

CODE OF CONDUCT

When you sign up for this course we assume that you agree to abide by the standard code of conduct for scientific work.

COURSE STRUCTURE

	MORNING 09:00 – 12:30	AFTERNOON 14:00 – 17:30
MONDAY	Introduction Entrepreneurship Theory & The Individual-Opportunity-Nexus	The Entrepreneurial Process
TUESDAY	Behavioral Approaches to Entrepreneurship I: Entrepreneurial Traits, Motivations, & Identity	Behavioral Approaches to Entrepreneurship II: Entrepreneurial Cognitions & Emotions
WEDNESDAY	Teams & Entrepreneurship	Work on own research papers. <i>One-on-one meetings with faculty upon advance scheduling (optional).</i>
THURSDAY	Entrepreneurial Strategy I: Economic Foundations	Entrepreneurial Strategy II: Business Experimentation & Market Creation
FRIDAY	Sociological Approaches to Entrepreneurship I: Cultural Entrepreneurship and Institutional Theory	Sociological Approaches to Entrepreneurship II: Institutional Logics Conclusion

A detailed list of session themes and reading assignments is provided below.

SESSION #1
MONDAY MORNING
ENTREPRENEURSHIP THEORY & THE INDIVIDUAL-OPPORTUNITY-NEXUS

In search for the unique unit of study that could demarcate the field of entrepreneurship, scholars have temporarily settled on the individual-opportunity-nexus. However, this concept and hence the domain of entrepreneurship study is contested. In particular, there is little agreement about the opportunity construct.

Core Readings

Alvarez, S., & Barney, J. 2007. Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1: 11–26.

Klein, P. G. 2008. Opportunity discovery, entrepreneurial action, and economic organization. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 2(3): 175-190.

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

Wood, M.S. 2017. Misgivings about dismantling the opportunity construct. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 7: 21-25

Additional Readings

Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2013. Epistemology, opportunities, and entrepreneurship: Comments on Venkataraman et al. (2012) and Shane (2012). *Academy of Management Review* 38: 154 – 157.

Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., McBride, R., & Wuebker, R. 2014. Realism in the Study of Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(2): 227-231.

Davidsson, P. 2015. Entrepreneurial opportunities and the entrepreneurship nexus: A re-conceptualization. *Journal of Business Venturing* 30(5): 674-695.

Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. 2003. Opportunities and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3): 333-349.

Shane, S. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1): 10-20.

Venkataraman, S. 1997. The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research: An editor's perspective. In J. A. Katz, & R. H. Brockhaus (Eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*: 119-138. Greenwich: JAI Press.

Venkataraman, S., Sarasvathy, S. D., Dew, N., & Forster, W. R. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: Whither the promise? Moving forward with entrepreneurship as a science of the artificial. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1): 21-33.

Wood, M. S.; Mckinley, W. 2017. After the Venture: The Reproduction and Destruction of Entrepreneurial Opportunity. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 11: 18-35.

SESSION #2
MONDAY AFTERNOON
THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS

Major emphasis in entrepreneurial studies has been placed on better understanding the entrepreneurial process and resulting insights into what entrepreneurs actually do, i.e. what constitutes entrepreneurial action. This session provides an eclectic collection of articles that will launch a discussion on how different epistemological perspectives lead to different lines of inquiry.

Core Readings

- Cornelissen, J. P., & Clarke, J. S. (2010). Imagining and rationalizing opportunities: Inductive reasoning and the creation and justification of new ventures. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 539-557.
- Lichtenstein, B. B., Dooley, K. J., & Lumpkin, G. T. 2006. Measuring emergence in the dynamics of new venture creation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(2), 153-175.
- 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.
- Welter, C., Mauer, R., and Wuebker, R. J. (2016) Bridging Behavioral Models and Theoretical Concepts: Effectuation and Bricolage in the Opportunity Creation Framework. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10: 5– 20.

