



IPL
instituto politécnico
de leiria

Entrepreneurship research: A bibliometric study of the ENANPADs 1997-2008

Manuel Portugal Ferreira
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

João Carvalho Santos
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

Nuno Rosa Reis
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

Fernando A. Ribeiro Serra
UNISUL Business School (UNISUL)

2010

working paper



**Glob
advantage**

Working paper nº 69/2010

globADVANTAGE
Center of Research in International Business & Strategy

INDEA - *Campus 5*

Rua das Olhalvas

Instituto Politécnico de Leiria

2414 - 016 Leiria

PORTUGAL

Tel. (+351) 244 845 051

Fax. (+351) 244 845 059

E-mail: globadvantage@ipleiria.pt

Webpage: www.globadvantage.ipleiria.pt

advantage

WORKING PAPER N° 69/2010

Dezembro 2010

Com o apoio da UNISUL Business School



Entrepreneurship Research: A Bibliometric Study of the EnANPADs 1997-2008

Manuel Portugal Ferreira

globADVANTAGE – Center of Research in International Business & Strategy
Escola Superior de Tecnologia e Gestão
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria
Morro do Lena – Alto do Vieiro
2411-901 Leiria, Portugal
E-mail: manuel.portugal@ipleiria.pt

João Carvalho Santos

globADVANTAGE – Center of Research in International Business & Strategy
Escola Superior de Tecnologia e Gestão
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria
Morro do Lena – Alto do Vieiro
2411-901 Leiria, Portugal
E-mail: joao.santos@estg.ipleiria.pt

Nuno Rosa Reis

globADVANTAGE – Center of Research on International Business & Strategy
Escola Superior de Tecnologia e Gestão
Instituto Politécnico de Leiria
Morro do Lena - Alto Vieiro
2411-911 Leiria, Portugal
E-mail: nuno.m.reis@ipleiria.pt
Phone: +351-244-843317
Fax: +351-244-820310

Fernando A. Ribeiro Serra

UNISUL Business School
Universidade do Sul de Santa Catarina
Rodovia SC 401, km 19
88050-001 Canasvieiras
Florianópolis – SC, Brasil
E-mail: fernando.serra@unisul.br

&

globADVANTAGE – Center of Research in International Business & Strategy

Entrepreneurship Research: A Bibliometric Study of the EnANPADs 1997-2008

ABSTRACT

We have witnessed a fast growth in academic interest on entrepreneurship over the past two to three decades, although at disparate paces in different countries. A wealth of papers presented and published, books, dedicated journals, websites, professional and research groups have emerged accompanying this increased interest. It is thus important to understand what are these scholars studying. In this paper we examine the state of the art in entrepreneurship research in Brazil, by scrutinizing the entire track record of the papers presented at the EnANPAD over a twelve years period: 1997 -to 2008. The results of the bibliometric analysis revealed that entrepreneurship research maintains a broad spectrum of interests, focusing both on contextual, individual and process issues. Less visible is a unified theoretical background or the use of established theories foundational to other management disciplines. It is notable the increase in Brazilian entrepreneurship research, both empiric, theoretical and case-study based. We conclude with an umbrella discussion and suggestions for future research.

Keywords: entrepreneurship research, entrepreneur, bibliometric study, EnANPAD.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship has been taking increased attention from both policy makers and academia. We have witnessed a fast growth in academic interest on entrepreneurship over the past two to three decades, although at disparate paces in different countries (Katz, 2003). A wealth of papers presented and published, an increasing number of books, dedicated journals, websites, professional and research groups and associations have emerged to accompany and support this growth in interest and research. It is thus important to understand what are these scholars doing and what are they studying (Low & MacMillan, 1988; Ucbasaran et al., 2001; Busenitz et al., 2003).

Albeit entrepreneurship research has been taking on attention from several disciplines such as management, economics, sociology, international business and economic geography there is not a specific theory, or a unified paradigm, that we may easily use to set the boundaries of entrepreneurship as a single standing discipline. Nonetheless, Busenitz and colleagues (2003) argue that recent developments are building a core domain for entrepreneurship. We may nonetheless identify a set of issues, or themes, that are arguably more popular in entrepreneurship research, such as psychological traits (McGrath et al., 1992; Reynolds et al., 2001; Low et al., 2003), intra-firm and corporate entrepreneurship (Zahra, Kuratko & Jennings, 1999; Kuratko et al., 2005), entrepreneurship education (Gorman et al., 1997; Peterman & Kennedy, 2003), innovation (Drucker, 1985; Noteboom, 2008), economic and regional development (Fritsch, 2008) and internationalization (Oviatt & McDougall, 1997).

In this paper we examine the papers presented at the EnANPAD to understand the kind of intellectual communities and the themes, objects, theories and methods most commonly used in entrepreneurship research in the Brazilian academia. We take on the purpose of accounting, or describing, for the diversity in existing research. Or, in other words, of describing the focus and research questions that are put forward in the field of entrepreneurship. The motivation is to overcome some scholars' fears that entrepreneurship research is too fragmented and incapable of building

a whole that permits a true advancement of research (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

The paper is organized as follows. First we present a review of the literature on entrepreneurship revealing broadly streams and objects of research. In the second section we explain the method used for our bibliometric study of current research on entrepreneurship. The multidisciplinary approaches that have been taken in the extant research to the study of entrepreneurship warrant that we summarize some of the main themes and approaches. We proceed with the analysis and results of the data. We conclude with a broad discussion, clarifying some limitations and avenues for additional research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The extant research on entrepreneurship comprises different objects and theories but may be tentatively classified in two groups, one focusing on the individuals and other on structure (Thornton, 1999). Ucbasaran, Westhead and Wright (2001) classified the extant research in two groups, contextual and process issues. The stream on individuals deals with the entrepreneur, his psychological traits and his immediate surroundings, such as the social groups or networks he is embedded in. Some of the core works on this stream are, for instance, McClelland's (1961) *'The achieving society'* where he notes cultural practices, and de Vries' (1977) arguments on the impact of the upbringing for shaping the entrepreneur's personality. Other studies focus on specific characteristics, such as risk taking, uncertainty avoidance, overconfidence, need for achievement, locus of control and several others (see, for instance, Begley & Boyd, 1987; Delmar & Davidsson, 2000).

The second group, deals with the understanding of how social and cultural structures encourages entrepreneurship, namely by providing information on market opportunities. This stream does not seek to understand who is entrepreneur but rather how social, cultural and institutional aspects induce entrepreneurship (Reynolds 1991). Some scholars delve into specific issues, such as how the entrepreneur's social

network eases access to needed resources (Audia & Rider, 2006; Li & Ferreira, 2006).

