

Some reflection on research ‘Schools’ and geographies

Per Davidsson*

Australian Centre for Entrepreneurship Research, QUT Business School, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia and Jönköping International Business School, Jönköping, Sweden

Reflecting on real and perceived differences between European and North American research cultures, I challenge views that ‘European’ research is under appreciated or discriminated against, and caution against isolationist European positions. Instead, I argue that although no distinctive and coherent European tradition or culture really exists, there may be elements of the prevalent research culture that can be turned into an advantage for Europe-based and/or European-trained researchers in helping to influence and improve one, global research conversation. Of course, a range of sub-communities and sub-conversations will and should exist, but there is no reason for these to be based on geography.

Keywords: European; North-American; research culture; research tradition; paradigm; publish-or-perish

Introduction

The conference that led to this special issue of *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* was first advertised under the label *New European School of Entrepreneurship*. Behind this choice of label one can infer sentiments that (a) some other, currently dominating ‘school’ is not fully satisfactory; (b) European scholarship is somehow barred from making its positive contributions through the means of the currently dominating ‘school’, although (c) European scholarship (potentially) actually has something valuable to contribute that is different from the currently dominating ‘school’. In post-workshop communication, the ‘school’ notion was exchanged for an emphasis on the ‘distinctiveness’ of European research, which reflects that the exchange at the workshop – and likely this special issue – can serve to refine and nuance perceptions of the current state of affairs as well as of what are the fruitful ways forward. However, I maintain that among some European entrepreneurship scholars the sentiments a-b-c still prevail. In this essay, I will offer my personal reflections on these sentiments and on how scholars who are not fully satisfied with what they perceive to be the currently dominating ‘school’ can increase the impact of their scholarship. Born, raised and research-trained in Sweden; resident in Australia, and highly active in the North American academic system as author, editor, reviewer, scholarly association officer and PhD course instructor, I do this as part insider, part outsider to the phenomena I discuss. This also means that the work I have personally undertaken during my career exemplifies some of the shortcomings with ‘North American’ as well as ‘European’ scholarship that I point out below; hence I include myself as target for the ‘straight talk’ that I deliver. I will deal with the issues in the order a-b-c as outlined above and conclude with some thoughts about how those who identify

*Email: per.davidsson@qut.edu.au

themselves as ‘European entrepreneurship scholars’ can best increase their impact on global scholarship in entrepreneurship.

Something is rotten in the state of...?

Whether we critically applied some in-depth, qualitative approach or multivariate statistics to investigate the matter, we would probably find that there is no such thing as a unitary ‘North American School’ of entrepreneurship research. Yet, for the purpose of this argument I will assume we can agree on the meaningfulness of such a construction, which is presumably represented by things like the BCERC (Babson) conference; the Academy of Management Entrepreneurship Division; Journal of Business Venturing (JBV); Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice (ETP) and the career logic of American academic institutions.

To criticize this institution – as part of a broader, North American (business) research culture – is easy. It is particularly easy if you are not forced to come up with a better, yet realistic alternative. As usual, it is probably easier to criticize it with force and precision if you are an insider rather than an outsider (cf. e.g. McCloskey’s [1998] critique of the discipline of economics) although such criticism rarely appears in print because of the risk that spineless, dishonest colleagues would quote you out of context in order to boost their own, quite different agendas. Hoping that such creatures either do not exist or have hereby been adequately repelled from such practice, I offer the following:

