Making Sense of Industrial Decline: How Legacies of the Past Influence the Development of Entrepreneurship Cultures in Formerly Industrialised Places

Abstract:

This paper explores how local communities in formerly industrialised places make sense of industrial decline and how the historical experience of industrialism has influenced the subsequent development of local entrepreneurship cultures. Based on a study with entrepreneurs and policymakers in Doncaster, a post-industrial English town in South Yorkshire, the paper demonstrates how legacies of the past persist through local informal institutions and permeate local perceptions of place and opportunity, stymieing the development of an entrepreneurship culture in the locality. Drawing on Cresswell's three-dimensional framework of place, the paper shows how place meanings can lag significantly behind material transformation and slow the adoption of new practices. The study reflects on these challenges and discusses the policy implications.

Introduction

"Local areas start with an inherited pattern of land use and a resource base and institutions that were tailored to another era. The legacy of the past can weigh heavily, and adapting to new futures can be difficult. In the last 30 years, the challenge in many areas has been to bring about economic, physical and social renewal and reorientation against a backdrop where much of their existing stock of floor space, human and physical capital was configured to produce goods that either no longer exist or are now made elsewhere in the world … In order to achieve such renewal and reorientation, sustained and substantial effort on several fronts is required, including the promotion of entrepreneurship […]." (Martin et al., 2016, p.351)

For decades, governments have attempted to stimulate entrepreneurial-led growth in formerly industrialised places, with enterprise policy seeking to promote entrepreneurship as an engine of socio-economic renewal (Greene et al., 2004; Beresford, 2015; Martin et al., 2016). In the UK, this started as a direct response to the deindustrialisation of the 1980s and 1990s through the promotion of a rhetoric around enterprise (MacDonald, 1996; Gardiner et al., 2013) and "freedom of independent economic action" (Dodd and Anderson 2001, p.21). However, this attempt to infuse entrepreneurial values such as individualism and independence into communities previously organised around mass production and employment in large-scale industries has not yielded the expected outcomes (Greene et al., 2004; Stuetzer et al., 2016; Gherhes et al., 2018). Many formerly industrialised localities are stuck in a "vicious cycle of low entrepreneurship and weak entrepreneurship culture" (Stuetzer et al., 2016, p.18), and have been labelled as unenterprising communities (Parkinson et al., 2016).

However, to understand why a culture of entrepreneurship has not developed in these places, we need "to better understand how and why the decisions and adaptive behaviours of different types of agents might vary spatially according to their particular economic, social and institutional contexts" (Bristow and Healy, 2015, p.243). In essence, how place-based factors intersect with the practice of entrepreneurship in post-industrial places and how these shape entrepreneurial cultures are critical questions when understanding how enterprise policy is operationalised in these places. While places that experienced industrial decline were implicitly regarded as settings in which entrepreneurship is expected to occur (Parkinson et al., 2016), research has shown that entrepreneurship is sensitive to institutional contexts (Welter, 2011; Korsgaard et al., 2015). Of particular importance are informal institutions that form the culture of a place (George and Zahra, 2002) and shape entrepreneurial behaviour (Huggins and

Thompson, 2015). Informal institutions can either support entrepreneurship if they are aligned with entrepreneurial values, norms and behaviours or they can pull in the opposite direction, stymieing efforts to promote entrepreneurial activity (Gherhes et al., 2018). Entrepreneurship can be defined broadly as the identification, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities (Shane, 2012). As an individual-led behaviour, it can manifest as independent economic action through self-employment or new firm start-ups (Acs et al., 2018). However, more than that, entrepreneurship is an endeavour that reflects the values of independence, autonomy, individualism, and achievement (Dodd and Andersson, 2001; Wyrwich, 2015; Stuetzer et al., 2016).

This is critical for understanding adaptation, or the lack thereof, in formerly industrialised places where local communities have for decades experienced an 'industrial way of life' governed by practices and a set of values, norms and behaviours that developed in relation to the nature of industrial activity (Byrne, 2002). This has left a long-term imprint and may have contributed to the development of cultures unsupportive of entrepreneurship (Stuetzer et al., 2016). Indeed, research has shown that people develop 'ways of life', or cultures, that are shaped by the nature of the socio-economic activity and attributes of the places in which they live and work (Byrne, 2002). Through socialisation, they attribute meaning (Gieryn, 2000) and form attachments to place (Parkinson et al., 2020), which can give rise to locale-specific discourses that influence occupational choices and thus socially accepted practices within place (Larson and Pearson, 2012; Gill and Larson, 2014). Critically, these can persist in spite of structural transformation and economic depletion (Johnstone and Lionais, 2004), and crystalise into local cultures that affect the entrepreneurial orientation of the residents (Busenitz et al., 2000). Nevertheless, the understanding of how institutions develop in relation to place and of how place influences the development of local entrepreneurship cultures remains limited (Parkinson et al., 2016; Anderson et al., 2018; Parkinson et al., 2020).

In this context, we need to understand how the historical experience of industrialism has subsequently influenced the development of entrepreneurship cultures in formerly industrialised places. While promoting entrepreneurship can be part of the adaptation of these places away from historical industries of the past, an understanding is required of how the local communities in these places have made sense of industrial decline and how their historical experience of industrialism may have shaped subsequent appeals of entrepreneurship. Only by understanding such aspects of the local institutional context can policies and development strategies be effectively designed and implemented (Rodríguez-Pose, 2013). In the UK, this is

especially critical for Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) which have set out to promote entrepreneurship in their areas.

This paper contributes to these research gaps through a focus on a formerly industrialised place that is undergoing economic transformation following industrial decline in the search for a new economic purpose and identity. The place has undergone significant transformation following industrial decline. After losing its status as a primary zone of production, it has confronted with "prolonged challenges involving long-term and uneven processes of de-industrialization and transition towards service-dominated economies" (Pike et al., 2010, p.2). We focus on how local communities in this place make sense of this transition and how the historical experience of industrialism has influenced the development of an entrepreneurship culture following industrial decline. Therefore, the two research questions informing the study are: (i) how do local communities in formerly industrialised places make sense of industrial decline and (ii) how does the historical experience of industrialism influence the subsequent development of a local entrepreneurship culture? To address these questions, the paper explores the relationship between place, informal institutions, and the development of cultures supportive of entrepreneurship. We adapt Cresswell's (2009) three-dimensional framework of place which invokes materiality (physical qualities), meaning (social understanding) and practice (social interaction) to elaborate different facets of place conceptualisation.

The paper shows that, in our case study of Doncaster, the historical experience of industrialism has remained engrained in the local culture and persists through a locale-specific discourse that keeps the history of industrialism alive and contrasts with the new opportunities afforded by the locality's materiality. Specifically, our findings show that place meanings have remained stuck in the past and lag significantly behind material transformation and slow the adoption of new – in this case, entrepreneurial – practices, stymieing the development of a local entrepreneurship culture. While industrial activity gave the place meaning and was associated with socio-economic prosperity and growth, its demise was interpreted by the local community as the loss of its raison d'être. The absence of large-scale industrial economic activity that once defined the community has led to the development of negative evaluations of the place, reinforcing a locale-specific discourse that the area lacks economic opportunity. Moreover, the strong attachment to the industrial past has seen the values and norms that governed the industrial way of life endure as legacies of the past through local informal institutions. A legacy of low aspirations stymies entrepreneurial ambition, with manifestations of entrepreneurship driven largely by necessity. The persistence of these values and meanings manifests as an

acutely localised form of institutional hysteresis where local informal institutions function to discourage entrepreneurial behaviour, making entrepreneurship a remote and unappealing endeavour. The paper concludes that policies aimed at fostering entrepreneurship in formerly industrialised places need to understand local informal institutions and the acutely localised nature of challenges or risk foundering in the face of largely invisible cultural barriers.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: section 2 discusses the importance of informal institutions and place for entrepreneurship; section 3 contextualises the research and sets out the methodology; section 4 presents the findings; section 5 discusses the findings and policy implications; and section 6 concludes with reflections and future research directions.

Literature Review

This study sits at the intersection between two literatures that are fundamental to the study of entrepreneurship: the importance of informal institutions for entrepreneurship and the role of place in shaping entrepreneurial behaviour.

Entrepreneurship and the Importance of Informal Institutions

Research has shown that returns to different forms of entrepreneurship are sensitive to institutional contexts (Mueller, 2006; Acs et al., 2008; Huggins and Thompson, 2015; Tubadji et al., 2016; Fritsch and Wyrwich, 2018). As the 'rules of the game' (Baumol, 1990), institutions govern individuals' behaviour, shaping their incentives to engage in particular activities (North, 1990). For example, institutions guide individuals' economic behaviour and their attitudes towards different economic activities, thereby influencing their tendency to start a business (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011). There is a distinction to be made between formal institutions, which are written down or formally accepted rules and regulations that shape the economic and legal framework of a society, and informal institutions, which are unwritten rules and include attitudes, customs, norms, values and conventions (North, 1990; Acs et al., 2008; Audretsch et al., 2017). These can enable and constrain social action, thus shaping incentives for engaging in entrepreneurial activity (Bruton et al., 2010; Bathelt and Glückler, 2014; Korsgaard et al., 2015). Therefore, a comprehensive understanding of entrepreneurship can only be achieved by analysing it through the lens of the institutional context in which it is embedded (Lang et al., 2013).

However, Welter (2011) notes that the institutional context remains 'somewhat neglected' in entrepreneurship research. In particular, analyses of economic development often omit cultural aspects, yet the different cultural traits of communities shape the prevailing entrepreneurship culture across places (Huggins and Thompson, 2015). Indeed, economic action is embedded within "cultural systems of ideological and normative beliefs" (Martin, 2000, p.85). As informal institutions comprise "the enduring set of values of a nation [or] a region" (George and Zahra, 2002, p.5) that form the culture of a place, they are particularly important for understanding manifestations of entrepreneurial behaviour within specific settings. As Bruton et al. (2010, p. 423) emphasise, the cultural context "is increasingly important in entrepreneurship research in terms of how societies accept entrepreneurs, inculcate values, and even create a cultural milieu whereby entrepreneurship is accepted and encouraged". Where informal institutions promote attitudes, values, customs, norms, and behaviours that are aligned with the ideology of entrepreneurship, they provide fertile institutional ground for entrepreneurial activity and entrepreneurship cultures to develop (North, 1990). Equally, they can stymie entrepreneurial activity and the development of entrepreneurship cultures where they do not incentivise such behaviour.

