



## **University of Texas at El Paso, College of Business Administration**

### **Ph.D. Seminar in International Entrepreneurship (MGMT 6352) Spring 2018**

Class Time: Wednesdays from 2:00 pm to 4:50 pm  
Classroom: COBA 307

Dr. Matthew A. Barlow, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Management  
Email: [mabarlow@utep.edu](mailto:mabarlow@utep.edu)  
Office: COBA 232

Office Hours: Mondays: 10:00 am -- 11:30 am; 1:30 pm – 3:00 pm  
Wednesdays: 10:00 am – 11:30 am

#### **Course Overview and Objectives**

This doctoral level entrepreneurship seminar invites students to explore the key questions of entrepreneurship research—the who, what, when, where, why and how of new value creation under uncertainty. Entrepreneurship research is multi-disciplinary, and draws on areas including: strategic management, economics, sociology, psychology, and social psychology. In studying entrepreneurship, we will also focus on the process of conducting and publishing entrepreneurship research. This includes what is the anatomy of a scholarly contribution and how does one conduct research in this field?

#### **Learning Objectives**

The primary overarching goal is to help doctoral students become independent scholars who are knowledgeable in the field of entrepreneurship. Specifically, students will be able to:

1. Develop an understanding of the concepts, theory, and research in entrepreneurship;
2. Summarize, integrate, and evaluate and research in entrepreneurship;
3. Develop new ideas and/or approaches that advance this research literature and that might serve as starting points for publishable research papers; and

4. Master research process skills critical to success in an academic career such as the ability to think clearly and communicate effectively both orally and in written form.

### Seminar Format and Assignments

Component	Percentage of Grade
<b>Class Preparation and Participation</b>	30%
<b>Final Paper</b>	40%
<b>Peer Review</b>	15%
<b>Final Presentation</b>	15%

#### *Class Preparation and Participation (30%)*

You are expected to be an active (and constructively critical) participant in all class sessions. Preparation before class is essential, and an important part of the evaluation of performance will be based on student preparedness and internalization of concepts as evidenced by in-class discussion. This component of the grade has three key elements: preparation of reading assignments before class, participation in class discussion, and contributing by offering feedback to one of your classmates on his/her research proposal.

Doctoral seminars are very small so the quality of the learning experience depends greatly on each person. A student who sits back and listens (however intently) is likely to detract from others' learning experience. Your class contributions should go well beyond "I liked this reading" and "I didn't like that one" (although these reactions are important). Try to dig deeper and ask questions like:

- ✓ What is missing?
- ✓ What relevant questions aren't answered?
- ✓ What are the article's broader implications?
- ✓ What assumptions does this perspective make?
- ✓ How tenable are those assumptions?
- ✓ You might also want to compare and contrast the articles on the questions above: How are these articles similar or different?
- ✓ What studies should be done to develop theory in the area under discussion?

Each student will also be required to lead the discussion on a chosen paper each week.

#### *Class Paper (40%)*

It is my belief that publication is the core of being a professor. As such, papers in this class should be written for the purpose of eventual publication. As such, you are required to prepare a 10 to 20 page term project that is a *proposal* for a research project, which should become the basis of a publishable paper or dissertation chapter. It should be aimed at either adding new knowledge to the entrepreneurship field or bringing a new perspective to existing findings. Either

way, it should be executed in a way that would be “interesting” in the sense of the Murray Davis “That’s Interesting” article.

**Format.** This research paper should adhere to the format and submission guidelines provided by the Academy of Management Journal (see [http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/style\\_guide.html](http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/style_guide.html) for details), and should be organized roughly as follows:

- 1) Your introduction should identify the existing “conversation” you are joining, what is missing from this conversation, and how you intend to fill that gap. If your first two pages don’t clearly explain your point, and why it is important, most readers will lose interest – especially reviewers.
- 2) A “Theory” section where you review the literature needed to put your contribution into focus. Then develop, explain, and justify your unique contribution. A complete theory would include three main elements – what causes what, why and how, and under what conditions:
  - a. What causes what? An empirically falsifiable prediction, with Independent and dependent variables that are clearly articulated and defined.
  - b. Why and how? A logical and internally-consistent causal mechanism, which provides a bridge or a process through which the assumptions and boundary conditions provided in part (c) below will lead naturally to the prediction provided in part (a) above.
  - c. Under what conditions? A clear statement of the bare minimum set of assumptions and boundary conditions that must be fulfilled in order for the causal mechanism in part (b) above to apply, and in order for the prediction in part (a) above to be derived. (Imposing additional assumptions and boundary conditions beyond the bare minimum is viewed as undesirable, because it unnecessarily restricts the theory’s range of applicability.)
  - d. Carve out a “bite-sized” contribution. Because it is nearly impossible to develop a complete, new, full-blown, paradigm-shifting theory in the space you will have, you may prefer to aim for making a smaller “bite-sized” contribution to theory, such as:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Articulating a theory’s hidden assumptions or boundary constraints.</li><li>✓ Examining interesting special cases, where more and/or stronger predictions can be derived under additional assumptions or boundary constraints.</li><li>✓ Finding inconsistencies within a theory.</li><li>✓ Articulating previously overlooked points of inconsistency between theories.</li><li>✓ Introducing a new construct or variable.</li><li>✓ Questioning an existing conceptual construct or variable.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Deriving new predictions from an old theory (or theories).</li><li>✓ Synthesizing multiple theories, where the combined whole differs from the sum of the parts – i.e., interaction effects, where the combination of theories generates new and different predictions.</li><li>✓ Extending a theory, by considering the consequences of relaxing restrictive assumptions or boundary constraints.</li><li>✓ Importing theories, constructs, or variables across levels of analysis.</li></ul>
---	--

- 3) A “Methodology” section in which you describe a research design that would be appropriate to test your question or idea, using data that could realistically be collected, organized, and analyzed within a one year time horizon (taking into account the financial constraints, data-access constraints, and time constraints on a typical doctoral student). Although this section will most likely consider how and where you might collect data, it is nevertheless possible that the relevant data might be readily available (e.g., in public databases or in data sets already collected by other researchers), in which case you are strongly encouraged to go ahead and perform the actual data analysis and report the results in the paper, in a separate “Results” section.
- 4) Length: Less is more. I have specified page limits that will push you to be very concise – this can be a special challenge. Accordingly, you should heed the following words of wisdom from the “Notice to Contributors” printed in every issue of Administrative Science Quarterly:

“We are interested in compact presentations of theory and research, suspecting that very long manuscripts contain an unclear line of argument, multiple arguments, or no argument at all. Each manuscript should contain one key point, which the author should be able to state in one sentence. Digressions from one key point are common when authors cite more literature than is necessary to frame and justify an argument.”

You should start thinking about your topic early in the semester, and you should discuss your initial thoughts with me, so I can point you towards related work. If your desired topic is covered late in the semester, you will need to read ahead to get started. This term project will require you to do additional reading beyond the syllabus. In order to help you structure and pace your work, you must submit intermediate work-in-progress products as outlined below, and the topic of your term project must be approved (so don’t get too far along before coordinating with me).

- 1) Term project topic must be approved by me by February 7, 2018, either verbally or via e-mail.
- 2) Printed outline of the proposed term project, 2 to 3 pages in length (necessary in order to gain approval of instructor) is due by February 28, 2018, but may be submitted earlier. This outline itself will not be graded, but rather will be used to provide developmental feedback. However, failure to submit an outline by the deadline may result in a reduced grade for the term project.
- 3) Two printed copies of a rough draft of the term project, including references, are due by April 11, 2018. This rough draft will not be graded but will be used to provide developmental feedback.
- 4) Reviews of the rough drafts will be exchanged at during April 18, 2018 class period, at which time you will also receive the instructor’s feedback.
- 5) Final written papers are due on May 9, 2018.

### ***Review of Peer's Paper (15%)***

Part of your grade will include providing feedback on a classmate's paper. The fact that this will not be a blind review process should sensitize you to the need for constructive feedback. The confidentiality of a blind review process gives the reviewer the freedom to provide frank, direct, and undiluted feedback without fear of negative consequences. Nevertheless, this confidentiality is not a license to be rude, insulting, or inappropriate. Rather, you should keep your criticisms constructive – i.e., focused on specific, concrete changes that could realistically improve the rough draft, taking into account all of the constraints on this term project assignment and on research projects in general. The peer review should be about 1 to 2 pages long.

For further advice on reviewing, please see the Academy of Management Journal's "Guidelines for Reviewers" web page at: [http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/reviewer\\_guidelines.html](http://aom.pace.edu/amjnew/reviewer_guidelines.html). You will receive the rough draft for you to review at class meeting on April 11, 2018. Please submit two printed, stapled copies of your peer review at class meeting on April 18, 2018.