- Research students and early career researchers on tenure track are put under strong institutional pressures to conform rather than becoming academics who think and act with maximal independence and integrity. As a result, they might follow neither their curiosity nor the real needs of society in their choice of research topics.
- There is an extreme focus on the quantifiable, such as numbers of articles published, journal impact factors and citation statistics (Adler and Harzing 2009).
- This (allegedly) leads to various unsound practices, such as authors cutting up their material into ‘minimum publishable units’ (and – why not? – analyzing, ‘packaging’ and ‘re-packaging’ results based on data they do not believe much in themselves, rather than investing in collecting the data that could really answer the research questions); journal editors trying to artificially boost their journals’ impact factors; individuals with editorial powers by-passing the double blind review system that is supposed to rule, in order to give preference to their own work or that of their disciples, and groups of authors forming ‘citation clubs’ to boost their own citation statistics.
- There are, arguably, frequent instances of make-believe ‘theory-drivenness’ where what has in truth been an explorative (or abductive, at best) research process is portrayed as pure theory-testing in the published end product.
- Similarly, there are instances of ‘methodological sophistication’ which may alternatively be portrayed as whipping the data until they give the desired result.
- There is constant misuse of statistical significance testing (Cohen 1994; Oakes 1986; Shaver 1993) and low regard for replication (Hubbard, Vetter, and Little 1998) which, in combination with the above, means that if this is truly a research tradition of positivist heritage (as many Europeans would say), it is not performing particularly well by (what should be) its own standards.
- Because of the singular focus on two types of related outcomes which both rely on ‘impressing your peers’ only – articles published in (highly ranked) scholarly journals, and getting tenure/promotion on that basis – there are mounting concerns that the research has little impact on or relevance for business and policy practice (Gulati 2007).

- Presumably, the extreme pressures to publish also lead to an increased risk of sheer research fraud such as plagiarism and fabricated data or results (Honig and Bedi 2012).

And yet, the tip of the iceberg that represents this supposedly so badly flawed research culture or academic system is also what produces the ‘best’ research, i.e. the research that others are most likely to use as inspiration for their own research, teaching or practice. A quick check of Google Scholar citation statistics – which reflect much more than just research papers citing research papers – shows that the list of the top 20 most-cited works ever on ‘entrepreneurship’ is totally dominated by North American authors or those of other origins who have spent most of their academic career in North America. How come?

My answer would be that for all its flaws, the North American academic system also has very considerable strengths. In my experience, their doctoral programmes provide more systematic and thorough training in the use of primary research tools such as substantive theories and empirical research techniques – and they are more likely to demand evidence that you actually absorb this knowledge to make it through the programme. The rule of not hiring your own research graduates creates a mechanism against in-breeding in favour of cross-fertilization as well as a pressure on students and their professors to co-produce an ‘employable end product’. There is no denying that aspects of the research infrastructure is stronger: *Journal of Business Venturing* and *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* have higher status globally (and higher impact factors) than do *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* or *International Small Business Journal*, and the leading conferences likewise have higher status and much higher rejection rates – a crude but relevant indicator of quality – than have their European counterparts. This also contributes to the tendency for the most important and widely discussed new ideas – such as the use of *effectuation* and *bricolage* in entrepreneurial processes – to either originate there or take off when put forward by North American-based scholars publishing in top level, North American-based journals (Baker and Nelson 2005; Sarasvathy 2001).

Furthermore, in my perception the peer-review system is much more widely embraced and appreciated. Where Europeans – at least of my generation – may have interpreted a rejection as an insult or evidence of one’s inferiority, it is widely understood among North American scholars that ‘accept as is’ is an outcome that never occurs in a journal worth publishing in; that rejection is the normal outcome; that an invitation to revise and resubmit (at high risk) is a fantastic achievement, and – above all – that the feedback from peer reviewers for good journals is the perhaps single most important vehicle we have for continuous competence development. Scholars who do not regularly subject themselves to the peer-review process simply do not learn and improve as much as they could (or should). The North American pressure to publish not only quantity but also quality – according to the criteria and journal hierarchy that prevails – forces researchers to undergo lifelong learning. Finally, financial remuneration (and possibly other attractive qualities of the system unbeknown to this author) tends to attract some of the best brains, and the publication pressure – which admittedly also has adverse effects – forces these people to share their insights and to do so in places where colleagues care to look, after peer-reviewing colleagues have helped them hone these insights and their presentation to near perfection. So, although one might wonder whether the iceberg needs to be that big in order to produce the top contributions that really make a difference, there is little doubt in my mind that the North American system has a lot going for it, despite its many and serious flaws.