Previous studies have shown that levels of entrepreneurship tend to persist across places, suggesting that this is indicative of the existence of an entrepreneurship culture that endures over time (e.g. Mueller 2006; Fritsch and Wyrwich, 2014; Fritsch et al., 2014; Fotopoulos, 2014; Fotopoulos and Storey, 2017; Fritsch and Wyrwich, 2018). However, while research has focused on places with strong traditions of entrepreneurship, less is known about places where a strong culture of entrepreneurship has not developed in the past. This includes formerly industrialised places where attempts to stimulate entrepreneurial-led growth post-deindustrialisation have not yielded the expected outcomes. Studies of formerly industrialised places have found a diminished local entrepreneurial spirit due to the prevalence of employment in large-scale industries in the past (Chinitz, 1961; Glaeser et al., 2015). For example, Stuetzer et al. (2016) show that the historical presence of large-scale industries has negatively affected the development of an entrepreneurship culture in formerly industrialised localities, arguing that fewer start-up opportunities, low-skill job requirements, a reduced necessity for education and accumulation of entrepreneurial skills, and the lack of entrepreneurial role models may have contributed to the development of informal institutions unfavourable to entrepreneurship.

Scholars have argued that entrepreneurial intentions and values are handed down generationally (Niittykangas and Tervo, 2005; Laspita et al., 2012; Wyrwich, 2015; Audretsch et al., 2017), but few have articulated the mechanisms by which this happens (Fritsch et al., 2019). Entrepreneurial values include independence, autonomy, individualism, and achievement (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011; Wyrwich, 2015; Stuetzer et al., 2016). These influence attitudes to enterprise (Parkins et al., 2020) and underpin strong cultures of entrepreneurship. However, the organisation of production and local economic activity around large-scale industries in formerly industrialised places meant that entrepreneurship was a 'rare event' in the industrial days (Stuetzer et al., 2016). As such, there were few independent business owners who could then transfer entrepreneurial values and attitudes to future generations of potential entrepreneurs (Chinitz, 1961). Instead, formerly industrialised places were governed by different sets of values, developing what Byrne (2002) calls an 'industrial structure of feeling', namely the specific set of values, norms and behaviours that governed the industrial 'way of life'. This is what Huggins and Thompson (2015, p.135) refer to as community culture, namely "the overarching or dominant mindsets that underlie the way in which places function in a broader societal sense". In formerly industrialised places, this was shaped by what Stuetzer et al. (2016) refer to as non-entrepreneurial work conditions, such as low autonomy, high division of labour, repetitive and monotonous tasks, lack of entrepreneurial role models.

Importantly, this can have long-lasting implications for the development of local entrepreneurship cultures. This is because the values, norms, and behaviours embedded in informal institutions, and which form local cultures, tend to endure, manifesting as "the old ethos, the hand of the past, or the carriers of history" (Pejovich, 1999, p. 166). As "durable systems of established and embedded social rules that structure social interactions" (Hodgson, 2006, p.13), informal institutions can create strong mechanisms of conformism and normative agreement, meaning that they more difficult to change (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011). Given the limited impact of successive enterprise policy waves in formerly industrialised places, it is critical to understand how the historical experience of industrialism has subsequently influenced the development of an entrepreneurship culture in these places. This can support the design and implementation of targeted economic development strategies that address place-specific challenges.

One mechanism through which informal institutions endure over time is institutional hysteresis, a form of path dependence that can manifest as a product of historical time

(Setterfield 1993; Setterfield, 2009; Tubadji et al. 2016). This creates a path dependence that is "grounded in the reproduction of instituted forms of behaviour" (Hudson 2005, p.583). The concept was adopted in the social sciences (Martin, 2012) to explain the persistence of institutions "even if the original conditions that caused their creation might have long disappeared" (Bathelt and Glückler 2014, p.348). Institutional hysteresis is often the outcome of "one-time disturbances [that] permanently affect the path of the economy" (Romer, 2001, p.471). Examples include major socio-economic shocks which inflict structural changes, such as deindustrialisation. Given the prolonged challenges of deindustrialisation (Pike et al., 2010), and the tendency of informal institutions to persist over time, institutional hysteresis provides an adequate lens for examining how the historical experience of industrialism has influenced the development of an entrepreneurship culture in places that experienced industrial decline.

Placing Entrepreneurship in Context

The nature of institutions is locally contingent and locally emergent (Martin, 2000), meaning that institutions develop in relation to place (Lang et al., 2013; Bathelt and Glückler, 2014). Indeed, "values and attitudes towards entrepreneurship are locally embedded" (Fotopoulos and Storey, 2017, p.672), and therefore informal institutions and the institutional environments they comprise are place- and geography-specific (Lang et al., 2013; Parkinson et al., 2020. Thus, entrepreneurship can ultimately be understood as "a product of the social and community cultural values present across places" (Huggins and Thompson, 2014, p.742). Therefore, in order to understand "when, how and why entrepreneurship happens" (Welter, 2011, p.165), there is a need to contextualise and understand entrepreneurship in relation to the specific setting in which it occurs. While previous studies have focused on the spatial dimension of place, there is a need to understand place multidimensionally, with it also being defined by "the economic, social cultural and institutional dimensions of a locality" (McCann and Rodríguez-Pose, 2011, p.207). This study links understandings of place with the local institutional dimension to examine how local communities in formerly industrialised places make sense of industrial decline and the subsequent appeals towards entrepreneurship.

In order to understand place as a concept, there is a key conceptual distinction to be made between space and place. Hudson (2001) explains that space relates to the economic evaluation of a location in terms of its profit capacity, while place refers to the social evaluation of a location in terms of the meaning attached to it. Therefore, the economic dimension relates to what is technically possible while the cultural dimension shapes what is socially acceptable

within a place. In Korsgaard et al.'s (2015, p.579) words, "a location becomes a place if meanings and experiences are attached to it". Others went further and sought to conceptualise place in more depth, as "complex intersections of location, materiality and meaningfulness" (Gill and Larson, 2014, p.535). Gieryn (2000) explains that places have three defining characteristics, namely geographic location, material form, and investment with meaning and value. Similarly, Cresswell (2009) argues that places are combinations of location, or the 'where' of place (i.e. an absolute point in space), locale (i.e. the material setting for social relations), and sense of place or meaning (i.e. the feelings and emotions evoked by a place). Cresswell (2013) further elaborates on this multidimensional understanding of place, referring to materiality (i.e. the physical and tangible), meaning (i.e. socialisation of place; social construction) and practice (i.e. the things that people do in space) as three main conceptual dimensions. It is this interpretation of place that this paper adopts to explore the influence of place on the development of entrepreneurship cultures in Doncaster as formerly industrialised place.

To place these conceptual distinctions in the context of this paper, many formerly industrialised places are representative of what Johnstone and Lionais (2004) call depleted communities. These are places that experienced economic decline due to resource depletion and lack the growth mechanisms required for economic regeneration, but they are also spaces of socialisation to which people become attached and attribute meaning and with which they develop emotional bonds (Gieryn, 2000; Paasi, 2009). The resources that previously fuelled their growth became depleted as industrial decline accelerated and led to the closure of coal mines and factories. As a result of deindustrialisation, many of England's northern economies, for example, have "been transformed from a booming core in the 19th century to … marginalised and near-bust peripher[ies] by the end of the 20th century" (Hudson, 2005, p.2). Following unsuccessful attempts to infuse entrepreneurial values in these places (Greene et al., 2004), many have been labelled unenterprising communities that are hostile to entrepreneurship (Parkinson et al., 2016).

However, to develop effective economic development strategies that go beyond the generic promotion of entrepreneurial activity and address place-specific challenges, we need to understand how local communities in formerly industrialised places have made sense of industrial decline and how this intersects with the development of entrepreneurship cultures locally. Importantly, industrial economic activity in these places was a source of civic pride, and the thriving industrial place fostered a strong sense of community and a shared place

identity (Byrne, 2002; Power, 2008). Nevertheless, the 'industrial way of life' that prevailed for long periods of time was followed by abrupt changes to materiality and practice caused by industrial decline. While some communities were able to adapt to the enterprise discourse and transition towards entrepreneurial practices (e.g. McKeever et al., 2015; Anderson and Gaddefors, 2016; Berglund et al., 2016), adaptation in other communities has been weaker and many continue oppose or disapprove of it (e.g. Anderson et al., 2018). Here, research has emphasised the importance of place meanings that draw upon physical, material, and symbolic aspects of place, and crystallise into locale-specific discourses (Lars and Pearson, 2012). These concepts are critical to understanding the adaptation, or lack thereof, of formerly industrialised places to a post-industrial setting that favours and promotes entrepreneurship. Similar to institutions, these local-specific discourses develop in relation to place and influence locally accepted practices, such as entrepreneurship, illustrating how local communities make sense of place (Gill and Larson, 2014). Therefore, a meaningful understanding of the impact of industrial decline in these places can only be obtained through contextualisation in relation to local institutional contexts (Pike et al., 2010).

Indeed, there are important relationships that can be drawn between informal institutions and place dimensions. First, informal institutions are socially constructed, and therefore can be conceptually linked to the meanings associated with place. Indeed, places are not static socio-institutional contexts constraining individuals in local communities but are shaped by social practices (Gill and Larson, 2014; Parkinson et al., 2016). As Popay et al. (2003, p.56, italics in original) emphasise, place represents "the canvas on which *shared* social meanings are constructed and interpreted". They are collectively "interpreted, narrated, perceived, felt, understood, and imagined" (Gieryn, 2000, p.465). Thus, there is an argument to be made that informal institutions are also shaped by the meanings that individuals attach to a particular place. Second, as Cresswell explains, while materiality changes slowly, meaning persists and practices evolve, with the three being inherently interlinked. Place meanings can therefore lag behind, similar to informal institutions, and can result in asymmetries where they do not align with how the place is practised (Anderson and Gaddefors, 2016). This intersectionality between place and informal institutions provides a useful framework for understanding how local communities in formerly industrialised places have made sense of industrial decline. This paper explores the relationship between place, informal institutions, and the development of cultures supportive of entrepreneurship in a formerly industrialised place that is undergoing economic

transformation following industrial decline in the search for a new economic purpose and identity.

