepreneurship.
Ethnic entrepreneurship	Ethnic groups	Territory influences entrepreneurship, as the entrepreneur influences the ethnic group based on social capital. Territorial entrepreneurship appears as a form of economic development and group engagement (CHOI, 2013; HEBERER, 2007).
Geographic entrepreneurship	Geographical area	Territory is understood as a geographical area, shaping entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship appears as a social activity, linked to culture by the context of creative industries (STEYAERT; KATZ, 2004; SCHIRAY <i>et al.</i> , 2017).

Source: Own elaboration

In **native entrepreneurship**, studies focus on indigenous communities, such as the Maori, where entrepreneurship emerges as a financial and social development tool for these marginalized communities. An important feature of native entrepreneurship is its concern in solving social issues neglected by governments (PEARSON; HELMS, 2013) and its use as a tool to generate income through community-based activities, such as tourism and handicrafts (KOKKRANIKAL; MORRISSON, 2002). Native entrepreneurship shows great concern for sustainable development and the well-being of indigenous communities, imparting a humanized perspective onto entrepreneurship, different from the profit maximization character attributed to entrepreneurship by society. This type of entrepreneurship has a prominent philosophical basis informed by the indigenous community's principles and values (AWATERE *et al.*, 2017). Studies based on this perspective mainly aim to understand the entrepreneur's role in building social capital for these communities (APRIL, 2008). In this context, the native territory is seen as a physical space that can be sustainably explored and a tool for income generation tool, which can help solve the social and economic issues of the indigenous communities.

Community entrepreneurship studies take on a broader approach, working

with different types of communities, and has a strong connection to social entrepreneurship, emerging as a complementary tool for community development (LONDON; MORFOPOULOS, 2009). As such, community entrepreneurship is a means to help alleviate chronic poverty contexts, considering the sustainable development of communities (PEREDO; CHRISMAN, 2006). Community entrepreneurs come from marginalized communities and contexts, including the entrepreneurial context, which focuses on the economy (IMAS *et al.*, 2012). One such example is research that addresses the difficulties women face when conducting business, neglecting aspects such as individual and community development (WANG; MORREL, 2015). Community entrepreneurship studies also present a cultural bias, highlighting the importance of cultural identity in entrepreneurship (QUEIROZ *et al.*, 2014). Sustainable tourism also appears within community entrepreneurship as a tool to aid territorial development, albeit in fewer studies (LOBO *et al.*, 2016). Community entrepreneurship seeks to understand the relationship between entrepreneurship and local development, where the territory emerges as a place of social development (BARRAGAN; AYAVIRI, 2017).

In **urban entrepreneurship**, the notion of territory equals cities and neighborhoods; thus, studies in this field

seek to understand how entrepreneurs can help resolve specific anomalies in a territory and promote urban well-being (MUÑOZ; COHEN, 2016). Urban entrepreneurs work in places with significant socioeconomic, cultural and environmental issues, using the territory as a living laboratory. Rather than seeking market opportunities, the urban entrepreneur sees the territory as a whole, focusing on solving problems caused by inadequate government provision of goods and services (COHEN *et al.*, 2016). Urban entrepreneurship is also linked to the areas of culture and tourism, serving as a tool to help the development of the territories (CARVALHO *et al.*, 2017). From urban entrepreneurship emerges the concept of urban gardening, in the context of social entrepreneurship, occupying and redefining marginalized spaces within territories (CALVET-MIR; MARCH, 2019).

Of the types of entrepreneurs described, **rural entrepreneurship** concentrates the smallest number of studies. Rural entrepreneurship is an important part of the innovation and development process of communities and job creation, emerging as a vital aspect for developing the rural economy (GORBUNTS OVA *et al.*, 2018). Its relationship with the notion of territory is superficial, where this aspect is seen as a source of income and development for the rural economy. Indigenous populations are also included in the field of rural entrepreneurship, analyzing the power exploitation that surrounds the development of the tourism industry.

Ethnic entrepreneurship sees entrepreneurship as a key factor in economic and ethnic development throughout history (CHOI, 2013). Studies in the field focus on the relationship between entrepreneurship and ethnic identity, where entrepreneurs bear ethnic symbols and act as modernizing agents, helping to shape the identity of the groups' territory. In this context, the territory influences the entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur influences the ethnic group

(HEBERER, 2007). One such example is the community of Nuosu, China, where ethnic entrepreneurs have established a new economy and elite, helping to shape the collective consciousness of their community.

