Thomas

- You have defined what institutional, socio-economic and cultural context – are these all necessary? Very big constructs. Then you have a separate section on societal attitudes and entrepreneurial behavior.
- What is your "lead concept" here of all these? Maybe just focus on the societal attitudes in entrepreneurship – is that a literature or a conversation? What do we know about how societal attitudes impact entrepreneurship?
- Then move the Nordic countries as a context for societal attitudes into its own section maybe the last section in the theory section moving to methods – can potentially also be part of the research context, depending on how you shape your theoretical argument.
- p. 15 "In general, societal attitudes towards entrepreneurship are described rather negative and unfavorable. This is particularly interesting, since research participants at the same time mention the active role from the political, institutional, as well as media side that actively are trying to present entrepreneurship in a positive light and improve the general perceptions." – Use this observation to build your puzzle – why is this important and interesting, or counterintuitive and thus an interesting problem to study?
- Should the discussion on Jante's law be part of the frontend framing where you write about Nordic societal attitudes? Then use this to frame the study and the research gap or puzzle. Write in the frontend everything we already know about the Nordic societal attitudes and then consider what is it that we do not yet have a clear understanding on?
- Create a master heading for the methods section and then place the relevant sections there as subheadings (research context, data collection, data analysis is a typical structure). Same goes for other sections as well – think about the heading hierarchy.
- In the final paper the philosophy section does not need to be so long – just mention that this is a constructivist study.
- Research context is usually the first section in the methods section, laying out the setting for the empirical study.
- Semi-structured interview format would assume that you have some themes and maybe some questions existing through the overall format is very flexible.
- With regards to findings, you need to show how you empirically (rigorously, from your data) identified the societal attitudes. How did you analyse for the attitudes? Why these and why not others? If they do not come from your data, you will need to establish the sources for these attitudes.
- **BUT, you actually do not analyze for the negative attitudes of individuals but entrepreneurs' perceptions thereof.** This is important to note. To what end do you analyze these perceptions? What do they then explain or do? So what? What do we already know or do not know?
- Is fear of failing a (perception of) societal attitude as well? Now missing from your list in the intro.
- With regards to the quotes, show who is talking (what is relevant info? I would say nationality if these are not all Finns – give the informants a pseudonym that let's the reader to distinguish them from one another)
- What is the role of the section on the aims to create a positive setting for entrepreneurship? Is this part of the research context? What is the focus of your analysis? Consider the analytical structure of your findings section – what is the core of the analysis and what is contextual?

- You then move to the coping mechanisms that emerge due to their perceptions of the societal attitudes – this is interesting! Make this the core focus on the analysis section. So what on the coping mechanisms – what do they explain on the whole? What does this analysis contribute to what literature? Are there some exemplary studies that you could use as example of structuring the analysis and argument (even if they do not address the same topic?) How do the perceptions of societal attitudes and coping mechanisms connect to one another?
- So, part one: construction of societal attitudes by entrepreneurs; part two: coping mechanisms. And what links them? What does this explain?
- Continue developing a figure of your analytical structure into one figure or table – now it does not yet work or is hard to decipher, and is not "fully" developed
- Provide all the key definitions upfront (e.g. egalitarianism now in discussion – your definition of that is somewhat problematic)
- "Institutional level" does not promote entrepreneurship – who promotes and with what effects? Be very clear with your argumentation, and the locus of agency.

Lin

- Again, I find this topic very interesting!
- Is the quote you start the paper the best way to create a set-up? Does it undermine your approach? Or is yours a critique or offers a different approach to national identity?
- ***Post-colonial perspective to identity work as a process*** offers a specific lens for your research – very good scoping. But is this what you do? What does post-colonial perspective actually mean? Is post-colonialism rather an empirical context for your study than an academic perspective or lens? Study more the post-colonialist research and its assumptions and approaches if you wish to use it as a lens, or then frame it as the empirical setting or a context. I think you now do the latter.
- Frontend framing on the whole has progressed nicely
- Consider what of the texts in the very beginning of the paper belong to the research context section.
- Many research questions – 2 seems to be most theoretically relevant, and 3 is a continuation on that. 1 is more a research context related question.
- Nationalism and national identity in MNC a contextual theory helping you to provide a broader contextualization of your analysis. Do you take a post-colonialist approach to identity work? What would that entail in practice? The last section "Language, name and dress..." should the pull together these studies to create a link to the focus of your empirical analysis. What in this literature on identity work as a process (using a post-colonial lens) we do not yet understand?
- Are names a case of language, primarily? What are they also? I would see them here as symbolic expressions of identity, which dress can be see as well. Just to note if the framing in this section on the language inhibits you to make an argument for the symbolic expressions for identity. Consider developing this conceptual approach further that you have begun with Humphreys and Brown. Connect with someone who does research of identity work – this can be really helpful providing you many short cuts for your conceptual and empirical development. Read papers on identity work, e.g. see if there are review papers in Academy of Management Annals.

- Or is your focus only on names (beginning of the methodology section) and language? I do not see very much attire here? What kind of data would you need for the analysis of the attire – textual but also images?
- Start the research design section with Research context – again, consider what texts go here (also see below)
- Place sections 4.1 and 4.2 to research context in the methods section – consider carefully what is the focus of your analysis and what is the context for that focus?
- Continue your work with the data structure – it is not fully coherent yet. Take contextual change away from here as this is about research context and not the core focus of the analysis? To what research question do your analytical categories "answer"? What do they explain? So what, to what end? What do they do or explain?
- Just to note, you have given the informants English language pseudonyms.
- What does the "purpose of *materializing*" mean? Why materializing? Use, adoption?
- So, you have resisting, then adoption would be a counter-aspect for that?
- What is the role of the strategic approaches to the identity work (4.6)? Do you have data on this? Does it require a further analysis? This line of analysis might answer the questions on what does your study actually explain.

Karelia

- Very good progress with thinking and scoping the work. There is something very interesting going on here.
- You open up quite nicely what is the tradition of the tekhnê research. What is the level of analysis, what assumptions on technology does it come with? What is the literature and who are the audiences for using that concept (STS?) Ontology: constructivist or relational?
- What kinds of assumptions on time and temporality come with the relational approaches? Inherently intertwined? Temporal structuring is not a very good fit with a relational approach to technology (and time/ temporality) – that is a social constructionist perspective with human rather than relational or distributed agency.
- What does it require from the methods to study technology and temporality with a relational approach? Observations are a good fit. (Relevant question is that is your chosen ontology.)
- I do not quite buy that the university is the level of analysis here. Rather, university is the context in which you study this team of researchers – so perhaps the level of analysis should be within the level of this group of people that you have interviewed and whom you observe. The researchers share the ethos or norms related to "sustainability innovation" - or is this rather a scholarly concept that they do not talk about themselves? So university and sustainability innovations are contextual aspects that provide the setting for this group's work. The level of analysis is the group of the people in it, or perhaps not the human agents but the processes within, again depending on your ontological and analytical approach.
- Consider what is your research issue/ research question? To what do your aggregate dimensions answer or provide knowledge? You frame this a bit too far away from your empirical setting?
- Analytical structure is still on a quite high level – if your focus is on analysing time or temporality this should be present in the codes or clearly understandable how these are about time or produce time.
- "Dirty work" to me refers to something else (stigmatized to some degree)
- Something about the materiality of the technology and how that produces time (e.g. Hernes)? Again, what is your level of analysis?

- Is the paper then about how people in this interdisciplinary research group construct, manage, ensure time? How they accelerate the experience of time (or what accelerates it?) Elongate time? etc. Perhaps further focused analyses of (constructions of) temporality are needed.