

# Replication Studies in Entrepreneurship: Mapping Current Efforts and Identifying Future Opportunities

Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice  
1–64

© The Author(s) 2026

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/10422587261415935

journals.sagepub.com/home/etp



Carolin Krieweth<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian Kruse<sup>1</sup> ,  
Jeremy C. Short<sup>2</sup> , Liljan Ruth Maren Schrameier<sup>1</sup> ,  
and Malte Brettel<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

Although scholars recognize the importance of replication for advancing scientific progress, little is known about the extent to which replication efforts have informed entrepreneurship research. This research brief systematically reviews the body of replication studies in the field, examining which replication designs have been employed and where future efforts could be directed. We find that conceptual extension and empirical generalization replication designs dominate, while checking of analysis and exact replications remain rare. We advocate for greater use of diverse replication designs, highlight promising avenues for future replication efforts, and propose specific practices to strengthen transparency, documentation, and reproducibility.

## Keywords

replication, replicability, Entrepreneurship, Manuscripts: Specialty Areas, robustness

Replication is essential for establishing confidence in published findings, ensuring the robustness of theoretical frameworks, and fostering cumulative knowledge in scientific research (Brandt et al., 2014; Francis, 2012; Schmidt et al., 2018). Entrepreneurship scholars have consistently noted that replication plays a particularly crucial role given the field's dynamic nature, where evolving market conditions and institutional changes can challenge existing theories (Anderson et al., 2019; Brush et al., 2022; Crawford et al., 2022; van Witteloostuijn et al., 2021). Indeed, scholars have argued that the “replication crisis”

---

<sup>1</sup>Innovation and Entrepreneurship Group (WIN)—TIME Research Area, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Department of Management, G. Brint Ryan College of Business, University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA

Current affiliation: Jeremy C. Short is now also affiliated with University of Waikato.

## Corresponding Author:

Carolin Krieweth, Innovation and Entrepreneurship Group (WIN) – TIME Research Area, Aachen, Germany.

Email: [krieweth@time.rwth-aachen.de](mailto:krieweth@time.rwth-aachen.de)

in management, psychology, and other social sciences is potentially creeping into entrepreneurship (Crawford et al., 2022). Consequently, over the past decade, replication has gained increasing attention, with leading journals such as *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* actively encouraging the submission of replication studies (Wiklund, 2023).

Despite these calls, relatively few replications have been published in high-quality outlets: our review identified only 58 replication studies over the past 30 years, of which only 25.9% are published in journals that are listed in the Financial Times journal list (FT50). This discrepancy underscores a persistent gap between editorial calls for replication and the reality of publication practices, which highlights the need for guidance on how replication studies can gain traction and visibility in the field.

Beyond the low number of published studies, there is also little clarity about what the field has actually achieved through existing replication efforts. Despite the surge in replication research in entrepreneurship, the field currently lacks a systematic review and synthesis of what has been achieved through replication, which relationships have been studied, and which phenomena should be studied in the future. Understanding which replication designs have been used in prior work is crucial because, without this knowledge, the field risks over-relying on narrow methodological approaches that may fail to capture the complexity of entrepreneurial phenomena (Block & Kuckertz, 2018). Understanding which phenomena have been replicated is paramount for assessing the robustness of findings in entrepreneurship research and to ensure replication efforts are commensurate with influential research streams within the field. Meta-analytic research suggests that at least two exact replications are necessary to reliably aggregate findings and assess an effect's stability (Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001; Valentine et al., 2010). However, it remains unclear which studies in entrepreneurship research have met these criteria. As a result, the extent to which widely accepted findings rest on a solid empirical foundation remains uncertain. Identifying future areas for replication is equally important, as doing so helps researchers determine which studies should be prioritized for replication to avoid concentrating future replication efforts on topics with limited impact (Crawford et al., 2022).

Building on these challenges, this research note addresses three key questions: Which replication designs dominate the field of entrepreneurship? Which phenomena have been replicated? Where should researchers focus their future replication efforts? To answer the first two questions, we systematically map the replication landscape in entrepreneurship by reviewing all replication studies published up to December 2025, without imposing a specific start date to ensure full coverage of the field's replication efforts over time. We classify the research designs employed into six distinct research categories using a replication framework recommended for theory development drawn from a critical realist perspective (Tsang & Kwan, 1999). This framework outlines potential replication types as a function of potentially similar or differing data sets/populations and differences in measurement and/or analysis. Our analysis revealed that conceptual extension and empirical generalization studies dominate over reanalyses of data and checking of analysis designs, likely due to limited data transparency in original studies (Bergh et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2022; Schwab & Starbuck, 2017; Short & Anglin, 2019) and perceived lower publication chances for designs perceived as “merely copying” (Earp & Trafimow, 2015, p. 621) the work of others. We then assess the relationships that have been replicated. To do so, we first categorize the studies thematically based on established research areas in entrepreneurship. Specifically, we assign each replication study to one of the 18 Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference (BCERC) tracks, which represent key areas of entrepreneurship research as the field has evolved. BCERC has long shaped academic discourse in

entrepreneurship through its influential track system and annually published *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* series (Babson College, 2025), making it a relevant framework for organizing our review. Analyzing each relationship examined within these tracks, we find that replication efforts in entrepreneurship cover a broad range of phenomena within the tracks, with little concentration of replication efforts on specific phenomena. Strikingly, only two studies have been replicated twice, raising concerns about whether the field has sufficient replications to assess the robustness of its core relationships, particularly those that have shaped and dominated entrepreneurship research. This pattern also underscores the broader bias of journals against publishing replication studies, which limits the accumulation of robust evidence even when replication efforts are undertaken (Bergh et al., 2017; Earp & Trafimow, 2015; Obenauer, 2024; Schwab & Starbuck, 2017).

To assess where future replication efforts should be directed, we conducted a targeted literature review of the most influential empirical studies in entrepreneurship. We focused on articles published in FT50-listed journals that have been cited more than 1,000 times (according to Scopus), as these studies have shaped core theoretical and empirical developments in the field. This procedure yielded 33 highly influential empirical studies. To determine which of these studies warrant replication, we examined whether their focal relationships had been subjected to at least two prior replication attempts.

Because highly cited studies are unevenly distributed across BCERC tracks, relying solely on the >1,000-citation threshold would risk overlooking entire research tracks that are not represented among the 33 influential studies and would obscure where meaningful replication needs exist within the field. To overcome this limitation and ensure that our analysis captures the breadth of influential empirical work in entrepreneurship, we conducted a complementary track-level analysis by identifying and reviewing the three most cited empirical studies within each BCERC track to assess where replication efforts are needed, regardless of whether these studies met the >1,000-citation criterion. This additional step enabled us to provide a more comprehensive track-level assessment of where replication efforts are most needed. We conclude by offering actionable recommendations for editors, reviewers, journals, universities, and scholars.

### ***Replication Review Process***

We systematically reviewed all published replication studies in entrepreneurship research up to December 2025 (all replications available at the time of submission). In line with prior guidance for systematic reviews (e.g., Köhler & Cortina, 2021; Mueller-Langer et al., 2019), we predefined our search terms, databases, and inclusion criteria before conducting the review. To ensure comprehensiveness, we applied the same search string (“replic\*” OR “revisit” AND “entrepren\*”) across three databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and EBSCO Business Source. Searches were conducted across all fields (title, abstract, keywords) and restricted to English-language, peer-reviewed publications. This yielded 381 records in Scopus, 491 in Web of Science, and 246 in EBSCO. After removing duplicates (460) and excluding records based on titles (363), abstracts (188), and full-text eligibility assessments (58), our final sample comprised 58 replication studies. Of these, 49 were identified through the systematic review, and nine additional studies were identified through cross-checks in Google Scholar and prior knowledge of the literature but were not captured in our database searches.

We did not restrict our search to a predefined list of journals (e.g., FT50) because our goal was to comprehensively capture replication efforts in entrepreneurship, regardless of

outlet prestige. However, to address concerns about outlet quality, we documented the journals in which each replication study appeared (see Table 2) and report the proportion of studies published in high-prestige journals. The most frequently represented journal in the final sample of 58 studies is the *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* (24.1%; 14 studies), followed by *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice* (15.5%; 9 studies). The *Journal of Family Business Strategy* and *Management Review Quarterly* each account for three studies (5.2%). The *Journal of Small Business Management*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*, and *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* are each represented by two studies (3.4%). All remaining journals are represented by a single study each ( $n = 22$  journals; 37.9% of the sample), reflecting a broad dispersion across outlets (see Table 1 for details).

Five journals in our sample belong to the FT50 list (*Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, *Organization Science*, *Research Policy*, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *Strategic Management Journal*), together accounting for 24.1% of all identified replication studies (14 studies). Notably, none of the replications in our dataset were published in the *Journal of Business Venturing*, despite its status as one of the field's leading outlets.

The majority (60.3%, 35 studies) of replication studies relied on observational data derived from large-scale surveys (e.g., PSED, GEM, HILDA, NLSY, SOEP, OECD) or archival datasets (e.g., Crunchbase, Compustat, SABI/AMADEUS, EBS). A smaller number employed questionnaire-based designs (31.0%, 18 studies) or adopted experimental designs (e.g., conjoint) (5.2%, 3 studies). In addition, two studies employed meta-analytic replications (3.5%) to reassess prior effect sizes with extended or updated datasets.

We categorized replication studies using the conceptual framework by Tsang and Kwan (1999). Their framework in *Academy of Management Review* offers a critical realist perspective differentiating replication studies based on six replication designs: Checking of analysis, reanalysis of data, exact replication, conceptual extension, empirical generalization, and generalization and extension. These designs vary depending on whether the study uses the same or different measurements, analytical techniques, datasets, or populations. Two coders independently assigned all studies to these replication designs with an initial agreement rate of 96.2%. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion until full consensus was reached. Table 1 presents an overview of the research designs based on the framework of Tsang and Kwan (1999).

## Results

We assign each replication study from our literature review to a replication design category and present the results in Table 1. We find that 9 (16.9%) studies employed multiple replication designs within one study. For instance, Lee et al. (2019) replicated the study of Covin and Slevin (1989) on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation (EO) and firm performance in hostile environments. In their replication, they employed two studies: in study one, they utilized the same survey measures used by Covin and Slevin (1989), but extended the sample to include firms of varying sizes across all industries. The second study followed the approach of generalization and extension by adopting an objective measurement of EO, as defined by Le Breton-Miller and Miller (2011), and applying it to secondary data from 1,479 Chinese public firms over an eight-year period.

Given these multiple efforts within studies, we analyze a total of 72 replication efforts. Conceptual extensions were the most frequently used design in our sample (30.5%, 22 studies), followed by empirical generalizations (23.6%, 17 studies). Generalization and

**Table 1.** Overview of Replication Designs.

Replication Type based on Tsang and Kwan (1999)	Definition according to Tsang and Kwan (1999)	Number of studies using this type of replication (% of total)	Studies
Checking of Analysis	Checking of analysis involves reapplying the same measurement and statistical procedures to the original dataset to confirm whether results were accurately derived.	5 (6.9%)	Block, Hansen, and Steinmetz (2022), Crawford et al. (2022), Hopp et al. (2018), Katz (1993), Skorodzyevskiy et al. (2025)
Exact Replication	Exact replication assesses whether an observed effect can be reproduced under identical methodological conditions but with a new sample drawn from the same population.	8 (11.1%)	Ben-Hafiedh and Hamelin (2022), Camuffo et al. (2024), Cowling et al. (2019), Glackin and Phelan (2020), Honig and Samuelsson (2014), Seong and Parker (2024), Stutz et al. (2022), van Dijk et al. (2025)
Empirical Generalization	Empirical generalization replicates the study with the same research design and analytical approach but uses a sample from a different population.	17 (23.6%)	Abbasiachavari and Block (2022), Adbi and Shukla (2023), Camuffo et al. (2024), Ciuchta and Finch (2019), Dahlqvist et al. (2000), Fossen et al. (2022), Frank et al. (2010), Hessels et al. (2020), Lee et al. (2019), Markin et al. (2022), Raffiee and Feng (2014), Runst et al. (2018), Seong and Parker (2024), Stephan et al. (2023), Verheul et al. (2016), Wismans et al. (2020), Wismans et al. (2021)
Reanalysis of Data	Reanalysis of data applies updated or alternative analytical techniques to the original dataset.	4 (5.5%)	Glosenberg et al. (2022), Hansen and Block (2020), Hopp et al. (2018), Skorodzyevskiy et al. (2025)
Conceptual Extension	In a conceptual extension, researchers use alternative measurement and analysis techniques while studying the same population.	22 (30.5%)	Altmeier and Fisch (2024), Artega-Fonseca et al. (2025), Arend et al. (2016), Block et al. (2022), Busenitz (1996), Carree et al. (2002), Chatterjee et al. (2023), Deng (2025), Ernesto et al. (2021), Ferrari et al. (2024), Fried et al.