Is European scholarship discriminated against in the North American-based mainstream?

When researchers do not have as much success at getting published or cited as they had hoped or think they deserve, they make all kinds of attributions of the reasons for this. Often they fail to realize that it is difficult for *anyone* based *anywhere* using *any* research approach to get accepted into the top outlets, which typically have an acceptance rate well below 10%. Many people who struggle to get published in leading journals probably do not realize how often the ‘big names’ that frequently appear there also get their work rejected and how they apply themselves to take criticism on board in order to learn how to communicate better with the intended audience. As a case in point: at an Academy of Management meeting session a few years ago, Shaker Zahra (see Table 1) presented a *quantitative* analysis of the rejection letters he had received over the last few years; as I recall it the number was something like 70!

Furthermore, it often seems to be alien to human (or researcher) nature to deduce that the reason for the lack of success is some objective shortcoming of one’s work. Hence, when less-than-expected publication success occurs for European entrepreneurship scholars trying their luck in the North American-based mainstream, they may conclude that they are discriminated against due to the non-North American origin of their data; their non-North American academic affiliation (and/or non-native command of English) or – especially if they work with qualitative data – a bias against the nature of their data.

So how true is the notion that the North American mainstream represents an isolationist, single-paradigm culture? It is well beyond the scope of this short essay to provide a thorough investigation of this issue, but in all my experience as a non-North American author, reviewer and editor for journals in that system such notions are *simply not true*. It is easy to find facts and figures to support my view. Take JBV (as of May 2010). The Editor-in-Chief is an Australian who succeeded an Indian trained at least partly in the qualitative tradition (see Van de Ven et al. 1999). Four of the 13 associate editors are Europeans, although only one is currently Europe based, and 15% of the editorial review board members are European. Despite this somewhat limited editorial representation, the European authors’ success is impressive. In 2009, the journal published 40 articles, 19 of which had Europe-based co-authors whereas 13 had only US-based authors. Out of the 10 most-cited JBV-articles of the decade (2000–2009), six had European co-authors. ETP has a similar European (or non-US) representation; somewhat less in published and cited articles but more on the editorial side.

Table 1. Rankings of top 25 authors 1995–2006 by quality- and quantity-weighted publications (Crump, Abbey, and Zu 2009).

Rank	Author	Affiliation	Country
1	Scott A. Shane	Case Western Reserve Univ.	USA
2	Shaker A. Zahra	Univ. of Minnesota	USA
3	Paul Westhead	Univ. of Nottingham	UK
4	Dean A. Shepherd	Indiana Univ.	USA
5	Mike Wright	Univ. of Nottingham	UK
6	James J. Chrisman	Mississippi State Univ.	USA
7	Peter J. Rosa	Univ. of Edinburgh	UK
8	James O. Fiet	Univ. of Louisville	USA
9	Per Davidsson	Queensland Univ. of Technology	Australia
10	Harry J. Sapienza	Univ. of Minnesota	USA

Table 2. Citation frequencies for 'paradigmatic' title words in combination with entrepreneurship keywords.

Title word	Total citations across all works	No. of works with > 10 citations	Highest number of cites for an individual work (and publication source)
<i>Paradigm terms</i>			
Construction ^a	< 369	5	54 (ETP)
Constructivist	148	2	109 (OS)
Constructionist	15	1	13 (conf)
Discourse	571	12	127 (JMS)
Discursive	218	4	90 (ERD)
Interpretive	21	0	10 (JBV)
Interpretative	0	0	0 (JBV)
Hermeneutic	21	1	15 (JITM)
Narrative	522	12	113 (book)
Phenomenological	58	1	44 (ISBJ)
<i>Comparison terms</i>			
Survey	1447	27	250 (N/A)
Longitudinal	1653	29	478 (JBV)
Orientation	7483	92	1697 (SMJ)
Gender	2466	44	260 (ETP)