Finally, **geographic entrepreneurship** studies considers entrepreneurship as a social activity (STEYAERT; KATZ, 2004), exploring and reflecting on the implications of conceiving entrepreneurship as a social phenomenon rather than an economic one. Research in this field explore the geopolitical, discursive, and social aspects of the spaces where entrepreneurship is produced and its impact on everyday life; and discussions on creative economy and its potential as a tool for social development (SCHIRAY *et al.*, 2017). A study conducted in Favela da Mangueira, in the city of Rio de Janeiro, for example, mapped seventeen initiatives associated with the creative economy, which developed artistic and cultural activities to help the community's youth learn about the their family history. This knowledge helped to strengthen social ties and individual empowerment, contributing to developing the local entrepreneurship. The study concludes that the creative economy dynamics in Mangueira also represent a case of social innovation, using social technology tools (SCHIRAY *et al.*, 2017).

Based on the analysis of this body of research on entrepreneurship and territoriality, we can propose three general observations. The first concerns the **predominance of an economic, social and environmental concept of territoriality on entrepreneurship**. Most studies place territory as a fundamental tool for income generation, sometimes as the only source of income for communities. In social terms, the territory emerges as a space where entrepreneurs can put their innovative ideas into practice, helping to lessen the social and environmental issues existing in a given context, impacting places outside the government's reach. Entrepreneurship is

used thus a tool to solve social issues, to create community engagement, and for economic development, generating changes in the local socioeconomic structure. In this context, territoriality is an auxiliary tool, serving mainly as a laboratory for entrepreneurs (a place where they can put their innovative ideas into practice), as a platform for economic innovation, as a source of income and social development.

Second, that **the cultural dimension of territoriality appears only on specific contexts**. The cultural dimension is most evident in native and ethnic entrepreneurs working with indigenous and Asian communities, respectively. In the former, the focus on Maori culture shapes entrepreneurship based on their customs; in the latter, territorial entrepreneurship is used to perpetuate the community's culture, such as the Korean community in Choi's (2013) study, part of a religious institution. In the mentioned study, ethnic entrepreneurship is a key factor for the community's economic development and throughout history has proven to be vital to community dynamics and a development opportunity for marginalized minorities. The studies approach culture from an economic point of view, where it helps to generate income in the communities.

The third and final observation highlights that **the territorial dimension of entrepreneurship is associated with marginalized territories and groups**. Such an association imposes limitations on both the territorial approach and the objects of study. Note that when not working with indigenous communities, the studies focus on other minorities and vulnerable groups, such as women, Asians, and residents of marginalized territories. Regarding the geographical level, we found studies analyzing communities, cities, states and archipelagos, but not territories such as neighborhoods and countries.

Territoriality and Cultural Entrepreneurship: Absences and Needs

Based on the literature review, we identified two major issues regarding the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality. First, the absence of a cultural perspective that emphasizes the identity and experience of entrepreneurship. Most studies present an economic, social and environmental concept of territoriality, with culture appearing in specific aspects such as tourism and handcrafts; only one study addressed culture from the perspective of creative economies.

The symbolic and cultural dimensions of the territory are constructed by the identity that social actors attribute to it (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). Culture and identity are therefore closely related to the territorial perspective. Identity can contribute to developing the autonomy of social actors at the most varied social levels, especially those most in need and neglected by the State's public policies (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). Experience, in turn, means the way in which the individual knows and constructs their reality, informing how they move within a space (TUAN, 2013). Human beings play a fundamental role in constructing a territory, outlining it through their experiences. Understanding the culture, identity, and experiences of social actors is key to understanding the territory as a whole, since culture shapes identity by giving meaning to experience and to identity choices (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009).