Currently there are many other approaches to the study of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial action emerging. It has been notable the interest on understanding the role and impact of entrepreneurial education (Hindle, 2006), gender, ethnicity and minority groups (Waldinger et al., 1990; Chaganti & Greene, 2002), and the role of social networks on fostering successful entrepreneurs (Birley, 1985; Mueller, 2006) and we observe some attempts on using mainstream theories such as the resource-based view to examine entrepreneurship (Chandler & Hanks, 1994; Hart et al., 1997). Other themes that gradually receive more attention include the social entrepreneurship, and the trend towards examining heterogeneity in contrast to the more traditional search for universal traits and contexts that may raise the propensity to become entrepreneur and for successful entrepreneurial endeavors (McClelland, 1987; Blanchflower & Oswald, 1998). In fact, it seems important to examine the individuals, in their context-specific environment and situation. That is, researchers look at individual heterogeneity studying individual's knowledge, preferences, abilities, behaviors, etc., rather than seek to identify personality traits and broad contextual factors (Gartner, Bird & Starr, 1992; Thornton, 1999; Davidsson, 2003).

Although it would not be feasible to review extensively the many lenses and objects that fall under the broad umbrella of entrepreneurship research, in this section we focus only a few of the main, or core, themes, in a rather parsimonious manner. It is well accepted in academia that entrepreneurship research is a flourishing domain of study as proved by an increasing wealth of papers published in the mainstream management/business journals.

What is entrepreneurship?

Despite a long tradition in entrepreneurship research there is no clear cut definition of what is entrepreneurship. Arguably more traditional, or earlier, definitions expressed the risks of buying and selling or the putting together the factors of production. Morris (1998), for instance, in a review of journal articles, found 77 different definitions. Nonetheless, we may

identify a set of common elements to prior research. Peter Drucker (1985) defined entrepreneurship as an act of innovation involving using the existing resources in novel ways. Bygrave and Hofer (1991) focused on the entrepreneurial process as the process that entails the entire process from the identification of opportunities for entrepreneurial action to the actual founding of a start-up firm. Stevenson (1985) referred to the process of exploiting emerging opportunities regardless of the resources that the entrepreneur controls. And Gartner (1988) simplified it to the creation of a new firm. Other definitions comprise how new opportunities are discovered, created and exploited and by whom (Venkataraman, 1997).

An often found connection is that linking entrepreneurship to innovation. Innovation, in a broad sense, may include process innovation, market innovation, product innovation, factor innovation, and even organizational innovation. Schumpeter's work, particularly his 1934 book, on the *Theory of economic growth*, describes the entrepreneur as the founder of a new firm and as the innovator. The idea that entrepreneurship and innovation are engines of economic growth remained to today (Reynolds et al., 2001).

Characteristics of entrepreneurs

A considerable wealth of effort has been put on understanding the psychological and sociological aspects of entrepreneurship and specific traits, or characteristics, of entrepreneurs (Louw et al., 2003). These studies identify a set of common traits among entrepreneurs such as the need for achievement, locus of control, self-confidence, innovation, persistence, risk-taking propensity, and so forth. Traditionally, the extant research has often related entrepreneurship as the product of surrounding environments or of personal attributes. Individuals are heterogeneously endowed with skills, knowledge, attitudes and preferences (values) which drive their motives and behavior (McFadden, 2001). In the same manner, also the environments hold different pools of knowledge, individuals, culture and institutions.

Hence, a number of scholars pinpoint some specific traits. For instance, the need for achievement (McClelland, 1961; Begley & Boyd, 1987), autonomy, trend towards creativity, propensity to take risks

(Brockhaus, 1982; Van Praag, Cramer J. & Hartrog, 2002), self confidence (Longenecker et al., 1994), locus of control (Brockhaus, 1982) and self-efficacy (DeNoble et al., 1999). Moreover, the entrepreneur needs to be persistent and able to deal with the anxieties surfacing during the start-up (DeNoble, Jung, & Ehrlich, 1999).

In sum, researchers seek to better understand the individual traits, the set of attitudes and behaviors driving entrepreneurial behaviors. For instance, the attitude towards the continuous search for business opportunities and behaviors that express the individuals' characteristics regarding the recognition of opportunities, idea generation, effort to pool together the resources required (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Li & Ferreira, 2007).

Behavioral aspects

The behavioral approaches to the study of entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship have gained momentum (Gartner et al., 1992). Research on entrepreneurial behaviors deal with what entrepreneurs do, how they do it and why (Gartner, 1988). To describe and identify entrepreneurs, extant research focused on entrepreneur's experiences, personality and background, although many of the usually referred traits are not consensual (Low & MacMillan, 1988; Gartner, 1990). Others scholars focused on the decision making processes (Baron, 1998), how entrepreneurs think and their heuristics (Baron, 1998), the level of uncertainty faced in decision making (Busenitz & Barney, 1997), namely regarding specific market information on the probable success of new product offerings.

The behavioral approaches aim at overcoming general prescriptions of the entrepreneurial traits and attitudes that seek these broad generalizations downplaying the importance of the individual. Nevertheless, many scholars still posit that some behaviors are common to successful entrepreneurs (McClelland, 1987). Within the behavioral approaches several specific traits and characteristics have been explored, such as the how the behaviors of novice, serial, and portfolio entrepreneurs differ (Alsos & Kolvereid, 1999), signaling legitimacy and survival, the planning of the startup, namely concerning the gathering and analyzing information, identifying risks and defining a business-level strategy (Delmar & Shane, 2003), speed in exploring the opportunities, among others.

Social context and social networks

How entrepreneurs discover and select market opportunities and the importance of their social ties to other external agents has deserved its own line of research (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Reynolds, 1991; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). For instance the studies by Birley (1985) and Low and MacMillan (1988) pioneered in advancing how networks are important for entrepreneurship, especially in discussing how the network may be important in obtaining advice and feedback on a new business plan and on the types of ties for several types of resources (e.g., Floyd & Wooldridge, 1999). Aldrich and Zimmer (1986) delved into how the networks help in providing new information on diverse issues that may underlie the identification of new business opportunities. They specifically distinguished the role of strong and weak ties networks. Perhaps most important, the social networks may be a primary referral for legitimacy - essential for new ventures that lack a track record of past successes (Stinchcombe, 1965). New ventures formed by a team, instead of a single owner, will thus likely have a wider social and business network on which to draw upon (Cooper, Gimeno-Gascon & Woo, 1994) and a diversified pool of competences (Slevin & Covin, 1992).

The entrepreneurs' networks comprises multiple types of agents – such as with government agencies, clients, suppliers, a previous employer, friends and family, business associates, and others - that facilitate accessing resources, gaining legitimacy, finding new business opportunities (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Van de Ven, 1993). And, because the entrepreneurs' networks are localized in a specific region, the founding of new firms will occur in proximity to the entrepreneurs' home or prior employer (Stam, 2007).

Entrepreneurship research and education

A large body of research delves into the teachability of entrepreneurship in contrast to the traditional view that entrepreneurs are born, not made. As Peter Drucker (1985) put it, entrepreneurship has nothing to do with genes, it is a discipline and as such it may be learned (see Gorman, Hanlon, & King, 1997). Ronstadt (1987) argued that more important is to understand what to teach and how.