Empirical Focus and Methodology

The empirical focus of this study is Doncaster, a post-industrial town located within the periphery of the Sheffield City Region (SCR), in the North of England. The town is known for its industrial heritage, with mining and rail engineering occupying an important place in its history. The SCR itself is a post-industrial region widely known for its history as a major centre for coal, steel and manufacturing in the 20th century when it was "one of the heartlands of the manufacturing industry in the UK" (Huggins and Johnston, 2009 p.234). However, the deindustrialisation of the 1980s and 1990s has destroyed large sections of its industry and with these large numbers of jobs in manufacturing and production.

Doncaster's experience of industrialism and deindustrialisation is a representative of that of many other formerly industrialised places. The locality's reliance on a small concentration of industries has seen it experience what van Stel and Storey (2004) refer to as the 'Upas Tree effect' whereby the dominance of a few key industries stymied the development and growth of other industries. Thus, when deindustrialisation accelerated in the 1980s, it had a seismic impact, resulting in socio-economic decline through large-scale job losses and the collapse of communities, leaving Doncaster as a depleted community with few growth mechanisms for revival (Johnstone and Lionais, 2004). The industrial decline has led to a prolonged period of economic decline and stagnation in the locality. With an average annual growth rate of 1.5 percent, Doncaster is among the UK cities with the lowest economic growth rate recorded between 1981 and 2011 (Martin et al., 2014), which along with it ranking 32nd out of the 74 UK cities that experience relative decline (Pike et al., 2016), is indicative of its (negative) path dependent performance post-deindustrialisation. Additionally, the unemployment that accompanied the decline in traditional industries "has left a legacy of relative deprivation which is still being tackled" (Huggins and Johnston, 2009 p.234). Doncaster is one of the most deprived local authorities in the SCR LEP area, and among the 15 percent most deprived local authority districts in the UK (see Table 1). While seeking to embark on economic renewal, Doncaster continues to rank among the least competitive localities in the UK (Huggins and Thompson, 2016).

[Insert Table 1 here]

We use the framework of materiality, meaning and practice to explore how place influences the development of entrepreneurship cultures in. The approach seeks evidence of change and of tone (positive or negative) in those three elements of place. Materiality refers to the physical and economic character of place so our observations in this category relate to changes in industrial structure. We identified meaning through the character of respondent observations – their feelings about Doncaster as a place and the reasons that they attributed to these. Finally, change in practice is, for the purposes of this study, related to entrepreneurial activity.

As Parkinson et al. (2016) argue, "to fully understand the context for enterprise in local communities, it is also important to examine the social practices that comprise context" (p.386). Therefore, to explore how the historical experience of industrialism has influenced the subsequent development of an entrepreneurship culture and how the local communities in Doncaster have made sense of industrial decline, the study employed qualitative approach. Gieryn (2000, p.472) argues that places are "as much phenomenological as spatial", and so a qualitative methodology allows for a focus on participants' experiences of social phenomena and, given that entrepreneurship is a 'lived experience' (Berglund, 2007), the approach enables the development of concepts that provide a richer understanding of entrepreneurship (Neergaard and Ulhøi, 2007). Qualitative research also emphasises the importance of social, historical, cultural and institutional contexts in shaping the way individuals understand their world (Snape and Spencer, 2003), and acknowledges that a social phenomenon "does not exist primarily in and of itself, but rather in the meaning that individuals attach to it" (Berglund, 2007, p.76).

In total, 50 in-depth interviews were conducted: 14 interviews with key stakeholders who have a remit for supporting economic regeneration and growth in Doncaster and across the SCR, and 36 interviews with owner-manager entrepreneurs in Doncaster. In-depth interviews are particularly appropriate as they focus on the individual, emphasising depth and nuance (Legard et al., 2003). By allowing interviewees to "speak in their own voice and express their own thoughts and feelings" (Berg, 2007, p. 96), they enable the researcher to elicit valuable and rich narrative data based on 'lived experiences' (Castillo-Montoya, 2016). The interviews

followed a semi-structured format, unfolding as guided conversation (Yin, 2014) and ensuring a degree of flexibility. This enabled the probing of issues that surfaced during the interview and that were not covered by previously prepared questions (Rowley, 2012). Whilst not adopting an ethnographic approach directly, the paper acknowledges an implicit ethnographic engagement and therefore, in line with McKeever et al.'s (2015) approach, the interviews capture the experiences and perceptions of those living in the local communities, thereby allowing a deeper understanding of the relationship between entrepreneurship and place.

A combination of purposive and snowball sampling was used. In stakeholders' case, a core group of respondents involved in economic strategy was invited to take part, and who then recommended other potential respondents. In owner-manager entrepreneurs' case, an initial sample of 5 was formed based on recommendations made by some of the local stakeholders. Thereafter, owner-managers were selected using snowball sampling. The sample includes 22 individuals born in Doncaster who subsequently started their business in the locality and 14 individuals who, at some point in their lives, moved to Doncaster and started their business there. Purposive sampling is widely used in qualitative research to ensure that specific categories of individuals possessing knowledge relevant to answering the research questions are interviewed (Rowley, 2012). While snowball sampling is not fully random and is subject to selection bias, it allows the researchers' high level of attentiveness to the focus of the study as they become immersed in the research area (Biernacki and Waldorf, 1981). The aim was to develop a rich understanding of entrepreneurship in place, rather than just results that support the generalisability of the findings (Onwuegbuzie and Leech, 2007). It was a stipulation of the research that the participating individuals remained anonymous. Therefore, stakeholders are abbreviated to S, and owner-manager entrepreneurs to OME.

The stakeholders in the sample were chosen due to their roles in economic development within Doncaster and their involvement in shaping the economic strategy of the region. Interviews were conducted with entrepreneurs to gain an account of their experiences of the place. In sum, interviews were carried out with both people acquainted and economically familiar with Doncaster, specifically its history and current trajectory. Speaking to these individuals enabled the development of an understanding of how people relate to, narrate and understand place.

The interviews were conducted between November 2015 and November 2016 and were recorded with the respondent's consent and transcribed before assuming a grounded approach

towards thematically analysing and coding the data to explore emergent themes. The interviews were coded following an open-coding strategy to ensure that potentially relevant insights are not overlooked (Gale et al., 2013). The data analysis technique used to inductively 'make sense' of the interviews was the constant comparative method, which involves coding the data while continually comparing newly analysed data with previous codes with the aim of identifying recurring themes (Thomas, 2011). The initial codes were grouped based on similarity, while being revised and refined through constant comparison with the data and key literature, thereby leading to the development of second-order concepts (Thomas, 2011). These were subsequently revised and labelled as the final themes. This approach ensured that the knowledge generated from content analysis "is based on participants' unique perspectives and grounded in the actual data" (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005, p.1280).

Findings

The findings are structured as five themes that present the socio-economic challenges that unfolded post-deindustrialisation, unpack how the local community in Doncaster has made sense of industrial decline, and examine how this has shaped subsequent appeals towards entrepreneurship in the locality. The first two sections present how the place was socialised and practised during industrialism, the impact of deindustrialisation, and the attempt to reshape practice within place. The final three sections look at how the local communities have responded to the loss of local industries and the influence this has had on subsequent appeals towards entrepreneurship.

From Prosperity to Socio-economic Decline: Changes in Materiality and Practice

As a typical industrial town, Doncaster's growth was fuelled by the development of mining and associated traditional industries. Industrialisation catalysed socio-economic development and brought economic growth and prosperity to the town:

'[The local mining communities] all saw phenomenally rapid growth. If you plot the development of these villages of the first 10 years of [the pit] opening, they just absolutely exploded.' (S1)

Industrial activity captured the bulk of local economic activity and provided employment on a large scale. The norm in many of the local communities was based on traditional

expectations of the roles of individuals within industrial sectors, mainly that men worked down the pit whilst women worked in textile industries. Employment in these traditional industries was so prevalent that 'you could go to a community and ask, "which one of you works in rail, manufacturing or mining?"' (S3).

An important aspect was the coherence between the materiality, meaning and practice of Doncaster as an industrial place. Socio-economic life in the locality was very much organised around the coal mining and associated large-scale production in factories. It was also not uncommon for locals to live in close proximity to their workplaces, with the different communities based around wherever local mines were, and a pipeline of local talent was continuously feeding the demand for labour-intensive work:

'The different communities were based around wherever local mines were … [so] when people left school it was often an automatic transfer. They went working in the local mine.' (OME27)

'It used to be a mining town. When you go to the suburbs it is just old terraced houses where all the miners used to work.' (OME18)

Importantly, industrial activity had a direct influence on how the community perceived itself and related to the place. Almost all interviewees portrayed industrialised Doncaster in relation to the local industries around which socio-economic activity was organised. One of them described it as "a pit town, having pit values" (OME2), while another referred to it as "a once thriving mining town" (S6). Indeed, working in local traditional industries generated a genuine sense of pride and belonging as communities identified with these (Thompson, 2010), and fostered the development of a way of life that was governed by around industrial activity.