### ***Final Presentation (15%)***

At the final session, you will give a 20-minute presentation about your project. The time limit will be strictly enforced, so you should practice to make sure it isn't too long. In this spirit, you should plan to use no more than 15 slides and don't cram more material in by talking faster or using smaller fonts. Rather than trying to present your entire term project, you should try to sell the audience on what the project is and make them want to see the full paper. Try to achieve the quality one would hope to see in a research presentation at a major academic conference.

One purpose of this class presentation is to facilitate the generation of constructive feedback, ideas, and suggestions from your classmates about your term project. So, at the end of each presentation, there will be a brief period for the class to ask questions, give comments, and offer suggestions.

## **Course Topics and Detailed Reading List**

### **Class Period 1: January 17, 2018 --- What does a contribution look like?**

#### ***Required Readings:***

- Davis, M. S. (1971). That's interesting! Towards a phenomenology of sociology and a sociology of phenomenology. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 1(2), 309–344.
- Grant, A. M., & Pollock, T. G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ--Part 3: Setting the Hook. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873–879. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.4000>
- Rindova, V. (2008). Editor's comments: Publishing theory when you are new to the game. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 300–303.

Shepherd, D. A., & Suddaby, R. (2017). Theory building: A review and integration. *Journal of Management*, 43(1), 59–86.

Whetten, D. A. (1989). What Constitutes a Theoretical Contribution? *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 490. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258554>

#### *Optional Readings:*

Alvesson, M., & Sandberg, J. (2011). Generating research questions through problematization. *Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 247–271.

Bamberger, P. A., & Pratt, M. G. (2010). Moving forward by looking back: Reclaiming unconventional research contexts and samples in organizational scholarship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(4), 665–671.

Smithey Fulmer, I. (2012). Editor's Comments: The Craft of Writing Theory Articles--Variety and Similarity in AMR. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(3), 327–331. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0026>

Suddaby, R. (2010). Editor's comments: Construct clarity in theories of management and organization. *The Academy of Management Review*, 346–357.

### **Class Period 2: January 24, 2018 --- Austrian Economics Contributions to Entrepreneurship**

#### *Required Readings:*

Dequech, D. (1999). Expectations and confidence under uncertainty. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 21(3), 415–430.

Hayek, F. A. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *The American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519–530.

Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. **[Read Chapter 1 and 2 only]**

Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), 60–85.

Klein, P. G., & Bylund, P. L. (2014). The place of Austrian economics in contemporary entrepreneurship research. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 27(3), 259–279.

Knight, F. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty and profit*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Langlois, R. N. (1985). Knowledge and Rationality in the Austrian School: An Analytical Survey. *Eastern Economic Journal*, 11(4), 309–330.

Schumpeter, J. A. (1949). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. [**Read pages 65-94 and 128-156 only**]

*Optional Readings:*

Dequech, D. (2003). Uncertainty and economic sociology. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 62(3), 509–532.

Hayek, F. A. (2002). Competition as a discovery procedure. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 5(3), 9–23.

Miller, K. D. (2007). Risk and rationality in entrepreneurial processes. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1–2), 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.2>

Schumpeter, J. A. (2006). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from <http://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780203202050>

**Class Period 3: January 31, 2018 --- Entrepreneurial Opportunities: Discovery and Creation Views**

*Required Readings:*

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1–2), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.4>

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2010). Entrepreneurship and epistemology: The philosophical underpinnings of the study of entrepreneurial opportunities. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 4(1), 557–583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2010.495521>

Davidsson, P. (2015). Entrepreneurial opportunities and the entrepreneurship nexus: A re-conceptualization. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(5), 674–695. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2015.01.002>

Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333–349.

Gloria-Palermo, S. (1999). Discovery versus creation: Implications of the Austrian view of the market process. *Institutions and the Evolution of Capitalism: Implications of Evolutionary Economics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

- Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. W. K. (2016). A Realist Perspective of Entrepreneurship: Opportunities as Propensities. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 410–434. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2014.0281>
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Short, J. C., Ketchen, D. J., Shook, C. L., & Ireland, R. D. (2010). The Concept of “Opportunity” in Entrepreneurship Research: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges. *Journal of Management*, 36(1), 40–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309342746>
- Venkataraman, S. (1997). The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth*, 3(1), 119–138.

