

Research Seminar in Entrepreneurship
Spring 2017

Course Number: 22:620:685 sec. 2
Tuesdays 9-11:50
Classroom: TBA

Professor Ted Baker
1 WP Room 1092
973-353-5488
tbaker@business.rutgers.edu

Draft: 6 January 2017

LEARNING GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

This seminar is targeted to participants who are pursuing research-based careers and who wish to interpret and contribute to research on entrepreneurship. One objective is to survey *some* of the major theoretical perspectives and issues studied in entrepreneurship research in the field of management, including both classic and contemporary scholarship and both theoretical and empirical contributions. Entrepreneurship research is inherently interdisciplinary, and we will draw on insights from scholars across a range of disciplines. That said, the content of this seminar will also be shaped by my current interests and those of the students enrolled this term. Because our doctoral program requires training in quantitative but not in qualitative methods, we will spend more time than we otherwise would explicating qualitative approaches to entrepreneurship research.

Another objective is to support students in drafting a paper that incorporates one or more of the topics covered in class with their own research interests and to help students learn in a hands-on manner about review and revision processes.

Throughout this course, we will attempt to avoid mindlessly recreating the stark distinction between “theoretically interesting” and “practically interesting” that plagues most management disciplines and indeed much of social science. We will take the perspective that theoretically and practically interesting insights can inhere in the same research products. Nonetheless, much of what is presented as practical insights in entrepreneurship has a limited basis in research, and much of the presentation of research – especially in journals that impose higher “technical” standards – does very little to help readers make judgments about practical implications. We can treat the “theoretical-practical” divide playfully by, for example, considering some popular treatments of entrepreneurship and assessing their claims in the scholarly literature and by wondering what might happen if we took the “practical” advice in some scholarly papers seriously.

Format

Class meets once a week. Students will read and discuss assigned materials and will take turns leading discussions. Each student will write a research paper that will be “reviewed” and then revised in response to the reviews.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Students are responsible for understanding the RU Academic Integrity Policy (http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/files/documents/AI_Policy_2013.pdf). I will strongly enforce this Policy and pursue all violations. By remaining in this course, you are agreeing to adhere to the RU Honor Policy: “On my honor, I have neither received nor given any unauthorized assistance on this examination or assignment.” Plagiarism is a serious violation of academic integrity. See business.rutgers.edu/ai for more details.

ACCOMMODATIONS and SUPPORT SERVICES

Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines>. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. To begin this process, please complete the Registration form on the ODS web site at: <https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/registration-form>. For more information please contact Kate Torres at (973)353-5375 or in the Office of Disability Services in the Paul Robeson Campus Center, in suite 219 or by contacting odsnewark@rutgers.edu.

If you are a military veteran or are on active military duty, you can obtain support through the Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services: <http://veterans.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of mental health services, please use our readily available services: Rutgers University-Newark Counseling Center: <http://counseling.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of physical health services, please use our readily available services: [Rutgers Health Services – Newark: <http://health.newark.rutgers.edu/>

If you are in need of legal services, please use our readily available services: <http://rusls.rutgers.edu/>

REQUIREMENTS and GRADING

An important part of this course will be your (in some cases continued) socialization into the journal review process. Therefore, about two-thirds of the way through the semester, your research paper for this class will be submitted for (not really) double-blind peer review, and you will serve as a reviewer for a classmate's paper. The review you write, along with your revised

manuscript and your response letter to the review you receive will form half of your grade. The remainder of your grade will be based on class contribution.

Class Preparation and Contribution (50% of grade) - Each participant is required to come prepared to class. Since class discussion is an integral part of the course, absences and lack of preparedness are unacceptable. Preparation will always involve reading and working with all the weekly assignments. In addition, each article will be assigned to a class member who will prepare a short (preferably a single page) written synopsis / critique of the article that they will e-mail to all class members by noon the day prior to our class meeting. While I will provide some introductory lecture materials, much of the course will involve engaging in discussions about seminar topics. Specific students will be tasked with leading our discussion of each article.