In fact, we may identify a set of issues that build the curricula of entrepreneurship courses and that are part of entrepreneurship research. Some of the issues that found their way to entrepreneurship curricula include the economic and social contribution of entrepreneurial firms and innovation (Upton, Teal & Felan, 2001). The financing of new firms, including angel investors and venture capital (Dimov & Shepherd, 2005). Also, the importance of corporate entrepreneurship, and intrapreneurship, and its focus on the internal efforts and dynamics of employees in existing firms (Zahra et al., 1999; Kuratko et al., 2005).

The entrepreneurship by women and minority groups has also germinated (Chaganti & Greene, 2002). So, as the ethical concerns, namely in the wake of the recent corporate scandals (Kuratko & Goldsby, 2004).

How entrepreneurs establish their firms

The manner in which entrepreneurs start their firms is a recurring facet in research. There are several forms that may be chosen, perhaps the most often are: spin-offs, corporate entrepreneurship, acquisition of an existing firm, acquiring a franchise and inhering a family firm.

Entrepreneurial firms are often the outcome of employees exiting their employer to start their businesses. The entrepreneurs that spin-offs from a prior employer (Audia & Rider, 2006) tend to establish their new firms in the same or a similar industry of their professional experience (Stam, 2007). And, if in some instances the new firm is set to exploit and opportunity in the market, in others the employee exits disgruntled with the employer (Klepper, 2007). The spin-offs from established firms may help explain the spatial clustering in some industries (Garnsey & Heffernan, 2005; Klepper, 2007).

Corporate entrepreneurship consists of creating a new business, a product or process innovation, market expansion (Zahra, Kuratko & Jennings, 1999) or the redesign of the business model. Large corporations are more rigid to changes even in the face of opportunities (Greene, Brush & Hart, 1999).

The acquisition of an existing firm occurs when the employee, often a manager, acquires the firm in which he works or some other firm. An

acquisition may be accompanied by the turnaround in the manner in which the firm operates (Malone, 1989). The motives for management buy-ins or buy-outs may be found in an employee being frustrated with the firm not exploring emerging opportunities, technologies, rejecting investment proposals, and generally carrying out projects that the previous owners rejected (Robbie et al., 1999). In other instances, it is just the will to control their own destiny (Baruch & Gebbie, 1998).

Some individuals may prefer to set their new firm franchising an existing concept or business model. Franchising is a manner to minimize uncertainty and risk (Spinelli, Birley & Leleux, 2003). The issues involving franchising, namely the governance form, the contract, the influence of the franchisor over the local franchisee, the characteristics of the entrepreneur that prefers a franchise, how they search and identify the best franchises and even the evaluation of the commercial value are just some topics that still warrant more research.

Some entrepreneurs simply inherit a business. These are family businesses. There is a wealth of research on family businesses and how these differ from other firms, especially due to the influence of the family in running the business, succession in the family, professionalization of management (Robbie et al., 1999), and so forth (Davis & Harveston, 1998; Chua, Chrisman & Sharma, 1999). In its core, inheriting a family business is arguably an entrepreneurial action.

The entrepreneurial process

A stream of research has been devoted to understanding the different stages of the entrepreneurial process. The entrepreneurial process comprises the activities, from the discovery of the problem, finding a solution, putting together the resources needed, marketing the product, moulding the organization, manufacturing and selling (Bygrave & Hofer, 1991; Slote, Kock & Coviello, 2010).

The recognition of an opportunity and the searching for relevant information is the initial stage in the entrepreneurial process (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Some research has thus sought to understand how

opportunities are searched, identified and evaluated (Venkataraman, 1997) and how they are exploited (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

A crucial ingredient to successful entrepreneurial firms is the resources the entrepreneur brings in. Some studies delve into the social networks and the human capital of entrepreneurs as a predictor of success (Gimeno et al., 1997; Li & Ferreira, 2007). The entrepreneur himself is a key resource (Bates, 1998). In fact, new firms with more and more varied resources seem to grow faster (Chandler & Hanks, 1994).

It is patent in our brief albeit broad review that entrepreneurship research has evolved in multiple directions. We now examine what is the current state of the art of entrepreneurship research in Brazil.

BIBLIOMETRIC STUDY OF ENANPAD

In this paper we examine the state of the art of entrepreneurship research in the Brazilian academia. For this endeavor we carry out a bibliometric study of the papers presented at the EnANPAD in the period 1997 to 2008.

Method

Bibliometric studies use extant published research to assess tendencies and eventually define patterns, thus helping explore, organize and make some sense of the work that has been done in a certain discipline (Diodato, 1994; Daim et al., 2006). It is worth noting that a bibliometric study may resort to different sources, such as published papers in refereed journals, dissertations and theses, books, papers presented at conferences, and so forth. Hence, by looking only at EnANPAD we do not have the aim at exhaustiveness, albeit this conference is representative of the research being carried out by Brazilian scholars. It is thus possible to observe shifts in the content of the discipline, theories adopted, co-authorship patterns and may reveal directions for future research.

Several authors have conducted bibliometric studies to understand the state of the art in different disciplines and sub-disciplines. In some instances, these studies evolve to examine journals and the content of the

papers published over a period of time (Ferreira, Li, Guisinger & Serra, 2009), in others to uncover emerging or under-explored areas of study (Merino, Carmo & Alvarez, 2006), the types of papers published and hazards in publishing in a specific journal (Phelan, Ferreira & Salvador, 2002), the main authors in a discipline or using a theory (Willett, 2007), the relative “quality” (or importance) of the journals (Baumgartner & Pieters, 2003) and the recent developments (Werner, 2002). It is interesting to note Phelan, Ferreira and Salvador’s (2002) conclusions that the papers published in the Strategic Management Journal have been increasing in length, are more often empirical and employed larger samples, used more references and were co-authored by more authors.

Sample

The data collection procedure involved only the papers presented at the EnANPAD, the major Brazilian conference that includes a variety of business disciplines, from strategy to organization behavior, finance, logistics, human resources, technology and entrepreneurship, among others. We further restricted our survey to the period from 1997 to 2008, a twelve years period. The exhaustive search permitted us to identify 156 papers for further examination. Table 1 depicts its distribution over the time period. It is further interesting to note that the majority of the papers are either empirical or case studies.

Table 1. Description of the sample

Year	Nº articles	Type of article (1)	Nº authors	Average number of authors
1997	1	T (0), E (1), C (0)	2	2
1998	0	T (0), E (0), C (0)	0	0
1999	1	T (1), E (0), C (0)	1	1
2000	0	T (0), E (0), C (0)	0	0
2001	2	T (0), E (2), C (0)	8	4
2002	5	T (0), E (5), C (0)	9	1,8
2003	22	T (1), E (13), C (8)	43	1,95
2004	24	T (4), E (16), C (4)	54	2,25
2005	25	T (3), E (17), C (5)	64	2,56
2006	27	T (5), E (11), C (11)	62	2,3
2007	28	T (9), E (9), C (10)	69	2,46
2008	21	T (3), E (10), C (8)	60	2,86
Total	156	T (26), E (84), C (46)	372	2,38

Note: (a) Type of article: T- Theoretical, E- Empirical, C- Case study
Source: the authors.

