Preface

The future is not given. Especially in this time of globalization and the network revolution, behavior at the individual level will be the key factor in shaping the evolution of the entire human species. Just as one particle can alter macroscopic organization in nature, so the role of individuals is more important now than ever in society. Ilya Prigogine (2000: 36-37)

Current organizational tides are often referred to as turbulent and complex. The labor market is increasingly characterized by temporary contracts and projects. The unpredictability of work life requires an active stance towards the management and creation of the relational component of professional life. Professionals need to spend considerable time on meeting new professional relations, getting along with former colleagues through networking and managing their day to day tasks. But how do they do so? How do they navigate the relational component of their work? Which motives guide their interactions? Is there a role for gut feelings and perceptions in managing their projects and what do they perceive as a successful interaction?

Researchers have acknowledged that social relations are important to understand why some professionals find new jobs, get resources or why some teams do better than others. Yet, this research is often concerned with the outcomes of relational structures and has paid limited attention to the processes of relational creation itself. This limits our understanding of how professionals themselves navigate the complexities and dynamics of interaction in their work. The prevailing assumption that professionals are economic and rational actors may not match the complex and ambiguous nature of practice that professionals are confronted with. In order to better understand how professionals themselves build and shape interaction conducive for their task at hand, attention is warranted to the subjective micro-dynamics of interaction.

In this thesis I study the role of temporary perceptions, preferences and beliefs that actors hold when building and shaping professional relations. This offers insight in individual approaches to meet new others and elaborating on the role of intuition in the complex daily work processes of interaction. Therefore, this thesis meets the call from Prigogine above: it studies how individual professional actors navigate the complexities of their context and stipulates cognition and motivation as particularly important in this process. As such this thesis studies interpersonal interaction at work in a novel and original way.
1. Introduction
1.1 Introduction
This thesis comprises five studies that contribute to a better understanding of the practical and often non-linear nature of interpersonal interaction in professional contexts. In this thesis the broad topic of interpersonal interaction is studied by means of interpersonal networking and intuition in task-related interaction. This introductory chapter serves to embed the studies into the academic debate of structure-agency in social sciences. This debate is concerned with the extent to which actors’ behaviors in professional contexts and the outcomes of these behaviors are subject to existing social environments or that instead these behaviors and outcomes are also created from within by actors. Actors then become agents of change.

So far, empirical representations of this debate tend to focus on structural compositions as approximation for understanding professional outcomes. In what follows, I will argue that this view restricts further theoretical development as it cannot accommodate for the non-linear and endogenous nature of relations and how these develop over time. In order to more closely reflect the ambiguous nature of reality, I refer the reader to the concept of human agency and the temporary individual level perceptions that feature professional interaction. After this conceptual introduction the overall research question and sub questions are introduced, followed by the research approach of this thesis.

1.2 Conceptual background
Over the past 30 years social network research has sought ways to capture how structural relational components determine individual level and organizational level outcomes. A social network is represented by relations that are called ties and actors\(^1\) that are called nodes. The central question in this research is whether particular structural compositions lead to particular individual or organizational outcomes. As such, social structures have been related to job search and performance (Porter & Woo, 2015), career success (Burt, 1992; Wolff & Moser, 2009), entrepreneurial outcomes (Hallen & Eisenhardt, 2012; Stam, Arzlanian, & Elfring, 2014), knowledge management and innovation (Obstfeld, 2005; Tsai, 2001). This association with a wide range of phenomena signifies its importance as field of research.

At the same time social network research is fiercely critiqued because insights are lacking on whether and how individual actors shape relations (Kilduff & Brass, 2010; Vissa, 2012) and the extent to which relations are in fact dynamic (Hoang & Antoncic,\(^1\)

\(^1\) In this introduction I use the term *actor* to refer to entrepreneur, manager and freelancer interchangeably.
2003; Mariotti & Delbridge, 2012). Through a structural approach this body of research has empirically treated actors as static and rational entities and has disregarded how social structures are endogenously created by individual actors from within (Casciaro et al., 2015; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). In fact, it has assumed interaction at actor-to-actor level to be rational and self-explanatory. This discrepancy between empirical approaches that assume rational actors and a linear reality and more complex conceptualizations of the individual actor’s ability to shape the social structure (Bandura, 2006; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998) has been referred to as the “endogeneity problem” (Bensaou, Galunic, & Jonczyk-Sédès, 2014; Stuart & Sorenson, 2007: 212). This discrepancy makes that current conclusions that are drawn on the outcomes of social structures are incomplete and possibly incorrect if we do not know whether and how individual actors are themselves agents of change (Ahuja, Soda, & Zaheer, 2012; Stuart & Sorenson, 2007).

