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Abstract

Museums in Sweden are found to be more and more mission-laden, as they gradually evolve from a custodian role to a visitor-focused socio-cultural institution. In their efforts to live up to their newly acquired role, more and more museums are prompted to inject entrepreneurial mindset and practices into their activity, leading to a nascent interest from the academic field in the possibility offered by entrepreneurship in the context of museums. We identify museums as a unique context motivated by the values and desires of the museum workers, whilst arguing that research on museum entrepreneurship has so far neglected the social aspect of these museum workers. Instead, the popular discourse has generally favored functionalism and positivism. As such, we propose to explore and potentialize an alternative view of entrepreneurship in museums that places the people, along with their values and desires, at its core. To that end, we conduct a case study with the Naval Museum, a governmental museum located in Karlskrona, Sweden. Through an iterative abductive approach inspired by grounded theory method, we shed light on several potentials and phenomena emerging from a combination of the museum workers’ values and the unique context of the Naval Museum. After performing a metamorphosis analysis inspired by Weiskopf and Steyaert, we give birth to child-museum-entrepreneurship, a concept unburdened of preconceptions. We then infuse it with Hjorth’s public entrepreneurship theory and discover a new form of becoming of museum entrepreneurship, potentializing its existence and power of re-creation and opening the door towards a human-centered museum entrepreneurship.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Background

“To create new values—that, even the lion cannot yet accomplish: but to create itself freedom for new creating—that can the might of the lion do.”

Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*

Traditionally considered the palace for housing, conserving, sourcing, and showcasing objects and artifacts, museums have now subsumed ever-increasing social responsibilities, expectations, and demands (Anderson, 2005; Kotler & Kotler, 2000; Lynch, 2011). Such conceptual shift has been largely anointed by governmental policies to contribute to the building of the civil society, making museums a vehicle of change and an agent of social inclusion and cultivation (Anderson, 2005; Sandell, 1998). The change in museum climate and discourses is gradually transforming the museums from collection-focused to visitor-focused, that is, from serving the objects and artifacts to serving the public and people (Kotler & Kotler, 2000; Lynch, 2011; McCall & Gray, 2014). This ontological transformation has not only increased the complexity of the museum practice but also prompted museums to seek ways to be relevant to the public, broaden their audience beyond elitist groups, and realize educational function in non-conventional fashions (Gradén & O’Dell, 2018; McCall & Gray, 2014; Nielsen, 2015).

Whilst taking up the old responsibility of conducting research, tending to the collection, and sharing knowledge, museums nowadays need to balance the resources used in promoting visitor engagement and experience through entertainment and marketing strategies as well as in pursuing other potential societal missions (Ashley, 2014; Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Gradén &
O’Dell, 2018; Lynch, 2011). The embedded relationship between the museum and society has given the museum as a cultural heritage institution new meanings and purposes as well as challenges and obstacles (Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Gainon-Court & Vuillaume, 2016; Sandell, 1998). Increased collaborations with external partners to remain competitive and co-creation with the public are commonly reported in the contemporary museum sector (Ashley, 2014; Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021). More and more state-funded museums in particular are by law required to collaborate with the local authorities or municipalities (Anderson, 2005; Knudsen, 2020).

Museum work can therefore be as socio-cultural as geo-political (Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Thompson, 2003). To avoid museums as a social-cultural center from falling under the political agenda, the concept of ‘the arm’s length’ has emerged in parts of the museum sector in Europe, meaning to give museums a certain autonomy and freedom despite being under the support and operation of the governments (Anderson, 2005; McCall & Gray, 2014). To legally observe this respectful distance, Sweden has enacted a new Museum Law (SFS 2017:563) in 2017, making explicit the role of the museums as providers of knowledge and purveyors of free opinion-building, who are obliged to form a strengthened bond with the community and contribute to societal development. With this positioning of the ‘new institution’ comes the idea of ‘armlängds avstånd’ (the arm’s length), to prevent political influences on the museum operations.

The cultural-political influence has always been quite prominent in the values and strategies adopted by museums (Alexander 2019; McCall & Gray, 2014; Thompson, 2003). As noted by Högberg and Jogmark (2021), to address the increasing social, cultural, and economic demands, several entrepreneurial aspects and intentions have been observed in many museums in Sweden. However, such a phenomenon only came about fairly recently as the concept of entrepreneurship has been commonly perceived as almost synonymous with
exploitation and profit-seeking. With commercialization being distanced and banished from being associated with cultural institutions by the Swedish political discourse in the 1970s, entrepreneurship consequently fell out of favor in the museum world in Sweden (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021).

The fear and concern for corruption of the museum integrity from commercialization are prevalent across the industry (Toepler, 2006). The notion of entrepreneurship in non-conventional places and spaces such as museums can be perceived as uncomfortable or negative by the museum workers (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021). Not only does the tension arise from the museum workers’ values with the introduction of entrepreneurship but the very concept of entrepreneurship in museums is often faced with criticism against them as non-profit organizations for metamorphosing into social enterprises (Toepler, 2006). With shrinking resources and funds, many museums around the world are asked to diversify income streams and become more financially independent from the governments (Greffe, Krebs & Pflieger, 2017; Toepler, 2006). Transformation of the museum identity also catalyzes the need for museum leadership and workers to reshape and reinvent the museum as a new institution and to possess innovative, risk-taking, and creative qualities in dealing with the expansion of the museum tasks and serving a wider audience (McCall & Gray, 2014; Suchy, 1999). This results in the museums becoming more and more entrepreneurial and business-like (Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Gainon-Court & Vuillaume, 2016; Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Suchy, 1999).

To clarify the root of such tension and to avoid the readers’ confusion, we adopt ICOM’s (2018) definition of ‘museum’ in this thesis which specifically refers to non-profit museums with an educational and societal focus, excluding the for-profit museums that may include economic priority in the mission. This distinction is crucial as “any study of museums needs to consider the mission of museums, both the formal, written ‘mission statement’ and also the implicit
aspirations of museum personnel across departments” (Alexander, 2019, p.84). Loaded with the missions and aspirations for a desired future, museum work is often complex and full of tensions arising from the interactions with the environments and the museum workers’ values (Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Davies, Paton & O’Sullivan, 2013). Note that the term ‘value’ used in this thesis refers to the ethical value such as a person’s set of beliefs, guiding principles, and what he/she finds important, and not the quantifiable economic value. Exploring the tensions and the often ‘invisible’ values at play may offer a way for understanding the complexity of the museum work (Davies, Paton & O’Sullivan, 2013).

Our research is then set on the case of the Naval Museum in Sweden as our vessel for exploration in the museum world. It is a governmental museum standing at the intersection of cultural heritage preservation and its societal missions whilst having an intricate relationship with its public status. Similarly, as mentioned by other Swedish museum leaders on the need of introducing and increasing entrepreneurial skills and knowledge (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021), the desire for incorporating the concept of entrepreneurship is also expressed by the Naval Museum leadership. Despite being only a looming presence, a rejuvenated form of museum entrepreneurship in the context of the Naval Museum may just bloom, transform, and come to life. It shall then be a festive process to witness that we will take you through step by step whilst we move on to the next discussion to bring more clarity of our study to light.

1.2 Problem discussion

1.2.1 Museum entrepreneurship as a nascent field
A museum is the crystallization of knowledge and culture through time and space, and at the same time a space for negotiating the past and the present. It
encapsulates a piece of our understanding of the world. Whether private or state-owned, museums traverse through cultural, historical, social, political, aesthetic, and scientific arenas and provide a public ground for inspiration, cultivation, and conversation (with others and oneself); museums are highly mission-bound and benefit-oriented (benefit to the public, artifacts, the museum itself, and other possible stakeholders involved).

In recent decades, a growing trend can be seen in museums adopting more business strategies and entrepreneurial activities due to a decrease in both governmental subsidies and philanthropic donations against the increase in social and political needs and demands (Alexander 2019; Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Toepler, 2006). The combination of these has quietly piloted the concept of social entrepreneurship into the museum world (Eid, 2019; Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Toepler, 2006), which gives hope with regard to the potential benefits that entrepreneurial initiatives may bring (Murphy, 2018; Surugiu & Surugiu, 2015). The increasing discussions on the entrepreneurial phenomenon in the context of museums have therefore caught our attention as researchers, identifying the lack of research on museum entrepreneurship whilst imagining the possibilities of where such investigation can lead. As Landström (1999, p.17) suggests, besides the innovative and pattern-breaking quality of the Schumpeterian entrepreneurs, the application of entrepreneurship can also be found in “discovering, organizing, and exploiting more ‘traditional’ business activities”.

We understand that the nature of museums is certainly different from that of businesses. Fundamentally, the biggest difference is most likely the non-profit focus with societal missions that cannot be compromised. We also identify museums as unique agents in society subject to the wave of social change but also effecting change. Becoming visitor-oriented, museums’ effort to increase audience engagement for facilitating learning and co-creation also signals the need for museums to adapt to the people’s needs and come up with innovative
solutions (Eid, 2019; Gainon-Court & Vuillaume, 2016; Gradén & O’Dell, 2018; Murphy, 2018; Surugiu & Surugiu, 2015). To create a better visitor experience and contribute to positive impacts on the society is therefore key for museums nowadays to stay relevant in society and to the people (Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Nielsen, 2015).

As far-reaching as it may seem for non-profit cultural institutions to have any connections with concepts stemming from neo-liberalism, many museum leaders hope in fact to rely on entrepreneurial qualities to maximize the museum’s potential to stay in accordance with its mission and go beyond its traditionally prescribed functions in society (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Knudsen, 2020; Suchy, 1999). Such an intention is often tempted by the prospect of more effectively and efficiently mobilizing and organizing resources, guiding them through technology and innovation, creating/discovering and turning obstacles into opportunities, as better tools or means to serve the interests of both the museum and the public. In this sense, the ontological relevance of entrepreneurship should not be limited to pecuniary pursuit or the economy but ought to find its place in the social (Steyaert & Katz, 2004; Thompson, 2003).

Although the predominant applications of entrepreneurship seem to consist in diversifying income, financing through entrepreneurial endeavors, or stepping into business-like activities (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Toepler, 2006), being commercial and entrepreneurial does not necessarily mean deviating from the museum's core values. As Brenton and Bouckaert’s argue (2021, p.725), “financial entrepreneurial museums are also progressive, ethical, and innovative”. However, whilst potentially benefitting from incorporating entrepreneurial skills and efforts, museums also need to be aware of the nature of contingencies inherent in entrepreneurism (Toepler, 2006).

Museums dance on the balance of financial, social, and political needs external to the original mission of caring for the collections. Consequently, they are
frequently left with tensions and dilemmas as they uphold high moral and ethical caution to prevent their missions and values from being invaded by such demands or getting distracted by peripheral activities meant to serve the core values and goals (Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Toepler, 2006). Therefore, coping with the tensions hung between the missions and the introduction of entrepreneurship into the museum framework can lead to many museum workers holding a promising yet skeptical stand around the notion of entrepreneurship since its very being stems from a profit-maximizing economy (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Toepler, 2006).

Despite not being a widely recognized or identified field, research on museums in relation to entrepreneurship studies appears to have the potential to develop into a discussion around the topic of museum entrepreneurship. So far, the body of extant literature dealing with the non-profit and public sectors has been rather limited (Thompson, 2003). Such literature anchored in the Nordic/Swedish museum context is unsurprisingly scarce (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021). In light of this, we call for filling this epistemological gap of museums interacting with entrepreneurship and for highlighting the tensions and paradoxes arising from this interface.

Museum entrepreneurship is thus meant to take into consideration the complexity of the role of museum workers and intended to be at the gateway of social entrepreneurship and museology (Toepler, 2006). Similarly, with societal missions at heart, museum entrepreneurship stretches from social entrepreneurship to conceptualizing entrepreneurial phenomena in the museums, while it differs from social entrepreneurship in the scope of the societal missions and with the addition of cultural and educational purposes. With regard to the uniqueness of this context, it is necessary to add to the body of literature both conceptually and empirically, giving space to a form of entrepreneurship in the museum arena.
1.2.2 Problematize the economic discourse of entrepreneurship

One of the biggest reasons why museums may hold prejudice and precaution when dealing with the infusion of entrepreneurship into their practices has a lot to do with what the concept is commonly known for (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021). Famously developed notably by Schumpeter and Kirzner to the end of maximizing profits through creating, discovering, and exploiting opportunities, entrepreneurship has been widely favored by many economic-focused organizations whilst money seems to run in its blood (Klyver & Bager, 2017). Originally, the concept of ‘entrepreneur’ simply meant “a person who is active and gets things done” and was later associated with “large-scale risk-taking” before being appropriated to the economic discourse (Landström, 1999, p.9).

To break free from the cycle of continuously being steered back to the economy as the focal point, more and more scholars shed light on the different faces of entrepreneurship and position it as socially constructed (Anderson, 2015; Langevång, 2017; Schaefer, Corner & Kearins, 2015). This call aims at broadening the perspectives and giving new meanings to entrepreneurship beyond the mainstream economic discourse which risks overshadowing the nuanced and multi-disciplinary realities weaved through entrepreneurship. Anderson and Gaddefors (2016, p.12) give a well-described summary of such conceptual reform of entrepreneurship:

In this light, entrepreneurship is not limited to starting new businesses, nor is it very economic. It appeared as a social phenomenon, but was not the conventional social enterprise. It seemed to be about engaging people in new ways of thinking, new ways of experiencing and above all about being. Indeed at root we argue for entrepreneurship as an experience. It may be experienced at first hand by doing; or experienced through what others do.
However, despite the rising call to unveil non-economic aspects, it is still hard to see the dominant discourse on entrepreneurship whole-heartedly departing from the path of ‘a better economic tool’. The reluctance present in the majority of the literature to relinquish the economy as the focal point has shackled entrepreneurship to a singular perspective which straps the depth of knowledge and the potential for theoretical development (see exceptions for example: Anderson & Gaddefors, 2016; Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017; Hjorth, 2013; Korsgaard & Anderson, 2011; Steyaert & Katz, 2004).

Steyaert and Katz (2004, p.188) have made explicit how tempting it is to fall back to the same old path, “As Giddens opens up for all forms of entrepreneurship, he simultaneously reduces them to an ‘economic energy’ and it makes us aware how easily the economic view slips back in.” The economic view calls to the mainstream discourse as Sirens call to the sailors with their mystic voice of attraction and eventually drown them in the sea. To avoid confusion, it is not our aim to demonize or deem lesser the economic relevance or importance but to remind ourselves that economic phenomena do not exist without the foundation of the society and that a reductionist view derived from positivism cannot always be sufficient for explaining lest understanding our world (Anderson, 2015). As Steyaert and Katz warn (2004, p.188), “The possibilities of entrepreneurship as a concept are at stake.” They further suggest “to indulge a multi-sided view on entrepreneurship, so that creative possibilities are not just economized, again in the public sector, again in civic society” (Steyaert & Katz, 2004, p.189).

1.2.3 Problematize the outcome-oriented discourse of entrepreneurship

The dominance of the economic worldview continues its influence on the need for people to seek explanations for entrepreneurial outcomes and pragmatic
functions of an entrepreneurial phenomenon (Anderson, 2015). Instead of approaching entrepreneurship in an exploratory manner to build understanding on the ground of the empirical world, solely focusing on explaining the outcomes may lose sight of the nuance and complexity of entrepreneurship as a social process (Anderson, 2015; Anderson & Gaddefors, 2016; Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017). Consequently, the context in which entrepreneurship takes place and evolves is often dimmed to the background whilst the outcomes of entrepreneurial efforts are being emphasized as if they were the sole purpose of the entrepreneurship discourse (Anderson, 2015; Anderson & Gaddefors, 2016; Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017).