Additional Readings

- Bhave, M. P. 1994. A process model of entrepreneurial venture creation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(3): 223-246.
- Carter, N. M., Gartner, W. B., Reynolds, P. D. 1996. Exploring start-up event sequences. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11(3): 151-166.
- Felin, T., & Zenger, T. R. 2009. Entrepreneurs as theorists: on the origins of collective beliefs and novel strategies. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(2), 127-146.
- Gersick, C. 1994. "Pacing strategic change: The case of a new venture", *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(1): 9- 45.
- Katz, J. 1993. "The dynamics of organizational emergence: A contemporary group formation perspective", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Winter: 97-101.
- Lichtenstein, B. B., Carter, N. M., Dooley, K. J., & Gartner, W. B. (2007). Complexity dynamics of nascent entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(2), 236-261.
- Steyaert, C. 2007. Entrepreneurship as a conceptual attractor? A review of process theories in 20 years of entrepreneurship studies. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 19(6): 453 - 477.
- Van de Ven, A. H., Engleman, R. M. 2004. Event- and outcome-driven explanations of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(3): 343-358.

**SESSION #3
TUESDAY MORNING
BEHAVIORAL APPROACHES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP I: MOTIVATIONS, &
IDENTITY**

In this first session on behavioral approaches, we zoom into aspects of entrepreneurial psychology and the impact on entrepreneurial behavior. We will aim to understand in particular current lines of reasoning in entrepreneurial behavior research as well as potential opportunities going forward for those interested in personality-related concepts and constructs.

Core Readings

- Fauchart, E., & Gruber, M. 2011. Darwinians, communitarians, and missionaries: The role of founder identity in entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 935-957.
- Hoang, H. & Gimeno, J. 2010. Becoming a founder: How founder role identity affects entrepreneurial transitions and persistence in founding. *Journal of Business Venturing* 25: 41-53.
- Hogg, M. A., Terry, D. J., & White, K. M. 1995. A tale of two theories: A critical comparison of identity theory with social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 58(4): 255-269.
- Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. 2003. Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2): 257-279.

Additional Readings

- 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): 587-598.
- Frese, M. 2009. Towards a Psychology of Entrepreneurship — An Action Theory Perspective, Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship, 5(6): 437-496.
- Jain, S., George, G., & Maltarich, M. 2009. Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. *Research Policy*, 38(6): 922-935.
- Powell, E. E. & Baker, T. 2014. It's what you make of it: founder identity and enacting strategic responses to adversity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5): 1406-1433.
- Shook, C. L., Priem, R. L., & McGee, J. E. 2003. Venture Creation and the Enterprising Individual: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 29(3): 380-399.
- Stewart, Jr., W. & Roth, P. 2001. Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A metaanalytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86: 145-153.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S.E., Lumpkin, G.T. 2010. The Relationship of Personality to Entrepreneurial Intentions and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *J. of Management*, 36(2): 381-404.
- Van Gelderen, M., Kautonen, T., Fink, M. 2015. From entrepreneurial intentions to actions: Self-control and action-related doubt, fear, and aversion. *J. of Business Venturing*, 30(5), 655-673.

SESSION #4
TUESDAY AFTERNOON
BEHAVIORAL APPROACHES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP II:
ENTREPRENEURIAL COGNITIONS & EMOTIONS

In this second session on behavioral approaches, we visit important works in the domain of cognitions and emotion research in entrepreneurship. These lines of research fit into the opportunity recognition perspective in entrepreneurship and have formed a substantial body of research in the domain of entrepreneurship. The aim of this session is to critically review the approaches and identify limitations and new avenues of research in this tradition.

Core Readings

- Baron, R. A., Ensley, M. D. 2006. Opportunity Recognition as the Detection of Meaningful Patterns: Evidence from Comparisons of Novice and Experienced Entrepreneurs. *Management Science*, 52(9): 1331-1344.
- Cardon M., Wincent J., Singh J., Drnovsek M. 2009. The Nature and Experience of Entrepreneurial Passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3): 511-532.
- Foo, M. D., Uy, M. A., & Baron, R. A. 2009. How do feelings influence effort? An empirical study of entrepreneurs' affect and venture effort. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(4): 1086-1094.
- Grégoire, D. A., Barr, P. S., Shepherd, D. A. 2010. Cognitive processes of opportunity recognition: The role of structural alignment. *Organization Science*, 21(2): 413-431.