Note: The search was performed in May 2010 with Publish or Perish software (www.harzing.com/pop.htm), which uses Google scholar data. Results are for the displayed title word in combination with any of the title words 'entrepreneur'; 'entrepreneurial'; 'entrepreneurship' or 'start-up'. ETP, Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice; OS, Organization Science; JMS, Journal of Business Studies; ERD, Entrepreneurship & Regional Development; JBV, Journal of Business Venturing; JITM, Journal of Information Technology Management; ISBJ, International Small Business Journal; SMJ, Strategic Management Journal.

^a Articles using the term for 'construction industry' deducted.

A recent compilation of 'best published researchers' in entrepreneurship (Crump, Abbey, and Zu 2009) arrived at the results displayed in Table 2. The compilation builds on weighted contributions to 26 journals (and some conferences) which are predominantly North American based. The results indicate (again) some but certainly not total dominance for North American researchers. If anything dominates strongly, it is researchers active in English-speaking countries. Note also that out of the six individuals representing US affiliations, one of them (Zahra) is an Egyptian and another (Shepherd) an Australian national. Four of the ten on the list (incl. Davidsson) were European based during most of the 'qualification period'.

As regards the Entrepreneurship Division, starting 2009 its annual Chairpersons – elected by the 2700 members – are best characterized by the following sequence of nationalities: Canadian; Swedish/Australian; English and US/German. Some 40% of the division's most prestigious dissertation and 'best paper' awards have gone to Europeans in the last decade, far exceeding the Europeans' share of the membership (currently 39% of members are non-US; up from some 25% in the beginning of the decade). As for the BCERC (Babson) conference, 35% of its proceedings editors were Europe based (2006–2008) and 47% of the best paper awards in the same period had one or more European authors. I will not tire (or embarrass) the reader with detailed data on the European counterparts. Suffice it to say that the evidence suggests that although European journals and conferences may appear somewhat isolationist (or lack appeal to non-Europeans), the

North American journals cannot be accused of being so. There is no bias against non-American data, individuals or affiliations.

As regards the nature of the data, it would be foolish to deny that the majority of empirical entrepreneurship articles published in the North American (or Global) mainstream use quantitative data and statistical analysis techniques. However, this does not in any way prove a bias. In order to establish the latter, we would need to check two unknown base rates: (a) what proportion of all entrepreneurship research studies use qualitative methods? and (b) what proportion of all entrepreneurship journal submissions are based on such methods? If either of these deviated non-negligibly from the proportion found in leading journals, we would at least have an *indication* of bias. What I know from personal experience is that through many years of reviewing and/or serving as manuscript editor for the journals in question, I have received very few qualitative pieces. In the few cases that I have, it has been more difficult than average to get the authors to take on board the feedback regarding how they need to revise the presentation of their research in order to appeal to the audience. I should caution that the latter impression is based on a sample size so small that considerable uncertainty surrounds it, but I know that colleagues in similar positions share these experiences. Importantly, what I also know – and which can be backed by data – is that much of the *most influential* (as indicated by citation statistics) research that appears in the mainstream is based on qualitative studies. This goes for the most cited, sole-authored piece by the number 1 ranked researcher in Table 1 (Shane 2000). It also goes for the research underlying the aforementioned concepts of *effectuation* and *bricolage* as applied to entrepreneurship problems (Baker and Nelson 2005; Garud and Karnoe 2003; Sarasvathy 2001, 2008), and likewise for the most cited piece on *business models* (Amit and Zott 2001) (note also that European authors and data are well represented here).