However, the over-reliance on this small number of industries made Doncaster particularly vulnerable to industrial decline. When deindustrialisation accelerated in the late 1980s, it caused unprecedented unemployment and led to socio-economic decline. More than half of those interviewed pointed to the magnitude of job losses, with those familiar with Doncaster's experience of industrial decline highlighting the impact on the previously self-sufficient and self-sustaining communities:

'Unfortunately, what happened was that when we lost the coal industry in the late 80's ... we also then lost within a matter of 1 or 2 years all the textile firms, so we also had this double whammy in those remote areas.' (S1)

'Once it all got shut down, the unemployment was ridiculous because people worked in mining.' (OME18)

Some of the local stakeholders who grew up in the locality explained that many families slipped into poverty following mine and factory closures. Moreover, this negative impact persists as there are still 'huge pockets of deprivation' (S3), and the loss of the industries that were at the heart of Doncaster's economic development in the past has made it 'very difficult to identify where growth potentially may come from' (S6). A key challenge was that the closure of mines and factories has led to significant changes in the materiality of place which also meant that practice had to change. As a local stakeholder explained:

'The problem that we faced early was that coal mines were a phenomenally efficient way in land use terms, to actually employ huge numbers of people … so when the pit closed you haven't got the capacity within the pit site to employ one to two thousand people.' (S1)

The Attempt to Reshape Practice: Promoting Entrepreneurship and New Economic Opportunities

A concerted institutional response to deindustrialisation in the UK has been the promotion of entrepreneurship in formerly industrialised places. Waves of enterprise policy across the past four decades have attempted to change practices in place by encouraging people to start their own business to stimulate entrepreneurial-led recovery and growth (Greene et al., 2004). One example is the Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI), which was aimed directly at promoting enterprise in deprived areas through a focus on removing barriers to entrepreneurship:

'Through the LEGI programme in the past the priority was quite a lot of start-up programmes aimed at people in and around deprived communities, trying to stimulate entrepreneurial activity … Doncaster had its own programme in the past. They've traditionally had a policy to help people start businesses.' (S9)

However, these successive policies have not seen the development of an entrepreneurship culture in the locality. The local stakeholders, some of whom were involved in the delivery of enterprise programmes, explained that these largely resulted in the creation of new businesses with highly localised economic activity and little growth potential. Therefore, despite

significant investment to promote enterprise through programmes such as LEGI, the impact in Doncaster was limited and 'there still isn't a legacy in place to support long-term growth and new start-up businesses' (S6).

More recent efforts from local leadership to reorientate the place and support socio-economic renewal have identified new strengths based on which these can be premised. These are endowed by Doncaster's geographical position and revolve around the connectivity infrastructure of the place, with local stakeholders stating that 'Doncaster's strength is now around its connectivity' (S7), because 'we've got better communication links than just about any other town or city in the UK' (S1), and 'we are literally at the heart of the country' (S14). There is indeed a significant drive, especially from the local council, to promote enterprise and economic development around this. All stakeholders emphasised that Doncaster's 'natural connectivity' offers significant economic opportunities that can be capitalised through entrepreneurial activity, with one of them emphasising:

'If you're looking at natural infrastructure, our connectivity is second to none … We half-jokingly pitch ourselves as North London … We've also got international links with the newest international airport in the UK … and then just up the road we've got a good working relationship with the Humber ports which are 40 minutes away, so pretty much rail, sea, and road. We've got fantastic connections so a big argument for companies [is] to do business around our connectivity.' (S5)

However, continuous efforts to support enterprise and the current attempt to rebrand Doncaster around connectivity have not filtered into people's motivations and perceptions. The local stakeholders highlighted the contrast with the continued underperformance of the locality in terms of economic development and entrepreneurial activity. One of the stakeholders highlighted this as a paradox stating: 'The reality is Doncaster's private sector doesn't travel well. It's perverse because we're so well located in terms of the infrastructure.' (S3). Moreover, the perceptions within the local community are rather negative and this is seen by local stakeholders as hindering adaptation. For example, one of them stated:

'One of our problems here is civic pride to some degree. People who've lived here all their life and maybe haven't engaged with the economy so well don't have a great opinion of the town that they live in, which is something we need to change really, because people don't really understand what's on their doorstep and actually we are moving forward.' (S2)

The contrast between new economic opportunities around connectivity that can be capitalised through entrepreneurial activity and the apparent lack of receptivity to change among local communities illustrate tensions between 'space' and 'place'. To understand this lack of synergy between 'space' and 'place' (Hudson, 2001), the following sections unpack how the local communities have made sense of industrial decline, highlight the legacy of industrialism, and examine how this historical experience has subsequently influenced appeals towards entrepreneurship.

Dwelling on the Past: Lagging Place Meanings Skew Perceptions of Opportunity

The interviews revealed that Doncaster's depletion of economic rationale was compounded by the loss of the raison d'être that had originally defined it as a community. As a local stakeholder emphasised, deindustrialisation 'turned on its head what these towns were here to do; they had a purpose then' (S4). The impact therefore extended beyond widespread unemployment and economic decline as it led to the loss of purpose and collapse of local communities:

'Almost the more significant thing [than the impact of job losses] has been the collapse in confidence in local communities.' (S2)

'As those communities and those areas of business that kept the town alive and thriving disappeared, communities lost their identity.' (S6)

By greatly diminishing the industrial practice of place with which the local communities strongly identified, the demise of industrial activity left a vacuum in the social psyche. Over the years, the loss of local traditional industries developed into perceptions that the locality became emptied of economic potential. As a stakeholder explained:

'There's not only a hole and a gap left by the loss of that industry but also it leaves people and the community feeling as though there's nothing there.' (S6)

Having lost its economic rationale as a space of production, Doncaster became a depleted community (Johnstone and Lionais, 2004). A strong attachment to the industrial past persists in the collective memory and as the decades have gone on, nothing has replaced the loss of industries and jobs to give the community a new sense of purpose and of place. As a result, the

perception of emptiness evolved into feelings of marginalisation and socio-economic peripherality:

'The [local communities] feel that actually Doncaster's a forgotten town.' (S6)

'People's general view, how they feel about it [i.e. loss of industry] [is] they've been left behind.' (OME28)

'I think Doncaster, since the closure of the pits have struggled economically and … I just think that we've seem to have been a little northern spot that's been forgotten about.' (OME30)

However, these perceptions also illustrate that, while the traditional industries that used to govern socio-economic life declined, these have left an imprint in the local community culture through the meanings that the communities attached to industrialised Doncaster. Specifically, the association of prosperity and growth with industrialisation has persisted, remaining engrained in people's memories. In the absence of industrial activity, this has led to the development of negative perceptions of opportunity, manifesting as 'a carrier of what Doncaster actually used to be' (OME28). As one interviewee emphasised:

'The problem is the industrial past. People are still looking at the way things were rather than at how things are now … People in Doncaster talk about "Well, we have the coal industry". I'm not trying to be churlish about it, but the thing is [the coal industry] is not there anymore!' (OME27)

This dwelling on the past keeps the memory of industrialism alive but also holds back adaptation and skews perceptions of opportunity in the locality which, as the local stakeholders have argued, are 'not based on fact' (S8). All local stakeholders acknowledge this as a key challenge, with two of them commenting:

'We have a problem with the general population [saying] that there isn't anything here … that there aren't opportunities, and there are!' (S12)

'There is a [perception] issue … right from young people through to the adult population … that Doncaster just hasn't got that offer.' (S8)

Comments by those familiar with Doncaster but not originating from the locality highlighted that the experience of industrial decline has eroded the way that the place is perceived by the local communities and the impact this has had on opportunity perceptions:

'People still think of back to the more traditional mining communities. The mines are not here anymore [but] a typical perception is that it's quite a rundown, depressed area.' (OME33)

'I think that people got stuck in a rut with Doncaster in that it went through a period of time that was quite hard work, especially after the pit closes in the '80s. There was high unemployment and I think that, generationally, there's been a misconception that Doncaster has a lack of opportunity.' (OME21)

Importantly, the negativity about opportunity has filtered into the perceptions of younger generations. For example, two interviewees highlighted that '[in Doncaster] it feels like there's nothing going on' (OME9) and 'amongst a lot of younger people there's sense of hopelessness' (OME27). A negative consequence of this is local talent depletion, with many of those with higher aspirations choosing to leave the locality to pursue their ambitions elsewhere. This was highlighted by the majority as a major challenge, with one interviewee explaining that 'there's nothing to keep them [young people] in Doncaster … It's not location, the location is fine, it's the perception of what Doncaster is.' (OME28), while another added: 'You talk to young people and they say "There's nothing for me in Doncaster. I'm going to head up to University of Sheffield and I'm never coming back".' (S5).

Negative Perceptions: An Acutely Localised Challenge

The interviews with local entrepreneurs revealed that negative perceptions of opportunity tend to be manifested by those with strong links to Doncaster's industrial past. Specifically, it was only individuals who were born and grew up in Doncaster and remained embedded in the locality who expressed negative perceptions of opportunity. This issue, which surfaced during the interviews, highlights that negative perceptions of opportunity are an acutely localised challenge. Almost all interviewees from this category expressed negative views, with some of them commenting:

'It's an old miners' town Doncaster, so once that all [that industry] went, it is what it is. It's hard to describe but it's not as good as what it used to be.' (OME18)

'If you really want to do something great, go to a city.' (OME7)

'It is quite stale … It's not particularly an exciting place to be.' (OME31)

'Doncaster, location-wise, is very good … It's a very good place to be geographically. In terms of what does Doncaster have to offer … I'm sorry to say that there's not a lot.' (OME12)

One entrepreneur who grew up in the borough explained that such negative perceptions of place and opportunity influenced their decision to leave the locality:

'When I was younger all I wanted to do was get out of Doncaster. I hated the place! I just thought it was living in its own bubble. I just really didn't like it and that's why I went [away] to university and then [abroad] for a year. I just wanted to get away from it because I didn't really see any value in staying.' (OME29)

Interestingly, the detachment from the local community culture made this individual reassess their perception and appreciate the locality upon return, which also influenced their decision to set up their own business there. At the same time, it made them realise that the town still has a stigma associated with it, which is linked to its industrial past. The respondent commented: 'I certainly think it's changed a lot since I was younger … I think there's a lot going for it. It just needs to shake off the coal mining stigma.' (OME29)

Among those who expressed such views there was almost a feeling of resignation that 'I don't see there's anything that anybody can do about that' (OME25). However, two respondents recognised the problem with these perceptions, with one stating that 'as a town we've gotten used to talking ourselves down' and that there are many opportunities 'but we don't shout about it' (OME4). The other respondent emphasised:

'I think Doncaster's improved tremendously in the last few years. I've always lived in Doncaster and I'm very proud to come from Doncaster. Doncaster's got loads to offer … [and] there are many things that are going on in Doncaster now [in terms of investment and regeneration].' (OME34)

Those who moved to Doncaster from somewhere else or who were born there but went away for a period and returned viewed the place more positively. They recognised the current opportunities within the locality or emphasised that the place is not particularly worse off than

other northern areas but were nevertheless aware that negative perceptions prevail in the local community. The quotes below illustrate the views of the majority of respondents in this group:

'I'm not originally from Doncaster, so I have a different perspective that I've brought … From my personal point of view it's really flourishing … Over the past 6 to 10 years … the town has grown, and business seems to be doing fairly well.' (OME3)

'It's actually a good transport hub, and there are opportunities for employment, and self-employment, and even setting up in business.' (OME21)

'There is a lot of regeneration going on, there's a lot of investment going on, and a lot of prospects for the future.' (OME26)

The perception was that 'Doncaster's got an awful lot going for it' (OME15) but the main challenge is 'the perception of what Doncaster is.' (OME28). As such, a general view among those more optimistic was that Doncaster needs to overcome its negative legacies of the past and adapt to the opportunities available in the present, with two of them stating that 'if [Doncaster] wants to change … it has to have a different viewpoint going forward; heritage is great, but it's not going to provide for the future' (OME28), and moving forward will require 'not being stuck in that history' (OME2). Another added: 'They need to develop a future plan that they can hang their hat on, wave their flag about it to say: "Doncaster is great because we do X, Y and Z"' (OME32).