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

Replication Type based on Tsang and Kwan (1999)	Definition according to Tsang and Kwan (1999)	Number of studies using this type of replication (% of total)	Studies
Generalization and Extension	Generalization and extension involve modifying both the methodological approach and the population under investigation.	16 (22.2%)	(1993), Jessri et al. (2020), Kacperczyk and Marx (2016), McKelvie et al. (2021), Park et al. (2016), Peterson et al. (2024), Skorodzyevskiy et al. (2025), Stutz et al. (2022), Sullivan (2015), van Dijk et al. (2025), van Hugten et al. (2021), Weismeyer-Sammer (2011) Block, Hansen, and Steinmetz (2022), Chandler et al. (2022), Jessri et al. (2020), Kanwal et al. (2025), Lee et al. (2019), Obschonka et al. (2013), Rodriguez-Peña (2023), Sambharya and Musteen (2014), Schneck et al. (2021), Shirokova et al. (2022), Short and Anglin (2019), Short et al. (2009), Slater and Narver (2000) Stephan et al. (2023), Stutz et al. (2022), van Dijk et al. (2025)

extension designs occurred 16 times (22.2%), reflecting a substantial share of replications that modified both methodology and population. Exact replications were less common (11.1%, 8 studies). Checking of analysis accounted for 6.9% of all designs (5 studies), while reanalysis of data was the least frequently used approach (5.5%, 4 studies). This is unfortunate, since reanalysis of data allows researchers to assess the robustness of findings using improved statistical techniques, test alternative model specifications, and uncover potential analytical biases that may have influenced the original conclusions (Tsang & Kwan, 1999). However, the rarity of this replication design likely reflects structural disincentives: such studies are often perceived as lacking sufficient theoretical or methodological novelty to merit publication on their own, unless they are embedded within broader methodological contributions or illustrate novel techniques (Bergh et al., 2017; Earp & Trafimow, 2015; Schwab & Starbuck, 2017). This dynamic highlights the tension between the scientific value of replication and the field's prevailing emphasis on theoretical advancement, which may discourage scholars from pursuing or submitting such studies despite their potential value. Also, the limited amount of exact replications is lamentable since exact replications provide useful input for meta-analyses and provide the foundational evidence necessary to assess the consistency of findings (Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001; Valentine et al., 2010). Without a solid base of exact replications, it becomes difficult to draw conclusions about the robustness of relationships (Tsang & Kwan, 1999). In sum, we find that a vast majority of replication studies use designs that extend and adapt existing research, while a minority use checking of analysis or reanalysis of data.

### *An Assessment of Key Entrepreneurship Replications*

To identify where replication efforts have taken place within entrepreneurship research, we mapped the studies identified in our literature review onto the 18 tracks of the BCERC. Since its founding in 1981, BCERC has become a leading venue for academic exchange in the field, fostering engagement between researchers and practitioners. Its annual *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* series, published since 1991, is one of the most comprehensive sources of empirical entrepreneurship research (Babson College, 2025). We chose BCERC's track system as the organizing framework for this review because of its long-standing influence and its structured, detailed delineation of research tracks. Although alternative frameworks exist, such as the broader disciplinary, functional, and contextual categories outlined by the *Journal of Business Venturing*, the BCERC tracks provide a more granular and widely recognized structure, making them better suited for capturing the diversity of replication efforts in the field without over-reliance on a particular journal.

These 18 tracks include *Characteristics of Entrepreneurs, Corporate Entrepreneurship, Crowdfunding, Entrepreneurial Cognition, Entrepreneurial Motivation, Environment, Ethics, Family, Financing, Franchising, Gender in Entrepreneurship, International, Networking, Public Policy, Research Methods, Social Entrepreneurship, Strategy, and Team and Governance*. These tracks also align closely with those identified by Ferreira et al. (2015) in their analysis of 30 years of entrepreneurship research in top journals, reflecting widely acknowledged domains in the field and offering a structured lens for assessing the breadth of replication efforts.

## Results

Applying these tracks as a framework, our analysis shows that replication efforts are unevenly distributed across research domains. Most replications focus on entrepreneurial cognition (20.7%; 12 studies), followed by strategy (17.2%; 10 studies) and entrepreneurial motivation (15.5%; 9 studies). Other areas, such as family (8.6%; 5 studies), financing (6.9%; 4 studies), gender in entrepreneurship (6.9%; 4 studies), and networking (5.2%; 3 studies), have received comparatively less attention. Tracks including characteristics of entrepreneurs, crowdfunding, environment, and public policy each account for only two replications (3.4% each), while research methods, teams and governance, and corporate entrepreneurship have only one replication study to date (1.7% each). Several tracks (e.g., ethics, franchising, international entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship) have not yet utilized replication.

This uneven distribution likely reflects not only variation in scholarly interest but also structural factors and publication biases in how replication studies are conducted by authors and evaluated by editors and journals (e.g., Nosek et al., 2022). Replications tend to cluster in areas such as *entrepreneurial cognition*, *strategy*, and *entrepreneurial motivation* because these fields often offer accessible data, established measures, and high theoretical visibility, which are features that may increase the likelihood of publication (e.g., Hubbard & Armstrong, 1994). By contrast, understudied tracks may require proprietary or longitudinal data, more complex designs, or face editorial preferences that reward theoretical novelty over verification. As a result, many replication efforts appear to arise opportunistically, because data are readily available or topics are convenient, rather than from theory-driven prioritization (Fanelli, 2012; Schmidt, 2009). Self-replications by original authors may further reinforce this pattern. Consequently, the current landscape of replication activity reflects where replications are feasible and publishable, rather than where they should be prioritized. Table 2 summarizes the distribution across tracks, and Table 3 provides a detailed overview of all studies.

### Identifying Future Replication Efforts

To assess the potential for further replication, we identified highly cited empirical studies in entrepreneurship. This focus is grounded in two key arguments. First, these studies serve as cornerstones of entrepreneurship theory, shaping conceptual frameworks and guiding empirical research (e.g., White & McCain, 1998). Their validity directly influences the trajectory of knowledge development, making their replication essential for ensuring theoretical coherence and empirical rigor (Tsang & Kwan, 1999). Second, entrepreneurship is inherently dynamic, with evolving economic, technological, and societal conditions that may alter the applicability of established findings (Bergh et al., 2017; Bettis et al., 2016). Replicating high-impact studies allows scholars to assess their robustness, generalizability, and continued relevance across diverse contexts and periods of time, ensuring that the field's foundational insights remain reliable as conditions change (Nosek et al., 2022).

To identify high-impact studies, we conducted a literature review using the Scopus database due to its robust indexing of academic literature across multiple disciplines and its ability to provide detailed citation metrics. This ensures that our selection reflects the most widely referenced and influential works in entrepreneurship research, aligning with established methods in entrepreneurship research that have relied on citation-based analyses to identify foundational studies (e.g., Ferreira et al., 2015). By using citation counts as a proxy for scholarly impact, we ensure that our selection includes studies that have significantly

**Table 2.** Overview of Replication Tracks.

BCERC track	Number of studies (% of total)	Journal	Studies
Entrepreneurial Cognition	12 (20.7%)	<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i> , <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , <i>Journal of Enterprising Communities</i> , <i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i> , <i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i> , <i>European Journal of Epidemiology</i> , <i>Applied Psychology: An International Review</i> , <i>Management Review Quarterly</i> , <i>Entrepreneurship Theory &amp; Practice</i> , <i>Global Journal of Entrepreneurship</i> , <i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> , <i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i> , <i>Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies</i> , <i>Schmalenbach Business Review</i> , <i>Management Review Quarterly</i> , <i>Organization Science</i> , <i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i> , <i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i> , <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	Arend et al. (2016), Arteaga-Fonseca et al. (2025), Busenitz (1996), Camuffo et al. (2024), Chatterjee et al. (2023), Honig and Samuelsson (2014), Peterson et al. (2024), Obschonka et al. (2013), Shirokova et al. (2022), Verheul et al. (2016), Wismans et al. (2020), Wismans et al. (2021)
Strategy	10 (17.2%)	<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i> , <i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i> , <i>Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies</i> , <i>Schmalenbach Business Review</i> , <i>Management Review Quarterly</i> , <i>Organization Science</i> , <i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i> , <i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i> , <i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	Adbi and Shukla (2023), Ben-Hafiedh and Hamelin (2022), Dahlqvist et al. (2000), Frank et al. (2010), Hopp et al. (2018), Kacperczyk and Marx (2016), Lee et al. (2019), Markin et al. (2022), Schneek et al. (2021), Short et al. (2009)
Entrepreneurial Motivation	9 (15.5%)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i> , <i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i> , <i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Ciuchta and Finch (2019), Cowling et al. (2019), Glosenberget al. (2022), Jessri et al. (2020), Katz (1993), McKelvie et al. (2021), Raffiee and Feng (2014), Stephan et al. (2023), van Hugten et al. (2021)
Family	5 (8.6%)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i> , <i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i> , <i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i> , <i>Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies</i>	Block, Hansen, and Steinmetz (2022), Ferrari et al. (2024), Hansen and Block (2020), Weismeier-Sammer (2011), Stutz et al. (2022)
Financing	4 (6.9%)	<i>The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance</i> , <i>Management Review Quarterly</i> , <i>Strategic Management Journal</i> , <i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Altmeier and Fisch (2024), Fried et al. (1993), Park et al. (2016), Jessri et al. (2020)

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

BCERC track	Number of studies (% of total)	Journal	Studies
Gender	4 (6.9%)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice, Journal of Business Venturing Insights, Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	Abbasiachavari and Block (2022), Deng (2025), Fossen et al. (2022), Seong and Parker (2024)
Networking	3 (5.2%)	<i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, Research Policy</i>	Sullivan (2015), van Dijk et al. (2025)
Characteristics	2 (3.4%)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights, Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	Hessels et al. (2020), Skorodzyevskiy et al. (2025)
Crowdfunding	2 (3.4%)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Kanwal et al. (2025), Short and Anglin (2019)
Public Policy	2 (3.4%)	<i>Empirical Economics, Entrepreneurship &amp; Regional Development</i>	Carree et al. (2002), Runst et al. (2018)
Environment	2 (3.4%)	<i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, Journal of International Entrepreneurship</i>	Ernesto et al. (2021), Sambharya and Musteen (2014)
Research Methods	1 (1.7%)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	Crawford et al. (2022)
Team and Governance	1 (1.7%)	<i>Management International Review</i>	Chandler et al. (2022)
Corporate Entrepreneurship	1 (1.7%)	<i>Journal of International Entrepreneurship</i>	Rodríguez-Peña (2023)

