



Open Research Online

Citation

Jevnaker, Birgit Helene and Hill, Inge (2024). Heritage Craft Entrepreneurship in 'the Wild': The Role of Entrepreneurial Placemaking for Rural Development. In: Hill, Inge; Elias, Sara R. S. T. A.; Dobson, Stephen and Jones, Paul eds. Creative (and Cultural) Industry Entrepreneurship in the 21st Century: Policy Challenges for and by Policymakers. Contemporary Issues in Entrepreneurship Research: Vol 18B. London, UK: Emerald Publishing Limited, pp. 213–226.

URL

<https://oro.open.ac.uk/90829/>

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1108/S2040-72462024000018B015>

License

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0) Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Policy

This document has been downloaded from Open Research Online, The Open University's repository of research publications. This version is being made available in accordance with Open Research Online policies available from [Open Research Online \(ORO\) Policies](#)

Versions

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding

Cite as:

Jevnaker, B. and Hill, I. (2024) Heritage craft entrepreneuring in the wild: the role of entrepreneurial placemaking for rural development. In: Hill, I., Elias, S., Dobson, S. and Jones, P. (eds.) *Creative (and cultural) entrepreneurship in the 21st Century*. Volume 18B. Chapter 2. Emerald Publishing Ltd.

Heritage craft entrepreneuring in the wild: the role of entrepreneurial placemaking for rural development

**Birgit Helene Jevnaker, BI Norwegian Business School, and
Inge Hill, The Open University ***

Abstract – This chapter investigates heritage craft entrepreneurship ‘in the wild’, creative start-ups emerging within a rural context in Norway and the UK. The research asks how entrepreneurs accomplish heritage craft entrepreneuring. To answer this question, we apply relational ontology, conceptualising entrepreneurship as the ongoing accomplishment of entrepreneurial activities, labelled entrepreneuring. We compare two rural heritage craft entrepreneuring accomplishments: Running a spinnery located on a farm in a valley in Norway and a tweed based textile creating organisation, co-located with other artisan entrepreneurs positioning in a community-led craft heritage building in the UK. Both entrepreneuring settings employ heritage craft in their businesses and engage in various forms of collaborations and placemaking in their creative entrepreneuring. This chapter unpacks three facets of artisan entrepreneuring through the lens of placemaking - connecting, organising, and co-developing in rural settings. We contribute to the entrepreneurship-as-practice and creative entrepreneurship literature and highlight the implications of placemaking for rural development.

Keywords: heritage entrepreneurship; craft entrepreneurship; entrepreneuring; rural entrepreneurship; placemaking; heritage craft entrepreneuring.

Introduction

In this chapter, we investigate heritage craft entrepreneurship in the rural ‘wild’, that is entrepreneuring emerging in a natural setting (rural) rather than in a ‘laboratory’ (Hutchins,

1995). Our focus is thus on craft entrepreneuring unfolding outside of any incubator protection (Pret & Cogan, 2019). We study two such heritage craft entrepreneuring settings, one in a rural district of Norway, with traditions of artists, agriculture, and guest houses, and one located in a UK village in a community-led craft heritage building, co-located with other craft and artisan entrepreneurs. Whilst these settings are located in different countries, the entrepreneurial practices have common characteristics and behaviours: both are led by a woman entrepreneur and use heritage craft in their businesses. This creative entrepreneuring is accomplished by both businesses through various forms of organising collaborations (Jevnaker, 2009) and related performative dynamics (Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b), and as part of these processes, they engage in placemaking. Hence, this research asks: How do craft entrepreneurs accomplish heritage craft entrepreneuring? To answer this question, we apply relational ontology and the concept of entrepreneurial placemaking (Hill et al., 2021) to shed light on dynamic entrepreneuring in the rural.

Specifically, we explore how working creatively with others impacts on the workings of rural businesses, employing entrepreneurial placemaking as a lens to further illuminate this process. Working creatively with others requires some alignment of interests, temporary shared activities and resource sharing, and is potentially value-creating (Jevnaker, 2009). However, these activities are still inadequately understood as a facet of collaborative relations (Stadtler & van Wassenhove, 2016), especially when enacted via creative industry entrepreneuring (Jevnaker, 2005, 2009). Exploring such examples seems more relevant than ever in a growing creative industry economy, with increasing distribution and fragmentation of labour linked to the Future of Work (Hill, 2021; Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b). Herein, we untangle situated entrepreneuring (Hill, 2021; Johannisson, 2018; Thompson et al., 2020) and focus on relational aspects of collaborations (Jevnaker, 1993, 2009) and placemaking (Hill et al., 2021) as a lens on rural heritage craft entrepreneurship in the wild.