These outcomes can most commonly be seen in the literature as bringing forth social, economic, or ecological values (Dey & Steyaert, 2012; Klamer, 2011; Kyrö, 2017). At the same time, the prevalence of the value-creation pre-conception of entrepreneurship has led to some critical discussions that question the all too positive and enigmatic effects of entrepreneurship and strive to uncover the less glorious effect of unintended consequences which some may call dark entrepreneurship (Berglund, Johannisson & Schwartz, 2012; Kraus et al., 2020; Wright & Zahra, 2011). Therefore, outcomes can be seen as a relatively neutral word that can refer to both the positive and negative (Karlsson, 2018). The obsession for entrepreneurship to create ‘value’, however, may be quite troublesome since value can mean different things to different people in different contexts (Anderson & Gaddefors, 2016). The discussion hovering around entrepreneurship as creation of value may also narrow the potential of entrepreneurship to the outcomes, reducing the human experience during the process (Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017) and failing to justify “the power of entrepreneurship to bring about change” (Anderson, 2015, p.146).

But entrepreneurship is about change. As Anderson argues, “change processes are at the heart of entrepreneurship” (2015, p.146). In this sense,
“entrepreneurship is always about becoming” (Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017, p.270). The concept of becoming epitomizes the processual and fluid view of entrepreneurship. As reflected by Gaddefors and Anderson (2017, p.273) in a longitudinal study, it is difficult to grasp the beginning of the process but that allows them to “focus on the doing in itself”. The consideration for the entrepreneurial processes and contexts allows for social and transformative nuances to emerge.

As Klamer (2011) points out, both Kirzner and Schumpeter lack the elaboration on the very intricate entrepreneurial process but focus on the outcomes and the categorization of how resources and opportunities can be capitalized. Such a reductionist view entails a risk of missing out on meaningfulness and a layer of humanity when seeking the explanation of economic phenomena (Klamer, 2011). Thus, moving away from a ‘one-type-fits-all’ tradition whilst considering the socio-geographical and human context gives space for more intensity and diversity in the entrepreneurship research and discussion (Baker & Welter, 2021; Lavoie & Chamlee-Wright, 2000). The often-forgotten human aspect cooks up the cauldron of values and desires that boil down to tension and synergy in the entrepreneurial process, offering the possibility to understand the human context at a deeper level (Berglund, Johannisson & Schwartz, 2012; Karlsson, 2018; Langevang, 2017).

Although no unanimous definition has been dedicated to describing what entrepreneurship entails, we posit that a context-dependent approach liberates us from the stalemate of seeking the one true definition of an abstraction and allows us to dive deeper into understanding a phenomenon (Anderson & Gaddefors, 2016; Gaddefors & Anderson, 2017; Lavoie & Chamlee-Wright, 2000; Welter, 2011).
1.2.4 Summary of problem discussion

To liberate entrepreneurship from the positivistic line of inquiry into the complexity of museum practices, we believe it is necessary to reclaim the space of the people who work behind the scenes at this intersection of a socio-cultural institution. Acknowledging the new phase of the Swedish state-owned museums with its endowed meanings and missions to serve the public, we identify the museum as a unique context motivated by the values and desires of the museum workers. Thus, we place such context in the foreground as our basis for analysis. Instead of the outcome-oriented research stream of entrepreneurship studies, we propose that museum entrepreneurship should be approached with consideration of the people at its core, allowing insights into the organic form of entrepreneurship.

1.3 Research objective and purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to motivate an alternative perspective of entrepreneurship in the world of museums, inspired by the values and desires enacted by the museum workers in their specific context. We strive to explore the possibilities induced by a metamorphosis of museum entrepreneurship towards the creation of a new becoming. To fulfill this purpose, we put forth the following research questions:

RQ1: How may the notion of museum entrepreneurship be understood beyond the economic discourse?

RQ2: What values and desires are enacted in the organizing and creation of museum work?

RQ3: How can values and desires act as potentials to be conceptualized into a form of becoming of museum entrepreneurship?
1.4 Outline of the thesis

As we set to answer the proposed research questions, we elaborate an approach finding inspiration in grounded theory method, as will be explained in detail throughout this paper. This approach is reflected in the organization of our paper, which does not strictly follow traditional thesis templates. In this section, we briefly explain how the present paper has been set up and introduce the main components of our research.

Chapter 1 introduces the knowledge found in current research on the field of museums, which suggests a rising responsibility taken by the museums, both as a blessing and a challenge. We identify the role of museums in society and how they strive to navigate through their work with the inclusion of entrepreneurship. In such a unique context, we problematize the mainstream entrepreneurship discourses that may conceal the strength and possibilities of entrepreneurship. As our research purpose, we set our focus on the values and desires of the museum workers whilst exploring the potential of entrepreneurship beyond the economic framework.

Chapter 2 reveals our approach and working philosophy in addressing the research topic. We delve into the specific aspects of our research design and describe in detail the iterative abductive process developed for the purpose of this study. We introduce the Naval Museum as the case under study and explain how, through exploration and interpretation of our observations, we conduct our thought experiment in that specific context. The methodology described in that section is a major element of our study as the research design itself serves as much to the resolution of our purpose as the ensuing analysis.

Chapter 3 introduces our theoretical framework and the concepts used in our thesis. After providing a deeper look into the current state of research regarding museum entrepreneurship, we introduce an experimental concept of metamorphosis which we then apply to museum entrepreneurship. Child-museum-entrepreneurship, the result of this metamorphosis of museum
entrepreneurship becomes one of the two main concepts defining our theoretical framework, together with public entrepreneurship.

Chapter 4 takes us into the Naval Museum, exploring its context and the practices at play through the prism of the values of museum workers. In the same movement, we make light of some phenomena that emerge or seem to have the potential to emerge at the museum. This part is not merely a restitution of empirical material, but also reflects our interpretative work and, as such, displays the results of several stages of our analytical process.

In chapter 5, our interpretative work about life at the Naval Museum meets our theoretical framework. In this part, we infuse child-museum-entrepreneurship with public entrepreneurship in the context of the Naval Museum and elaborate on a potential conceptualization of values and desires within museum entrepreneurship.

Finally, chapter 6 concludes our endeavor as we summarize our thoughts, answer our research questions, and make explicit our contribution.

2 Methodology

2.1 Philosophical assumptions

As a central building brick to our research design, we need to ponder about the research philosophy that guides our approach. Being aware of the state of mind we are in and of the philosophical assumptions we make as we devise our methodology and conduct our research is necessary in order to create a coherent piece and to understand why we make the choices we do (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). Self-awareness allows us to reflect upon the relevance of our various decisions along the research process and gives us the possibility to critically evaluate our own choices. Lindgren and Packendorff
(2007) note that entrepreneurship research tends to be somewhat unified in its philosophical stance, leading to rare and unreflective discussions on these aspects. Such an absence of debate around topics revolving around the definition and perception of reality, knowledge and the impact of the researcher’s values induces a risk for an acceptance by default of simplistic views and positions lacking nuance. We will aim, in the upcoming subsections and throughout the presentation of our methodology, at avoiding such shortcomings, and strive to present instead a detailed and nuanced depiction of our stance.

Three philosophical assumptions that guide our thought process will be discussed in the following sections: ontological assumptions, epistemological assumptions, and axiological assumptions.

2.1.1 Ontological assumptions

A discussion of our ontological assumptions is critical in order to fully understand our approach and understanding of reality within the frame of our research. The vision we hold of reality in the context of this research informs the quality of our observations and interpretations. It defines the legitimacy in and of itself of any form of interpretative work.

Our research fundamentally aims at including people, values and desires in the academic discussion around museum entrepreneurship as a field of research. As such, we tackle questions that we see as intrinsically individual, based on people’s own lived experiences. This entails that one person’s reality is defined by these experiences, cannot exist objectively, and cannot be conceived as permanent in any given form, as reality and the conception of reality evolve concurrently to life experiences. Reality is an evolving process, and every person is living and developing their own individual reality (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018).
In addition to this double depiction of reality from a subject’s perspective, reality being not only in a constant state of redefinition but also subjective to each and every individual, our vision of reality as researchers must allow for a multiplicity of interpretations. In this, we summon social constructionism as a useful perspective that finds a clear application in our case. In such a view, social interactions are central in the creation of knowledge (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2007; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018), not only on an individual level but also during the conduct of qualitative research, defined by interactions between researchers and subjects. We mostly subscribe to a view where ‘social reality’ is constituted by the efforts of the researchers and by the research itself (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). The knowledge created through research then constitutes one version of reality, developing in its own world and self-realizing – it becomes reality because it has been researched as a version of reality. Our research objective, opening the door for alternative ways of understanding museum entrepreneurship, is fundamentally set in accordance with this vision, in the sense that refusing to recognize the strict existence of one single reality automatically renders inapplicable any claim that entrepreneurship theory should be applied in a certain way. Rather, this philosophical approach allows us to summon various potential theories or concepts around entrepreneurship (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2007) and to assert our interpretative stance throughout this research.

2.1.2 Epistemological assumptions

Having clarified our ontological assumptions, we can derive from them the epistemological assumptions that guide our research and discuss our understanding of knowledge within the frame of this research.

In many respects, our epistemological assumptions follow those connected to the interpretivist research philosophy. Emphasizing that “humans are different
from physical phenomena because they create meanings” (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016, p.136), interpretivism considers that social meanings are given by and to humans depending on their social realities rather than ascribed by universal laws. In such a view, epistemological assumptions have us focus on individual understandings, sense-making, and interpretations. Considering that reality is explored, within the frame of our research, as an individual setting both ascribed to each person and in constant evolution, the knowledge attributed to it must be seen as a construct. In that sense, data itself only exists insofar as it is created by the sense-making process, taking place during the research process and the interactions with (and between) the researchers. Data is then understood not for the value it carries, but rather for the meaning given to it (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). Data can therefore not be collected, which would imply that it already exists. Instead, we consider that it can be created through social interactions and gathered by the researcher as notes and recordings, to be subsequently processed into codes.

Such considerations are central in our epistemological approach and have us acknowledge that 1) interviewees, and the subjects of our observations in general, are not purveyors of truth (Alvesson, 2003), as truth as such only exists through the interactions between the subject and the researchers (as well as in between the researchers in our case), 2) the ‘data’ gathered through interviews and other methods is dependent on every element of the setting, and must be recognized as both unique and situational (Alvesson, 2003; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018).

Finally, if knowledge cannot be collected as objective truth, if it is unique and dependent on the data gathering setting, we must recognize the prominence of interpretation and analysis work in the creation and processing of knowledge (Alvesson, 2003). This conclusion to our epistemological stance is vital as it constitutes the core of our approach: we gather ‘data’ from museum employees and we aim, through analysis, to identify and interpret meanings stemming
from the data in a way that has not been done before in the field of museum entrepreneurship, thereby potentializing the role of values and desires in the academic field of museum entrepreneurship.

2.1.3 Axiological assumptions

Given the interpretative stance we adopt to conduct this study and the importance, demonstrated above, of our own thoughts and ideas in the analytical process, it is necessary to increase our self-awareness and to ponder the importance of our own values and judgments as researchers within the frame of this study. It is clear, given the previous considerations, that every step of the data gathering and analysis process is marked by our own views and that the decisions we take are our own. But beyond this claim which, we gather, can certainly be applied to the majority of research projects, axiology must be recognized here as a central part of our research proposal, to begin with (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018), and we as researchers must acknowledge that we have an influence on the research (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). Even though the development of our research purpose finds support in the extant literature and partially explored phenomena, it is our own views and what we consider as potentially important, i.e., the values and special characteristics entailed in museum work, that made us decide to explore this topic in the first place. Other researchers, given the same information as we have gathered, may not have found this topic to be of importance or may have instead concluded that museum entrepreneurship should indeed take a positivistic stance.

Additionally, we strive to open the realm of possibilities when considering museum work, philosophically speaking. Delving into questions of values held by museum workers has us questioning fundamental elements such as employees’ intrinsic motivations for working at the museum, their desires, and
the potential for evolution as human beings. In this sense, we are exploring whether museum entrepreneurship, if conceptualized with such priorities in mind, may have the potential to contribute to social emancipation (Guba & Lincoln, 2005) and the development of a new becoming.

2.2 Research design

Our philosophical stance clarified, we now proceed to elaborate the research design as a framework for our study. A qualitative approach is necessary in our case to deeply explore the values and desires of our subjects and to capture both verbal and non-verbal elements that transpire during social interactions. A multi-methods approach is adopted and will be detailed in a later section.

2.2.1 Methodological purpose

The methodology used in our research takes an exploratory stance, as we strive to understand more about a phenomenon (Thomas, 2011): make light of the values and desires carried by museum employees in the specific context of the Naval Museum. Only after conducting such an exploratory work can we be able to reflect upon the potential that these values and desires hold for a new form of becoming in museum entrepreneurship.

To fulfill this purpose, and in the logical continuation of our philosophical stance, an interpretative approach is naturally followed and has us engage in a discussion between our empirical observations and theory (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019), as well as with our own thoughts and values as indicated through the axiology surrounding the project and discussed earlier. This interpretative stance can help us inform praxis (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018), not forcing us into the elaboration of new frameworks or theories but rather unlocking the academic discussion in the field of entrepreneurship in
the context of museums. Furthermore, taking a reflexive view on our methodology, we subscribe to the idea that while building upon empirical material would hardly allow us to devise reliable theories, this empirical material can instead be a precious source of inspiration and allow for exploration and the opening of new perspectives, as is the aim of our study (Alvesson, 2003).

This last point can be explored further by looking through the lens of normative theory, which would have us pass judgments based on today’s observations in order to work for a more desirable future (Schwandt & Gates, 2018; Thacher, 2006). This view, value-laden at its core, is coherent with our approach and axiology. By reflecting on the case of the Naval Museum, we aim at contributing to the discussion about museum entrepreneurship by inviting values and desires carried by museum workers into the debate. Such an endeavor is pursued not for any form of personal gain, but rather because we believe that a more ‘desirable’ (in our view) future for society may be attained by having this debate, and by exploring the potentialization of values and desires in museum entrepreneurship.

To summarize, our approach is multi-faceted in its objectives. It is exploratory in methodological terms, as this approach allows us to better understand certain phenomena at play. It is also normative in that it aims at enhancing the debate around entrepreneurship in museum contexts in the hope of a more ‘desirable’ future. It is however important to note that this normative character does not extend to the results of our research: we are interested in opening a debate oriented towards the direction of ‘enhancement’, not promoting the exact results of our research which can rather be considered as an illustration of that ‘enhancement’.
2.2.2 Research strategy

Our philosophical stance and methodological purpose being now clarified, we proceed to describe the strategy used to reach our objectives.

Through this research, we aim to better understand the phenomena at play when discussing values in relation to museum entrepreneurship. It is our belief that at the early stage where the academic discussion on museum entrepreneurship finds itself, learning can mostly be done on-site rather than through the extant literature, which is still rather discreet. Furthermore, we subscribe to the idea that knowledge in social sciences is most likely necessarily situated in a specific context (Flyvbjerg, 2004), and that context-free claims of universality in such theory should be taken with the greatest caution. As such, studying phenomena happening in a specific context can be seen as fundamentally relevant, as interpretation of certain knowledge can best be done when studying it in its context (Flyvbjerg, 2004).

Such considerations led us to choose the case study as a favored research strategy for our study. Exploring the real-life setting of a museum allows us to better catch certain meanings and behaviors that might otherwise elude us when considered from afar (Schwandt & Gates, 2018; Flyvbjerg, 2004). Connecting to our epistemological stance, we also recognize the case study as a relevant way to identify and develop new perspectives in the theoretical and philosophical consideration of museum entrepreneurship (Eisenhardt, 1989). As we are studying a context-bound case and phenomenon, we necessarily learn from this specific context, and our interpretations and analyses of the knowledge studied are necessarily empirically valid – which does not, by any means, imply that they are necessarily good or of high quality, but rather that they are backed by interpretation of reality (Eisenhardt, 1989; Flyvbjerg, 2004).