**Table 3. Overview of Replication Studies.**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Abbasianchavari and Block (2022)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Gender	Gender gap	Koellinger et al. (2013)	GEM adult population survey, n = 17 countries	GEM adult population survey, n = 58 countries	Confirmed gender gap in entrepreneurial propensity but found that equalizing confidence in skills reverses the negative gender effect	Reinforces perceptual differences in explaining gender gaps and suggests interventions enhancing women's confidence could close the gap
Aebi and Shukla (2023)	<i>Journal of International Business Studies</i>	Strategy	Registration Enterprise	Assenova and Sorenson (2017)	Enterprise-level data, n = 12,146 firms across n = 18 countries in sub-Saharan Africa	enterprise-level data, n = 134,198 firms across n = 143 countries	Narrow replication in sub-Saharan Africa confirmed findings on firm registration's positive effects on sales and employment. Broader replication in 143 countries revealed heterogeneous effects based on institutional moderators like regulatory burden and market openness	Highlighted the contextual nature of registration's impact on performance and emphasized cross-country studies for robust insights
Altmeier and Fisch (2024)	<i>Management Review Quarterly</i>	Financing	Business Angels	Block et al. (2019)	Crunchbase, n = 3,232 investments made by n = 1,348 business angels, personality identified by using Receptiviti	Crunchbase, n = 4,449 investments made by n = 1,241 business angels, OLCPPT to identify personality traits via the last 3,200 tweets per business angel	Found differing personality traits impact syndication behavior. Neuroticism had positive effects, unlike Block et al.'s (2019) findings	Highlights variability in computerized personality tools and underscores the role of gender and experience in business angel syndication behavior
Arend et al. (2016)	<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Cognitive Biases	Buseinitz and Barney (1997)	Survey, sample of entrepreneurs and managers, n = 124	Broader sampling across entrepreneurs and managers with moderating variables like environmental dynamism, n = 201	Confirmed cognitive biases in entrepreneurs but mixed results for performance impacts. Moderating variables like environmental dynamism influenced findings	Broader sampling introduces variability in findings. Encouraged exploring environmental influences on entrepreneurial cognition

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Arteaga-Fonseca et al. (2025)	<i>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Human Capital Theory and Venture Capital Firms	Dimov and Shepherd (2005)	n = 112 independent U.S. VC firms from VentureXpert with $\geq 20$ portfolio companies, all active in the high-tech wireless industry. Sample limited to firms with at least one investment in the past 5 years. Human capital data from firm websites	n = 118 VC firms (including private, corporate, and public VCs) via VentureXpert across low-, medium-, and high-tech industries. No 5-year limit. Used additional sources like LinkedIn for human capital data. Expanded outcome variables (IPOs, bankruptcies, M&A, underpricing, returns)	Find support for hypotheses that were not supported in original study. General human capital was positively related to VC success measures. Specific human capital reduced failure indicators. Effects varied depending on the type of VC outcome, industry context, and time to exit. Some previously unsupported hypotheses found support	Highlights the importance of context and measurement in understanding human capital effects. Demonstrates how replication can uncover conditional effects and contribute to theory building
Ben-Hafædth and Hamelin (2022)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	Strategy	Firm Growth	Davidsson et al. (2009)	n = 2,952 European SMEs, 4-year period	n = 664,629 European SMEs, 8-year period	Replicated findings showing profitability-first as a superior strategy over growth-first for overall performance. Effect sizes showed slight changes in an extended sample of firms	Confirmed original findings but emphasized effect size changes. Suggested future research on smaller firms and growth-profit dynamics
Block (2022)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Family	Family Firms	Duran et al. (2016)	Meta-analysis, n = 108 primary studies from n = 42 countries	Survey, n = 290	Original study showed family firms produce more innovation output with less innovation input. Replication found weaker effects on input and no effect on output.	Highlights heterogeneity within family firms, recommending future research focus on internal differences instead of general comparisons with nonfamily firms.

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Busenitz (1996)	<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Entrepreneurial Alertness	Kaish and Glad (1991)	Survey of entrepreneurs and managers on entrepreneurial alertness, $n = 51$ founders, $n = 36$ of financial company	survey questions, entrepreneurs $n = 124$ ; manager: N.A., only response rate given, but no clear number of addressed contacts, only stating + 10,000	Replicated and refined the entrepreneurial alertness scale. Enhanced measurement reliability by adding new questions. Identified persistent reliability issues with original measures	Importance of improving scales and addressing sampling issues
Camuffo et al. (2024)	<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Entrepreneurial decision making	Camuffo et al. (2008)	$n = 117$ early-stage entrepreneurs, enrolled in a startup accelerator program organized by the Politecnico di Milano School of Management. They were either in the process of starting a business or had recently started one, groups randomly assigned to either (a) a treatment group receiving training in a scientific approach to decision-making, or (b) a control group receiving standard entrepreneurship support	RGCZ: study conducted in Milan as original study, same setting, new sample; RCT3: Turin, targeting tech entrepreneurs; RCT4: London, broader entrepreneurial population; total $n = 1,383$ across all three replications	Replication confirms positive effects of scientific training on decision-making outcomes. Treated entrepreneurs are more likely to pivot, drop ideas with weak evidence, and perform better	Provides robust evidence supporting scientific decision-making training. Encourages embedding such practices in entrepreneurship education and policy design.

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Carree et al. (2002)		Public Policy	Business ownership rates and economic development	Carree et al. (2002)	n = 23 OECD countries (former EU-15, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, United States); Business ownership (self-employment) from COMPENDIA 2004.2; GDP per capita, unemployment, labor income share and related variables from OECD Labour Force Statistics and OECD National Accounts; n = 153, 1976–1996	n = 23 OECD countries (former EU-15, Australia, Canada, Iceland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Switzerland, US); Business ownership (self-employment) from COMPENDIA 2004.2; GDP per capita, unemployment, labor income share and related variables from OECD Labour Force Statistics and OECD National Accounts; n = 161 4-year observations (1980, 1984, 1988, 1992, 1996, 2000, 2004)	Study finds no empirical support that a U-shaped equilibrium fits better than an L-shape; countries converge about 13% toward the equilibrium rate every 4 years; unemployment increases business ownership while higher labor income share reduces it; Italy consistently exceeds predicted levels; economic growth suffers when business ownership is below equilibrium but not when it is above	By extending the original Carree et al. (2002) model with longer time series and refined functional forms, the study shows that earlier claims of a U-shape are not robust, that undershooting the equilibrium harms economic growth whereas overshooting does not, and that replicating prior models with richer data improves understanding of entrepreneurship—development dynamics
Chandler et al. (2022)	MIR	Team & Governance	Governance	Sanders and Carpenter (1998)	S&P 500 index, n = 258 firms in 1 year (1992)	S&P 1500 index via Compustat, n = 10,493 firm-year observations from n = 1,305 firms between 1999 and 2019	Confirmed board independence and CEO-chairman separation but found no link with TMT size or CEO compensation	Governance responses to internationalization evolve with socio-economic changes, stressing the importance of contextual adaptations in replication studies

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Chatterjee et al. (2023)	<i>Journal of Enterprising Communities</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Entrepreneurial behavior	Weismeyer-Sammer (2011)	Survey of Austria-based family firms n = 372 respondents of Indian family firms	Core model largely confirmed, but generational involvement becomes insignificant when accounting for tech platform adoption	Extends understanding of digital entrepreneurship in Indian family business context: highlights boundary condition of tech platform use in explaining entrepreneurial behavior	
Ciuchta and Finch (2019)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Entrepreneurial intentions and self-efficacy	Zhao et al. (2005)	n = 454 MBA students	n = 925 adults from diverse demographic backgrounds	Replicated the relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and intentions using a general adult population instead of MBA students. Self-efficacy remained a key predictor; but effect sizes varied across demographic groups	Highlighted the robustness of self-efficacy's role in entrepreneurial intentions while advocating for demographic-specific approaches in future studies
Cowling et al. (2019)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Self-employment motivation	Cowling (2000)	European Working Conditions Survey: n = 13 Western European countries	European Working Conditions Survey: n = 35 Western European countries	Confirmed key findings on gender gaps and education's impact on self-employment, with nuanced updates showing diminished secondary education effects and a reversed tertiary education trend. Gender gaps, while still present, have narrowed significantly	Confirmed original findings while illustrating how cultural, economic, and educational contexts influence self-employment motivation over time

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Crawford et al. (2022)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Research Methods	Nascent Entrepreneurship	All PSED-based studies	PSED-based studies	Analyzed 19 studies, identifying systemic issues in nascent entrepreneurship research	Only 6 of 19 replication attempts successfully aligned with original findings; others faced documentation and methodological challenges	Highlights systemic issues like poor documentation and limited replication culture, advocating for open data practices and institutional support
Dahlqvist et al. (2000)	<i>Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies</i>	Strategy	New Venture Performance	Cooper et al. (1994)	Survey, n = 2,994, NIFB database	Survey, n = 7,256 new enterprises via The Swedish National Board for Industrial and Technical Development (NUTEK) and Statistics Sweden	Confirmed financial resources and demographic factors predict venture outcomes but found differences in management know-how and industry-specific capital due to contextual factors in Sweden vs. United States	Highlighted contextual differences and operational variability in new venture performance predictors, emphasizing the need for robust measures
Deng (2025)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Gender	Gender bias in fundraising	Brooks et al. (2014)	Small field sample, n = 90 from a pitch competition and investment judgments from non-expert MTurk participants; single-industry focus (veterinary tech), limiting external validity compared to real-world decisions by professional investors	Crunchbase archival dataset with n = 9,285 entrepreneurs, 13 industries and 105 countries between 2014 and 2018	Findings confirm prior evidence that women face funding disadvantages, but differ by showing that attractive men raised less capital than less-attractive men, while attractiveness had no significant effect for women	Shows the value of large-scale conceptual replications with real-world archival data, revealing that some effects (female funding penalty) are robust while others reverse. Underscores the context-sensitivity of entrepreneurial bias research and the need for multi-method replication

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Ernesto et al. (2021)	<i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship</i>	Environment	Poverty and entrepreneurship in developing countries	Amorós and Cristó (2011)	n = 66 countries with Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data (37 developing economies), 2001–2008; Poverty indicators (HDI, HDI trends, Gini) drawn from UNDP, UNU-WIDER, World Bank	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor data, UN-UNDP, Human Development Index from 2010–2019, country-level panel covering n = 99–104 countries over the period 2010–2019, depending on model specification	Results reconfirm that both total and necessity-motivated early-stage entrepreneurship are positive associated with the effect on countries' poverty reduction trends, especially in developing countries	Demonstrates the value of updating and extending country-level panel analyses with recent GEM and HDI data to reassess the poverty-entrepreneurship link
Ferrari et al. (2024)	<i>Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies</i>	Family	Organizational culture and entrepreneurial orientation in family firms	Cherchem (2017)	Survey, n = 106 family SMEs in France	One-wave survey, n = 107, Brazilian family firms in textile and clothing industry	Clan and hierarchical cultures are positively associated with; moderation differs by generational involvement	Underscores the importance of replication by showing that prior culture-EO findings do not fully generalize; reveals that relationships and moderating effects shift across contexts and EO dimensions
Fossen et al. (2022)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Gender	Self-Employment	Nicolau et al. (2018)	UK twins: N = 347 monozygotic twin pairs and n = 303 twin pairs from National Survey of MIDUS database	German SOEP-IS, n = 974 adults	Did not replicate findings that 2D:4D ratio correlates with self-employment.	Calls for more research into 2D:4D as a proxy for prenatal testosterone exposure and its role in entrepreneurial behavior.

