KEY TERMS

Disciplinary influences present partial and fragmented illustrations of identity, entrepreneurship, and literacy.

Not to mention, each field has its own reservations about the choice of words used to describe the subject, as well as the impact of those words on the larger arguments concerning individuals involved and affected.

A multidisciplinary approach to understanding variables that constitute entrepreneurial identity bridges language used across fields, which present fragmented understandings of such topics on their own.

IDENTITY

• “Identity exists by how it is defined,” (Saldaña, 2016).
• My work takes up an intersectional approach to identity offering an inclusionary space for all individuals (Crenshaw, 1991; Collins 1990).

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

• Scholarship on entrepreneurship is fragmentary (Cerulo, 1997; Elliot, 2011; Essers et al., 2017).
• There’s a general disagreement on what entrepreneurship is and how to talk about it in relation to identity (Gartner, 1990).

LITERACY

• In this work, I follow Barton’s (1994) delineation of literacy as a social event, fostering thinking about this concept in terms of the ecology of literacy.
• A main quality of entrepreneurial identity, I argue, is best understood by tracing literacy practices which people use in their daily transitions within their ascribed roles and domains – at home, work, and with other outside third party organizations.

TRANSFER

• James Royer et al. (2005) define transfer as “a term that describes a situation where information learned at one point in time influences performance on information encountered at a later point in time.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In response to Welter et al.’s (2017) call for research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity, this project explores a broadened definition of entrepreneurial identity suggesting that the persona is -- and should be -- understood as separate from what it means to be an entrepreneur.

The rhetoric fueling entrepreneurial performance is found in an individual’s ability to read the social situation at specific moments, seize the opportunity at hand, draw skills/key insights from previous experiences, and play to their audience through a response that caters to their needs.

Analysis of New York Times articles on Elizabeth Holmes renders empirical findings on the media’s casting of entrepreneurial identity. The data was used to assess a 3-dimensional heuristic, derived from a multidisciplinary approach, which probes understandings of variables that constitute entrepreneurial identity. In sum, the project attempts to bridge language used to articulate entrepreneurial research across fields.

ENTREPRENEURIAL PROFILE

“In order to be successful in today’s world – no matter what your profession is -- you’ve got to demonstrate your ability to innovate, be creative, have a solid drive/work ethic, network well, be adaptable, and have technological expertise.”

- Pre-Pilot Study Participant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embodied Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles Performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process-Based Trajectory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Management Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXPLANATION OF THE CUBE

This project offers a 3-dimensional heuristic that probes a nuanced understanding of the qualities and performance of entrepreneurial identity.

Each panel represents the different features that constitute the entrepreneurial identity profile.

Application of the cube concept dictates that what can be observed and analyzed about entrepreneurial identity, from any situation, is only that information which pertains to the panel that is forward-facing, depending on the angle.

The greatest strength of this heuristic is that it places attention on the inherent socio-cultural power dynamics at play that foreground certain facets of entrepreneurial identities in context while hiding others.

CLOSER LOOK AT CASE STUDY DATA

A deeper dive into the case study data shows language, embodiment, and domain as the top 3 codes (i.e., cube panels) that emerged in the 5 New York Times articles selected for this study; these are explained in further detail in the coding schema below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGUAGE</td>
<td>Words used to describe, quote and/or paraphrase Elizabeth Holmes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Exaggerate; accuse; lie; carefully crafted pitch; elaborate fiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBODIMENT</td>
<td>Tangible/visible form(s) &amp; representation(s) and/or expression of identity (e.g., age, gender, race, class, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51 years old; striking presence; uniform of black turtlenecks; youngest female billionaire; Stanford dropout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMAIN</td>
<td>Cultural spheres of activity, which exist independently but also overlap at times, range across individual, organizational, and collective groups</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Peer review; Food and Drug Administration; Securities and Exchange Commission; Walgreens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FURTHER READING