A flaw usually ascribed to case studies is their tendency to produce idiosyncratic theory and findings that are difficult to generalize (Eisenhardt,
1989; Yin, 2014), as a case is necessarily heavily anchored in its context and serves to study special phenomena and provide empirical knowledge based on that context, not universal truths. We hear this criticism of the strategy, but do not consider it an issue in our case. Our research aims at expanding the scope of what could be considered when studying and conceptualizing museum entrepreneurship. We aim at broadening the debate within museum entrepreneurship and present perspectives through which researchers may want to include values in their conception of museum entrepreneurship. The generalization of our findings is not an objective. Furthermore, the specific context of the Naval Museum provides an opportunity rather than an obstacle (Dubois & Gadde, 2002) as it allows a specific interpretative work that sees us dive arguably deeper into the ‘whys’ and ‘whats’ of our subject than other methods would.

2.2.3 Presentation of the case

The Naval Museum, located on the island of Stumholmen in Karlskrona and bathing in the Baltic Sea, is dedicated to the history of the Swedish navy. It is part of SMTM (Statens Maritima och Transporthistoriska Museer), a Swedish governmental agency comprising five museums whose activities revolve around the themes of maritime and transport history. As a governmental museum placed under the Swedish Ministry of Culture, it epitomizes the double promise of administrating and preserving heritage while providing a service of societal interest. The museum is also evolving under the Museum Law enacted in 2017, affirming its role in society and giving it a form of official independence from the administration in the daily running of its activity. As a strategy and action plan were being devised in early 2021 to guide the activity of the museum for the coming years, the museum’s leadership took it upon itself to explicitly explore the pursuit of social value creation through its activity.
In this context, the Naval Museum shows great promise as a case to delve into in the frame of our study. Several employees have been interested in exploring ways to pursue their societal mission and have set their aim, over the year preceding this research, on both defining the social value that they strive to create and the ways to achieve this objective. Entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial methods are to be found among the different leads they have been exploring to reach this goal. We need to clarify: we are not, in the scope of this study, looking at how entrepreneurship may be or may have been implemented or tested at the museum. However, it can be argued that the curiosity displayed by the museum employees that have been involved in this endeavor may have gotten them to start thinking to some extent, although not necessarily consciously, about what they believe is important in their work, which may ultimately facilitate the disclosing of their values during the frame of our research. We understand that such a consideration may be seen by some as a drawback, but our epistemological stance would rather have us take this as just one of many possible manifestations of ‘reality’.

On more practical terms, access to the Naval Museum as a field of research was made easy as one of us authors had performed an internship there in the few months preceding the study and created sufficient contact with several employees and with the management to facilitate the organization of this research project. This previous experience also gave us some initial knowledge of the organization, which we believe simplified the work of exploring the values and desires of museum workers at the Naval Museum.

2.2.4 **Unit of analysis**

As we strive to shed light on values and desires in the context of the Naval Museum, our unit of analysis is set on the employees of the museum as a primary choice. The organizational structure of the museum may complicate
things: employees are divided into departments and units, one of which is the ‘Naval Museum unit’, yet several employees from other departments and units (Collection, Communication…) are also working partly or entirely with and for the service of the Naval Museum. For matters of clarity, we include all those employees, working ‘with and for’ the Naval Museum, within our unit of analysis, even though they may not officially belong to the Naval Museum unit. Even as we identify specific individuals that receive our main attention in the data gathering process, we care to maintain a holistic perspective and remember to consider the context as a whole (Thomas, 2011).

Over the course of this paper, we often refer to these employees as ‘museum workers’, for two reasons. We find that ‘worker’ is a more inclusive word to refer to all people working ‘with and for’ the museum, who may not all be ‘employees’ of SMTM in a strict sense. This term is also generally preferred as it carries, in our eyes, an active dimension of ‘somebody that does something’, which we do not find as readily in the term ‘employee’, which rather seems to refer to a passive administrative status.

2.3 Theory development

Our research is focused on the case of the Naval Museum, where we explore the values of museum workers and attempt to give our contextualized interpretations the possibility, a chance, to be integrated into future considerations about museum entrepreneurship. To that aim, an abductive approach to theory development is understood as the most appropriate method. We do not follow the most literal translation of what abductive reasoning is often said to be, the identification and selection of the most plausible hypothesis in a given case (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). Instead, we understand abduction as a process fueled by an iterative discussion between the empirical world and theory that, in the end, allows us to produce an
interpretative and analytical text that potentializes the integration of values and desires into the research field of museum entrepreneurship (Bryant & Charmaz, 2007). This approach is fundamentally in phase with our constructivist and interpretivist stance, as it relies on a hermeneutical dialogue and constant analysis of what is being observed (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018).

In concrete terms, the abductive approach that we implement in our research consists of a back and forth between gathering empirical data, interpreting this data, identifying theories in the literature that seem to connect to patterns or ideas that emerge from the analysis of empirical material, and taking inspiration from these theories or frameworks to proceed to a more informed and focused next phase of data gathering. This back and forth allow us to capture the essence of both the empirical world and theoretical visions, concepts, and ideas (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).

Another element defining our approach is the potential for the evolution of our ideas and theories along the way. As we gather more data and analyze it at every step of the way, some ideas or concepts considered as potential choices for our theoretical framework, for example after the first stage of empirical data gathering, get redirected and act as a stepping stone to other, more relevant or interesting theories (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). This constant evolution of our frame of reference throughout our research process is the essence of what makes it a useful approach in creating the potential for integrating values and desires into the academic field of museum entrepreneurship.

We insist that the theories that we eventually select and explore in the frame of our study must be seen as a tool that allows us to produce a theoretical contribution to the debate on the place of values in the conceptualization of museum entrepreneurship (Thomas, 2011). It is therefore important to mention that while a presentation of the theories eventually explored is necessary so as
to ensure a good understanding of the subject, these theories are only to be seen as the theoretical framework that allows, in the end, the production of our theoretical contribution.

Additional details about our choices and implementation of methods for data gathering and analysis will be given in the next sub-sections.

2.4 Data gathering
To explore the empirical world, a variety of methods are used in our abductive process in accordance with our interpretative stance. During the data gathering process, we kept in mind the consideration, stemming from our social constructivist perspective, that all empirical work is defined by interactions between subjects and researchers, making us necessarily a part of the world that we study (Lindgren & Packendorff, 2007). Our interpretivist view is also marked by the consideration that “everything is data” (Stern, 2007, p.115), and that our observations focus not only on words and actions but also interactions, expressions, etc. Note that the use of several methods for data gathering in our design is not done for the purpose of triangulation, which would have us work towards accuracy of data, but rather in an attempt at revealing new perspectives and getting as close as possible to values and desires enacted by museum employees, allowing further interpretation and analysis (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).

Three main types of data were gathered during the study: secondary data, primary observation data, and primary interview data.

Secondary data
Secondary data refers in our case to audio-visual material such as the museum website or an organizational meeting recording, as well as other documents
such as the museum’s strategy plan, public policies, or even workshop creations, such as collages. From employees. In a general sense, secondary data was gathered early in the data gathering process, and mostly before any type of primary data. Information from secondary data is used primarily to increase our initial knowledge about the museum and SMTM, and as such played an important role as the foundation for understanding the context in which the Naval Museum is situated. Secondary data also provides us with additional information and representation of the museum practices (Creswell & Poth, 2017), and generally fuels our empirical understanding and interpretation.

To motivate our research aim and purpose, in addition to secondary data, we gathered valuable sources of primary data by exploring the empirical world. The primary data gathered can be categorized in two main ways: observation and interviews. Our approach allows for flexibility to move between analysis of the data gathered and observational work, with the intent to improve or supplement our understanding of the material or to help generate new ideas for interpretation (Eisenhardt, 1989).

Observation

The observation phase took place at an early stage and paved the way to a better understanding of the context and characteristics of the museum work environment and practices. It initially granted us some precious insights into how a day working at the Naval Museum can be. In addition, as the first step in our abductive process, observation gave birth to the first insights from the empirical world and contributed to the development of ideas and preliminary directions for research of relevant theory (Layder, 2013). The observation was chiefly done through shadowing, following our subjects in their environment, and trying not to interfere in their activities, in a naturalistic way (Lincoln,
Lynham & Guba, 2018). This shadowing allowed us to capture first-hand elements pertaining to everyday life that may not otherwise have been expressed in, for example, an interview situation (McDonald, 2005). Additionally, we were on one occasion invited to participate in a collage workshop hosted by the employee we were shadowing at that time. Switching from our usual role of observers as participants, taking notes from a distance without getting involved in the activity, to participants as observers where we engaged in activities on-site, allowed us to embrace various perspectives on the events happening in the museum and to capture different types of data, such as casual discussions or a certain atmosphere (Creswell & Poth, 2017).

We followed three employees, selected beforehand, for a duration varying from two to four hours each. During these shadowing sessions, we took note of all data emerging, regardless of whether it seemed directly relevant to our study or did not have any form of connection that was immediately apparent. Such notes include notably the actions taken by the subject, certain words or expressions pronounced, observations of their movements, attitudes and reactions, as well as depictions of their interactions with colleagues or visitors.

The three employees that we followed were initially selected because they are all in direct contact with visitors as a central part of their work at the museum, even as they hold different positions. We made this choice as we thought that this front-facing characteristic was appropriate in that early stage of the study, allowing us to get an overview of the practice of museum work in contact with visitors before gradually going behind the scenes. We acknowledge that such a decision necessarily has an impact on which themes and ideas emerged from the data, but we must state that every starting point could be met with this comment. We were aware of this component as we were performing the shadowing and tried to take it into account as we were analyzing the ensuing notes. We expect that this aspect has been somewhat mitigated as we pursued
our later investigation by interacting with other museum workers holding less front-facing positions.

In addition to shadowing, we conducted general on-site observation in a way to build rapport with the research participants and to experience the field at our own pace. During the entire observation period, we stayed alert to our surroundings and considered occasions such as coffee talk and digressions in coordination meetings as potentially holding value in the information they convey. Such observation can also be treated as a rich source of insights and is worth taking note of (Corbin & Strauss, 2015), which proved correct in our case.

Interviews

In the second stage of our primary data gathering process, we conducted interviews with six museum workers holding different positions, including at management level, intending for rich and diversified insights to emerge. Considering the exploratory nature of the study, semi-structured interviews were conducted, giving the interviewees the freedom to reflect and contemplate in their own way while remaining relevant to the research purpose (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016).

As a central part of our abductive process, coding categories were initially defined after the first shadowings, and from thereon regularly revised (see final coding categories in appendix 1). The coding process will be described in detail in the next section. The resulting categories from this coding, at each stage of the data gathering process, were translated into a directional interview guide and thematized into discussion topics, each containing several questions. As we strive to explore and investigate a phenomenon and to make light of values and desires, the questions written in the interview guide were not to be followed strictly but rather considered for guiding and eliciting purpose
(Corbin & Strauss, 2015). As a result, the questions asked and discussion points taken up could vary and be tailored to the respective interviewee, whilst the focus of the interview was placed on the interaction with the interviewees and our adaptability to the content of the discussion (Thomas, 2011).

All interviews lasted approximately one hour, save for one interview lasting 20 minutes to fit the availability of the respondent. Two out of six interviews were performed on-site while the others were conducted digitally due to time and cost constraints. Conducting several interviews in person gave us the chance to build physical connections and to sense the subtle reactions of the interviewees, which was crucial in conducting in-depth qualitative interviews. Each interview was recorded for later transcription.

**Sampling**

Through our design, we strive to understand the world of the Naval Museum and how the values and desires of museum workers were enacted. Being aware of the scope and time constraints of our research project, we acknowledged that we would not be able to establish contact with all museum workers at the Naval Museum, as we certainly would try to if time allowed, so as to conduct a truly comprehensive exploration. Instead, we adopted the maximum variation sampling strategy, aiming at gathering a diversity of viewpoints with the hope of capturing varied and complementary perspectives (Creswell & Poth, 2017). We set an objective of 7 to 10 museum workers that would hopefully participate in the study, whose selection was based on the variety of their respective positions at the museum, on our previous knowledge of the organization and of their respective work tasks, and with the help of the organizational developer of the museum. Together with the organizational developer, we eventually selected three employees to shadow and another six employees to interview (see table 1 below).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shadowing</th>
<th>Role at the museum</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum Host</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>2h 15min</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibition Host</td>
<td>Fredrik</td>
<td>2h 0min</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Officer</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>4h 0min</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Role at the museum</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>1h 8min</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>1h 13min</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Librarian</td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>1h 10min</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Director</td>
<td>Mats</td>
<td>20min</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Visitor Experience</td>
<td>Susanne</td>
<td>1h 15min</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Education Unit</td>
<td>Malin</td>
<td>1h 5min</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Participants in the data gathering process. (Source: authors)

2.5 Data analysis

In several respects, our research design finds a large inspiration in grounded theory methods, which comes further to light when it comes to our data analysis process. Yet, we do not join the ranks of the many researchers who, according to Bryant and Charmaz (2007), claim to apply a grounded theory method on the sole basis of conceptual resemblances with their own research design. Rather, we acknowledge that we take inspiration from the heuristic approach that defines grounded theory methods and subscribe to its general philosophy, yet without strictly applying a grounded theory method ourselves.
As described previously, the analysis of the material took place all along our process. When time allowed, each day of data collection was immediately followed by transcribing -whether from notes stemming from observations or interviews-, coding, and analysis of the data, with the double objective of adapting our data collection methods to the actual needs of the study and of continuously enriching our theoretical framework and our interpretation of the data gathered. Through this process, we aimed at producing interpretations inherently backed by reality (Eisenhardt, 1989). The steps taken throughout this process will be further detailed in the following sub-sections.

2.5.1 Coding philosophy

While we did not strictly use the coding techniques prescribed in various versions of grounded theory method, we took inspiration from them to deploy an interpretation of the data grounded in the empirical world and framed in theories to identify. The spirit of coding in grounded theory is found insofar as we first attempted to capture how our subjects expressed their feelings and thoughts (Charmaz, 2006), with their vocabulary and within the script of their reality (Alvesson, 2003). Part of the coding was therefore done in vivo, keeping the original essence of the material to the best of our ability (Charmaz, 2006), and focusing on the subjects’ own experiences and phrasing (Gioia, Corley & Hamilton, 2012). Our codes were therefore not predetermined but rather emerged from our observations (Hood, 2007).

As we pursued deeper our coding endeavor, we were able to capture a view of reality, expressed not only by our subjects but necessarily also by us as researchers (Charmaz, 2006). We gradually ascribe our own understandings, our own vocabulary, as codes onto the data (Gioia, Corley & Hamilton, 2012) and from such interpretative work, we identify concepts or ideas that may find an echo in existing theories or frameworks. As our understanding of the
phenomena under study and our interpretative stance evolve with time, we consider both our data and our codes as dynamic items which also have the potential for revision and evolution as the study goes on (Hood, 2007). We do not aim at theory development or generation per se, but we do get inspiration from data while resting upon existing theories or frameworks to devise a potential way of integrating values and desires into the discussion on museum entrepreneurship.