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Frank et al. (2010)	<i>Schmalenbrach Business Review</i>	Strategy	Entrepreneurial Orientation	Wiklund and Shepherd (2005)	Two-waves of data collection: I. Telephone interview n = 465, survey n = 465, CD-ROM database UC-Select; II: 413 Telephone interview n = 413	Survey, n = 125, via Austrian EEI, includes microbusinesses (fewer than 10 employees), small businesses (10–49 employees), and medium-sized businesses (50–249 employees)	Replicated EO-performance relationship in Austrian firms, highlighting contextual moderation by environmental and resource conditions. Partial support for original findings, with EO showing negative effects in some configurations	Demonstrated that EO-performance linkage depends on context, such as resource availability and cultural dynamics, questioning universal applicability
Fried et al. (1993)	<i>The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance</i>	Financing	Venture Capital	MacMillan et al. (1985)	Survey of n = 161 venture capitalists, all NVCA members (USA)	Survey of n = 143 VC firms listed in Pratt's Guide to Venture Capital Sources, including NVCA and non-NVCA members; reduced the original 24-item investment evaluation scale to 14 items	No statistically significant differences between original and replication overall. Only one significant difference: greater emphasis on market acceptance in the replication. Notably, VCs in the replication rated liquidity and expected returns as less essential	Contextual changes over time (e.g., shift from early- to late-stage investing, declining returns) likely explain some differences. Illustrates the importance of historical and industry context in interpreting VC evaluation criteria across studies
Glackin and Phelan (2020)	<i>New England Journal of Entrepreneurship</i>	Education	Competency-based entrepreneurship education	Morris et al. (2013)	n = 40 entrepreneurship students in U.S. university in South Africa, measuring 13 entrepreneurial competencies	n = 13 entrepreneurship students; same 13 competencies measured in a classroom setting	Replicates Morris et al.'s findings on the uneven distribution of entrepreneurial competencies among students and confirms the value of experiential learning	Supports the use of competency-based frameworks in entrepreneurship education; shows the framework's applicability in smaller classroom settings
Glossenberg et al. (2022)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Self-efficacy	Miao et al. (2017)	161 U.S. manufacturing SMEs	Conducted meta-analysis, n = 159, including financial and non-financial success measures	Found stronger effects for entrepreneurial self-efficacy compared to generalized self-efficacy, with effect sizes varying by success type (financial/non-financial)	Emphasized the importance of conceptualizing success measures in self-efficacy research and highlighted variations across financial and non-financial success indicators

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Hansen and Block (2020)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Family	Family Firms	O'Boyle Jr et al. (2012)	Meta-Analysis, n = 78 articles reporting n = 95 samples	Meta-Analysis, Study I: 236 studies with 811 effect sizes; Study II: 1,095 studies with 4,215 effect sizes (2,513 Pearson correlations; 1,702 partial correlations)	Confirmed original findings on the family involvement-performance link but found nuanced effect size variations due to methodological differences	Demonstrates robustness of family involvement-performance link but emphasizes consistency in meta-analytic designs to improve reliability of findings
Hessels et al. (2020)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Characteristics	Returns to Education	van Praag et al. (2013)	Longitudinal data from the U.S. NLSY n = 66,000 person-year observations, n = 5,600 entrepreneurs/employees	Longitudinal data from the HILDA Survey (2005–2017), n = 92,591 person-year observations (16,293 individuals)	Higher returns to education for entrepreneurs compared to employees, primarily among entrepreneurs without employees. Limited evidence for job control as a mediator	Confirms education as a robust predictor of entrepreneurial income, particularly for solo entrepreneurs, but calls for deeper examination of mediating mechanisms
Honig and Samuelsson (2014)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Business Planning	Delmar and Shane (2004), Honig and Karlsson (2004)	Honig and Karlsson (2004); Swedish version of the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics, n = 396 entrepreneurs; Delmar and Shane (2004); Swedish version of the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics, n = 223 entrepreneurs	Swedish version of the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics, n = 623	Replication of H&K (2004): Successfully replicated and extended their study over 10 years. Business networks and prior customer relationships were stronger predictors of survival. Replication of D&S (2004): Unable to fully replicate due to methodological inconsistencies and left-censoring issues, revealing that many organizing activities occurred before business planning. Findings suggest reverse causality, where planning follows venture development rather than driving it.	Performance outcomes observed in a 10-year window differ significantly from conclusions drawn in shorter studies, emphasizing the need for long-term data collection. Data sharing practices in management research lag behind other disciplines

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Hopp et al. (2018)	<i>Management Review Quarterly</i>	Strategy	Business Planning	Hong and Karlsson (2004)	Hong and Karlsson (2004): Swedish version of the PSED, n = 396 entrepreneurs	Hong and Karlsson (2004): Swedish version of the PSED, n = 396 entrepreneurs	Replicated formal business planning's impact on performance and institutional antecedents. Found discrepancies due to coding and dataset evolution. Reanalysis showed business planning affects survival but not profitability	Partial replication highlighted fragility of institutional influences on planning and emphasized mixed evidence on the impact of formal business
Jessri et al. (2020)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Financing	Decision making	Monsen et al. (2010)	Conjoint experiment, n = 61 working MBA students	Conjoint experiment, n = 53 corporate employees, n = 1,696 decisions	Found financial and non-financial factors influence corporate venture participation, moderated by self-efficacy and independence	Highlights the role of individual-level moderators in corporate entrepreneurship and recommends exploring financial and psychological motivators
Kacperczyk and Marx (2016)	<i>Organization Science</i>	Strategy	Firm Size and Dissolution	Multiple studies (e.g., Effenbein et al., 2010)	New venture performance in the United States	n = 8,940, Hand-collected dataset of career histories in the ASR	Confirmed smaller firms have higher entrepreneurship rates due to limited internal opportunities. Found firm dissolution increases entrepreneurial transitions. Contextual factors such as industry and firm characteristics significantly influence results.	Emphasized that the "small-firm effect" reflects internal opportunity constraints, with entrepreneurial pathways shaped by dissolution and firm size dynamics.

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Kanwal et al. (2025)	<i>Journal of Management Scientific Reports</i>	Crowdfunding	Crowdfunding	Calic and Shevchenko (2020), Moss et al. (2015), Chan et al. (2021), Parhankangas and Renko (2017)	320,088 Kickstarter projects (Calic & Shevchenko, 2020), 400,000 + Kiva microloan campaigns (Moss et al., 2015), 81,765 Kickstarter projects (Chan et al., 2021), 656 Kickstarter campaigns (Parhankangas & Renko, 2017)	n = 613 completed campaigns from 73 U.S. universities on GiveCampus and ScaleFunder, content-analytic replication using LIWC, DICTON, and validated linguistic-style measures	Study found that only about 11% of originally significant effects replicated, while all null results were reproduced. Most linguistic cues, including entrepreneurial, virtuous, money-salient, concrete, precise, interactive, and distant styles, showed no effect in this context. Only competitive aggressiveness partially replicated	Study findings show that linguistic-style effects from 2017 to 2020 crowdfunding research do not generalize to university-based campaigns. Strong identity ties between donors and creators reduce the impact of linguistic persuasion cues, underscoring the need for contextual replications to assess robustness and boundary conditions
Katz (1993)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory &amp; Practice</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Self-employment and satisfaction	Eden (1975), Naughton (1987b), Naughton (1987a)	Quality of employment survey results and Quality of Working Conditions survey	Quality of employment survey results and Quality of Working Conditions survey, n = 1,092	Confirmed higher job satisfaction among self-employed compared to wage workers, while addressing inconsistencies in satisfaction for managerial roles. Highlighted data handling and coding issues in original studies	Reinforced satisfaction differences favoring self-employment and emphasized the need for standardized methodologies in replication
Lee et al. (2019)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Strategy	Entrepreneurial Orientation	Covin and Slevin (1989)	Survey data, manufacturing SMEs, n = 161	Survey, data from U.S. executives, n = 119	Study 1 replicated EO-performance findings in diverse firm sizes and industries. Study 2 extended findings to Chinese public firms using objective EO measures. Both studies confirmed that EO positively impacts firm performance, particularly in hostile environments.	Confirmed EO-performance relationship, emphasizing diverse replication methods (e.g. survey and secondary data) for generalizability

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Marklin et al. (2022)	<i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i>	Strategy	Firm performance	Miller et al. (2007)	Archival panel data on 1,237 publicly traded U.S. firms (1994–2000), categorizing firms into lone-founder, family, and nonfamily firms	Chinese publicly listed firms included on the Shanghai Stock Exchange or Shenzhen Stock Exchange between 2008 and 2015, $n = 13,623$ firm-year observations from $n = 2,040$ listed companies	Replication confirms that lone-founder firms outperform other firm types. Additionally, family firms outperform nonfamily firms at high levels of family ownership. State-owned enterprises underperform all other groups	Provides empirical generalization of founder-type effects in the Chinese institutional context. Highlights that family firm performance benefits from higher ownership and those institutional differences shape firm outcomes
McKelvie et al. (2021)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Growth attitudes	Wiklund et al. (2003)	small business managers in Sweden, $n = 1,470$	small business managers in United States, $n = 751$	Comparing United States and Swedish contexts. Found differences in motivational drivers, with U.S. managers emphasizing financial gains and Swedish managers prioritizing non-economic outcomes	Demonstrated the importance of cultural and institutional contexts in shaping growth motivations, supporting the relevance of cross-contextual replication studies
Obschonka et al. (2013)	<i>Journal of Vocational Behavior</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Antisocial Behavior	Zhang et al. (2009)	survey data from $n = 165$ men from the United States	IDA data from Sweden, $n \approx 1,000$ Study start: 1965 (age 10) Follow-up ages: 10, 13, 15, 16, 43 (women), 47 (men) Duration: 37 years Dropout rate: Low ( $\leq 5\%$ at school age, 11% women, 18% men at last follow-up) Data sources: Surveys, official records (criminality)	Confirmed adolescent antisocial rule-breaking as a predictor of entrepreneurship in men	Strengthened evidence for the unillness hypothesis with richer datasets and broader research questions. Highlighted limitations of self-reported data in the original study

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Park et al. (2016)	<i>Strategic Management Journal</i>	Financing	Use of signals for IPOs	Certo et al. (2001), Filatotchev and Bishop (2002), Cohen and Dean (2005)	Certo et al. (2001): Examined 368 U.S. IPOs of firms aged 10 years or younger, issued between 1990 and 1998, Filatotchev and Bishop (2002): Analyzed 251 IPOs listed in the United Kingdom during 1999–2000, Cohen and Dean (2005): Studied 121 U.S. IPOs of firms aged 15 years or younger, issued between 1998 and 1999	Conducted replications of all three studies using a sample of U.S. IPO firms that filed registration (S-1) statements with the SEC between January 2010 and May 2013. Period was selected because, after 2009, significant changes occurred in how firms, consumers, and investors exchange and access information	None of the three original results were confirmed in replication study. Oversubscription consistently predicted underpricing, many governance variables had no significant effect. Changes in technology, regulation, and information access may have reduced the signaling value of leadership and board variables	IPO underpricing is complex and context-dependent; governance signals found in older studies may no longer hold in modern, information-rich IPO markets. Future research should focus on variables that reflect today's investor information environment and control for demand-side effects like oversubscription
Peterson et al. (2024)	<i>Global Journal of Entrepreneurship</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Psychological Capital	Sebora and Tanttuoskula (2011)	n = 224 junior (16.5%) and senior (83.5%) undergraduate students (Midwest, U.S.)	n = 94, 94 university students enrolled in entrepreneurship courses (Upper Midwest, U.S.)	PsyCap predicts entrepreneurial and effectuation intentions, driven primarily by resilience	Replicates the positive PsyCap–entrepreneurial intention relationship and shows that resilience primarily drives this effect, clarifying the mechanism behind the aggregate PsyCap finding and its link to effectuation-oriented thinking

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Raffie and Feng (2014)	<i>Academy of Management Journal</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Decision to become an entrepreneur	Folta et al. (2010); Petrova (2012)	Folta et al. (2010): 44,613 Swedish male wage earners (ages 25–50) in knowledge-intensive sectors, followed longitudinally from 1994 to 2001 using matched employer–employee registry data; Petrova (2012): GEM	NLSY79 longitudinal survey (U.S.; n = 5,299 individuals for entry models; n = 1,093 for survival models)	Replications generally support prior findings that risk-averse and low-CSE individuals prefer hybrid entry and that staged entry via hybrid entrepreneurship improves survival	Replicates and extends prior hybrid entrepreneurship studies using a different large-scale longitudinal dataset, confirming the robustness of key effects while showing that staged entry enhances survival, particularly for experienced entrepreneurs
Rodriguez-Peña (2023)	<i>Journal of International Entrepreneurship</i>	Corporate entrepreneurship	Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance	Ambad and Abdul Wahab (2017)	n = 130 publicly listed firms (Bursa Malaysia, main market)	n = 202 subsidiaries of Colombian business groups	Findings show that EO has a strong positive effect on profitability, while CV has a strong negative effect. For firm growth, EO is positive and CV is negative, but neither effect is statistically significant. ED does not moderate the EO–profitability or CV–growth relationships	Replicates prior evidence on the positive EO–profitability relationship in large firms from emerging economies, while showing that corporate venturing negatively relates to performance and that environmental dynamism does not act as a boundary condition. Extends earlier findings by demonstrating the context-specific nature of corporate entrepreneurship effects and cautions against generalizing moderation effects across settings.

