

Foundations of Entrepreneurship Research
MGT 88000

Zicklin School of Business
Baruch College, City University of New York

“There is nothing so practical as a good theory.”

– Kurt Lewin, modern pioneer of social, organizational, and applied psychology (1890-1947)

Professor

Scott L. Newbert, Ph.D.

Professor of Management and Lawrence N. Field Chair in Entrepreneurship

Newman Vertical Campus 9-269

646-312-3645

scott.newbert@baruch.cuny.edu (best way to contact me)

Office hours by appointment

Prerequisites

Students must be enrolled and in good standing in the Ph.D. program.

Course description

This course is designed to introduce students to the theoretical and methodological approaches used in entrepreneurship and family business research as well as to acclimate them to the work of an entrepreneurship scholar. In so doing, students will explore [1] the major theories, concepts, models, frameworks, etc. that have been developed to predict and explain the behavior of entrepreneurial and family firms, [2] the main analytical techniques that have been used to empirically examine them, [3] the protocols for conducting rigorous academic research, and [4] the standards for and expectations of high-quality reviewing.

Learning objectives

This course is designed to enrich the student’s awareness of and ability to conduct scholarship on entrepreneurship. Specifically, upon completion of the course, students will have:

1. Gained a deep understanding of the foundational and contemporary conversations in entrepreneurship
2. Developed the ability to conduct and present original, novel, rigorous academic research on entrepreneurship
3. Gained insight into the peer-review and editorial processes
4. Learned how to respond effectively to critiques of their research

Format

This course will follow a seminar-style format, which means that learning will result not from the delivery of content by the instructor, but rather from discussions among the instructor and students. Class sessions will, therefore, be devoted to discussing, evaluating, debating, and critiquing the readings associated with each topic to better understand the material and to generate new ideas for research. To support this approach, students are expected to arrive at class having read and thought carefully about each of the readings and prepared to engage in thoughtful discussion about them.

Course resources

All readings are required and are accessible via the [Business Source Complete](#) database unless otherwise noted. All assignments should be uploaded to [Blackboard](#).

Class schedule

Class	Date	Topic	Due
1	1/30	The research process I Domain of entrepreneurship	Weekly deliverables
2	2/6	Directions for future research	Weekly deliverables
3	2/13	Risk and uncertainty	Weekly deliverables
4	2/20	The research process II	Journal review, Proposal
5	2/27	Opportunity	Weekly deliverables
6	3/5	Entrepreneurial learning	Weekly deliverables
7	3/12	Resourcefulness	Weekly deliverables
8	3/19	The research process III	Working draft, Interactive presentation
9	3/26	Methods	Weekly deliverables
10	4/2	Psychological perspectives	Weekly deliverables
11	4/23	The research process IV	Submission
12	4/30	Sociological perspectives	Weekly deliverables
13	5/7	Strategic perspectives	Weekly deliverables
14	5/14	Exit and failure	Weekly deliverables
15	5/21	The research process V	Revision, Response document, Presentation

Grading

Assignment	Percent of grade	
Classroom contribution	15	
Weekly deliverables	15	
Journal review	7.5	
Research paper	Proposal	5
	Working draft	10
	Interactive presentation	5
	Submission	15
	Presentation	7.5
	Revision	15
	Response document	5

Evaluation

Grade	Range
A	93.0 - 100.0
A-	90.0 - 92.9
B+	87.0 - 89.9
B	83.0 - 86.9
B-	80.0 - 82.9
C+	77.0 - 79.9
C	73.0 - 76.9
C-	70.0 - 72.9
F	0 - 69.9

Source: [Baruch College Faculty Handbook](#)

Assignments

All assignments must be completed independently, adhere to all requirements listed below, and be submitted via [Blackboard](#) on time in order to receive credit. If you anticipate a problem in meeting any assignment deadline, please contact me at least one week before the due date to discuss how to remedy the problem; otherwise, late assignments will not be accepted and will receive a grade of zero.