The next section develops the theoretical framing for our analysis, followed by the case studies and the discussion of our contributions to creative entrepreneurship (theoretical) and rural development (managerial). While we clearly discuss two women entrepreneurial practices, we are not focusing on the gender aspects in their entrepreneuring.

Perspectives on heritage craft entrepreneuring

Our most important conceptualisation considers creative industry entrepreneuring as enactive processes of business creation, applied to the creation of heritage crafts. Our case studies focus on the settings of heritage craft entrepreneuring in the rural ‘wild’, as unfolding

phenomena in rural areas, beyond any shielded ‘laboratory’ or incubator. Creative industry entrepreneuring in the rural ‘wild’ appears fascinating and demanding to capture, thus some sensitising aspects (Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b) are briefly elaborated below.

Rural entrepreneurship

The literature differentiates between businesses located in rural areas, and ‘rural businesses’ (Bosworth & Turner, 2018; Hill & Mole, 2022). The latter denotes those businesses interlinked with the local/regional socio-economic context, drawing on local suppliers, staff, material resources and customers. Our heritage craft entrepreneuring case studies are the latter type of business. The context for doing business in ‘the rural’ is unique; population and business density, and variability, are lower than in urban areas. Hence, different business development strategies are needed, for example to address limited access to business relevant infrastructure (Beckmann et al., 2021; Mole et al., 2022; Turner et al., 2021). Consequently, firm characteristics of rural businesses are different to urban ones; businesses in rural areas are usually smaller than in urban ones (Phillips et al., 2019). What is often overlooked is that over 80% of the rural economy consists of non-food and non-agricultural businesses (for the UK, Scott, 2020).

Placemaking

Placemaking is a location-related process-related concept (e.g., Courage, 2021; Hill et al., 2021; Rae, 2020). Existing research typically embraces the social and material dimensions of placemaking processes, including their messiness (Massey, 2005). Recent literature also acknowledges that placemaking is embedded in constructing work both *in* and *with* space, by human and so-called ‘nonhuman’ agents (such as production and service facilities, transportation routes, as well as dwellings). For example, unstable digital infrastructure such as internet connectivity may both foster and hinder digital placemaking (Hill et al., 2021). Thus, we contend that places and placemaking unfold in dynamic socio-material practices by and for agents. These unfolding practices include the aesthetic and flexible uses of buildings and nature for craft experiments and co-development, varieties of fabrication, selling events, meetings and other gatherings in an evolving landscape. Within the rural, craft-making sites may attract and become habited by diversely talented agents: humans, but also animals, plants - natural and artificial elements constituting what we call a ‘place’. Our encounters suggest that field agents co-create meaning and attachment to places (Cilliers &

Timmermans, 2014), by emergent actions. We thus address how entrepreneuring could be realised outside of formal planning mechanisms.

Placemaking adds value by attracting or retaining residents, contributing to employment and self-employment, making or reorganising new discourses for groups and communities, and other active community participation (Courage, 2021). Yet, we know less about how placemaking is actually unfolding – and how creative industries perform it. The process of placemaking requires agents or ‘placemakers’ (Courage, 2021; Hill et al., 2021) who engage in relevant activities. How this placemaking unfolds is theorised from a process-relational perspective in this chapter.

Creative and heritage craft entrepreneurship

Creative industry entrepreneurs have a role beyond urban habitats, yet, it is lesser known *how* their entrepreneuring is accomplished in the rural (see Hill et al., 2021; Hill et al., 2023). So, why are rural creative start-ups important? Ample evidence suggests that creative industries firms tend to be small (Hill, 2021) and highly fragmented (Bruce & Jevnaker, 1998), and skilled creative specialists are often concentrated in some city landscapes (Florida, 2002). Yet, would-be entrepreneurial agents, start-ups, also engage in creative industry and self-employed work in regional non-urban settings (Ratten & Ferreira, 2017; Lagerqvist & Bornmal, 2015). However, beyond organised creative hubs (Hill et al., 2021), creative industry entrepreneurship and artisan business practices in the rural landscape are rarely studied (but see Velez et al., 2022).