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Runst et al. (2018)	<i>Empirical Economics</i>	Public Policy	Entry Regulation	Rostaan-Afshar (2014)	German microcensus data, focus: craftsmen, n = 22,1951	German Confederation of Skilled Crafts (ZDH), n = 170,398	Partially confirmed original findings that deregulation increased entry rates, with additional evidence on regional and long-term variations	Highlights industry-specific and external factors like unemployment and economic shocks, recommending context-aware replication studies
Sambharya and Musteen (2014)	<i>Journal of International Entrepreneurship</i>	Environment	Institutional environment	Replicates prior GEM-based institutional studies examining regulatory, normative, and cognitive influences on opportunity- and necessity-driven entrepreneurship, such as Bowen and De Clercq (2008); Van Stel et al. (2007); McMullen et al. (2008); Stenholm et al. (2013)	Various GEM-based samples	n = 43 countries (GEM data)	Institutional environment affects entrepreneurship differently across necessity and opportunity contexts, with cognitive institutions playing a central role	Synthesizes and replicates prior GEM-based findings by showing that institutional effects on entrepreneurship differ by entrepreneurial type, highlighting the central role of cognitive (cultural) institutions
Schneck et al. (2021)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Strategy	Firm growth	Coad et al. (2016)	UK firm panel data on sales growth trajectories of young firms	German administrative panel data (895,459 young firms that submitted turnover tax preregistration forms, 2001–2011)	Confirms that growth paths are erratic and few young firms sustain high growth. Persistently growing firms tend to invest more at founding and are commonly in manufacturing	Supports original findings on the unpredictability of new firm growth and extends them by identifying key characteristics of persistent growers

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Seong and Parker (2024)	<i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	Gender	Gendered wording in job adverts	Gaucher et al. (2011)	118 Canadian-born female university students	Female individuals, 18–25 years old, fluent in English, and residing in Canada or United States, $n = 165$ and $n = 425$ participants for the exact replication and empirical generalization via Prolific Academic	Masculine wording reduces job appeal among women in start-up ads, but not in ads for established firms.	Replication successful in start-up context only. Highlights a boundary condition: gendered wording deters women particularly in entrepreneurial (start-up) settings.
Shirokova et al. (2022)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	ADHD	Yu et al. (2019)	Two samples for two studies: (a) online survey data from YPO in the United States, $n = 222$ ; (b) SABI/AMADEUS to identify entrepreneurs in wine industry in Spain, $n = 122$	survey SMEs in Russia, $n = 610$	Challenged the original finding linking hyperactivity with EO, but confirmed the positive association between EO and firm performance. Found partial mediation of EO in ADHD-performance relationships, diverging from the original results	Replication highlights cultural/national differences and dimensional nuances in EO, suggesting further robustness testing is necessary
Short and Anglin (2019)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Crowdfunding	Crowdfunding	Allison et al. (2013), Anglin et al. (2014), Moss et al. (2015)	Allison et al. (2013): $n = 8,204$ loans from Kiwa; Anglin et al. (2014): $n = 13,000$ entrepreneurial narratives from Kiwa; Moss et al. (2015): $n = 400,000$ loans from Kiwa	$n = 1,000$ campaigns from Kickstarter (reward-based crowdfunding)	Successfully replicated some findings from Allison et al. (2013) and Anglin et al. (2014) but failed to replicate Moss et al. (2015)	Emphasizes challenges in generalizing crowdfunding findings across contexts and recommends cognitive psychology approaches for deeper insights

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Short et al. (2009)	<i>Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal</i>	Strategy	Firm and industry effects	For example, Rumelt (1991); McGahan and Porter (1997); Mauri and Michaels (1998)	Various samples to study the association of firm and industry effects on performance	Two samples: $n = 7256$ young Swedish firms, $n = 12,692$ established firms	<p>Finds that industry effects play a limited role in explaining new venture performance, especially survival. Industry membership matters less for sales and sales growth in new ventures than in established firms. Post hoc analyses show that firm size and funding are positively related to new venture sales and survival</p>	Demonstrates that early venture performance is shaped primarily by firm-level factors rather than industry context. Extends the firm-vs.-industry effects debate in entrepreneurship and highlights the central role of the liabilities of newness and smallness
Skorodiyevskiy et al. (2025)	<i>Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice</i>	Characteristics	Human and social capital	Davidsson and Honig (2003)	Swedish PSED; 380 nascent entrepreneurs from an initial sample of $n = 961$ eligible individuals drawn from a registry of Swedish adults with landline phones; data from initial and 18-month follow-up interviews	<p>Study 1: checking of analysis by using same dataset (Sweden PSED), same methods, own code.</p> <p>Study 2: reanalysis of data by using same dataset but new control variable (initial stage of development).</p> <p>Study 3: conceptual extension by U.S. PSED II, similar variables and methods</p>	<p>Study 1: mostly same results, minor deviation, study 2: results largely hold, some effects reduced.</p> <p>study 3: HC stronger in U.S., SC differs by context; bonding SC stronger in Sweden</p>	<p>Supports robustness of key effects from D&amp;H, highlights contextual differences in HC and SC importance, and cautions against simplistic inclusion of control variables that may mediate key relationships</p>

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Slater and Narver (2000)	<i>Journal of Business Research</i>	Strategy	Market orientation	Narver and Slater (1990)	n = 140 business units (commodity products businesses and noncommodity businesses)	n = 53 single-business corporations of SBUs of multibusiness corporations in three western cities by teams of MBA students from Strategic Management and Marketing Strategy classes	Replication confirms a positive relationship between Market Orientation and business profitability; effect size stronger than in the original study ( $\beta = .662$ vs. $.501$ ); correlation nearly identical ( $.362$ vs. $.345$ ); no significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation and profitability; underscoring the value of replication for validating core marketing-strategy relationships	Replications strengthen confidence in the Market Orientation-performance link; show its generalizability across industries, and address the original study's design limits. They also find that Entrepreneurial Orientation does not predict profitability, underscoring the value of replication for validating core marketing-strategy relationships
Stephan et al. (2023)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial motivation	Psychological well-being of hybrid entrepreneurs	Ardianti et al. (2022)	UKHLS, 2009-2019; n = 2,241 hybrid entrepreneurs	German SOEP, 1999-2015; n = 56,420 individuals, incl. n = 3,093 hybrid entrepreneurs	Study 1 replicates key patterns: hybrid entrepreneurs report higher well-being than wage employees but lower than full-time entrepreneurs. Studies 2 and 3 extend the analysis, showing mediating effects of income and job satisfaction, and variation by gender and motivation	Study 1 replicates key patterns: hybrid entrepreneurs report higher well-being than wage employees but lower than full-time entrepreneurs. Studies 2 and 3 extend the analysis, showing mediating effects of income and job satisfaction, and variation by gender and motivation
Stutz et al. (2022)	<i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i>	Family	Credibility in family firms	Hsueh and Gomez-Solorzano (2019)	Experimental design testing credibility of CSR reporting in family vs. non-family firms	5 studies with German participants; Study 1 mirrors original, Studies 2-5 extend with new variables (benevolence), manipulation checks, stakeholder roles	Study 1 does not replicate original findings. Extensions find that perceived family firm status boosts credibility via benevolence perception and increases stakeholder behavioral intentions	Family firm signal enhances CSR credibility due to perceived benevolence. Highlights importance of manipulation checks and stakeholder context in family firm experiments

(continued)

**Table 3.** (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Sullivan (2015)	<i>Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship</i>	Networking	Network Ties	Sullivan and Ford (2014)	Survey, U.S. entrepreneurs identified via records on the State of Florida Department of Corporations website and assembled into a database, n = 174	Survey, PSED-I, n = 59	Network structure and content serve as important resources for entrepreneurs, confirming their importance in venture development	Replication was successful but highlighted the need for larger samples, as only 2 out of 5 hypotheses were supported. The study emphasizes the value of using a different theoretical lens in replications
van Dijk et al. (2025)	<i>Research Policy</i>	Networking	Entrepreneurial ecosystem	Coad and Srhoj (2023)	Regional panel data from Croatia and Slovenia (2002–2017), using two measures of HGF	Study 1: Firm-level panel data, Netherlands, 2006 to 2021, study 2: Proxies for productive entrepreneurship—employment-based HGFs, sales-based HGFs, innovative start-ups (potential HGFs), uses employment- and sales-based HGFs;	Contrary to the findings of the original study, study 1 finds strong persistence of productive entrepreneurship in the Netherlands. Study 2 shows that ecosystem size and quality significantly moderate this persistence	Refutes Coad and Srhoj's (2023) conclusion. Shows that persistence does exist in high-quality and larger EEs. Strengthens the framework by explaining when persistence is more likely and guides nuanced policy
van Hugen et al. (2021)	<i>Journal of Business Venturing Insights</i>	Entrepreneurial Motivation	Entrepreneurial well-being	Carree and Verheul (2012)	Survey, n = 1,107, Dutch founders	Survey, n = 244, Flemish founders	Extended the study by incorporating psychological flexibility as a determinant of entrepreneurial well-being. Identified education, income, work-life balance, and work satisfaction as key drivers	Advanced understanding of well-being in entrepreneurship by emphasizing psychological flexibility and highlighting challenges in integrating diverse well-being measures

(continued)

Table 3. (continued)

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Verheul et al. (2016)	<i>European Journal of Epidemiology</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	ADHD	Verheul et al. (2015)	Population-based data from the STAGE cohort (Swedish Twin Registry), $n = 7,208$	Dutch student sample from the GUESS dataset, $n = 13,112$	In the Swedish sample, general ADHD symptoms and especially hyperactivity were positively associated with self-employment. No association was found for attention-deficit symptoms. The positive association for hyperactivity was replicated in the Dutch student sample	Confirms a robust association between hyperactivity symptoms and self-employment across different populations, supporting the idea of a "bright side" of certain ADHD traits in entrepreneurship
Weismeier-Sammer (2011)	<i>Journal of Family Business Strategy</i>	Family	Family Firms	Kellermanns and Eddleston (2006)	Survey, $n = 126$ family members from $n = 74$ family firms	Survey, $n = 413$ Australian family firms	Confirmed most findings, including the importance of willingness to change and technological opportunity recognition. Diverged on the role of strategic planning	Stresses the influence of firm size on entrepreneurial behavior and highlights strategic planning differences between small and large family firms
Wisnans et al. (2020)	<i>Applied Psychology: An International Review</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	ADHD	Yu et al. (2019)	online survey data from YPO in the United States, $n = 222$ ; SABI/ AMADEUS to identify entrepreneurs in wine industry in Spain, $n = 122$	French small business owners, $n = 802$ SME owner	Found ADHD symptoms related differently to EO dimensions. Hyperactivity linked to EO but no total association found. Highlighted reliability issues with ADHD scales	Emphasized the critical role of operationalization in replicating studies on ADHD and EO. Highlighted challenges in constructing cumulative knowledge with lower-reliability constructs

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Replication study	Journal	Babson track	Theme	Original study	Data & sample original study	Data & sample replication study	Findings	Conclusion
Wisnans et al. (2021)	<i>Management Review Quarterly</i>	Entrepreneurial Cognition	ADHD	Wisnans et al. (2020), Yu et al. (2019)	Yu et al. (2019): online survey data from YPO in the United States, n = 222; SABI/ AMADEUS to identify entrepreneurs in wine industry in Spain, n = 1227; Wisnans et al. (2020): French small business owners, n = 802 SME owner	n = 255 Japanese small business owners	<p>Finds ADHD positively linked to EO in Japan, driven mainly by risk-taking and partly by innovativeness. Hyperactivity relates positively to EO, though the underlying EO subdimensions differ from Western studies.</p> <p>Attention-deficit predicts EO in PLS-SEM but not OLS, diverging from prior null or negative results. Mental (not physical) hyperactivity is positively associated with EO</p>	Demonstrated a positive association between ADHD and EO, replicating and extending prior findings in a culturally distinct (Japanese) entrepreneurial context. Highlighted cultural and methodological nuances in how ADHD symptoms relate to EO, underlining the importance of context

Note. ADHD = Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; ASR = Automatic Speech Recognition; CSR = Corporate Social Responsibility; CV = competitive velocity; ED = Environmental dynamism; EEI = Electrical and Electronics Industry; HGF = high-growth firms; HILDA = Household, Income and Labor Dynamics in Australia; IDA = Individual Development and Adaptation; MIDUS = Midlife Development in the United States; MIR = Management International Review; NLSY = National Longitudinal Survey of Youth; OLCPT = Open language Chief Personality Tool; PLS-SEM = Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling; PSED = Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics; RCT = Randomized Controlled Trial; SBU = Strategic Business Unit; SEC = Securities and Exchange Commission; SME = Small and Medium-sized Enterprise; SOEP = Socio-Economic Panel; SOEP-IS = Socio-Economic Panel's Innovation Sample; UKHLS = UK Household Longitudinal Study; VC = Venture Capital; YPO = Young Presidents' Organization; ZDH = Zentralverband des Deutschen Handwerks.

shaped theoretical development and empirical inquiry within the field (Aguinis & Glavas, 2012; Ramos-Rodríguez & Ruíz-Navarro, 2004).