Individual Paper and Response Letter (40% of grade) - Participants will write a research paper that relates one or more of the topics covered in class to their own research interests. I am flexible as to the format of the paper, because I want it to meet your needs. One option is the "front end" of a research paper that defines a research question, reviews and critiques the extant literature, develops a few testable hypotheses, and proposes a method for testing the proposed hypotheses. If you have data and want to do a full paper with analysis and results that's okay, but you are still subject to the page limit. A pure theory paper is also acceptable, as is the development of a dissertation proposal. The body of the manuscript (excluding title page, references, figures, etc.) should not exceed 25 PAGES, double spaced with one inch margins and 12 point times new roman font. Each paper will undergo a "journal review process." Papers spanning entrepreneurship and other disciplines such as sociology, organization theory, psychology, organizational behavior, accounting, finance, marketing, strategy, communications, etc. are all acceptable – subject to my prior approval of the subject matter.

Your final grade will reflect your revised paper (incorporating your response to the reviewer's comments) and your written responses to the reviewer explaining how you responded to each comment, or why you elected not to adopt a particular suggestion.

Review (10% of grade): You are responsible for providing a useful review of a manuscript submitted to the blind review process. Please keep your review to two, single-spaced pages and enumerating between five and eight points.

COURSE SCHEDULE

The following list of readings represents a sampling from the universe of readings one might see in a standard management doctoral seminar in entrepreneurship¹. In general, however, we will decide week-to-week what to read, based partly on participant interests and the discussion topics

¹ I don't think such a "standard" course exists. In putting together this seminar, I collected syllabi from seven eminent entrepreneurship scholars. No single paper or weekly topic appeared in more than three of the syllabi and if I had assessed "inter-rater reliability" using chosen main topics or papers as "measures" of the core of entrepreneurship research, the results would have indicated near-randomness. Entrepreneurship remains a big, messy, interdisciplinary field.

that evolve during the seminar (or when interesting papers are newly published). The list below is primarily a resource from which we will draw and a guide to the scholarly terrain².

Please note: in the list below, “required” articles (which *will* change during the term: in general, we will assign four to six required papers) are marked by **bolding and underlining** the author names. “Routledge Companion” refers to the Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship (Baker & Welter, eds.) I have assigned a few chapters from it and listed some others in supplemental readings. When I have suggested that you “skim” a paper, I intend that you read it carefully enough to get the gist of the author’s argument, but don’t require that you understand the details that support the argument.

<p>1/18</p>	<p>Warmup and background information</p>	<p>Please email to me at least twenty-four hours before our the first class meeting a one-to-two page essay, single spaced with one inch margins and 12 point times new roman font, answering the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are your primary career goals? 2. What are your main academic interests at the moment? 3. Why are you taking this course? <p>Please write this brief essay as well as you can: I will use this document to form an initial assessment of how well you write.</p> <p>Please also email me a current vita.</p> <p>We will use the following three papers (especially the third) throughout the term as lenses on how the authors we read frame their papers. You may have read these papers in an earlier course: great! Please read them again <u>prior to our first class session.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Alvesson, M. & Sandberg, J.</u> 2011. Generating research questions through problematization. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 36 (2): 247-271. • <u>Grant A. & Pollock, T.</u> 2011. From the editors. Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the hook. <i>Academy of</i>
--------------------	---	--

² There are some obvious lacunae, such as “corporate entrepreneurship,” “entrepreneurial orientation,” young firm internationalization and some other popular topics. If participants in the course are strongly interested in any such topics, we will find a way to talk about them.

		<p><i>Management Journal</i>, 54(5): 873-879. Although this purports to be about publishing in AMJ, it is useful, in my opinion, for any journal that focuses on theoretical contribution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locke, K. & Golden-Biddle. 1997. Constructing opportunities for contribution: Structuring intertextual coherence and “problematizing” in organizational studies. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 40 (5) 1023-1062. <p>Please come to class prepared to describe and explain how some specific empirical research paper from an elite journal – I’d suggest picking your favorite such paper – fits into the “Locke and Golden-Biddle scheme.</p> <p>Optional: Depending on how much you know about entrepreneurship already, you may also want to take a look at (skim for an hour or two) the following book. Although, in my opinion, Scott Shane (one of the most profoundly talented and productive entrepreneurship scholars of all time) draws a few too-strong inferences from the evidence he adduces, the book is a good introduction to some recent facts and fantasies about entrepreneurship. The digital version of the book is available inexpensively.</p> <p>Shane, S. 2010. <i>The Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The costly myths that entrepreneurs, investors and policy makers live by.</i> New Haven: Yale University Press.</p>
1/25	<p>Roots and Classics: What is entrepreneurship? What is the state of entrepreneurship research?</p>	<p>There are a lot of papers this week, but none of them is technically challenging and most are quite short. I’ve suggested that you “skim” several of them. We start with some economic perspectives, move on to a discussion of how economics-infused strategy perspectives guide the training of many current entrepreneurship scholars, spend some time</p>