Although qualitative studies may be quantitatively under-represented in the North American mainstream, it would seem an exaggeration to suggest that there is a lack of appreciation for good, qualitative work. To me the problem – if there is one – would seem in no small part to be that (European) researchers with a preference for qualitative approaches do not invest enough in learning how to design, target, present and revise qualitative work in order for it to appeal to the audience of the journals in question. It would seem there may be considerable self-censoring going on: researchers refraining from submitting in the first place and thereby foregoing an opportunity to test their hypothesis of a bias and – more importantly – and opportunity to learn.

But perhaps the problem is one of bias against paradigms rather than against qualitative data, the positive examples above possibly representing examples of using qualitative data in research that is basically of positivist heritage? It is probably much easier to find support for the notion that certain journals have paradigmatic preferences than for them being biased against qualitative data or authors from outside North America. But it is also easier to defend such practices – individual scholarly journals are entitled to have whatever paradigmatic orientations they like. Those who disagree have the opportunity and responsibility to use or develop alternative outlets and compete for ‘market share’ in the global ‘market for systematically backed ideas’ that research presumably represents.

Furthermore, for ‘subscribers’ to a paradigm it is easy to fail to check the base rates (cf. above) and, therefore, to see one’s own ‘tribe’ or ‘approach’ as under-represented. As a quick check I investigated the prevalence of well-cited works using any of the partly overlapping, paradigm-signalling title words ‘narrative’, ‘interpretive’, ‘constructivist’, etc. in combination with some of the most likely entrepreneurship title words to get a sense of the total ‘size’ of these discourses (see Table 2). The analysis uses Google Scholar data,

which means that citations in a much broader set of outlets than scholarly journals are counted. Only using works in which the term appears in the title, will, of course, exclude many works that use the approach in question. Therefore, in order to make it possible to compare ‘relative magnitudes’, I included the same type of analysis for the ‘mainstream’ methods and topics terms ‘survey’, ‘longitudinal’, ‘orientation’ and ‘gender’.

What this analysis suggests is that the research approach(es) implied by the ‘paradigm’ title words included in the table is not a very sizeable one on the global stage. The number of works using ‘gender’ in the title in combination with any of the key entrepreneurship terms and which has received more than 10 cites is greater than the corresponding number of works summed across all the ‘paradigm’ terms (and this comparison excludes a similar number of works using ‘female’ rather than ‘gender’ in the title). To make the most extreme comparison, there exists a single work on Entrepreneurial Orientation (Lumpkin and Dess 1996) that roughly has the same number of citations as all of the works using the ‘paradigm’ title words combined (note that there is likely to be a certain amount of double counting among these entries). Hence, it should not come as a surprise that pieces of the latter kind do not appear very often in the North American-based journals in entrepreneurship and management. However, as the information within parentheses in the rightmost column shows that literature is far from void of this type of entries. To take one particularly good example, central features of Helene Ahl’s doctoral dissertation *The Making of the Female Entrepreneur* (Ahl 2002) – a feminist, Foucaultian discourse analysis which applies constructivism in a context in which its relevance should be obvious to anyone and which is also easy and enjoyable for any intelligent person to read – have subsequently been converted into a journal article (Ahl 2006) published in a leading North American outlet. Not only that, it has also become one of the best-cited articles in that outlet for that year. Ergo, it can be done.

What European scholarship can contribute, and how

I noted above that even if it is convenient to speak of such a beast, in actual fact there is no unitary ‘North American School’ of entrepreneurship research. European academic realities are in all likelihood even more heterogeneous. And yet, we feel that the European research culture is in some respects ‘different’ and that some aspects of this difference are ‘for the better’. Arguably, part of this distinctiveness is that European research culture is more allowing, both in terms of career paths/drivers and in terms of the scope and novelty of the research questions PhD students and young researchers are permitted to take on (hence probably the many dissertation awards – but probably also many young souls gone astray in the process). There is perhaps more emphasis on complexity, context and deep understanding of the data at hand than on simple (but potentially powerful) abstractions and generalizations. The culture is, arguably, also more diverse, allowing a broader set of approaches which can lead to fruitful cross-fertilization (or stale conflicts between camps). Regardless of its nature, the data may often be better, either because business statistics, response rates or access to interesting but sensitive information is better (in some European countries) or because the less extreme publication pressure means researchers can invest as they should in data collection rather than cranking out papers based on data that are easy to come by (Cooper 1993).