2.5.2 Iterative abductive process in action
In this sub-section, we will describe the implementation of our abductive process as introduced previously, using coding as a central point of attention connecting every step. The coding of the data successively gathered was made in two main stages, each marked by several steps, and is summarized in table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Coding level</th>
<th>Initial and focused coding (inspired)</th>
<th>Thematic coding (inspired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>1st level</td>
<td>280 codes</td>
<td>20 codes (6 to 7 per shadowing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd level</td>
<td>98 codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd level</td>
<td>17 codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>4th level</td>
<td>8 codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5th level</td>
<td>11 codes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6th level</td>
<td>10 codes (separation context-practice // values)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Coding process. (Source: authors)
2.5.2.1 Iterative abductive process – Stage One

The first stage allowed us to identify common elements in the values held by museum workers. It also allowed us to get a first understanding of what museum work entails, both in terms of individual tasks, responsibility, and shared attributes. This first stage covers the notes gathered through the shadowing of three employees on two different days. The process in this first stage was first implemented onto the first two shadowings and completed in the same manner immediately after the third shadowing was performed. Two complementary methods were initially used:

- One of us co-authors produced a form of initial coding inspired by grounded theory method (Charmaz, 2006), where every line of observation was given one or several unique codes, which we designated as ‘first-level codes’. A total of 280 unique first-level codes were produced from the three shadowings. Following a principle of data reduction, they were combined into 98 second-level codes, which were finally reduced down to 17 third-level codes through a form of focused coding inspired by the same iteration of grounded theory method (Charmaz, 2006). In-vivo codes were used all along this process and allowed us to stick as close to our subjects’ expressed reality as possible. Approximately half of the third-order codes were still phrased in-vivo.

- At the same time, the second co-author performed a form of individual thematic coding, looking for patterns and themes that would emerge from the study of the raw data of each observation (Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2016). This coding produced 6 to 7 codes per individual shadowing, for a total of 20 codes.

After analysis and combination of the results stemming from these two entry points, a set of 8 fourth-level categories was devised, 4 of which were named
in-vivo. These fourth-level codes marked a critical step in our iterative work, as they represented the first instance of in-depth sense-making of the data gathered. This 8-categories coding chart was used not only to prepare for the first interviews but also as an empirical basis to look for theories or concepts in literature on entrepreneurship that might resonate with the codes.

2.5.2.2 Iterative abductive process – Stage Two

This threshold represents the transition to the second stage of coding as the remaining 8 categories were then used in several consecutive interviews. These categories were continually updated, based on the one hand on their analytical potential and on the other hand on their apparent relevance and faithfulness. A first look into literature was performed at the fourth-level coding, giving us several ideas and leads but still only having a marginal influence on the iterative process so far. After conducting, transcribing, and analyzing the first interview, we reached fifth-level coding, comprised of 11 categories, including several points that would, later on, be understood as ‘potentials’ or ‘phenomena’.

Two more interviews led us to sixth-level coding, where another threshold was reached as we managed to make a distinction between, on the one side, the context and practice of museum work, and values on the other side. These sixth-level categories allowed us to further deepen our research into literature which, this time, provided promising and precise answers which, as a result, had a rather strong influence on the last three interviews, while the coding categories themselves saw their role concurrently diminishing. This switch from coding to literature as the main support for the last three interviews allowed us to focus on the exploration of potentials and phenomena in addition to values, giving birth to or developing several interpretations.
Finally, as our data gathering process was complete following the final interviews, the sixth-level codes were confirmed and refined, and several phenomena were identified or redefined. Meanwhile, we were able to confirm our theoretical framework with the help of the final codes, values, and phenomena, and proceed to the analysis combining all these elements.

A representation of the main steps of the process described above can be found in figure 1.

2.6 Quality criteria

As has been developed in previous sections, the approach we take in this study takes the features of an interpretative practice and is anchored in social constructionism. In such an approach, we emphasized certain assumptions that have a direct impact on how ‘data’ can be created and interpreted. We consider that reality cannot exist objectively, that it is instead subjective and in a perpetual state of redefinition. We also see that the meaning ascribed to what we, as researchers, both jointly and individually observe, is the result of a construct marked by social interactions, sense-making, and contextualized interpretations. People’s lived experiences are at the center of attention in our research, but we acknowledge that our own values and visions necessarily give a certain shade to our interpretations as we set to make sense of realities necessarily unknown to us.

Yet, taking an interpretative stance does not grant us the liberty to conduct our research as we please and to claim its quality on the sole pretense that it rests upon interpretative grounds. We must indeed be able to demonstrate that, despite its interpretative character, our research is to be trusted as a serious endeavor (Schwandt, 2007). We will strive, in the following paragraphs, to answer the question asked by Lincoln, Lynham and Guba: “Are we interpretively rigorous?” (2018, p.138).
Figure 1. Iterative abductive process. (Source: authors)

To that end, we see in trustworthiness and authenticity two useful concepts, developed with the aim of satisfying specificities pertaining to naturalistic
interpretative approaches (Lincoln & Guba, 1986), for assessing the reliability of our work.

2.6.1 Trustworthiness

The proposed assessment of the trustworthiness of our paper is made via the analysis of our methodology in the light of four quality criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability, the last two of which will be considered together.

2.6.1.1 Credibility

As we consider reality to be a subjective experience, we cannot pretend to explore or reveal a reality that would take place in the empirical world. However, as we forge our own realities and try to reconstruct our subjects’ respective realities, we must strive to improve the match between our interpretation of their reality and their own interpretation of their reality (Wigren, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). To the aim of improving this credibility, several elements are to be considered.

First, a somewhat prolonged engagement in the field has been performed, as one of us has previously been involved in the Naval Museum’s work and has been, during a period of several months, working at the Naval Museum as an intern and in regular contact with most respondents. This immersion in the setting of the Naval Museum increases the chances that our interpretation of respondents’ reality, as expressed during our interactions, matches somewhat closely their own interpretation of their reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

To strengthen the credibility of our research, we also presented our respondents with an account of our findings in the form of an advanced draft of our research. In this draft, the entirety of our written interpretative work
with regard to their accounts was present in an advanced form, where some grammatical rephrasing might still be done but without impacting the meaning or the content. By sending this draft, we gave the respondents a chance to make comments or suggest corrections if they felt that their words and actions had been misinterpreted (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). Following the transmission of the draft in question to all respondents, we received one comment regarding the meaning of a sentence leading us to its rephrasing, and several suggestions to improve museum-specific vocabulary.

We mentioned earlier that we are not using triangulation, the use of several data gathering methods, for the purpose of checking the accuracy of our data, which is worth developing here. On this matter, we partly subscribe to the argument put forth by Guba and Lincoln (1989), who consider that triangulation carries a positivistic understanding as it aims at confirming the existence of a phenomenon. Such a view cannot be compatible with our approach as we are interested in exploring values and constructions of reality, which cannot, by ontological logic, be checked through triangulation, as they are dependent on everyone’s own reality. However, the use of different methods throughout our abductive data gathering process did help us in developing concepts, ideas, and possible interpretations that a sole method may not have uncovered, or not in the same way (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). Our initial observations performed through shadowing, coupled both with the use of secondary data aimed at better understanding the context as well as pre-existing knowledge about both the individuals and the organization, led us in certain directions while conducting interviews, directions which we may not have followed had we not varied our methods of data gathering.
2.6.1.2 Transferability

The transferability of our study must be differentiated from the research of generalization, which is not the objective. We emphasize the importance of the uniqueness of our case and the context in which it is situated. Through this case study, we aim at developing an example of how values can be integrated into a theory of entrepreneurship in a museum – in this case, the Swedish Naval Museum. It is, by construction, not generalizable, given the necessary uniqueness of its context. However, we aim at making the results of this study transferable, in the sense that they could inspire the conduct of similar endeavors in other contexts (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Throughout this paper, we strive to provide thick descriptions that display as clearly as possible the context and culture in which the case is situated, facilitating the transferability of our research (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019; Guba & Lincoln, 1989). By providing a rich and contextualized account of the phenomena observed and explored, we hope to provide a solid basis for the transferability of our results. It is worth noting, however, that the inclusion of a rich context in the presentation of our study is not initially made for the purpose of transferability. Rather, it is a fundamental part of the analysis, without which none of the work proposed here could have seen the light. In a case such as ours based on social constructionism, context is not a pretext for transferability; rather, we see transferability as a natural and logical result of our work, one which we hopefully reach in the eyes of our readers.

2.6.1.3 Dependability and confirmability

The criteria of dependability and confirmability put forth by Lincoln and Guba (1986) respectively aim at ensuring that our research process is logical and traceable (Wigren, 2007) and that outcomes and analyses are indeed the result
of our (interpretative) work and not “simply figments of the evaluator’s imagination” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p.243).

While no inquiry audit has been performed to this aim, we can attest to the fact that we paid close and rigorous attention to the documentation of our process during the whole duration of the study. All notes stemming from our observation and shadowing, initially taken on paper, have been reproduced in a digital format, and all recordings have been faithfully transcribed. Several drawings and diagrams, having greatly contributed to the development of our analytical framework, have been immortalized by photos and saved digitally. The present document has been saved and archived in close to 20 versions at various stages of its redaction, where the evolution of our work can be witnessed. To this, can be added a myriad of complementary digital worksheets where notes, thoughts, and partial or full textual developments reflect the progression of our work and interpretations. The entirety of these documents is presently stored in a Microsoft OneDrive repository.

Through the existence and accessibility of this repository and the documents it contains, we believe that our research would achieve dependability, were an inquiry audit to be conducted. Likewise, we consider that confirmability can be demonstrated through the study of the numerous documents and diagrams illustrating the evolution of our thoughts and the logic behind our interpretations.

2.6.2 Authenticity

In addition to the four criteria of trustworthiness dedicated to assessing the quality and reliability of the methodology, Lincoln and Guba (1986) developed criteria of authenticity which are more deeply rooted in social constructivism and focus on assessing the respect of some of its fundamental assumptions. (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018). These criteria prove more difficult to fulfill
in a small-scale project such as ours, and the limitations of time and scope in our research did not allow for their full consideration. Yet, we discuss in this section how we believe that the criteria of fairness and, to a certain extent, ontological authenticity, were fulfilled through this research project. Additionally, we open the door to the possible application of three additional quality criteria: educational, catalytic, and tactical authenticity.

2.6.2.1 Fairness

Our study aims at exploring and interpreting the values found in museum workers at the Naval Museum. This aim led us to seek the voice of employees in various corners of the museum, holding very different positions, spread across levels of hierarchy, and holding a variety of viewpoints on their activity. It is important that these voices be heard at equal levels and that, for example, a voice from the management does not smother one from a department employee. This balance and equality of treatment are what the criterion of fairness seeks to evaluate (Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018). We did our best to ensure the respect of this criterion throughout the research process, even as we designed our approach and discussed the possibilities for interviews throughout the museum with the organizational developer, who did not in any way try to prevent our search for a diversity of viewpoints and positions, instead rather encouraging it. The data gathered through observations and interviews were processed similarly regardless of the identity of their source, and both the conceptual design and visual presentation of the coding tools we devised placed all respondents on an equal level, to the point of almost being indiscernible from one another. We must however acknowledge that additional fairness would have been reached if we had been able to include museum workers representing all possible positions working at and with the museum, which has not been possible because of the limited time and scope of this study.
2.6.2.2 *Ontological authenticity*

Through a constructionist approach, it is expected that respondents and participants also gain from the process and can develop as they contribute to the study. To that aim, the criterion of ontological authenticity evaluates the extent to which respondents have learned and widened their understanding of their reality and their own constructions (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). It is, for now, difficult to assess to which extent this criterion has been fulfilled, as the short timeframe within which the research was conducted did not allow for any form of audits during the process itself. We did, however, receive comments from several of our respondents after our respective shadowing or interviews as well as after transmission of our draft, indicating that our exchanges pushed them to think more deeply about their own views and understandings. Such comments can be seen as proof of contribution to the criterion of ontological authenticity.

2.6.2.3 *Educational, catalytic, and tactical authenticity*

While ontological authenticity means to show the improvement of stakeholders’ understanding of their own constructions, educational authenticity refers to their enhanced understanding of other people’s constructions and reality. As for catalytic and tactical authenticity, they respectively refer to the extent to which participation in this research project facilitates the possibility for action based on its findings, and the degree to which stakeholders feel empowered to act (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2018).

We believe and hope that our research, and the ensuing reading of this thesis, will contribute to those three criteria as well and that museum workers at the Naval Museum will indeed get an enhanced understanding of each other’s
reality, that action will be facilitated and that they will feel empowered to act upon it. However, such considerations cannot be explored or proven as of now, as the thesis in its entirety has not yet been produced and reflected upon. While we wish that the research process itself and respondents’ contribution to it may have sparked these elements, we will not make unfounded assumptions here and place instead our bets on the future appropriation of this thesis by the museum workers at the Naval Museum. In an attempt at increasing the chances for these emancipating quality criteria to be fulfilled, we will maintain contact with the Naval Museum even after the production of this report and be open to discussing these topics further with all stakeholders interested.

2.7 Ethical considerations
Ethics play a central part in the elaboration of the research design and should not be relegated to a secondary topic (Bell, Bryman & Harley, 2019). Four main areas are identified by Diener and Crandall as reported by Bell, Bryman and Harley (2019, p.114):

- “whether there is harm to participants
- whether there is a lack of informed consent
- whether there is an invasion of privacy
- whether deception is involved”

That harm to participants should be avoided at all costs holds a central place in our design, elaborated with this condition as a prerequisite. In particular, we need to acknowledge that our approach situates itself close to people’s feelings, emotions and thoughts, as we are striving to make light of and interpret their values and desires in the context of the museum and through critical analysis. The no-harm imperative was taken up on our initiative during
an initial meeting held with three representatives of the museum, where we made our intentions clear and emphasized that we wished above all to avoid creating negative consequences for anyone. We explicitly asked the museum’s representatives, who later came to be interview respondents themselves, to reroute or stop us if they ever felt that we were touching on too sensitive topics that may cause harm, even though we realized that such a scenario would entail a drastic reduction of the scope and ambition of our study. Such rerouting never occurred.

Confidentiality of data and respondents can also be a useful way of safeguarding against personal harm as a result of the study (ALLEA – ALL European Academies, 2017). In virtue of our research design, featuring a unique case study in a somewhat small work team where it appears clear, from previous experience at the Naval Museum, that ‘everybody knows everybody’, we found that indicating the identity of our respondents throughout our report would be difficult to avoid efficiently. Yet, we were ready to make the radical adjustments needed to ensure confidentiality, if it proved necessary. To that aim, every respondent to our study was asked whether they wished to participate anonymously, but all respondents gave their consent to have quotes as well as their first name explicitly written in the paper. As mentioned previously, all respondents were offered the possibility to check the exact quotes attributed to them in our report as well as the meaning assigned to their testimony, so as to prevent potential misunderstandings from harming them in any way.

Before each interview began, the ethical formality of obtaining consent from the interviewees was carried out (see appendix 2). All respondents were informed of the use that would be made of the data gathered through our interactions and were offered the possibility to retract from their consent at any moment, should they feel uncomfortable or for any other reason. However, as our data gathering methods, and particularly shadowing, involved taking notes
occasionally involving visitors, their reactions and interactions with museum workers, it was not possible for us to gather explicit consent from every visitor involved in our notetaking. To mitigate this aspect, we made sure during the writing of this thesis that no characteristic specific enough to any particular visitor that we encountered was detailed, so as to ascertain their anonymity.

Preventing invasion of privacy of the participants was seen as a major factor when devising the design of our research, particularly regarding interactions with our respondents. As we set to explore values and desires and tried to make light of other phenomena that may emerge during the research process, our line of inquiry was close to people’s own experiences, which entailed a possibility that some elements of the respondents’ personal life may make their way into the conversation. We applied our duty as researchers to clearly and strictly identify lines that we must not cross, even if we were led to believe that additional information may be interesting to us, and made sure to turn our gaze in case elements of a seemingly private nature were to take place in front of us. As respondents were offered the possibility to review the quotes and claims attributed to them, we believe that no invasion of privacy is to be reported in the conduct of this study.