In this thesis I argue that it is of particular importance to pay attention to the micro-processes of interpersonal interaction and centralize the actor’s internal complexity to understand relational development in a professional environment that is indivisibly connected and dynamic (Bandura, 2006; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Lord, Dinh, & Hoffman, 2015). This level of analysis offers possibilities to uncover how and why actors engage in interpersonal interaction (Casciaro et al., 2015; Porter & Woo, 2015). It allows us to understand whether actor’s behaviors towards others (e.g., Hallen & Eisenhardt, 2012; Vissa, 2012) are indeed build on the premise that social relations offer opportunities for professional prestige (Burt, 1992) competition, manipulation and strategic advantage (Casciaro, Gino, & Kouchaki, 2014; Kilduff & Brass, 2010; Obstfeld, 2005) or are also reciprocal in nature, promote well-being (Coleman, 1990), cooperation (Kilduff & Brass, 2010; Xiao & Tsui, 2007) giving to others or friendship (Colbert, Bono, & Purvanova, 2016). Table 1.1. provides a snapshot of criticisms that make this problem of endogeneity manifest in the literature.
Table 1.1. Criticisms on determinism and exogeneity in social network research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter &amp; Woo (2015: 1482)</td>
<td>“However, the current literature falls short in explicating whether and how interpersonal resources play a role in the dyadic processes that underlie networking partners’ relationship development.”</td>
<td>How &amp; why interpersonal networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasselli et al., (2015: 2)</td>
<td>“Indeed, basic questions concerning the micro-foundations of social networks have been neglected despite regular calls for more social network research on micro-organizational behavior topics in general.”</td>
<td>Micro-foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casciaro et al., (2014: 707)</td>
<td>“To date, network research has been ambiguous about the purpose of the creation and maintenance of social ties”</td>
<td>How &amp; why interpersonal networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bensaou et al., (2014: 30)</td>
<td>A second shortcoming of network research is that it tends to be static, lacking appreciation of network dynamics, including the possibility of endogeneity.</td>
<td>Time &amp; endogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariotti &amp; Delbridge (2012: 514)</td>
<td>“The network literature has paid little attention to the temporal characteristics of ties; in other words, ties are treated as if they are unaffected by time and history.”</td>
<td>Time &amp; endogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahuja et al., (2012: 434)</td>
<td>“Perhaps most critically, an understanding of network outcomes is incomplete and potentially flawed without an appreciation of the genesis and evolution of the underlying network structures.”</td>
<td>Time &amp; endogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klyver et al., (2011: 153)</td>
<td>“Thus it seems as though many previous studies on social networks and organizational behaviour have been under socialized and have not taken sufficient account of the influence from people’s past and current contexts.”</td>
<td>How &amp; why interpersonal networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilduff &amp; Brass (2010: 336)</td>
<td>“Critics have called for richer psychological theory to supplement the overreliance on rational choice models of individual behavior in social network research.”</td>
<td>How &amp; why interpersonal networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart &amp; Sorenson (2007: 212)</td>
<td>“Extant research has almost entirely ignored this rampant endogeneity problem and, as a result, bias likely contaminates many (if not most) of the existing estimates of network effects.”</td>
<td>Endogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoang &amp; Antoncic (2003: 167)</td>
<td>“Many questions remain regarding how network content, governance, and structure emerge and develop over time. To support this initiative, more longitudinal and qualitative work is required.”</td>
<td>Time &amp; qualitative research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These critiques on the dominant view of actors as static, rational and instrumental will be addressed in this thesis by redirecting attention to the micro-processes of interaction (Casciaro et al., 2015; Tasselli, Kilduff, & Menges, 2015). This means that I focus on actor’s perceptions and one-to-one interactions to illuminate the minutiae of interaction and change (see for a review on levels of analysis, Carpenter, Li, & Jiang, 2012). Throughout this introduction I will use the term “interpersonal interaction” to refer to interactions that involve interpersonal networking as well as task-related interactions.
1.2.1 Interpersonal interaction based on endogeneity

