This paper develops a methodology for researching entrepreneurial opportunities. We argue that opportunities can best be understood as dynamic and fluid effects of entrepreneurial processes that are enacted differently across different sites. On this basis we develop a methodology for studying entrepreneurial opportunities suited to track the opportunity across enactments and sites. The methodology is demonstrated through an analysis of the genesis of the company “The Republic of Tea”, as portrayed in the book of the same name.

INTRODUCTION
Since the introduction of the nexus perspective, the opportunity concept has moved to the centre of entrepreneurial research (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000, Eckhardt and Shane, 2003, Shane, 2003). While few question the relevance of the opportunity concept, there has been a lively discussion about the nature of opportunities; a discussion that appears only to continue and broaden (McMullen et al., 2007). Drawing heavily on Austrian economics, in the nexus perspective, opportunity designates an objective element in the entrepreneurial process. The presence of an objective element means that the success or failure of an entrepreneurial venture is not determined by the ideas and effort of the entrepreneur alone. There has to be some potential need or gap in the market in order for the venture to succeed (Shane, 2003). Following this line of thinking the opportunity exists prior to the entrepreneurial process and for the process to commence the opportunity must be discovered by an alert individual. Therefore, this view is often referred to as “the discovery view” of opportunity (Alvarez, 2005, Sarasvathy et al., 2002).

The discovery view has been criticised from various angles. Some of these angles are summed up in a “creation view” of opportunities (Alvarez, 2005, Sarasvathy et al., 2002). The common characteristic of the creation view is that opportunities are not seen as having a prior existence. When a given product has become a success it is only natural to assume that a market has been found and that the opportunity was actually always there. However, the success of an objective element depends on the actions and creativity of the individuals along with context of these actions. Alvarez (2005) argues that under conditions of uncertainty (rather than risk) opportunities are created and refined through a process of continual trial and error. Nevertheless, what turns out to be the opportunity cannot be known or anticipated in advance. This notion has strong similarities with Sarasvathy’s (2001) theory of effectuation. In effectual processes, ends are not fixed and given in advance, but continually redefined depending on the resources available. Here the opportunity is created as the residual of a dynamic and interactional process (Sarasvathy et al., 2002).

Furthermore, writers of a social constructionist temper have argued that both opportunities and individuals are constructed or evolve in entrepreneurial processes (Sarason et al., 2006, Piihl, 2005, Fletcher, 2006). This translates into a strong critique of the discovery view. The critique is basically
that the discovery view is incapable of describing adequately the struggles, interactions and
negotiations of the entrepreneurial process (Fletcher, 2006, Piihl, 2005). By taking the prior existence
of opportunities for granted the struggles disappear behind simplified and reifying theoretical terms
(Piihl, 2005).

According to Fletcher (2006), this problem can only be addressed through a refinement of the
theoretical concept of opportunity and the development of more sophisticated methodologies for
researching entrepreneurial opportunities. This paper seeks to address the two issues by proposing a
nominalist methodology. Being nominalist entails a specific view of opportunities as a set of (possibly
different) practices that take place at different locations in time and space. The concepts of “site” and
“enactment” are therefore introduced to aid the research. The advantages of the approach are illustrated
using the case of “The Republic of Tea” and this enterprise’s journey from idea germination to what it
is today.

The paper commences by unfolding the nominalist perspective. This section sets the scene through a
discussion of what opportunities are and are not. The next section moves to a presentation of sites and
enactments as a means to understanding how opportunities are continually reinterpreted by those
involved in creating and acting upon them. The following section describes how we propose to go
about analysing “The Republic of Tea”. This is followed by the actual case analysis.

A NOMINALIST APPROACH TO OPPORTUNITIES
Social constructionists argue that taking for granted the prior existence of opportunities, as proposed
by the discovery view, shrouds some of the struggles and interactions of entrepreneurial processes. On
the other hand, the creation view and some social constructionist perspectives might be argued to
assume that once constructed the opportunity attains a definite and stable form. This might also
constitute a problematic taken-for-granted in terms of exploring the continued dynamics which unfold,
even after e.g. the formation of a business. A nominalist perspective on opportunities questions such
"taken-for-granteds". In a nominalist view, "a name" is assigned to a series of processes (Foucault,
1998), thereby avoiding any reification or essentiality of the opportunity. This shifts the focus in
opportunity research, from the opportunity as "a thing" to opportunity as "a process". Opportunity thus
becomes a name we attribute to series of processes, which appear to the researcher and/or other relevant
actors as somehow linked together.