Artisan entrepreneurs create tangible small batch or unique ‘crafted’ products manually supported by tools (Arias & Cruz, 2019; Elias et al., 2018) and often suitable for everyday use. ‘Craft’ is related to handmade products but can also be performed in minor or greater parts with modern machinery (Arias & Cruz, 2019). Heritage crafting includes a variety of ancient skills and specialised materials such as textiles, paper, functional work, decorative work, and fashion craft, as well as aesthetic hybrids of these crafting forms (Lagerqvist & Bornmal, 2015). Heritage crafting is, paradoxically, regarded as a promising area of business for the future. The products, along with the creation processes and their meaningful outcomes, are in-demand, while simultaneously the ancient craft-skilled practitioners are vanishing.

For the purposes of this research, heritage craft is defined as a practice, which employs knowledge, skills, and creative arts, and entails an understanding of traditional

materials, design, and techniques, as well as familiarity with options that have been practised for two or more successive generations.

Entrepreneurship

Viewed as a subset of process-relational theories, the lens of practice theories (Gherardi, 2019; Schatzki, 2001) facilitates our focus on how human relations are actually enacted, via iterative dynamic interlinked sets of processes and activities (Langley & Tsoukas, 2017), which are by nature socio-material (Gherardi, 2019). Process-relational reasoning focuses on the dynamic aspect of social interactions, particularly between people, processes and institutions, ideas, and tangible objects, and hence, offers greater understanding of how actions unfold and outcomes are accomplished (Langley & Tsoukas, 2017; Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b).

The term ‘practice’ acts as a heuristic device and focuses on interconnected and organising sets of activities, which are situated in and mediated by their socio-material contexts and social macrostructures (Gherardi, 2019). Practices, usually used in plural, vary from simple sets – such as buying a cinema ticket – to the increasingly complex, like starting a business (Hill, 2018; Schatzki, 2001). Agents enact these practices within fields, conceptualised as arenas of power (Johannisson, 2018; Sklaveniti & Steyaert, 2020).

Theoretical framing summary

To answer our explorative research question, (how artisan entrepreneurs accomplish heritage craft entrepreneurship in the rural), we employ a process-relational lens (Langley & Tsoukas, 2017). This lens enables us to zoom in on actual activities among agents over time in the settings studied. We specifically explore how rural creative placemaking unfolds via analysing heritage craft entrepreneurship through the lens of entrepreneurial placemaking (Hill et al., 2021). Hence, we conceptualise entrepreneurial placemaking as the heuristic device needed to explain rural creative business creation.

Methodology

The study adopts a phenomenological inspired approach to reconstruct situated entrepreneurial activities (Pret et al., 2016) through a comparative case study strategy (Yin, 2018). As Eisenhardt and Graebner (2007) argue, unusual or extreme cases are instances of theoretical sampling that may be very useful for building new insights and theories. The process-relational lens (Hill, 2021; Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b) allowed us to explore

creative industry collaboration (Jevnaker, 2009) unfolding in real-world entrepreneuring (Johannisson, 2018). Zooming in on everyday activities helped to reconstruct and openly reflect upon the specific efforts and challenges (Johannisson, 2018). As a point of departure, this chapter is based on the entrepreneurs' narratives of situated practices. Both entrepreneurial settings are regarded as extreme cases, as the socio-material context in which entrepreneuring is enacted are unique and yet typical of two types of rural contexts.

Case selection and researcher positionality

The chapter investigates entrepreneurial practices in rural contexts, illuminated by two artisan entrepreneurs, Sheila and Elbjorg, who both started creative industry firms using heritage craft activities and resources: Elbjorg started a spinnery on a farm in a valley in Norway, whilst Sheila is using tweed in a UK village, in a community-led craft heritage building co-located with other artisan entrepreneurs. Both micro-businesses are led by a woman entrepreneur, apply heritage craft practices in their businesses and engage in various forms of collaborations in their creative entrepreneuring.

The cases were selected by each researcher with the aim to have comparable creative entrepreneurial settings. Each author researched a case study in their country of residence. This explicit positionality is important as it impacts on the data gathering and interpretation (Johannisson, 2018). The Norwegian case is known to the Norwegian researcher informally through networks pre-dating the empirical research phase. The UK case is part of a larger study of a rural creative hub conducted by the UK researcher.

Data collection and data analysis

The process-relational lens (Hill, 2018, 2021; Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b) allowed us to explore creative entrepreneurs' collaborations (Jevnaker, 2005, 2009) as they unfold in real-world entrepreneuring (Johannisson, 2018). Zooming in on everyday activities helped to reconstruct and openly reflect upon the specific efforts and challenges (Cunliffe & Scaratti, 2017).