To further unravel the micro-dynamics of interpersonal interaction, I turn to the concept of human agency. In outlining the relevance of this concept I will describe two features that will motivate the studies in this thesis. First, I will elaborate on interpersonal interaction as being built upon subjective motives, perceptions and experiences of the individual actor (e.g., Bandura, 2006; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Lord et al., 2015). Second, I will reflect on methodological approaches that stay closer to the initial definition of agency under conditions of endogeneity.

Human agency to direct interpersonal interaction

Based on an often used definition, human agency is understood as: “a temporally embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its habitual aspect), but also oriented toward the future (as a capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within the contingencies of the moment)” (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998: 963). In this definition agency is conceptualized as an interpretive processes unfolding in an ongoing dialogue with prospective situations. This makes that human agency is contextualized and that in its engaged form it constitutes a recursive process (Bandura, 2006) in which actor and other are indivisibly connected. Agency can take habitual forms rooted in routines and past experiences (Giddens, 1984), but can also drive actors to deviate from the past and create alternative futures (Lord et al., 2015).

Recently, this definition has been of great inspiration for studies on social networks by highlighting the need for multilevel research (e.g., Ibarra, Kilduff, & Tsai, 2005) or actor’s actions. Social network research that has aimed to come to grips with the role of the individual actor has so far focused on what actors do (Vissa, 2012; Zott & Huy, 2007) or strategies they have towards others. These can be means oriented (Bensaou et al., 2014) or aim to efficiently form relations (Hallen & Eisenhardt, 2012). This implies that instead of seeing the social structure surrounding the actor as exogenous, the actor is able to craft the relations (s)he is part of. Nonetheless, the indivisible connection between actor and others as suggested by the definition of Emirbayer and Mische (1998) puts research at a squeeze. It seems that these frontrunner studies, still have idealized individual actors as capable of taking deliberate and purposeful social actions and as such has overemphasized the role for rationality and purposeful action (Coleman, 1990; Kilduff & Brass, 2010). Consequently,
these approaches still remain devoid of how an individual actor’s perceptions and motives influence our understanding of the origins of interaction.

If I apply the definition outlined above, interpersonal interaction is an internally complex temporal dynamic process in which actors engage. This points at a more integral human engagement in social action in which actors may bring their pasts and imagined futures to their ability to craft the present (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). It further emphasizes the subjective nature of experience, feelings, thoughts and motives that can be both shaped and emerge through the particular context in which this interpersonal encounter takes place. The component of agency as complex dynamic process calls for descriptive accounts of the intra-subjective complexities and how they unfold with reality (Emirbayer & Mische, 1998; Tsoukas & Chia, 2002).

These internal complexities comprise perceptions, motivations and ways of knowing that go beyond rationality per se. In this perspective there is no objective approach to know reality. Consequently, individual level psychological processes are important to further understanding the micro-processes of human agency in interpersonal interaction (Carnabuci & Diószegi, 2015; Casciaro et al., 2015; Hallen & Eisenhardt, 2012; Porter & Woo, 2015). These subjective processes can provide information as to how actors perceive their action and therefore jointly shape subsequent actions as well as gain insights in why this interaction takes place.

Therefore, instead of seeking ways to portray individual actors as objective and stable entities, we need to think of how to conduct research on social relations when the environment is non-linear, dynamic and interconnected (Bandura, 2006; Emirbayer & Mische, 1998). Methodologically this implies that in order to better understand how and why individual actors engage in interpersonal interaction (Casciaro et al., 2015; Porter & Woo, 2015), qualitative and process research is needed to capture the complexities and ambiguities involved in social interaction (Bensaou et al., 2014; Berthod, Grothe-Hammer, & Sydow, 2016). Table 1.1. can be translated as a need for qualitative, process-oriented studies to come to grips with the phenomenon of interpersonal interaction. This work needs to further action oriented perspectives on agency through understanding the role of the individual in the creation and development of social relations over time (Bensaou et al., 2014; Gulati & Srivastava, 2014). This then provides richer and dynamic insights in the process of interaction through which outcomes emerge (Hoang & Antoncic, 2003; S. L. Jack, 2005).
1.3 Research question