		<p>on the “Shane & Venkat” attempt to define the “distinctive domain” of entrepreneurship and end with the perspective of entrepreneurship as a behavior and as “organization creation.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Schumpeter, J.</u> 1942. <i>Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy</i>. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 81-86. (Chapter VII: The Process of Creative Destruction). • <u>Baumol, W.J.</u> 1968. Entrepreneurship in Economic Theory, <i>American Economic Review</i>, Vol. LVII, No. 2, pp. 64-71. • <u>Kirzner, I.</u> 1997. Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, 35:60-85. (skim) • <u>Baker, T., & Pollock, T. G.</u> 2007. Making the marriage work: The benefits of strategy’s takeover of entrepreneurship for strategic organization. <i>Strategic Organization</i>, 5(3), 297-312. • <u>Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S.</u> 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 25: 217-226. (As you will learn, I disagree with much of this paper, but it is important to the field) • <u>Shane, S.</u> 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 37, 1: 10-20. (skim) • <u>Venkataraman, et al.</u> 2012. Reflections on the AMR decade award: whither the promise? Moving forward with entrepreneurship as a science of the artificial. (skim) • <u>Baker, T. & Welter, F.</u> 2014. Bridges to the Future. Introductory chapter in Routledge Companion. • <u>Kim, P.</u> 2014. Action and process, vision and values: Entrepreneurship means something different to everyone. Pp. 59-76 in <i>Routledge Companion to</i>
--	--	--

		<p><i>Entrepreneurship</i>. (skim)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Baker T., Powell, E. & Fultz, A.</u> Whatdya know? Qualitative methods in entrepreneurship. Forthcoming chapter. • Aldrich, H. 2011. Beam me up (Scott)ie! Institutional theorists' struggles with the emergent nature of entrepreneurship. • <u>Busenitz, L. W.</u>, West, P., Shepherd, D., Nelson, T., Zacharakis, A. & Chandler, G. (2003). Entrepreneurship in emergence: Past trends and future directions. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 29 (3): 285-308. • Davidsson, P., Low, M., & Wright, M. 2001. Low and MacMillan ten years on: Achievements and future directions for entrepreneurship research. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>, 25(4): 5-15. • Demmert, H., and Klein, D. 2003. Experiment on entrepreneurial discovery: an attempt to demonstrate the conjecture of Hayek and Kirzner. <i>Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization</i>, 50: 295-310. • Drucker, P. 1985. <i>Innovation and Entrepreneurship</i>. New York: Harper and Row, pp. 30-38. • Knight, F. 1964. <i>Risk, Uncertainty and Profit</i>. New York: Augustus Kelley; pp. 269-275. • Landstrom, H. 2014. Entrepreneurship research and its historical background. Pp. 21-40 in T. Baker and F. Welter (eds.). <i>The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship</i>. • Schumpeter, J. 1934. <i>The Theory of Economic Development</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press. • Venkataraman, S. 1997. The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. In J. Katz and R. Brockhaus (Eds.), <i>Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth</i>, vol. 3: 119-138. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zahra, S., Dess, G.G., et al. 2001. Dialogue. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 26: 8-16. • Zahra, S.A. 2007. Contextualizing theory building in entrepreneurship research. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 22: 443-452.
2/1	Opportunities	<p>Many people in entrepreneurship will tell you that the concept of “opportunities” is central to current research in entrepreneurship. It is certainly hard to avoid. Much of the heat has been around “discovery” versus “creation.” The recent literature pertinent to this is large and we will read a few of the cornerstone contributions and a couple of broader ranging studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Eckhardt, J. & Shane, S.</u> 2003. Opportunities and Entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 29(3): 333-349. • <u>Alvarez, S., & Barney, J.</u> 2007. Discovery and Creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>, 1: 11-26. • <u>Gartner, W.B, B. Teague, T. Baker, R.D. Wadhani.</u> A brief history of the idea of opportunity. • <u>Shane, S.</u> 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. <i>Organization Science</i>, 11: 448-469. • <u>Short et al.</u> 2009. The Concept of "Opportunity" in Entrepreneurship Research: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 36(1): 1-28. • <u>Shepherd et al.</u> 2013. “I care about nature, but ...”: Disengaging values in assessing opportunities that cause harm. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 56(5) 1251-1273. • Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J.B. 2010. Epistemology and Entrepreneurship: The Philosophical Underpinnings of the Study of Entrepreneurial Opportunities.