Studying real-life entrepreneurial activities requires open ways to capture all possible details of daily entrepreneuring (Johannisson, 2018). Thus, the data collection instruments need to be able to capture as much rich and nuanced data as possible, including narratives. The data were collected from several sources: interviews, observations, websites, press-clippings, informal documents, and social media. Interviews (semi-structured and probing explorative) and recurrent informal conversations were grounded in the informants' first-

hand experiences. One long interview face-to-face and several site visits allowed recurrent conversations and observations in Norway. The research in the UK includes two interviews within 2021, once online during lockdown phase when the artist was at home and once face-to-face in the studio with associated visits to the whole building and the site, event observation.

Recurrent site visits included walking around and having reflective conversations on site. Specifically, rich narratives helped identify and understand recurrent aspects of the ongoing placemaking (Hill et al., 2021) resulting from collaborative work with other place agents (Jevnaker, 2003, 2009). Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim. We applied inductive coding in line with our interpretative approach twice (See Table 1, following Gioia et al., 2013) leading to the emergent themes and aggregated codes.

Findings and analysis

First, we delineate the two settings of rural heritage craft entrepreneuring. The two settings illuminate similar yet different solutions for rural heritage craft entrepreneuring to have a wider impact on rural socio-economic development.

Case Vignette 1: Sheila, Textile artist, UK - 'Wildlife inspired'

Sheila (a pseudonym) is a textile artist based in the UK, creating accessories, homeware and original artwork, mainly using original English and Scottish tweeds. Her products include brooches, hair clips, bags, lampshades, and scarves, which feature nature and imaginatively enhance animals and landscapes. Using tweed connects her to the family history of her two great uncles who manufactured fine wool tweeds. Most of the fabrics are natural and sustainably produced, a small amount is repurposed (bags) using recycled plastic bottles and cotton.

Her love of nature and fabrics keeps her going. Sheila cannot earn a full-time salary with her creative work as yet, and hence, works as an employee in part-time jobs. One day a week she works for an alternative agriculture organisation in the administration team, and another day, she packages vegetables for an organic food delivery company.

Sheila works from a studio in a rural creative hub, where she gains inspiration and inspires others. Locally, she is engaged in an online community that she co-created during the COVID-19 lockdowns during 2020-21 to raise the profile of local artists and increase the local market size for handcrafted goods. She communicates with customers via Facebook,

Instagram pages and her website. She sells via Etsy directly and regularly takes part in craft fairs, regional Open Studio events and Open Days at her creative hub. She also sells her products in six shops around the UK, some of which are hundreds of miles away.

The COVID-19 lockdown phases forced her to engage much more with social media, including livestreaming her work from temporary fairs. During 2021, Sheila co-created an online fair with over 50 local artisan entrepreneurs, advertised with social media, and took part in two other local online markets. In 2022, she is back at in-person events and fairs, but streams live from these events and publishes short videos showcasing her art.

Case Vignette 2: Elbjorg, spinning wool entrepreneur, Norway - 'co-creating in the wild'

When selling their home in Norway's capital Oslo, Elbjorg (a pseudonym) and her husband bought a small farm in a rural valley in 1992. Growing up with craft traditions performed by her mother (a "modiste", hat-maker) and grandmother (weaving and sewing), Elbjorg is very interested in what she calls "forgotten" craft traditions, and the fact that "women in textiles have been creating for hundreds of years". With this background, educated as a nurse, and an idea-historian university graduate, Elbjorg has broad experience in exploration, knowledge-creation, and caring work for and with others, which she applies to business creation. She also became dedicated to "beginning with mohair goats", inspired by a rural-narrative TV program.

In the early 2000s, Elbjorg had a passion and practised skills for heritage craft with wool resources. Establishing a weaving room with several manual looms in the barn attic preceded the formal business foundation. However, the industrially spun wool yarn available in Norway in the early 2000 was chemically treated and did not include wool from the ancient sheep breeds. Elbjorg eventually started to engage with several researchers and teachers at two higher education schools in the region, especially interested in the prospective use of wool from local sheep and goats including her own mohair goats.

When Elbjorg discovered that her mohair goats' wool that she first sent to Denmark, was further transported as far as South-Africa to be washed and spun, she began searching for new solutions. "It was not sustainable", she says in the interview. Another eye-opener was a research-based report from one of the local universities that pointed to the opportunity for handling the local wool from sheep and goats, from around 70 interested farmers.

At that time, she did not find any small-scale wool handling and spinning solutions in Norway or the other European countries. After a while she and her IT-educated son found small-scale suitable spinning machines in Canada and ordered several in 2008. The woman-

led company was then afterwards formally established the same year as a limited company with several owners. The wool-handling and spinning started on her farm property.