Our search included the term *\*entrepreneur\** across all fields (title, abstract, keywords), and was limited to English-language publications, yielding an initial dataset of 637,829 results. To enhance the quality and relevance of our analysis, we refined the search to include only peer-reviewed articles, resulting in 429,468 studies. Further narrowing our scope, we focused on articles published in journals listed on the FT50 list, a benchmark for high-quality academic publications. This step reduced the dataset to 11,967 studies. We then filtered the results to studies cited more than 1,000 times as of March 2025, as citation counts are a widely accepted proxy for scholarly impact and relevance within a field (Ferreira et al., 2015; Reader & Watkins, 2006; Xu et al., 2018). This procedure reduced the number of studies to 213. We manually reviewed all 213 studies and retained only those explicitly focused on entrepreneurship phenomena ( $n = 61$ ). We classified these 61 studies into conceptual and empirical categories and retained only the empirical studies ( $n = 33$ ), given their value in meta-analytic analyses. Two coders independently assigned each study to one of the BCERC tracks, resulting in an initial agreement rate of 94.3%. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached. However, while our analysis focused on empirical studies amenable to exact replication, our literature review reveals that many of the most influential articles in entrepreneurship are either conceptual or based on qualitative empirical work (e.g., Baker et al., 2023).

For these 33 highly cited empirical studies, we then conducted two further analytical steps. First, we examined whether their focal relationships had already been subjected to at least two exact replication attempts. In case studies that had not yet undergone such replication, we propose conducting exact replications and reanalyses of the original data, given their importance for strengthening the robustness of foundational empirical findings. Second, building on Tsang and Kwan's (1999) framework, we identify an additional replication design suitable for these studies and, for each study, develop an illustrative research question to underline what targeted replication efforts could focus on (see Table 4).

Next, we map the most influential studies to the 18 BCERC research tracks and contrast them with the number of replications in each track to illustrate where replication has occurred and where additional efforts are needed (Table 5). The analysis of the distribution across research categories shows that the largest share of studies falls within the strategy category (18.2%; 6 studies), followed by entrepreneurial cognition (15.2%; 5 studies). International entrepreneurship and networking are each represented by four studies (12.1% each), while crowdfunding and entrepreneurial motivation each account for three studies (9.1% each). Characteristics of entrepreneurs and corporate entrepreneurship are each represented by two studies (6.1% each). In contrast, family, financing, gender in entrepreneurship, and public policy are each represented by a single study (3.0% each), making them the least represented tracks. No highly cited studies were found in Ethics, Research Methods, Social Entrepreneurship, Environment, Team & Governance, or Franchising. Consequently, relying solely on the 33 highly cited empirical studies identified through the >1,000-citation threshold would provide an imbalanced basis for identifying future replication opportunities within individual BCERC tracks, given their uneven distribution across research areas and the resulting underrepresentation of several tracks. To address this imbalance, we conducted a complementary track-level review using track-specific keyword searches in Scopus (see Table 6). For each BCERC track, we identified and screened the most highly cited articles based on citation counts. We excluded Research Methods, which typically did not examine substantive theoretical relationships that can be

**Table 4.** Avenues for Future Research.

Author(s)	# of Citations	Track	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Covin and Slevin (1989)	3,849	Strategy	Yes	Yes	Do the original findings remain robust when the data are reanalyzed using contemporary analytical techniques? (Reanalysis of data)
Sarasvathy (2001)	3,769	Entrepreneurial Cognition	No	Yes	Does effectuation theory hold in more diverse, non-U.S. entrepreneurial populations beyond the original small and homogeneous sample? (Empirical generalization)
Miller (1983)	3,563	Corporate Entrepreneurship	No	Yes	Do Miller's original firm typologies remain applicable when tested in contemporary, global, and digitally oriented firms? (Generalization and extension)
Krueger et al. (2000)	3,533	Entrepreneurial Cognition	No	Yes	Do intention-based models predict entrepreneurship similarly when applied to non-student samples and alternative measurement approaches? (Empirical generalization)
Shane (2000)	3,097	Entrepreneurial Cognition	No	Yes	Do the original opportunity discovery mechanisms apply equally across different industries and venture contexts, including high-tech sectors? (Conceptual extension)
Davidsson and Honig (2003)	3,059	Entrepreneurial Cognition	Yes	Yes	Has the relationship between social and human capital and nascent entrepreneurship changed with the rise of digital networking platforms? (Conceptual extension)
Mollick (2014)	2,702	Crowdfunding	No	Yes	Do Mollick's original findings on crowdfunding success generalize across different platform types, industries, and national contexts? (Empirical generalization)

(continued)

**Table 4.** (continued)

Author(s)	# of Citations	Track	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Liñán and Chen (2009)	2,359	Entrepreneurial Motivation	No	Yes	Does the Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire retain its validity across newer venture types, regions, and post-pandemic entrepreneurial contexts? (Generalization and extension)
Rauch et al. (2009)	2,209	Strategy	No	Yes	Does the EO–performance relationship identified in the original study persist across different industries and more recent entrepreneurial environments? (Empirical generalization)
Peng and Luo (2000)	2,201	Networking	No	Yes	Do the original relationships between managerial ties and firm performance hold in different countries and under contemporary networking conditions? (Generalization and extension)
Zahra et al. (2000)	2,073	International	No	Yes	Do the original internationalization mechanisms apply in entrepreneurial contexts shaped by digital trade and platform-based market entry? (Conceptual extension)
Wiklund and Shepherd (2005)	2,035	Strategy	Yes	Yes	Do the configurational EO–performance profiles identified in the original study remain valid in contemporary entrepreneurial settings? (Conceptual extension)
Lumpkin and Dess (2001)	1,988	Strategy	No	Yes	Do the original dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation operate similarly in more collaborative, dynamic, and regulated environments? (Generalization and extension)
Autio et al. (2000)	1,971	International	No	Yes	Do early internationalization advantages persist when ventures expand through digital channels and global value chains? (Empirical generalization)

(continued)

**Table 4.** (continued)

Author(s)	# of Citations	Track	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Chen et al. (1998)	1,970	Characteristics of Entrepreneurs	No	Yes	Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy exhibit similar effects across different demographic groups and contemporary entrepreneurial contexts? (Generalization and extension)
Yli-Renko et al. (2002)	1,961	Networking	No	Yes	Does the role of social capital in knowledge acquisition remain consistent across industries and different innovation settings? (Empirical generalization)
Baum et al. (2000)	1,867	Networking	No	Yes	Do the original relationships between alliance networks and venture performance hold when newer forms of partnerships are considered? (Conceptual extension)
Busenitz and Barney (1997)	1,726	Characteristics of Entrepreneurs	Yes	Yes	Do the cognitive bias mechanisms identified in the original study operate similarly across different entrepreneurial settings and populations? (Conceptual extension)
Miller and Friesen (1982)	1,673	Strategy	No	Yes	Does the conservative versus entrepreneurial firm distinction remain meaningful across modern organizational forms and innovation models? (Generalization and extension)
Belleflamme et al. (2014)	1,644	Crowdfunding	No	Yes	Do the original findings on crowdfunding model preferences generalize across different platforms, industries, and time periods? (Empirical generalization)
Cooper et al. (1994)	1,552	Financing	Yes	Yes	Does the relationship between initial capital and firm performance remain robust across industries, regions, and economic cycles? (Empirical generalization)

(continued)

Table 4. (continued)

Author(s)	# of Citations	Track	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Soutaris et al. (2007)	1,545	Entrepreneurial Motivation	No	Yes	Do the effects of entrepreneurship education persist when newer program formats and longer-term entrepreneurial outcomes are considered? (Conceptual extension)
Lounsbury and Glynn (2001)	1,494	Entrepreneurial Motivation	No	Yes	Does the relationship between entrepreneurial storytelling and resource acquisition hold across different cultural and institutional contexts? (Generalization and extension)
Lu and Beamish (2001)	1,479	International	No	Yes	Do the original findings on SME internationalization remain robust under contemporary market conditions and policy regimes? (Empirical generalization)
Maguire et al. (2004)	1,457	Public Policy	No	Yes	Do institutional entrepreneurship strategies identified in the original study apply in newer, more digitally mediated policy contexts? (Conceptual extension)
Wilson et al. (2007)	1,383	Gender in Entrepreneurship	No	Yes	Do gender differences in entrepreneurial intentions persist across different cultural, age, and national contexts? (Empirical generalization)
Arregle et al. (2007)	1,320	Family	No	Yes	Does the role of social capital operate similarly across family and non-family firms in different cultural settings? (Empirical generalization)
Zahra and Covin (1995)	1,284	Corporate Entrepreneurship	No	Yes	Do alternative definitions and measures of corporate entrepreneurship relate to performance in ways similar to the original study? (Conceptual extension)
Ahlers et al. (2015)	1,253	Crowdfunding	No	Yes	Do the original signaling mechanisms in crowdfunding remain relevant under evolving platform designs? (Conceptual extension)

(continued)

**Table 4.** (continued)

Author(s)	# of Citations	Track	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Unger et al. (2011)	1,246	Entrepreneurial Cognition	No	Yes	Do the relationships between human capital and entrepreneurial outcomes remain stable across time, industries, and economic conditions? (Generalization and extension)
Zott and Amit (2007)	1,160	Strategy	No	Yes	Does the business model–performance relationship generalize across different firm types and cultural contexts? (Empirical generalization)
Shane and Cable (2002)	1,141	Networking	No	Yes	Do the original network-based mechanisms for opportunity access hold when digital and social media ties are considered? (Conceptual extension)
Mueller and Thomas (2001)	1,127	International	No	Yes	Do the relationships between cultural dimensions and entrepreneurial traits persist across broader cultural, gender, and regional contexts? (Generalization and extension)

**Table 5.** Distribution of Existing and Recommended Replication Studies Across BCERC Tracks.

Babson track	Replication studies (in numbers)	Influential studies for future replication efforts (in numbers)
Characteristics of Entrepreneurs	2	2
Corporate Entrepreneurship	—	2
Crowdfunding	2	3
Entrepreneurial Cognition	11	5
Entrepreneurial Motivation	7	3
Environment	1	—
Ethics	—	—
Family	5	1
Financing	4	1
Franchising	—	—
Gender in Entrepreneurship	4	1
International	—	4
Networking	2	4
Public Policy	1	1
Research Methods	1	—
Social Entrepreneurship	—	—
Strategy	10	6
Team & Governance	1	—

subjected to relationship-level replication. Studies were retained if they were empirical, focused on entrepreneurs, and substantively aligned with the thematic scope of the respective track. From this pool, we selected the three most highly cited studies per track that had not already been included in the initial set of 33 influential studies. This approach enabled us to capture foundational empirical work across all tracks and to derive more balanced, track-specific directions for future replication efforts. Table 6 summarizes the resulting candidate studies, along with illustrative research questions and suitable research designs.