Second, the absence of an analysis of the territorial perspective of cultural entrepreneurship. Creative and cultural economies must be approached from a territorial perspective, since they occur in territories such as neighborhoods, cities and countries, and their relationship with culture is undeniable. Cultural entrepreneurship is thus essential to understand and drive the creative economy, that is, to see territoriality as part of cultural entrepreneurship. Studies on entrepreneurship have analyzed cities,

seeking to understand how they develop into places of economic and industrial growth, centers of innovation and creativity, a home for creative professionals and for minorities (STEYAERT, 2004). Nonetheless, the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and territory is scarce in current studies (KUHLMKE *et al.*, 2015; HARTLEY *et al.*, 2015; ELIAS *et al.*, 2018).

Cultural entrepreneurs need to understand their work context, seeking to know the political and economic structure of cities and regions, local problems, and the profile of consumers and workers. The local context consists of the particularities of the local community and territory, and cultural entrepreneurs need to familiarize themselves with this context (KUHLMKE *et al.*, 2015).

TERRITORIAL PERSPECTIVES TO ADVANCE ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

To contribute to the advancement of research on cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality, we propose two theoretical approaches in the field of territoriality: identity and experience. In our perspective, these approaches can open fruitful and relevant paths for future research in the field of cultural entrepreneurship, allowing for theoretical sophistication and better alignment with its cultural dimension.

The Perspective of Territoriality as Identity

Understood as a relational and historical process carried out culturally, economically and politically, identity plays a fundamental role in discussions about territoriality (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). Organization studies, for example, have been exploring organizational identity for some time, approaching the concept as a process, as a dynamic, as a strategy, as power, as control, as narrative and as work (DAVEL *et al.*, 2016). Despite the extensive

knowledge on organizational identity, little is known about an organization's relationship with the identity of the territory in which it is located. As identity is the product of social relations developed in a given place, the territory emerges as a crucial dimension for its construction (DAVEL *et al.*, 2016). Territorial identity, therefore, is not a unity; rather it is interspersed with various other identities and their symbolic content (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009).

Approaching territoriality as identity means understanding the territory from an integrated perspective, that is, as a politically structured domain and as a symbolic and identity appropriation, inherent to a certain social class. In this context, the territory is defined by a combination of cultural and political processes (HAESBAERT, 1997), involving a symbolic and cultural dimension – identity attributed by the social actors who live there – and a political-disciplinary dimension – forms of control exerted on these actors. It is through symbols that social relations acquire meaning; where identity can have a more or less lasting character, depending on the living conditions of social groups (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009).

Although little explored by organization studies, territorial identity is closely linked to many organizational practices related to products and services, whose identity can become inseparable from the territory in which they are produced, managing to be consolidated as regional and national brands and gain prominence within the international economy (DAVEL *et al.*, 2016). We can divide cultural identities into two types: the first emerges when a given social group seeks to recover its history through a shared culture that is represented by identity; the second is based on recognition among social actors and their common demands. Territory as identity is a hybrid perspective, in which territorial identity is understood as

a process of social, economic, political, and cultural relations (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009)

While culture has the ability to shape identity by giving meaning to identity practices, territorial identity is directly influenced by the political and cultural strength of social groups that inhabit a given territory (HAESBAERT, 1997). Not being strictly natural, political, economic or cultural (HAESBAERT, 2011), territory can only be defined by the intersection of all these aspects in a given historical context. The geographic space – also called territory – functions as a link between the world and society where actions and objects are inseparable, becoming a social instance (SANTOS, 1996). In this context, territoriality can be understood as a historically contextualized process of social, political as well as cultural and economic relations of a social group (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009).

In short, identity can be understood in a hybrid perspective, as a historical and relational process produced by culture, economy, and politics. Territorial identity encompasses the territorial relationships that we establish daily, involving material and immaterial works produced by society, such as music, beliefs, values, houses, etc. (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). Territorial identity is, therefore, a social construction that results from the cultural and political relations social groups establish in a territory (SANTOS; DAVEL, 2018). As such, territory and identity influence each other mutually, for no social relationship happens disconnected from the territorial dimension (SANTOS; DAVEL, 2018). The construction of territorial identity reveals identity potentials and territorial identity matrices (CEZÉRIO; DAVEL, 2017, p. 271).