The critique that social network research falls short of understanding the dynamics and subjectivities that endogenously create them, calls for an exploration of the micro-processes of interaction at the dyadic level. An exploration of the micro-processes introduces an inside perspective that centralizes the subjective perceptions of the actor as embedded in the local context. Therefore, I put forward the following overarching research question:

“How can interpersonal interaction be understood under endogeneity in different organizational contexts?”

With regard to this question I developed an integrative framework that seeks to address this question in two main streams that emerged through the research process. I first examine the relational nature of interpersonal networking approaches by seeking to understand how perceptions and motivations inform interactions over time. I then proceed with a particular cognitive approach to interpersonal relations that emerged through data-collection – i.e. intuition and its role in task-related interaction. Consequently, this thesis consists of two parts together describing interpersonal interaction: the exploration of 1) interpersonal networking approaches and 2) intuition in task-related interaction. Table 1.2. gives an overview of the concepts used in this thesis.

Table 1.2. Thesis core concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept of study</th>
<th>Employed definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal networking</td>
<td>“Interpersonal networking is concerned with the practice of building and maintaining professional relationships.” (Porter &amp; Woo, 2015: 1478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-related interaction</td>
<td>Interaction at dyadic or group level that is task-related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human agency</td>
<td>“A temporal embedded process of social engagement, informed by the past (in its habitual aspect), but also oriented towards the future (as a capacity to imagine alternative possibilities) and toward the present (as a capacity to contextualize past habits and future projects within contingencies of the moment.)” (Emirbayer &amp; Mische, 1998: 963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Uncertainty</td>
<td>“Perceived inability to predict something accurately.” (Milliken, 1987: 136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intuition</td>
<td>“Affectively charged judgments that arise through rapid nonconscious and holistic associations.” (Dane &amp; Pratt, 2007: 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social intuition</td>
<td>“Rapid and automatic evaluation of another person’s cognitive and/or affective state through the perception and processing of non-verbal indicators.” (Gore &amp;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation

Concerns intentionality, direction and persistence of social action – adapted from Casciaro et al. (2015)

1.3.1 Part I: Interpersonal networking approaches

In response to overly structural approaches, scholars have started to visualize actors as active agents that engage in thoughtful actions and strategies to engage in interpersonal networking. For instance, entrepreneurs engage in actions that broaden their network or further develop existing relations (Vissa, 2012) or network strategies that efficiently target desired others (Hallen & Eisenhardt, 2012).

Yet, despite this agentic turn, theories on interpersonal networking fall short of psychological understanding of the particular approaches actors employ (Kilduff & Brass, 2010; Tasselli et al., 2015). It seems that a particular assumption that has joined social network research in its development; namely that individual behaviour reflect strategic and calculative intentions of actors (Stuart & Sorenson, 2007). Consequently, actors engage in networking actions and strategies that are viewed as means to an end. This implies that the type and structures of relations an individual actors are embedded in, contribute to career outcomes such as promotion, job search and resource acquisition (Burt, 1992; Porter & Woo, 2015; Stam et al., 2014). In this view professional relations are understood to be important for instrumental support. Relationships are thus capitalized as capital.

While this may be the case in competitive organizations for all kinds of processes and individuals, it also provides an impoverished view on social interaction as humans (Klyver, Evald, & Hindle, 2011). This short illustration creates a few questions that seem unclear from the literature. First, next to instrumental motives for interpersonal networking, relationships are also needed for general human functioning at work (Colbert et al., 2016). Second, the question is whether motives of actors are clear upfront (Casciaro et al., 2014; Nebus, 2006) or that they emerge through the social engagement itself (Tocher, Oswald, & Hall, 2015) or even are subject to particular environmental contexts that create motivations and perceptions. This calls for a better understanding of why individual actors engage in networking and how their motives and perceptions influence their actions. Therefore, I put forward sub-question 1:

*How and why do individual actors engage in interpersonal networking approaches?*

This sub-question will be given substance by examining multiple contexts in which actors engage in interpersonal networking. These entail freelancers, entrepreneurs and
international nascent entrepreneurs. This question is answered in the Chapters 2, 3 and 4 of this thesis. In Chapter 2 I examine how freelancers engage in interpersonal networking and their perceptions about this phenomenon in their context. In Chapter 3 I proceed by theorizing how networking is shaped when motives and goals emerge through the process of interaction. Finally, in Chapter 4 I demonstrate how nascent entrepreneurs that enter a new environment engage in interpersonal networking.

