

# SCIO22Z-LZ: ENTREPRENEURSHIP & INNOVATION

6 (3+3) ECTS OFFERED ON FRIDAYS 13.15-16.00 IN PERIODS IV-V, SPRING 2021

**Details of the syllabus may change. For up-to-date information refer to course website.**

## TEACHER-IN-CHARGE

Kelley A. Packalen, PhD • TUAS 3193 • Telephone: 046 563 5954 • Email: [kelley.a.packalen@aalto.fi](mailto:kelley.a.packalen@aalto.fi)  
Office hours: <https://calendly.com/kelleypackalen/aalto-office-hours>

## ABOUT THE COURSE

Welcome to Entrepreneurship & Innovation! This seminar introduces you to a sampling of theoretical and empirical literature in the domain of entrepreneurship and innovation – two distinct but related fields of research. Our first six weeks (module 1) will focus on entrepreneurship although the topic of innovation will also appear in some articles; the reverse – a focus on innovation with some articles also speaking to entrepreneurship – will be the focus of the last six weeks of the course (module 2).

Both entrepreneurship and innovation can be studied using theories from a variety of different disciplines. In this course our assigned readings will primarily draw on theories from the field of sociology (and its sub-domains of economic sociology and institutional theory) and secondarily economics. Theories from psychology will be less prominent most weeks. Following an introduction to entrepreneurship as a distinct field of research, each week will focus on a different stage of the entrepreneurial life cycle of a firm. Our six weeks on innovation will focus primarily on scientific, or what I call “big I” innovation. We will move from studying innovation at a macro to micro level and then conclude with a discussion on inclusive, sustainable and responsible innovation.

This is an interactive class with learning based predominantly on class discussions and individual reflections. You are expected to fully prepare for each class, attend class, and actively facilitate and participate in the weekly discussions.

You are encouraged to take all twelve weeks of the course, but the course is structured such that you may enroll in the first six weeks (entrepreneurship) or the last six weeks (innovation) only. Each module is 3 ECTS.

## TEACHING PERIOD:

This 12-week course is offered from 13.15-16.00 on Fridays **starting Friday March 5, 2021.**

## STATUS OF THE COURSE:

The optional course is open to Aalto University doctoral students and students from other universities as long as the size of class permits.

Level of the course:	Doctoral level
Prerequisite:	None
Language of instruction:	English
Registration:	The course is offered for doctoral students. To enroll see instructions on the course website. The course will be organized if at least six students have enrolled.

Grading Scale: 1-5 for each of the 3 ECTS modules;  
class participation 30% and written assignments 70%

Workload: Class participation: 6(12) classes x 3 hours per class = 18(36) hours  
Pre-class work (reading): 6(12) classes x 5 hours per class = 30(60) hours  
Post-class work (written) 6(12) classes x 3 hours per class = 18(36) hours

## LEARNING OUTCOMES:

The course is built around three core outcomes. Your success in this course is dependent on your ability to:

- Actively listen and contribute to discussions in a meaningful and professionally appropriate way (as evidenced by your class participation and discussion facilitation)
- Critically evaluate both classical and contemporary entrepreneurial frameworks to understand their strengths and limitations (as evidenced by your class participation, learning diary and learning syntheses)
- Connect and extend theoretical knowledge and analytical frameworks in proposing solutions to current gaps in the literature (as evidenced by your learning syntheses)

## FOSTERING A CULTURE OF SAFETY AND INCLUSION IN THE CLASSROOM

The majority of our time together will be spent in discussion. As such it is critical that we work together to create an environment where everyone feels welcomed, safe, included, valued and respected.

To emphasize that there is no one right way to study any of the topics we cover, I have selected articles with an eye to expanding the context in which empirical work is studied, showcasing a wide range of authors, and incorporating papers which focus on equity, diversity and inclusiveness (EDI)-related issues.

To encourage students to share their own understanding and opinions of the week's topic and assigned articles, at the beginning of the course we will – as a group – create our own classroom specific norms for conversation. The class-specific norms will expand on these ground rules, which we will follow to create an atmosphere of respect:<sup>1</sup>

- Notice and question our own judgement and biases
- Trust in people's positive intentions – ask for and allow clarification before assuming otherwise
- Speak for ourselves, not on behalf of others
- Share talk time
- Be open to learning from the many different perspectives in the room
- Invite and acknowledge difference – both visible and invisible
- Be curious; seek to understand difference rather than persuade others to think the way we do

If at any point in the semester you have any questions, concerns or ideas related to classroom culture, or equity, diversity and/or inclusion more generally please reach out to me.

## ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

---

<sup>1</sup> Credit for ground rules goes to Alison Cummings, a Learning Specialist with Queen's University Human Resources, who moderated a faculty discussion in which I participated on anti-racism, discrimination & inclusion at Smith School of Business.

I use the standard Aalto University 1-5 grading scale. Detailed assignment descriptions and rubrics are available in the appendices at the end of this syllabus. I will also strive to provide you with feedback on your initial assignments quickly so you will be able to incorporate that feedback as you move forward.

### SUBMITTING ASSIGNMENTS

Unless otherwise noted, all assignments are to be submitted as an electronic copy to the course website by 23.59 on the Tuesday following the class in which the material was discussed.

### SUMMARY OF ASSIGNMENTS AND THEIR DEADLINES

Type	Assignment	Percent of Final Grade	Due 23.59 (if not in class)
Participation	In-class participation	30	Every class
Learning diary	Reflections on each week's readings and class discussions	50	Tuesday following class (for weeks 1-5 & 7-11)
Learning synthesis	Entrepreneurship synthesis Innovation synthesis	20	Tuesday following class (for weeks 6 and 12)

### PARTICIPATION

Participation is a large part of the course as much of the value of this seminar derives from collective discussions that involve the participation of everyone. As such, you will be asked to read three articles (four shorter articles in week 1) prior to each class and serve as discussion facilitator and note keeper at least once per the course. The overall goal for the semester is for you to improve your ability to actively listen and contribute to discussions in a meaningful and professionally appropriate way.<sup>2</sup> **Appendix A** at the end of this syllabus provides you with specific details on what is expected in terms of participation and how you will be evaluated.

### LEARNING DIARY AND SYNTHESSES

A learning diary provides you with the opportunity to reflect on the week's reading and classroom discussion in a holistic way that is also personal. It is not just a summary of the week's reading and discussion, but a deeper reflection – critical and/or supportive - on your thoughts with respect to the week's topic and your own and/or others' ideas. A good diary will also demonstrate an evolution of your thinking overtime by for example connecting to topics that we studied earlier in the semester and/or you have been exposed to outside of class. Finally, the diary provides you with an opportunity to explore new ideas, mull uncertainties, and investigate connections to your own research in a way that is grounded in the literature and theories covered in the course.

At the end of each module you will have the opportunity to pull your weekly learning together in a higher-level synthesis. For example, grounding your discussion in the course literature and theories, you may consider how the topics fit together, discuss what you perceive to be hot topics or recurring themes, formulate research questions for future study, identify shortcomings of the field, and/or connect the topics to your own work.

---

<sup>2</sup>Group discussion is a skill and like all skills requires practice. In our first class we will spend some time discussing our opinions on what behaviours facilitate good discussions with the goal of developing classroom norms. You may find the following article to be useful in thinking about what you value in discussion and what you would like to improve during our time together: Hollander, J.A. (2002). "Learning to discuss: Strategies for improving the quality of a class discussion." *Teaching Sociology*, 30(3), 317-327.

**Appendices B and C** at the end of this syllabus provide you with specific details on these assignments and how you will be evaluated.

### LATE POLICIES AND FLEXIBILITY WITH DEADLINES

The late policies and flexibility that I have in place are designed to consider the unique circumstances of each student while at the same time encouraging you to stay engaged with the material for the duration of the course. In crafting these policies, I worked to balance both the needs of individual students as well as fairness across all students.

### SUMMARY OF LATE POLICIES AND FLEXIBILITY BY ASSIGNMENT TYPE

Type	Late Penalty	Flexibility
Participation	Not applicable	Miss one class from each module (i.e. entrepreneurship & innovation) without penalty
Learning diary	½ point for each 72 hours late (e.g. 4 → 3.5)	Lowest one grade from each module (i.e. entrepreneurship & innovation) is dropped
Learning synthesis	½ point for each 72 hours late (e.g. 4 → 3.5)	If the deadline does not work, you may request a reasonable alternative deadline. Requests must be made at least 48 hours in advance and are binding once agreed upon.

### LATE PENALTIES

Each assignment has a clearly stated late penalty that has been designed to encourage you to complete your work before its deadline while at the same time not being overly harsh if you do miss a deadline. For example, some weeks you may find that taking an extra day or two to complete your weekly learning diary entry will result in a higher quality entry that more than makes up for the late penalty.