Entrepreneurship: A Remote and Unappealing Endeavour

This final section focuses on how this dwelling on the past, the loss of industry, and the experience of industrialism have influenced subsequent appeals towards entrepreneurship in the locality. The analysis is centred around local cultural values which the interviews have collectively shown to contrast with the ideology of enterprise and the values promoted by entrepreneurship.

To examine how the historical experience of industrialism has shaped the local community culture, it is important to understand how industrialism manifested through the local norms, values and behaviours. More than half of stakeholders and entrepreneurs highlighted that the industrial way of life revolved around expectations of employment in large-scale traditional industries, wage labour and unionised work. The prevalence of industrial activity in the past

meant that entrepreneurship in industrialised Doncaster was a rare event (Stuetzer et al., 2016), as the socialisation of place around production and manufacturing did not incentivise nor did it create widespread opportunities for independent economic activity. As two interviewees highlighted:

'Historically, [because of] the type of [large-scale] businesses that were here, for example huge mining communities … people weren't entrepreneurs. They all worked, and it was highly unionised.' (OME3)

'There was a dependence on large employers which meant there was less incentive or less aspiration [to start a business].' (S7)

These so-called non-entrepreneurial conditions that characterised industrial socio-economic life (Stuetzer et al., 2016) not only did not foster the development of values congruent with the enterprise ideology but anchored the local community culture in what Byrne (2002) refers to an 'industrial structure of feeling'. The interviews collectively highlighted the persistence of this structure of feeling and its influence on attitudes to entrepreneurship in the present, with a small number of respondents providing concrete examples. For example, a respondent exemplified how the industrial cultural legacy continues to shape incentives locally and to disincentivise entrepreneurial behaviour:

'That history [of unionised culture] filters down into families … If somebody's grandfather or father worked in a coal mine and in this highly unionised culture, they've always grown up with that mindset, and it doesn't quite go with entrepreneurship … People's history and perceptions like that that are passed on the generation do take a long time to change.' (OME3)

A stakeholder closely familiar with the local context explained that 'adjusting from that heavy industry, big employers through to an enterprise culture has been incredibly difficult' (S8). Indeed, even though traditional industries have declined substantially, and with them opportunities for large-scale employment, the memory of a once thriving wage labour culture (Hudson, 2005) persists as a legacy of the past. While industrial decline put an end to the automatic transfer of people from schools into the local mines, the majority of respondents emphasised that the local communities have not adapted to the post-industrial realities. As an interviewee highlighted, 'now there's not that option [to work in traditional industries] there anymore [but] the local mining communities seem to take a very parochial attitude' (OME27).

A local stakeholder added: 'There is still a mentality that "If I can't get a job at the end of my street, I'm not bothered"' (S8).

The majority of local stakeholders highlighted a continued preference for employment as opposed to self-employment in the locality. The paradox is that that the locality is confronted with many cases of generational unemployment with 'some second, third generation of unemployment in some areas' (S3). This challenge was highlighted by both local stakeholders and entrepreneurship as a legacy of low aspiration, with two of them stating:

'That "can do" attitude out there is maybe not strong in Doncaster … it's something around culture, particularly at home, in families where in a lot of cases you might be dealing with generational unemployment issues where people think "Well my mum's never worked, my dad's never worked, my grandparents never worked".' (S5)

'I do think within Doncaster there's a lack of aspiration and inspiration amongst people. People often don't seem to want to do better for themselves. It's like they are resigned to what their lot is.' (OME35)

The implication of such legacies of the past for entrepreneurship is that the historical experience of industrialism that continues to give the place meaning and enduring local cultural values and norms belonging to a past era make entrepreneurship a remote, if even intended, and unappealing endeavour. As a local stakeholder emphasised that 'there is an aspirational deficit within Doncaster, which does hold setting up a new business back' (S7). Entrepreneurial aspiration in the locality tends to manifest rather as 'a choice of last resort' (Davidsson and Wiklund, 1997), with many starting a business out of necessity, motivated by the 'need of earning a living' (S4) in the absence of other opportunities, perceived or otherwise. A local stakeholder explained this through an example:

'We keep a log of all our enquiry levels … and the traditional time to actually lay off your workforce is, unfortunately, November-December, and the peak time for people ringing us up and saying "I wanted to start my own business, what are the courses?" is January … Unfortunately, historically in Doncaster the demand for start-up has been not out of choice but out of necessity.' (S1)

The challenge of legacies of the past is compounded by the historical absence of local entrepreneurs as role models. As one entrepreneur highlighted, there is a lack of prominent local examples of successful entrepreneurs who could inspire others to start a business: 'If

there's any entrepreneurs who have come from Doncaster or who have made it big time …
there's no history of anything like that.' (OME23). Moreover, a small number of respondents
highlighted that entrepreneurial ambition and achievement are, in fact, often met with suspicion
and even negativity by the local community. This is meaningful as it shows that
entrepreneurship is still an unaccepted practice in place and is culturally sanctioned. Two
respondents who, through their experience as entrepreneurs in the locality, encountered this
issue highlighted a low social approval of entrepreneurship:

> 'There's a bit of a "Tall Poppy" syndrome, or as a society we still like to know people's place and
> we still like to know that they work for a company.' (OME22)

> 'There's quite a lot of suspicion in Doncaster. Everyone's suspicious when you're doing well, and
> everyone's of a mentality that when you're not doing well, they kind of find it quite amusing. It's
> probably still a place … I would say that sometimes is kind of stuck in the past.' (OME12)

Therefore, the interviews highlight an incongruence between place meanings and the
practice of entrepreneurship, the former of which continue to be shaped by legacies of the past.
The historical experience of industrialism remains encapsulated in local informal institutions
that define the local culture and continues to be drawn upon by local communities in assigning
meaning to place. This sees entrepreneurship refuted as a new local practice, with
entrepreneurial behaviour manifesting largely out of necessity as opposed to as a reflection of
entrepreneurial values on which a local culture of entrepreneurship can flourish.

Discussion and Policy Implications

Our case study of Doncaster illustrates how new practices—in this instance entrepreneurship—
in formerly industrialised places can be stymied by lagging place meanings that manifest as a
persistent strong attachment to the past. We used Creswell's multidimensional interpretation
of place to examine how disjuncture between the materiality, meaning and practice of place
can slow adaptation to a post-industrial reality. The findings show that, while Doncaster
exhibits a number of attributes that could underpin a fertile entrepreneurial environment – i.e.
its *materiality* is of a more diverse and well-connected, and no longer traditionally industrial,
place – *meaning* has shifted more slowly.

In exploring how the local communities have made sense of industrialism, the first three themes show that the historical experience and memory of industrialism have remained engrained in the local culture. New developments and efforts to renew and reorient the locality have not filled the void created by local industrial decline, and the promotion of entrepreneurship in particular has not filtered into people's motivations and perceptions. On the contrary, these attempts to promote economic activity around connectivity have been met with scepticism, with some expressing rather cynical views of Doncaster becoming 'a glorified warehouse' (OME4). As Gieryn (2000, p.473) notes, "meanings that individuals and groups assign to places are more or less embedded in historically contingent and shared cultural understandings of the terrain". In Doncaster's case, the memory of traditional industrial activity has endured the passage of time through place meanings firmly anchored in the locality's industrial past—how the place used to be socialised and practiced—despite changes in materiality and practice post-deindustrialisation. As such, locals continue to characterise the place in relation to it formerly industrial attributes, dwelling on the past and the 'good old days' of prosperity and growth. The findings show that the loss of local industries was not overcome easily by the local communities, but this continues to evoke perceptions of emptiness and marginalisation which, over time, have developed into negative perceptions of opportunity.

In the fourth theme we showed that negative perceptions of opportunity are an acutely localised challenge, as these were largely manifested by those with strong links to Doncaster's industrial past. As Gieryn (2000, p.481) asserts, "the longer people have lived in a place, the more rooted they feel, and the grater their attachment to it". This negativity towards opportunity in place may therefore be explained by local embeddedness, as those who have moved to the locality or went away for a period of time were significantly less negative and largely expressed positive views towards the economic development potential of current opportunities.

Moreover, the feelings of emptiness and marginalisation and the associated perceived lack of opportunity relate how the places are socialised and understood (Johnstone and Lionais, 2004). As emphasised by Anderson (2000, p.93) "[i]t is the social use of space that gives meaning to the notion of periphery" which therefore means that 'peripherality' also becomes culturally specific. In Doncaster's case, this perception of peripherality is self-imagined and self-imposed through (negative) social evaluation and is therefore 'subjectively experienced' (Anderson et al., 2001). These findings suggest that the understanding of place needs to extend beyond geography—beyond the spatial dimension—as local perceptions and attitudes that have been described as parochial have pushed the locality into a 'little bubble in the middle'

(S3). Such perceptions stymie current attempts to ground the place in new practices and to confer a new economic identity and purpose.