RESULTS

Of the 156 articles identified, only 26 are theoretical, 84 empirical and 46 were case studies (see table 1). In 2008, for example, of the 21 articles identified, 10 were empirical, 8 case studies and only 3 theoretical. Also interesting to note is that research in entrepreneurship seems to be increasingly collaborative – the average number of authors is consistently around two and in an upward trend, in 2008 it was close to an average of 3 authors per paper (2,85).

Table 2. Empirical studies: Examples

Authors	Year	Title	Research question	Sample	Focus
Nina Cunha & Telma Barbosa	1997	Alguns fatores intervenientes no processo de empreendedorship: Um estudo na micro região da zona da Mata de Viçosa	Factors involved in the entrepreneurship process	181 Enterprises of the micro region of Mota de Viçosa – MG	Entrepreneurial process, antecedents, external influences
Juárez Chagas & Henrique Freitas	2001	Comportamento gerencial, gênero e empreendeddorismo	Entrepreneurial behavior and characterize the decision profile of micro, small and medium sized firms in Rio Grande do Sul.	110 administrators	Behavior and profile of the entrepreneur
Cleufe Pelisson, Luis Aligleri, Fernando Gimenez, Hilka Machado, Valdir Gomes & Lilian Aligleri	2001	A tomada de decisão segundo o comportamento empreendedor: Uma survey na região das Missões	Describe and analyze the profiles of men and women entrepreneurs in Brazil	159 entrepreneurs	Behavior and profile of the entrepreneur
Fernando Gimenez & Edmundo Júnior	2002	Investigando o potencial empreendedor e de liderança criativa	Analyze the association between rates of entrepreneurial potential and creative leadership as well as those with gender, age and educational level.	55 incubated enterprises	Who is the entrepreneur, antecedents of entrepreneurship, Leadership, creativity
Moema Siqueira & Liliane Guimarães	2002	Estratégias empreendedoras de negócios Tupiniquins	Identify convergence and divergence between the standard value and the cases analyzed.	17 interviews with entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurial behavior, leadership, who is the entrepreneur
Liliane Guimarães	2002	Empreendedorismo no Currículo dos Cursos de Graduação e Pós-graduação em Administração:	Present the historical development in the curricula of undergraduate and graduate	319 courses offered in 116 U.S. universities	Teaching and methodologies in entrepreneurship

		Análise da organização didático-pedagógica destas disciplinas em escolas de negócios norte-americanas	(MBA) in management (in the USA). Examine the content and teaching methodologies.		courses
Hilka Machado, Vanderly Janeiro & Ana Martins	2003	Empreendedoras: Estilo gerencial e desempenho das empresas	What are the main characteristics of the entrepreneurial management style? Is there any association between management style and performance of firms?	30 women entrepreneurs	Management styles in na entrepreneurial firm, gender
Rosane Cruz, Claudio Forner & Naira Libermann	2003	Perfil de pequenas empresas brasileiras atendidas pelo programa Empretec do Sebrae e seus empreendedores	Is the entrepreneur style interfered from the firms' results	1445 participants of the program Empretec	Characteristics of the entrepreneur, entrepreneurial behavior
Kátia Ayres	2003	Incidência de stress e características de empreendedorismo: Contribuições e ameaças ao desempenho dos empreendedores de empresas incubadas	Level of performance of the entrepreneur and the stress levels	49 entrepreneurs incubated - EBTs	Incubators, stress of the entrepreneurs, characteristics of entrepreneurs
Rosane Cruz	2004	Os valores motivacionais dos empreendedores de pequenas empresas de software do RS	Whether the entrepreneur has a significant influence on the performance of the new firm and the direction taken for the firms	112 firms	Values and motivations of the entrepreneur, who is the entrepreneur
Ivan Dutra	2004	Ambiente empreendedor e a mortalidade empresarial: Estudo do perfil do empreendedor da micro e pequena empresa no norte do Paraná	Factors that influence the mortality rates of micro and small enterprises and the profile of the entrepreneur	262 interviews	Economic impact of entrepreneurship, mortality
Eda Souza & Gumersindo	2005	Atitude empreendedora em proprietários-gerentes de	Building and validating a scale for measuring entrepreneurial	290 owners-managers in retail	Entrepreneurial attitudes, validate a

Júnior		pequenas empresas. Construção de um instrumento de medida – IMAE.	attitude		research instrument
Caio Fontanelle, Marianne Hoeltgebaum & Amélia Silveira	2006	A influência do perfil empreendedor dos franqueados no desempenho organizacional	Relationship between entrepreneurial behavior of franchisees and the performance of the firm	44 franchisees in 42 cities in Brazil	Entrepreneurial profile for franchising
Gumersindo Júnior & Eda de Souza	2006	Instrumento de medida da atitude empreendedora – IMAE: Construção e validação de uma escala	Four dimensions for entrepreneurial attitude: planning, innovation, power and realization – presenting the <i>Instrumento de Medida de Atitude Empreendedora – IMAE</i>	290 owners-managers in retail	Attitudes and behaviors of entrepreneurs, construction of a scale
Manuella Lima, Suziane Santos & Anderson Dantas	2006	Propensão ao empreendedorismo dos alunos do ensino fundamental: Um estudo comparativo com alunos de 7ª e 8ª séries, entre instituições de ensino municipais e privadas de Maceió	Entrepreneurial behaviors or propensity of students	400 surveys to municipal and private schools	Students' propensity to entrepreneurship
John Child & Suzana Rodrigues	2007	The role of trust in international entrepreneurship	Trust within the context of international entrepreneurship	32 UK SMEs exporting to Brazil	International entrepreneurship, relational networks, trust
Maria Bohnenberger, Serje Schmidt & Ernani Freitas	2007	A influência da família na formação empreendedora	How the family context contributes to entrepreneurial behavior of students	1.122 students	Entrepreneurial profile, family antecedents

Each paper was classified as to its type. For instance, an empirical paper was one that dealt with statistics, either using data from primary or secondary sources. In any instance, these papers were quantitative in nature. Some examples of empirical studies are shown in Table 2, below, where we may also observe that the samples used vary substantially. In fact, some of the studies report firms, other incubators, other entrepreneurs (Gimenez, Edmundo Júnior, 2002), owners (Gumersindo & Souza, 2006), students (Bohnenberger, Schmidt & Freitas, 2007) or managers (e.g., Chagas & Freitas, 2001). It is also worth noting that some papers employ large scale samples, permitting broad and more generalizable results and conclusions.

