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Abstract: Many commentators have highlighted aspects of observed enterprise behaviour which do not appear to conform to the usually accepted understanding about it and also that many of the policies apparently informed by the accepted thinking appear not to have worked. Therefore there appear to be grounds for questioning the conventional wisdom in this area. What is that conventional wisdom? It is not clearly recorded as such but this paper suggests that it is based on, or at least consistent with, a set of assumptions such as the following: (a.) that enterprise is a sub-set of business; (b.) that, consequently, big-business-based thinking can be applied to it (on the assumption that all businesses are essentially homogeneous); and (c.) therefore it is assumed that, for example, that (i.) the aim of any business is to maximise its profits and that consequently it must want to grow; (ii.) that a business should prepare for the future by researching, forecasting, and then planning based on those forecasts; and that (iii.) business decisions will be based on logic not social influence. Although there are reasons for thinking those assumptions could have been made, and evidence that they were made, there are also reasons for thinking that the assumptions are wrong or at least misleading. Therefore this paper argues that, if knowledge about enterprise is to improve, a new paradigm is required. Accepting that requirement does not automatically reveal what the new thinking should be but, based on its analysis, this paper makes some suggestions for avenues to explore.

Keywords: enterprise; conventional wisdom; assumptions, big business-based thinking; paradigm

Introduction

After working in this field for nearly forty years, variously as an enterprise agency executive, a policymaker, a consultant, a writer, and an (amateur) academic, I have concluded that we have developed a widely shared conventional wisdom about enterprise, parts of which appear to be misinformed and which consequently can be very misleading. Therefore this paper attempts to explain that conclusion and highlight some of its possible implications.

Background

Although there appears to have been some academic exploration of enterprise (and/or entrepreneurship) as early as the 1930s and a number of small business support initiatives were launched from the 1960s onwards, interest began to develop in a substantial way in the 1980s. In many countries, unemployment had started to rise alarmingly during the 1970s, so Birch’s finding—released in 1979—that, at least in the USA, it was small businesses which created net new jobs, attracted much attention, especially in official circles. That interest was supported by government budgets which in turn stimulated an enterprise industry, manifest for instance in policies and agencies which sought guidance about the enterprise and small businesses they wanted to encourage. This stimulated a search for relevant knowledge and,
as Gibb (2000: 13) put it, “an explosion of research into entrepreneurship and the small and medium enterprise”.

From this, an understanding of enterprise was assembled relatively quickly which then became the accepted guide and, as such, was passed on to others. It thus became the “conventional wisdom”, a term used by Galbraith (1958: 17-18) to refer to a widely shared received understanding which has the endorsement of accepted usage and is therefore convenient to accept and follow. But conventional wisdom is not necessarily correct, as Gibb (2000: 13) also reflected of this period:

> Despite the increase in academic knowledge, indeed perhaps because of it, there has been a growth of ignorance and a major manifestation of this growth of ignorance is the emergence of a number of outstanding “mythical concepts” and “myths” which are considerably influencing the establishment of policy priorities.

Indeed, many commentators have pointed out aspects of observed enterprise behaviour which appear not to conform to the accepted wisdom and it is also relevant that those policies apparently informed by this thinking appear not to have worked (as described, for example, in Bridge and O’Neil 2018: Ch16). Therefore it is suggested that there are grounds for questioning the received wisdom.

### The Potential Legacy of a False Theory

This situation is not unique. As Popper (1989: 8) explained, it is usual for new bodies of knowledge to start from a basis of ideology, myths, guesses and/or assumptions, and hunches which appeared at some time to “make sense”, and, unless refutation is attempted, such “erroneous beliefs may have an astonishing power to survive”. An example is provided by the history of medical understanding which shows that, once accepted, false theories can endure and there is often a refusal to accept contrary empirical evidence because the prevailing theories did not support it and it is easier just to continue to follow conventional views. Furthermore, even when apparently abandoned, such theories can still leave a lasting legacy (see Box 1).

---

**Box 1 – An example of the lasting legacy of a discredited theory**

At one time, bleeding was the accepted cure for many ailments. This was based on the humours theory which originated with the Hippocratic doctors of classical Greece as a supposedly observation-based alternative to a medicine based on religious superstition and/or magic. It held that an illness was caused by an imbalance of the humours in a body. As it was supposed that blood made a body hot and wet (as someone who lost a lot of blood through injury became cold and dry), so someone with a fever who was too hot and wet (high temperature and sweating) must have too much blood—therefore removing some should restore the balance.