Finally, we strived to prevent deception, defined by Bell, Bryman and Harley (2019, p.123) as “when researchers represent their research as something other than what it is”. Participants allocating their time, attention, and thoughts to our research deserve to be properly informed of our objectives and our topic. While we could not realistically make a detailed account of our whole approach to every participant, we strove to inform them of all major elements they needed to know in order to feel comfortable, as well as to answer their questions without fault. In addition, all interviews were introduced with our intent to explore and discuss some key points, such as what the interviewees found to be special or important in their work (see appendix 2). The respect for this ethical guideline proved to be delicate at times, as we were concerned
that revealing too much about our project or approach might, to some extent, influence our interactions with the respondents as well as the topics they wish to take up or elaborate upon. Concurrently, our research design relying on an iterative building process made it impossible for us to reveal any information regarding, for example, our theoretical framework, as it was in a constant state of redefinition. Therefore, we hope that despite a potential lack of clarity about our exact focus stemming from our research design, the respondents did not feel deceived in the process.

3 Theoretical framework

Our theoretical framework rests upon two main concepts which will, in the final phase of the analysis, meet and complete each other in order to potentialize values in museum entrepreneurship: child-museum-entrepreneurship and public entrepreneurship. While public entrepreneurship as introduced and used here stems entirely from the existing literature, we need to proceed in several steps to give birth to child-museum-entrepreneurship as a new concept, which will be detailed in this section.

3.1 Child-museum-entrepreneurship

To define the concept of child-museum-entrepreneurship, we proceed in three steps. First, we take a deeper look into the literature on museum entrepreneurship as a phenomenon and as a field of academic interest. We then summon a concept of metamorphosis adapted from Nietzsche’s work and, in a final step, apply this metamorphosis to museum entrepreneurship so as to give birth to child-museum-entrepreneurship as a central concept in this study.
3.1.1 Museum entrepreneurship

The phenomenon of museums becoming more entrepreneurial often seems to be accompanied by a discussion around increased demands for marketing strategies and other business capacities, making the museums more business-like (Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Suchy, 1999; Toepler, 2006). This tendency to associate entrepreneurship with the economic realm can be recognized as a remnant of the narrower view on entrepreneurship stemming from the neoliberal era (Fernández-Herrería & Martínez-Rodríguez, 2016). With the broadening definition of the concept of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship in non-profit and public sectors such as museums should be able to jump outside the box of an enterprising body prioritizing self-interest (Thompson, 2003). This broader and deeper take on the notion of entrepreneurship liberates itself from the frame of the neo-liberal and gives rise to the many possibilities underlying different contexts.

In the literature dealing with entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial endeavors in a museum context, the notion of entrepreneurship seems to take different meanings in different scenarios. It can still focus on being financially entrepreneurial (Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021) or it can leverage the stereotypical connotation of starting up a new organization, such as the establishment of museums in Gradén and O’Dell’s study (2018).

Directing toward a more diversified dimension, Suchy (1999) highlights the emotions and passion observed in the museum work through qualitative interviews with over 45 directors/leaders from internationally known museums, enriching the nuance of entrepreneurship with a layer of human quality. Similarly, through qualitative interviews with museum leaders in Sweden, Högberg and Jogmark’s study (2021) leads to the discussion on the relationship between entrepreneurship and their practices in the museums where new means, ends, and markets are sought to meet their social and financial needs. In this scenario, the museums interviewed differ however
from public museums and have a higher degree of need to resort to their own means of financing. Here, museum entrepreneurship emphasizes a large part on the entrepreneurial knowledge, skills, and competence in response to the changing society and even the unforeseen crisis of COVID-19.

Perhaps this unsettled portrayal of museum entrepreneurship should not come as a surprise, as even classical entrepreneurship has not yet seen a universal use or understanding. However, well-known qualities such as risk-taking, innovation, collaboration, openness, creative organizing, and adaptability seem to be widely adopted in the discussion of entrepreneurial activities undertaken by the museums (Ashley, 2014; Knudsen, 2020; Kotler & Kotler, 2000; McCall & Gray, 2014; Nielsen, 2015; Suchy, 1999; Toepler, 2006). In response to an ever-changing society, entrepreneurship seems to reflect its adaptive and transformative nature on the evolution of its presence in the museum area as well, which seems so far described in the literature to be transcribed into a tool, strategy, or mindset for museums to meet their needs and fuel their goals. In this sense, museum entrepreneurship is enacted for sourcing not only diversified income streams but also ways to achieve the museum's missions.

Interestingly, the tensions arising from the museum-entrepreneurship interface seem to have a certain correlation to museums not being neutral. Gradén and O'Dell (2019) argue that cultural heritage is not entirely cultural but can be used and made economically. It is also no secret that there stands a skepticism toward non-profit museums being commercial, making profits, collaborating with businesses, or adopting practices similar to for-profit enterprises (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Toepler, 2006). In such a scenario, entrepreneurship can appear quite opportunistic and managerial. Despite a common acknowledgment of entrepreneurship being embedded in the social and cultural dimensions, the economic motivation of museums is irrefutable (Brenton & Bouckaert, 2021; Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Toepler, 2006).
In addition to the socio-cultural or education context, public museums in particular are directly impacted by policies (Anderson, 2005; Alexander 2019), which may hinder or facilitate the development of museum entrepreneurship (Thompson, 2003). Political involvement, be it collaboration or other entanglements, seems to be unavoidable and necessary for museums to maneuver around to safeguard their success, especially if museums operate under a government or rely on public funds (Anderson, 2005; Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Gradén & O’Dell, 2018; Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Knudsen, 2020; McCall & Gray, 2014; Suchy, 1999; Thompson, 2003). Therefore, cultural heritage and museum exhibitions may also become to a certain degree political instruments (Bønnelycke et al., 2021; Gradén & O’Dell, 2019). As a consequence, to thrive or die for public museums has a large part being in the hand of local policies or political decisions (Anderson, 2005).

Entrepreneurship is grounded in the context and the people. How entrepreneurship in the museums is practiced, processed, and realized, however, is rarely articulated in-depth in the literature, besides a generally pragmatic view setting the values and emotions of the museum workers to the background (see for exceptions: Davies, Paton & O’Sullivan, 2013; Suchy, 1999; Toepler, 2006). On the other hand, the accounts and perspectives gathered on entrepreneurship in museums in general have so far been largely taken from the museum leaders/directors rather than from other museum workers also playing a crucial part in their respective areas (Högberg & Jogmark, 2021; Suchy, 1999; Toepler, 2006). To this end, whether implicitly or explicitly expressed, a form of museum entrepreneurship seems to be understood as the process of trying or experimenting to make things different in new ways. Following our research aim and purpose, we are motivated to explore entrepreneurship grounded in the museum and the people in this context in an effort to understand the surprising and liberating potentials that such inquiry has to offer.
3.1.2 Metamorphoses

Weiskopf and Steyaert (2009) take inspiration from Nietzsche’s work “Thus Spoke Zarathustra” and draw upon a parable of metamorphoses to reframe the view on entrepreneurship studies. Nietzsche’s original parable goes as such. A spirit, an empty vessel, undergoes three metamorphoses: from spirit to camel, from camel to lion, and from lion to child (Nietzsche, [1892] 1999), gradually growing from a form marked by burden, and creating itself into a being of freedom. Weiskopf and Steyaert’s work places entrepreneurship under the scope of this parable as they intend to grant Nietzschean child-like qualities to a field of entrepreneurship that appears to be stuck in images of itself (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009). We introduce in this section Nietzsche’s three metamorphoses as interpreted by Weiskopf and Steyaert in the frame of entrepreneurship.

From spirit to camel

The camel is laden with values, preconceptions and paradoxes and, in Nietzsche’s parable, wanders into the wilderness carrying its burden (Nietzsche, [1892] 1999). Entrepreneurship carries similar forms of weight in several forms, attached to it and accompanying it normally into its journeys. Such sources of weight can be found, in Weiskopf and Steyaert’s interpretation, in the ever-present call and research for entrepreneurial qualities in not only entrepreneurs but also at every stratum of the enterprise. They also point at the normativity of neo-positivistic research as a dominant paradigm that prevents the emergence of other approaches and philosophies in entrepreneurship study, as well as the optimistic assumption carried by this research and translated into policy-making that entrepreneurship holds the key to fast and relevant solutions to a range of problems, be they economic, social, environmental or of any variety (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009).
From camel to lion

The transformation into lion involves rising up, saying ‘Nay’ and refusing to carry further the camel’s burden, fighting off a dragon named ‘Thou-shalt’ that tries to defend the status quo that the camel always carries (Nietzsche, [1892] 1999). The lion takes a stand and formulates a fundamental critique against the assumptions posited by Thou-shalt that restrict creativity: the automatic quest for entrepreneurial qualities, the hegemony of neo-positivistic research, and the optimistic assumption of entrepreneurship as a solution (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009).

Entrepreneurship study must also, through this metamorphosis, say No to essentialism that ascribes necessary characteristics to individuals and organizations, instead of considering their respective place in society as a product of history and allowing for their permanent re-creation. It must say No to representationalism that, following positivistic assumptions, decrees that a world ‘out there’ exists in a given form and that entrepreneurship study’s main purpose is to reveal the world’s only truth. Finally, as it takes its stand as a lion, entrepreneurship study must say No to a discourse of enterprise whose rhetoric binds people to predetermined roles, thereby limiting their freedom (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009). Such ‘naysaying’ should not be seen as a negative movement; rather, it aims at going beyond delimitations and unleashing creativity in a “non-positive affirmation” (Foucault, 1998, quoted in Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009, p.198). The lion must however be cautious not to reproduce the patterns it sets to deconstruct by establishing absolute truths, even as those may be in opposition to the initial burden (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009). What matters is the opening of possibilities, which the child will set to explore after a final metamorphosis.
From lion to child

Saying ‘Nay’ allowed the lion to allow itself the freedom of creating anew. As critique has been formulated, a final metamorphosis into a child, carrying nothing but innocence and a promise for new beginnings, completes the transformation from a burdened spirit into a new becoming claiming ‘Yea’ on its journey towards the new (Nietzsche, [1892] 1999). Entrepreneurship study reaches this stage as it asks itself questions necessary for its emancipation from an encumbered tradition and as it permits the ‘normal’ to leave space for creation and re-creation (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009). Having taken a stand against the ‘normal’ in its previous form, child-entrepreneurship now says ‘Yes’ and embraces the potential that lies in the acknowledgment of a world full of possibilities, in the “power of thought” and in the “life-enhancing effects of specific discourses and practices” (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009, p.200). Through such a metamorphosis, entrepreneurship adopts a social ontology of becoming (Steyaert, 2007) and, through an ongoing, processual movement, sets to creatively transform its own role as a field of study as well as to imagine actualizations of the world (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009).

3.1.3 Metamorphoses of museum entrepreneurship

Nietzsche’s parable of the three metamorphoses as interpreted by Weiskopf and Steyaert allows us to imagine entrepreneurship as a spirit, a camel, a lion, and a child. As we turn our gaze onto museum entrepreneurship, we set to imagine how it could embody these metamorphoses, allowing us to liberate the discussion and to open the field of possibilities in research on museum entrepreneurship.

A first movement from spirit to camel has us acknowledge the burden carried by museum entrepreneurship. First, we identify an assumption in attempts at conceptualizing a museum entrepreneurship that would necessarily have a
positive potential if applied to museums. We also note that museum entrepreneurship has so far mostly been concerned with how it can be useful and contribute with regard to challenges faced by museums, but that the discussion has rarely found the questions of ‘why’ or ‘what for’. We are also echoing the call from Weiskopf and Steyaert to watch out for the “Me-PLC (Public Limited Company)” phenomenon (2009, p.186), that tends to emerge when employees are asked to be entrepreneurs of sorts as a result of a normative model stemming from an enterprise discourse, breeding a managerial form of entrepreneurship that does not leave room for new possibilities of life. Finally, while research on museum entrepreneurship takes various forms and includes case studies, we note an apparent lack of fundamental differentiation based on the local context so far in that research.

The lion voices a critical ‘No’ against those assumptions and preconceptions. It refuses to assume a positive potential for entrepreneurship, to content itself with a functionalist view of museum entrepreneurship focusing chiefly on ‘how’, to give into a Me-PLC phenomenon ascribing fundamental entrepreneurial traits to all, and to acknowledge a decontextualized universalism of museum entrepreneurship. It continues its critique further, supported by its initial naysaying. The lion says no to essentialism in museum entrepreneurship, claiming simply that not all museums are the same, therefore not all museum entrepreneurship can be the same. It denies claims of representationalism as the study of the empirical world in museum entrepreneurship cannot be neutral and cannot pretend to provide definitive answers. It finally rejects the discourse of enterprise as a natural state and vocabulary that would serve as a natural basis for the conceptualization of museum entrepreneurship.

Now that museum entrepreneurship has been relieved from preconceptions and that a critical Nay has been voiced against the dragon Thou-shalt, a holy Yea can be claimed, giving birth to child-museum-entrepreneurship,
unburdened and free to create and re-create itself. In a child form, museum entrepreneurship can start anew and explore its own becoming. The door is open for countless possibilities to emerge, limited only by imagination and creativity. In our journey forward, we will explore one possible movement for child-museum-entrepreneurship, as it encounters on its road another concept finding its strength in the freedom it sets to bring about: public entrepreneurship.

3.2 Public entrepreneurship

3.2.1 Social entrepreneurship and the consumer

Our theoretical framework finds its main anchor point in the notion of public entrepreneurship developed by Hjorth (2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). To clarify from the onset: ‘public’ entrepreneurship does not here refer to the public sector, to the State, but rather refers to people, to the public sphere in which a whole population evolves. This concept finds its genesis in dissatisfaction with what social entrepreneurship, in its most widespread application, has come to be. The initial diagnosis performed by Hjorth and Bjerke (2006) is that social entrepreneurship has not succeeded in distancing itself sufficiently from economic and managerial rhetoric.

In this diagnosis, the concept of social entrepreneurship seems to be fundamentally flawed as it has been built upon the intent that managerial methods and economic rationality should be put to use to solve identified social issues. In this traditional vision, social entrepreneurship rests upon a functionalist approach and assumption inducing that social issues are just one manifestation of a challenge, of opportunities that can be discovered by the social entrepreneur and upon which one can apply methods and thought processes inherited from classical management theory (Hjorth, 2013). But the application of market mechanisms onto social phenomena with a managerial
perspective tends to push the social back to be a context, while economic considerations take prevalence, and this especially in a Scandinavian society marked by a history of welfare state (Hjorth, 2013).

The intent of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurs may be genuine and benevolent in that they would be sincere in their desire to try and solve social issues, rather than solely focus on economic and financial success as is predicated in classical visions of business (Friedman, [1970] 2007). However, this grand purpose cannot fulfill its true promise as the approach taken still follows the economic managerial logic and its accompanying ontology. It ensues that the social aspect of social entrepreneurship does not constitute a strong guideline in itself but is instead understood as just a field where the economy can be performed, an “epiphenomenon of the market” (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006, p.100).

As social entrepreneurship seems to be stuck in the economic rhetoric, it becomes impossible for individuals to play another role than that ascribed by that economic rhetoric: the role of consumers that can serve economic interests (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). The state of consumer in society is not necessarily degrading in and of itself. There is a certain freedom in being a consumer, in particular as a consumer’s freedom of choice becomes an economic instrument with the potential to affect society. However, the consumer’s freedom stops there. When society is managerialized, freedom is limited to what is considered a reasonable and desirable level, defined by the extent to which one contributes to the success of the management strategies in place and limited to the resolution of malfunctions (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). Enterprising in this context holds little potential as managerial requirements always hold precedence over desire. Yet, enterprising is encouraged, as long as it is performed within the authorized frame, the ‘normal’ (Hjorth, 2013).