Additional Readings

- Cardon, M. S., Post, C., & Forster, W. R. 2017. Team entrepreneurial passion: Its emergence and influence in new venture teams. *Academy of Management Review*, 42(2), 283-305.
- Dane, E. (2010). Reconsidering the trade-off between expertise and flexibility: A cognitive entrenchment perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(4), 579-603.
- Kier, A. S.; McMullen, J. S. 2018. Entrepreneurial Imaginativeness in New Venture Ideation, *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(6): 2265-2295.
- Mitchell, R., Shepherd, D. A. 2012. Capability development and decision incongruence in strategic opportunity pursuit. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(4): 355-381.
- Shepherd, D. A., Williams, T. A., Patzelt, H. 2015. Thinking about entrepreneurial decision making: Review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 41(1): 11-46.
- Simon, M., Houghton, S. M., Aquino, K. 1999. Cognitive biases, risk perception, and venture formation: How individuals decide to start companies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(2): 113-134.

**SESSION #5
 WEDNESDAY MORNING
 TEAMS & ENTREPRENEURSHIP**

Empirics show that more than 80% of high-growth businesses are started as a team effort and only about half of all original founding teams make it past the 5-year mark. That leads to a number of questions to the curious scholar regarding the viability of team endeavors, what makes for successful entrepreneurial teams and how do (should) entrepreneurial team organize their operations.

Core Readings

- Lazar, M., Miron-Spektor, E., Agarwal, R., Erez, M., Goldfarb, B., & Chen, G. (2019). Entrepreneurial team formation. *Academy of Management Annals*, (ja).
- Hellmann, T., & Wasserman, N. 2016. The first deal: The division of founder equity in new ventures. *Management Science*, 63(8), 2647-2666.
- Jung, HeeJung, Balagopal V, Pich M. 2017. How Do Entrepreneurial Founding Teams Allocate Task Positions? *Academy of Management Journal* 60(1): 264-294.
- Ruef, M., Aldrich, H. E., & Carter, N. M. 2003. The structure of founding teams: Homophily, strong ties, and isolation among US entrepreneurs. *American Sociological Review*, 195-222.

Additional Readings

- Aldrich HE, Kim PH. 2007. Small worlds, infinite possibilities? How social networks affect entrepreneurial team formation and search. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1-2): 147-165.
- Chowdhury S. 2005. Demographic diversity for building an effective entrepreneurial team: is it important? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(6): 727-746.
- Clarysse, B., & Moray, N. 2004. A process study of entrepreneurial team formation: the case of a research-based spin-off. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(1), 55-79.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. 2013. Top management teams and the performance of entrepreneurial firms. *Small Business Economics*, 40(4), 805-816.
- Ensley, M., Pearson, A., Amason, A. 2002. Understanding the dynamics of new venture top management teams: Cohesion, conflict and new venture performance. *JBV*, 17(4), 365-386.
- Ferguson AJ, Cohen LE, Burton MD, Beckman, CM. 2016. Misfit and milestones: Structural elaboration and capability reinforcement in the evolution of entrepreneurial top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(4): 1430-1450.
- Hoogendoorn, S., Parker, S. C., & Van Praag, M. 2017. Smart or Diverse Start-up Teams? Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Organization Science*, 28(6), 1010-1028.
- Klotz, A. C., Hmieleski, K. M., Bradley, B. H., & Busenitz, L. W. 2014. New venture teams: A review of the literature and roadmap for future research. *Journal of Management*, 40(1), 226-255.
- Ucbasaran, D., Lockett, A., Wright, M., & Westhead, P. 2003. Entrepreneurial founder teams: Factors associated with member entry and exit. *ET&P*, 28(2), 107-128.

SESSION #6
THURSDAY MORNING
ENTREPRENEURIAL STRATEGY I: ECONOMIC FOUNDATIONS

This first session on entrepreneurial strategy focuses on different scholarly approaches to the study of entrepreneurial strategy, with the aim to facilitate discussion of different philosophical and epistemological underpinnings and how those inform the respective lines of research. This session covers in particular approaches by researchers anchored in an economics background.