		<p>Academy of Management Annals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J.B., Anderson, P. Forthcoming. Forming and exploiting opportunities: • Baron, R. 2006. Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: How entrepreneurs “Connect the dots” to identify new business opportunities. <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i>, 20(1): 104-119. • Demmert, H., and Klein, D. 2003. Experiment on entrepreneurial discovery: an attempt to demonstrate the conjecture of Hayek and Kirzner. <i>Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization</i>, 50: 295-310. • Gloria-Palermo, S. 1999. Discovery versus Creation: Implications of the Austrian View of the Market Process'. In J. Groenewegen, & J. Vromen (Eds.), <i>Institutions and the Evolution of Capitalism: Implications of Evolutionary Economics</i>. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. • Klevorick, A., Levin, R., Nelson, R., and Winter, S. 1995. On the sources and significance of inter-industry differences in technological opportunities. <i>Research Policy</i>, 24: 185-205. (SS) • McMullen, J. S., Shepherd, D. A., 2006. Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 31(1), 132-152.
2/8	Firm formation and emergence	<p>My own research is mostly oriented to entrepreneurship as organization formation and entrepreneurs as founders. This is perhaps most easily contrasted with perspectives defining entrepreneurship as one or more specific forms of “innovation.” Not all entrepreneurship is particularly innovative and not all innovation is entrepreneurship. But some entrepreneurship is highly innovative, sometimes at multiple levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Aldrich, H., and Fiol, M.</u> 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of

		<p>industry creation. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 19(4): 645-670.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Aldrich, H. & Ruef, M.</u> 2006. <i>Organizations evolving</i>. (2nd ed.) London: Sage. Chapter 4: “Entrepreneurs and the emergence of new organizations.” • <u>Baker, T., Miner, A.S. & Eesley, D.T.</u> 2003. Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process. <i>Research Policy</i>: 32: 255 • <u>Bhide, A.</u> 2000. <i>The Origin and Evolution of New Business</i>: Chapters 1 and 2. New York: Oxford University Press. • <u>Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B., & Reynolds, P. D.</u> 1996. Exploring start-up event sequences. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 11(3): 151-167. • <u>Sorensen, J. B.</u> 2007. Bureaucracy and entrepreneurship: Workplace effects on entrepreneurial entry. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 52(3): 387-412. • <u>Panel study of entrepreneurial dynamics (PSED) & Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)</u> – familiarize yourself with these two projects. • <u>Klepper, S.</u> 2001. "Employee Startups in High-Tech Industries," <i>Industrial and Corporate Change</i>, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 639-674. • <u>Bhave, M. P.</u> 1994. A process model of entrepreneurial venture creation. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 9(3): 223-246. • <u>Birley, S., & Westhead, P.</u> 1994. A taxonomy of business start-up reasons and their impact on firm growth and size.
--	--	---

		<p>Journal of Business Venturing, 9(1): 7-32.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gersick, C. J. G. 1994. Pacing strategic change: The case of a new venture. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 37(1): 9-46. • Herron, L., & Sapienza, H. J. 1992. The entrepreneur and the initiation of new venture launch activities. <i>Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice</i>, 17(1): 49-56. • Larson, A., & Starr, J. A. 1992. A network model of organization formation. <i>Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice</i>, 17(2): 5-16. • Mitchell, R. K., Smith, B., Seawright, K. W., & Morse, E. A. 2000. Cross-cultural cognitions and the venture creation decision. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 43(5): 974-993. • Singh, Jitendra V., Tucker, David J. and House, Robert J. (1986) "Organizational Legitimacy and the Liability of Newness", <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 31: pp. 171-193 • Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., & Brewer, M. B. 1998. Intellectual human capital and the birth of U.S. biotechnology enterprises. <i>American Economic Review</i>, 88(1): 290-307.
2/15	Founder Identity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M.</u> 2009. The Nature and Experience of Entrepreneurial Passion. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 34 (3), 511-532. • <u>Fauchart, E., & Gruber, M.</u> 2011. Darwinians, Communitarians, and Missionaries: The Role of Founder Identity in Entrepreneurship. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 54 (5), 935-957. • <u>Powell, E.E & Baker, T.</u> 2014. It's what you make of it: Founder identity and enacting strategic responses to adversity. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 57, 5: 1406-1433. • <u>Powell, E.E & Baker, T.</u> 2017? Come