### BUILT-IN FLEXIBILITY

I recognize that there may be times that you are ill, have significant deadlines in another course or work project and/or other extenuating circumstances that prohibit you from attending class and/or completing a weekly entry in your learning diary. Therefore, I have built flexibility into these assignments such that you may miss one class from each module without penalty and your lowest two grades – one from each module – on the learning diary assignments will be dropped.

### FLEXIBILITY ON REQUEST

I have selected deadlines for the learning syntheses that are intended to balance recency of material with time for reflection. I recognize, however, that sometimes these deadlines may not work for you because of deadlines in other courses and/or other time specific commitments that you may have.

As such for those assignments that do not have built in flexibility you may contact me about the possibility of changing an assignment’s deadline at least 48 hours in advance of the deadline. Together we will agree on a new deadline that is both manageable and reasonable given the joint requirements of the course and your other commitments. Once we agree on a new deadline it is binding (i.e. you may not request a further extension) and the stated late penalties will apply if your assignment is submitted after the agreed upon deadline.

Please note that the purpose of this flexibility is not meant to provide you with additional time at the last minute because for example you did not manage your time well. This is why requests for an extended deadline must be made at least 48 hours in advance. Rather the purpose is to provide you with the opportunity – if needed – to better balance your workload across all commitments while still providing an equitable environment to all students.

---

#### PROLONGED EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCE

The above late penalties and flexibly are designed to accommodate normal ups and downs of remote learning. If, however, you experience a prolonged extenuating circumstance (e.g. multi-week illness that prevents you from completing school work, prolonged unavoidable family commitments) please reach out to me as soon as possible so we can work together to create a plan that will enable to you to complete the course successfully.

## SCIO22Z-LZ – ENTREPRENEURSHIP & INNOVATION: CLASS SCHEDULE AND READINGS

This is a survey course meant to introduce you to many different areas of entrepreneurship and innovation. It is not a deep dive into any one topic within the field of entrepreneurship. In fact, we could easily turn many of the weekly topics into entire courses! Given the survey nature of the course the readings are by no means exhaustive or even representative of the particular topic as a whole. The papers that I have selected are meant to introduce you to some of the key issues in each of the areas that we discuss. As such, most weeks I include a seminal article, a literature review or a contemporary article, and an article that addresses issues related to EDI (equity, diversity and inclusion). **Appendix D** provides a list of optional articles if you want to delve deeper into a particular week's topic.

**I have limited the required readings to three readings per week (four shorter articles in week 1). In doing so I expect that you will have sufficient time to thoughtfully read and process the content of each article.**

### ENTREPRENEURSHIP MODULE

---

#### WEEK 1 (FRI MAR 5, 2021): WHO IS AN ENTREPRENEUR?

Gartner, W. B. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11-32.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.

Ramoglou, S., Gartner, W. B., & Tsang, E. W. (2020). "Who is an entrepreneur?" is (still) the wrong question. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13, e00168.

Miller, D., & Le Breton-Miller, I. (2017). Underdog entrepreneurs: A model of challenge-based entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 41(1), 7-17.

---

#### WEEK 2 (FRI MAR 12, 2021): FOUNDER IMPRINTING

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Organizations and social structure. In J. March (ed.) *Handbook of Organizations*, 44(2), 142-193. [Note: Version online is a reprint of the original chapter]

Mathias, B. D., Williams, D. W., & Smith, A. R. (2015). Entrepreneurial inception: The role of imprinting in entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1), 11-28.

Battilana, J., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C. and Model, J. (2015). Harnessing productive tensions in hybrid organizations: the case of work integration social enterprises. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58(6): 1658-1685.

---

#### WEEK 3 (FRI MAR 19, 2021): SOCIAL AND HUMAN CAPITAL

Lazar, M., Miron-Spektor, E., Agarwal, R., Erez, M., Goldfarb, B., & Chen, G. (2020). Entrepreneurial team formation. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 29-59.

Abraham, M. (2020). Gender-role incongruity and audience-based gender bias: An examination of networking among entrepreneurs. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 151-180.

Wang, D. J. (2020). When do return migrants become entrepreneurs? The role of global social networks and institutional distance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 14(2), 125-148.

---

WEEK 4 (FRI MAR 26, 2021): FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Kanze, D., Huang, L., Conley, M. A., & Higgins, E. T. (2018). We ask men to win and women not to lose: Closing the gender gap in startup funding. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 586-614.

Neville, F., Forrester, J. K., O'Toole, J., & Riding, A. (2018). 'Why even bother trying?' Examining discouragement among racial-minority entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(3), 424-456.

Singh, J., & Dutt, P. (2021). Microfinance and entrepreneurship at the base of the pyramid. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, online first;

---

WEEK 5 (FRI APR 9, 2021): GROWTH IN NEW VENTURES

Achtenhagen, L., Naldi, L., & Melin, L. (2010). "Business growth"—Do practitioners and scholars really talk about the same thing?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(2), 289-316.

Decker, S., Estrin, S., & Mickiewicz, T. (2020). The tangled historical roots of entrepreneurial growth aspirations. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 14(4), 616-638.

Marquis, C., & Qiao, K. (2020). Waking from Mao's dream: Communist ideological imprinting and the internationalization of entrepreneurial ventures in China. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(3), 795-830.

---

WEEK 6 (FRI APR 16, 2021): RESILLIANCE

Gimeno, J. Folta, T, Cooper, AC and Woo, C. (1997). Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42, 750-783.

Salvato, C., Sargiacomo, M., Amore, M. D., & Minichilli, A. (2020). Natural disasters as a source of entrepreneurial opportunity: Family business resilience after an earthquake. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 14(4), 594-615.

Shepherd, D. A., Saade, F. P., & Wincent, J. (2020). How to circumvent adversity? Refugee-entrepreneurs' resilience in the face of substantial and persistent adversity. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(4), 105940.

---

INNOVATION MODULE

---

WEEK 7 (FRI APR 23, 2021): INNOVATION STUDIES

Dosi, G. (1982). Technological paradigms and technological trajectories: A suggested interpretation of the determinants and directions of technical change. *Research Policy*, 11(3): 147-162.

Brooks, H. (1994). The relationship between science and technology. *Research Policy*, 23(5), 477-486.

Fini, R., Rasmussen, E., Siegel, D., & Wiklund, J. (2018). Rethinking the commercialization of public science: From entrepreneurial outcomes to societal impacts. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 32(1), 4-20.

---

WEEK 8 (FRI APR 30, 2021): DISRUPTIVE INNOVATIONS, DIFFUSION & INDUSTRY EVOLUTION

Tushman M.L. & Anderson P. (1986). Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 439-465.

Tripsas, M. (1997). Unraveling the process of creative destruction: Complementary assets and incumbent survival in the typesetter industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(S1), 119-142.

Hargadon, A. B., & Douglas, Y. (2001). When innovations meet institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(3), 476–501.

---

WEEK 9 (FRI MAY 7, 2021): CLUSTERS AND KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVERS

Pouder, R. & St. John, C. (1996). Hot spots and blind spots: Geographic clusters of firms and innovation, *Academy of Management Review*, 21(4), 1192-1225.

Powell, W.W., Packalen, K.A., & Whittington, K.C. (2012). Organizational and institutional genesis: the emergence of high-tech clusters in the life sciences. In W. Powell and J. Padgett (Ed.) *The Emergence Of Organizations and Markets*. Princeton University Press.

Qureshi, I., Sutter, C., & Bhatt, B. (2018). The transformative power of knowledge sharing in settings of poverty and social inequality. *Organization Studies*, 39(11), 1575-1599.

---

WEEK 10 (FRI MAY 14, 2021): PROCESS OF INNOVATION

Cohen, W. M., & Levinthal, D. A. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128-152.

Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Lebovitz, S., & Zalmanson, L. (2020). Minimal and adaptive coordination: How hackathons' projects accelerate innovation without killing it. *Academy of Management Journal*, (online first).

Saka-Helmhout, A., Chappin, M., & Vermeulen, P. (2019). Multiple paths to firm innovation in Sub-Saharan Africa: How informal institutions matter. *Organization Studies*, (online first).

---

WEEK 11 (FRI MAY 28, 2021): INNOVATORS

Bogers, M., Afuah, A., & Bastian, B. (2010). Users as innovators: A review, critique, and future research directions. *Journal of Management*, 36(4), 857-875.

Cook, L. D. (2014). Violence and economic activity: Evidence from African American patents, 1870–1940. *Journal of Economic Growth*, 19(2), 221-257.

Bonesso, S., Gerli, F., Pizzi, C., & Boyatzis, R. E. (2020). The role of intangible human capital in innovation diversification: Linking behavioral competencies with different types of innovation. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 29(3), 661-681.

---

WEEK 12 (FRI JUN 4, 2021): RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION

George, G., McGahan, A. M., & Prabhu, J. (2012). Innovation for inclusive growth: Towards a theoretical framework and a research agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(4), 661-683.

Shu, C., Zhou, K. Z., Xiao, Y., & Gao, S. (2016). How green management influences product innovation in China: The role of institutional benefits. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(3), 471-485.

Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(9), 1568-1580.



APPENDIX A: CLASSROOM DISCUSSION AND PARTICIPATION

**30% OF FINAL GRADE, 1 CLASS FROM EACH MODULE MAY BE MISSED WITHOUT PENALTY**

“Many...discussions fail because...expectations for ensuring an effective discussion incorrectly lie on the discussion leader, when, in fact, it is the discussion participants who should carry most of the weight of the discussion.” – Soranno (2010 p. 85)

Participation is a large part of the course as much of the value of this seminar derives from collective discussions that involve everyone’s participation. As such, you will read assigned articles prior to each class and actively contribute to class discussions. The overall goal for the course is for you to improve your ability to actively listen and contribute to discussions in a meaningful and professionally appropriate way.

Your participation in class will be assessed throughout the course. Key to participation is a focus on quality rather than quantity and evidence of active listening. I will also be listening for the extent to which your comments build on what others have said rather than signal that you are interested only in articulating your own opinions.

Specifically, each class you will have the opportunity to participate in one of three roles: the discussion facilitator (one student), the recorder (one student), and the discussion participants (the remaining students plus instructor). My expectation is that you will volunteer to be the facilitator at least once and the recorder at least once. To ensure that everyone has a chance to volunteer priority will be given to those who have not yet held these roles. Roles will be assigned at the start of each class so as to prevent the situation where you signed up for a given role but then are unable to fulfil that role because for example you are ill or otherwise unable to attend class at the last moment.

LOGISTICS FOR PARTICIPATION

DEADLINES AND LATE PENALTIES

Classroom	In class	Late penalty	Built-in flexibility
Participation in classroom discussions	Fridays	n/a	One class missed per module (i.e. entrepreneurship or innovation) without it impacting your grade

WORKLOAD

The bulk of your time each week outside of class will be spent reading the assigned journal articles that will form the basis of our discussion in class together. For those of you who are newer to reading academic articles you may find the process to be slow going at first, particularly as you learn field-specific lingo. Over the course of the semester the speed with which you read the articles should increase, but the time it takes to read a journal article will likely always be longer than the time it takes to read a similar length newspaper or magazine article. As such, I expect that you will spend about five to six hours reading and making notes (e.g. in the columns) on each week’s articles. More details on how to approach these readings and what to prepare for our discussion periods – including how to prepare a good question for discussion – can be found below.

GRADING

I will consider your participation each class and provide you with formal feedback after the first module. That said, please feel free to reach out to me if you would like feedback sooner. Participation will be scored on a scale of 1 to 5, using a modified version of Schlechty’s (2002) level of engagement (as viewed in the infographic created by Sylvia Duckworth (n.d.)).

Grade	Description
5	<b>Engagement:</b> Your comments are thoughtful and provide evidence that you are well prepared for class (e.g. they are grounded in the theories, frameworks, mechanisms and/or data from the readings). Your remarks demonstrate that you have been actively listening to your peers by building off their comments, acknowledging that what you planned to state has already been said and/or properly acknowledging the thoughts of others in your own statements.
4	<b>Strategic compliance:</b> Your comments are well formulated but often specific to a particular article rather than demonstrating evidence of reading and reflecting on all the work. Your comments do not build on what others say and sometimes seem separate from the conversation. Rather than actively listening to your peers you may spend your time thinking about what to say next.
3	<b>Ritual compliance:</b> Your comments typically highlight specific findings and sometimes connections between two points, but rarely think about the implications of those connections. You tend to participate early in the session by answering introductory type questions and then stop actively participating.
2	<b>Retreatism:</b> You are disengaged from the conversation and do not participate. You keep to yourself, but do not distract others in the class and do not engage in other activities.
1	<b>Rebellion:</b> You are disengaged from the conversation and do not participate. You engage in other activities during class time (e.g. checking email, scrolling social media, completing work for another class) and/or disrupt others abilities to participate.
0	<b>Absent</b>

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EACH OF THE ROLES AND STRATEGIES

MODIFIED FROM SORANNO (2010: TABLE 1)

**Preparation of all students prior to the discussion period.** All students should do the following to prepare:

- a. Prepare by thoroughly reading the articles (perhaps more than once), and having a solid understanding of the big-picture of the article as well as the details. For those who are new to reading academic articles you may find the more specific tips listed below to be useful.

**The group participants.** The group participants are responsible for most discussion content and should do the following:

- a. Provide ~2 questions for discussion at the beginning of the discussion period. Some ideas for types of topics to discuss include: delving deeper into a particular research area, exploring the evidence the authors provide for any of their conclusions, expanding on an implication of the study, exploring the implications of this particular study for understanding of different disciplinary areas or for how the research could be applied in a variety of different capacities, etc. Please **see the section on formulating questions** for more details on crafting good discussion questions.
- b. Provide insights, questions, answers to questions from the facilitator or recorder.

- c. Actively listen to fellow group participants and respond to each other’s comments rather than just bringing their own comments to the table.

**The recorder.** The recorder is a “servant to the group” and is responsible for being the memory of the discussion group and for recording participants’ contributions (Rees, 1998). The recorder should do the following:

- a. Keep notes during the discussion for later distribution to the group.
- b. At the end of the discussion compile a list of “take home messages” on an overhead that the group participants help to create.
- c. After class, transcribe discussion notes and distribute to the group within a couple days.
- d. As appropriate, help the facilitator move the discussion along.

**The facilitator.** The facilitator is also a “servant to the group” (Rees, 1998). Facilitation is about seeing what the group needs to move forward and providing guidance and empowering the group. At the start of the session the facilitator guides the class in deciding the order of topics to be discussed, prioritizing as necessary and then guiding the class in the discussion of the topics. With approximately 10 minutes remaining in the session, the facilitator asks the participants and recorder to summarize the discussion.

During the session the facilitator is encouraged to use any of the following strategies to facilitate the discussion (modified from Rees, 1998):

- a. Probe in-depth into a comment/idea: Encourages more in-depth analysis, such as: “Why did you say that?” or “Could you be more specific?”
- b. Paraphrase: Only for clarification of a comment made by a student, not to evaluate or improve it.
- c. Refer back to earlier comments: Which ties the discussion to previous student’s contributions.
- d. Be comfortable with silence: Be willing to wait once a question is posed as people need time to think and frame a response.
- e. Give positive reinforcement: This encourages participation, especially to students who are quieter.
- f. Include quieter members: Some ways to draw people out are to ask students directly for their opinion on something that has been brought up, to refer back to comments that quieter people make to draw them out further, or to ask people to take a minute to individually write down their thoughts.
- g. Shift perspective of the discussion: If all students seem to agree, it may be less likely that a single or few students who feel differently would speak up. To get these students to speak up, ask if there “might be another viewpoint that could be missing from the discussion.” You can also ask for the implications of the topic or a big-picture question; or ask for a specific example or for details to enrich a discussion that may be at too broad of a level.
- h. Summarize: Occasional summary is helpful to keep the group focused. You can briefly summarize what has been said before moving on.

**SOME TIPS FOR THOSE NEW TO READING ACADEMIC ARTICLES**

In reading through the articles in advance of class here are some of the questions you might want to ask yourself. Keep in mind that these are general questions and as such may be more or less appropriate for any one article. The answers to these questions are the kind of information that I scribble in the margins of the

pages or alternatively highlight and annotate with phrases such as “research question” or “main theory” although I encourage you adopt the format that works best for you. Some of you may find it useful to keep notes, or begin drafting your diary entry, which you would then finish after the class discussion.

1. What is the scope of the research (i.e. what is the research question)?
2. What are the underlying theoretical motivations? Underlying assumptions?
3. What primary mechanisms and/or arguments are posited?
4. What is the (empirical or conceptual) evidence to support the mechanisms and/or argument(s)? How convincing?
5. How is the article positioned in the extant literature? What are its contributions to that literature?
  - a. Is the main point of the article to: build on extent prior theoretical arguments?; explain why those theories are not the best approach?; carve out a niche topic?; etc.
6. What are the main conclusions of the article?
7. What are the strengths of the article? What are the shortcomings and/or flaws?
8. What is one way in which you could extend this research? This could take the form of deriving a new argument, connecting to other dependent variables or different settings, etc.

---

#### FOR EMPIRICAL PIECES:

1. What are the basic assumptions behind the analysis?
2. What are the research techniques and methodology (e.g. sample, analysis, etc.)?
3. How could this analysis be improved? Be specific and practical (do not make suggestions that you could not realistically envision yourself implementing).

#### SOME TIPS ON FORMULATING GOOD DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Depending on the size of our class you will be asked to bring 1-3 discussion questions to the class. These questions will create our agenda for the day’s discussion thereby enabling you as a class to drive the discussion based on themes in which you are most interested. **The types of questions asked, however, will have a big impact on the quality of discussion in which we engage.** Quite simply, not all questions are the same.