Readings

The readings for this course have been carefully selected to provide a broad overview of entrepreneurship research. They represent a mix of seminal ideas and novel approaches to studying each topic, and while not exhaustive, should provide students with a solid understanding of the main conversations in the field. All readings are accessible via the [Business Source Complete](#) database unless otherwise noted.

The research process I	
1	Course syllabus. Available on Blackboard .
2	Colquitt JA, George G. 2011. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 1: Topic Choice. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 54(3): 432–435.
3	Bono, JE, McNamara. 2011. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 2: Research design. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 54(4): 657-660.
4	MacInnis D. 2003. Responsibilities of a good reviewer: Lessons learned from kindergarten. <i>Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science</i> , 31(3): 344-345.
5	Lepak D. 2009. Editor's comments: What is good reviewing? <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 34(3): 375-381.
6	King EB, Avery DR, Hebl MR, Cortina JM. 2018. Systematic subjectivity: How subtle biases infect the scholarship review process. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 44(3): 843-853.
Domain of entrepreneurship	
1	Hébert RF, Link AN. 1989. In search of the meaning of entrepreneurship. <i>Small Business Economics</i> , 1(1): 39-49.
2	Penrose E. 1959. The productive opportunity of the firm and the entrepreneur. In <i>The Theory of the Growth of the Firm</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 31-42. Available on Blackboard .
3	Gartner WB. 1990. What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 5(1): 15-28. Available on Blackboard .
4	Brush CG, Duhaime IM, Gartner WB, Stewart A, Katz JA, Hitt MA, Alvarez SA, Meyer GD, Venkataraman S. 2003. Doctoral education in the field of entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 29(3): 309-331.
5	Shane S, Venkataraman S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 25(1): 217-226.
Directions for future research	
1	Welter F. 2011. Contextualizing entrepreneurship: Conceptual challenges and ways forward. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 35(1): 165-184.
2	Saebi T, Foss NJ, Linder S. 2019. Social entrepreneurship research: Past achievements and future promises. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 45(1): 70-95. Available on Blackboard .
3	Shepherd DA. 2015. Party on! A call for entrepreneurship research that is more interactive, activity based, cognitively hot, compassionate, and prosocial. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 30(4): 489-507.
4	Packard MD. 2017. Where did interpretivism go in the theory of entrepreneurship? <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 32(5): 536-549.
5	Welter, Friederike; Baker, Ted; Audretsch, David B.; Gartner, William B. 2017. Everyday entrepreneurship: A call for entrepreneurship research to embrace entrepreneurial diversity. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 41(3): 311-321.

Risk and uncertainty	
1	Langlois RN, Cosgel M. 1993. Frank Knight on risk, uncertainty, and the firm: A new interpretation. <i>Economic Inquiry</i> , 31: 456-465.
2	McMullen J, Shepherd D. 2006. Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> . 31: 132-152.
3	Alvarez SA, Barney JB. 2005. How do entrepreneurs organize firms under conditions of uncertainty? <i>Journal of Management</i> , 31(5): 776-793.
4	McKelvie A, Haynie JM, Gustavsson V. 2011. Unpacking the uncertainty construct: Implications for entrepreneurial action. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 26(3): 273-292.
5	Miller KD. 2007. Risk and rationality in entrepreneurial processes. <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i> , 1(1-2): 57-74.
The research process II	
1	Grant, AM, Pollock, TG. 2011. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 3: Setting the hook. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 54(5): 873-879.
2	Sparrowe RT, Mayer KJ. 2011. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 4: Grounding hypotheses. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 54(6): 1098–1102.
3	Clark T, Floyd SW, Wright M. 2006. On the review process and journal development. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i> , 43(3): 655-664.
4	Shepherd DA. 2010. Letter from the editor-in-chief. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 25(1): 1-5.
5	Starbuck WH. 2016. 60th anniversary essay: How journals could improve research practices in social science. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 61(2): 165-183.
Opportunity	
1	Kirzner I. 1997. Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i> , 35(1): 60-85.
2	Sarasvathy SD, Dew N, Velamuri SR, Venkataraman S. Three views of entrepreneurial opportunity. In <i>Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research: An Interdisciplinary Survey and Introduction</i> , 2 nd edition, Acs ZJ, Audretsch DB (eds). New York: Springer, pp. 77-96.
3	Dimov D. 2011. Grappling with the unbearable elusiveness of entrepreneurial opportunities. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 35(1): 57-81.
4	Haynie JM., Shepherd DA., McMullen JS. 2009. An opportunity for me? The role of resources in opportunity evaluation decisions. <i>Journal of Management Studies</i> , 46(3): 337–361.
5	Dimov, D. (2007). From opportunity insight to opportunity intention: The importance of person-situation learning match. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 31(4): 561-583.
Entrepreneurial learning	
1	Hayek FA. 1945. The use of knowledge in society. <i>The American Economic Review</i> , 35(4): 519-530.
2	Dew N, Velamuri SR, Venkataraman S. 2004. Dispersed knowledge and an entrepreneurial theory of the firm. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 19(5): 659-679.
3	Cope J. 2005. Toward a dynamic learning perspective of entrepreneurship. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 29(4): 373-397.
4	Politis D. 2005. The process of entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 29(4): 399-424.
5	Corbett AC. 2007. Learning asymmetries and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 22(1): 97-118.