Core Readings

- Ansari, S., Garud, R., Kumaraswamy, A. 2016. The disruptor's dilemma: TiVo and the U.S. television ecosystem. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37: 1829-1853.
- Gans, J. S., Stern, S., Wu, J. 2019. Foundations of entrepreneurial strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 40: 736– 756. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3010>
- 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.
- Teece, D. J. 1986. Profiting from technological innovation: Implications for integration, collaboration, licensing and public policy. *Research Policy*, 15(6), 285-305.

Additional Readings

- Christensen, C. M., McDonald, R., Altman, E. J., Palmer, J. E. 2018. Disruptive innovation: An intellectual history and directions for future research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 55(7), 1043-1078.
- Contigiani, Andrea, Experimentation and Appropriability in Early-Stage Ventures: Evidence from the US Software Industry (January 1, 2019). SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3282261>
- Fern, MJ, Cardinal, LB, O'Neill, HM. 2012. The genesis of strategy in new ventures: Escaping the constraints of founder team knowledge, *Strategic Management Journal*, 33: 427-47.
- Flammini, S., Arcese, G., Lucchetti, M. and Mortara, L. 2017. "Business model configuration and dynamics for technology commercialization in mature markets", *British Food Journal* 119(11): 2340-2358. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BFJ-03-2017-0125>
- Gans, J., Ryall, M. D. 2017. Value capture theory: A strategic management review. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38: 17-41. doi:10.1002/smj.2592
- 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.
- Uzunca, B. 2018. A Competence-Based View of Industry Evolution: The Impact of Submarket Convergence on Incumbent–Entrant Dynamics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(2), 738-768.
- Vissa, B. 2012. Agency in action: Entrepreneurs' networking style and initiation of economic exchange. *Organization Science*, 23: 492-510.

SESSION #7
THURSDAY AFTERNOON
**ENTREPRENEURIAL STRATEGY II: BUSINESS EXPERIMENTATION & MARKET
 CREATION**

This second session on entrepreneurial strategy zooms into more recent works contributed by scholars who study product markets and entrepreneurial strategy formation. This literature often studies agentic processes in entrepreneurial management and elicits insights into how entrepreneurs manage trade-offs and experiment for optimal product-market positioning.

Core Readings

- Hannah, D. P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2018). How firms navigate cooperation and competition in nascent ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(12), 3163-3192.
- McDonald, R. M., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2019). Parallel play: Startups, nascent markets, and effective business-model design. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 0001839219852349.
- Ott, T. E., Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. 2017. Strategy formation in entrepreneurial settings: Past insights and future directions. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 11(3), 306-325.
- Santos, F., Eisenhardt, K. M. 2009. Constructing markets and shaping boundaries: Entrepreneurial power in nascent fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52: 643-671

Additional Readings

- Amit, R., Zott, C. 2001. Value creation in e-business. *Strat. Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 493-520.
- Andries, P., Debackere, K., & Van Looy, B. 2013. Simultaneous experimentation as a learning strategy: Business model development under uncertainty. *Strat. Entrepreneurship Journal*, 7(4), 288-310.
- Gavetti, G., & Rivkin, J. W. (2007). On the origin of strategy: Action and cognition over time. *Organization Science*, 18(3), 420-439.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2017). Superior Strategy in Entrepreneurial Settings: Thinking, Doing, and the Logic of Opportunity. *Strategy Science*, 2(4), 246-257.
 doi:10.1287/stsc.2017.0045
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Bingham, C. B. (2017). Superior Strategy in Entrepreneurial Settings: Thinking, Doing, and the Logic of Opportunity. *Strategy Science*, 2(4), 246-257.
- Leatherbee, M., Katila, R., The Lean Startup Method: Team Composition, Hypothesis-testing, and Early-stage Business Models (August 15, 2019). Available at
 SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2902869> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2902869>
- Ozcan, P. & K.M. Eisenhardt. 2009. Origin of alliance portfolios: Entrepreneurs, network strategies and firm performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2): 246-279.
- Zott, C. Amit, R. 2008. The Fit Between Product Market Strategy and Business Model: Implications for firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(1): 1-26.

SESSION #8
FRIDAY MORNING
SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP I: CULTURAL & INSTITUTIONAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

While early approaches to the study of entrepreneurship have rested squarely on either economic or psychological theorizing, there are increasingly sociologists interested in the phenomenon and have made important contributions to the field. This session surveys this literature with a particular emphasis on concepts from institutional theory.