One serious implication of this is that opportunities are not definite. An opportunity is multiple (Law,
2004). So when examining an entrepreneurial opportunity, we should not expect this to be one and the
same thing at all times and places. To paraphrase Foucault, an opportunity is a multiplicity of
practices that come into play in various strategies (Foucault, 1998, p. 100). The task of the researcher
is then to reconstruct the distribution of discursive, material, bodily and other elements across time and
space. Such a reconstruction will yield an, albeit incomplete, but thicker, more detailed and capturing
description of the entrepreneurial processes.

Hence, what is being investigated is “practices”. Foucault defines practices as “places where what is
said and what is done, rules imposed and reasons given, the planned and the taken-for-granted meet
and interconnect” (Foucault, 2002, p. 225). The reason why practices are so important to study is that
what comes to count as true, factual, existing and taken for granted is produced in these practices
(Law, 2004, Latour, 1987). Discourses and other forms of practice continually and systematically form
the objects that they refer to and speak of (Foucault, 2005). Therefore reality as it appears to
individuals is constructed within the practices in which the individuals partake. The nominalist
researcher, by force of the methodological approach, is not mislead by what has been produced as true
or false, factual or fictional. That an opportunity post hoc appears to have always existed, and therefore
can be taken for granted (see Shane, 2000 for an example of how this way of thinking works), must not
seduce the researcher to assume that this is in fact the case. Instead focus is shifted to the processes and
negotiations leading to the establishment of the opportunity as a factual and real entity. This of course
renders impossible the idea that opportunities exist prior to action involving them (e.g. discovery). For
the same reason, opportunities cannot be assumed to take on any definite form or stability. Given that
opportunities exist only in practices, they can never be more stable than the practices in which they are
enacted.

However, if an opportunity has neither prior nor stable existence, why then hold on to the concept?
Basically for the same reason that it was introduced in the nexus perspective (Shane and
Venkataraman, 2000, Korsgaard, 2007). Opportunity is useful as a tool for making sense of entrepreneurial processes, because it designates an exteriority to the inside of the entrepreneurs mind(s) and the company or companies started in the entrepreneurial processes. The opportunity designates that which links the processes together across the many ideas, firms, actors, technologies, firms etc. involved in the processes (Piihl, 2005). This is exactly why an opportunity is multiple; more than one less than many (Law, 2004). It is not a definite single thing, but fragmented and different across time and space.

SITES AND ENACTMENTS
So the object of study is practices that vary over time and space. However, different and novel conceptual tools are needed to close in on the specific practices that we are looking for. The previous discussion made clear that opportunities vary across time and space and therefore opportunities may well be different depending on when and where you look. Hence, introducing the concepts of “site” and “enactment” establish concepts that may help in answering the simple questions: “what are we looking for” and “where should we look”?

Enactments
The term enactment, as presented by Law (2004), is preferred to the more often used “construction”, as we know it from various forms of constructionism (Burr, 2003, Fletcher, 2006) since “construction” seems to lend itself to the idea that something is being constructed, like a building. During construction it is still unknown what the result will be, but once constructed, it is there and has a definite form, and if we want to change it, then we need an entirely new reconstruction process.

Enactment, on the other hand, signifies a continued process of constructing and reconstructing. Enactment is perceived as a reality-producing practice, and as Law (2004) puts it: “enactment and practice never stops, and realities depend on their continued crafting” (p.56).

Another question worth asking, which emerges when answering the “what are we looking for” question, is “who is doing the enacting”? Which actors are involved in the enactments processes? The answer to this question depends on the specific context of interest; however, some overall comments are worth making. As the opportunity part of the nexus introduced by Shane and Venkataraman is not a definite entity, it should not be assumed that the other part of the nexus, namely the individual, is definite and exists prior to the entrepreneurial processes. In fact the individual, or the subject, too, is the result of practices; a name attributed to specific processes (Foucault, 1998). Enactment is the continuing practice of producing reality, but it is not simply human beings who participate in this production. It happens (at least mostly) in “a combination of people, techniques, texts, architectural arrangements and natural phenomena which are themselves being enacted and re-enacted” (Law, 2004, p. 56). A nominalist researcher thus needs to take into account the actions of both human actors and non-human actors.