#### *Optional Readings:*

- Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., & Anderson, P. (2013). Forming and exploiting opportunities: The implications of discovery and creation processes for entrepreneurial and organizational research. *Organization Science*, 24(1), 301–317. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1110.0727>

AMR 2013 Dialogue on Opportunities

AMR 2017 Dialogue on Opportunities

### **Class Period 4: February 7, 2018 --- Entrepreneurship and Sociology**

#### *Required Readings:*

- Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645–670.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Kenworthy, A. (1999). The accidental entrepreneur: Campbellian antinomies and organizational foundings. *Variations in Organization Science: In Honor of Donald Campbell*, 19–33.
- Bogenhold, D., Fink, M., & Kraus, S. (2014). Integrative entrepreneurship research – bridging the gap between sociological and economic perspectives. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 6(2), 118–139.
- Campbell, D. T. (1960). Blind variation and selective retentions in creative thought as in other knowledge processes. *Psychological Review*, 67(6), 380.
- Carroll, G. R., & Khessina, O. M. (2005). The ecology of entrepreneurship. In *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 167–200). Springer. Retrieved from [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/0-387-23622-8\\_9](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/0-387-23622-8_9)



- Carroll, G. R., & Swaminathan, A. (2000). Why the microbrewery movement? Organizational dynamics of resource partitioning in the U.S brewing industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 106(3), 715–762.
- Dobrev, S. D., & Barnett, W. P. (2005). Organizational roles and transition to entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), 433–449.
- Sorenson, O., & Stuart, T. E. (2008). 12 Entrepreneurship: A Field of Dreams? *The Academy of Management Annals*, 2(1), 517–543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211669>
- Thornton, P. H. (1999). The sociology of entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19–46.

### **Class Period 5: February 14, 2018 --- Entrepreneurial Cognition and Decision-Making**

#### *Required Readings:*

- Baron, R. A. (1998). Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(4), 275–294.
- Baron, R. A. (2004). The cognitive perspective: A valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic “why” questions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(2), 221–239. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(03\)00008-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00008-9)
- Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, 9–30.
- Forbes, D. P. (1999). Cognitive approaches to new venture creation. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 1(4), 415–439.
- Gaglio, C. M., & Katz, J. A. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification: Entrepreneurial action. *Small Business Economics*, 16(2), 95–111.
- Grégoire, D. A., Barr, P. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2010). Cognitive Processes of Opportunity Recognition: The Role of Structural Alignment. *Organization Science*, 21(2), 413–431. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1090.0462>
- Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L. W., Bird, B., Marie Gaglio, C., McMullen, J. S., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2007). The central question in entrepreneurial cognition research 2007. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(1), 1–27.
- Shepherd, D. A., McMullen, J. S., & Ocasio, W. (2017). Is that an opportunity? An attention model of top managers' opportunity beliefs for strategic action: An Attention Model of

Top Managers' Opportunity Beliefs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(3), 626–644.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2499>

Shepherd, D. A., Williams, T. A., & Patzelt, H. (2015). Thinking about entrepreneurial decision making: Review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 11–46.

*Optional Readings:*

Baron, R. A. (2008). The role of affect in the entrepreneurial process. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(2), 328–340.

Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 511–532.

Dew, N., Grichnik, D., Mayer-Haug, K., Read, S., & Brinckmann, J. (2015). Situated Entrepreneurial Cognition: Situated Entrepreneurial Cognition. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 17(2), 143–164. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12051>

Forbes, D. P. (2005). Are some entrepreneurs more overconfident than others? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(5), 623–640. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2004.05.001>

Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2002). Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cognition: Rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2), 93–104.

Mitchell, R. K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P. P., Morse, E. A., & Smith, J. B. (2004). The distinctive and inclusive domain of entrepreneurial cognition research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(6), 505–518.

Simon, M., Houghton, S. M., & Aquino, K. (2000). Cognitive biases, risk perception, and venture formation: How individuals decide to start companies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 113–134.