Based on having used this methodology for discussion in the past, below is what I have learned about how to formulate questions that lead to better classroom discussions that are grounded in the literature and theories that we are studying. Many thanks to the former students in the class whose questions are being shared to illustrate the different types of questions you might want to ask.

1. First, ***very narrow questions don’t lend themselves to discussions*** and are perhaps best asked either in the chat, during break, after class, during office hours or by looking up the answer in a textbook or online (e.g. *Why did the author choose variable X to study phenomena Y?* or *What is discourse analysis?* or *Does anyone know any studies that cover X in different context/population/etc.*).
2. Similarly, ***questions that ask about a related – but not studied in the class – situation or context produce responses that are largely dependent on opinions rather than being grounded in the literature.*** While these broad, big questions are good for brainstorming potential research questions and/or learning of

one another's personal experiences they tend to take the conversation off course and do not further one of the learning objectives of the course which is to learn to engage with and critique academic literature. Examples of these types of questions include: "how would argument X play out in a different environment", "What has happened in the field since this review article was published?", and/or "Does theory X still hold today?"

**Note this last example of a question can work provided that we look at the mechanisms underlying the theory and evaluate each in the context of today's environment.** The tendency, however is to rush to opinion-based responses based on our own experiences rather than focus on the theoretical mechanisms. To avoid this, if you want to ask a "Does theory X still hold today" question, please also prepare a summary of the main tenants of the theory and be prepared to share these when you are asked to elaborate on your question. This will keep the conversation focused and the outcome fruitful to our understanding of the argument and its potential limitations.

3. **"Big issue" questions** are similar to 2, but are even broader in that they are not application questions but more fundamental questions like the trait versus behaviour question from week one. These questions **should be used with care.**

In some cases, when I have presented debates in the literature (as with trait vs. behaviour in week 1) these "big" questions can be fruitful, but if we do not carefully watch the time these questions can get away from us. Thus, these questions should be used strategically when the need arises and probably should be discussed at the end of the class so as to better manage our time. In addition, to the extent possible our responses should be grounded in literature that we have read in the course.

4. In contrast to 2 and 3, **questions that ask about a course-related situation, context or phenomenon are some of the most fruitful questions we can ask.** Why? Because these open the door for the class to engage in a critical analysis of two different theoretical models and/or the boundaries of the arguments in one paper versus another. Importantly, it provides everyone with the opportunity to engage in the conversation based on the class' shared understanding and equal access to evidence to support their responses. An example of this kind of question is:

*"Could the throne vs kingdom paradox (Wasserman, 2017) be more prominent in family entrepreneurship, where hierarchy in kinship might dominate allocation of power and authority?"*

5. **Questions about methods should be used sparingly and only when directed at helping us to understand the research question rather than methodology.** Examples of these kinds of questions, where the methodology ties back to the literature, include:

*"Is the example of the typesetter industry a sufficient one for answering Tripsas' opening question: 'Why do incumbent firms sometimes fail drastically in the face of radical technological change, yet other times survive and prosper?' (Tripsas, 119)."*

*"Have the authors' jumped to conclusions with using R&D spending as a proxy for innovation?"*

6. **Dig deeper questions – about a specific hypothesis and/or about the theory and/or main argument in the paper are also good questions** as they encourage us to directly engage with an article, consider the validity of underlying mechanisms (e.g. frustration as an underlying mechanism for founder exit following IPO), etc. Here are some examples:

*"How do the three cultures in the Klyver article differ in their formation strategies?"*

*“In Gundry's and Welsch's (2001) paper, was there enough theory for proposing hypotheses?”* This question from a prior student is good provided that we then go into the theory. The person stating this type of question should be prepared to state the information on theory that is in the paper so that we start grounded in the evidence rather than relying on memory and opinion.

*“What the Tripsas (1997) article does not cover is that incumbents and new entrants might engage in cooperation/acquisition within and between each other rather than compete. How would the three factors discussed by Tripsas (1997) alongside the strength of the industry in protecting patterns determine incumbents' desire to cooperate or compete? Are there other factors involved in determining incumbents desire to cooperate with or acquire new entrants”* This question asked us to consider an extension, but very much in the context of the main theoretical argument of the paper. Thus, we could go back to each mechanism in the paper and consider scenarios under which competition or cooperation might prevail. Again, the person asking the question should be prepared to direct the rest of the class to the appropriate page in the article where the mechanisms or factors are discussed.

7. Finally, **questions that ask about how all, or a subset of authors, addressed a particular theme of interest are good.** Like 4., these types of questions enable us to engage in the day's literature more deeply by comparing and contrasting a concept across different authors. For example,

*“Hsu (2004) controls for the characteristics of the startups in investigating whether they accept discounted offers from reputable VCs. Also, Kanze et al. (2018) adopt a homogeneous view of gender, considering all women entrepreneurs in the same group. How do you think the findings of these two studies would have differed had they adopted a heterogeneous perspective?”* Because we also had the example of another paper on gender differences from the prior week, this question is grounded in the literature and we could use evidence from a prior week to help us to respond to this question.

**A final important note related to questions and responses:** I very much want everyone to bring their own experiences and diverse backgrounds into their responses. To that end, the last thing that I want my guidance above to suggest is that there is no place in the classroom for these comments. Rather, ***your own experiences should be used to support evidence from the literature of the week such that the personal experiences, knowledge of related literature, etc. enables us to better understand the article, its theoretical argument and/or potential boundary conditions.***

An excellent example of personal experiences meaningfully adding to a conversation without taking us down a side path was when a prior class read an article about how different types of trust between spousal and sibling founding teams may lead to different types of firm outcomes. One student brought up the point that the findings may not apply to cultures such as her own where arranged marriages continue. Another student followed with his own experience of an arranged marriage and how the nature of trust had evolved over the past seven years that he had been married to his spouse. After this point was made about cultural differences and boundary conditions the conversation moved on and did not dwell on the topic of arranged marriages (by for example discussing arranged marriage and its impact on entrepreneurship more broadly).

## REFERENCES

- Duckworth, S. (n.d.). Levels of Engagement. Sylvia Duckworth's Drawings for Sale. [sylviaduckworth.shop](http://sylviaduckworth.shop)
- Rees, F. (2005). *The facilitator excellence handbook*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Schlechty, P. C. (2002). *Working on the work an action plan for teachers, principals and superintendents* (1sted.). Jossey Bass.
- Soranno, P. A. (2010). Improving student discussions in graduate and undergraduate courses: Transforming the discussion leader. *Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education*, 39(1), 84-91.

## APPENDIX B: LEARNING DIARY

### 50% OF FINAL GRADE (~6% PER DIARY ENTRY), LOWEST 1(2) OF 5(10) GRADES DROPPED

A learning diary provides you with the opportunity practice academic writing and to reflect on the week’s reading and classroom discussion in a holistic way that is also personal. It is not just a summary of the week’s reading and discussion, but a deeper reflection – critical and/or supportive - on your thoughts with respect to the week’s topic and your own and/or others’ ideas, whether those come from our discussion, the assigned literature, and/or your own knowledge. A good diary will also demonstrate an evolution of your thinking overtime by for example connecting to topics that we studied earlier in the semester and/or you have been exposed to outside of class (but see my caveat below). Finally, the diary provides you with an opportunity to explore new ideas, mull uncertainties, and investigate connections to your own ongoing research.

## LOGISTICS FOR WEEKLY DIARY ENTRIES

### DEADLINES AND LATE PENALTIES

Learning diary	Due 11.59	Late penalty	Flexibility
Reflections on readings and class discussions from weeks 1-5 & 7-11	Tuesdays following class in which readings discussed	½ point for each 72 hours late (e.g. 4 → 3.5)	Lowest one grade from each module (i.e. entrepreneurship & innovation) is dropped

### WORD LIMIT AND FORMATTING GUIDELINES

In this class your diaries, which should be about 1000 words (not including references), will provide you with an opportunity to practice academic writing. By this I mean that the readings in the class should take centre stage as evidence for the arguments and critiques that you make. Your own research, personal experiences and other literature you read may be used to support and enhance your discussion of the course literature, but should not outshine it. It is an opportunity for you to link theories, explore boundary conditions and identify topic themes.

Proper citation of sources is expected. This includes not only the journal articles which we read for class but also proper attribution of other’s comments such as those your peers made during our discussions.

While discussion of course material – with classmates both in and out of classroom discussion as well as with friends, family members and peers – is not only acceptable, but encouraged, ***the diary entries themselves are individual assignments that provide me with your own thoughts and opinions.*** As appropriate, using first person will clearly distinguish your own thoughts from those of others.

- Example: In class Prof. Kelley asked if anyone had entrepreneurial experience and could speak to their experiences as it related to building networks. Mikko’s response prompted me to think about potential boundary conditions of the networking theory we had discussed in class. Specifically, I...
- Example: My five-year-old daughter asked me what I was reading. I explained the concept of embeddedness as follows.... Afterwards she asked me... Her questions helped me to better understand the concept because I had to translate the academic lingo into terms that a five-year-old would understand. Specifically, I....