Managerial social entrepreneurship seems satisfied with the status quo. It finds a translation in traditional implementations of social entrepreneurship as
described above and can be simply seen as the market’s interaction with the social-economic field. However, when entrepreneurship becomes situated in society and not just in the economy, there is a strength to find in entrepreneurial entrepreneurship, which can be understood as a place of freedom, going beyond the basic choice-making freedom of the consumer (Hjorth, 2013). Such a transformation requires a paradigm shift of sorts, which is what Hjorth proposes with the concept of public entrepreneurship (2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006).

3.2.2 Public entrepreneurship and the citizen

The concept of public entrepreneurship finds its main conceptual basis in the search for the creation of sociality. Sociality is considered by Hjorth and Bjerke (2006, p.101) as “collective investments in a desired image, investments which produce an assemblage, a heterogeneous multiplicity united by co-functioning, by sympathy”. In short, this is what Nietzsche calls “new possibilities of life and for living” (Hjorth, 2013, p.40). To attain these goals, social entrepreneurship would reinvent itself into public entrepreneurship. A double movement is necessary for this transition to take place: from social to public, and from consumer to citizen.

Emancipation from a managerial understanding of entrepreneurship can allow for a freer form of entrepreneurship to surface. The desire for enhanced possibilities of life drives the potential development of public entrepreneurship in one’s context, just as the conceptualization of public entrepreneurship in a context aims at fueling the desire to create sociality – and the desire for creating desire for sociality –, through actualized forms of entrepreneurship (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006).

Here again, the anchoring of social entrepreneurship in the economic is what makes it problematic: desire, in public entrepreneurship, is strongly conducive
to new possibilities of life, when its virtue in an economically marked social entrepreneurship pertains to the freedom of a consumer. Likewise, acknowledging the possibility to realize social change allows for the creation of sociality as it takes a different road from the usual optimism anchored in managerial entrepreneurship that considers entrepreneurship as a cure for all ails. The movement is to emphasize the social in society, which does not seem to be successfully done by social entrepreneurship (Hjorth, 2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006).

Such a move requires a focus on the “in-betweens, the relationships, and not the individuals” (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006, p.102). Sociality is found in a collective ground and flourishes as interfaces are created within society. It becomes therefore entrepreneurship’s role to depart from the ‘normal’ managerial and to instead create the conditions for a relational world, for a society finding its strength in the everyday expression of a community not composed of consumers, but of what Hjorth calls ‘citizens’ (Hjorth, 2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006).

Public entrepreneurship proposes the production of a public space where public entrepreneurs and citizens together explore and actualize possibilities for the creation of sociality (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). Relationships in this public space can find their means of expression through experiences and concrete situations as new possibilities of life come to light. The enactment of a community on a public space marked by its local, cultural, and historical context gives the possibility for citizens to bring the social back to the center of attention (Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006). Such a public space, firmly anchored in society and local constructs, becomes a space for the actualization of belonging through increased sociality.

Entrepreneurship becomes about society and englobes citizen-entrepreneurs acting in a public space together with other citizens, potentializing their becoming and belonging. Thus would new forms of sociality be created,
through experiences and concrete situations, through relationships and entrepreneurial entrepreneurship.

For the purpose of this study, we identify elements that seem to define the concept of public entrepreneurship, and sort them into four categories, as displayed in figure 2. Such categorization will allow us, later on, to more easily integrate public entrepreneurship into our analysis and to make clearer connections with child-museum-entrepreneurship. Keywords are identified and categorized into the following categories:

**Collective** = Collective + Heterogeneous + Anchored

**Relational** = Relationships + Belonging + Social + Sympathy

**Public** = Public space + Experiences + Situations

**Desire** = Desire to create + Desire for social change + Belief in the possibility of change + Becoming

*Figure 2. Public entrepreneurship. (Source: authors)*
4 Life at the Naval Museum

In this chapter, you are invited to visit the Naval Museum in Karlskrona, Sweden through the findings from our field research. We will guide you through the unique context encompassing the museum and introduce you to the practices performed by the museum workers. Once you become more familiar with the case, we will dive under the surface of the Naval Museum in an attempts to shed some light onto the values carried by museum workers. Finally, as values give way to certain phenomena emerging or with the potential to emerge at the Naval Museum, we take child-museum-entrepreneurship to shore and accompany it through its new becoming.

4.1 Context – Practice

4.1.1 Working at the Naval Museum

As a part of SMTM (The Swedish National Maritime and Transport Museums), the Naval Museum is a governmental museum bearing a special responsibility as a state agent, subject to the policy and budget of the Swedish government. The Naval Museum finds in this status as a public museum one of its main specificities, impacting the whole activity.

Through this public status, the Naval Museum receives grants from SMTM as its primary source of income. As such, it is differentiated not only from private museums but also from other public museums, as SMTM is mostly funded by taxes and revenues from its museum members, especially from the museums in Stockholm such as the Vasa Museum. Then, the revenues are further redistributed to each member, including the Naval Museum. This puts a relatively low financial pressure on the Naval Museum and gives it the means and energy to focus on activities central to its mission and purpose. Instead of
having to focus on financial survival, the museum workers also get the opportunities to experiment and develop projects that seem interesting to them.

That being said, the museum workers seem generally inclined to consider the possibility of increasing the museum’s revenue through commercialization, provided that the profit generated serves as a means to support the museum’s mission rather than as an end: “Our main objective is not the commercial business, but I do think we could do a lot more commercial products to develop as an organization as well” (Malin, Organizational Developer).

On the other hand, the public status of the museum limits the possibilities of running commercialized activities, as there is a need to follow the regulations applying to public institutions. Such regulations also imply that the museum is less susceptible to the moral dilemma of dealing with profitable opportunities and the need to please individual clients or sponsors. The head of the Visitor Experience and Education (VEE) Unit explained how to say no to monetizing pressure and stay on track with their mission.

> If someone asks me, ‘I want to do this at the museum. I’ll pay you this much money.’ I can easily say, No, that’s not our job. That’s not our purpose as a museum, to do that. It’s easy to say no and feel secure in that. If you’re a little private museum, you can be in the hands of people with money. We’re quite resistant to that, yet, so far. (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit)

For now, as the museum mainly relies on governmental funding, the moral responsibility of handling the people’s money reflects not only in using the resources wisely and carefully but also in giving back to the people. A strong orientation to contribute to society and create something meaningful for the visitors is therefore embedded in the museum’s mission. The organizational developer metaphorically described what such a mission means to them.
You know Pippi Longstocking, right? The story character and she's super super strong and she said if you're super strong, you have to be super nice. And that's sort of what I think too, like we are super strong. We belong to the government. We have to be very considerate with what we do. We should serve the people and the society in the best way we can. (Malin, Organizational Developer)

Although the Naval Museum strives to maintain independence as a governmental museum, it may not be entirely neutral in the sense that it is subject to the government regime, mandates, and organizational structure. The frustration caused by bureaucracy can be reflected on, for example, occasionally inconsistent planning and strategies that go against the efforts previously made or administrative barriers to ideas and tasks. As indicated by several museum workers, the inherent structural complexity of the public institution also involves communication problems, general slowness in execution, and occasional administrative mishaps that can take a toll on the team’s morale.

The administrative weight of working under the public structure does not prevent the museum from actively pursuing its mission, especially embodied through its guidelines: ‘Äkta, Vaken, Överraskande’ (‘Real, Awake, Surprising’). Although officially designed by the museum, these guidelines seem to reflect the practice of museum workers and to be naturally infused in their daily experience.

The quality of ‘Äkta’ (‘Real’) in particular has been expressed by several of our research participants working at different levels in the museum, emphasizing the dark and hidden side of the past that is less discussed and remembered by the people. “You need to show the problems of the world” (Anna, Senior Librarian). Being honest and truthful about the dark side of history, instead of solely exhibiting its beautiful and glorious depiction,
requires the museum workers to be mindful of how and what the museum communicates with its audience. The untold stories are difficult to handle and can be met with criticism and uncomfortable eyes. Yet, “to be a museum, you have to do the uncomfortable stuff as well” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

The Naval Museum thus needs to take on the responsibility to help itself and its audience to find the strength in accepting such tension and encourage the people to think, broaden their horizons, and be open-minded. On the odyssey to understanding the past and present as well as imagining the future, it is a necessary step to dare and “not be afraid of talking about the bad things” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

The ‘Awake’ (‘Vaken’) spirit leads the museum to question itself and its exhibitions concerning the events of the world. At the time when this research study was conducted, the war between Russia and Ukraine resonated painfully as several rooms and corridors were dedicated to the Cold War and the bloody history marking the relationship between Russia and Sweden. The reflecting and relating potential of cultural heritage connects the past and present and reminds us that “the museum is about the Navy, war, and death” (Amanda, Communications Officer).

Beyond geopolitics and in a more local fashion, the Naval Museum strives to stay awake and conducts various experimental activities to reveal to visitors the behind-the-scene museum practices and to engage the audience in interactive ways. An ongoing example is the thematic room, hosting temporary activities and acting as a place for interaction, visitor participation and reflection (figure 3). The thematic room presents subjects that would not normally be shown in the exhibitions. During the time of this thesis study, the theme of deaccessioning (‘gallring’) was arranged to disclose the dilemma faced by the museum collection workers in their necessary decision to remove certain objects from the collection (figure 4).
Many museum workers are quite happy to let the visitors know that there is much more to the museum than meets the eye. The organizational developer commented, “it's a low stake experiment but could also be valuable both to us internally, but of course also to our visitors, because there are things going on that might be a surprise” (Malin, Organizational Developer). Many museum workers seem to have this desire to implement their creative ideas by trying out new things to make the museum-going experience more worthwhile and inviting, to surprise and be surprised in the process of experimenting and experiencing.

These creative endeavors have to find room in an otherwise complex role distribution, where most workers seem to juggle a wide range of tasks. At the
same time, museum practices, such as researching, preserving, planning exhibitions, or preparing activities, vary a lot depending on the role. To navigate through the multifaceted work, the museum workers rely very much on the collaboration with their colleagues where a reciprocating relationship of helping each other is well established within the organization. “I can find somebody, a colleague that knows exactly what I need to know and you know that's pretty cool to have all these specialists working with me” (Malin, Organizational Developer).

Figure 4. The thematic room currently displays examples of objects that are in process of being removed from the collection through deaccessioning. The museum possesses 7 identical copies of this portrait of Queen Victoria (1862-1930) – does it really need to keep that many?

Paradoxically, the multifaceted nature of the museum practices can be as routine and structured as full of surprises. As reminisced by Lin, museum host,
anything could be expected to happen at the museum, from heart-warming and touching encounters to people throwing up or entering the museum with a sword. The combination of the predictable and unpredictable events marks the life working at the museum as summarized by the senior librarian, “It’s nice to go to work and know that okay this is going to happen today. And sometimes I love that I have no idea what’s going to happen” (Anna, Collection, 2022).

As we become more familiarized with how the museum operates to support its mission, we will observe museum practices from the visitor angle to broaden our understanding in the next sub-section.

4.1.2 Visiting the Naval Museum

Visiting the Naval Museum is not so much seeing as experiencing. One can certainly explore the exhibitions, indulge in the beauty of the surroundings, and admire the majesty of the building and its submarine hall. One of the main working objectives of the museum is to make sure that the visitors have all their needs met: a nice restaurant, a museum shop, clean toilets, and general cleanliness are often named as key elements to a satisfactory visit. One can also aim at increasing their knowledge through the exhibitions or find joy during creative workshops. A little boy shouted, “I love this! (‘Jag älskar detta!’)”, as he was cutting through old magazines to create a collage during a workshop. As the museum director shared his thought on visiting the museum, “sometimes it’s just to have a good time, have a good experience, look at our figurehead hall, and have a beautiful experience” (Mats, Museum Director).

Although learning is important and central to the museum’s goal and purpose, for the visitors to enjoy and have fun seems to be the primary goal of the museum staff. Compared to the more traditional objective of showing off the collection, the visiting experience nowadays has reached far beyond purely looking at the objects on display but touches upon more subtle social desires.
The museum director noted, “we know that a lot of people come together, in a family, to have a common experience together, and then they have something to talk about when they get home or when they meet at a restaurant” (Mats, Museum Director). To make the museum a more welcoming, inspiring, and fun place for the visitors, several elements that make the visiting experience positive and enriching are highlighted below.

First and foremost is the creation of feeling and atmosphere. Each space in the museum is designed for a specific purpose and loaded with different emotions to make a certain impression and atmosphere for the visitors. In this regard, the Naval Museum lives in a dynamic of many faces shown to the people visiting the museum. By transitioning the space, time, and people in the museum, the atmosphere presented can be majestic, serious, and solemn. Simultaneously, the museum staff ensures that the feeling created at the museum is warm and inviting, and the general layout is rather conducive to, for example, children running and loud discussions. Not every profile of visitors is reported to be happy with this more casual atmosphere, but it is a choice well assumed by the museum. As the head of visitor experience recalled while talking with an old man visiting, “he said to me, ‘this is terrible. It’s so much noise, so many kids, they’re having fun everywhere!’ So, I said, ‘yeah that’s great, isn’t it? Thank you. I know we’re doing the right stuff!’” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

At the same time, a person’s feeling is contingent on circumstances which are sometimes beyond the control of the museum, such as the weather conditions. The opening of the thematic room in December 2021 happened to take place on the day of a snowstorm which, presumably, very few visitors dared face – even though it remains difficult to pinpoint the exact reasons why some events attract people whilst others do not. Overall, the museum workers seem to have made peace with the fact that things can be unpredictable and acknowledge the role of contingency in the visitor experience: “Of course, the exhibitions
have to be good, but if the day in total is not good, [the visitors] won’t remember anything from the exhibitions” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

The museum visiting experience is also an experience about the people: the people you go with, the people you meet and interact with, or even just the people you see. A visitor’s feeling can be directly impacted by the context of their visit as well as the people involved:

You know, it’s a constant process because you enter this space with different emotions to start with or if you're entering with the group, or if you enter for the first time. If you're familiar and you go there every week, you will have a different response. (Malin, Organizational Developer)

The relationship between the museum employees and visitors can get quite intimate at times as well, which forms a bond that makes both sides feel valued. As the museum host told us, “You feel like you want to help. People write letters, emails, and show a lot of appreciation” (Lin, Museum Host). The genuine interactions between people make an integral part of the visit.

The museum is also working on building a sense of belonging and welcoming feeling for all people. Reminiscing the older Naval Museum when it was mostly about showing off the grandiose collection, the senior librarian recognized that the museum nowadays has a different shade of meaning, “it’s easier for ordinary people to go to museums to feel at home and feel safe” (Anna, Senior Librarian). The same sentiment is shared by her colleague as she imagined a desired future scenario “if everyone thought that ‘this is my place. I can go whenever I want to. This is part of me’” (Marie, Program Coordinator). The effort to create a sense of belonging can also be realized with the help of digital tools. “I think it’s to show also that you are more than a museum, that you are like a community” (Amanda, Communicator).
Responding to societal change, the visitor experience is more and more marked by digitalization, both at the physical museum and online. Through on-site digital tools such as the QR codes connecting to an app offering audio-guided tours, the museum hopes to reach the younger generations and to stay in pace with its audience’s needs. “To give a little bit extra, and also a modern museum feeling, so that we get away from the ‘mossiga’ (old/stale)” (Amanda, Communications Officer). The museum communicator expressed such desire to renovate the conventional museum practices by incorporating more digitalization and interactive activities: “It’s nice to give a new learning experience” (Amanda, Communications Officer).