The Perspective of Territoriality as Experience

In territoriality theory, the concept of experience encompasses the direct (e.g.,

five senses) and indirect (e.g., symbols) ways in which human beings perceive and construct their reality (TUAN, 2013). Comprised of feelings and thoughts, experience is defined as the ability to learn from one's own experiences. How we move through space is informed by experience. We can have a sense of space using only taste, smell or hearing; but to access the emotion linked to experience, most people make use of the five senses at the same time, making the experience richer (TUAN, 2013).

Spatial perception depends on the quality of one's senses and the capacity of one's mind to extrapolate the existing information on the territory. An object or place achieves concrete reality when our experience of it is total, that is, an experience brought on by the senses and the mind. We cannot define an individual, a community, and a society without placing them in a certain territorial context (HAESBAERT, 2011). By residing for a long period in one space, we can know it intimately; but its image will only be clear if we can also observe it from the outside and think about our experiences there. The human species is a producer of symbols and is characterized by its member's attachment to places. For some social scientists, culture functions as an explanatory factor for differences regarding the concept of space and place between different societies or social groups (TUAN, 2013).

As an object of study, territory transits through several fields, such as political science, economy, anthropology, sociology and psychology – each with a certain perspective. While geography focuses on the materiality of the territory, economy, for example, perceives territory as a location factor or as a production base. In cultural studies, the territory is understood as a product of the symbolic appropriation of space by a group (HAESBAERT, 2011). How people perceive the world and assign values to its parts, as well as the elaboration of spatial schemes depends on their culture; and the

similarities found derived from the structure and values of the human body. Culture and experience, therefore, have a profound influence on an individual's interpretation of territory. Space is more than a point of view or a fleeting feeling, it is a condition for the human being's biological survival (TUAN, 2013).

To better understand the perspective of territory as experience, we must start from the children's notion of space (TUAN, 2013). Although children are under constant cultural influences that shape their ideas of space and place, one could say that children have no world. Such a statement is based on the fact that children lack the ability to distinguish themselves from the external environment. Children see their mothers as their first place of belonging, later filled by an emotional attachment that transforms the mother into a secure source of shelter and physical-psychological well-being. As children grow up, they become attached to objects rather than people, which will later turn into attachment to locations.

A child's geographic space grows as they get older, but not necessarily on a larger scale. Children create emotional attachments to spaces that reflect their age: young children like to hide in small spaces, such as furniture; older children, in turn, seek out larger spaces, whether in nature or built by humans. In adolescence and adulthood, we support our emotional needs by creating bonds to spaces and places, regardless of their size. Unlike children, adults can attach deep meaning to a space by accumulating feelings in the place over the years (TUAN, 2013).

Territory and territoriality are central concepts in geography, as they relate to human spatiality. Space, on the other hand, is a general and somewhat vague category (HAESBAERT, 2011). Despite sharing space with other animals, humans respond to this space in complex ways, playing a key role in its transformation into a geographic space, by giving meaning to spatial forms (SANTOS, 1996). Without

human action, space is only a landscape. Territory and space describe, thus, different objects. According to Santos (1996), the territory exists from its materiality, while space brings materiality to the life that animates it. Territory corresponds to natural and human-made complexes, being historically constructed as the negation of the natural world.

THE PERSPECTIVE OF TERRITORIALITY AS AN IDENTITY EXPERIENCE: PROPOSALS AND CHALLENGES FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

Based on identity and experience, the territoriality of entrepreneurship can be investigated and understood from a new perspective: territoriality as an identity experience, where the experiences of social actors characterize the territory, and territorial identity is strengthened by entrepreneurship. Identity results from the historical and relational processes that individuals or social groups go through, configuring itself as a territorial heritage (SAQUET; BRISKIEVICZ, 2009). Experience, in turn, refers to how human beings move around and experience an environment (TUAN, 2013). Territoriality, identity, and experience happen simultaneously, where one influences the other within a dynamic relationship.

In this integrative perspective, the theories of identity and experience blend and complement each other to conceptualize the territory. Based on such approach, identity is built and strengthened by the experiences social actors have within a territory; experience, in turn, can only occur in a territory, as it is constituted by the experiences of those who inhabit it; finally, a territory emerges when social actors give meaning to a place. By understanding territoriality as an identity experience, we perceive the territory from its cultural, political, and social dimensions. In this perspective, human beings play a key role

in constructing the territory's identity. Each person experiences and perceives a territory differently, which leads us to understand territorial identity as the result of the multiple and dynamic experiences of those who inhabit it. Territoriality as an identity experience comprises not only the experiences lived by its social actors, but those lived by the territory itself, allowing us to analyze the historical and cultural events that have shaped the identity of a place and to understand how these events have shaped the identity of its social actors. Within this perspective, people and territory are intimately linked, influencing each other.

