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“What’s Hot in Entrepreneurship Research 2013” is the first of a number of future, yearly trend surveys

Motivation

- **Purpose of “What’s Hot in Entrepreneurship Research?”**
  - Identification of essential and upcoming topics in entrepreneurship research
  - Identification of essential and upcoming methods in entrepreneurship research
  - Potential identification of trends in topics and methods once future rounds of the survey have been conducted

- **Methodological approach of “What’s Hot in Entrepreneurship Research?”**
  - Implementation of a global online expert survey
  - Inclusion of indirect questions developed by members of FGF’s entrepreneurship research workgroup to ensure validity of results
  - Collection of data at the beginning of each year
Imagine a fresh doctoral student asking you for advice on what topic to pursue in her thesis. What area within entrepreneurship research would you recommend to her?

I would recommend this topic because of its academic potential.  
I would recommend this topic because of its potential with respect to entrepreneurial practice.
Similarly, hot methods are collected through an open question as well and again afterwards categorized

Method Questions

Research methods are constantly evolving. What particular method do you consider interesting, but have not yet found time to master?

- This is an essential method every entrepreneurship researcher needs to understand.
- This is a new or neglected method with the potential to produce new insights.
Roughly 200 experts in the field participated in this survey

Data Collection

- Sampling through the “Community Database”
  - Database including at the moment approximately 3,500 contacts to entrepreneurship researchers worldwide
  - Inclusion criterion: Presentation of entrepreneurship research at one of the major academic conferences (e.g. AoM Entrepreneurship Division, BCERC, ICSB, etc.)

- Data collection
  - 1,000 randomly selected entries from the “Community Database”
  - Invitation to participate in a five minute online survey (online in February 2013)
  - 196 useable responses returned (19.6% response rate)
Respondents originate from 39 different countries with the US, Canada, France, Germany and Australia dominating the first half of the sample

Origin of the participants
The sample is well acquainted with the entrepreneurship phenomenon and can rely on considerable experience

Descriptives

**Primary area of research interest**

- Entrepreneurship (66.8%)
- Small Business (15.3%)
- Innovation (11.7%)
- Other (6.1%)

**Academic status**

- Doctoral Student (19.9%)
- Ass. professor / lecturer (22.4%)
- Full or chaired professor (25%)
- Assoc. professor / senior lecturer (18.8%)
- Postdoc (9.2%)
- Professor emeritus (1%)
- Other (3.6%)

On average, respondents have been interested in entrepreneurship research for 10.4 years (SD 7.3)
Answers to the open-ended questions were categorized into 14 main categories with a plethora of subcategories.
What is hot is determined by a traditional and a social perspective

“Hottest” topic categories

- Entrepreneurial Process
- Social Entrepreneurship
- Entrepreneurial Behavior
- Psychology of Entrepreneurship
- Entrepreneurship / Innovation Interface
- Family Firms
- Entrepreneurship as such
- Economics of Entrepreneurship
- Entrepreneurial Opportunities
- Entrepreneurial Finance
- International Entrepreneurship
- Geography
- Corporate Entrepreneurship
- Education
Do the results indicate a research-practice gap?

Topic categories by potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Potential</th>
<th>Practice Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of additional issues were raised by the respondents

Quotes

“I would encourage the individual to pursue the validity of what is being taught against what is effective in practice.”

“Pursue what interests you. Hot topics ebb and flow. It's silly to obsess over what someone thinks would make an excellent soup d'jour.”

“Since the 1970s, the word entrepreneurship has lost any operational meaning. Anymore the question is not who is an entrepreneur, but rather, who is not? I would suggest getting back to its roots as an economic institution.”

“I am more or less unconcerned with the topic. The most important thing is design and clean identification of the phenomenon.”

“To look at what is current and do something else. There is too much, for instance, on the standard three Shane & Venkat questions.”
Answers to questions regarding interesting methods can be sorted into four categories

Categorizing answers II

Methods

- Qualitative
  - Photo analysis
  - Case studies
  - Narrative interviews
  - Interpretive studies
  - Grounded theory
  - Discourse analysis
  - Action research
  - Field research
  - Ethnography

- Quantitative
  - Multilevel modeling
  - Time series analysis
  - Meta analysis
  - Event study
  - Laboratory experiments
  - Panel regression
  - Structural equation modeling
  - Confirmatory factor analysis
  - Quantile treatment effects
  - Agent based modeling
  - Latent difference scores
  - Partial least squares
  - Lingam
  - Simulations
  - Bayesian methods
  - Conjoint analysis
  - Regressions
  - Factor analysis
  - Network analysis
  - Panel data analysis
  - Content analysis
  - Spatial econometrics

- Mixed-Methods

- Other
  - Paradigm interplay
  - OWL
  - Geographic Information Systems
  - KETSO
  - Historical method
  - Design methodology
  - Mathematical modeling
  - MRI Brain Research
  - Cognitive mapping
  - QCA
  - Social Media
  - Eye Tracking
Quantitative methods dominate – but are seen somewhat sceptical

Method categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative methods</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methods</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed methods</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other methods</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Essential knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>New or neglected knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Apparently, researchers from different paradigms feel the need to learn from contrasting paradigms (e.g. qualitative vs. quantitative)

Ten most frequently mentioned methods
What you “need” to know differs extremely from what you might want to know

**Top ten rated methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential Methods</th>
<th>New or Neglected Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Panel data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Methods with less than 2 entries omitted.
Three final questions instead of a conclusion

Final questions

- Is social entrepreneurship an overrated phenomenon?
- Is QCA the next big methodological thing?
- Does it make sense to repeat the survey – and if yes, when?
Thank you for your attention!
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