Uygur, U., & Kim, S. M. (2016). Evolution of Entrepreneurial Judgment With Venture-Specific Experience: Evolution of Entrepreneurial Judgment. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10(2), 169–193. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1222>

**Class Period 6: February 21, 2018 --- Entrepreneurial Theory of the Firm**

*Required Readings:*

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2004). Organizing rent generation and appropriation: toward a theory of the entrepreneurial firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(5), 621–635.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2003.09.002>

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2005). How do entrepreneurs organize firms under conditions of uncertainty? *Journal of Management*, 31(5), 776–793. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206305279486>

Alvarez, S. A., & Busenitz, L. W. (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 755–775. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630102700609>

Klein, P. G. (2008). Opportunity discovery, entrepreneurial action, and economic organization. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2(3), 175–190. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.50>

Langlois, R. N. (2013). The Austrian theory of the firm: Retrospect and prospect. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 26(3), 247–258. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-012-0171-y>

#### *Optional Readings:*

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. (2007). The entrepreneurial theory of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(7), 1057–1063.

Foss, K., Foss, N. J., Klein, P. G., & Klein, S. K. (2007). The entrepreneurial organization of heterogeneous capital\*. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44(7), 1165–1186.

Sarasvathy, S. D., & Dew, N. (2013). Without judgment: An empirically-based entrepreneurial theory of the firm. *The Review of Austrian Economics*, 26(3), 277–296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11138-011-0170-4>

### **Class Period 7: February 28, 2018 --- International Entrepreneurship**

#### *Required Readings:*

Joardar, A., & Wu, S. (2017). Liabilities and benefits: Examining the two sides of the foreignness coin from entrepreneurial perspective. *International Business Review*, 26(6), 1157–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2017.04.008>

Khavul, S., Pérez-Nordtvedt, L., & Wood, E. (2010). Organizational entrainment and international new ventures from emerging markets. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 104–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.01.008>

Terjesen, S., Hessels, J., & Li, D. (2016). Comparative international entrepreneurship: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 42(1), 299–344.

Thomas, A. S., & Mueller, S. L. (2000). A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 31(2), 287–301.

Zahra, S. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (2000). International Expansion by new venture firms: International diversity, mode of market entry, technological learning, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5), 925–950. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1556420>

*Optional Readings:*

- Coviello, N. E., & Jones, M. V., 2004. Methodological issues in international entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19:485-508.
- Dimitratos, P., & Jones, M. V., 2005. Future directions for international entrepreneurship research. *International Business Review*, 14(2):119-128.
- Fernhaber, S. A., McDougall, P. P., & Oviatt, B. M., 2007. Exploring the Role of Industry Structure in New Venture Internationalization. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 31(4):517-542
- Joardar, A., & Wu, S., 2011. Entrepreneurial orientation as a remedy for liability of foreignness. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Science*. 28:328-340.
- Jones, M. V., & Casulli, L. 2014. International entrepreneurship: Exploring the logic and utility of individual experience through comparative reasoning approaches. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38, 45-69.
- Jones, M. V., & Coviello, N. E., 2005. Internationalisation: conceptualising an entrepreneurial process of behaviour in time. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 36(3):284-303.
- McDougall, P. P., & Oviatt B. M., 2000. International entrepreneurship: the intersection of two research paths. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(5):902-906
- Oviatt, B. M., & McDougall, P. P., 2005. Defining International Entrepreneurship and Modelling the Speed of Internationalization. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 29(5):537-553.

**Class Period 8: March 21, 2018 --- Entrepreneurial Action & Learning**

*Required Readings:*

- Baker, T., & Nelson, R. E. (2005). Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50(3), 329–366.
- Brinckmann, J., Grichnik, D., & Kapsa, D. (2010). Should entrepreneurs plan or just storm the castle? A meta-analysis on contextual factors impacting the business planning–performance relationship in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 24–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.10.007>
- Corbett, A. C. (2005). Experiential learning within the process of opportunity identification and exploitation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 473–491.
- Delmar, F., & Shane, S. (2003). Does business planning facilitate the development of new ventures? *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(12), 1165–1185.

- Dew, N., Read, S., Sarasvathy, S. D., & Wiltbank, R. (2009). Effectual versus predictive logics in entrepreneurial decision-making: Differences between experts and novices. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(4), 287–309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.02.002>
- Kautonen, T., van Gelderen, M., & Fink, M. (2015). Robustness of the Theory of Planned Behavior in Predicting Entrepreneurial Intentions and Actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(3), 655–674. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12056>
- McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 132–152.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *The Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243. <https://doi.org/10.2307/259121>
- Wang, C. L., & Chugh, H. (2014). Entrepreneurial Learning: Past Research and Future Challenges: Advancing Entrepreneurial Learning Research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(1), 24–61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12007>

#### *Optional Readings:*

- Harrison, R. T., & Leitch, C. M. (2005). Entrepreneurial learning: Researching the interface between learning and the entrepreneurial context. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 351–371.
- Welter, C., Mauer, R., & Wuebker, R. J. (2016). Bridging behavioral models and theoretical concepts: effectuation and bricolage in the opportunity creation framework. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10(1), 5–20.