How can these potential advantages be used for the benefit of European scholars and for global scholarship in entrepreneurship? By orchestrating an ‘New, European School of Entrepreneurship?’ That is the wrong track, in my humble opinion. This is why, when approached a couple of years ago by the would-be founders of a planned new journal with

'European' in its title and which explicitly built on the perception that leading journals discriminated against the use of European data, I refused to back the effort or serve on its editorial board. As I see it, the effort built on incorrect assumptions and staked out an undesirable way forward with its geographically constrained focus. Setting up a parallel 'school' is an isolationist strategy that is not called for in the first place (cf. my above arguments) and which threatens to avoid rather than adopt those aspects of the North American system which are worth copying (in reasonable measure). Furthermore, it would require the building up of a whole parallel infrastructure including outlets, quality criteria and tough peer reviewing that is as well developed and coherent as the North American counterpart. Although it is theoretically possible to set up a parallel system with equally strong – albeit different – quality-driving institutions, it is a very, very difficult task. Very well established and powerful scholars in the USA have been working very systematically for over a decade on establishing *Strategic Entrepreneurship* (Hitt et al. 2002; Hitt and Ireland 2000; Ireland, Hitt, and Sirmon 2003), including a new journal by that name (see e.g. Alvarez and Barney 2007) with the aim to reach the very top. It still remains to be seen whether complete success will be reached. It may well be, but who in Europe would have the even greater influence and stamina to herd the stray and wild cats of European scholarship?

The welcome drift from an emphasis on 'school' to 'distinctiveness' in the process leading to this Special Issue arguably reflects the above concerns while maintaining that aspects of the distinctiveness that we associate with the 'European' are worth cultivating. I agree. Let us return to the top 10 list in Table 1. Add to that list some above-mentioned heavyweights behind the most influential new ideas in entrepreneurship in the last decade: Saras Sarasvathy, Ted Baker, Raffi Amit and Christoph Zott. As long-term editor of *JBV* and co-author of the best-cited entrepreneurship paper of the last decade (Shane and Venkataraman 2000), let us also add Sankaran Venkataraman. What do we see? Many but not all individuals on the list have their researcher training from highly respected institutions. However, we do *not* primarily see American 'research broilers' whose sole experience is the conformist US training and tenure system. Neither do we see European solo players who try to be old style German or newer style French philosophers with little regard for collective and cumulative building of knowledge based on systematic, empirical data. What we see is instead to a great extent those who have a fair bit of exposure to the North American research culture *and* something else that arguably permits them to take the excesses of that culture with a pinch of salt. 'Something else' sometimes means originating from or having one's research training from a different country (as with Amit, Davidsson, Rosa, Shepherd, Venkataraman, Westhead, Wright, Zahra and Zott) and, therefore, a partially different mindset. In other cases it might mean having the academic path as second career (as with Baker and Fiet). In some cases it means a combination of both (as with Sarasvathy, who is an Indian; an ex-entrepreneur and research-trained under a Nobel Laureate at a top US institution).

In other words, *Researchers fostered in a European research culture are well positioned to achieve high impact* (which is why they already are doing it to a considerable extent). This is mainly due to the creative tension between different paradigmatic orientations and their respective criteria for what constitutes 'good' and worthwhile research. Some further strengthening of European research training would be good, as would some increase in the pressure (without reaching North American extremes) to participate in high-level international publishing – and especially in embracing tough, peer feedback as a welcome and necessary means of professional development. This in combination with the 'European advantages' discussed above would put European

scholars in an even better position to contribute to the dominant *global* system (or culture) of academic publishing, and – importantly – to change it from within.