Resourcefulness	
1	Baker T, Nelson RE. 2005. Creating something from nothing: Resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. <i>Administrative Science Quarterly</i> , 50(3): 329-366.
2	Sarasvathy SD. 2001. Causation and effectuation: Towards a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. <i>Academy of Management Review</i> , 26(2): 243-263.
3	Fisher G. 2012. Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: A behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 36(5): 1019-1051.
4	Alvarez S, Busenitz LW. 2001. The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. <i>Journal of Management</i> , 27: 755–776.
5	Rawhouser H, Villanueva J, Newbert SL. 2017. Strategies and tools for entrepreneurial resource access: A cross-disciplinary review and typology. <i>International Journal of Management Reviews</i> , 19(4): 473-491.
The research process III	
1	Zhang Y, Shaw JD. 2012. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 5: Crafting the methods and results, <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 55(1): 8-12.
2	Geletkanycz M, Tepper BJ. 2011. From the editors: Publishing in AMJ – Part 6: Discussing the implications. <i>Academy of Management Journal</i> , 55 (2): 256-260.
3	Murphy KR, Auginis H. 2019. HARKing: How badly can cherry-picking and question trolling produce bias in published results? <i>Journal of Business and Psychology</i> , 34: 1-17
4	Bettis RA, Ethiraj S, Gambardella A, Helfat C, Mitchell W. 2016. Creating repeatable cumulative knowledge in strategic management. <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , 37(2): 257-261.
5	JBV reviews. Available on Blackboard .
Methods	
1	Short JC, Ketchen DJ, Combs JG, Ireland RD. 2010. Research methods in entrepreneurship: Opportunities and challenges. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> , 13(1): 6-15.
2	Davidsson P, Wiklund J. 2001. Levels of analysis in entrepreneurship research: Current research practice and suggestions for the future. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 25(4): 81-99.
3	Hsu DK, Simmons SA, Wieland AM. 2017. Designing entrepreneurship experiments: A review, typology, and research agenda. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i> , 20(3): 379-412.
4	Yang T, Aldrich HE. 2012. Out of sight but not out of mind: Why failure to account for left truncation biases research on failure rates. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> 27(4): 477-492.
5	Anderson BS, Wennberg K, McMullen JS. 2019. Editorial: Enhancing quantitative theory-testing entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 34(5): 1-11.
Psychological perspectives	
1	Shaver KG, Scott LR. 1991. Person, process, choice: The psychology of new venture creation. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> , 16(2): 23-45.
2	Zhao H, Seibert SE. 2006. The big five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. <i>Journal of Applied Psychology</i> , 91(2): 259-271.
3	Delgado García JB, De Quevedo Puente E, Blanco Mazagatos V. 2015. How affect relates to entrepreneurship: A systematic review of the literature and research agenda. <i>International Journal of Management Reviews</i> , 17(2): 191-211.
4	Cardon MS, Kirk CP. 2015. Entrepreneurial passion as mediator of the self-efficacy to persistence relationship. <i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i> . 39(5): 1027-1050.
5	Shepherd DA, Haynie JM. 2009. Birds of a feather don't always flock together: Identity management in entrepreneurship. <i>Journal of Business Venturing</i> , 24 (4): 316-337.