Thus, in December 1799, when George Washington became ill with a nasty sore throat after being out for a time in nasty weather, his doctors bled him. Because the first bleeding didn’t work, he was bled again and it is recorded that over the space of 10 hours they removed about half his blood—which must have contributed significantly to his subsequent death.

Eventually, following discoveries such as that of the circulation of blood, this practice was abandoned. However, the legacy of the theory was that there was nothing in medical understanding to explain why cleanliness in surgical practice might matter. Consequently, when those who, like Ignaz Semmelweis in 1847, offered empirical evidence that hand washing and other cleanliness measures in surgery saved lives, their claims were dismissed by the establishment as being without a rational foundation.
What is the Convention Enterprise Wisdom?

Given the above, it should not be unexpected that we could have developed a conventional wisdom about enterprise, aspects of which are questionable and/or unhelpful. But what is that understanding? It is not recorded as such but it is suggested here that it is based on, or at least consistent with, a set of assumptions such as the following:

- That enterprise is a sub-set of business.
- Consequently big-business-based thinking is applied to it (on the assumption that all businesses are essentially homogeneous).
- Therefore, for example, it is assumed that:
  - The aim of a business is to maximise its profits—and therefore it must want to grow.
  - A business should prepare for the future by researching, forecasting, and then planning based on those forecasts.
  - Business decisions will be based on logic not social influence.

Enterprise as a Sub-set of Business

Why might those assumptions have been made and were they made? Furthermore, are they correct? As indicated, above enterprise was of particular interest because of its apparent connection to small businesses and their job-creation potential. So it would have seemed reasonable to look at it from a business perspective and see it as relating primarily to business. There is evidence that this was done as teaching and researching it has often been assigned to business schools and it has been promoted to business agencies. However, even in the 1980s, there were two main views on what enterprise was. One treated it as business entrepreneurialism and the other as a group of qualities and competencies that enable individuals, organisations, communities, societies, and cultures to be flexible, creative, and adaptable (OECD 1989). However, it is seems that it was the former view which prevailed in official thinking.

Much received ‘business’ understanding is based essentially on the supposed practice of big business and, as enterprise is assumed to be a part of business and it is assumed that businesses are relatively homogeneous, big-business thinking is applied subconsciously to new and small businesses. Thus they are often treated as if they were small big businesses even though Penrose had explained in (1959:19) that

*The differences in the administrative structure of the very small and the very large firms are so great that in many ways it is hard to see that the two species are of the same genus. ... We cannot define a caterpillar and then use the same definition for a butterfly.*

Maximising Profits

Then, in line with big-business-based thinking, it would seem reasonable to assume that all businesses seek to maximise their profits, and consequently have a growth imperative. This was reinforced by pronouncements like that of Friedman who declared in 1970 that “the social responsibility of business is to increase its profits”. It is also reflected in comments such as this one in a small business advice booklet: “one of the things that most, if not all, businesses have in common is a desire to grow and expand” (Gundy 2008: 2).

However, there is evidence to the contrary coming from those who have actually looked at businesses and their aims. For instance, Reijonen and Komppula reported (2007: 698) on research which found that the “entrepreneurs in this study measured their success primarily through customer satisfaction and respect. Other criteria related to job satisfaction, quality
of products and making a reasonable living”. In 2010, Kay reported that the “most profitable businesses are not the most profit-oriented” and “paradoxically...visionary companies make more money than...purely profit driven companies” (1 & 8). Hurst and Pugsley (2011) used data from entrepreneurs sampled just before they started their businesses and found that “Most small businesses have little desire to grow big” (73) and, at the time of formation, “most small business owners do not want or expect their businesses to grow” (75). If anything, “those who reported nonpecuniary benefits as a primary motivation had a higher probability of survival” (103). In a survey of micro-businesses in Ireland, Bourke and Roper (2019: 2) found that “Over 80 per cent of the micro-business owners reported ‘freedom to adapt my own approach to work’ and ‘greater flexibility for personal and family life’ as key personal motivators”.