### GRADING

For diary entries the primary focus will be on your ability to formulate connections between the week’s readings

Grade	Description
5	High quality (e.g. grammar, style and format) submission that covers multiple themes of the week’s topic and has acceptable extensions at the macro level (i.e. combining learning from multiple articles), connections within and between articles and relevant ideas.
4	Average to high quality submission that addresses several themes of the week’s topic and has attempted extensions at the macro level (i.e. combining learning from multiple articles); or a high-quality submission that addresses covers multiple themes from the week but limits extensions and connections to those within single articles only.
3	Average to low quality submission that addresses some themes of the topic and has limited attempts to build extensions or a complete coverage of the topic which is a summary of the material rather than a reflection upon it.
2	Low quality submission that addresses limited theme of the topic and is primarily a summary rather than a reflection on those limited theme (e.g. you provide a summary of one the week’s article)
1	Low quality submission that poorly summarizes some components of the topic. (e.g. you focus your writing so much on the class discussion that the reader would not know if you had read the articles that week)
0	Did not submit

**INFORMATION THAT MIGHT GO IN A LEARNING DIARY**

Below I include suggested prompts that you might want to mull over in your learning diary. You are not limited to the prompts on this list, but you should reflect on similar types of questions (see also questions for discussion for the type of information you may want to cover)

- What did I learn? Was there something that changed my views and why? Focus on and analyze the themes important to you grounding the discussion in the relevant theories and/or frameworks.
- What did I not understand? What went against my own ideas? Why? What was less comprehensible? Why? Focus on and analyze the questions that left you puzzled. Again, dissect the literature, and if appropriate bring findings from external literature to support your concerns.
- What we have discussed may have some relevance for you and your studies. Can you identify what this is? How are you able to apply this knowledge in your studies? Be specific in using the theory or frameworks from the assigned literature.
- How does what you learned this week relate to earlier weeks in the course? Does this new information change your thinking about an earlier topic? If yes, what would you change about what you wrote earlier and why? Bring in new theories, framework and examples to support your argument.
- Criticize or defend aspects of the topic discussed during class. Remember criticizing is not license to be overly negative and alternatively defending isn’t about over the top praise. Rather, whether you criticize or defend an argument you want to do so analytically using clear and coherent rationales.

As with our classroom discussions, I encourage everyone to bring their own experiences and diverse backgrounds into their diary entries. To do this effectively, ***your own experiences should be used to support evidence from the literature of the week such that the personal experiences, knowledge of related literature, etc. enables the reader to better understand the assigned article(s), its theoretical argument(s) and/or potential boundary conditions.*** Or, to continue my centre stage analogy from above, references to material and experiences outside of class should be the supporting cast rather than the star of the show (which should be the week’s assigned readings).



## APPENDIX C: LEARNING SYNTHESSES

### 20% OF FINAL GRADE (10% PER SYNTHESIS)

At the end of each module – entrepreneurship and innovation – you will have the opportunity to pull your weekly learning together in a higher-level synthesis. **Note: In the weeks that your learning syntheses are due you do not need to submit a separate weekly learning diary for that week’s topic** (i.e. resilience & responsible innovation). Learnings from these weeks can be included as appropriate in the learning syntheses.

### LOGISTICS FOR LEARNING SYNTHESSES

#### DEADLINES AND LATE PENALTIES

Learning syntheses	Due 11.59	Late penalty	Flexibility
Entrepreneurship Innovation	Tuesday after week 6 Tuesday after week 12	½ point for each 72 hours late (e.g. 4 → 3.5)	If the deadline does not work for you may request a reasonable alternative deadline that does work. Requests must be made at least 48 hours in advance and are binding once agreed upon.

#### WORD LIMIT AND FORMATTING GUIDELINES

An approximately 1500-word synthesis (per subject area). Proper citation of sources is expected. References, figures, tables and/or diagrams are not included in the word limit, but please limit yourself to no more than two figures, tables and/or diagrams per synthesis. **These are individual assignments** which clearly reflect your own thoughts, opinions and conclusions regarding the topics discussed in the course.

#### GRADING

The same rubric that was used for the learning diaries will be used, but the level of analysis is moved to the module as a whole rather than a single week’s topic.

#### HOW TO APPROACH A LEARNING SYNTHESIS

A good way to think about your learning syntheses vis-à-vis your diary entries are that your diary entries each analyze a particular ecosystem within a forest (e.g. a birch grove, a copse of fir trees, the swamp, an open meadow). In contrast your syntheses analyze the forest ecosystem as a whole. What are the common elements? What is the relationship (positive or negative) between the different ecosystems?

I suggest that as you are preparing your weekly diary entries you may want to note areas that you think you will want to return to in your syntheses. I also encourage you to review your diary entries in their entirety near the beginning of working on your syntheses as this will remind you of what you were thinking each week and hopefully help you to identify reoccurring themes that you may want to focus on in your synthesis.

You are encouraged to focus your syntheses on the areas on which you are most passionate while still bringing together multiple topics. For example, you may consider how the topics fit together, discuss what you perceive to be hot topics, formulate research questions for future study, identify shortcomings of the field, and/or connect the topics to your own work. What is not acceptable is to devote your entire synthesis to a single week’s topic as this would be a summary of one week rather than a higher-level discussion of the research field. If you are unsure of what to focus on in your summary I encourage you to meet with me and we can discuss if your approach is appropriate.

## APPENDIX D: OPTIONAL WEEKLY READINGS

As mentioned at the outset, this is a survey course, which means that we are limited to covering just three articles on each topic. In reality entire courses could be taught on each of the weekly topics. Over the years that I have taught this course I have included ever expanding lists of optional readings. These readings include those that I have removed from earlier years as I update the course with more current content as well as those articles that didn't quite make my top three, but would have definitely been included if I had increased the number of weekly readings to four or five. I include these optional readings here as my gift to you. If you are particularly interested in one of the weekly topics the optional reading lists below provide you with an eclectic reading list to start exploring the topic in a little more detail.

### WEEK 1: WHO IS AN ENTREPRENEUR?

#### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Aldrich, H. E., & Martinez, M. A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 41-56.
- Baum, J. R., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 587.
- Caliendo, M., & Kritikos, A. S. (2010). Start-ups by the unemployed: characteristics, survival and direct employment effects. *Small Business Economics*, 35(1), 71-92.
- Demetry, D. (2017). Pop-up to professional: Emerging entrepreneurial identity and evolving vocabularies of motive. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 3(2), 187-207.
- Douglas, E. J. (2013). Reconstructing entrepreneurial intentions to identify predisposition for growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(5), 633-651.
- Fitzsimmons, J. R., & Douglas, E. J. (2011). Interaction between feasibility and desirability in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(4), 431-440.
- Foss, N. J., & Grandori, A. (2020). Entrepreneurship and the firm: a conversation on foundations and prospects. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 29(3), 581-598.
- Gartner, W. B., Shaver, K. G., Gatewood, E., & Katz, J. A. (1994). Finding the Entrepreneur in Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 5–9. [Note: Introduction to special issue]
- Hoang, H., & Gimeno, J. (2010). Becoming a founder: How founder role identity affects entrepreneurial transitions and persistence in founding. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 41-53.
- Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18, 91-104.
- Lee, L., Wong, P. K., Der Foo, M., & Leung, A. (2011). Entrepreneurial intentions: The influence of organizational and individual factors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 124-136.
- 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.

- 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.
- Stephan, U. (2018). Entrepreneurs' mental health and well-being: A review and research agenda. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 32(3), 290–322
- Townsend, D. M., Busenitz, L. W., & Arthurs, J. D. (2010). To start or not to start: Outcome and ability expectations in the decision to start a new venture. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 192-202.
- Townsend, D. M., Busenitz, L. W., & Arthurs, J. D. (2010). To start or not to start: Outcome and ability expectations in the decision to start a new venture. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 192-202.
- Unger, J. M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 341-358.
- Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship—conceptual challenges and ways forward. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165-184.
- Zapkau, F. B., Schwens, C., & Kabst, R. (2017). The role of prior entrepreneurial exposure in the entrepreneurial process: A review and future research implications. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55(1), 56-86.

## WEEK 2: FOUNDER IMPRINTING

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Beckman, C. M., & Burton, M. D. (2008). Founding the future: Path dependence in the evolution of top management teams from founding to IPO. *Organization Science*, 19(1), 3-24.
- Boeker, W. (1988). Organizational origins: Entrepreneurial and environmental imprinting at the time of founding. In G. Carroll (Ed.), *Ecological Models of Organizations*, 33-51. Ballinger Publishing.
- Boeker, W. (1989). Strategic change: The effects of founding and history. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 489-515.
- Bryant, P. T. (2014). Imprinting by design: The microfoundations of entrepreneurial adaptation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(5), 1081-1102.
- Burton, M. D. Sørensen, J. B. & Beckman, C. M. (2002). Coming from good stock: Career histories and new venture formation. Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Burton, M. D., & Beckman, C. M. (2007). Leaving a legacy: Position imprints and successor turnover in young firms. *American Sociological Review*, 72(2), 239-266.
- Dencker, J., Bacq, S., Gruber, M., & Haas, M. (2019). Reconceptualizing necessity entrepreneurship: A contextualized framework of entrepreneurial processes under the condition of basic needs. *The Academy of Management Review*. Online first.
- Ellis, S., Aharonson, B. S., Drori, I., & Shapira, Z. (2017). Imprinting through inheritance: A multi-genealogical study of entrepreneurial proclivity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(2), 500-522.
- Erdogan, I., Rondi, E., & De Massis, A. (2020). Managing the tradition and innovation paradox in family firms: A family imprinting perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 44(1), 20-54.