In the context of cultural entrepreneurship, territorial identity and experience are concepts that allows us to understand the territory in full. Cultural ventures are based on lived experiences and personal beliefs, seeking to understand the process by which entrepreneurs experience and interact with their environment. Within creative economies, cultural entrepreneurship is the one responsible for making the territory culturally and creatively dynamic. Since creative economies develop in territories, it becomes necessary to understand the territoriality of cultural entrepreneurship. In this context, social actors are part of the creative production process, in which identity and experience are key to understanding entrepreneurial practice and developing creative economies.

Experience is an important aspect for creative economies because it combines the personal identity and expressions of social actors with culture. In this context, understanding how people experience and live in a territory is essential for cultural entrepreneurship. Promoting cultural entrepreneurship from a territorial logic based on identity and experience allows the creative economy to flourish, growing in cities and regions due to the constant identification of opportunities and the organization of cultural activities (KUHLE *et al.*, 2015). Creative

economies produce cultural, economic, social and community value in a territory; thus, cultural entrepreneurship influences and is influenced by the strengthening of territorial identity.

To adopt such perspective, of territoriality as identity experience, two major research challenges need to be overcome. **First, the challenge** of how to further investigate the issues of culture, territoriality, identity, and experience in entrepreneurship studies. While this field of research is a source of information on these topics, it is only one path for the discussion on territoriality as an identity experience. Explorations on this topic can be further enriched by the broad and wide range of existing research on territoriality, identity and experience. To further explore the issues raised, researchers can look to studies and theories in other areas, such as geography, to better understand the relationships between territoriality, culture, identity, and experience. Researchers must be careful, however, about the high theoretical load that exists. While this is a good thing, it can also pose a challenge.

The **second challenge** concerns the choice of an appropriate methodological approach to empirically research territoriality as an identity experience of cultural entrepreneurship. Research based on this new perspective requires reflecting on which methodology would be appropriate, since we have several aspects to be analyzed in an integrated way. The chosen methodology must be able to address territorial entrepreneurship and its relations with culture, territoriality, identity, and experience, seeking to understand its singularities. A powerful methodological approach to understanding territoriality as an identity experience is ethnography, as the method seeks to understand the object of study from the sensemaking (GOBO *et al.*, 2017) and sensoriality (PINK, 2009; MARINS; DAVEL, 2020a). We also highlight participant observation, as it considers the interactions between researchers and social

actors, helping to understand how the latter behave in a given space.

TERRITORIALIZATION OF CULTURAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP: DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Although more recent studies point to the importance of studying the relation between cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality, progress remains slow and timid. Compared with the vast universe of studies on entrepreneurship, the amount of research on cultural entrepreneurship is still incipient, despite its importance for society. The reviewed studies have very similar theoretical approaches, limited to the study of territorial entrepreneurship from an economic, social and environmental perspective. Within this context, territory appears in a theoretically limited and unfocused way and entrepreneurship is addressed based on a perspective closer to the traditional one, that is, of revenue generation (DAVEL; CORA, 2016). The empirical objects of research are also limited, with most studies focusing on indigenous communities, on entrepreneurship exploiting the community's territory for tourism.

The present study has four major implications: two theoretical, one methodological and one practical. The **first implication** is to foster discussions about the relationship between entrepreneurship and culture, territoriality, and identity experience. By introducing the concepts of identity and experience, we propose a broad and diverse understanding of the territoriality of entrepreneurship. Regarding territoriality as an identity experience, the perspective requires research in fields beyond management, such as geography, to propose a new theoretical approach. Based on the perspective of territoriality as an identity experience, we seek to open new paths for research in the field of entrepreneurship, especially in cultural entrepreneurship. Our results contribute

thus to more in-depth discussions on territoriality in cultural entrepreneurship.