Core Readings

- Johnson, V. 2007. What Is Organizational Imprinting? Cultural Entrepreneurship in the Founding of the Paris Opera. *American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1): 97-127. doi:10.1086/517899
- Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy, and the acquisitions of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 545-564.
- Tracey P. Phillips N. Jarvis O. 2011. Bridging institutional entrepreneurship and the creation of new organizational forms: a multilevel model. *Organization Science*, 22: 60-80.
- Zott, C., & Huy, Q. 2007. How entrepreneurs use symbolic management to acquire resources. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52: 70-105.

Additional Readings

- Aldrich, H., Fiol, M. 1994. Fools Rush In? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19(4): 645-670.
- Carroll, G. R., Swaminathan, A. 2000. Why the Microbrewery Movement? Organizational Dynamics of Resource Partitioning in the American Brewery Industry after Prohibition, *American Journal of Sociology*, 106: 715-762.
- Martens, M. L., Jennings, J. E., & Jennings, P. D. 2007. Do the stories they tell get them the money they need? The role of entrepreneurial narratives in resource acquisition. *Academy of management journal*, 50(5), 1107-1132.
- McDonald, Rory, and Cheng Gao. "Pivoting Isn't Enough? Managing Strategic Reorientation in New Ventures." *Organization Science* (forthcoming).
- Murray, F. 2010. The Oncomouse That Roared: Hybrid Exchange Strategies as a Source of Distinction at the Boundary of Overlapping Institutions. *American Journal of Sociology*, 116(2): 341-88.
- Hargadon, A. B. & Douglas, Y. (2001) "When Innovations Meet Institutions: Edison and the design of the electric light," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46(3): 476.
- Tolbert, P.S., David, R.J. Sine, W.D. 2011. Studying choice and change: The intersection of institutional theory and entrepreneurship research. *Organization Science*, 22: 1332 -1344.
- Wry, T., Lounsbury, M., & Jennings, P. D. 2014. Hybrid vigor: Securing venture capital by spanning categories in nanotechnology. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(5), 1309-1333.

SESSION #9
FRIDAY AFTERNOON
SOCIOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO ENTREPRENEURSHIP II: INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS

Newer institutional theories that include more agency such as institutional logics provide new insights that explain the behavior of entrepreneurs and their stakeholders such as venture capitalists. In this concluding session, we focus on recent works in this line of theorizing with the intention to stimulate discussion for future avenues of research.

Core Readings

- 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.
- Besharov, M. I., Smith, W. K. 2014. Multiple Institutional Logics in Organizations: Explaining Their Varied Nature and Implications. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(3): 364-381.
- Almandoz, J. 2014. Founding teams as carriers of competing logics: When institutional forces predict banks' risk exposure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 59(3), 442-473.
- Thornton, P. H., Ocasio, W., Lounsbury, M. 2012. The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure, and Process: OUP Oxford: Ch. 2: 20-48.

Additional Readings

- Thornton, P. H. 2004: Markets from culture: Institutional logics and organizational decisions in higher education publishing: Stanford University Press.
- Battilana, Julie; Dorado, Silvia 2010: Building sustainable hybrid organisations: the case of commercial microfinance organisations. *Academy of Management Journal* 53 (6), pp. 1419–1440.
- Almandoz, J. 2012. Arriving at the Starting Line: The Impact of Community and Financial Logics on new Banking Ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55: 1381-1406.
- Pontikes, E.G., W.P. Barnett. 2017. The Non-consensus entrepreneur: organizational responses to vital events, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 62(1): 140-178.
- Prahalad, C.K., Bettis, R.A. 1986 The Dominant Logic: a new Linkage Between Diversity and Performance, *Strategic Management Journal*, 7: 485-501.
- Thornton, P. H. 1999. The Sociology of Entrepreneurship. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 25: 19-46.
- Smith, W. K.; Besharov, M. L. 2019: Bowing before dual gods: How structured flexibility sustains organizational hybridity. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 64 (1): 1–44.

--- End of Seminar ---