1.3.2 Part II: Intuition in task-related interaction

Being puzzled by the partial picture that guided social interaction and their outcomes at work, the practice of data collection has triggered my interest in a special form of cognition that seemed to stir interpersonal interaction. Often disregarded as an elusive and vague concept, while potentially omnipresent in human reasoning and interpersonal interaction in general (Haidt, 2001; Lieberman, 2000; Neisser, 1963; Vaughan, 1979), intuition can be understood as “affectively charged judgments that arises through rapid, unconscious and holistic associations” (Dane & Pratt, 2007: 40).

As with other management concepts (Sandberg & Tsoukas, 2011; Yanow & Tsoukas, 2009) scholars have so far viewed intuition from ‘the outside’ (Hodgkinson, Sadler-Smith, Sinclair, & Ashkanasy, 2009; Petitmengin, 2014) and have put forward abstract theories that potentially are loosely coupled with practice. Consequently, the field is plagued with few empirical studies (Miles & Sadler-Smith, 2014; Sadler-Smith, 2016b). The discrepancy between the reason oriented educational systems (Sadler-Smith & Burke, 2009) and the complex and stressful organizational reality actors operate in, may make that knowing from within is not self-evidently clear or given attention. To better come to grips with this subjective phenomenon in practice, I put forward sub-question 2 that guides Chapter 5:

*How is intuition attuned to in practice by individual actors?*

Together with its abstract conceptualization, scholars have mainly focused on intuition in decisions and creativity thereby leaving the contextual social component of intuition aside. However, intuitions are omnipresent in the automatic evaluation of others and the reading of unconscious information through verbal or non-verbal communication (Gore & Sadler-Smith, 2011). The neglect of the social component of this concept (Ashkanasy, Becker, & Waldman, 2014; Sinclair, 2011) seems at odds with reality. The suggestion that we need a better understanding of this concept, is exemplified by the fact that intuition is essential to interpersonal functioning and flourishing (Ambady, 2010) as well as that it can serve
leaders in change (Greenleaf & Spears, 2002). Empirical work has started to highlight its
ing importance in processes of relationship formation such as employee selection and
performance appraisal (Gore & Sadler-Smith, 2011; Miles & Sadler-Smith, 2014). Sub-
question 3 emerged from the data and guides Chapter 6:

*How and why do actors deploy social intuition in practice?*

Sub-questions 2 and 3 put forward here in Part II are answered in the Chapters 5 and 6 of
this thesis. These chapters rely on stories about intuition in task-related interaction and
seek to understand what managers do to attend to these experiences labeled as such.

1.4 Research approach

In line with the above, I assume that the nature of reality is endogenous. This implies that
reality is both created by individual actors as well as influenced by others – there is a
recursive nature of co-production. Herein I follow scholars that argue for a constant
interaction between the individual actor and the social environment (Bandura, 2001, 2006;
Giddens, 1984; Lord et al., 2015). This ontological position of entanglement, makes how
individual actors think an important conduit of knowledge, since the way the actor thinks
shapes his/her reality (Dane & George, 2014) and subsequent behaviors. The constant
gradual change that the social environment is subject to, further puts an emphasis on time
in conducting research, since interactions change over the course of time and these changes
are enforced by the interactions itself (Lord et al., 2015). This makes that the findings are
reflections of perceptions, intuitions, motivations and interpersonal networking approaches
at a particular point in time.