The **second implication** is to promote a more detailed understanding of the specificity of cultural entrepreneurship and its importance to the creative economy sector. Working with territoriality as an identity experience within cultural entrepreneurship is an interesting approach, since creative economies combine the identity and expression of social actors with whole cultural systems. Such a new perspective can open new paths for research, allowing us to understand the origins of cultural practices and how they relate to people and territories. Studying creative economies based on the proposed approach requires overcoming the disciplinary distinctions between the social sciences, where economics is studied, and the humanities and arts, the so-called place of culture (HARTLEY *et al.*, 2015).

The **third implication** is to help researchers choose an appropriate research methodology for studying territoriality as an identity experience. One possibility would be ethnography, a method that seeks to understand the object of study from sensemaking (GOBO *et al.*, 2017), sensoriality (PINK, 2009; MARINS; DAVEL, 2020a) and mindful walking (JUNG, 2014). Or maybe participant observation, method that considers the interactions between the researcher and social actors, helping to understand the latter's behavior in a given space. As a complement to ethnography, we suggest the use of audiovisual resources, capable of providing a more complete view of the object. Jung (2014), for example, proposes the concept of "mindful walking," where consciously walking through the territory under study helps to better understand it, its particularities and its people.

Finally, the **fourth implication** is practical. Our results can help improve the practice of entrepreneurs and public policy managers, as it provides entrepreneur educators with a knowledge more in tune with the importance of the territory for

developing cultural entrepreneurship in creative territories. For professionals in the public sector, the discussion can help support public policies that seek to further develop the relationship between cultural entrepreneurship and territoriality. We emphasize the role of cultural entrepreneurs in the development of territories, neighborhoods and cities. For professors, our results can foster discussion on cultural and territorial entrepreneurship in the classroom, a topic that so far has been little addressed in the country's universities.

CONCLUSIONS

This article proposed a new perspective on the topics of entrepreneurship, culture, territoriality, and their intersections. Cultural entrepreneurship is an emerging theme and its relations with identity and territoriality require better exploration. A broad literature search allowed us to verify that the number of studies on territorial entrepreneurship is, in fact, insignificant within the wide universe of entrepreneurship research. Nonetheless, the existing studies address extremely relevant issues and corroborate the state of the art. Beyond the issue of territory, these studies treat culture, despite its key role in constructing a territory's identity, as a secondary aspect, showing the prevalence of economy-based perspectives in entrepreneurship studies.

Our results invite researchers to think about the territory in an integrated way, that is, as a product of the intersection between cultural, political and economic dimensions. Territoriality as an identity experience seeks a more complex and dynamic understanding of territoriality than that presented in current studies, identifying and understanding its particularities and social actors. Within this perspective, one cannot dissociate the territorial identity from the social groups that inhabit a given territory, since the cultural and political strength of these groups is what defines it.

Understanding how entrepreneurship functions in the artistic and cultural spheres, does not mean excluding the economic discourse. Entrepreneurship is not a monolithic and static concept, usually depending on the intersection of two or more discourses (economic and cultural, for example). Entrepreneurship can also affect our perception of things and how people engage with a given space. Based on proposed perspective of territoriality as an identity experience, we seek to understand cultural entrepreneurship in a broader way, encompassing the social, economic, political, and cultural aspects involved. For us, entrepreneurship can be considered a creative intervention, with the power to increase not only the management capacity, but the social capacity of society (HJORTH, 2013).

REFERENCES

APRIL, W. I. Experiential learning from the Khoi-Khoi (Namibia) and Maori (New Zealand) Communities, **The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation**, v. 9, n. 2, p. 103-110, 2008.

AWATERE, S.; MIKA, J.; HUDSON, M.; PAULING, C.; LAMBERT, S.; REID, J. Whakatipu Rawa Ma Nga Uri Whakatipu: Optimising the 'Maori' in Maori Economic Development. **AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples**, v. 13, n. 2, p. 80-88, 2017.

BARRAGAN, M. C.; AYAVIRI, V. D. Innovación y emprendimiento, y su relación con el desarrollo local del pueblo de Salinas de Guaranda, Provincia Bolívar, Ecuador. **Información tecnológica**, v. 28, n. 6, p. 71-80, 2017.