As Gieryn (2000, p.475) emphasised, "culturally reproduced images of places are … real in their consequences". In Doncaster's case, the strong attachment to the industrial past within local communities has slowed the adaptation of practice to a post-industrial reality and have rendered efforts to promote entrepreneurship ineffective. Importantly, this dwelling on the past has given rise to a locale-specific discourse that keeps the history of industrialism alive and contrasts with the new opportunities afforded by the locality's materiality. While previous studies have shown how entrepreneurs draw on place-based locale-specific discourses to shape their entrepreneurial practices (Lars and Pearson, 2012; Gill and Larson, 2014), our paper presents a case where a locale-specific discourse that is entrenched in the past is mobilised to resists entrepreneurial practice altogether. Indeed, policy efforts to ascribe new meanings to place and to influence practice to nudge the locality towards a more entrepreneurially driven trajectory of renewal and growth have not seen the expected result. The experience is illustrative of rather a juxtaposition between new economic opportunities and old meanings of place, between the past and the present, between two narratives that co-exist within the same space but are not synergetic.

Therefore, the way that local communities in Doncaster have made sense of industrial decline, and the historical experience of industrialism, have prevented the development of an entrepreneurship culture in the locality. A continued cultural gravity (Tubadji et al., 2016) towards employment as opposed to self-employment, generational unemployment, and a legacy of low aspirations manifest as 'remanences' (Grinfeld et al., 2009) of the industrial past. Moreover, a low social approval of entrepreneurship in the locality is reflected in the manifestation of a "Tall Poppy" syndrome (Andersson et al., 2018).

Finally, the findings highlight that it is through local informal institutions that encapsulate the 'industrial structure of feeling' (Byrne, 2002) that legacies of the past have endured. Section five provides examples of how informal institutions act as 'carriers of history' (Pejovich, 1999). This acutely localised form of institutional hysteresis has seen cultural values that were developed in the past continue shape the local informal incentive structures even though the original conditions that led to their creation have disappeared. As a result, entrepreneurial aspiration tends to manifest rather as 'a choice of last resort' (Davidsson and Wiklund, 1997), and entrepreneurship remains a remote and unappealing endeavour, with manifestations of

entrepreneurial ambition being limited in nature and scope. The institutional hysteresis experienced by Doncaster is an example of how local informal institutions can function to sustain a cycle of low entrepreneurship and weak entrepreneurship culture (Stuetzer et al., 2016). This form of hysteresis is akin to the 'cultural lag' highlighted by Sztompka (1996) and the cultural hysteresis described by Tubadji et al. (2016), although acutely localised in its impact and maintained by the 'slow burn' character of deindustrialisation (Pike et al., 2010).

The findings have important implications both for the area's future economic development and for the effectiveness of economic strategies that rely on encouraging entrepreneurship. As laid out in its cornerstone document, the SCR Strategic Economic Plan (SCR, 2014), the SCR LEP aims to create a more entrepreneurial and resilient city-regional economy, placing the development of cultures supportive of entrepreneurship at the core of the approach. As two LEP officials highlighted, 'It's about how we foster an entrepreneurial culture … within the City Region' (S9), and about 'making entrepreneurship and starting up a business a real viable option' (S6). However, if the LEP is to foster entrepreneurship in the locality, there is a need to understand local informal institutions and the acutely localised nature of challenges. In Doncaster's case, the locality does not have the culture that underpins the type of entrepreneurship aspired to in policy. While policy promotes independent economic action anchored in values such as independence, autonomy, individualism, and achievement, the local culture remains antithetic to these. The historical experience of industrialism remains alive through local informal institutions and continues to fuel a locale-specific discourse that hinders the realisation of new opportunities and the evolution of practice as local communities remain unreceptive to new narratives and refute entrepreneurship as a new practice.

The key implication is that a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to policy is inappropriate. This applies not only from a national context perspective, given the regional variation of entrepreneurship culture (Dodd and Hynes, 2012; Rodríguez-Pose, 2013; Mason et al., 2015), but also in the intra-regional context, as informal institutions can vary within the same region and the nature of the challenges facing different localities can be acutely localised, as in Doncaster's case. In this sense, place-based policy can be an important mechanism that can alleviate the impact of institutional hysteresis and support adaptation in localities like Doncaster. While informal institutions change slowly over time (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011), and thus adaptation in formerly industrialised places "is long term, even generational" (Pike et al., 2010, p.9), "culture is not destiny" (Chakraborty et al., 2016, p.288). Change is possible but requires a place-based approach that is sensitive to Doncaster's acutely localised

challenges. Such an approach recognises that place matters if policy is to succeed in tackling the "persistent underutilisation of potential and reducing persistent social exclusion" (Barca, 2009, p.VII). However, the understanding of place needs to transcend the spatial dimension of geographical context, with place also being defined by "the economic, social cultural and institutional dimensions of a locality" (McCann and Rodríguez-Pose, 2011, p.207), all of which exert a significant influence on economic and social behaviour (Barca, 2009; Barca et al., 2012).

Therefore, understanding local institutions is critical for designing and implementing effective economic development strategies (Rodríguez-Pose, 2013). If the strategy is to foster the development of an entrepreneurship culture to promote entrepreneurship in formerly industrialised places, one area where policy can focus is education, in particular entrepreneurship education. Dodd and Hynes (2012) have highlighted that enterprise education needs to be sensitive to local contexts, especially in less developed areas where there is less cultural support for the archetypal high-growth entrepreneurship promoted by policy makers. Such programmes can help raise entrepreneurial aspirations and highlight entrepreneurship as a viable career option. Similarly, Fayolle et al. (2015) highlight that there is value in promoting entrepreneurship in schools, showing that the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes on entrepreneurial intention is positive and greater where students have not been previously exposed to entrepreneurship and did not initially consider entrepreneurship as a career option.

Other place-based initiatives can include the promotion of local entrepreneurial role models. Despite entrepreneurship no longer being such a rare event in Doncaster, in part due to successive waves of enterprise policy promoting entrepreneurial activity, there is still a lack of prominent examples of successful entrepreneurs. Therefore, promoting local entrepreneurial role models can serve as an important self-reinforcing mechanism in the development of an entrepreneurship culture (Bosma et al., 2012; Huggins et al., 2015), signalling entrepreneurship as a career choice (Mueller, 2006; Fritsch et al., 2019). As Bornstein (2004, cited in Thompson, 2010) acknowledges, "every social change needs a leading entrepreneur and also thousands of grass-roots entrepreneurs working together".

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to explore how local communities in formerly industrialised places make sense of industrial decline and how the historical experience of industrialism has influenced the subsequent development of local entrepreneurship cultures in those places. Our findings show that in places with a strong industrial heritage, the historical experience of industrialism can persist and remain engrained in the local culture. In our case study of Doncaster, the persistence of industrial era values and meanings through local informal institutions manifests as an acutely localised form of institutional hysteresis where local informal institutions function to discourage entrepreneurial behaviour. While the local setting studied here has undergone material transformation post-deindustrialisation, place meanings have remained stuck in the past and slow the adoption of new – in this case, entrepreneurial – practices, stymieing the development of a local entrepreneurship culture.

Our findings also highlight that, by depleting the locality of its economic purpose and raison d'être, industrial decline led to the development of negative evaluations of the place which reinforce a locale-specific discourse that the area lacks economic opportunity. Local efforts to reshape practice and promote new economic opportunities have been met with scepticism and resistance, and the loss of local industries continues to evoke perceptions of emptiness and marginalisation. While practices of place have evolved to increasingly include some form of entrepreneurial activity, this is driven largely by necessity as opposed to opportunity as entrepreneurship is often seen as a choice of last resort. Importantly, these negative perceptions of opportunity compound the impact of institutional hysteresis, maintaining low aspiration levels and limiting entrepreneurial ambition. By exploring the historical experience of industrialism and how local communities in formerly industrialised places make sense of industrial decline, the paper provides a richer understanding of the relationship between place and entrepreneurship.

The findings have important implications for regional economic development policy. Critically, if policy is to foster entrepreneurship in formerly industrialised places, there is a need to understand how localities have made sense of industrial decline, and thus the local informal institutions that comprise local culture. In Doncaster's case, the challenges are acutely localised, and the local culture does not provide the institutional ground that can foster the development of a local entrepreneurship culture and promote the type of entrepreneurship aspired to in policy. Institutional hysteresis at the local level manifests as a catalyst whereby historical legacies of the past persist and maintain a cycle of low entrepreneurship and weak entrepreneurship culture. Moreover, place meanings that are attached to the industrial past

stymie policy efforts to ascribe new meanings to place through the pursuit of new economic opportunities based on a different, post-industrial place materiality and to reshape practice around enterprise and entrepreneurship. Therefore, if the LEP is to pursue an economic strategy based on enterprise promotion, there is a need to understand local level informal institutions and the acutely localised nature of challenges, and how these shape attitudes to enterprise locally.

More broadly, the paper contributes to a better understanding of the roots of uneven development (Mueller et al., 2008; Rodríguez-Pose, 2013; Huggins and Thompson, 2014; Martin et al., 2016; Fotopoulos and Storey, 2017), and advances the understanding of why some local and regional economies are more hindered in their attempts at renewal and transformation than others which remain locked in decline or underperformance (Hassink, 2010). By showing that local informal institutions matter, and the enduring legacy of historical memories around a place, the paper resonates with previous studies that, when it comes to economic development policy, 'one size does not fit all' (Rodríguez-Pose, 2013; Mason et al., 2015; Ross et al., 2015).

Although the study is geographically localised given its focus on Doncaster, which limits the generalisability of the findings, the study provides rich insights into the influence of local level informal institutions on the development of local entrepreneurship cultures, thereby allowing for analytical generalisation. Future research can examine other similar localities where place-based and path-dependent institutional processes catalyse or hinder economic and social transformation. For example, focusing on places that transitioned to new economic trajectories through entrepreneurial activity can provide important lessons for policymakers about how entrepreneurship can be fostered effectively in such places. In the UK, previous research has identified most low enterprise counties in northern regions, peripheral, and former industrial regions (Mueller et al., 2008; Mason et al., 2015). Such localities span across regions and can be found in both peripheral as well as more central regions. Therefore, future research at the national level could examine whether there are any differences between formerly industrialised places located in peripheral regions and those located in more central regions. Outside the UK, research has highlighted similar challenges confronting formerly industrialised places. For example, Austria's old industrial areas experience lower than average start-up activity and weaker economic performance (Tödtling and Wanzenböck, 2003), while regional economies in the Netherlands face similar institutional challenges (Benneworth et al., 2006). Indeed, many of Western Europe's old industrial areas continue to experience economic

underperformance (Birch et al., 2010). Therefore, there is potential for future comparative case study research to compare formerly industrialised places at the international level.