This local spinning company is among the very few spinning wool from sheep and goats in Norway, washing and handling the wool locally in ecological ways. Elbjorg and her team also spin custom-based yarn from other animals (e.g., moxas, dogs). The company now mainly sells varieties of self-produced natural yarn, and a few finished knitted products, e.g., shawls, jumpers, cardigans, mittens, tablecloths, pillowcases, and carpets.

Below we delineate three recurrent practices we identified in both the UK village and in the valleys of Norway, which underpin rural entrepreneurial placemaking. The creation of heritage craft businesses has required skilfully organising specific resources and processes, including placemaking for creative industry business collaborations, which we turn to next.

(TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE)

How entrepreneurial placemaking unfolds

The regional context, with its sources for materials, related skills and people, is key in heritage craft entrepreneurship. However, it is less understood how entrepreneurs can actually foster or cultivate this type of entrepreneuring to create dynamic rural entrepreneurial places (Hill et al., 2021). Taking the two cases as our point of departure uncovers both similarities and differences in the two rural artisan entrepreneurs' placemaking activities. Both were immersed in enacting heritage skilled entrepreneurial activities, but differences prevailed in making places (for buying and selling heritage goods) accessible for and with others, physically and online.

We start by analysing the spinning case in Norway to illuminate some placemaking dynamics and especially how they serve as a vehicle for business development in the rural area. After some years (2008-2011) with spinning machines only located in the barn, a new, separately located factory building was built with a visiting exhibition room/shop and its own parking lot. Not only machinery but the whole building helps to connect, co-develop and organise craft production, presentations and sales, as well as receiving visiting groups well (often with home-made cakes). Gaining funding from public sources, while initially dependent on "much persuasion", became easier, and then with the new spinnery crafts production was "clearly no hobby", Elbjorg underlined. In 2022, around 50 farmers from several regions are delivering wool to this spinning enterprise. Elbjorg is co-creating jobs for

local women in the spinnery including specialists recruited to the site (around 5), as well as for one or two visiting apprentices staying a period at the farm.

Experimentation in a 3 year-long funded research project, on the use of wool from ancient sheep breeds, unfolds in the spinnery since 2022. One of Elbjorg's family members is leading this wool project in partnership with external researchers in crafts and agriculture education. Another family member is the spinning company's chairperson and has contributed for several years to the enterprise (e.g., organising the company webpage with net based shopping generating over 50% of its current sales). Everyone in this spinning company enjoys a salary on the same level, as a "flat organisation". A network of co-engaged knitters also contributes to co-development of creative patterns and samples of finished products, displayed online and in the shop. The numerous collective events before the pandemic included both temporary scheduled group visits and more spontaneous heritage craft presentations for other visitors to the spinnery.

The UK entrepreneurial placemaking activities occurred during and after UK COVID-19 induced lockdown phases, as temporary digital and physical entrepreneurial placemaking (Hill et al., 2021). Sheila is involved in creating dynamic marketplaces using a variety of tools and channels. Her placemaking activities establish temporary marketplaces where selling to end customers is possible. Co-developing is very important to her, she has worked with other local artisan entrepreneurs in all marketplaces. Placemaking is the academic term, and she thoroughly explains the key ingredients of a place that works: "it's not about making place it's about making connections and community (...), I think I just see there's been enormous benefits having a creative community particularly during COVID." She highlights how the fragmented working conditions of many artisan entrepreneurs with portfolio careers (part-time employment and self-employment simultaneously) can be overcome through online communities (see Hill et al., 2021) that meet to organise markets and sell at these temporary markets. Connecting with others often leads to peer learning and support, while co-developing a community of artisan entrepreneurs and organising marketplaces for selling their goods (see Table 1).

Sheila's own heritage entrepreneuring is a vehicle that allows her to connect with other artisan entrepreneurs, to overcome the loneliness as a single entrepreneur, and create places for social connections while organising activities for the wider local (artisan) community. These organising practices often lead to economically relevant exchanges where artisan entrepreneurs can also support each other. This peer support is a side-effect of organising events, fairs and exhibitions, as the last quote in Table 1 demonstrates: Returning

to the first quote by Sheila, entrepreneurial placemaking (see Hill et al., 2021) is the ongoing accomplishment of various sets of interconnected activities (Gherardi, 2019; Hill, 2018), which can be fragile and is less understood (Bruce & Jevnaker, 1998; Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b). Our research hones in on connecting, co-developing, and organising. Sheila outlines explicitly what she regards as essential for being able to do business, not only during lockdown phases - connecting with people, meeting up, exchanging ideas, communicating, which leads to practical outcomes of organising events and fairs, including online and physical events in the locality via Open Studio events and Open days in the creative hub.