**Deterministic Thinking**

Possibly following big business practice, it seems to be assumed that businesses should reduce future uncertainty by forecasting and planning. Humans, it has been said, have a clear desire for forecasts and “the more unpredictable the world becomes, the more we seek out and rely on forecasts and predictions to determine what we should do” (Gimpl and Dakin 1984: 125). Furthermore, following the example of Newton, there is the belief that with enough effort we should be able to discover the mechanism behind things and from that establish what will happen. As Voltaire is to reported to have said, *no problem can withstand the assault of sustained thinking.*

Thus a belief in determinism has arisen and businesses are expected to research, forecast, and plan for the future and business plans are often advocated as the essential tool for start-up businesses—this despite a number of declared contrary views. For instance, Sarasvathy (2008), in her questioning of successful entrepreneurs, found that they generally distrusted market research and preferred an approach not of planning and then trying to make that plan happen, but of evolving their enterprises depending on how things developed and what opportunities and/or partners were found—an approach which she labelled “effectuation”. Indeed, as Bjerke (2007: 8) put it:

*I am more than ever convinced that entrepreneurship cannot be planned to any major extent in advance, and that planning even goes against the entrepreneurial idea.*

**Actions are Based on Logic**

Accepted enterprise thinking seems to have followed traditional economic theory in assuming that people in their business activities act logically to maximise their benefit (often thought to be financial gain). Consequently, despite the alternative views advocated by behavioural economics, the nature and use of social capital is rarely taught in business schools and neither is its application included in business plans. Nevertheless, despite this, it is clear, at least to psychologists, that human beings are very socially influenced and, as (Kahneman 2003: 162) observed:

*My first exposure to the psychological assumptions of economics was in a report...in the early 1970s. Its first or second sentence stated that the agent of economic theory is rational and selfish, and that his tastes do not change. I found this list quite startling, because I had been professionally trained as a psychologist not to believe a word of it.*

Others have also pointed out that human beings are very socially influenced and that influence can override or preclude logical analysis. For instance, Earls has stated that “We do what we do because of other people and what they seem to be doing” (2009: 5) and that “independent thinking is to humans as swimming is to cats: we can do it if we have to”
Pinker, for instance, states that the “refusal to acknowledge human nature is like the Victorians’ embarrassment about sex, only worse: it distorts our science and scholarship, our public discourse and our day-to-day lives” (Pinker 2003: introduction). Rowson and McGilchrist further think that:

The notion that we are rational individuals who respond to information by making decisions consciously, consistently and independently is, at best, a very partial account of who we are. A wide body of scientific knowledge is now telling us what many have long intuitively sensed – humans are a fundamentally social species, formed through and for social interaction (2013: 3)

In Conclusion

The above argumentation suggests not only why people might have made the suggested assumptions but also provides reasons for thinking that they did make them. The assumptions may not have been consciously made and/or deliberately recorded as such; nevertheless, it is suggested that together they do provide a basis for, and/or an explanation of, received thinking. It also indicates that if those assumptions do indeed explain the conventional wisdom, then, at least in part, it is wrong. However, just recognising that parts of it are wrong and changing those individual misconceptions piecemeal will not be helpful if the foundations for that thinking are not also changed.

Towards a New Paradigm?

If, as indicated, the conventional wisdom is questionable, how might that be improved? Ferguson (1987: 71-2) has suggested that there are four ways to change thinking:

- **By exception** - that’s an exception to the rule (not an exception which disproves the rule).

- **Incremental** – change so slowly as to be hardly noticeable.

  Like a *pendulum* – abandon all current thinking and go to the other extreme (but there might be some good parts of current thinking and any new thinking is unlikely to be complete and without its own faults).

- **Paradigm change** – consciously develop a new way of thinking.

She also notes that “Change by exception, incremental change, and pendulum change stop short of transformation. The brain cannot deal with conflicting information unless it can integrate it ... [and] harmonize the ideas into a powerful synthesis”, and that, she adds, ‘is paradigm change” (1987: 72).