- Johnson, V. (2007). What is organizational imprinting? Cultural entrepreneurship in the founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 97-127.
- Kimberly, J. (1975). Environmental Constraints and Organizational Structure: A Comparative Analysis of Rehabilitation Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20(1), 1-9.
- Milanov, H., & Fernhaber, S. A. (2009). The impact of early imprinting on the evolution of new venture networks. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(1), 46-61.
- Milanov, H., Shepherd, D. A. (2013). The importance of the first relationship: The ongoing influence of initial network on future status. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34: 727-750.
- O'Donnell, P., O'Gorman, C., & Clinton, E. (2020). Rethinking the 'necessity' in necessity entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*. Online first.
- Pierce, L., & Snyder, J. A. (2020). Historical Origins of Firm Ownership Structure: The Persistent Effects of the African Slave Trade. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(6), 1687-1713.
- Schein, E. H. (1983). The role of the founder in creating organizational culture. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(1), 13-28.
- Simsek, Z., Fox, B., & Heavey, C. (2015). What's past is prologue: A framework, review, and future directions for organizational research on imprinting. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 288–317.
- Snihur, Y., & Zott, C. (2020). The genesis and metamorphosis of novelty imprints: How business model innovation emerges in young ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(2), 554-583.

### WEEK 3: SOCIAL AND HUMAN CAPITAL

---

#### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Batjargal, B. (2003). Social capital and entrepreneurial performance in Russia: A longitudinal study. *Organization Studies*, 24, 535–556.
- Burt, R. S. (2018). Network Disadvantaged Entrepreneurs: Density, Hierarchy, and Success in China and the West. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 1042258718783514.
- Chang, E. P., Memili, E., Chrisman, J. J., Kellermanns, F. W., & Chua, J. H. (2009). Family social capital, venture preparedness, and start-up decisions: A study of Hispanic entrepreneurs in New England. *Family Business Review*, 22(3), 279-292.
- Davidsson, P. & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 301-331.
- Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Stephan, U. (2016). Human capital in social and commercial entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 449-467.
- Kacperczyk, A., & Younkin, P. (2017). The paradox of breadth: The tension between experience and legitimacy in the transition to entrepreneurship. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62(4), 731-764.
- Kleinhempel, J., Beugelsdijk, S., & Klasing, M. J. (2020). The Changing Role of Social Capital During the Venture Creation Process: A Multilevel Study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 1042258720913022.

- Klyver, K., & Foley, D. (2012). Networking and culture in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 24(7-8), 561–588.
- Knight, A. P., Greer, L. L., & De Jong, B. (2020). Start-up teams: a multidimensional conceptualization, conceptualization, integrative review of past research, and future research agenda. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 231-266.
- Marvel, M. R., Davis, J. L., & Sproul, C. R. (2016). Human capital and entrepreneurship research: A critical review and future directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(3), 599-626.
- Ozdemir, S. Z., Moran, P., Zhong, X., & Bliemel, M. J. (2016). Reaching and acquiring valuable resources: The entrepreneur's use of brokerage, cohesion, and embeddedness. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(1), 49-79.
- Packalen, K. A. (2007). Complementing capital: The role of status, demographic features, and social capital in founding teams' abilities to obtain resources. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(6), 873-891.
- Uzzi, B. (1999). Embeddedness in the making of financial capital. How social relations and networks benefit firms seeking financing. *American Sociological Review*, 64, 481-505.
- Venkatesh, V., Shaw, J. D., Sykes, T. A., Wamba, S. F., & Macharia, M. (2017). Networks, technology, and entrepreneurship: A field quasi-experiment among women in rural India. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(5), 1709-1740.
- Woolley, J. L. (2019). Gender, education, and occupation: how founder experiences influence firm outcomes. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5(3), 266-290.
- Zimmerman, M. A., & Zeitz, G. J. (2002). Beyond survival: Achieving new venture growth by building legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(3), 414-431.

#### WEEK 4: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

---

##### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Ahlers, G. K. C., Cumming, D., Günther, C., & Schweizer, D. (2015). Signaling in equity crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(4), 955-980.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2014). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(5), 585-609.
- Calic, G., & Mosakowski, E. (2016). Kicking Off Social Entrepreneurship: How A Sustainability Orientation Influences Crowdfunding Success. *Journal of Management Studies*, 53(5), 738–767.
- Chandler, G. N., & Hanks, S. H. (1998). An examination of the substitutability of founders human and financial capital in emerging business ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(5), 353-369.
- Clarke, J. S., Cornelissen, J. P., & Healey, M. P. (2019). Actions speak louder than words: How figurative language and gesturing in entrepreneurial pitches influences investment judgments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(2), 335-360.
- Cooper, A. C., Gimeno-Gascon, F. J., & Woo, C. Y. (1994). Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(5), 371-395.

- Hallen, B. L., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2012). Catalyzing strategies and efficient tie formation: how entrepreneurial firms obtain investment ties. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 35-70.
- Hsu, D. H. (2004). What do entrepreneurs pay for venture capital affiliation?. *The Journal of Finance*, 59(4), 1805-1844.
- Hsu, D. H. (2007). Experienced entrepreneurial founders, organizational capital, and venture capital funding. *Research Policy*, 36(5), 722-741.
- Huang, L., Joshi, P., Wakslak, C., & Wu, A. (2020). Sizing Up Entrepreneurial Potential: Gender Differences in Communication and Investor Perceptions of Long-Term Growth and Scalability. *Academy of Management Journal*, (online first).
- Jiang, L., Yin, D., & Liu, D. (2019). Can joy buy you money? The impact of the strength, duration, and phases of an entrepreneur's peak displayed joy on funding performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(6), 1848-1871.
- Kim, P. H., Aldrich, H. E., & Keister, L. A. (2006). Access (not) denied: The impact of financial, human, and cultural capital on entrepreneurial entry in the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 27(1), 5-22.
- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 1-16.
- Orser, B. J., Riding, A. L., & Manley, K. (2006). Women entrepreneurs and financial capital. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 643-665.
- Plummer, L. A., Allison, T. H., & Connelly, B. L. (2016). Better together? Signaling interactions in new venture pursuit of initial external capital. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(5), 1585-1604.
- Shafi, K., Mohammadi, A., & Johan, S. A. (2020). Investment ties gone awry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 295-327.
- Tonoyan, V., Strohmeier, R., & Jennings, J. E. (2020). Gender gaps in perceived start-up ease: Implications of sex-based labor market segregation for entrepreneurship across 22 European countries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 65(1), 181-225.
- Tsay, C. J. (2020). Visuals Dominate Investor Decisions about Entrepreneurial Pitches. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, (online first).

## WEEK 5: GROWTH IN NEW VENTURES

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Baum, J. R., Locke, E. A., & Smith, K. G. (2001). A multidimensional model of venture growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(2), 292-303.
- Cassar, G. (2007). Money, money, money? A longitudinal investigation of entrepreneur career reasons, growth preferences and achieved growth. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(1), 89-107.
- Clarysse, B., Bruneel, J., & Wright, M. (2011). Explaining growth paths of young technology-based firms: structuring resource portfolios in different competitive environments. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(2), 137-157.