Online platforms such as the museum website and social media have also received increased attention due to the COVID-19 pandemic and its associated restrictions. Due to this situation, the museum was closed for several months and remained somewhat empty for several more even after its reopening, forcing the museum to rethink its ways of reaching its audience. However, focusing more on this online space is more than just an ad-hoc measure but allows the museum to move towards its objective of being a museum for all people, not only in Karlskrona. “What I do here should be always for the people. It should be everyone’s museum. We are here for everyone” (Marie, Program Coordinator). The possibilities for visitors to engage online are constantly being developed, often through the museum website such as the webpage Upplev Hemma (Marinmuseum, 2022), an invitation to DIY and create your own museum at home.

On the other hand, turning to the digital represents a challenge potentially threatening or forfeiting some of the quality and experience exclusive to a physical visit at the museum: “That’s why a museum, instead of going to a virtual museum, to actually see the object, maybe even to hold an object, is something special” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit). Ultimately, the objective is
for the visitors to experience the same feeling whether the visit is done on-site or online:

I think that when you visit the museum, it’s more of a ‘Wow’ feeling. It’s more ‘äkta’ (real). But it felt like the communication on the digital forms is not really there. So that’s one of my goals, to get the same feeling. You are supposed to be a visitor on the webpage and in the museum and you should get the same feeling. (Amanda, Communications Officer)

4.2 Values – Phenomena

Now that we have seen the practices of the Naval Museum in a contextualized manner, in the next section, we will move to a deeper level and look more closely at what might be the values that lie behind such practices. Our discussion on values will also make light of certain phenomena observed and interpreted in the specific context of the Naval Museum. These are not values but rather desires, outcomes, possibilities.

4.2.1 Learning and sense-making powered by cultural heritage

Besides the relationships between people, people’s interactions with the places/spaces and objects form an interesting interface between humans and the cultural heritage experienced by humans. Cultural heritage can be experienced not only through objects or physical spaces but also through stories. “The collections are of course the core of our histories. Not only the collections of things, we have collections of stories as well” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

The objects preserved and exhibited are considered to hold rich historical backgrounds and stories that empower them and make them valuable and sacred in some ways. The objects in the museums are valuable not for how
much money they are worth but for what stories they can tell. “If an object has a story, where does it come from, who owned it, where was it made, what is it made of, all these things... it comes a bit to life. The authenticity itself is kind of magic” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit). At the same time, the collecting and preserving of cultural heritage are not always oriented towards the past, as stories and artifacts in the present will also be considered part of the cultural heritage in the future. The museum, therefore, acts as a meeting point between the past, present, and future: “We keep things as we collect things but if we don’t collect them now, they won’t be there in 50 years” (Anna, Senior Librarian).

Yet, the attachment to the objects must be tempered with a sense of practicality. The museum is selective and realistic in that not everything can or should be taken into the collection. The objects need to bear meanings and stories valuable to the museum and its subject for them to find legitimacy in the collection. Objects that are too worn down or broken also raise questions: Should they be removed? Should they be repaired? Or should the museum workers simply keep the ‘damage’ as part of the history to keep the originality? After all, “in a museum collection, the object is meant to be frozen in time” (Fredrik, Exhibition Host). There are no standard answers to these questions, but the deaccessioning (‘gallring’) process seems to be well integrated with the museum workers’ working principles:

You have to be realistic about things. We are not collectors in that way. We are trying to preserve something like a memory or a history. If you don’t need it or we have duplicates then there’s no point really in keeping things. Or maybe things are not really our goals. (Marie, Program Coordinator)

The collection and exhibitions provide not only knowledge but also a source of inspiration to link the past with the present and up for individual
interpretation. In the meaning-making process, people interact with the surroundings, the objects, and the stories and connect with them in various ways. It is a rather stimulating experience enabled by the museum to learn, connect, and reflect.

Both the museum and its practices are heavily knowledge-based, almost regardless of the position. The context is rich in knowledge that benefits and attracts both the employees and visitors. There is also a noticeable orientation to seek multi-perspective knowledge, refusing to accept only the side that is presented and given but attempting to unveil the hidden and forgotten. “I think there are always stories that are missing” (Marie, Program Coordinator). The senior librarian also commented, “I’d expect new perspectives on things. Things and exhibitions that make me think in a new way” (Anna, Senior Librarian). The inspiring element of knowledge dissemination seems to be unanimously highlighted by the museum employees across all levels. The museum director finds the museum workplace quite inspiring as well. “It inspires you to find more, to learn more, to see ‘okay, you can look at it that way’. So, for me it’s inspiring. It’s never-ending. It’s a never-ending story” (Mats, Museum Director).

However, knowledge itself is not necessarily as much of a central point as learning. Both visitors and employees are constantly challenged to learn rather than to acquire knowledge. According to the museum employees, a large part of the learning done at the museum is not just about the Swedish Navy, but about everything this learning process entails, which can be learning about the people, yourself, and the world. Sometimes, it is as much learning as reflecting and performing a mental exercise to relate and be challenged by your preconceptions. To elaborate and clarify this phenomenon, three types of learning taking place at the Naval Museum are identified.

The first type of learning is ‘learning as enriching’. It is to build upon new knowledge and perspectives which serve as a way of inspiration and
stimulation. The museum director expressed some expectations for the visitors through the museum activities. “I hope they have more questions when they leave us than when they came” (Mats, Museum Director). Naturally, this is to assume that the learning aspect is what the visitors are looking for. “Of course, you want to provide knowledge, but that’s very much up to the visitors if they want to learn or not. You can’t guarantee that” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

The second type of learning is ‘learning as knowing’, which provides a sense of peace to people who simply want to be validated or confirm that their existing knowledge is right. This phenomenon has been pointed out by several museum workers from their experience with the visitors:

The adults maybe want something like new knowledge or maybe just want to be confirmed in the knowledge that they already have. So, they might not want any new knowledge at all. They just want to know that they’re right or talk to someone. (Marie, Program Coordinator, 2022)

The third type of learning is ‘learning as understanding’, to create connections between several phenomena across time and space and to link newly acquired knowledge to personal experience. On the museum’s role in delivering knowledge and learning, the head of visitor experience commented, “That’s an important role, of course, to try and educate, try to make them do the connections” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit). The museum director also showed his contemplation and interpretation of this form of learning.

Fantastic opportunity to work with the historical here and give the possibility to people to connect and to give perspectives. Often, we talk about the museum’s role to learn about the past, to learn about now, and to learn about the future. (Mats, Museum Director)
The learning process benefits not only the visitors but also the museum employees as a learning triangle is formed amongst the employees, visitors, and the museum as a knowledge-laden context (see figure 5). Not only can the visitors learn from the museum and employees, but the museum workers can also learn a lot from the visitors. As the senior librarian explained, “The visitors usually come here to learn and I learn at the same time because there are questions that I don’t know and I have to learn. In order to help them, I need to learn as well” (Anna, Senior Librarian). Sometimes, the visitors can also be a source of knowledge by sharing anecdotes or personal stories.

![Figure 5. The learning triangle. (Source: authors)](image)

The educational and enlightening function is no doubt a main pursuit for the museum to contribute to building a fully functioning society where people can deepen, broaden, and exchange ideas and opinions with the help of one another. Yet, the social aspect of the museum is perhaps no less important than its historical purpose. In the next sub-section, we will dive deeper into the human and social sides through the different facets of life at the Naval Museum.
4.2.2 Energy from passion and people

Museum work is deeply driven by human aspects, where passion, consideration for the visitors, and openness make life at work much more interesting and rewarding. Regardless of their role in the museum, the museum workers seem to share an interest in the subjects dealt with by the Naval Museum. Even though their initial attraction to the topics differs wildly from case to case, it seems to develop in two main possible ways.

The first scenario is an initial passion or interest in the central subjects defining the museum: the Swedish navy, ships, and history. The organizational developer found in the Naval Museum a perfect place to nurture and deepen her interest “in the sort of humanistic aspects of the history”:

To have a relationship with history and have a relationship with cultural heritage, I think it's something that’s very enriching for individuals and societies to have. That is what motivates me to study history myself and to work in a history institution. (Malin, Organizational Developer)

A second possibility is an initial lack of interest or knowledge about the topic as the person starts working at the museum, which quickly grows into a field of interest and somewhat of a passion. The communicator of the museum found herself in such a position: “After being here for 5 months I absolutely love it. And I really love history. I didn’t know that (laughs)” (Amanda, Communications Officer). Regardless of the initial degree of interest in these topics, curiosity and interest tend to increase and last for the museum workers. “I feel like my interest in history and the Navy increased after working here. I think it’s like that for many people working here. Some summer workers become interested after working here in the summer” (Marie, Program Coordinator).
On the other hand, the curiosity about the people and interest in the interactions with the visitors are also found to fuel the life of the museum workers. There is an overarching orientation exhibited by the museum workers both at the front and backstage to see, listen, and feel the visitors, whether it is critical to the success of their job or an additional aspect that they generally appreciate.

To provide a better visiting experience and service to the visitors, it is crucial to understand and know the audience better. Walking around the exhibitions, talking with the visitors, and interacting with them online or through programs and activities seems to be a favored strategy for the museum workers to receive instant feedback and to build connections with the visitors. “You can’t just rely on what you think is good. You have to ask the visitors. That’s what I mean. Sometimes you make an exhibition, and afterward you think ‘Who asked for this? Who wanted this?’” (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit).

Whilst the museum is committed to serving people and uses direct interactions to that end, helping people also plays an important role in the museum practices and contributes to creating a bond between the museum workers and visitors. Providing and receiving help not only makes the visitors happy and satisfied but also seems to bring joy and fulfillment to the museum workers. Sometimes, helping does not mean solving a problem completely, but demonstrating an act of kindness that builds a social connection. As we were provided with anecdotes of museum workers helping the visitors or even passers-by find a specific book or print family photos for a relative on their deathbed, the extent to which this sense of help can reach appeared clearly.

There seems to be a widespread consensus found amongst the museum workers to be aware of the impacts of the choices they make on the audiences. The responsibility to the people and society means that the museum workers need to be mindful of the underlying messages and feelings produced by their activities and practices.
Interacting with the visitors is also described by the museum workers to be a fun experience. Many visitors enjoy talking to the museum staff and sharing their stories and knowledge. “They want to talk a lot. They want to tell you things” (Marie, Program Coordinator). Whilst the interests of the visitors in the naval history or ships are manifest, it also seems like many of these interactions are not merely about bestowing knowledge but also about creating connections and interaction with the museum staff. A perceived desire and genuine interest from the museum workers to know more about the visitors and to help them through their day allows the visitors to be seen as individuals instead of a mass of audience.

In the eyes of the museum staff, visitors are more than just visitors. Several museum workers emphasize the social function and possibilities of the museum to be not only a place of knowledge or convenience but also a social arena where people can meet up, even without necessarily visiting the exhibitions.

Everyone wants different things from the museum. Sometimes people just want to meet others in a cool environment. And they don’t think about the objects at all. They think here is people and I want to meet people. That’s fine too. (Marie, Program Coordinator)

In this sense, there is a general desire for the museum employees to bring in more people and re-imagine the museum ground as a social center/hub where different people and opinions meet. The organizational developer clarified why such social space is essential in society.

A democratic society is very reliant on these spaces to be open where people can form their own opinions and learn about stuff, think, and reflect. It’s also a possible arena for people who wouldn’t necessarily meet otherwise. A hub, a meeting point where their experiences and
Overall, the museum workers display their passion and interest in the practices and activities of their jobs and actively try to connect with visitors in the practice of their work, both out of duty and genuine consideration. We find a phenomenon emerging in the identity shaping of museum workers, guided by their sense of purpose to work to the benefit of society.

4.2.3 Sense of purpose and identity

Personal interests and backgrounds reflect on the choice of working at the museum where the nature of the work can meet the need for personal belonging and desires. Conversely, private life can also be shaped by the job and the identity given by the job.

The work has affected me privately in many ways because I love books that's why I chose my profession as well but like I said when people hear about where you work, they usually ask a lot of questions and they are usually quite impressed as well or by the title of senior librarian. My surrounding is getting a view of me because of where I work. I don’t mind. (Anna, Senior Librarian)

One may also notice that their social circle has changed or that the people’s reaction towards their job is different from before. “You started to reflect and think about other jobs sometimes. All your friends become museum people. This whole different set of people” (Marie, Program Coordinator).

Museum workers seem to have developed a certain kind of connection with the museum as their identity metamorphoses with the museum. “I feel connected to the museum. It becomes part of your identity after a while”
(Marie, Program Coordinator). The identity of working within a governmental entity and cultural heritage institution also provides a sense of purpose as an important screw in the greater work of constructing society and the civilization.

I’m proud of working here, maybe not specifically about the Naval Museum but about being part of keeping the history and being able to save it for the next generation. I’m proud of helping people see history and learn about history. (Anna, Senior Librarian)

Positioned as a mission-laden actor in society, the Naval Museum carries the responsibility to the people whilst paddling through the turbulent tides of history. This special identity gives the museum its purpose to contribute to society and benefit the people. This image also impacts the people working at the museum to nurture their sense of purpose in co-constructing and co-creating the world through museum practices.

The feeling of connection transforms through time and can be translated into a sense of belonging expressed by the museum workers as closeness to the heart, something that feels familiar and comforting, and attachment to the place or the role. “I see exhibitions that I've made and think oh maybe we should have done it differently in that way. Or you know, I look at it and that's the place that's very, very familiar” (Malin, Organizational Developer). The feeling of connection with the museum can also be built through disconnection and reconnection. “Sometimes, you forget about it and you get used to it like you forget about this pretty view, but you reconnect with it. It is a bit like an old friend sometimes” (Marie, Program Coordinator).

Although the private life is inevitably affected by the job as a museum worker, for good or for bad, it is a conscious choice of the museum workers to avoid letting the job take over the self, as a person. This sort of resistance is seen in
many museum workers as they emphasize the importance to separate themselves from work and not let “the museum become you” (Marie, Program Coordinator). In a way, it is to keep their personal life and identity intact without being framed under the singular aspect as a museum worker or state official.

I think that people are different, but many of my old colleagues, the archaeologists, they are archaeologists. They don’t work as archaeologists. And I don’t think that’s the best way to go about it because, if that job is not available for example, you lose your whole identity. Many of these experts, they are very very connected to their jobs; their job becomes their favorite private thing to do as well. Of course, I love going to museums. I am very quick to judge if I think a museum is good or not or if an exhibition is good or not. But I work at the museum. I am not the museum. I am head of the unit, but that’s my job. I think that’s quite important because otherwise it gets too personal, sometimes. (Susanne, Head of VEE Unit)

4.3 Connecting

As we dived into the Naval Museum, its context and practices as well as the values carried by museum workers and emerging phenomena, several links were made and created an assemblage that irremediably connects all these elements. *Figure 6* gives a full depiction of these connections, which have been made explicit in the current section.
Figure 6. Connections between context, practice, values carried by museum workers, and emerging phenomena. (Source: authors)

5 Growing child-museum-entrepreneurship

We have discovered the context and practices at play at the Naval Museum and, through our observations and necessary interpretation, shed light on values seemingly carried by museum workers in this context. From such material, we also followed the interpretation so as to make light of several potentials, or phenomena, that seem to be partly expressed in the words of museum workers, but also emerging from desires and as a result of the unique combination of values, practices, and context at play at the Swedish Naval Museum. In addition to, but really beyond the values identified, the recognition of these phenomena marked a decisive step in our iterative process and allowed us to recognize the possibility of child-museum-entrepreneurship
and public entrepreneurship as a rejuvenating framework. The setting is now ready for child-museum-entrepreneurship to start growing. Our child-museum-entrepreneurship found public entrepreneurship and is using it as a model for its development. Other child-museum-entrepreneurships may take different directions.