## Results

Our analysis of the most cited entrepreneurship studies and their replication status highlights key patterns and challenges in the field's approach to replication. While Table 5 indicates that replication activity is present across a wide range of BCERC tracks, too few of the field's foundational studies have been replicated, even though they are crucial for cumulative knowledge. This suggests that the core issue is not necessarily the distribution of replication across tracks but that the field's most influential studies have rarely been revisited. Notably, only five of the 33 most cited empirical studies have been replicated (Busenitz and Barney, 1997; Cooper et al., 1994; Covin & Slevin, 1989; Davidsson & Honig, 2003; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005).

This lack of replication of highly influential studies may reflect structural and cultural barriers that differ from the more general obstacles discussed earlier. For instance, replications of widely cited studies might be perceived as making them harder to publish unless substantial methodological innovation is added (Bergh et al., 2017; Earp & Trafimow, 2015; Hubbard & Armstrong, 1994). Moreover, researchers may be especially hesitant to re-examine findings that have become foundational to the field or that are associated with

**Table 6.** Avenues for Future Research across BCERC Tracks.

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Characteristics of Entrepreneurs	1,603	Gimeno et al. (1997)	No	Yes	Do the relationships between entrepreneurs' human capital-based performance thresholds (e.g., alternative employment opportunities, psychic income, and switching costs) and new venture survival replicate in contemporary entrepreneurial contexts characterized by lower entry barriers, more flexible labor markets, and alternative career options such as hybrid and gig employment? (Empirical generalization)
	984	Arenius and Minniti (2005)	No	Yes	Do the relationships identified using early GEM data persist in post-2002 samples, given structural changes in entrepreneurial motives and institutional environments? (Empirical generalization)
	848	Cooper et al. (1988)	No	Yes	Does the detachment between entrepreneurs' early-stage confidence judgments and objective indicators of preparedness persist when entrepreneurial optimism is elicited using structured self-assessments that distinguish between confidence level and judgment calibration? (Conceptual Extension)
Corporate Entrepreneurship	1,781	Ahuja and Lampert (2001)	No	Yes	Do the organizational pathologies that inhibit breakthrough innovation (familiarity, maturity, and propinquity traps) also constrain breakthrough invention in other industries, and can experimentation with novel, emerging, and pioneering technologies similarly help firms overcome these constraints when technological search is operationalized

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
	1,003	Zahra (1991)	No	Yes	differently? (Generalization and extension) Do the relationships between environmental, strategic, and organizational antecedents of corporate entrepreneurship, and their association with firm financial performance, remain robust when reanalyzed using alternative and more advanced analytical techniques? (Reanalysis of data)
	832	Zahra (1996)	No	Yes	Do the relationships between corporate governance structures (e.g., executive ownership, institutional ownership, and board composition) and corporate entrepreneurship persist when corporate entrepreneurship is conceptualized and measured using more differentiated indicators, and when governance incentives are modeled more explicitly? (Conceptual extension)
Crowdfunding	814	Colombo et al. (2015)	No	Yes	Do the self-reinforcing funding dynamics triggered by proponents' internal social capital also emerge on other crowdfunding platforms, or is this mechanism contingent on platform-specific community features such as reciprocity norms and visibility of prior support? (Empirical generalization)
	752	Agrawal et al. (2015)	No	Yes	Does the differential responsiveness of socially connected and distant funders to cumulative funding signals persist when social connectedness is measured more directly and dynamically, rather than proxied by geographic distance, across different stages of the

(continued)

**Table 6.** (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Entrepreneurial Cognition	685	Burtch et al. (2013)	No	Yes	investment process? (Conceptual extension) Is the attenuation of social proximity effects after the first investment indeed driven by search-related mechanisms rather than monitoring activities, when search and monitoring are explicitly distinguished in funders' decision processes? (Conceptual extension) Do the differences in opportunity prototypes between novice and experienced entrepreneurs persist across different entrepreneurial contexts? (Empirical generalization)
	1,019	Baron and Ensley (2006)	No	Yes	How do contemporary entrepreneurs conceptualize business models in digitally intensive and uncertain environments, and do the core dimensions identified in prior work persist, transform, or expand when business models are treated as dynamic cognitive and entrepreneurial tools rather than static representations? (Generalization and extension)
	692	George and Bock (2011)	No	Yes	Do the three dimensions of entrepreneurial alertness—scanning and search, association and connection, and evaluation and judgment—also characterize opportunity recognition in contemporary entrepreneurial contexts? (Empirical generalization)
Entrepreneurial Motivation	730	Tang et al. (2012)	No	Yes	Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy continue to fully mediate the effects of learning experiences, prior entrepreneurial exposure, and risk propensity on entrepreneurial intentions in contemporary and more diverse
	2,110	Zhao et al. (2005)	Yes	Yes	

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
	1,051	Oosterbeek et al. (2010)	No	Yes	entrepreneurial contexts beyond MBA student populations? (Empirical generalization) Under which conditions does entrepreneurship education fail to enhance entrepreneurial skills and intentions, and what contextual or individual factors may explain null or negative effects? (Conceptual extension)
	964	McGee et al. (2009)	No	Yes	Does the multidimensional structure of entrepreneurial self-efficacy identified in prior work also characterize entrepreneurial actors in contemporary and diverse entrepreneurial contexts? (Empirical generalization)
Environment	907	Aragón-Correa et al. (2008)	No	Yes	Do the organizational capabilities identified in the original study (shared vision, stakeholder management, and strategic proactivity) continue to explain SMEs' environmental strategies in more recent contexts? (Conceptual extension)
	794	Naman & Slevin (1993)	No	Yes	Do the original dimensions of fit (entrepreneurial style, organizational structure, and mission strategy) continue to jointly explain firm performance in contemporary SME contexts? (Conceptual extension)
	778	Zahra (1993)	No	Yes	Do different environmental settings continue to be associated with distinct patterns of corporate innovation, venturing, and renewal activities? (Empirical generalization)
Ethics	250	Fassin et al. (2011)	No	Yes	Do small-business owner-managers in different institutional and cultural contexts similarly differentiate between concepts related to corporate social responsibility and business ethics,

(continued)

**Table 6.** (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
	209	Hechavarría et al. (2017)	No	Yes	despite ongoing conceptual ambiguity in the academic literature? (Empirical generalization) Do gender differences in entrepreneurs' economic, social, and environmental value creation goals, and their moderation by societal post-materialism, persist across different time periods and societal contexts or do changing social norms and sustainability discourses alter these patterns? (Empirical generalization)
	162	Bacq et al. (2016)	No	Yes	Do the distinctive entrepreneurial profiles of social entrepreneurs, including their relatively low confidence and involvement, persist across different countries and more recent periods? (Empirical generalization)
Family	902	Zahra (2005)	No	Yes	How do different types of entrepreneurial risk taking relate to family involvement and CEO founder tenure when alternative governance logics beyond agency theory are considered? (Conceptual extension)
	900	Naldi et al. (2007)	No	Yes	Does the negative relationship between risk taking and firm performance in family firms persist when alternative model specifications and performance measures are applied? (Reanalysis of data)
	872	Zahra et al. (2004)	No	Yes	Do the relationships between organizational culture dimensions and entrepreneurship differ across institutional contexts, and does the role of family involvement in shaping these effects

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Financing	1,254	Li et al. (2008)	No	Yes	Do political embeddedness similarly enhance firm performance by facilitating access to resources and legal protection in different institutional contexts, and how does its role vary with the strength of formal market institutions? (Generalization and extension)
	1,016	Kaplan and Strömberg (2003)	No	Yes	Do alternative early-stage investors allocate cash flow and control rights in similar ways as venture capitalists, or do different investor types rely on distinct contracting logics? (Generalization and extension)
	997	Baum and Silvermam (2004)	No	Yes	Do the conclusions regarding venture capitalists' scouting versus coaching roles depend on how startup characteristics and performance outcomes are operationalized and compared? (Checking of Analysis)
Franchising	317	Sorenson and Sørensen (2001)	No	Yes	Does the trade-off between experimentation and knowledge diffusion associated with different governance forms persist in contemporary multi-unit organizations, and how do changes in coordination and learning technologies alter this balance? (Generalization and extension)
	194	Kaufmann and Dant (1996)	No	Yes	Do the reported growth advantages of multi-unit franchising remain when alternative measures of growth and franchising intensity are used? (Reanalysis of data)
	174	Norton (1988)	No	Yes	Do agency and informational incentives similarly explain the prevalence of franchise contracts

(continued)

**Table 6.** (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Gender in Entrepreneurship	847	Gupta et al. (2009)	No	Yes	across industries and regions beyond those originally examined? (Empirical generalization) Are the observed gender-stereotype patterns in entrepreneurial intentions consistent across different demographic groups? (Empirical generalization)
	796	Langowitz and Minniti (2007)	No	Yes	Which specific perceptual variables are most strongly associated with women's entrepreneurial propensity, and do these perceptions differ in their relative importance? (Conceptual extension)
	675	Shinnar et al. (2012)	No	Yes	Do different types of perceived barriers relate differently to entrepreneurial intentions for men and women? (Conceptual extension)
International	2,175	Knight and Cavusgil (2004)	No	Yes	Do the reported associations between orientations, strategies, and international success remain when alternative operationalizations are used? (Checking of analysis)
	715	Coviello and Munro (1995)	No	Yes	Do different types of network relationships play distinct roles at different stages of early internationalization? (Conceptual extension)
	677	Thomas and Mueller (2000)	No	Yes	Do cross-cultural differences in entrepreneurial characteristics persist when alternative personality traits associated with entrepreneurship are examined? (Conceptual extension)
Networking	1,141	Birley (1985)	No	Yes	Does the relative reliance on informal vs. formal networks during the start-up process differ

(continued)

Table 6. (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
	861	Brüderl and Preisendörfer (1998)	No	Yes	across types of entrepreneurs or venture growth intentions? (Conceptual extension) Do different types of network support (e.g., emotional, informational, financial) relate differently to the survival and growth of new ventures? (Conceptual extension)
	715	Coviello and Munro (1995)	No	Yes	Do networks similarly shape international market choice and entry modes in entrepreneurial firms beyond high-technology sectors, and does the role of early network relationships vary accordingly? (Generalization and extension)
Public Policy	1,080	Shane (2009)	No	Yes	Where do different types of new ventures differ in terms of their growth and employment potential? (Conceptual extension)
	921	Wennekers et al. (2005)	No	Yes	Does the concentration of job creation and growth among a small subset of start-ups persist across different regions and time periods? (Empirical generalization)
	757	O'Shea et al. (2005)	No	Yes	Do the resource and capability attributes associated with university spinoff activity identified in earlier studies also predict spinoff creation in more recent periods and outside the U.S. context? (Empirical generalization)
Social Entrepreneurship	548	Hockerts (2017)	No	Yes	Do the antecedents of social entrepreneurial intentions identified in student samples generalize to post-education populations? (Empirical generalization)
	533	Parhankangas and Renko (2017)	Yes	Yes	Do the reported differences in the importance of linguistic style for social vs. commercial

(continued)

**Table 6.** (continued)

Track	# of Citations	Authors	Already replicated?	Exact replication required	Research questions and designs beyond exact replications
Strategy	526	Hwee Nga and Shamuganathan (2010)	No	Yes	crowdfunding campaigns persist when alternative linguistic features or text-analytic approaches are applied? (Reanalysis of data) Are the personality traits associated with social entrepreneurial intentions also related to actual social entrepreneurial engagement? (Generalization and extension)
	1,752	Eisenhardt and Schoonhoven (1996)	No	Yes	Do the strategic and social drivers of alliance formation identified persist in more recent industry contexts? (Empirical generalization)
	1,372	Zhou et al. (2005)	No	Yes	Does the relationship between strategic orientations and different types of breakthrough innovation extend to contemporary innovation environments? (Empirical generalization)
Team and Governance	922	Covin et al. (2006)	No	Yes	Does the positive relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm sales growth persist in more recent organizational and strategic contexts? (Empirical generalization)
	248	Kor and Misangyi (2008)	No	Yes	Does the experience-supplementing role of external directors generalize to other governance structures and stages of entrepreneurial firms? (Generalization and extension)
	210	Boeker and Wiltbank (2005)	No	Yes	Do the growth-related and governance-related predictors of top management team change identified in early studies of start-ups generalize to more recent founding cohorts? (Empirical generalization)

(continued)

prominent scholars, as doing so may be perceived as academically or professionally risky (Schwab & Starbuck, 2017).