- Colombo, M. G., & Grilli, L. (2010). On growth drivers of high-tech start-ups: Exploring the role of founders' human capital and venture capital. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(6), 610-626.
- DeSantola, A., & Gulati, R. (2017). Scaling: Organizing and growth in entrepreneurial ventures. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(2), 640-668.
- Fisher, G., Kotha, S., & Lahiri, A. (2016). Changing with the times: An integrated view of identity, legitimacy, and new venture life cycles. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 383-409.
- Gundry, L. K., & Welsch, H. P. (2001). The ambitious entrepreneur: High growth strategies of women-owned enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 453-470.
- Hampel, C. E., Tracey, P., & Weber, K. (2020). The art of the pivot: How new ventures manage identification relationships with stakeholders as they change direction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(2), 440-471.
- Hmieleski, K. M., & Baron, R. A. (2009). Entrepreneurs' optimism and new venture performance: A social cognitive perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(3), 473-488.
- Jin, L., Madison, K., Kraiczy, N. D., Kellermanns, F. W., Crook, T. R., & Xi, J. (2017). Entrepreneurial team composition characteristics and new venture performance: A meta-analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(5), 743-771.
- Ko, E. J., & McKelvie, A. (2018). Signaling for more money: The roles of founders' human capital and investor prominence in resource acquisition across different stages of firm development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(4), 438-454.
- Leitch, C., Hill, F., & Neergaard, H. (2010). Entrepreneurial and business growth and the quest for a "comprehensive theory": Tilting at windmills?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(2), 249-260.
- Mathias, B. D., & Williams, D. W. (2018). Giving up the hats? Entrepreneurs' role transitions and venture growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 33(3), 261-277.
- McKelvie, A., & Wiklund, J. (2010). Advancing firm growth research: A focus on growth mode instead of growth rate. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(2), 261-288.
- Parker, S. C., Gamble, E. N., Moroz, P. W., & Branzei, O. (2019). The impact of B lab certification on firm growth. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 5(1), 57-77.
- Rosenbusch, N., Brinckmann, J., & Müller, V. (2013). Does acquiring venture capital pay off for the funded firms? A meta-analysis on the relationship between venture capital investment and funded firm financial performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(3), 335-353.

#### BONUS WEEK: ENTREPRENEURIAL EXIT

##### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Aggarwal, V. A. Hsu, D. H. (2014). Entrepreneurial exits and innovation. *Management Science* 60(4), 867-887.
- Blumentritt, T. P. (2016). Bringing successors into the fold: The impact of founders' actions on successors. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(6), 1261-1267.
- Cardon, M. S., Stevens, C. E., & Potter, D. R. (2011). Misfortunes or mistakes?: Cultural sensemaking of entrepreneurial failure. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 79-92.

- Cope, J. (2011). Entrepreneurial learning from failure: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(6): 604-623.
- DeTienne, D. R. (2010). Entrepreneurial exit as a critical component of the entrepreneurial process: Theoretical development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 203-215.
- DeTienne, D. R., McKelvie, A., & Chandler, G. N. (2015). Making sense of entrepreneurial exit strategies: A typology and test. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(2), 255-272.
- Graebner, M. E., Heimeriks, K. H., Huy, Q. N., & Vaara, E. (2017). The process of postmerger integration: A review and agenda for future research. *Academy of Management Annals*, 11(1), 1-32.
- Lee, J. S. K., Zhao, G., & Lu, F. (2019). The Effect of Value Congruence Between Founder and Successor on Successor's Willingness: The Mediating Role of the Founder–Successor Relationship. *Family Business Review*, 32(3), 259–276.
- Packalen, K.A. (2015). When silos collapse, what happens to the seeds?: A case study of the diffusion of people and ideas when research programs are cancelled. in D. DeTienne & K. Wennberg (Ed.) *Edward Elgar Research Handbook on Entrepreneurial Exit*: 64-86. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rouse, E. D. (2016). Beginning's end: How founders psychologically disengage from their organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(5), 1605-1629.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., Peng, B., & Shepherd, D. (2020). Should I stay or should I go? Founder power and exit via initial public offering. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 64-95.
- Wennberg, K., Wiklund, J., DeTienne, D. R., & Cardon, M. S. (2010). Reconceptualizing entrepreneurial exit: Divergent exit routes and their drivers. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(4), 361-375.
- Williams, T., Thorgren, S., & Lindh, I. (2019). Rising from failure, staying down, or more of the same? An inductive study of entrepreneurial reentry. *Academy of Management Discoveries*.

## WEEK 7: INNOVATION STUDIES

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Abernathy, W. J., & Utterback, J. M. (1978). Patterns of industrial innovation. *Technology Review*, 80(7), 40-47.
- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2003). Innovation and technological change. In *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 55-79). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Bresnahan, T. F., & Trajtenberg, M. (1995). General purpose technologies 'Engines of growth?'. *Journal of Econometrics*, 65(1), 83-108.
- Di Stefano, G., Gambardella, A., & Verona, G. (2012). Technology push and demand pull perspectives in innovation studies: Current findings and future research directions. *Research Policy*, 41(8), 1283-1295.
- Fagerberg, J. & Verspagen, B. (2009). Innovation studies — The emerging structure of a new scientific field. *Research Policy*, 38(2), 218- 233.
- Martin, B. R. (2012). The evolution of science policy and innovation studies. *Research Policy*, 41(7), 1219-1239.
- Rosenberg, N. (1969). The direction of technological change: inducement mechanisms and focusing devices. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 18(1, Part 1), 1-24.



Rosenberg, N. (1979). Technological interdependence in the American economy. *Technology and Culture*, 20(1), 25-50.

Teece, D. J. (1986). Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *The Transfer and Licensing of Know-How and Intellectual Property: Understanding the Multinational Enterprise in the Modern World*, 15, 67-88.

## WEEK 8: DISRUPTIVE INNOVATIONS, DIFFUSION & INDUSTRY EVOLUTION

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

Agarwal, R., & Tripsas, M. (2008). Technology and industry evolution. *The Handbook of Technology and Innovation Management*, 1, 1-55.

Anderson, P. & Tushman, M. L. (1990). Technological discontinuities and dominant designs: A cyclical model of technological change. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(4): 604-633.

Christensen C, & Bower J.L.. (1996). Customer Power, Strategic Investment, and the Failure of the Leading Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 197-218.

Cowan, R. (1990). Nuclear power reactors: a study in technological lock-in. *The Journal of Economic History*, 50(3), 541-567.

Di Stefano, G., Gambardella, A., & Verona, G. (2012). Technology push and demand pull perspectives in innovation studies: Current findings and future research directions. *Research Policy*, 41(8), 1283-1295.

Eggers J. P., & Park K. F. (2017). Incumbent adaptation to technological change: The past, present, and future of research on heterogeneous incumbent response. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(1), 357-389.

Eggers, J. P., & Kaul, A. (2018). Motivation and ability? A behavioral perspective on the pursuit of radical invention in multi-technology incumbents. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(1), 67-93.

Franke N., Poetz M. K., & Schreier M. (2014). Integrating problem solvers from analogous markets in new product ideation. *Management Science*, 60(4), 1063-1081.

Henderson, R. (1993). Underinvestment and incompetence as responses to radical innovation: Evidence from the photolithographic alignment equipment industry. *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 248-270.

Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative science Quarterly*, 35(1), 9-30.

Kapoor, R., & Furr, N. R. (2015). Complementarities and competition: Unpacking the drivers of entrants' technology choices in the solar photovoltaic industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(3), 416-436.

Katila, R., Thatchenkery, S., Christensen, M. Q., & Zenios, S. (2017). Is there a doctor in the house? Expert product users, organizational roles, and innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(6), 2415-2437.

Klepper, S. (1996). Entry, exit, growth, and innovation over the product life cycle. *The American Economic Review*, 562-583.

Klepper, S. (1997). Industry life cycles. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 6(1), 145-182.

- Marx, M., Gans, J. S., & Hsu, D. H. (2014). Dynamic commercialization strategies for disruptive technologies: Evidence from the speech recognition industry. *Management Science*, 60(12), 3103-3123.
- Moeen, M., & Agarwal, R. (2016). Incubation of an industry: heterogeneous knowledge bases and modes of value capture. *Strategic Management Journal*.
- Murmann, J. P., & Frenken, K. (2006). Toward a systematic framework for research on dominant designs, technological innovations, and industrial change. *Research Policy*, 35(7), 925-952.
- Priem R., 2007. A consumer perspective on value creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(1): 219-235.
- Suarez, F. F., & Utterback, J. M. (1995). Dominant designs and the survival of firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(6), 415-430.
- von Hippel, E. 1976. The dominant role of users in the scientific instrument innovation process. *Research Policy*, 5 (3): 212-39.
- Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., & Brewer, M. B. (1998). Intellectual human capital and the birth of US biotechnology enterprises. *The American Economic Review*, 88(1), 290-306.

## WEEK 9: CLUSTERS AND KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVERS

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Almeida, P., & Kogut, B. (1999). Localization of knowledge and the mobility of engineers in regional networks. *Management science*, 45(7), 905-917.
- Audretsch, D. B., Cunningham, J. A., Kuratko, D. F., Lehmann, E. E., & Menter, M. (2018). Entrepreneurial ecosystems: Economic, technological, and societal impacts. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 44(2), 1-13.
- Belso-Martínez, J. A., Mas-Tur, A., & Roig-Tierno, N. (2017). Synergistic effects and the co-existence of networks in clusters. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 29(1-2), 137-154.
- Chang, Y., & Chen, M. (2016). Service regime and innovation clusters: An empirical study from service firms in Taiwan. *Research Policy*, 45(9), 18-45
- Conley, T. G., & Udry, C. R.. (2010). Learning about a new technology: Pineapple in Ghana. *American Economic Review*, 100(1), 35-69.
- Funk, R. J. (2014). Making the most of where you are: Geography, networks, and innovation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1), 193-222.
- Jaffe, A. B., Trajtenberg, M., & Henderson, R. (1992). Geographic localization of knowledge spillovers as evidenced by patent citations (No. w3993). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Marx, M., Strumsky, D., & Fleming, L. (2009). Mobility, skills, and the Michigan non-compete experiment. *Management Science*, 55(6), 875-889.
- Töpfer, S., Cantner, U., & Graf, H. (2017). Structural dynamics of innovation networks in German leading-edge clusters. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 44(6), 1-24.
- Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R. & Brewer, M. B. (1998). Intellectual human capital and the birth of US biotechnology enterprises, *The American Economic Review*, 88(1), 290-306.