My most recent (and on-going) close-up European experience is that of the Jönköping International Business School. Based on that experience – which I dare praise because so many others than myself have been critical to the relative success (see Crump, Abbey, and Zu 2009) – I believe in particular in the creation of dense research environments that do not attach themselves to only one ‘school’, i.e. which do not religiously follow only one philosophical or methodological ‘faith’ but instead combines a *focus on the phenomenon* of entrepreneurship with an *openness regarding paradigms and techniques* for studying that phenomenon. The doctoral dissertations in Jönköping were a healthy mix of longitudinal survey studies (Dahlqvist 2007; McKelvie 2007; Naldi 2008; Samuelsson 2004; Wiklund 1998) and a broad variety of qualitative approaches to data collection and analysis (Brundin 2002; Garvi 2007; Hang 2007; Karlsson 2005; Löfstål 2008; Markowska 2011) including an ethnography (Wigren 2003) and the previously mentioned Foucaultian discourse analysis using text as data (Ahl 2002), contrasted with experimental and other ‘laboratory’ approaches (Bruns 2004; Gustafsson 2004; Hunter 2009); work based on advanced, customized, longitudinal data-sets (Hellerstedt 2009) and those using mixed, qualitative–quantitative data (van Weezel 2009). For anyone who does not embrace the totally un-academic notion that ‘all the good/smart guys are/do like us’ this is a wonderful type of research environment to be in, and I feel confident that some pressure to address quality standards of *other* paradigms – i.e. to have to deal with the blind spots of one’s own paradigm – had a positive influence on all of these works, contributing to several of the authors winning national and international awards and continuing to successful journal publication.

To create such an allowing (but certainly not tension free) research environment requires research leaders representing somewhat different traditions while having sufficient appreciation for the alternatives. Frequent interaction with the international research community – or, rather, communities – further enriches such an environment, I might add. Whereas challenging to develop it is in my perception far more likely to be a realistic proposition in Europe than it is in North America. If so, this is a European distinctiveness that is well worth pursuing and preserving.

References

- Adler, N., and A. Harzing. 2009. “When Knowledge Wins: Transcending the Sense and Nonsense of Academic Rankings.” *The Academy of Management Learning and Education (AMLE)* 8 (1): 72–95.
- Ahl, H. 2006. “Why Research on Women Entrepreneurs Needs New Directions.” *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 30 (5): 595–621.
- Ahl, H. J. 2002. “The Making of the Female Entrepreneur.” Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Alvarez, S. A., and J. Barney. 2007. “Discovery and Creation: Alternative Theories of Entrepreneurial Creation.” *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1 (1-2): 11–26.
- Amit, R., and C. Zott. 2001. “Value Drivers in e-business.” *Strategic Management Journal* 22: 493–520.
- Baker, T., and R. E. Nelson. 2005. “Creating Something from Nothing: Resource Construction Through Entrepreneurial Bricolage.” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 50 (3): 329.
- Brundin, E. 2002. “Emotions in Motion. Leadership during Radical Change.” Doctoral diss., Jönköping International Business School.