References

Acs, Z.J., Desai, S. and Hessels, J. (2008). "Entrepreneurship, economic development and institutions." *Small Business Economics*, 31(2/3): 219–234.

Acs, Z.J., Estrin, S. and Mickiewicz, T. (2018). "Entrepreneurship, institutional economics, and economic growth: an ecosystem perspective." *Small Business Economics*, 51: 501–514, doi: 10.1007/s11187-018-0013-9.

Anderson, A.R. (2000). "Paradox in the periphery: an entrepreneurial reconstruction?." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 12(2): 91–109, doi: 10.1080/089856200283027.

Anderson, A.R., Jack, S. and McAuley, A. (2001). "Periphery? What periphery? Marketing to a state of mind." *Irish Marketing Review*, 14(1): 26–34.

Anderson, A.R., Warren, L. and Bensemann, J. (2018). "Identity, enactment, and entrepreneurship engagement in a declining place." *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(4): 1559–1577, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12406.

Anderson, A.R. and Gaddefors, J. (2016). "Entrepreneurship as a community phenomenon; reconnecting meanings and place." *International Journal Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, 28(4): 504–518.

Audretsch, D.B., Obschonka, M., Gosling, S.D. and Potter, J. (2017). "A new perspective on entrepreneurial regions: linking cultural identity with latent and manifest entrepreneurship." *Small Business Economics*, 48(3): 681697, doi: 10.1007/s11187-016-9787-9.

Barca, F. (2009). "An agenda for a reformed cohesion policy: a place-based approach to meeting European Union challenges and expectations." Independent report, prepared at the request of the European Commissioner for Regional Policy, Danuta Hübner, European Commission, Brussels.

Barca, F., McCann, P. and Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2012). "The case for regional development intervention: place-based versus place-neutral approaches." Journal of Regional Science, 52(1): 134–152, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9787.2011.00756.x.

Bathelt, H. and Glückler, J. (2014). "Institutional change in economic geography." *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(3): 340–363, doi: 10.1177/0309132513507823.

Baumol, W.J. (1990). "Entrepreneurship: productive, unproductive, and destructive." *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5): 893–921.

Benneworth, P., Hospers, G.J. and Jongbloed, B. (2006). "New economic impulses in old industrial regions: the case of the University of Twente." in Prinz, A., Steenge, A.E. and Schmidt, J. (eds) *Innovation: technical, economic and institutional aspects*, Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Beresford, R. (2015). "New Labour and enterprise policy: continuity or change? Evidence from general election manifestos." *British Politics*, 10(3): 335–355, doi: 10.1057/bp.20.

Berg, B. L. (2007). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. London: Pearson.

Berglund, H. (2007). "Researching entrepreneurship as lived experience." in Neergaard, H. and Ulhøi, J.P. (eds) *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Berglund, K., Gaddefors, J. and Lindgren, M. (2016). "Provoking identities: entrepreneurship and emerging identity positions in rural development." *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 28(1-2): 76–96, doi: 10.1080/08985626.2015.1109002.

Biernacki, P. and Waldorf, D. (1981). "Snowball sampling: problems and techniques of chain referral sampling." Sociological Methods and Research, 10(2): 141–163. doi: 10.1177/004912418101000205.

Birch, K., MacKinnon, D. and Cumbers, A. (2010). "Old industrial regions in Europe: a comparative assessment of economic performance." *Regional Studies*, 44(1): 35–53, doi: 10.1080/00343400802195147.

Bosma, N., Hessels, J., Schutjens, V., Van Praag, M. and Verheul, I. (2012). "Entrepreneurship and role models." *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33(2): 410–424, doi: 10.1016/j.joep.2011.03.004.

Bristow, G. and Healy, A. (2015). "Crisis response, choice and resilience: insights from complexity thinking." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 8(2): 241–256, doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsv002.

Bruton, G.D., Ahlstrom, D. and Li, H.L. (2010). "Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: Where are we now and where do we need to move in the future?" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* 34(3): 421–440. doi:10.1111/j.1540- 6520.2010.00390.x.

Busenitz, L.W., Gomez, C. and Spencer, J.W. (2000). "Country institutional profiles: Unlocking entrepreneurial phenomena." *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5): 994–1003, doi: 10.2307/1556423.

Byrne, D. (2002). "Industrial culture in a post-industrial world: The case of the North East of England." *City*, 6(3): 279-289, doi: 10.1080/1360481022000037733.

Castillo-Montoya, M. (2016). "Preparing for interview research: The interview protocol refinement framework." *The Qualitative Report*, 21(5): 811-831.

Chakraborty, S., Thompson, J.C. and Yehoue, E.B. (2016). "The culture of entrepreneurship." *Journal of Economic Theory*, 163: 288–317, doi: 10.1016/j.jet.2015.12.007.

Chinitz, B. (1961). "Contrasts in agglomeration: New York and Pittsburgh." *American Economic Review Papers and* Proceedings, 51(2): 279–289.

Cresswell, T. (2009). "Place." in Thrift, N. and Kitchen, R. (eds) *International Encyclopedia of Human* Geography, Oxford: Elsevier.

Cresswell, T. (2013). *Place: A short introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Davidsson P. and Wiklund, J. (1997). "Values, beliefs and regional variations in new firm formation rates." *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18(2-3): 179–199, doi: 10.1016/S0167-4870(97)00004-4.

Dodd, S.D. and Anderson, A.R. (2001). "Understanding the enterprise culture paradigm: paradox and policy." *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 2(1): 13–26.

Dodd, S.D. and Hynes, B.C. (2012). "The impact of regional entrepreneurial contexts upon enterprise education." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 24(9-10): 741–766, doi: 10.1080/08985626.2011.566376.

Estrin, S. and Mickiewicz, T. (2011). "Entrepreneurship in transition economies: the role of institutions and generational change." in Minniti, M. (ed.) *The Dynamics of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Fayolle, A. and Gailly, B. (2015). "The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intention: Hysteresis and persistence." Journal of Small Business Management, 53(1), 75–93, doi: 10.1111/jsbm.12065.

Fotopoulos, G. (2014). "On the spatial stickiness of UK new firm formation rates." *Journal of Economic Geography*, 14(3): 651–679, doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbt011.

Fotopoulos, G. and Storey, D.J. (2017). "Persistence and change in interregional differences in entrepreneurship: England and Wales, 1921-2011." *Environment and Planning A*, 49(3): 670–702, doi: 10.1177/0308518X16674336.

Fritsch, M. and Wyrwich, M. (2014). "The long persistence of regional levels of entrepreneurship: Germany, 1925–2005." *Regional Studies*, 48(6): 955–973, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2013.816414.

Fritsch, M. and Wyrwich, M. (2018). "Regional knowledge, entrepreneurial culture, and innovative start-ups over time and space—an empirical investigation." *Small Business Economics*, 51: 337–353, doi: 10.1007/s11187-018-0016-6.

Fritsch, M., Bublitz, E., Sorgner, A. and Wyrwich, M. (2014). "How much of a socialist legacy? The re-emergence of entrepreneurship in the East German transformation to a market economy." *Small Business Economics*, 43(2): 427–446, doi: 10.1007/s11187-014-9544-x.

Fritsch, M., Obschonka, M. and Wyrwich, M. (2019). "Historical roots of entrepreneurial culture and innovation activity – an analysis for German regions." *Regional Studies*, 53(9): 1296–1307, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2019.1580357.

Gill, R. and Larson, G.S. (2014). "Making the ideal (local) entrepreneur: Place and the regional development of high-tech entrepreneurial identity." *Human Relations*, 67(5): 519–542, doi: 10.1177/0018726713496829.

Gaddefors, J. & Cronsell, N. (2009). "Returnees and Local Stakeholders Co-producing the Entrepreneurial Region." *European Planning Studies*, 17(8): 1191–1203, doi: 10.1080/09654310902981045.

Gale, N.K., Heath, G., Cameron, E., Rashid, S. and Redwood, S. (2013). "Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research." *BMC medical research methodology*, 13: 117–117, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-117.

Gardiner, B., Martin, R., Sunley, P. and Tyler, P. (2013). "Spatially unbalanced growth in the British economy." *Journal of Economic Geography*, 13(6): 889–928, doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbt003.

George, G. and Zahra, S.A. (2002). "Culture and its consequences for entrepreneurship." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(4): 5–9.

Gherhes, C., Vorley, T. and Williams, N. (2018). "Entrepreneurship and local economic resilience: the impact of institutional hysteresis in peripheral places." *Small Business Economics*, 51(3): 577–590, doi: 10.1007/s11187-017-9946-7.

Gieryn, T.F. (2000). "A space for place in sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 463–496.

Glaeser, E.L., Kerr, S.P. and Kerr, W.R. (2015). "Entrepreneurship and urban growth: an empirical assessment with historical mines." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(2): 498–520.

Greene, F.J., Mole, K.F. and Storey, D.J. (2004). "Does more mean worse? Three decades of enterprise policy in the Tees Valley." *Urban Studies*, 41(7): 1207–1228, doi: 10.1080/0042098042000214752.

Grinfeld, M., Cross, R. and Lamba, H. (2009). "Hysteresis and economics-taking the economic past into account." *IEEE Control Systems*, 29(1): 30–43, doi: 10.1109/MCS.2008.930445.

Hassink, R. (2010). "Regional resilience: a promising concept to explain differences in regional economic adaptability?." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3(1): 45–58, doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsp033.

Hodgson, G.M. (2006). What are institutions?. *Journal of economic issues*, 40(1), 1–26.

Hsieh, H.F. and Shannon, S.E. (2005). "Three approaches to qualitative content analysis." *Qualitative health research*, 15(9): 1277–1288, doi: 10.1177/1049732305276687.

Hudson, R. (2001). *Producing Places*. London: Guilford Press.

Hudson, R. (2005). "Rethinking change in old industrial regions: reflecting on the experiences of North East England." *Environment and Planning A*, 37(4): 581–596, doi: 10.1068/a36274.