CARVALHO, C. D. M. B.; CUTRIM, K. D. G.; COSTA, S. R. Empreendedorismo cultural e turismo: Perspectivas para desenvolvimento das indústrias criativas no bairro da Madre Deus, São Luís (Maranhão,

Brasil), **Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi: Ciências Humanas**, v. 12, n. 2, p. 629-646, 2017.

CEZÁRIO, H.; DAVEL, E.; SANCHO QUEROL, L. Tecnologia social das mobilizações: identidade e participação na gestão de iniciativas museológicas comunitárias, **Museologia e Patrimônio**, v. 10, n. 2, p. 261–282, 2017.

CHOI, H. Religious institutions and ethnic entrepreneurship: The Korean ethnic church as a small business incubator. **Economic Development Quarterly**, v. 24, n. 4, p. 372-383, 2010.

COHEN, B.; ALMIRALL, S.; CHESBROUGH, H. The city as a lab: open innovation meets the collaborative economy. **California Management Review**, v. 59, n. 1, p. 5-13, 2016.

COHEN, B.; MUÑOZ, P. Toward a theory of purpose-driven urban entrepreneurship. **Organization & Environment**, v. 28, n. 3, p. 264-285, 2015.

DAVEL, E.; CORÁ, M. A. J. Empreendedorismo cultural: cultura como recurso retórico, processo de criação e de consumo simbólico. **Políticas Culturais em Revista**, v. 9, n. 1, p. 363-387, 2016.

DASKALAKI, M.; HJORTH, D.; MAIR, J. Are entrepreneurship, communities, and social transformation related? **Journal of Management Inquiry**, v. 24, n. 4, p. 419-423, 2015.

ELIAS, S. R. S. T. A.; CHILES, T. H.; DUNCAN, C. M.; VULTEE, D. M. The Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship: how arts entrepreneurs and their customers co-create aesthetic value, **Organization Studies**, v. 39, n. 2-3, p. 345-372, 2018.

GORBUNTSOVA, T., DOBSON, S., PALMER, N. Rural entrepreneurial space and identity: A study of local tour operators

and ‘the Nenets’ indigenous reindeer herders, **International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation**, v. 19, n. 4, p. 261-272, 2018.

GOBO, G., MOLLE, A. **Doing Ethnography**. 2. ed. London: Sage Publications, 2016.

HAESBAERT, R. **O mito da desterritorialização: do “fim dos territórios” à multiterritorialidade**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand, 2011.

HAESBAERT, R. **Des-territorialização e identidade: a rede “gaúcha” no nordeste**. Rio de Janeiro: EDUFF, 1997.

HARTLEY, J., WEN, W., LI, H. S. **Creative economy and culture: challenges, changes and futures for the creative industries**. London: Sage Publications, 2015.

HAUSMANN, A.; HEINZE, A. Entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative industries: insights from an emergent field. **Artivate: A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts**, 5, n. 2, p. 7-22, 2016.

HEBERER, T. Entrepreneurs and ethnic identity. In: HEBERER, T. (Ed.). **Doing business in rural China: Liangshan’s new ethnic entrepreneurs**. Seattle: University of Washington Press, p. 186-205, 2007.

HJORTH, D. Public entrepreneurship: desiring social change, creating sociality, **Entrepreneurship and Regional Development**, v. 25, n. 1-2, p. 34-51, 2013.

IMAS, J. M.; WILSON, N.; WESTON, A. Barefoot entrepreneurs. **Organization**, v. 19, n. 5, p. 263-285, 2012.

JUNG, Y. Mindful Walking: The serendipitous journey of community-based ethnography, **Qualitative Inquiry**, v. 20, n.

5, p. 621-627, 2014.

KOKKRANIKAL, J.; MORRISON, A. Entrepreneurship and sustainable tourism: the houseboats of Kerala. **Tourism and Hospitality Research**, v. 4, n. 1, p. 7-20, 2002.

KUHLKE, O., SCHRAMME, A., KOOYAMA, R. **Creating cultural capital: cultural entrepreneurship in theory, pedagogy and practice**. Utrecht: Eburon Academic Publishers, 2, p. 982-1012, 2016.

LONDON, M.; MORFOPOULOS, P. R. G. **Social entrepreneurship: how to start successful corporate social responsibility and community-based initiatives for advocacy and change**. Abingdon: Routledge, 2019.