Enactment, however, is not a completely free activity, where everything is equally likely to become real. Enactments draw on and relate to, what Law (2004) calls “hinterlands”. In order to be upheld and legitimate, an enactment must relate to other enactments, either by contributing to or drawing on them. In science an enactment must draw on previously established enactments to gain legitimacy and be upheld (Latour, 1987). This is in essence the hinterland. It comprises the rules that are established to which all have to adhere in order to be acknowledged. In principle anything can be said and thought, but the trick is to have it accepted as true, real and sensible, which is what science is all about. This requires a coherence and consistency with other statements, beliefs and action. The hinterland thus to some extent limits the “freedom” to enact.

Sites
The spatial has entered entrepreneurship in various forms, perhaps, most prominently in the literature on clusters, industrial districts and innovative milieus. This literature emphasises that the spatial dimensions affect opportunity exploitation, and may even constitute a source of opportunities in and of it self. Although not limited to a strictly geographical conceptualization of space, there is obviously a very strong material and objective tendency, in the talk of (geographical) regions and proximities. Recently other writers have engaged with spatial concepts (Anderson, 2000, Hjorth, 2004, Hjorth, 2005) focusing on the (socially) constructed nature of space. Shared across these conceptualizations of space is the understanding that entrepreneurship happens in a place, and that this place intervenes in the process. It is not purely a container for the activities. The concept of site developed in this paper
lies closer to the spatial concept of Hjorth (2004), when he uses space as a metaphor for “that period of time when a possibility to actualize (often materialize) an imagined creation is practised in concrete social relations” (Hjorth, 2004: 418).

Although, as Hjorth points out, space and time are inseparable, the concept of site seeks to establish a characteristic of enactment, namely that it is localized. Enactment occurs at specific times and locations. The site(s) of an opportunity thus means the place(s) you need to go to find it. Sites themselves are equally enacted and contextual. A site is performed in practice, too. The internet or a webpage is not a site unless somebody is enacting it.

The importance of sites is demonstrated in other studies (de Laet and Mol, 2000, Mol, 2002). A given opportunity is (most likely) enacted differently at different sites. An opportunity exists in a number of locations, and each location has its own particular enactment of the opportunity. The enactments in turn produce their own version of the opportunity (Law, 2004) There are multiple opportunities (Mol, 2002).

So sites are not necessarily in what we might otherwise call geographical space, such as regions are. Sites can be both “real” and “virtual”. An internet page and a television show are equally valid sites for opportunity enactment as a retail store or factory floor.

To sum up: the task of the researcher is to follow the entrepreneurial processes across sites and enactments, thereby in her report reconstructing the distribution of different practices in time and space. The methodology of sites and enactments assists in this reconstruction by offering answers to the questions “what are we looking for”, “who is doing it” and “where do we look”?

**METHOD**

The concepts of site and enactment provide some assistance in the research process, but there are still unresolved issues of how to use these in practice. What kinds of data are needed, and how might they be collected and analysed, if the multiplicity of opportunity is to be investigated?

The studies by so-called actor network theorists, such as Mol, Latour and Law have made extensive use of ethnographic approaches, where practices are watched closely as they unfold. Such an approach has proven immensely effective in examining the workings of modern science, technology and medicine (see Latour and Woolgar, 1986 for a brilliant and groundbreaking example of this). However, whilst the advantages of this approach are readily seen, it is also very demanding in terms of time and resources. Further, it tends to require presence! In relation to entrepreneurship there are further problems. An ethnographic investigation of entrepreneurial processes would have to identify these almost before they begin, and would constantly suffer the risk that the processes would end abruptly, as most entrepreneurial processes are quite short-lived.

Foucault, and the many forms of discourse analysis that his writings have inspired, typically seek to reconstruct the processes in retrospect using different forms of text. The texts take the form of documents, reports and other written artefacts (Foucault, 2005), or interviews with relevant people involved in the processes. This approach has advantages in terms of presence, time and costs. Drawbacks, however, relate to issues of availability of documents and interviewees, as well as the fact that writings and interviewees tell only parts of the “whole” story. In relation to entrepreneurship it has been suggested that narrative analysis has significant advantages as entrepreneurs in general are more than happy to tell stories of themselves and their businesses (McKenzie, 2007). Furthermore narrative analysis is already focused on process, as development and progression is embodied in the nature of narratives.