		<p>together: Identities and organizing in multi-founder nascent ventures. <i>Provisionally accepted at Academy of Management Journal</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Mead, George H.</u> The ‘I’ and the ‘me.’ From Mind, Self and Society. • Ashforth, B. E. 2001. <i>Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective</i>. Psychology Press. • Hogg, M., Terry, D., & White, K. 1995. A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. <i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>, 58, 255-269. • Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. 2009. Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. <i>Research Policy</i>, 38 (6), 922-935. • Stryker, S. 1980. <i>Symbolic interactionism: A social structural version</i>. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Pub. Co. • Stryker, S., & Burke, P. 2000. The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. <i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>, 63 (4), 284-297. • Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. 1979. An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), <i>The social psychology of intergroup relations</i> (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.
2/22	Resource Constraints and Entrepreneurial Resourcefulness 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>George, G.</u> 2005. Slack resources and the performance of privately held firms. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 48(4): 661-676. • <u>Katila, R. & Shane, S.</u> 2005. When does lack of resources make new firms innovative? <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 48: 814-829. • <u>Kodithuwakku, S. S., & Rosa, P.</u> 2002. The entrepreneurial process and economic success in a constrained environment.

		<p><i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 17: 431-465.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Holtz-Eakin, D., Joulfaian, D, Rosen, H.</u> 1994. Sticking it out: Entrepreneurial survival and liquidity constraints. <i>Journal of Political Economy</i>. • <u>Gimeno, Folta, Cooper & Woo.</u> 1997. Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. <i>ASQ</i>, 42: 750-783.
3/1	Resource Constraints and Entrepreneurial Resourcefulness 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Baker, T., Miner, A.S. & Eesley, D.T.</u> 2003. Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving and improvisational competencies in the founding process. <i>Research Policy</i>: 32: 255 • <u>Baker, T. & Nelson, R.E.</u> 2005. Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction through Entrepreneurial Bricolage. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 50: 329-366) • <u>Senyard, J., Baker, T., Steffens, P. & Davidsson, P.</u> 2014. Bricolage as a Path to Innovativeness for Resource-Constrained New Firms. <i>Journal of Product Innovation Management</i>, 31, 2: 211-230. • <u>Hmieleski, K., & Corbett, A.</u> 2008. The contrasting interaction effects of improvisational behavior with entrepreneurial self-efficacy on new venture performance and entrepreneur work satisfaction. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 23: 482 – 496. • <u>Sonenshein, S.</u> 2014. How organizations foster the creative use of resources. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 57(814-848). • Garud, R., & Karnoe, P. 2003. Bricolage versus breakthrough: distributed and embedded agency in technology entrepreneurship. <i>Research Policy</i>, 32(2): 277-300. • Banerjee, P.M. and Campbell, B.A. 2009. Inventor bricolage and firm technology