The paper was considered a case study if it delved around the study of one or a limited number of cases. These could be cases of firms, new ventures or notable individual entrepreneurs whose biography warranted focus. For instance, Tondolo, Bitencourt and Tondolo (2008) examined the firm 'Vinícola Miolo', Rosas, Froehner and Sbragia (2007) studied intellectual property protection in the case of 'empresa Alfa' and Tschá, Tabosa and Cabral (2007) used 'O Imaginário Pernambucano' to show collective entrepreneurship. Chieh and Andreassi's (2007) intra-entrepreneurship study used 'Unibanco', while on the same subject of corporate intrapreneurship Garcez and Sbragia (2006) resorted to the case of the petrochemical 'Braskem' and Sequeira (2005) the 'ONG Refazer'. The use of venture capital to finance new risky businesses was dealt with the case study of FK Biotecnologia by Scherer (2006). Benedetti, Rebello and Reyes (2005) used six cases of bakeries to look into the importance of innovation efforts. The presentation of teaching case studies was under-represented with a simple paper by Guimarães and Cardoza (2004) who revealed the case 'Cosméticos contém 1g'. Finally, it is worth pointing that notable entrepreneurs warranted some, albeit minor, attention. Joaquim Fillho (2003) presented the case of 'Barão de Mauá'.

A more detailed analysis may elucidate the evolution and concentration of specific authors. Some authors had more presentations at EnANPAD in the twelve years under analysis: Guimarães in 2002 (2 articles) 2003 (2 articles) and 2004 (2 articles); Gimenez in 2001, 2002, 2005 and 2008;

Paiva Jr. in 2002, 2004 (2 articles) and 2005 (3 articles); Wetzel 2002, 2003 and 2006; Martes in 2003, 2006 and 2007; Dutra in 2003, 2004 and 2005; Souza in 2006 (2 articles), 2007 and 2008 (Table 3).

Table 3. Authors with multiple presentations at the EnANPAD in entrepreneurship

Authors	Title	Year	Type of article
Siqueira, M. & Guimarães, L.	Estratégias empreendedoras de negócios Tupiniquins	2002	Empiric
Guimarães, L.	Empreendedorismo no currículo dos cursos de Graduação e Pós-graduação em Administração: Análise da organização didático-pedagógica destas disciplinas em escolas de negócios norte-americanas	2002	Empiric
Versiani, A. & Guimarães, L.	Aprendendo a estruturar um novo negócio: O papel das incubadoras na constituição das pequenas empresas de base tecnológica	2003	Empiric
Oliveira, D. & Guimarães, L.	Perfil empreendedor e ações de apoio ao empreendedorismo: O NAE/SEBRAE em questão	2003	Empiric
Guimarães, L. & Cardozo, G.	Teaching case: Cosmetics Contém 1g - a case of entrepreneurship	2004	Case study
Versiani, A. & Guimarães, L.	A Construção da carreira de "Empreendedor" – delineando as bases do aprendizado e conhecimento na criação de empresas	2004	Empiric
Pelisson, C., Aligleri, L., Gimenez, F. , Machado, H. & Aligleri, L.	A Tomada de decisão segundo o comportamento empreendedor: Uma survey na região das Missões	2001	Empiric
Gimenez, F. & Júnior, E.	Investigando o potencial empreendedor e de Liderança Criativa	2002	Empiric
Júnior, E. & Gimenez, F.	Potencial empreendedor e liderança criativa: Um estudo com varejistas de materiais de construção da cidade de Curitiba/Pr	2005	Empiric
Gimenez, F. , Ferreira, J. & Ramos, S.	Configuração empreendedora ou configurações empreendedoras? Indo um pouco além de Mintzberg	2008	Case study
Paiva Jr, F. & Cordeiro, A.	Empreendedorismo e o espírito empreendedor: Uma análise da evolução dos estudos na produção acadêmica brasileira	2002	Empiric
Mello, S., Paiva	Maturidade empreendedora e <i>expertise</i> em	2004	Empiric

Jr, F., Neto, A. & Lubi, L.	compasso de inovação e risco: Um estudo em empresas de base tecnológica		
Paiva Jr, F.	O empreendedor e sua identidade cultural: Em busca do desenvolvimento local	2005	Empirical
Gonçalves, C. & Paiva Jr, F.	Competitividade e inovação influenciando o crescimento empresarial: A perspectiva dos empreendedores de empresas de base tecnológica	2005	Empiric
Paiva Jr, F.	Confiança nas interações sociais do empreendedor: Um marco de fortalecimento dialógico	2005	Empiric
Quental, C. & Wetzel, U.	Equilíbrio trabalho-vida e empreendedorismo: A experiência das mulheres brasileiras	2002	Empiric
Rodrigues, M. & Wetzel, U.	As motivações das empreendedoras de serviços de bufês do Estado do Rio de Janeiro na decisão de iniciar o seu negócio	2003	Empiric
Dias, V., Secco, G., Pessoa, G. & Wetzel, U.	A Idealização da profissional adequada aos "novos tempos": Análise da construção imagética da mulher "empreendedora" pela revista Exame.	2006	Theoretical
Dias, V., Secco, G., Pessoa, G. & Wetzel, U.	Distinção entre as noções de empresária e 'empreendedora' na mídia de negócios: Um estudo comparativo entre as revistas Exame e <i>Fortune</i>	2007	Theoretical
Martes, A. & Rodrigues, C.	Ethnic entrepreneurship and religion: The case of brazilians in the U.S.	2003	Empiric
Martes, A.	De volta aos clássicos: Empreendedorismo e conflito institucional	2006	Theoretical
Serafim, M. & Martes, A.	Sobre esta pedra edificarei a minha empresa: Organizações religiosas e o incentivo ao empreendedorismo	2007	Case study
Dutra, I. & Previdelli.	Perfil do empreendedor versus mortalidade de empresas: Estudo de caso do perfil do micro e pequeno empreendedor	2003	Empiric
Dutra, I.	Ambiente empreendedor e a mortalidade empresarial: Estudo do perfil do empreendedor da micro e pequena empresa no norte do Paraná	2004	Empiric
Lenzi, F., Venturi, J. & Dutra, I.	Estudo comparativo das características e tipos de empreendedores em pequenas empresas	2005	Empiric
Júnior, G. & Souza, E.	Instrumento de medida da atitude empreendedora – IMAE: Construção e validação de uma escala	2006	Empiric
Souza, E. & Souza, C.	Atitude empreendedora: Um estudo em organizações brasileiras	2006	Empiric
Souza, E. & Lucas, C.	Cultura e atitude empreendedora nas vinícolas do Vale do Vinhedo – RS	2007	Case study
Pedrosa, M. &	Atitude empreendedora no setor hoteleiro	2008	Empiric

Souza, E.	brasileiro: Um estudo em pequenos e grandes hotéis no Distrito Federal		
------------------	--	--	--

Source: The authors.

DISCUSSION

The analysis of texts on EnANPAD allows us to gauge some points on the evolution of entrepreneurial studies. Clearly, the weight of the empirical articles prevails, with a relative growth of case studies in relation to purely theoretical, or conceptual articles, over the last twelve years. It is also notable that entrepreneurship research is increasingly done in co-authorship, involving a growing number of authors.