Thus, the three practices of connecting, organising and co-developing are interconnected and underpin the entrepreneurial placemaking practices. Both entrepreneurs set up their creative industry venture to cultivate local wool traditions, such as weaving, using local materials.

So what does this mean for creative industry research? Creative industries in ‘the wild’

Our research offers two theoretical contributions to the creative industries and entrepreneurship-as-practice literature we discuss before we outline some management implications.

Co-creating synergies in craft entrepreneuring in the rural

Rather than any single success factor for rural heritage craft businesses, we were intrigued by how Sheila and Elbjorg were both engaging in multiple voluntary processes of placemaking as a vehicle for ‘successful’ rural entrepreneuring. In the settings studied, the heritage craft entrepreneurs were recurrently exploiting materials, means, and matters such as events, fairs, and webpages to showcase offerings, sell craft products, or raise money for something genuinely embedded in their heritage craft networks.

This finding resonates with the idea of entrepreneuring in the rural as quite complex enactive interweaving (Johannisson, 2018), and illustrated ‘rural business’ activities using local resources (materials, networks, employing local staff) (Bosworth and Turner, 2018; Hill & Mole, 2022). Yet, ‘enactment’ does not fully capture what Sheila and Elbjorg are doing and saying. The creative industry practices that suprised us rather involved making synergy when co-creating with – and in part against – other contemporary industry practices

(Jevnaker, 2005). This seems to be an important element in whether collectively improved entrepreneurial places for local crafts (Hill et al., 2021) can work – or not work. An important implication for future research is to further investigate the possible ‘bottom-up’ creation of synergy in developmental micro activities generated and shared with others (Jevnaker, 2009) as essential practices of co-creation amongst creative entrepreneurs in rural locations.

Organising in and ‘with’ the wild

Another contribution emanates from studying creative industry entrepreneuring in the remote rural. As we have addressed heritage craft entrepreneurship as creative venturing emerging in the business world, rather than shielded in a laboratory (a well serviced and resourced urban environment), we found it useful to borrow the ‘wild’ cognition metaphor of Hutchins (1995). Using this contextual metaphor allowed us to identify the more hidden activities and challenges of the heritage craft entrepreneuring as both real-life joyful action and strivings (Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b). In short, it helped to convey more of the everyday efforts of, for, and with, particular artisans. “We are working for the crafts, not for money”, but “we need to cover the salaries”, Elbjorg contended. Evidently, both entrepreneurs Elbjorg and Sheila, are making heritage craft not only ‘in the wild’ but also ‘with the wild’, which is a novel application of this concept.

Implications for enacting heritage craft entrepreneuring in the rural

Hence, rather than looking at heritage craft as fixed cultural objects or given resources, the two artisan entrepreneurs proactively exploited heritage materials in new developments. In their ongoing collaborative enactments with others (Jevnaker, 2005), creative agents actually co-create *entrepreneurial placemaking in the rural*. Implications for rural development address the need to engage with creative entrepreneurs and their invisible supply chains - associates they work with and the roles as self-employed associates to other businesses (see Jevnaker, 2009; Jones & Ratten, 2020). Associates who support the creation processes do not show up on employment records, and hence, the wider economic contribution is less visible (Jevnaker & Olaisen, 2022b). Local development officers in local authorities would benefit from organising regular gatherings, not only for creative entrepreneurs, but also their supply chain businesses, to foster relationship building. These gatherings would help to keep creative entrepreneurs in their locations in the wild, and overcome distance and cost by

bridging this distance through on- and off-line business working events. These events would then recurrently contribute to realising entrepreneurial placemaking.

Conclusion

This research asked how craft entrepreneurs accomplish heritage craft entrepreneuring in the rural. Adopting a process-relational view, we studied two rural heritage textiles micro-business settings, which allowed for identification of some entrepreneurial craft practices. Specifically, we identified how their craft entrepreneuring is developed by many temporary connecting, co-creating and developing, and organising activities, in the rural 'wild'. We used the lens 'entrepreneurial placemaking' (Hill et al., 2022) to capture the performance of these entrepreneurial practices.

A common theme of all practices was co-creating with the material, the social, and the symbolic aspects of heritage craft such as becoming visible in many of the internet-based presentations. Notably, the two rural artisan entrepreneurial settings in Norway and the UK were both engaging in placemaking via 'wildlife inspired' new resource combinations.