- Bruns, V. 2004. "Who Receives Bank Loans? A Study of Lending Officers' Assessments of Loans to Growing Small and Medium-sized Enterprises." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Cohen, J. 1994. "The Earth is Round ($p < .05$)." *American Psychologist* 47 (12): 997–1003.
- Cooper, A. C. 1993. "Challenges in Predicting new Firm Performance." *Journal of Business Venturing* 8: 241–253.
- Crump, M. E. S., A. Abbey, and X. Zu. 2009. "Rankings of Top Entrepreneurship Researchers and Affiliations: 1995–2006." Paper presented at academy of management annual meeting, Chicago.
- Dahlqvist, J. 2007. "Assessing New Economic Activity: Process and Performance in New Ventures." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Garud, R., and P. Karnoe. 2003. "Bricolage Versus Breakthrough: Distributed and Embedded Agency in Technology Entrepreneurship." *Research Policy* 32 (2): 277–300.
- Garvi, M. 2007. "Capital for the Future: Implications of Founding Visions in the Venture Capital Setting." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Gulati, R. 2007. "The Rigor-Relevance Debate in Management Research." *Academy of Management Journal* 50 (4): 775–782.
- Gustafsson, V. 2004. "Entrepreneurial Decision-Making." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Hang, M. 2007. "Media Business Venturing: A Study on the Choice of Organizational Mode." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Hellerstedt, K. 2009. "The Composition of New Venture Teams: Its Dynamics and Consequences." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Hitt, M., D. Ireland, M. S. Camp, and D. L. Sexton, eds. 2002. *Strategic Entrepreneurship: Creating a New Mindset*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hitt, M., and R. D. Ireland. 2000. "The Intersection of Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management Research." In *The Blackwell Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, edited by D. L. Sexton, and H. Landström. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Honig, B., and A. Bedi. 2012. "The Fox in the Hen House: A Critical Examination of Plagiarism among Members of the Academy of Management." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 11(1): 101–123. http://aom.pace.edu/InPress/main.asp?action=unassigned&p_id=2&p_short=AMLE
- Hubbard, R., D. E. Vetter, and E. L. Little. 1998. "Replication in Strategic Management: Scientific Testing for Validity Generalizability, and Usefulness." *Strategic Management Journal* 19: 243–254.
- Hunter, E. 2009. "Celebrity Entrepreneurship and Celebrity Endorsement." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Ireland, R. D., M. A. Hitt, and D. G. Sirmon. 2003. "A Model of Strategic Entrepreneurship: The Construct and Its Dimensions." *Journal of Management* 29 (6): 963–989.
- Karlsson, T. 2005. "Business Plan in New Ventures: An Institutional Perspective." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Lövstål, E. 2008. "Management Control Systems in Entrepreneurial Organisations: A Balancing Challenge." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and G. G. Dess. 1996. "Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking it to Performance." *Academy of Management Review* 21 (1): 135–172.
- Markowska, M. 2011. "Entrepreneurial Competence Development: Triggers, Processes & Consequences." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- McKelvie, A. 2007. "Innovation in New Firms: Examining the Role of Knowledge and Growth Willingness." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- McCloskey, D. 1998. *The Rhetoric of Economics*. 2nd ed. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Naldi, L. 2008. "Growth through Internationalization: A Knowledge Perspective on SMEs." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.

- Oakes, M. 1986. *Statistical Inference: A Commentary for the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Samuelsson, M. 2004. "Creating New Ventures: A Longitudinal Investigation of the Nascent Venturing Process." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Sarasvathy, S. 2001. "Causation and Effectuation: Towards a Theoretical Shift from Economic Inevitability to Entrepreneurial Contingency." *Academy of Management Review* 26 (2): 243–288.
- Sarasvathy, S. 2008. *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Elgar.
- Shane, S. 2000. "Prior Knowledge and the Discovery of Entrepreneurial Opportunities." *Organization Science* 11 (4): 448–469.
- Shane, S., and S. Venkataraman. 2000. "The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research." *Academy of Management Review* 25 (1): 217–226.
- Shaver, J. 1993. "What Statistical Significance Testing is, and What it is Not." *Journal of Experimental Education* 61 (4): 293–316.
- Van de Ven, A. H., D. Polley, R. Garud, and S. Venkataraman. 1999. *The Innovation Journey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Weezel, A. 2009. "Entrepreneurial Strategy-Making Mode and Performance: A study of the Newspaper Industry." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Wigren, C. 2003. "The Spirit of Gnosjö. The Grand Narrative and Beyond." Doctoral diss., Jönköping International Business School. Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.
- Wiklund, J. 1998. "Small Firm Growth and Performance: Entrepreneurship and Beyond." Doctoral diss., Jönköping, Sweden: Jönköping International Business School.

Copyright of Entrepreneurship & Regional Development is the property of Routledge and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.