The Brazilian research related to the topic of entrepreneurship EnANPAD's, as gauged by the papers presented at the EnANPAD, seems often rather exploratory, which is justified by the still embryonic stage of development. After all, it is worth remembering that the Entrepreneurship division at the ANPAD was created only in 2003. Nevertheless, it is obvious the sharp increase in entrepreneurship research for the period reported – 1997 to 2008. For example, in 1997, the first year we considered, only one paper was presented at the conference, while the last four years - from 2005 to 2008 - 101 articles were presented.

A careful review of the content of the 156 paper included in our sample confirmed existing works (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Busenitz et al., 2003) that entrepreneurship research is inclusive to many disciplines and concepts. Perhaps less promising is that we failed to see clear lines of research as development of new theory goes, or even the application of existing theories of other management disciplines. Entrepreneurship research has much to gain from using and leveraging some of the extant theories and views in its studies. For instance, from strategic management it may draw on the resource-based view of the firm and on transaction costs. The social networks ideas that it draws from sociology may be further developed beyond a casuistic examination of resource dependence arguments. From finance a set of concepts may be absorbed as well as from human resources. The fact is that entrepreneurship, as a discipline may actually and with legitimacy capture from other business disciplines. In this

manner, it may be able to overcome the usual criticisms that entrepreneurship is still in a theory building phase of development (Wiseman & Skilton, 1999) or that it is a fragmented jigsaw of different areas (Harrison & Leitch, 1996).

This study is useful for understanding how the Brazilian academia has been evolving and in doing that it opens up directions for future research. For instance, while it became clear that there is a strong focus on the characteristics of the entrepreneurs and the entrepreneurial process, several other areas warrant far more focus. We pointed above the need for a more theoretically driven research, one with a theory building potential, but also on the value and importance of the networks, social and business, of not only the entrepreneur and entrepreneurial team but also of other closer ties. Also there is room for the institutional theory to make way into entrepreneurship research, as context is a major driver of entrepreneurs. The fact is that much has been evolving in the institutional environment in Brazil and may be further delved. Finally, while we identified some papers that focused on the incubators, it is important to move beyond single case studies of incubators to truly understand the benefits of incubation. Moreover, research has largely failed to connect strategies and performance in multiple entrepreneurial processes.

We believe that this paper has attained its objectives. First, and foremost, to understand the current state of the art of Brazilian entrepreneurship research. By examining the entire track record of the papers presented at the EnANPAD over the period from 1997 to 2008, we do not claim to encompass all the research being done, but it is undeniable that it is a representative sample of the existing research. Our endeavor is revealing of some areas that may be explored in the future.

Our study has unavoidable limitations that may also be explored in the future. For instance, our purpose was not to evaluate accurately the content of the papers. Such content analysis may be made and some classification may be put forward. Eventually, this research may be revealing of research gaps, connections between authors and theories. Other limitation derive from the data source. We only examined the papers presented at the EnANPAD, but there is a wealth of scholarly journals and other conferences

that accept entrepreneurship research. An extension of our paper may thus be made.

We call for additional research. In Brazil, we have the conditions to take the lead on this discipline, partly due to official efforts made to promote entrepreneurial action, partly for the cultural and socio-economic conditions that lead to a very high number of individuals involved in starting up firms. The progress is remarkable but a munificent path is laid for the discipline to glow in the business academia.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H. & Zimmer, C. (1986) Entrepreneurship through social networks, In Sexton, D. & Kasarda, J. (Eds), **The art and science of entrepreneurship**, Cambridge, MA.: Ballinger.
- Alsos, G & Kolvereid, L. (1999). The business gestation process of novice, serial and parallel business founders. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 22, 101-114.
- Audia, P. & Rider, C. (2006) Entrepreneurs as organizational products revisited. In Baum, J. Frese, M. & Baron, R. (Eds) **The Psychology of Entrepreneurship**. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 113-130.
- Baron, R. (1998) Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: Why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 13: 275-294.
- Baruch, Y. & Gebbie, D. (1998) Cultures of success: Characteristics of the UK's leading MBO teams and managers. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 13: 423-439.
- Bates, T. (1998) Survival patterns among newcomers to franchising. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 13: 113-130.
- Baumgartner, H. & Pieters, R. (2003) The structural influence of marketing journals: A citation analysis of the discipline and its subareas over time, **Journal of Marketing**, 67: 123-139.
- Begley, T. & Boyd, D. (1987) Psychological characteristics associated with entrepreneurial performance, **Journal of Business Venturing**, 2(1): 213-225.
- Benedetti, M., Rebello, K. & Reyes, D. (2005) **Empreendedores e inovação: Contribuições para a estratégia do empreendimento**. ENANPAD
- Birley, S. (1985) The role of networks in the entrepreneurial process, **Journal of Business Venturing**, 1: 107-117.

- Blanchflower, D. & Oswald, A. (1998) What makes an entrepreneur? **Journal of Labor Economics**, 16: 26–59.
- Bohnenberger, M., Schmidt, S. & Freitas, E. (2007) **A influência da família na formação empreendedora**. ENANPAD
- Busenitz, L. & Barney, J. (1997) Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 12: 9–30.
- Busenitz, L., West, G., Shepherd, D., Nelson, T., Chandler, G. & Zacharakis, A. (2003) Entrepreneurship research in emergence: Past trends and future directions. **Journal of Management**, 29 (3): 285-308.
- Bygrave, W. & Holer, C. (1991) Theorizing about entrepreneurship. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 16(2): 13-22.
- Chaganti, R. & Greene, P. (2002) Who are ethnic entrepreneurs? A study of entrepreneurs' ethnic involvement and business characteristics. **Journal of Small Business Management**, 40(2): 126–143.
- Chagas, J. & Freitas, H. (2001) **Comportamento gerencial, gênero e empreendedorismo**. ENANPAD.
- Chandler, G. & Hanks, S. (1994) Market attractiveness, resource-based capabilities, venture strategies and venture performance. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 9: 331-349.
- Chieh, N. & Andreassi, T. (2007) **Intra-empreendedorismo: Um estudo de caso sobre o entendimento e a aplicação dos fundamentos organizacionais associados ao termo**. ENANPAD.
- Chua, J., Chrisman, J. & Sharma, P. (1999) Defining the family business by behavior. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 23: 19-37.
- Cooper, A., Gimeno-Gascon, F. & Woo, C. (1994) Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 9: 371-395.
- Covin, J. & Slevin, D. (1989) Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. **Strategic Management Journal**, 10: 75-87.
- Daim, U., Rueda, U., Martin, H. & Gerdtsri, P. (2006) Forecasting emerging technologies: Use of bibliometrics and patent analysis, **Technological Forecasting and Social Change**, 73: 981-1012.
- Davidsson, P. (2003) The domain of entrepreneurship research: Some suggestions. In Shepherd, D. & Katz, J. (Eds.), **Cognitive Approaches to Entrepreneurship Research**. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Davis, P. & Harveston, P. (1998) The influence of family on the family business succession process: A multi-generational perspective. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 22: 31-53.
- De Noble, A., Jung, D. & Ehrlich, S. (1999) Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: The development of a measure and its relationship to entrepreneurial action. **Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research**. Boston: Babson College.