Here it is suggested that the many identified exceptions to established enterprise thinking do disprove the rule and that incremental change would take a long time to become tangibly manifest during which the conventional wisdom would continue to mislead. However, not all current thinking is wrong and there is no contrary foundation worked out and ready to download. This suggests that a pendulum change would not be appropriate and instead paradigm transformation is needed.
Box 2 - Confusing language

In discussions about enterprise and its associated concepts such as small business and entrepreneurship, caution is needed about the confusion that can result from some of the language. Often the customary vocabulary includes words which can have more than one meaning or implication and therefore do not help to improve understanding when it is not clear which meaning is intended or understood. An example is the two different interpretations of the word enterprise which were highlighted earlier in this paper. There are other words which may be misunderstood, including:

Entrepreneurship. There is no single, clear, and widely accepted definition of entrepreneurship. For instance, in 1988, Gartner was able to present a summary of 29 views on entrepreneurs, 21 of which included some sort of a definition. As some of the definitions offered are not consistent with others, Bridge (2017) has gone as far as to suggest that the use of the word should be dropped.

Business. Sometimes, possibly because it is a convenient way to interpret the available data, anyone who appears to be self-employed is said to have a business. However, such an occupational endeavour can have very little in common with a large, shareholder-driven corporation, even though it can also be labelled a business. But, because they are both often described as businesses, it can lead to the assumption that they have a lot in common.

Success. As indicated below, success in business should mean delivering the owner’s aims—which are not always growth and profit. Nevertheless, business professionals (such as professional managers, consultants, and academics) often adopt short-term financial gain as the key measure of business success and wrongly dismiss as underperforming enterprises which instead deliver other benefits to their owners.

Failure. One sort of failure is when someone does something which does not work—but that outcome should have been foreseen if reasonable prior reconnaissance and/or thought had been undertaken. However, another sort occurs in trial and error situations when it is not possible or practical to find out in advance what will happen and trying it to see is the only, or at least the most practical, way to find out. If it doesn't work, that is nevertheless a successful experiment in that it has demonstrated what happens in those circumstances. Does a belief in determinism lead to the stigmatisation of failure because all failure is assumed to be the first sort, whereas, in some circumstance risking the second sort is the best way to make progress? Thus, while the first sort of failure is bad, the second may often be the result of good practice.

What might a new paradigm be? Knowing that one is needed does not immediately indicate everything which it might include, but it does indicate the need to look for better insights—and that search might be assisted by seeing the subject from different perspectives. Just as in medicine, ending the practice of bleeding to cure fevers was not on its own enough to end the legacy of the humours theory, and a new perspective on how illnesses might be transmitted was necessary for the practices advocated by people like Semmelweis, Pasteur, and Lister to become the accepted way to reduce infections (see Box 1). The following thoughts are offered to suggest possible aspects of an alternative perspective which might come from questioning the assumptions indicated. Of course, there are many
examples that might be raised, but these are offered as some of the possible implications of the current thinking and/or the changes that might therefore be considered.

**What is Enterprise?**

If enterprise is not just a sub-set of business, what is it? This question is especially relevant for enterprise (or ‘entrepreneurship’) education, with observers such as Hytti and Kuopusjärvi (2004) and Hannon (2005) having reported different aims which might be encompassed in Mitra’s (2016) categorisation of courses as being about, for, through or with entrepreneurship, which might in turn be summarised as:

*About:* awareness of the significance and nature of enterprise and entrepreneurship and a focus on knowledge specific to new firm formation or innovation.

*For:* encouraging the development of new business ventures.

*Through:* student-centred experimental and action learning.

*With:* added-value entrepreneurship supplementing a wide range of disciplines.

Many other quotations could also be added but, nevertheless, is the key issue here the distinction that has been made between learning how to be an entrepreneur and start a business and learning how to be entrepreneurial/enterprising in any field of endeavour? However, it would appear to have been convenient to often conflate these two things as if they were different aspects of the same activity. Even when it is claimed that a course is about being enterprising/entrepreneurial, it is still often linked to business applications—as, for example, in this description apparently appealing across disciplines but still stressing prototyping and business modelling as key components:

> At its core, entrepreneurship education is boundary spanning. The tools of an entrepreneurship education (e.g. prototyping, business modelling, ideation, effectuation, etc.) are interdisciplinary and designed to engage learners from across the college campus and beyond. The lessons of entrepreneurship education are acquired in a problem-centric environment where learners from diverse disciplines combine resources to tackle specific problems and derive unique solutions that alone they may struggle to accomplish (USASBE 2022: 1)

This conflation has the benefit of implying that, being business-linked, all forms of enterprise education have a direct economic benefit and so can deliver economic policy aims, as well as being able to be taught using the same syllabus. But is that correct? Instead, if they were clearly separated, what could and/or should be taught for each of them?