In this research we have chosen to employ the concepts of site and enactment in an analysis of “The Republic of Tea”. “The Republic of Tea” is an enterprise, which sells tea, but it does more than that, it tells a story. Actually, it tells multiple stories. These stories can be accessed by anyone with a computer and an Internet connection. We were first introduced to “The Republic of Tea” in a workshop with Bill Gartner, and later acquired the book of the same name. The data of this analysis is the book “The Republic of Tea” – but our investigation naturally led us to the website of the enterprise too (www.therepublicoftea.com). The book consists primarily of the fax correspondence between the two founders in the period leading to the birth of the tea company "The Republic of Tea". It tells of the struggles and joys of the two founders, who refer to themselves as the Ministers of Progress and
Leaves. As such the book is a unique collection of data. The fax correspondence is accompanied by later commentary by the founders as well as drafts of business plans and drawings by the wife of one of the founders, which appear to have played a significant role in the development of "The Republic of Tea". Naturally, we have no way of knowing what is neglected and left out in the book. Nevertheless, it lends itself beautifully to our analysis. It explicitly purports to present a different "behind the scenes" look at the birth of a company. As such it also serves as an antidote to the narrow depiction of entrepreneurial processes we might find in the discovery view of opportunities.

Using the data provided by the book, it is possible to tell any number of different stories of "The Republic of Tea". It establishes different series of enactments and sites, and thus provides insights into the irreducible complexity of "The Republic of Tea" as an opportunity. Two such stories will be presented below using the book in different ways to illustrate how the concepts of sites and enactments may assist us in researching entrepreneurial processes.

**"THE REPUBLIC OF TEA"**

**A tale of two sites**

Websites can be a seductive site when studying entrepreneurial ventures. If you visit the website of "The Republic of Tea" (http://www.republicoftea.com) you will meet a beautiful website with an elaborate design which corresponds well with the products sold over the website. When moving the cursor across the page various menus roll down and these as well as other links will lead you to different sub-pages in a nicely structured web. Each link has a definite destination and you click effortless round the sub-pages. Some will take you to product-descriptions of the Yerba Mate Latte Herbal Tea while another takes you to customer service. A remarkable thing about the webpage in all its complexity is that it seems to have no dead ends. Every link leads to a designated sub-page. "The Republic of Tea" thus at the site of http://www.republicoftea.com appears to be a coherent and complete whole.

Flipping through the pages of the book "The Republic of Tea", a completely different story is told. The faxes, comments and business plans in the book tell of almost nothing but dead ends. Meetings with Lipton that never happen; retail stores never opened; tea packing companies never bought and so forth. There are of course things described in the book that were in fact actualised, such as the catalogue, but the dead ends surely outnumber the actualised ideas. Indeed an impression easily derived from reading the book is that the Republic very nearly was never established. The Republic of the book is anything but coherent and complete, but more like a myriad of ideas, teas and scenarios almost randomly thrown about.

Which is the true "Republic of Tea"? Neither and both would be the nominalist answer. "The Republic of Tea" can and must not be reduced to one of the two. The reason for this is simple. The two sites and enactments are linked together in the series that we (as well as the founders, webmaster and employees of "The Republic of Tea") name "The Republic of Tea"². Therefore neither will give you a complete description of the object in question. Privileging the website will make you blind to the struggles and negotiations of starting a firm, while privileging the book makes a number of recent developments invisible. Therefore including the most possible sites and enactments will produce better accounts of entrepreneurial processes in their irreducible complexity.

**Unfolding the opportunity**

The above story of two sites tells us little about the opportunity. To learn of this we must tell another story which makes a different use of the book. In the above story the book was treated as a site in itself. Any given site may however be broken down into any new number of sites. Indeed this invariably happens when a site is investigated in depth (Mol, 2002). If we read the book a number of new sites make themselves available for analysis on different levels. Each individual fax message might be constructed as a site, while the collected faxes of the Minister of Leaves might be termed the Ministry of Leaves, as indeed the Minister of Progress himself does (see p. 145). Breaking the book up into sites in this way demonstrates how a great number of (possible) enactments of "The Republic of Tea" are in play, and that these enactments are very different. A number of these are presented in Table 1.