- Delmar, F. & Davidsson, P. (2000) Where do they come from? Prevalence and characteristics of nascent entrepreneurs. **Entrepreneurship and Regional Development**, 12, 1-23.
- Delmar, F. & Shane, S. (2003). Does business planning facilitate the development of new ventures? **Strategic Management Journal**, 24(12): 1165-85.
- Dimov, D. & Shepherd, D. (2005) Human capital theory and venture capital firms: Exploring "home runs" and "strike outs." **Journal of Business Venturing**, 20(1): 1-21.
- Diodato, V. (1994) **Dictionary of bibliometrics**, Haworth Press: Binghamton, NY.
- Drucker, P. (1985) **Innovation and entrepreneurship**. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ferreira, M.P, Li, D., Guisinger, S. & Serra, F. (2009) Is the international business environment the actual context for international business research? **RAE - Revista de Administração Empresas**. 49(3): 282-294.
- Filho, J. (2003) **O empreendedorismo no sistema cultural brasileiro: A história do Barão de Mauá**. ENANPAD
- Floyd, S. & Wooldridge, B. (1999) Knowledge creation and social networks in corporate entrepreneurship: The renewal of organizational capability. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 23: 123-143.
- Fritsch, M. (2008) How does new business formation affect regional development? Introduction to the special issue. **Small Business Economics**, 30(1): 1-14
- Garcez, M. & Sbragia, R. (2006) **As estratégias de empreendedorismo corporativo interno por desenvolvimento de mercados e os fatores críticos do sucesso**. ENANPAD
- Garnsey E. & Heffernan P. (2005) High tech clustering through spin out and attraction: The Cambridge case, **Regional Studies**, 39(8): 1127-1144.
- Gartner, W. (1988) Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. **American Journal of Small Business**, 12: 11-32.
- Gartner, W., Bird, B. & Starr, J. (1992) Acting as if: Differentiating entrepreneurial from organizational behavior. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 16(3): 13-31.
- Gartner, W. (2001) Is there an elephant in entrepreneurship? Blind assumptions in theory development. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 25(4): 27-39.
- Gartner, W. (1990) What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? **Journal of Business Venturing**, 5(1): 15-28.
- Gimenez, F. & Júnior, E. (2002) **Investigando o potencial empreendedor e de liderança criativa**. ENANPAD
- Gimeno, J., Folta, T., Cooper, A. & Woo, C. (1997) Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 42: 750-783.

- Gorman, G., Hanlon, D. & King, W. (1997) Some research perspectives on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education, and education for small business management: A ten-year literature review. **International Small Business Journal**, 15: 56-77.
- Greene, P., Brush, C. & Hart, M. (1999) The corporate venture champion: A Resource-Based approach to role and process. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 23: 103-122.
- Guimarães, L. & Cardoza, G. (2004) **Teaching case: Cosmetics contém 1g - a case of entrepreneurship**. ENANPAD
- Harrison, R. & Leitch, C. (1996) Discipline emergence in entrepreneurship: Accumulative fragmentalism or paradigmatic science? **Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Change**, 5(2): 65-83.
- Hart, M., Greene, P. & Brush, C. (1997) Leveraging resources: Building and organization on an entrepreneurial resource base. In Reynolds, P., Carter, W., Davidsson, P. Gartner, W. & McDougall, P. (Eds.) **Frontiers in Entrepreneurship Research 1997**. Wellesley, Massachusetts: Babson College, 347-348.
- Júnior, G. & Souza, E. (2006) **Instrumento de medida da atitude empreendedora – IMAE: Construção e validação de uma escala**. ENANPAD
- Katz, J. (2003) The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 18(2): 283-300.
- Kets de Vries, M. (1977) The entrepreneurial personality: A person at the crossroads. **Journal of Management Studies**, 14(1): 34-57.
- Klepper, S. (2007) Disagreements, spinoffs, and the evolution of Detroit as the capital of the U.S. automobile industry. **Management Science**, 53: 616-631.
- Kuratko, D. & Goldsby, M. (2004) Corporate entrepreneurs or rogue middle managers: A framework for ethical corporate entrepreneurship. **Journal of Business Ethics**, 55(1): 13-30.
- Kuratko, D., Ireland, R., Covin, J. & Hornsby, J. (2005) A model of middle-level managers' entrepreneurial behavior. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 29(6).
- Li, Dan & Ferreira, Manuel P. (2006) The evolutionary model of entrepreneurial firms' dependence on networks: Going beyond the start-up stage. **Notas Económicas**, 24: 48-63.
- Louw, L., Eeden, S., Bosch, J. & Venter, D. (2003) Entrepreneurial traits of undergraduate students selected South African tertiary institutions. **Management Dynamics**, 6(4): p.73-90.
- Low, M. & MacMillan, I. (1988) Entrepreneurship: Past research and future challenges. **Journal of Management**, 35, 139-161.

- Malone, S. (1989) Characteristics of smaller company leveraged buyouts. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 4: 349-359.
- McClelland, D. (1961) **The achieving society**. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. (1987) Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. **Journal of Creative Behavior**, 21: 219-233.
- McFadden, D. (2001) Economic choices. **American Economic Review**, 91: 351-78.
- McGrath, R., MacMillan, I. & Scheinbert, S. (1992) Elitist, risk takers and rugged individualists? An exploratory analysis of cultural differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. **Journal of Business Venturing**, 7(2): 115-136.
- Merino, M., Carmo, M. & Álvarez, M. (2006) 25 years of Technovation: Characterization and evolution of the journal, **Technovation**, 26: 1303-1316.
- Morris, M. (1998) **Entrepreneurial intensity: Sustainable advantages for individuals, organizations, and societies**. Westport, CT: Quorum.
- Mueller, P. (2006) Entrepreneurship in the region: Breeding ground for nascent entrepreneurs? **Small Business Economics**, 27: 41-58.
- Nooteboom, B. (2008) Learning, discovery and collaboration. In Nooteboom, B. & Stam, E. (Eds.) **Micro-Foundations for Innovation Policy**. Amsterdam / Chicago: Amsterdam University Press/Chicago University Press:75-102.
- Oviatt, B. & McDougall, P. (1997) Challenges for internationalization process theory: The case of international new ventures, **Management International Review**, 37: 85-99.
- Peterman, N. & Kennedy, J. (2003) Enterprise education: Influencing students' perceptions of entrepreneurship. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 28, 129-144.
- Phelan, S., Ferreira, M.P. & Salvador, R. (2002) The first twenty years of the Strategic Management Journal, **Strategic Management Journal**, 23: 1161-1168.
- Reynolds, P. (1991) Sociology and entrepreneurship: Concepts and contributions. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 16(2): 47-70.
- Reynolds, P., Camp, S., Bygrave, W., Autio, E. & Hay, M. (2001) **Global entrepreneurship monitor**. Kansas City, MO: Kauffman Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership.
- Robbie, K., Wright, M. & Albrighton, M. (1999) High tech management buy-outs. **Venture Capital: An International Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance**, 1: 219-240.
- Ronstadt, R. (1987) The educated entrepreneurs: A new era of entrepreneurial education is beginning. **American Journal of Small Business**, 11(4): 37-53.