In conclusion, we specifically point to the essential roles of creative 'heritage craft placemakers' and their continued co-creative entrepreneurial placemaking - as embedded in recurrent connecting, creatively co-developing, and organising practices with others *in* and *with* the rural 'wild'.

Notes

*Equal authorship. Corresponding author Birgit Helene Jevnaker

References

Arias, R.A.C., & Cruz, A.D. (2019). Rethinking artisan entrepreneurship in a small island. A tale of two chocolatiers in Roatan, Honduras. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 25 (4), 633-661.

Bruce, M., & Jevnaker, B.H. (Eds.) (1998). *Management of Design Alliances: Sustaining Competitive Advantage*. Chichester: J. Wiley & Sons.

Beckmann, M., Garkisch, M., & Zeyen, A. (2021). Together we are strong? A systematic literature review on how SMEs use relation-based collaboration to operate in rural

areas. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 1-35. DOI: [10.1080/08276331.2021.1874605](https://doi.org/10.1080/08276331.2021.1874605).

Bosworth, G., & Turner, R. (2018). Interrogating the meaning of a rural business through a rural capitals framework. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 60, 1-10.

Cilliers, E., & Timmermans, W. (2014). The importance of creative participatory planning in the public place-making process. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 41(3), 413-429.

Courage, C. (2021). Preface: the radical potential of placemaking. In C. Courage, T. Borrup, M.R. Jackson, et al. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Placemaking* (pp. 217–223). London and New York, NY: Routledge.

Cunliffe, A.L., & Scaratti, G. (2017). Embedding Impact in Engaged Research: Developing Socially Useful Knowledge through Dialogical Sensemaking. *Brit J Manage*, 28: 29-44. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12204>

Eisenhardt, K.M., & Graebner, M.E. (2007). Theory building from cases: opportunities and challenges. *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (1), 25–32.

Elias S.R.S.T.A., Chiles, T.H., Duncan C.M., & Vultee, D. M.(2018). The aesthetics of entrepreneurship: how arts entrepreneurs and their customers co-create aesthetic value. *Organisation Studies* 39 (2–3), 345–372.

Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Perseus Book Group.

Gherardi, S. (2019). *How to Conduct a Practice-Based study. Problems and Methods*. 2nd ed. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Gioia, D.A., Corley, K.G., & Hamilton, A.L. (2013). Seeking qualitative rigor in inductive research: notes on the gioia methodology. *Organizational Research Methods* 16 (1), 15–31.

Hutchins, E. (1995). *Cognition in the Wild*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hill, I., Elias, S.R.S.T.A., Dobson, S. and Jones, P. (2023). Creative (and cultural) industry entrepreneurship in the 21st century – state of the art. In: Hill, I. et al. (Eds). *Creative (and cultural) industry entrepreneurship in the 21st century* (pp. 1-21). London: Emerald Publishing.

Hill, I. (2022). Ethnographic methods for capturing the sociomateriality of entrepreneurial practices. In N. Thompson, O. Byrne, B. Teague, & A. Jenkins (Eds.), *Research Handbook on Entrepreneurship as Practice*. Research Handbooks in Business and Management Series (pp. 266-280). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hill, I. (2021). Spotlight on UK artisan entrepreneurs' situated collaborations: through the lens of entrepreneurial capitals and their conversion. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 27 (1), 99-121.

Hill, I. (2018). How did you get up and running? Taking a Bourdieuan perspective towards a framework for negotiating strategic fit. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 30 (5-6), 662-696.

Hill, I., & Mole, K. (2022). *State of the Art Review - Supporting Rural Businesses*. Newcastle: National Innovation Centre for Rural Enterprise, July 2022. (last accessed 25-10-22, <https://nicre.co.uk/media/1wmhonux/nicre-sota-no-4-july-2022-supporting-rural-businesses.pdf>).

Hill, I., Manning, L., & Frost, R. (2021). Rural arts entrepreneurs' placemaking - how 'entrepreneurial placemaking' explains rural creative hub evolution during COVID-19 lockdown. *Local Economy* 36 (7-8), 627-649.

Jevnaker, B. H. (1993). Creating an Entrepreneurial Management System in Large Corporations. The Case of STK Innova. In H. Klandt (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship and Business Development, Fgf Entrepreneurship Research Monographien*; Bd. 3 (pp. 335-357). UK: Avebury.