2016 AMR Dialogues on Effectuation

### **Class Period 9: March 28, 2018 --- Institutional Entrepreneurship**

#### *Required Readings:*

- Alvarez, S. A., Young, S. L., & Woolley, J. L. (2015). Opportunities and institutions: A co-creation story of the king crab industry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1), 95–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.07.011>
- Hiatt, S. R., Sine, W. D., & Tolbert, P. S. (2009). From Pabst to Pepsi: The deinstitutionalization of social practices and the creation of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 54(4), 635–667.

- Lee, C.-K., & Hung, S.-C. (2014). Institutional Entrepreneurship in the Informal Economy: China's Shan-Zhai Mobile Phones: China's Shan-Zhai Mobile Phones. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 8(1), 16–36. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1174>
- Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), 545–564. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.188>
- Marquis, C., & Tilcsik, A. (2013). Imprinting: Toward a Multilevel Theory. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 195–245. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2013.766076>
- Sine, W. D., & David, R. J. (2010). Institutions and entrepreneurship. In *Research in the Sociology of Work* (Vol. 21, pp. 1–26). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Soule, S. A. (2012). Social movements and markets, industries, and firms. *Organization Studies*, 33(12), 1715–1733.
- Tolbert, P. S., David, R. J., & Sine, W. D. (2011). Studying Choice and Change: The Intersection of Institutional Theory and Entrepreneurship Research. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1332–1344. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0601>
- Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2011). Legitimizing nascent collective identities: Coordinating cultural entrepreneurship. *Organization Science*, 22(2), 449–463. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0613>

#### *Optional Readings:*

- Battilana, J., Leca, B., & Boxenbaum, E. (2009). 2 How Actors Change Institutions: Towards a Theory of Institutional Entrepreneurship. *The Academy of Management Annals*, 3(1), 65–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520903053598>
- David, R. J., Sine, W. D., & Haveman, H. A. (2013). Seizing Opportunity in Emerging Fields: How Institutional Entrepreneurs Legitimated the Professional Form of Management Consulting. *Organization Science*, 24(2), 356–377. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1120.0745>
- Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, William. (2008). Institutional Logics. In *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational institutionalism* (pp. 99–129). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

## **Class Period 10: April 4, 2018 --- Social Entrepreneurship**

### *Required Readings:*

- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Tracey, P. (2011). Social entrepreneurship: A critique and future directions. *Organization Science*, 22(5), 1203–1213.  
<https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0620>
- Dacin, P. A., Dacin, M. T., & Matear, M. (2010). Social entrepreneurship: Why we don't need a new theory and how we move forward from here. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 24(3), 37–57.
- Di Domenico, M., Haugh, H., & Tracey, P. (2010). Social Bricolage: Theorizing Social Value Creation in Social Enterprises. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 681–703.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00370.x>
- Gedajlovic, E., Honig, B., Moore, C. B., Payne, G. T., & Wright, M. (2013). Social Capital and Entrepreneurship: A Schema and Research Agenda. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(3), 455–478. <https://doi.org/10.1111/etap.12042>
- Meyskens, M., Robb-Post, C., Stamp, J. A., Carsrud, A. L., & Reynolds, P. D. (2010). Social Ventures from a Resource-Based Perspective: An Exploratory Study Assessing Global Ashoka Fellows. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 661–680.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00389.x>
- Short, J. C., Moss, T. W., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 161–194. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.69>
- Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2008.04.007>

## **Class Period 11, 12, & 13: April 11, 18, & 25, 2018 --- Student's Choice**

*Potential topics could include: Entrepreneurial Orientation, Entrepreneurial Motivation, Entrepreneurial Human Capital, Entrepreneurship & Social Networks, Venture Capital, Business Models, Innovation, or more detailed readings on a topic that was of interest, or any other topic in entrepreneurship of the student's choice.*

## **Class Period 14: May 2, 2018 --- Final Presentations**