- Rosas, A., Froehner, J. & Sbragia, R. (2007) **O valor da proteção intelectual das inovações sob a perspectiva do empreendedor: Um estudo de caso.** ENANPAD
- Scherer, F. (2006) **Utilização de capital de risco como fomentador de empresas de base tecnológica: O caso da FK Biotecnologia.** ENANPAD
- Schumpeter, J. (1934) **The theory of economic development.** Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Sequeira, S. (2005) **Intra-empendedorismo em organizações não-governamentais como prática de gestão e como legitimação: Estudo de caso da ONG REFAZER.** ENANPAD.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000) The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. **Academy of Management Review**, 25(1): 217-226.
- Slevin, D. & Covin, J. (1992) Creating and maintaining high-performance teams. In Sexton, D. & Kasarda, J. (Eds.) **The State of the Art of Entrepreneurship.** Boston, MA: PWS-Kent Publishing Company, 358-386.
- Slotte-Kock, S. & Coviello, N. (2010) Entrepreneurship research on network processes: A review and ways forward. **Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice**, 34 (1): 31-57.
- Spinelli, S. Birley S. & Leleux, B. (2003) An analysis of shareholder return in public franchisor companies. **The Journal of Private Equity**, 6 (3): 56-67.
- Stam, E. (2007) Why butterflies don't leave. Locational behavior of entrepreneurial firms. **Economic Geography**, 83 (1): 27-50.
- Stevenson H (1985) The heart of entrepreneurship. **Harvard Business Review**, March-April, pp. 85-94.
- Stinchcombe, A. (1965) Social structure and organisations, In March, J. (Ed.), **Handbook of Organizations**, Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.
- Thornton, P. (1999) The sociology of entrepreneurship. **Annual Review of Sociology**. 25: 19-46.
- Tondolo, V., Bitencourt, C. & Tondolo, R. (2008) **Implementação de estratégia empreendedora internacional no setor de vinhos: O caso da Vinícola Miolo.** ENANPAD.
- Tschá, E., Tabosa, T. & Cabral, G. (2007) **Empreendimento social transformador: O caso do Imaginário Pernambucano – Cabo de Santo Agostinho.** ENANPAD
- Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P. & Wright, M. (2001) The focus of entrepreneurial research: Contextual and process issues, **Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice**, 25(4): 57-80.
- Upton, N., Teal, E. & Felan, J. (2001) Strategic and business planning practices of fast-growing family firms. **Journal of Small Business Management**, 39(4): 60-72.

- Van de Ven, A. (1993) The development of an infrastructure for entrepreneurship, **Journal of Business Venturing**, 8: 211-230.
- Van Praag, C. & Versloot, P. (2007) What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research, **Small Business Economics**, 29: 351–382.
- Van Praag, C., Cramer J. & Hartrog J. (2002) Low risk aversion encourages the choice for entrepreneurship: An empirical test of a truism. **Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization**, 48: 29-36.
- Venkataraman, S. (1997) The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research. In Katz, J. (Ed.) **Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth**. Volume III. JAI Press, pp. 119-138.
- Waldinger, R., Aldrich, H. & Ward, R. (1990) Ethnic entrepreneurs: Immigrant business in industrial societies. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Werner, S. (2002) Recent developments in international management research: A review of 20 top management journals, **Journal of Management**, 28: 277-305.
- Willett, P. (2007) A bibliometric analysis of the Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling, **Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling**, 26: 602-606.
- Wiseman, R. & Skilton, P. (1999) Divisions and differences: Exploring publication preferences and productivity across management subfields. **Journal of Management Inquiry**, 8: 299–320.
- Zahra, S., Kuratko, D. & Jennings, D. (1999) Corporate entrepreneurship and wealth creation: Contemporary and emerging perspectives. **Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice**, 24(2): 5–9.

Os autores/The authors

Manuel Portugal Ferreira

Doutorado em Business Administration pela David Eccles School of Business, da Universidade de Utah, EUA, MBA pela Universidade Católica de Lisboa e Licenciado em Economia pela Universidade de Coimbra, Portugal. É Professor Coordenador no Instituto Politécnico de Leiria, onde dirige o globADVANTAGE – Center of Research in International Business & Strategy do qual é fundador. Professor de Estratégia e Gestão Internacional. A sua investigação centra-se, fundamentalmente, na estratégia de empresas multinacionais, internacionalização e aquisições com foco na visão baseada nos recursos. Co-autor dos livros 'Ser empreendedor: Pensar, criar e moldar a nova empresa', 'Casos de estudo: Usar, escrever e estudar', 'Marketing para empreendedores e pequenas empresas', 'Gestão estratégica das organizações públicas', 'Gestão estratégica: Conceitos e casos portugueses' e 'Gestão empresarial'.

E-mail: manuel.portugal@ipleiria.pt

João Carvalho Santos

Licenciado em Gestão pelo Instituto Politécnico de Leiria e doutorando em Gestão na Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto. Professor das disciplinas de Inovação e Empreendedorismo, Estratégia Empresarial e Gestão Internacional no Instituto Politécnico de Leiria. Membro Associado do centro de investigação globADVANTAGE – Center of Research in International Business & Strategy onde desenvolve investigação nas áreas da Estratégia Empresarial, Empreendedorismo e Negócios Internacionais. Co-autor dos livros 'Ser empreendedor: Pensar, criar e moldar a nova empresa' e 'Gestão empresarial'.

E-mail: joao.santos@estg.ipleiria.pt

Nuno Rosa Reis

Licenciado em Gestão pelo Instituto Politécnico de Leiria e licenciado em Línguas Estrangeiras Aplicadas pela Universidade Católica Portuguesa. Docente no Instituto Politécnico de Leiria, nas áreas de Estratégia e Empreendedorismo. Investigador no globADVANTAGE. Co-autor dos livros 'Marketing para empreendedores e pequenas empresas' e 'Gestão empresarial'.

E-mail: nuno.m.reis@ipleiria.pt

Fernando Ribeiro Serra

Doutor em Engenharia pela PUC-Rio - Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. É Professor da UNISUL – Universidade do Sul de Santa Catarina, Brasil, onde dirige a Unisul Business School e é professor do Mestrado em Administração. Participa no grupo de pesquisa de cenários prospectivos da UNISUL, S3 Studium (Itália) e globADVANTAGE (Portugal). Foi Professor no IBMEC/RJ, PUC-Rio, FGV, Universidade Candido Mendes e UFRRJ. A sua experiência inclui, ainda, cargos de conselheiro (Portugal e Brasil), direção e consultoria. A sua pesquisa foca a Estratégia e Empreendedorismo.

E-mail: fernando.serra@unisul.br