The research process IV	
1	Humphrey J. 2001. You are the best visual. Harvard Management Communication Letter, 4(10): 10-11.
2	Clayton J. 2000. Presentations 101. Harvard Management Communication Letter, 3(11): 4-5.
3	Selover E. 2012. How Pecha Kucha changed my life. TEDxOrlando, October 26. Available on Blackboard .
4	Seibert SE. 2006. Anatomy of an R&R (or, reviewers are an author's best friends. . .). Academy of Management Journal, 49: 203–207.
5	Rynes SL. 2017. Observations on 'anatomy of an R&R' and other reflections. Academy of Management Journal, 49(2): 208-214.
6	JBV decision letter. Available on Blackboard .
Sociological perspectives	
1	Reynolds PD. 1991. Sociology and entrepreneurship: Concepts and contributions. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 16(2): 47-70.
2	Aldrich H, Fiol M. 1994. Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. Academy of Management Review, 19(4): 645-670.
3	Aldrich HE, Kim PH. 2007. Small worlds, infinite possibilities: How social networks affect entrepreneurial team formation and search. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1: 147–165.
4	Stam W, Arzlanian S, Elfring T. 2014. Social capital of entrepreneurs and small firm performance: A meta-analysis of contextual and methodological moderators. Journal of Business Venturing, 29(1): 152-173.
5	Newbert SL, Tornikoski ET, Quigley NR. 2013. Exploring the evolution of supporter networks in the creation of new organizations. Journal of Business Venturing, 28(2): 281-298.
Strategic perspectives	
1	Hitt MA, Ireland RD, Sirmon DG, Trahms CA. 2011. Strategic entrepreneurship: Creating value for individuals, organizations, and society. Academy of Management Perspectives. 25(2): 57-75.
2	Sapienza HJ, Autio E, George G, Zahra S. 2006. A capabilities perspective on the effects of early internationalization on firm survival and growth. Academy of Management Review, 31(4): 914-933.
3	Covin JG, Miles M. 1999. Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 23(3): 47-63. Available on Blackboard .
4	Ireland RD, Covin JG, Kuratko DF. 2009. Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. 33(1): 19-46.
5	Rauch A, Wiklund J, Lumpkin GT, Freese M. 2009. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice. 33(3): 761-787.
Exit and failure	
1	Bruderl J, Schussler R. 1990. Organizational mortality: The liabilities of newness and adolescence. Administrative Science Quarterly, 35(3): 530–547.
2	McCarthy AM, Schoorman FD, Cooper AC. 1993. Reinvestment decisions by entrepreneurs: Rational decision-making or escalation of commitment? Journal of Business Venturing, 8(1): 9-24. Available on Blackboard .
3	Shepherd DA, Wiklund J, Haynie JM. 2009. Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. Journal of Business Venturing, 24(2): 134-148.
4	Justo R, DeTienne DR, Sieger P. 2015. Failure or voluntary exit? Reassessing the female underperformance hypothesis. Journal of Business Venturing, 30(6): 775-792.
5	Rouse ED. 2016. Beginning's end: How founders psychologically disengage from their organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 59(5): 1605-1629.