Of course, some people who are enterprising will want to start businesses, but many will apply it in other ways—for instance as enterprising explorers, artists, theatre directors, or care workers—and they don’t need to learn the mechanics of starting a business. It is also the case that some businesses are started by not very enterprising people; for instance, this is the usual way to practice the trade that an individual might have learnt. Acknowledging that being enterprising and starting a business are different things allows a fresh perspective to be taken, considering, for instance, how being enterprising for any aspect of life should be taught, provided that it is not essentially conflated with the process of starting a business.
The Motivation to Start a Business

However, that does not mean that starting a business should be ignored. It is still a relevant activity for many people and policymakers might still want to encourage it. But why would someone be inclined to start a business? Traditional, policy thinking seems to assume that, if business start-up is supported, people will do it—hence in 2003 the declared aim for the UK’s Small Business Service (SBS 2003: 4) was “making the UK the best place in the world to start or grow a business”. However, as the proverb puts it, you can lead a horse to water but you cannot make it drink; and in many cases providing start-up assistance does not appear to have led to an increase in start-up rates (Bridge and O’Neill 2018: 336). It is therefore interesting that, early in 2022, a press release by the UK’s Enterprise Research Centre reported finding that “more than 70% of Britons believe it is easy to start a business in the UK”, but, despite this, “less than one in ten has any intention of doing so” (ERC 2022).

What then, as people might perceive them, are the pros and cons of attempting business start-up and therefore the triggers to their intentions which policy might seek to influence? The book *The Rainforest* (Hwang and Horowitt 2012: 124 & 126), with its analysis of Silicon Valley, suggests an interesting comparison:

The traditional perspective is likely to be:

*Pros:* You might make more money.\(^1\)

*Cons:* It requires a considerable investment of time, effort and stress. It is also likely to mean sacrificing, not only any existing career investment and future prospects, but also the social standing and respect that comes being seen to be in a recognised profession.

Whereas the Silicon Valley perception is more likely to be:

*Pros:* It earn you money but it might also satisfy a sense of adventure, opportunity, discovery, independence and/or passion. It has social approval and often the joy of sharing and/or successful teamwork. And it can leave a legacy for others.

*Cons:* It does require time and effort and it involves exposing yourself and your ideas to new contacts (but this can be compensated by making new friends). It might lead to ‘failure’ (but you could regret not trying and any setback is often mitigated by social support).

As such, recognising that human intentions are often more influenced by social norms than by the supposed economic logic of a situation can provide a better perspective from which to develop an appropriate policy for encouraging or supporting small business start-ups.

The Aims of Those with a Business and Consequent Business Behaviour

Programmes designed to help businesses are often labelled *growth* programmes as if growth is what most business owners want. However, suppose if, instead of business growth being the aim, we talked of business success? A focus on growth clearly conforms to an assumption that businesses primarily aim to make money and therefore want to

---

1 However, while some people do make money this way, evidence suggests that most self-employed people are not motivated primarily by money and on average earn less than their comparably employed peers (for instance, see Amit et al. 2001, and Hårman and Mattsson 2019).
grow—but what if for many businesses success is something different? What implications does that have for understanding business behaviour?

It has been observed that “an enterprise is a goal-achievement device” (Hunter 2007). But businesses do not formulate aims—it is the people who own and/or run them who have aims and try to achieve them through their businesses. So why do people operate businesses—what are their aims/goals? Is personal wealth (and therefore business growth) actually only a minority or subordinate aim, as some research suggests, and does growth tend to shorten the life of a business, as West indicates in his book _Scale_ (2017)? In reality are people’s aims often plural and actually very heterogeneous, for example, to sustain a living and a lifestyle, to enjoy it and/or gain fulfilment, to explore an idea, to follow a family tradition, to fulfil a community need, because it is the norm for a trade/skill, to practice/develop a skill/ability, or to make a contribution?