## WEEK 10: PROCESS OF INNOVATION

## OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Benner, M. J. (2010). Securities analysts and incumbent response to radical technological change: Evidence from digital photography and internet telephony. *Organization Science*, 21(1), 42-62.
- Boudreau, K. J., Lacetera, N., & Lakhani, K. R. (2011). Incentives and problem uncertainty in innovation contests: An empirical analysis. *Management Science*, 57(5), 843-863.
- Chesbrough, H., & Rosenbloom, R. S. (2002). The role of the business model in capturing value from innovation: evidence from Xerox Corporation's technology spin-off companies. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(3), 529-555.
- Crossan, M. M., Lane, H. W., & White, R. E. (1999). An organizational learning framework: From intuition to institution. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(3), 522-537.
- Dan, S. M., Spaid, B. I., & Noble, C. H. (2018). Exploring the sources of design innovations: Insights from the computer, communications and audio equipment industries. *Research Policy*, 47(8), 1495-1504.
- Danneels, E. (2011). Trying to become a different type of company: Dynamic capability at Smith Corona. *Strategic Management Journal*, 32(1), 1-31.
- Dunlap-Hinkler, D., Kotabe, M., Mudambi, R. (2010). A story of breakthrough versus incremental innovation: Corporate entrepreneurship in the global pharmaceutical industry. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 4(2), 106-127.
- Gans, J. S., & Stern, S. (2003). The product market and the market for "ideas": Commercialization strategies for technology entrepreneurs. *Research Policy*, 32(2), 333-350.
- Gilbert, C. G. (2005). Unbundling the structure of inertia: Resource versus routine rigidity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 741-763.
- Grimaldi, R., Kenney, M., Siegel, D. S., & Wright, M. (2011). 30 years after Bayh–Dole: Reassessing academic entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 40(8), 1045-1057.
- Hampel, C., Perkmann, M., & Phillips, N. (2020). Beyond the lean start-up: experimentation in corporate entrepreneurship and innovation. *Innovation*, 22(1), 1-11.
- Hargadon, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 716-749.
- Helfat, C. E., & Lieberman, M. B. (2002). The birth of capabilities: Market entry and the importance of pre-history. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(4), 725-760.
- Henderson, R. M., & Clark, K. B. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 9-30.
- Hill, C. W., & Rothaermel, F. T. (2003). The performance of incumbent firms in the face of radical technological innovation. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 257-274.
- Kaplan, S. (2008). Cognition, capabilities, and incentives: Assessing firm response to the fiber-optic revolution. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(4), 672-695.

- Majchrzak, A., Griffith, T. L., Reetz, D. K., & Alexy, O. (2018). Catalyst organizations as a new organization design for innovation: The case of hyperloop transportation technologies. *Academy of Management Discoveries*, 4(4), 472-496.
- Murray, F. (2002). Innovation as co-evolution of scientific and technological networks: exploring tissue engineering. *Research Policy* 31(8): 1389-1403.
- Owen-Smith, J. (2003). From separate systems to a hybrid order: Accumulative advantage across public and private science at research one universities. *Research Policy* 32(6), 1081-1104
- Pahnke, E. C., Katila, R., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2015). Who takes you to the dance? How partners' institutional logics influence innovation in young firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(4), 596-633.
- Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Broström, A., D'Este, P., ... & Sobrero, M. (2013). Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. *Research Policy*, 42(2), 423-442.
- Puranam, P., Singh, H., & Zollo, M. (2006). Organizing for innovation: Managing the coordination-autonomy dilemma in technology acquisitions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49(2), 263-280.
- Rosenbloom, R. S. (2000). Leadership, capabilities, and technological change: The transformation of NCR in the electronic era. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1083-1103.
- Rosenbusch, N., Brinckmann, J., & Bausch, A. (2011). Is innovation always beneficial? A meta-analysis of the relationship between innovation and performance in SMEs. *Journal of business Venturing*, 26(4), 441-457.
- Schubert, T., & Tavassoli, S. (2020). Product innovation and educational diversity in top and middle management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 272-294.
- Taylor, A., & Helfat, C. E. (2009). Organizational linkages for surviving technological change: Complementary assets, middle management, and ambidexterity. *Organization Science*, 20(4), 718-739.
- Tripsas, M., & Gavetti, G. (2000). Capabilities, cognition, and inertia: Evidence from digital imaging. *Strategic management journal*, 21(10-11), 1147-1161.
- Tushman, M. L., & Anderson, P. (1986). Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31(3), 439-465.

## WEEK 11: INNOVATORS

---

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Baron, R. A., & Tang, J. (2011). The role of entrepreneurs in firm-level innovation: Joint effects of positive affect, creativity, and environmental dynamism. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 49-60.
- Cook, L. D. & Gerson, J. (2019, July). The implications of U.S. gender and racial disparities in income and wealth inequality at each stage of the innovation process. Washington Center for Equitable Group Policy Paper. [equitablegrowth.org](http://equitablegrowth.org)
- Fuchs, C., Sting, F. J., Schlickel, M., & Alexy, O. (2019). The ideator's bias: How identity-induced self-efficacy drives overestimation in employee-driven process innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(5), 1498-1522.

- Godart, F. C., Maddux, W. W., Shipilov, A. V., & Galinsky, A. D. (2015). Fashion with a foreign flair: Professional experiences abroad facilitate the creative innovations of organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 58, 195–220.
- Howard, M. D., Boeker, W., & Andrus, J. L. (2019). The spawning of ecosystems: How cohort effects benefit new ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 62(4), 1163-1193.
- Jones, B. F. (2009). The burden of knowledge and the “death of the renaissance man”: Is innovation getting harder?. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76(1), 283-317.
- Liu, D., Gong, Y., Zhou, J., & Huang, J. C. (2017). Human resource systems, employee creativity, and firm innovation: The moderating role of firm ownership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(3), 1164-1188.
- Manso, G. (2011). Motivating innovation. *The Journal of Finance*, 66(5), 1823-1860.
- Mercier, N. R., Ranjit, V., & Reardon, R. J. (2018). Engaging women innovators: Analytical support for women innovator programming in university technology transfer. *Technology & Innovation*, 19(4), 685-699.
- Perry-Smith, J. E., & Mannucci, P. V. (2017). From creativity to innovation: The social network drivers of the four phases of the idea journey. *Academy of Management Review*, 42, 53–79.
- Sauermann, H., & Cohen, W. M. (2010). What makes them tick? Employee motives and firm innovation. *Management Science*, 56(12), 2134-2153.
- Vuori, T. O., & Huy, Q. N. (2015). Distributed attention and shared emotions in the innovation process: How Nokia lost the smartphone battle. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 61(1), 9-51.
- Wagner, S., & Goossen, M. C. (2018). Knowing me, knowing you: Inventor mobility and the formation of technology-oriented alliances. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6), 2026-2052.

## WEEK 12: RESPONSIBLE INNOVATION

### OPTIONAL READINGS:

- Bansal, P., & Grewatsch, S. (2020). The unsustainable truth about the stage-gate new product innovation process. *Innovation*, 22(3), 217-227.
- Bendell, B. L. (2017). I don't want to be green: Prosocial motivation effects on firm environmental innovation rejection decisions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143(2), 277-288.
- Cuntz, A., Foray, D., & Mostovova, E. (2020). On the economics of social innovation—a conceptual framework and its policy implications. *Innovation*, (online first).
- Dignum, V. (2018). Ethics in artificial intelligence: introduction to the special issue. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 20(1), 1–3.
- Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2020). Institutional conditions and social innovations in emerging economies: Insights from mexican enterprises' initiatives for protecting/preventing the effect of violent events. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 45(4), 929-957.
- Pandza, K., & Ellwood, P. (2013). Strategic and ethical foundations for responsible innovation. *Research Policy*, 42(5), 1112-1125.

- Schumacher, E. G., & Wasieleski, D. M. (2013). Institutionalizing ethical innovation in organizations: An integrated causal model of moral innovation decision processes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(1), 15-37.
- van der Have, R. P., & Rubalcaba, L. (2016). Social innovation research: An emerging area of innovation studies?. *Research Policy*, 45(9), 1923-1935.
- Voegtlin, C., & Scherer, A. G. (2017). Responsible innovation and the innovation of responsibility: Governing sustainable development in a globalized world. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 143(2), 227-243.