<p>| Table 1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;The Republic of Tea&quot; as...</th>
<th>Enactment</th>
<th>Site(s)</th>
<th>Later developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A conversation on Plane</strong> (pages 7-11)</td>
<td>In the account of the Minister of Leaves he met the Minister of Progress in a car on the way to the airport. Both had attended a conference, and were leaving early. They struck up a conversation. The conversation was so interesting that the two rearranged the seats on their plane, so they might continue. “We were in a highly charged no-man’s-land, outside space and time, where the source of an Idea was revealing itself to us in its yet unborn state. Time and space reappeared seven hours later when we looked up and saw that the plane, on the ground in San Francisco, was empty” (p. 7) In the conversation the Ministers to be, explore the possibility of starting a tea business, incorporating a specific philosophy of life (or vice versa): “By the time we landed, we were wholesaling, mail-ordering, and selling tea in 150 retail stores in the best locations in America, we were the premier merchants of Tea in America […] we were helping people to discover their own paths to longevity with herbal teas, and we were unleashing a new way of life in America.” (p. 11)</td>
<td>A flight to San Francisco A no-man’s-land out of space and time Linked to a great number of possible sites such a retail stores, mail-order catalogues. The conversation becomes the starting point for the personal communication between the two Ministers to-be, which eventually end up in the starting of the company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A stand in a local culture centre</strong> (pages 185-187)</td>
<td>The Minister of Progress at some point presents the idea of starting the republic as a small stand at the local arts center: “I wanted you to know that I’m thinking about creating a little tea stand in the Sedona Arts Center. […] My goal is to show them that tea will be a wonderful way to: a) raise money for the Arts Center in a steady way; b) draw more attention to the Arts Center in uptown Sedona; c) get more visitors to tour the exhibits.” (p. 185) “I envision some kind of a roadside tea hut that sits in the front land of the Sedona Arts Center (SAC), just off the main road where 1000s of visitors walk and drive every week” (p. 185)</td>
<td>The Ministry of Progress Links to the site of the Sedona Arts Center. The Minister of Leaves does not think well of this idea and describes it in a reflection in the book as absurd (p. 187). Although he does not relate this directly to the Minister of Progress he makes no secret of it in the following correspondence. The idea is seemingly not pursued further.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A chain of retail stores</td>
<td>The idea of “The Republic of Tea” as a chain of retail stores is presented in the opening pages of the book (see above), but only fully developed later. The idea (re)appears during a trip to London: “One day while walking down Fulham Road […] the idea for our own retail store vividly materialized. We had been inspired by the successful Whittard’s chain of tea shops with their fine and broad selection. We three recognized the importance of creating a “context” for enjoying fine tea in America. We wanted to sell tea and create a new tea experience, and the most dramatic way to do this was clearly in a retail environment” (p. 241). For a while this enactment co-exists with “The Republic of Tea” as a mail-order company.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a mail-order company (Dispersed throughout the book, but see pages 255-258 in particular)</td>
<td>That “The Republic of Tea” should be a mail-order company is an idea presented throughout the book. On pages 255 to 258 a detailed description of the potential layout and content of the first catalogue is presented including detailed sketches of how the pages might look.</td>
<td>The Ministries of Progress and Leaves. Links to potential sites of retail stores across America. “The Republic of Tea” eventually is launched as a mail-order catalogue and whole sale tea purveyor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a alternative to coffee (pages 117-119)</td>
<td>At an occasion where the Ministers and their families have gotten together, the wives have seemingly prompted an idea in the Ministry of Leaves: “Our enchanting wives have rendered us the greatest service of all. They have told us what the business is really about. It is about caffeine. The world does not need another herbal tea. What the world needs is a sensible alternative to coffee. An alternative that reduces caffeine by 75% and at the same time provides a new flavourful taste in a hot beverage”.</td>
<td>The Ministry of Leaves. Links to the site of the conversation(s) where the wives imprint the idea in the Minister of Leaves. The issue of tea versus coffee is in play in many enactments and sites of “The Republic of Tea” (see e.g. the introduction page 3). Most places however somewhat underplayed. Indeed the Minister of Progress does not support this enactments fully, and seems to effectively kill it, in the response to the fax from the Minister of Leaves: “It sounds like caffeine could become a major issue of product positioning, but I’d like to think about this long and hard. I still find it a dangerous point of front-line definition for our company. […] It would be very dangerous to promote tea as an alternative to coffee. It’s one of those things that people must discover.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| As a philosophy of life (Dispersed throughout the book, and also readily available at the www.republicoftea.com). | Throughout the book there are numerous discussions on what the philosophy behind “The Republic of Tea” is. Describing all these different perspectives. | The Ministries of Progress and Leaves. Links to future t- Links to future t- Living life sip by sip and other similar ideas/philosophies/slogans seem to be an integral part of the current enactments of
Two things to note about the enactments in the book: As they are only presented in text form, we only have access to the discursive parts of the enactments. If there are material, bodily or other elements incorporated in the enactment these are only related discursively in the book. As stated above most of what is in the book are dead-ends, most of the enactments are never much more than discursive. They are mostly only spoken of, and to a very little degree, incorporated in other forms of practice. As an example there is talk of making "The Republic of Tea" a chain of retail stores, but the talk is never translated into the practice of actually building stores, while the talk of mail-order-catalogues is in fact later actualised in the practices of designing, printing, and mailing catalogues.