		<p>research and development. <i>R&D Management</i> 39, 5: 473-487.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delmar, F., and Shane, S. 2003. Does business planning facilitate the development of new ventures? <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 24: 1165-1185. • Dew, N., Read, S. Sarasvathy, S., & Wiltbank, R. 2009. Effectual versus predictive logics in entrepreneurial decision-making: Differences between experts and novices. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 24: 287-309.
3/8	Social E'Ship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Peredo, A.M.</u> 2014. Poverty, reciprocity and community-based entrepreneurship: enlarging the discussion. Chapter 17 in Baker & Welter, <i>Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship</i>. • <u>Mair, J., & Marti, I.</u> 2006. Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. <i>Journal of World Business</i>, 41: 36-44. • <u>Miller, T. L., Grimes, M. G., McMullen, J. S., & Vogus, T. J. (2012).</u> Venturing for others with heart and head: How compassion encourages social entrepreneurship. <i>Academy of management review</i>, 37(4), 616-640. • <u>Short, J.C., Moss, T.W., & Lumpkin, G.T.</u> 2009. Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>, 3: 161-194. • <u>Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M.</u> 2009. A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 24(5): 519-532. • Austin, J., Stevenson, H.W., & Wei-Skillern, J. 2006. Social and commercial entrepreneurship: Same, different, or both? <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>, 30(1): 1-22. •
3/22	Socio-economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Liebenstein, H.</u> 1968. Entrepreneurship

	Development	<p>and Development. <i>American Economic Review</i>, Vol. LLVIII, No. 2, pp. 72-83.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Prahalad, C.K. & Hammond, A.</u> 2002. Serving the world's poor, profitably. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, 80(9): 48-57. • TBD – Burgeoning literature
3/29	Individual (mostly cognitive) Differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Busenitz, L. & Barney, J.</u> 1997. Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 12(1), 9-30. • <u>Stewart, Jr., W. & Roth, P.</u> 2001. Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i>, 86: 145-153. (optional: see rebuttal by Miner and Raju (2004) and response). • <u>Baron, R.</u> 2004. The cognitive perspective: A valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic "why" questions. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 19: 221-239. • <u>Hmieleski, K. & Baron, R.</u> 2009. Entrepreneurs' optimism and new venture performance: A social cognitive perspective. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 52(3): 473-488. • <u>Sarasvathy, S.</u> 2001. Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 26(2): 243-263. • <u>Dew, N., Read, S. Sarasvathy, S., & Wiltbank, R.</u> 2009. Effectual versus predictive logics in entrepreneurial decision-making: Differences between experts and novices. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 24: 287-309. • <u>Arend</u> AMR paper: Effectuation as Ineffectual • <u>Sarasvathy:</u> Response to Arend.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gartner, W.B. 1988. "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. <i>American Journal of Small Business</i>, Spring, 1988, pp. 11-32. •
4/5	Ethnicity	<p>TBD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jones, T. & Ram, M. Entrepreneurship as ethnic minority liberation. Chapter 25 in Baker and Welter, <i>Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship</i>. • Porter, M.E., 1995. The competitive advantage of the inner city. <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, (May-June), pg. 55-71. • Butler, J., 1996. Entrepreneurship and the advantages of the inner city: How to augment the Porter thesis. <i>Review of Black Political Economy</i>, 24 (2/3): 30-50. • Gittel, R. & Thompson, J.P., 1999. Inner-city business development and entrepreneurship: New frontiers for policy and research. <i>Urban Problems and Community Development</i>, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute. pg. 473-520. • Moss, P. & Tilly, C., 2001. Why opportunity isn't knocking: Racial inequality and the demand for labor. In A. O'Connor, C. Tilly & L. Bobo (Eds.), <i>Urban Inequality: Evidence from Four Cities</i>. Russell Sage Foundation. Pg. 444-495. • Fairchild, G. 2008a. The influence of residential segregation and its correlates on ethnic enterprise. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 23 (5): 513-527. • Fairchild, G. 2008b. Spatial assimilation and self-employment: The case of black Americans. <i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship</i>, 13 (3): 269-291. • Robinson, J., 2007. Urban entrepreneurship: Patterns and policy. <i>Western New England Law Review</i>, 30: 103-118. • Robinson, J. & Hayes, R., 2012. Opportunity recognition in inner-