MARINS, S. R.; DAVEL, E. Etnografia estética na pesquisa em estudos organizacionais: princípios, processos e desafios. **Revista Brasileira de Estudos Organizacionais**, 7, n. 2, p. 1-39, 2020a.

MARINS, S. R.; DAVEL, E. P. B. Empreendedorismo cultural e artístico: veredas da produção acadêmica. **Revista Pensamento Contemporâneo em Administração**, 14, n. 4, p. 115-140, 2020b.

MUÑOZ, P.; COHEN, B. The making of the urban entrepreneur. **California Management Review**, v. 59, n. 1, p. 79-91, 2016.

PEARSON, C. A. L.; HELMS, K. Indigenous social entrepreneurship: the Gumatj clan enterprise in East Arnhem Land. **The Journal of Entrepreneurship**, v. 22, n. 1, p. 43-70, 2013.

PEREDO, A. M.; CHRISMAN, J. J. Toward a theory of community-based enterprise. **Academy of Management Review**, v. 31, n. 2, p. 309-328, 2006.

PINK, S. **Doing sensory ethnography**. London: Sage Publications, 2009.

QUEIROZ, M. S. de A.; PINHO, V. de S.; CARNEIRO, S. N. V. O Desafio do empreendedorismo local: uma perspectiva cultural e familiar em narrativas. **Revista Expressão Católica**, v. 3, n. 1, p. 228-250, 2014.

SANTOS, M. **A Natureza do espaço: técnica e tempo, razão e emoção**. São Paulo: EDUSP, 2006.

SANTOS, F. P., DAVEL, E. P. B. Gestão de equipamentos culturais com base na identidade territorial, **Revista Gestão & Conexões**, v. 7, n. 2, p. 7-42, 2018.

SAQUET, M. A.; BRISKIEVICZ, M. Territorialidade e identidade: um patrimônio no desenvolvimento territorial. **Caderno Prudentino de Geografia**, v. 31, n. 1, p. 3-16, 2009.

SCHIRAY, D. M.; CARVALHO, C. C.; AFONSO, R. Creative economy as a social technology approach: A case study in favela da Mangueira, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. **Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administración**, v. 30, n. 4, p. 508-528, 2017.

STEYAERT, C.; KATZ, J. A. Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society. Entrepreneurship and regional development. **Entrepreneurship & Regional Development**, v. 16, n. 3, p. 179-196, 2004.

SILVA, M. C. de A. Notas etnográficas sobre o empreendedorismo em favelas cariocas. **Etnográfica**, v. 21, n. 3, p. 585-598, 2017.

STEYAERT, C.; KATZ, J. Reclaiming the space of entrepreneurship in society: geographical, discursive and social dimensions. **Entrepreneurship &**

Regional Development, v. 16, n. 3, p. 179-196, 2004.

TUAN, Y. **Espaço e lugar: a perspectiva da experiência**. Lodrina: EDUEL, 2013.

ⁱ Joyce Neri dos Reis Neves

Mestrado e Graduação em Administração pela Escola de Administração, Universidade Federal da Bahia. Pesquisa sobre empreendedorismo cultural, territorialidade, identidade, valor simbólico e cultura.

ⁱⁱ Eduardo Paes Barreto Davel

Professor na Escola de Administração da Universidade Federal da Bahia. Pesquisador no CIAGS - Centro Interdisciplinar de Desenvolvimento e Gestão Social (UFBA) e no NPGA - Núcleo de Pós-graduação em Administração (UFBA). Pós-doutorado em Administração pela Nova School of Business and Economics da Universidade Nova de Lisboa (Portugal). Ph.D. em Administração pela École des Hautes Études commerciales de Montreal (Canadá). Pesquisador visitante na Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science da New School for Social Research (New York, EUA). Coordenador do coletivo de pesquisa OCA - Organizações, Cultura e Arte (CNPq). Editor da O&S - Revista Organizações & Sociedade. Editor associado da RAE - Revista de Administração de Empresas e da RIGS - Revista Interdisciplinar de Gestão Social. Pesquisa e publica sobre empreendedorismo cultural, educação em Administração, métodos qualitativos de pesquisa, aprendizagem, criatividade, cultura, arte e estética nas organizações.