We summon here again the description of public entrepreneurship we produced earlier. This description is placed in front of the values, practices, and phenomena explored in the context of the Naval Museum. We will strive, in this section, to illustrate how this setting can allow for a value-bound form of entrepreneurship to emerge.

The diagram in figure 7 will serve as a support for our development. Museum workers’ values and emerging phenomena, on the left-hand side, are connected to the categories defining public entrepreneurship that we identified earlier on the right-hand side. Contextual elements are found to have played their part by now, especially insofar as they contributed to shedding light on the phenomena described. Child-museum-entrepreneurship, a being of desire, creation, and recreation, asks the question: Who can benefit from new possibilities of life? The possible answers to that question are endless. It is likely that one possible answer could be everyone. For the purpose of this study, we will be limiting ourselves here to imagining how sociality could be actualized for workers at the Naval Museum as well as its visitors. The connections identified will be further developed in this section. A reminder of the key characteristics defining each category of public entrepreneurship will introduce each sub-section.
5.1 Re-creation as collective

Collective – Heterogeneous – Anchored

Child-museum-entrepreneurship will not struggle hard to find a collective spirit in which it can evolve through public entrepreneurship at the Naval Museum. The conditions are there. The fundamental openness that seems to characterize museum workers in their approach to visitors appears as a strong
basis from which communication and exchanges can take place. The desire to turn the museum into a social arena, where people come not necessarily to take advantage of the exhibitions but rather to engage in social interactions or even to enjoy the space, leaves room for the imagination of a collective force to be enacted. Activities organized with the intent of engaging specific groups contribute all the more as they allow for the expression of heterogeneity which comes as a strength when these diverse profiles meet. Such a collective force is necessarily anchored in local constructs, taking advantage of its contextual specificities to constitute its uniqueness and its richness. Strong of their collaborative spirit and evolving in the same context, museum workers also see their possibilities of a better life strengthened as they constitute themselves as both part and facilitators of this collective.

Child-museum-entrepreneurship can thrive when its creators are touched with a sense of purpose and a common interest. That many employees developed this interest only as they started working at the museum makes for a compelling argument: not only do they contribute to the heterogeneity of visions, viewpoints, and histories, but they also infuse their energy for a newfound interest-passion into their work and the creation of new possibilities. A sense of purpose anchored in a local, cultural, and historical context can also be a powerful force to raise child-museum-entrepreneurship and gather a community, allowing for museum workers to realize their purpose – or at least to serve social change – and for visitors to benefit from the actualization of that energy, passion, desire. Finally, as the museum offers new perspectives and thought-provoking experiences and strives to increase understanding of the past and society, it permits the re-acknowledgment of one’s identity and one’s place in the community and opens wide the door for an enhanced inter-community understanding.
5.2 Re-creation as relational

*Relationships – Belonging – Social – Sympathy*

Child-museum-entrepreneurship, ignited from the voicing of a critical ‘Yes’, developed a form where to evolve and re-create itself. In this iteration, child-museum-entrepreneurship will find its life at the Naval Museum through a collective and heterogeneous movement, bound to and powered by the richness of its unique context. A collective movement is however not enough to enact public entrepreneurship. It requires the expression of relationships, in a freedom made possible by sympathy and inclusion. Ultimately, the enhancement of a sense of belonging in both visitors and museum employees will bring our movement to its next phase.

The Naval Museum is a place of learning. As much as one learns about the history, one learns about the past – history being seen here as a discursive construct for presenting the past – and as one learns about the past, one sees the world a bit clearer, their perspective widens. In the collective movement that is made possible by the extension of people’s understanding of each other, this enhanced understanding becomes a tool for the creation of sociality. In that frame, the creation and maturation of relationships can there again be made possible as learning is done communally: learn with each other, from each other. Provoke each other’s thoughts and work together towards a resolution. In their respective initial entry point, both museum workers and visitors can grow individually and together by nurturing this social sharing and by, continually, being ready to learn about each other and from each other. Such a view, fundamentally inclusive and built on sympathy, permits a renewed belonging, enhancing the possibilities of life for all involved.

As we watch the collaborative spirit at play between the workers at the Naval Museum, it is easy to imagine how this ease of helping each other out could translate within or for a collective movement placing the social at its center. This trait is amplified as we remember how museum workers try to ‘see’
visitors in their everyday life, try to be there for them and to understand them, not only to perform their job but also as genuine acts of humanity. A movement emphasizing these relationships cannot but contribute to people’s belonging, belonging to the collective, belonging to society, belonging with themselves. A social arena is effectively built through this process, fueled by the strong sense of purpose carried by museum workers. Public entrepreneurship brings here child-museum-entrepreneurship into a relational collective movement with actors mutually enhancing each other through sympathetic, genuine, passioned relationships.

5.3 Re-creation as public

**Public space – Experiences – Situations**

Child-museum-entrepreneurship is starting to grow as an iteration of public entrepreneurship. It discovers itself as a collective and fundamentally social movement, finding at its core relationships conducive to an increased sense of belonging and freedom. As these relationships develop, they can find their expression in lived experiences and unexplored situations, which can take place in a public space to invent, create and re-create. Here again, the Naval Museum holds much promise.

The desire and potential expressed by the museum workers to form and transform the Naval Museum into a social arena function as a catalyzer and open possibilities for the collective movement to explore its newly found horizons. The Naval Museum is built on the one side upon the display of its collection, extended by an invitation both for visitors and museum workers to interpret cultural heritage, and on the other side upon consideration for visitors, both for museum workers to be able to perform their work to the extent they wish and out of genuine interest and consideration. Such a setup opens infinite possibilities for the collective to develop its relationships, enhance belonging
and take advantage of its heterogeneity while finding its expression in a unique context. Child-museum-entrepreneurship must remember that it is in evolution, always in re-creation. It cannot deal in absolutes, for its reason for being is the acceptance and embracement of re-creation as a way forward – or aside. A public space can be found in the Naval Museum in the most practical term, not only as a place where experiences can be lived and situations can emerge but also as an institution, a haven under which roof – both physical and metaphorical – one is safe and encouraged to express one’s freedom.

5.4 Re-creation as desire

*Desire to create – Desire for social change – Belief in the possibility of change – Becoming*

Here it is, child-museum-entrepreneurship, ready to emancipate itself. It discovered in public entrepreneurship the possibility of powerful relationships in a collective movement, finding in the Naval Museum a public space where experiences can be lived and situations created. But it must care to remember what gave it birth and what drives it forward: desire. To remember where desire can be found, we go back to some of the central values found in museum workers at the Naval Museum.

Passion and interest can certainly be thought to fuel desire. One can find the determination to act upon one’s desires when passion or interest brings the subject to the center of attention. Learning, the desire to learn, which appears to be a central value and objective for museum workers, contains desire in itself. Learning is fundamentally an emancipating process; it entails a desire for change and the construction of a new becoming. The weight of cultural heritage, when felt not only by museum workers but also by visitors, can also be conducive to desire. By looking at and, occasionally, interacting with objects, one also looks at and interacts with the past and with history. Such
encounters can be made to be thought-provoking, giving birth not only to new perspectives but also to a desire for social change. By looking at the past, one understands that the past has been made. The past was a becoming, it was a time for new possibilities of life, and surely enough, new possibilities of life have been created, if one chooses to look at it. By looking at the past, one can not only create the desire for social change but also ignite the belief that social change is possible. This is what child-museum-entrepreneurship, now infused with public entrepreneurship, has the potential to offer at the Swedish Naval Museum.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Summary of the thesis
Throughout this thesis, we set to explore an alternative perspective on entrepreneurship in the world of museums. By setting our focus on the museum workers at the Swedish Naval Museum, we shed light on several values that they seem to carry and embody through their work. Through a handcrafted abductive approach that largely takes inspiration from grounded theory method, in particular from the iteration proposed by Charmaz (2006), we were able to explore these values in their specific context. This exploration allowed us to shed light upon several desires and potentials partly expressed by museum workers who participated in our study, and partly through a concomitant interpretative work. Having identified and defined elements of contexts and practice, values, and potentials held by the museum workers, we were able to summon two theoretical concepts stemming from the critical literature on entrepreneurship.

Through metamorphosis (Weiskopf & Steyaert, 2009), we gave birth to child-museum-entrepreneurship, a vessel free of all burdens and preconceptions
regarding entrepreneurship in the context of museums, opening the possibility for a new becoming of museum entrepreneurship to emerge. As we infused child-museum-entrepreneurship with public entrepreneurship (Hjorth, 2013; Hjorth & Bjerke, 2006), we conceptualized one possible form of becoming of museum entrepreneurship. Drawing on the freedom of creativity that the metamorphosis of museum entrepreneurship into a child form allows, we envisioned the actualization of public entrepreneurship in the context of the Swedish Naval Museum. In this specific context, we described how the values and desires enacted by the museum workers in the organizing and creation of museum work appeared to be a fertile ground for the application of a museum entrepreneurship, past its metamorphosis into a child, infused with public entrepreneurship. We finally found that such application not only opens new possibilities of life for both museum workers and visitors, but also ignites the belief that social change is possible and, hopefully, the desire to pursue it.

6.2 Reflections, contributions, and limitations
Before we conclude, several points deserve some additional attention. First, we need to emphasize the character of deep embeddedness of our research in its local, cultural, and historical context. The desires and values of museum workers of the Swedish Naval Museum managed to find their translation into the concept of public entrepreneurship only because they were situated in a context that seems to allow it, from its special status as a public museum with low financial pressure to its geographical situation in a Swedish city on the Baltic Sea, not forgetting that the topic itself of the museum appears conducive for such experimentations. We do not claim a potential for generalization from this study, in the sense that its findings cannot be blindly replicated onto other museums in different contexts, yet we insist on the transferable character of our approach to other cases. Our research would certainly have benefited from a deeper emphasis on additional, here unexplored aspects of the context.
We believe that our contribution lies not only in its main conceptual and theoretical findings but also in its broader focus on the museum workers, when it appeared to us that most research conducted so far seemed to be based on the perspectives of museum leaders exclusively. While we managed to code and conceptualize elements brought to us by workers holding various positions, ‘leadership’ or not, we cannot help but emphasize how rich and insightful our discussions have been. It is easy to imagine how our research might have taken a wildly different turn if, for example, we had chosen to shadow the museum director instead of several visitor-facing employees, as we did.

This remark leads us however to formulate a word of caution concerning two elements in the present study. First, given the somewhat reduced scope of our research, taking place over a period of four months, we were not able to set our gaze on more than nine museum workers. While we tried to spread our attention over a varied assortment of positions and areas of work, we have undeniably not been able to capture points of view stemming from all directions. Second, as our work holds a firmly interpretative stance, our findings need to be understood just as such – interpretations. We encourage curious readers to proceed to their own interpretations and to challenge ours. Even as we strove for rigor and flexibility – flexibility in the method, rigor in the implementation – in the conduct of a form of research inspired by grounded theory method, we cannot pretend that we gathered the degree of nuance nor of certainty that a full-scale grounded theory method would have.

We want to make it clear that we are not, through this research, pretending that economic considerations do not or should not hold any part in entrepreneurship research in museums, even though our final selection of theories barely mentions this aspect, and even as the ground for our problem discussion lies in the recognition of an excess of economy and functionalism in the study of museum entrepreneurship. We deem highly the valuable previous research that
defined the challenges faced by museums and functionally described potential benefits that entrepreneurship in the context of museums could bring. We believe that such research should be integrated and placed in a dialogue with the stream of research that we pursued in this paper, focusing on values, desires, society, and becoming.

Our final point of attention here is to clearly emphasize that even though our initial intent with this research is somewhat normative as we strive to contribute to a more ‘desirable’ future, the findings of our research are, on the contrary, not to be taken from a normative standpoint. By creating child-museum-entrepreneurship, we open possibilities for research to take the values and desires of museum workers into consideration when conceptualizing museum entrepreneurship, and we certainly do not intend to close any such possibility. That is to say, our suggestion of public entrepreneurship and even of child-museum-entrepreneurship is just that, a suggestion, an illustration of what such concepts could come to be. We are not claiming that summoning and combining these two concepts is necessarily the best way to incorporate the values and desires of museum workers into museum entrepreneurship theory. We are, however, affirming that such conceptualization is a way of doing, a form of becoming of museum entrepreneurship.

This remark is not without consequences and brings about what is possibly the main contribution of this paper. We initially set to explore the potentialization of values and desires as a form of becoming of museum entrepreneurship. Throughout our paper, we produced an illustration of that potentialization, a demonstration of a possibility. Because we conceptualized museum entrepreneurship in a way that places the values and desires of museum workers at the center, it can be affirmed that such an endeavor is possible to do – because we did it. Because it has been done, then it can be done. As such, we encourage researchers to pursue this line of inquiry and to diversify their approaches when engaging in this field. We are in no position to delve into
specifics, but our research leaves us optimistic about the possibilities for museum entrepreneurship – or entrepreneurship in the context of museums – to integrate the values and desires of museum workers into a field of research fueled by curiosity and freed of all burden.

6.3 From child-museum-entrepreneurship to...?

After metamorphosis, after its preconceptions have been questioned and challenged, a child came to be. We, research, bear a responsibility towards this child. It is research’s duty to nurture this child, make it grow and evolve, think about the world, discover its own strengths and limitations, and learn to pay attention to its surrounding world. It is our responsibility in research to help this child grow, and not just blindly follow the easiest path. Only once it has been nurtured and developed enough may it be left to fare on its own – yet, even then, the child must adopt an attitude of lifelong learning and make sure to keep in touch with ‘reality’, its reality.

This is only the beginning of a becoming.
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Appendix 1

Codes Generated from Data Gathering (4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> level coding)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; level coding</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; level coding</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; level coding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Close to heart”</td>
<td>“Close to heart”</td>
<td>Passion and interest *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>Social interactions</td>
<td>Visitor experience **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A museum in society</td>
<td>A museum in society</td>
<td>Public museum: The good and the bad **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal collaboration</td>
<td>Internal collaboration</td>
<td>Sense of purpose *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“See people”</td>
<td>“See people”</td>
<td>Visitor-oriented *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Learn from the audience, the audience learns from you”</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge / Learning *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency of museum work</td>
<td>Contingency of museum work</td>
<td>Museum work **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objects “frozen in time” in new museum institution</td>
<td>Objects “frozen in time”</td>
<td>Feeling the weight of cultural heritage *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New museum institution</td>
<td></td>
<td>Turn to the digital **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought-provoking, curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real, Awake, Surprising **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Äkta, Vaken, Överraskande</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Effect on identity) ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categorized as ‘Values’

** Categorized as ‘Context – Practice’

*** Late addition, eventually recognized as a ‘Phenomenon’.
Appendix 2

Consent Protocol for Interviews

The following questions/statements were always asked/clarified before each interview proceeded. The interviews were only carried out with the consent to the following from each interviewee.

- Introduce our aim of the interview, e.g.: *We are here to talk about what you find interesting, important, special, frustrating at the museum, how it feels in general, we will go into more details during the interview.*
- Introduce the frame of the interview, e.g.: *This interview and our notes are exclusively going to be used in our current research.*
- Consent to record the interview on mobile devices.
- Right to anonymity, e.g.: *By default, we are hoping to include quotes with your first name, but if you prefer to be anonymous, we can arrange that. You can decide now or let us know later if you change your mind.*
- The interviewee has the right to stop the interview at any moment.
- Clarify how much time the interview will last and when we need to stop the interview.
- Confirm the possibility to get back to them for confirmation that there is no misunderstanding from the content taken from this interview (quotes, etc.) and that our interpretations make sense to them.