		<p>city markets: An exploratory study. <i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship</i>, 17 (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sriram, V., Mersha, T. & Herron, L., 2007. Drivers of urban entrepreneurship: An integrative model. <i>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research</i>, 13 (4): 235-251. • Fairchild, Gregory B. "Residential segregation influences on the likelihood of ethnic self-employment." <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> 33.2 (2009): 373-395. • Fairchild, Gregory B. "The influence of residential segregation and its correlates on ethnic enterprise in urban areas." <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> 23.5 (2008): 513-527
4/12 Initial Paper Submissions	Gender	TBD
4/19 Reviews	Context	TBD
4/26	Academic E'ship,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Grimaldi, Kenney, Siegel and Wright.</u> 2011. Thirty years after Bayh-Dole: Reassessing academic entrepreneurship. <i>Research Policy</i> 40(8): 1045-1075. • <u>Markman, Gianiodis and Phan.</u> 2009. Supply-side innovation and technology commercialization. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i> 46(4): 625-649. • <u>Rothaermel, Agung and Jiang.</u> 2007. University entrepreneurship: A Taxonomy of the literature. <i>Industrial and Corporate Change</i> 16: 691-791 • <u>O'shea, et al.</u> 2005. Entrepreneurial orientation, technology transfer and spinoff performance of US universities. <i>Research Policy</i> 34 (2005): 994-1009.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Acs, Z., and Audretsch, D.</u> 1988. Innovation in large and small firms: An empirical analysis. <i>The American Economic Review</i>, 78(4): 678-690. • <u>Ganiodis, P.</u> 2014. A framework for investigating university-based technology transfer and commercialization. Chapter 14 in <i>Routledge Companion</i>. • <u>Hsu D.J., Gans, J. & Stern, S.</u> 2002. When Does Start-up Innovation Spur the Gale of Creative Destruction? <i>RAND Journal of Economics</i>, 33: 571-586. • <u>Li, H. & Atuahene-Gima K.</u> 2001. Product innovation strategy and performance of new technology ventures in China. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>, 44(6): 1123-1134. • <u>O'Shea, R. P.; Allen, T. J.; Chevalier, A; & Roche, F.</u> 2005. Entrepreneurial orientation, technology transfer and spinoff performance of U.S. universities. <i>Research Policy</i>, 34(7): 994-1009. • <u>Jensen, R. & Jones, M.</u> 2012 University Startups and Entrepreneurship: New Data, New Results. Working paper. • <u>Shane, S.</u> 2002. <i>Selling university technology: Patterns from MIT</i> <i>Management Science</i>, 48(1), 122-137. • <u>Benner, M. & Tushman, M.</u> 2002. Process management and technological innovation: A longitudinal study of the photography and paint industries. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>. • <u>Christiansen, C., and Bower, J.</u> 1996. Customer power, strategic investment, and the failure of leading firms. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i>, 17: 197-218. • <u>Henderson, R. M., & Clarke, K. B.</u> 1990. Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 35(1): 9-30. • <u>Hoetker, G. & Agarwal, R.</u> 2007. Death hurts but it isn't fatal: The post-exit
--	--	---

		<p>diffusion of knowledge created by innovative companies. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tripsas, M. 2009. Technology, identity and inertia through the lens of the “Digital Photography Company”. <i>Organization Science</i>, 20: 441-460. • Tushman, M. L., & Anderson, P. 1986. Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 31(3): 439-465.
<p>5/3 Final Papers</p>	<p>Failure and the Darker Sides</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Baumol, W.J.</u> 1990. Entrepreneurship: Productive, unproductive and destructive. <i>Journal of Political Economy</i>, 98,5: 893-921. • <u>Azoulay, P. & Shane, S.</u> 2001. Entrepreneurs, contracts and the failure of young firms. <i>Management Science</i>, 47(3): 337-358. • <u>McGrath, R.</u> 1999. Falling forward: Real options reasoning and entrepreneurial failure. <i>Academy of Management Review</i>, 24: 13 - 30. • <u>Shepherd, D.A., Wiklund, J., & Haynie, J.M.</u> 2009. Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 24(2): 134-148. • Gimeno, J., Folta, T. B., Cooper, A. C., & Woo, C. Y. 1997. Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i>, 42: 750-783. • Jenkins, A., Brudin, E, and Wiklund, J. (in press). Individual responses to firm failure: Appraisals, grief, and the influence of prior failure experiences. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, in press. • Ucbasaran, D., Shepherd, D. A., Lockett, A., & Lyon, S. J. (2013). Life After

		<p>Business Failure The Process and Consequences of Business Failure for Entrepreneurs. <i>Journal of Management</i>, 39(1), 163-202.</p> <p>Simon, M., Houghton, S.M., & Savelli, S. 2003. Out of the frying pan...? Why small business managers introduce high-risk products. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i>, 18: 419-440.</p>
--	--	--

DRAFT