This ontological position steers the research approach towards qualitative and
process studies in which the perception of the individual actor is important for knowledge
creation. To answer the research question this thesis took a multi-source, multi-method
qualitative research design. I relied on multiple datasets as well as methods to answer the
research question. The chosen research design fits the fields it addresses. For instance, the
field of intuition finds itself in the stage that qualitative research, and in particular
interpretative and phenomenological research is needed to better understand the
phenomenon through a practical perspective (Hodgkinson & Sadler-Smith, 2011; Miles &
Sadler-Smith, 2014; Sadler-Smith, 2016b), while social network research has called for
more qualitative and process studies (Bensaou et al., 2014; Berthod et al., 2016). Generally, multi-source studies are more easily generalizable since their findings are more
firmly rooted in practice.
The answer to the research questions raised above, consisted of several steps that chronologically align with a development of my professional interest in the research topics. I started with an interest in individual level motivations and perceptions that informed interpersonal networking of actors. Therefore, I started working on two chapters that examined interpersonal networking of entrepreneurs. To start with, I worked with a readily available dataset 58 of nascent entrepreneurs that participated in a 20-week program aimed at starting a new venture. This dataset consisted of 859 diaries, observations, business plans that I analyzed using mixed methods. At the same time, I started developing a conceptualization of entrepreneurial networking that relaxed the assumption of goal-directedness and centralized the condition of uncertainty to understand entrepreneurial networking.

Simultaneously, I approached professional network NET in the Netherlands. Due to previous employment relations I was familiar with their approach to interpersonal networking and saw potential for theory development. I was granted access and started to interview the experienced freelancers of NET and started to attend network meetings. I followed this network for one year which resulted in 21 interviews, 5 observations of network meetings, informal small-talks as well as insight in official documents, website and internal communication devices.

While conducting these interviews I encountered the notion of intuition and was triggered by it. I put myself to read academic articles and books on intuition, and found that this concept was limitedly studied in management science, let alone social interaction. Therefore, I adapted my approach while doing research (Schultze, 2000; Timmermans & Tavory, 2012) and started another round of data collection in which the experiences with and attention for intuition were central themes of study. This dataset was created with the help of earlier interviewed freelancers from NET by means of snowball sampling. Through these professionals additional others were approached for an interview which resulted in 23 additional interviews. All informants were also asked to fill out a short survey with background information and their preferred way of thinking. This way of collecting data resulted in a total of 44 interviews, of which some of the first round also lengthily covered the topic of intuition in task-related interaction.

This process of collecting data can be understood as emergent. While I had initial ideas about professional network NET, I have adjusted my approach based on the insights that I accrued along the way. This adoptive approach is a common phenomenon in qualitative research (Gioia, Corley, & Hamilton, 2013; Schultze, 2000) and shows the
pivotal role of the perception of to the individual researcher and how the course of action can be altered based on this information. Such an adaptive perspective is not in line with linear approaches to research, but has played an influential role in scientific discoveries (Dew, 2009; Dörfler & Eden, 2014; Marton, Fensham, & Chaiklin, 1994) since it allows the researcher to pursue contingencies that emerge through the process.

In addition to that, qualitative research involves a co-production of the informant and the researcher or research team to create knowledge. Therefore my individual preferences and unconscious drivers form tacit knowledge during the research process (Alvesson, 2011; Schultze, 2000) and intrinsically influence the process of data collection and analysis. Therefore I worked with co-authors or students in all projects to reflect on my thinking. I also improved the reliability of the findings through either using multiple data sources or discussing my interpretation of the data with my co-authors. At the same time, I also think that my sincere interest in these two phenomena has contributed to the rich data that I have been able to collect. Figure 1.1. illustrates that I became more interested in the micro-level processes as I proceeded with my research.

Based on this process of data collection, this thesis covers four empirical studies and one conceptual study. Chapter 2 describes the network interactions of the members of NET by using a case study that consists of 21 interviews, observations and archival data. Chapter 3 introduces a conceptual study on the motivations on interpersonal networking by entrepreneurs. Chapter 4 relied on the longitudinal dataset of 859 diaries coupled with observations of the social network interactions of entrepreneurs. Chapter 5 then uses 25 interviews with experienced managers on the practices of intuition as well as additional survey information. Chapter 6 then proceeds by using the total set of 44 interviews in to study the purpose with which intuition in task-related interactions are deployed.