Where might we find the opportunity? In a discovery view we would have to assume that a) the opportunity somehow exists prior to discovery, b) that the opportunity remains the same throughout the process, and c) that what goes on in the book is first and foremost a process of evaluation. It is quite possible to analyse the story/stories, told in the book, in this way. It does however render three out of six of the enactments in Table 1, indifferent for the analysis. It also enforces linearity in to the stories in that they must progress towards a goal given in advance, namely the Schumpeterian combination of high quality tea, and a whole sale and mail-order-catalogue based marketing strategy. The discovery view would argue that the opportunity pre-exists in the form of a potential new combination that may be sold with a profit (Shane, 2003). It simply needs to be discovered and evaluated. By this line of thinking the book must tell as story of the discovery and evaluation of the opportunity.

Against this kind of analysis, we might argue that the many enactments matter, they each represent a relevant part of the story, and all contribute in making "The Republic of Tea" what it is. Secondly, the form(s) that "The Republic of Tea" takes on later are not given in advance. Each of the enactments in the book represents a path that could have been taken. Whether or not it would have been successful cannot be determined. Whether there was an opportunity (as understood in the discovery view) or not can never determined except post hoc (Korsgaard, 2007).

Should we instead adhere to the creation view, a significant advantage is obtained. The different enactments in the book, are all relevant in so far as they constitute a trial and error process (Alvarez, 2005). This process results in the creation of "The Republic of Tea" as mail-order and whole sale tea purveyor. A more complex story is thus told of the genesis of "The Republic of Tea". The problem, however, with this approach is that once created the opportunity attains a stability and unity, that we must be vary of. As illustrated in section 5.1 this would reduce complexity of our story/stories of "The Republic of Tea". Furthermore we cannot assume that the opportunities remain the same in the future.

In a nominalist approach we attempt to incorporate a complexity both over time and at any given point in time. Therefore all the enactments presented in the book, as well as any other enactment we might link into the series of practices, that we call "The Republic of Tea", are relevant. Each of the enactments contributes to the unfolding of the stories of the Republic.

Unfolding is a key word here. How many folds can we unfold when telling the stories of "The Republic of Tea"? A discovery view seems to unfold only a minority of the enactments and sites, we come across. Many folds are kept folded in, if we look for the opportunity, the discovery, the evaluation and the exploitation. A creation view unfolds many more folds, when looking for the trials and errors of the process, yet the present multiplicity of enactments and sites are kept unfolded. The last folds may be unfolded if we give up the assumption that an opportunity attains singularity and stability. If we look for multiplicity and series of practices, there is in principle no end to the folds we might unfold when telling stories of entrepreneurial processes.

NOTES
1 In the actual passage from “The Will to Knowledge” Foucault is referring only to discursive practices. In this paper however we include other forms of practice, as did Foucault in some of his later works.

2 See the webpages http://www.republicoftea.com/pages/portofentry.asp and http://www.republicoftea.com/templates/detail.asp?navID=452 for a wonderful demonstration of how the link or series between the two sites is established.
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