Nevertheless, policymakers seek growth, businesses are assumed to want growth and business schools teach growth—but that is like the medical establishment preaching bleeding as a cure, doctors believing it was the correct treatment and patients expecting and/or asking to be bled. Suppose, therefore, that instead of following that conventional wisdom and seeking to assist business growth, the aim was to foster business success. What would that perspective mean for those seeking to help businesses, and their owners, through polices, courses, support programmes, and so on? This perspective could also lead to a better understanding of business behaviour and a recognition that business owners who do not take apparent opportunities to grow their businesses are not necessarily managing them badly.

**Determinism or an Uncertain Future**

Traditional business thinking may emphasise the need to research and forecast and consequently plan on that basis, but history shows us that often the future does not conform to predictions. Therefore, instead of thinking that, with the right application, the business future can be reliably determined, how can and/or should people prepare for uncertainty? Planning is not without its uses but, instead of recommending that future uncertainty be reduced by careful research, forecasting, and planning, would a perspective based on accepting uncertainty indicate the applicability of approaches such as effectuation (Sarasvathy 2008—mentioned above) and also:

*Trial and error*. The process commonly known as trial and error (although if correctly applied it is not ‘error’) is acknowledged to be a good way to proceed when the only practical way to assess the efficacy of an idea (e.g. for a product or service) is to try it for real and observe the results. Then, if it does not work as hoped, that can be investigated and ways are sought to improve the offering before testing it again. As Harford (2011: 26) observes, “Whether we like it or not, trial and error is a tremendously powerful process for solving problems in a complex world, while expert leadership is not.”

*Lean start-up*. Lean start-up is a version of trial and error which advocates market-testing a product as early as possible as customer reactions are often not predictable and so the sooner corrections can be made, the less resources will be wasted on things that will later need to be corrected. As the saying puts it, *fail early, fail cheap*.

*Exploration*. Bridge and Hegarty (2013) suggest that new ventures have more in common with explorers than with established big businesses—and suggest 10 exploration principles to guide them.
**Ready-fire-aim.** Most people will have heard the expression *ready-aim-fire* which is applicable for rifle shooting when, once the trigger is squeezed, the shooter has no further control over the bullet. However, life is much more like a guided missile which, after preparation, can be steered in flight once launched. Therefore, *ready-fire-aim* is often the best course to follow.

**Antifragility.** Taleb (2013) invented the word *antifragile* to mean the opposite of fragile. This is not, he suggests, “robust” because, if something fragile is handled roughly it is liable to be damaged and something robust is liable to be unchanged—and what he wanted was a label for something which, if handled roughly, becomes better and/or stronger as a result. However, that will only happen from exposure to adverse conditions, rather than trying to hide from them, and the wherewithal to learn from their effects and apply that learning.

This is not a case of always forecasting and planning or always preparing for uncertainty, but of understanding both approaches and knowing when each is appropriate. Instead of thinking that one of these approaches will cover every eventuality, one should have both tools in their toolbox, as Sarasvathy advocates (2008).

**Using Social Capital**

The influence of social norms has been mentioned above and the concept of social capital recognises other benefits that can be obtained from social connections. However, has the tendency to ignore social influence on business led to it being neglected? As Schuller et al. (2000) have commented, social capital is relatively immature as a concept and it “has several adolescent characteristics: it is neither tidy nor mature; it can be abused, analytically and politically; its future is unpredictable” but, they add, “it offers much promise” (35).

As its label implies, social capital is like financial capital in that it needs to be accumulated to be used but, in considering its nature and use, Coleman’s observations be a helpful starting point as he suggested (1988: S98) that social capital “is not a single entity, but a variety of different entities having two characteristics in common: They all consist of some aspect of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of individuals who are within the structure”. He also suggested (1988: S102-5) that its different applications or effects include accessing “relevant information channels, developing trust and mutual obligations and establishing norms of behaviour and sanctions for transgressing them”.

**In Conclusion**

The above analysis suggests that there are good reasons for questioning the conventional wisdom about enterprise and that its basis can be explained by a set of assumptions which do seem to have been made but which appear to be misguided. If our conventional wisdom about enterprise is indeed based on such problematic foundations, this indicates that, if enterprise is to be better understood and polices to promote it are to be effective, a new paradigm is needed—even if we do not precisely know what that could be. However, a start might be made by exploring some of the different perspectives revealed by questioning the suggested assumptions. If they provide a better understanding of enterprise and could assist efforts to help and/or promote it (see also Bridge 2022) should they be examined further?
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