Huggins, R. and Johnston, A. (2009). "Knowledge networks in an uncompetitive region: SME innovation and growth." *Growth and Change*, 40(2): 227–259, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2257.2009.00474.x.

Huggins, R. and Thompson, P. (2014). "Culture, entrepreneurship and uneven development: a spatial analysis." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 26(9-10): 726–752, doi: 10.1080/08985626.2014.985740.

Huggins, R. and Thompson, P. (2015). "Culture and place-based development: a socio-economic analysis." *Regional Studies*, 49(1): 130–159, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2014.889817.

Huggins, R. and Thompson, P. (2016). *UK competitiveness index 2016*. Available from: http://www.cforic.org/downloads.php [Accessed 16 December 2017].

Johnstone, H. and Lionais, D. (2004). "Depleted communities and community business entrepreneurship: revaluing space through place." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16(3): 217–233, doi: 10.1080/0898562042000197117.

Korsgaard, S., Ferguson, R. and Gaddefors, J. (2015). "The best of both worlds: how rural entrepreneurs use placial embeddedness and strategic networks to create opportunities." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 27(9–10), 574–598, doi: 10.1080/08985626.2015.1085100.

Lang, R., Fink, M. and Kibler, E. (2013). "Understanding place-based entrepreneurship in rural Central Europe: A comparative institutional analysis." *International Small Business Journal*, 32(2): 204–227, doi: 10.1177/0266242613488614.

Larson, G.S. and Pearson, A.R. (2012). "Placing Identity: Place as a Discursive Resource for Occupational Identity Work Among High-Tech Entrepreneurs." *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(2): 241–266, doi: 10.1177/0893318911435319.

Laspita, S., Breugst, N., Heblich, S. and Patzelt, H. (2012). "Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(4): 414–435, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.11.006.

Legard, R., Keegan, J. and Ward, K. (2003). "In-depth interviews." in Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds) *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*, London, UK: SAGE Publications.

MacDonald, R. (1996). "Welfare dependency, the enterprise culture and self-employed survival." *Work, Employment and Society*, 11(3): 431–47, doi: 10.1177/0950017096103002.

Martin, R. (2000). "Institutional approaches in economic geography." in Sheppard, E. and Barnes, T.J. (eds), *A companion to economic geography*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Martin, R. (2012). "Regional economic resilience, hysteresis and recessionary shocks." *Journal of Economic Geography*, 12(1): 1–32, doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbr019.

Martin, R., Pike, A., Tyler, P. and Gardiner, B. (2016). "Spatially rebalancing the UK economy: towards a new policy model?." *Regional Studies*, 50(2): 342–357, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2015.1118450.

Martin, R., Tyler, P. and Gardiner, B. (2014). *The evolving economic performance of UK cities: city growth patterns 1981-2011*. London: Government Office for Science. Available from: https://www.gov.uk [Accessed 16 February 2017].

Mason, C., Brown, R., Hart, M. and Anyadike-Danes, M. (2015). "High-growth firms, jobs and peripheral regions: the case of Scotland." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 8(2): 343–358. doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsu032.

McCann, P. and Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2011). "Why and when development policy should be place-based." in *OECD Regional Outlook 2011: Building resilient regions for stronger economies*, Paris: OECD Publishing, doi: 10.1787/9789264120983-16-en.

McKeever, E., Jack, S. and Anderson, A. (2015). "Embedded entrepreneurship in the creative re-construction on place." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1): 50–65, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.07.002.

Mueller, P. (2006). "Entrepreneurship in the region: breeding ground for nascent entrepreneurs?." *Small Business Economics*, 27(1): 41–58, doi: 10.1007/s11187-006-6951-7.

Mueller, P., van Stel, A. and Storey, D. J. (2008). "The effects of new firm formation on regional development over time: the case of Great Britain." *Small Business Economics*, 30(1): 59–71. doi: 10.1007/s11187-007-9056-z.

Neergaard, H. and Ulhøi, J.P. (2007). "Introduction: methodological variety in entrepreneurship research." in Neergaard, H. and Ulhøi, J.P. (eds) *Handbook of qualitative research methods in entrepreneurship*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Niittykangas, H. and Tervo, H. (2005). "Spatial variations in intergenerational transmission of self-employment." *Regional Studies*, 39(3): 319–332, doi: 10.1080/00343400500087166.

North, D.C. (1990). *Institutions, institutional change and economic performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Leech, N.L. (2007). "Sampling designs in qualitative research: making the sampling process more public." *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2): 238–254.

Paasi, A. (2009). "The resurgence of the 'Region' and 'Regional Identity': theoretical perspectives and empirical observations on regional dynamics in Europe." *Review of International Studies*, 35(1): 121–146, doi: 10.1017/S0260210509008456.

Parkinson, C., Howorth, C. and Southern, A. (2016). "The crafting of an (un)enterprising community: Context and the social practice of talk." *International Small Business Journal*, 35(4): 385–404, doi: 10.1177/0266242615621123.

Parkinson, C., Nowak, V., Howorth, C. and Southern, A. (2020). "Multipartite attitudes to enterprise: A comparative study of young people and place." *International Small Business Journal*, 38(4): 293–317, doi: 10.1177/0266242619892829.

Pejovich, S. (1999). "The effects of the interaction of formal and informal institutions on social stability and economic development." *Journal of Markets & Morality* 2, 2: 164–181.

Pike, A., Dawley, S. and Tomaney, J. (2010). "Resilience, adaptation and adaptability." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 3(1): 59–70, doi: 10.1093 /cjres/rsq001.

Pike, A., MacKinnon, D., Coombes, M., Champion, T., Bradley, D., Cumbers, A., Robson, L. and Wymer, C. (2016). *Uneven growth: tackling city decline*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation. Available from: https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/uneven-growth-tackling-city-decline [Accessed 17 October 2017].

Popay, J., Thomas, C., Williams, G. et al. (2003). "A proper place to live: health inequalities, agency, and the normative dimensions of space." *Social Science and Medicine*, 57: 55–69.

Power, R. (2008) ""After the Black Gold": a view of mining heritage from coalfield areas in Britain." *Folklore*, 119(2): 160–181, doi: 10.1080/00155870802056977.

Rodríguez-Pose, A. (2013). "Do institutions matter for regional development?," *Regional Studies*, 47(7): 1034-1047, doi: 10.1080/00343404.2012.748978.

Romer, R. (2001). *Advanced macroeconomics*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ross, A.G., Adams, J. and Crossan, K. (2015). "Entrepreneurship and the spatial context: a panel data study into regional determinants of small growing firms in Scotland." *Local Economy*, 30(6): 672–688, doi: 10.1177/0269094215600135.

Rowley, J. (2012). "Conducting research interviews." *Management Research Review*, 35(3/4): 260–271, doi: 10.1108/01409171211210154.

Setterfield, M. (1993). "A model of institutional hysteresis." *Journal of Economic Issues*, 27(3): 755–774.

Setterfield, M. (2009). "Path dependency, hysteresis and macrodynamics." in Arestis, P. and Sawyer, M. (eds) *Path Dependency and Macroeconomics*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Shane, S. (2012). Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: Delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1): 10–20, doi: 10.5465/amr.2011.0078.

Sheffield City Region (SCR) (2014). *Strategic Economic Plan: a focused 10 year plan for private sector growth 2015-2025*. Available from: http://sheffieldcityregion.org.uk [Accessed 15 August 2016].

Snape, D. and Spencer, L. (2003). "The foundations of qualitative research." in Ritchie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds) *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*, London, UK: SAGE Publications.

Stuetzer, M., Obschonka, M., Audretsch, D.B., Wyrwich, M., Rentfrow, P.J., Coombes, M., Shaw-Taylor, L. and Satchell, M. (2016). "Industry structure, entrepreneurship, and culture: an empirical analysis using historical coal fields." *European Economic Review*, 86: 52–72. doi: 10.1016/j.euroecorev.2015.08.012.

Sztompka, P. (1996). "Looking back: the year 1989 as a cultural and civilizational break." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, 29(2): 115–129, doi: 10.1016/S0967-067 X(96)80001-8.

Thomas, G. (2011). "A typology for the case study in social science following a review of definition, discourse and structure." *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(6): 511–521, doi: 10.1177/1077800411409884.

Thompson, J. (2010). "'Entrepreneurship enablers'–their unsung and unquantified role in competitiveness and regeneration." *Local Economy*, 25(1): 58–73, doi: 10.1080/02690940903545406.

Tödtling, F. and Wanzenböck, H. (2003). "Regional differences in structural characteristics of start-ups." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 15(4): 351–370, doi: 10.1080/0898562032000058923.

Tubadji, A., Nijkamp, P. and Angelis, V. (2016). "Cultural hysteresis, entrepreneurship and economic crisis: an analysis of buffers to unemployment after economic shocks." *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 9(1): 103–136, doi: 10.1093/cjres/rsv035.

van Stel, A. and Storey, D.J. (2004). "The link between firm births and job creation: is there a Upas Tree effect?." *Regional Studies*, 38(8): 893–909, doi: 10.1080/0034340042000280929.

Welter, F. (2011). "Contextualizing entrepreneurship – conceptual challenges and ways forward." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1): 165–184, doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00427.x.

Wyrwich, M. (2015). "Entrepreneurship and the intergenerational transmission of values." *Small Business Economics*, 45(1): 191–213, doi: 10.1007/s11187-015-9649-x.

Yin, R.K. (2014). *Case study research: design and methods*, 5th ed., Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Table 1. Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) ranking for SCR LEP local authority districts 2015

Local Authority District	IMD-Rank of average rank	IMD-Rank of average score	IMD-Rank of proportion of LSOAs in most deprived 10% nationally	IMD - Rank of extent	IMD - Rank of local concentration
Barnsley	37	39	32	39	48
Doncaster	48	42	37	42	51
Bolsover	61	87	142	104	143
Rotherham	62	52	43	52	23
Chesterfield	85	81	96	74	94
Sheffield	94	60	26	47	29
Bassetlaw	115	114	97	107	78
North East Derbyshire	190	184	180	172	172
Derbyshire Dales	258	257	165	242	284

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government: English indices of deprivation 2015