Jevnaker, B.H. (2003). Industrial designers as boundary workers. In N. Paulsen, & T. Hernes (Eds.), *Managing Boundaries in Organizations: Multiple Perspectives* (pp. 110-128). Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jevnaker, B. H. (2005). Vita Activa: On Relationships between Design(ers) and Business. *Design Issues* 21 (3), 25-48.

Jevnaker, B.H. (2009). Mediating In-Between: How Industrial Design Advances Business and User Innovation. In S. Poggenpohl, & K. Sato (Eds.), *Design Integrations: Research and Collaboration* (pp. 87-118). Bristol, UK: Intellect, In the US distr. in collaboration with The University of Chicago Press.

Jevnaker, B.H., & Olaisen, J. (2022a). A comparative study of knowledge management research studies: making research more relevant and creative. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice* 20 (2), 292-303. DOI: 10.1080/14778238.2021.2020695.

Jevnaker, B. H., & Olaisen, J. (2022b). *Reimagining Sustainable Organization. Perspectives on Arts, Design, Leadership, Knowledge and Project Management*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, Springer Nature.

Johannisson, B. (2018). *Disclosing Entrepreneurship as Practice. The Enactive Approach*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Jones, P., & Ratten, V. (2020). Knowledge spillovers and entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 19(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14778238.2020.1801363>.

Lagerqvist, B., & Bornmal, D. (2015). Development of new economies by merging heritage and entrepreneurship. The issue of preserving, using or developing – or all? *Ecocycles* 1 (1), 16-21.

Massey, D. (2005). *For Space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Langley, A., & Tsoukas, H. (2017). Introduction. In A. Langley, & H. Tsoukas (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Process Organisation Studies* (pp. 1-26). London: SAGE.

Phillips, J., Gorton, M. Tiwasing, P., Cowie, P., Maioli, S., & Newbery, R. (2019). *Progressing rural contributions to the UK Industrial Strategy*. Newcastle: Newcastle University. Rural Economy and Land Use Policy and Practice Note 8.

Pret, T., Shaw, E., & Drakopoulou Dodd, S. (2016). Painting the full picture: the conversion of economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital. *International Small Business Journal*, 34 (8), 1004-1027.

Pret, T., & Cogan, A. (2019). Artisan entrepreneurship: a systematic literature review and research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25 (4), 529-614.

Rae, D. (2020). Intercultural Entrepreneurship in Creative Place-Making. In R. Granger (Eds.), *Value Construction in the Creative Economy: Negotiating Innovation and Transformation* (pp. 131-150). Cham/Switzerland: Palgrave.

Ratten V., & Ferreira J.J. (2017). Future research direction for cultural entrepreneurship and regional innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 21 (3), 163-169.

Scott, E. (2020). *Rural Economy and UK Agriculture: Issues for the New Parliament*. London: House of Lords Library.

Schatzki, T. (2001). Introduction: practice theory. In T. R. Schatzki, K. Knorr-Cetina, & E. von Savigny, E. (Eds.) (2001), *The practice turn in contemporary theory* (pp. 1-15). London: Routledge.

Sklaveniti, C., & Steyaert, C. (2020). Reflecting with Pierre Bourdieu: towards a reflexive outlook for practice-based studies of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 32 (3-4), 313-333.

Stadtler, L., & van Wassenhove, L.N. (2016). Coopetition as a paradox: Integrative approaches in a multi-company, cross-sector partnership. *Organization Studies*, 37 (5), 655–685.

Thompson, N., Verduijn, K., & Gartner, W. (2020). Entrepreneurship-as-practice: grounding contemporary theories of practice into entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 32 (3-4), 247-256.

Turner, R., Phillipson, J., Gorton, M., Cowie, P., Dwyer, J., Goodwin-Hawkins, B., Hill, I., Mole, K., Nguyen, T., Roper, S., Thompson-Glen, M., Rowe, F., Tocco, B., & Wishart, M. (2021). *What is the contribution of rural enterprise to Levelling up, and how can this be further enabled?* Briefing paper no 1. March 2021. Newcastle: National Innovation Centre for Rural Enterprise (NICRE) (last accessed 2-10-22 <https://nicre.co.uk/media/rgfbvgkc/what-is-the-contribution-of-rural-enterprise-to-levelling-up-and-how-can-this-be-further-enabled.pdf>).

Velez, J., Siepel, Hill, I., Rowe, F. (2022). *Mapping and examining the determinants of England's rural creative microclusters*. NICRE (and PEC) Research report No. 7. National Innovation Centre for Rural Enterprise. Newcastle. May 2022.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case Study Research and Applications: Design and Methods*. 6th edition. Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.