1.5 Thesis outline
This makes that this thesis comprises a total of five main chapters that together are informative on research question as outlined above. An overview of the chapters is schematically shown in Figure 1.1. In what follows I briefly describe the main chapters.
Chapter 2 discusses a case study of professional network NET. This chapter shows what a professional network offers to freelancers and how they network. Informed by interviews, observations and archival data I find that these professionals view their participation in NET as a way to seek business friendships. Connected to others met at previous projects or to others that they find interesting, they engage in professional learning and social activities. Network membership and the practice of networking gives them a feeling of belonging. Networking is viewed as matter of give and take and no direct business outcomes are to be expected. In sum, this chapter describes a networking approach of freelancers by emphasizing the personal component that seems important to them.

Chapter 3 then proceeds by theorizing on the relaxation of the assumption of goal-directedness in networking behaviors as proposed by chapter 2. It asks the question how entrepreneurs engage in networking when the future and their own preferences are unknown. Interpersonal networking becomes a podium for questions such as what can we do together or what can I do for you? I suggest that under conditions of uncertainty entrepreneurial network actions are also informed by altruistic motives that lead to pro-social behaviors. In addition to that, uncertainty about the future and unclarity about their own goals creates a platform for incorporating the unknown – serendipitous encounters – and treat them as opportunities rather than threats. Herein I propose a theory of
entrepreneurial networking under uncertainty that is informed by creation theory as well as effectuation.

Chapter 4 features a longitudinal analysis of how nascent entrepreneurs create a business network in a new environment. This chapter is based on weekly diary data of 28 entrepreneurial ventures that are monitored over a 20-week period. In this chapter I take an ‘inside’ perspective on networking and I am able to trace how perceptions and actions over time either do or do not result in the creation of a new business network. I argue that network creation of nascent entrepreneurs consists of three components – initiating, reacting and evaluating, that together describe whether and how entrepreneurs are able to create network momentum – the perception that a network starts to exist. This chapter provides insight in the process of interpersonal networking and how personal reflections influence the creation of a new network over time.

Chapter 5 explores how the subjective experience of intuition is attuned to by actors in practice. Embedded in an educational system that emphasizes rationality as main source of information, I wondered whether the recognition and interpretation of intuition was self-explanatory in practice. I turned to experienced managers, amongst others project managers and freelancers, and used their insights and experiences to create a theoretical framework that describes intra-subjective forces that come forward when talking about intuition in a particular work situation. The data showed three ways in which intuition was consumed by experienced managers. These are distinguished by their ability to switch cognitive perspectives – i.e. from active thinking to intuition and vice versa. In this chapter the notions of attention, relaxation and inquiry are furthermore emphasized when managers wanted to attune to intuition in their work.

Chapter 6 takes this a step further in studying the how and with which purposes intuition in task-related interactions are deployed. I find that compared to the known judgmental function of social intuition, these are said to be applied for development, cooperation or assessing change readiness purposes. In task-related interaction such as project meetings, managerial intercourses, coaching and training sessions, the communication of this tacit dimension becomes important since its emergence is not always self-evidently related to the matter at stake. By displaying ascribed purposes of social intuition beyond automatic evaluation, I extend the current conceptualization of social intuition by showing that attributions are present throughout social work life and are understood to foster development, cooperation and change.
The findings of these five studies are summed up in the final chapter of this thesis. This chapter discusses the theoretical and practical implications as well as contextualizes my research and provides avenues for further inquiry.

1.6 Thesis output
Table 1.3 gives an overview of the current academic output. Three studies of this thesis have been presented at academic conferences, Chapter 3 has been published and Chapters 4 and 5 are in the review process. The other two chapters will follow this path shortly. For four chapters I have worked together with co-authors. Therefore, within these four chapters I will use first-person plural ‘we’ when referring to the authors.
Table 1.3. Thesis output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Research approach</th>
<th>Conference presentations</th>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Publication status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interpersonal networking of freelancers: Seeking business friendships</td>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Practicing intuition: In-depth managerial accounts on the need for attention, inquiry and relaxation</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>Paper presented at:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Under review with: Journal of Management Studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Social intuitions in task-related interaction: Stimulating development, cooperation and assessing change readiness</td>
<td>Interview study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>