Classroom contribution

Because deep understanding occurs when students actively engage in critical discussion, each student's contributions to all class sessions will play an invaluable role in the collective ability to make sense of the theoretical, methodological, and procedural aspects of entrepreneurship research. As such, all students are expected to add meaningfully to the learning environment by thinking carefully and critically about the issues raised in the readings, formulating well-grounded thoughts about them, identifying relevant practical examples of them, and then sharing these insights with their peers during classroom discussions. In addition, all students are expected to help their peers improve their own research and reviewing skills by providing thoughtful, constructive suggestions during periodic feedback sessions throughout the semester. Please note that comments expressed during class discussions will not be evaluated based on whether they are "right" or "wrong," but rather on the depth of thought with which they were developed and the degree to which they add to the collective understanding of the course topics. Thus, in grading classroom contribution, the following criteria will be used:

- Relevance – do your comments speak directly to the issues and concepts being addressed? Do they extend our understanding of those issues or concepts? Do they reflect your adequate preparation to participate in the discussion?
- Additivity – do your comments reflect active listening to the comments of other class members? Have they incorporated insights introduced earlier and built upon them?
- Substance – do your comments make a real contribution to the ideas being exchanged? Has anything new been gained from your contribution to the discussion?
- Persuasiveness – have your points been well articulated, argued, and supported, such that others take note of the convincing nature of your points?
- Questioning – have your comments reasonably questioned the comments of others or challenged their assumptions without disparaging the person who offered them?
- Consistency – has your participation been evenly spread across all class sessions rather than concentrated in one or two sessions?

As a final point, please do not confuse attendance with contribution. Being present is a necessary but insufficient condition for a student's ability to contribute to a positive learning environment; therefore, each student is expected to be on time for and attend each class session in full. Students who miss, arrive late to, or leave early from class without a legitimate excuse approved by the instructor will be penalized one-half of their classroom contribution grade for each of the first two occurrences; a third such occurrence will result in a grade of F for the course.

Weekly deliverables

In order to best make sense of the course topics, we will engage in thoughtful, critical discussion of all of the assigned readings, both individually and collectively. To facilitate these conversations, students will prepare the following assignments each week (a schedule of which is available on [Blackboard](#)), which will be completed individually and then be shared with the entire class as discussion board posts on [Blackboard](#).

Reflections

A successful scholar will be able to digest and interpret a good deal of complex information. In order to stimulate thought on the individual readings (and to later serve as an accessible summary of those readings for future reference), one student each week will be assigned to prepare a short reflection on each reading. Reflections should very briefly (~½ page for each reading, outline/bulleted form) highlight the following issues for each reading and be uploaded to [Blackboard](#) no later than two days prior to the class during which the readings will be discussed:

- Purpose –what gap are the authors trying to fill?
- Description – what general approach have the authors taken to conduct the research?
- Contribution – what are the main takeaways/insights (i.e., the novel ideas, arguments, findings, etc.) from the research that move conversations in entrepreneurship forward?
- Strengths – what qualities of the study (i.e., thesis, theorizing, sampling, empirical techniques, etc.) are particularly novel and/or well-executed and why?
- Weaknesses – what errors, assumptions, controversial assertions, etc. (aside from any limitations acknowledged by the authors) should give us pause when interpreting the research and why?

Synthesis

An important skill of a successful scholar (and entrepreneur, for that matter) is the ability to see connections among otherwise disconnected ideas. In order to hone this skill, one student each week will be assigned to synthesize the key issues across all of the readings for the topic. Note, the goal is not to summarize each article in sequential fashion, but rather weave together an integrative discussion about all articles can collectively inform our understanding of the topic. Syntheses should be both succinct (~1,000 words) and well-articulated (essay form, scholarly writing) and be uploaded to [Blackboard](#) no later than two days prior to the class during which the readings will be discussed. Following are some questions to help stimulate the synthesis:

- What is the overarching issue being addressed across all of the readings?
- What is/are the common thread/s that links the various readings together?
- What nuances/divergent approaches have the various authors taken in researching the topic?
- On what issues is there agreement and/or disagreement?
- What can we learn about the topic from the set of readings as a whole?

Class lead

In addition to thinking critically on their own about a given topic, scholars must also demonstrate the ability to challenge others to think critically as well. To this end, one student each week will be assigned to lead a discussion on the major issues raised in the assigned readings as well as where research on the topic may go in the future. In order to prepare for this task, the discussion leader should review his/her peers' reflections and synthesis on the assigned readings and then develop a set of ~8-10 questions that emerge directly from the readings and which are designed to stimulate conversation about how those readings might collectively shape our understanding of the overall topic. The list of questions should be uploaded to [Blackboard](#) no later than one day prior to the class during which the readings will be discussed. Following are some points to consider about the readings (individually and collectively) that may help generate good discussion questions:

- Points of confusion
- Controversial issues
- Omissions in the research design
- Disagreement/debate among authors of different articles
- Ideas for future research (in addition to those identified by the authors)
- Insightful points raised in your peers' reflections/synthesis
- Personal thoughts/ideas about the topic

Journal review

Understanding the journal review process is essential for any serious scholar for at least two reasons. First, in order to become a respected member of any scholarly community, you must be able to critically evaluate research in your field. This ability will not only make you a valued colleague and co-author, but also facilitate invitations for ad hoc reviewing, editorial review board membership, and editorships at high-quality conferences and journals. Second, publishing is not solely a function of the rigor of one's research, but also of the ability to

make sense of and respond to reviewers' and editors' comments on it. In order to help students gain insight into the journal review process, they will be assigned to conduct an informal review of a manuscript that is currently under consideration at Journal of Business Venturing, the top-ranked journal in entrepreneurship. Reviews should be somewhere in the neighborhood of 2-3 pages (single-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word) and be uploaded to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be discussed. During class, students will share their reviews with their peers at which time the instructor will share the reviews submitted by the "real" reviewers and facilitate a discussion about how the various comments and recommendations might be reconciled into an editorial decision on the manuscript. At the end of the semester, the instructor will share his decision letter with the students and discuss how the authors of the submitted manuscript might move forward. Please note, given the double-blind nature of the journal review process, the submitted manuscript, the formal reviews, and the decision letter will all be anonymized and students will be held to strict confidentiality standards for all parts of this assignment.

Research paper

The ability to publish high quality research is the sine qua non of a successful career as a scholar. Thus, each student will write an original research paper on a pre-approved topic within the entrepreneurship domain. All papers must be empirical in nature and include statistical analyses of data surrounding an entrepreneurial phenomenon (i.e., no descriptive or qualitative studies, and no meta-analyses). Given the constrained timeline in which this paper must be completed, students are strongly encouraged to use publicly-available secondary database. Please note, a link to a list of entrepreneurship databases that may be useful, as well as exemplar articles that have used many of them, is available on [Blackboard](#). Given that a main objective of this assignment is to mirror the actual research process, there will be several deliverables associated with this assignment over the course of the semester:

Proposal

During the first few weeks of the semester, students should think carefully about what within the domain of entrepreneurship that has not been satisfactorily addressed. Based on a combination of these gaps, their interests, and the instructor's guidance, students will develop a short proposal (2 pages maximum, bulleted/outline form, MS Word) for their research project that specifies the following:

- Title
- Topic – what area in the entrepreneurship domain is being explored and why is this of interest to you?
- Objectives – what research questions will be answered?
- Contribution – what gap in the literature is filled by the paper?
- Approach – what literature will the paper draw upon to develop the conceptual model?; what hypotheses will be tested?; where will the data come from?; how will the data be analyzed?
- Plan – what is the timeline for the work to be done?
- References – cite all references used to support your idea

Students must upload their proposals to [Blackboard](#) no later than one day prior to the class during which they will be presented. During class, each student will have a maximum of 10 minutes to present their proposals to their peers in an informal, roundtable-style discussion. Peers and the instructor will then have 15 minutes to provide thoughtful feedback on each proposal with an aim toward improving its focus and rigor.

Working draft

Based on the oral and written feedback provided on the proposal, each student will prepare a working draft of his/her research paper. The working draft should be ~10-15 pages in length (double-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word), with a focus on the "front end." In other words, students need not have analyzed their data yet, but should have access to and have begun to explore it, as well as have a plan for how they will code and analyze it.

Thus, working drafts should include the following major sections (note, this is a general guide from which students are free to deviate so long as the requisite information is included):

- Title – choose something informative yet provocative if possible
- Abstract – provide an overview of the research in 100 words or less
- Introduction – make a case for why the research you are conducting is important
- Hypothesis development – review relevant, current literature, identify a theoretical foundation for your conceptual model, explain the causal mechanisms at work, and present the conceptual model visually
- Method – explain in detail the sample (what database is being used), the measurement model (how will the dependent, independent, and control variables be operationalized), and the empirical approach (how will the data be analyzed)

Each of the above sections are discussed at length in course readings (see Research Process topics), so be sure to refer to them for more detail. Also, for the sake of consistency, and to prepare students for future submissions to the top management journal, working drafts must be formatted according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#). Students must upload their working drafts to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented.

Interactive presentation

Papers that are promising but not quite developed enough for formal presentations are designated to informal, discussion-based presentation sessions at the leading academic conferences for entrepreneurship research, including the Academy of Management Conference and the Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference. As the research papers at this stage of the course are similarly undeveloped at this point in the semester, and to gain experience in this format of presentation, students will share the main ideas of their working drafts with the instructor and their peers in a 25-minute roundtable discussion. Note, because this is a conversation (i.e., two-way dialogue) rather than a traditional presentation (i.e., one-way dialogue), PowerPoint will not be used to communicate any information except to a visual representation of the model the student intends to test; thus, use only one slide may be used. The goal of this session is for peers and the instructor to offer constructive feedback on how to improve the quality of the research and offer useful suggestions for the work ahead. Students must upload their single PowerPoint slide to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented.

Submission

Based on the oral and written feedback provided on the working draft, students will prepare an initial draft of their research paper for submission. This submission should be ~30 pages all inclusive (double-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word) and include all of the major sections included in the working draft as well as the following:

- Results – explain what you found and which hypotheses they do/do not support
- Discussion – explain what the findings mean with respect to your theorizing as well as how they contribute to theory and practice more generally
- Limitations and directions for future research – identify limitations with your study and how they might be improved upon by future scholars
- Conclusion – what is the main takeaway from the study
- References – cite all sources

As with the working draft, students should refer to the articles in the various Research Process topics for more detail on these sections and format their submissions according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#). Students must upload their submissions to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented.

In order to build upon the students' understanding of the peer-review and editorial processes and to provide them experience of responding to critiques of their own research, submissions will be handled as if they were submitted to a journal. Thus, the instructor will provide each student with a thorough review of his/her submission and render one of the following editorial decisions on it, which will correspond to a grade for the assignment:

Decision	Grade	
Accept	A+	100
Minor revisions	A	95
Moderate revisions	B	85
Major revisions	C	75
Reject	F	0-69

Revision

Based on the written feedback provided on the submission, students will prepare a revised draft of their research paper. This revision is expected to address the concerns outlined in the instructor's decision letter in substantive ways. As with the working draft and submission, students should refer to the articles in the various Research Process topics for more detail on these sections and format their submissions according to the Academy of Management Journal's [Style Guide for Authors](#). Students must upload their revisions to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented. As with the submission, the instructor will provide each student with a thorough review of his/her revision and render a second editorial decision on it along with a corresponding grade per the above rubric.

Response document

The difference between submitting a paper and publishing it is almost always determined by the author's responsiveness to the reviewers and the editor. For good or bad, those who review and edit a paper are the gatekeepers and, thus, authors must respond to their concerns in ways that appease them. This does not mean that authors have to do whatever the reviewers and editors say, but they do need to do most of it and, for those things they choose not to do, they must put forth a defensible (and respectful) argument in support of their non-action. Thus, in order to develop experience and competency in responding to reviewers and editors, students must document, point by point, how they revised their submissions in response to each of the individual concerns raised by the instructor. The response should be parsimonious (i.e., there is no need to cut-and-paste entire sections of the revision to show how the manuscript has evolved) but, at the same time, be specific (i.e., a concise explanation of each change should be provided along with page references to where those changes reside in the revision). While preparing such a document may seem tedious, there are four important reasons for doing so:

- It is standard practice in the field
- It communicates to the reviewers and editors that all of their concerns have been addressed
- It minimizes the likelihood that reviewers and editor will introduce new concerns in future rounds
- It allows the author to present their version of what they did rather than allow reviewers and editors to infer what was done (or not) on their own

Response documents should include each comment made by the instructor, followed immediately by an explanation of the way in which the manuscript was (or was not) revised to address it. Students must upload their response documents (single-spaced, 12-point font, MS Word) to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which the revision will be presented.

Presentation

During class, students will present their revised research papers to their peers in a formal research presentation. Consistent with most conference guidelines, each student will have 20 minutes to present their papers (presentations will be timed), and there will be a 10-minute question and answer period. PowerPoint slides must be used; however, they should be used to aid the student in his/her communication of the research and not the other way around. For some guidance on research presentations, please refer to the readings and videos on presenting in the Research Process topics and the Academy of Management's [Oral Presentation Guidelines](#). Students must upload their presentation slides to [Blackboard](#) no later than the day prior to the class during which they will be presented.

Academic integrity

All students are expected to abide by Baruch College's [Policy on Academic Honesty](#), which addresses cheating, plagiarism, obtaining an unfair advantage, collusion and other forms of academic dishonesty. All students are encouraged to complete Baruch College's [Plagiarism Tutorial](#) as they will be held to the standards outlined therein. For a first offense, a violation of this policy will result in a grade of zero for the assignment and may result in an F for the course. A second offense will automatically result in an F for the course. Additionally, all violations of this policy will be reported to the office of the Dean of Students and recorded in the student's permanent file.

Accommodations for students with disabilities

It is college policy to provide accommodations and academic adjustments for students with disabilities. Any student with a disability who may need accommodations in this class is requested to speak directly to Student Disability Services located in Newman Vertical Campus, Room 2-272 as early in the semester as possible. All discussions will remain confidential.

Faculty bio

Scott L. Newbert, PhD is a Professor of Management, the Lawrence N. Field Chair in Entrepreneurship, and the Academic Director of the Lawrence N. Field Programs in Entrepreneurship at Baruch College, City University of New York. He received his PhD in entrepreneurship and strategic management from Rutgers University. Before joining Baruch College, he was a Professor of Management at Villanova University, where he held term appointments as the Harry Halloran Emerging Scholar in Social Entrepreneurship and the and Anne Quinn Welsh Faculty Fellow in Honors. Dr. Newbert has taught graduate and undergraduate courses in entrepreneurship, design, strategy, and business ethics at Baruch College, Villanova University, Rutgers University, New Jersey Institute of Technology, and Monmouth University. His research interests include the processes by which existing and nascent firms create value through the entrepreneurial use of resources, the determinants of firm creation, and the socioeconomic impacts of entrepreneurial activity. Dr. Newbert has published and/or presented more than 100 scholarly papers on these and related topics, many of which have appeared in the world's leading academic journals, including *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *Small Business Economics*, *Family Business Review*, and *Strategic Organization*. In total, Dr. Newbert's published research has received more than 1,800 Web of Science® citations and more than 5,000 Google® citations. Dr. Newbert also serves as a field editor for *Journal of Business Venturing*, the top-ranked journal in the field of entrepreneurship, as well as an editorial board member for *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Management Studies*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *Journal of Small Business Management*, and *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*. In addition to his academic endeavors, Dr. Newbert provides consulting services to non-profit and for-profit organizations, serving clients including the United States and Dutch governments and Sandia National Laboratories. Prior to obtaining his PhD, he worked in sales for Hershey Foods Corporation, co-founded a privately-owned marketing consulting firm, serving clients including Colgate-Palmolive and Johnson & Johnson, and co-founded Monmouth University's Division I FCS college football program.