Yet the limited replication of these studies is problematic precisely because they have shaped core theoretical frameworks in entrepreneurship. With so few efforts, it remains uncertain whether key insights, such as the validity of effectuation theory (Sarasvathy, 2008), the relationship between firm structure and entrepreneurial behavior (Miller, 1983), or the predictive power of entrepreneurial intentions models (Krueger et al., 2000), hold across contexts, time periods, and methods (Aguinis et al., 2017; Hubbard & Armstrong, 1994; Tsang & Kwan, 1999). Given this lack of cumulative evidence, the field is far from being able to draw conclusions about consensus or saturation in specific research areas.

To address this gap, we outline avenues for future replication and argue that both the 33 foundational studies and the most highly cited studies within each BCERC track warrant systematic attention. Addressing these studies systematically can strengthen the field's theoretical core and enhance its practical relevance.

### *Discussion and Recommendations for the Research Community*

On an overarching level, this research brief contributes to the entrepreneurship literature by providing the first systematic mapping of replication efforts in the field. Notably, we find only two studies have been replicated more than twice (Honig and Karlsson, 2004; Yu et al., 2019), which is problematic given meta-analytic guidance that a minimum of two independent exact replications are necessary to assess the reliability of an effect (Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001; Valentine et al., 2010).

Our analysis also reveals that replication designs in entrepreneurship have predominantly relied on extension designs rather than exact replications or reanalyses of original data. Combined with the fact that most highly influential studies in the field have never been replicated, this highlights a substantial gap in the evidence base needed to verify the robustness of widely accepted empirical findings in entrepreneurship. This is concerning given evidence from other disciplines, such as psychology, where large-scale replication initiatives have revealed substantial discrepancies between original and replicated effect sizes, sparking broader concerns about research reliability (Baker, 2015; Open Science Collaboration, 2015; Wicherts, 2011). Similar discussions have emerged in entrepreneurship research (Crawford et al., 2022; Markin et al., 2022; van Witteloostuijn et al., 2021), with some scholars suggesting that the field may face comparable challenges (Schwab & Starbuck, 2017; Short & Anglin, 2019). However, without a sufficient body of replications, the field lacks the empirical foundation needed to evaluate whether a replication crisis exists (e.g., Crawford et al., 2022).

Moreover, our analysis shows that replication efforts are unevenly distributed across research domains, suggesting that current patterns may reflect topic visibility, editorial expectations, or methodological convenience rather than systematic prioritization. This imbalance further points to potential structural barriers that discourage scholars from undertaking replication efforts.

Following the example of methods scholars who offer actionable guidance for specific areas of organizational research (e.g., Aguinis et al., 2020), we conclude our research brief by outlining recommendations aimed at improving the transparency and replicability of original studies. Below, we outline these recommendations for consideration by key stakeholders impacted by current dynamics surrounding replication in entrepreneurship (cf.

**Table 7.** Recommendations to Promote Replication in Entrepreneurship Research.

Stakeholder Group	Actionable Recommendation	Potential Benefits
Editors and reviewers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Motivate authors to perform exact replications and checking of analysis</li> <li>• Encourage additional replication efforts commensurate with core entrepreneurship topic areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves cumulative knowledge of the field and encourages increased rigor</li> <li>• Ensures knowledge across entrepreneurship field rather than certain studies or fashionable topics</li> </ul>
Journals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop infrastructure that promotes a culture for open data</li> <li>• Create a section that prioritizes replication of core entrepreneurship studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater transparency and trust in research findings</li> <li>• Increased awareness and citations of core entrepreneurial phenomena</li> </ul>
Universities, departments, and tenure committees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize and support replications for tenure where data are available</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce career risks, stigma, and protect authors</li> </ul>
Scholars	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop quantitative replications of qualitative designs</li> <li>• Use AI to support transparent and scalable replication</li> <li>• Encourage replication Efforts for doctoral students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allows for increased validation of core topics</li> <li>• Harnesses responsible AI use</li> <li>• Builds knowledge of the field and may lead to early academic success where threshold for theoretical contribution is lower</li> </ul>

Crawford et al., 2022). In the following, we describe the specific actions that various stakeholders can take to advance these recommendations (summarized in Table 7).

### *Recommendations for Editors and Reviewers*

Editors can play a central role in encouraging replications by explicitly welcoming replication submissions, creating special issues or dedicated tracks for replication research, and signaling that rigor, not only novelty, drives evaluation (Block, Fisch, et al., 2022; Stephan et al., 2023). This can motivate scholars to conduct both exact replications and reanalysis of data, thus contributing toward treating replication as a meaningful scientific contribution rather than merely copying prior work. Promoting a culture where replication is valued on par with theoretical innovation will reinforce the message that verifying knowledge is as important as generating it (Newbert et al., 2022; Stephan et al., 2023).

The historic lack of encouragement for replication has created a dynamic where many highly cited and foundational entrepreneurship studies have never been replicated, creating blind spots in the field's cumulative knowledge. We recommend that future replication efforts strategically target the most influential studies that have shaped the field but have not yet been subjected to rigorous empirical validation. We argue that prioritizing foundational studies, such as those with at least 1,000 citations, and expanding replication into underrepresented areas are not competing objectives, but complementary strategies.

Together, they ensure that replication serves both to verify the field's theoretical cornerstones and to broaden its empirical scope.

We encourage editors to explicitly invite replications in underexplored or methodologically challenging areas by setting up special issues focused on such topics, and by clarifying that theoretically meaningful replications are welcome regardless of subject matter. Authors can also play a role in counteracting implicit biases by prioritizing replication targets that are theoretically important but underexamined, rather than focusing only on phenomena with easily accessible data.

### **Recommendations for Journals**

Journals can serve as powerful repositories of knowledge that encourage and archive data to encourage transparency. While editors can encourage such efforts as leaders, scientific reporting is necessary but insufficient without access to original data (Crawford et al., 2022; Schwab & Starbuck, 2017). Even with documented procedures, the absence of publicly accessible datasets limits exact replications and follow-up analyses (Carpenter et al., 2011). Existing platforms such as the Open Science Framework and institutional repositories like ICPSR demonstrate how structured, long-term access enables replication and extension studies. The publicly available PSED datasets, for example, have facilitated multiple reanalyses and empirical refinements (Delmar & Shane, 2004; Kim et al., 2006; Reynolds, 2017).

Leading journals have begun adopting open-data policies: *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *Organization Science* and the *Journal of Applied Psychology* require authors to disclose data and methodological details wherever legally and ethically permissible, and to explain explicitly when constraints prevent data sharing. Such policies acknowledge that some data cannot legally or ethically be shared, yet set a default expectation of openness when possible. Authors similarly benefit from preparing reusable datasets, clearly documenting variables and procedures, and depositing materials in trusted repositories. Although open data cannot eliminate all barriers to replication, institutionalizing open access wherever feasible supports transparency, enables methodological scrutiny, and enhances cumulative science (Carpenter et al., 2011; Hardwicke et al., 2018).

Journals could benefit by having dedicated sections devoted to replicating key findings on particular topic. Mandating immediate data and code disclosure as a submission condition remains controversial, as scholars have raised concerns about opportunistic behavior during peer review (van Witteloostuijn et al., 2021), and note that legal, ethical, and proprietary constraints often preclude full disclosure (*Administrative Science Quarterly*, 2024). As an alternative, journals could explicitly prioritize replication studies that build on work where authors have already made data and code available or can grant reasonable access upon request. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* has been pioneering in the field of entrepreneurship with their research briefs section. Other journals would similarly benefit by creating sections that make the publication of replication efforts the norm rather than the exception.

Providing space for original authors to respond allows constructive contextualization of replication findings and reduces adversarial framing. Authors can help by responding openly and collegially to replication attempts, clarifying methodological choices, and avoiding defensive positioning. Exchanges similar to the *Academy of Management Review* "dialogue" format can help clarify methodological choices and contextualize replication findings. A recent exchange between van Dijk et al. (2025), who replicated Coad

and Srhoj (2023), and Coad and Srhoj, 2025) subsequent response in *Research Policy* demonstrate how transparent, collegial discussion can advance cumulative knowledge. Clear expectations for constructive engagement can reduce stigma and strengthen the legitimacy of replication work in the field. This reinforces the view that replication is a collaborative, corrective process rather than adversarial (Amrhein et al., 2019; Earp & Trafimow, 2015), and signals that reproducibility and transparency are valued contributions to the field (e.g., Stephan et al., 2023).

### ***Recommendations for Universities, Departments, and Tenure Committee***

One reason for the limited available replication studies could be that many scholars remain reluctant to conduct replications. Many entrepreneurship scholars perceive replication as less intellectually stimulating and rewarding, seeing it as “merely copying” (Earp & Trafimow, 2015, p. 621) prior work, especially in a field that values theoretical novelty (van Witteloostuijn et al., 2021). Academic norms and incentives continue to prioritize originality over verification (Block, Fisch, et al., 2022), and replication studies are time-intensive yet often lack the prestige and impact of novel research (e.g., Newbert et al., 2022). Early-career scholars, in particular, may avoid replication to secure tenure or funding and researchers may view replication as an implicit critique of the original authors (Earp & Trafimow, 2015). Lingering publication bias against replications in top-tier journals exacerbates these challenges (Block, Fisch, et al., 2022)

Specific university policies valuing replication can further encourage commitment to building collective knowledge in this manner. Many influential entrepreneurship studies may remain unreplicated because scholars perceive replication as risky. The greater field of management has often viewed theoretical efforts (often without supporting data) as more valuable than building knowledge through empirical confirmations without theoretical insights. Our review of replication in entrepreneurship suggests that might result in wrong-headed priorities that limit the cumulative knowledge needed to build legitimacy in the field. Universities, departments, and tenure committees are in a unique position to alter such dynamics (cf. McMullin, 2019).

### ***Recommendations for Scholars***

Many of the field’s most influential contributions are conceptual or draw on qualitative evidence (e.g., Baker et al., 2023). Although these studies are grounded in rich empirical observation, their propositions have often not been systematically tested using quantitative methods. As such, they represent prime candidates for quantitative replication, enabling researchers to assess the generalizability of these insights across broader samples, industries, and national contexts. This approach aligns with calls for greater methodological pluralism in replication research (e.g., Bergh et al., 2017), and would help strengthen the empirical foundations of many theoretical perspectives that currently rest on limited case data. We therefore encourage authors to translate qualitative constructs into measurable variables, develop appropriate operationalizations, and test propositions using diverse datasets. Such quantitative replications can broaden the empirical foundation of theories that currently rest on limited case evidence.

Significantly more replication studies are needed per phenomenon to enable meta-analyses. Meta-analyses play a crucial role in assessing the reliability and magnitude of effects, offering stronger evidence for theoretical validity than individual studies or narrative

reviews (Rosenthal & DiMatteo, 2001). However, meta-analyses depend on a sufficient number of exact replications of the same phenomenon, as no single study, or even a single replication, can conclusively confirm or refute an effect (e.g., Ethiraj et al., 2016). To allow meaningful synthesis, at least two independent exact replications per effect are generally considered the minimum for statistical aggregation (Valentine et al., 2010). Yet our analysis reveals that, to date, only two studies in entrepreneurship research has been replicated twice. This highlights an urgent need for more systematic replication efforts focused on established relationships, to generate the critical mass of evidence required for robust meta-analytical assessments. Scholars can contribute by aligning their replication designs with existing studies to facilitate effect-size comparability.

One of the main reasons why replication remains rare in entrepreneurship research is the substantial time and labor involved. Exact replications require extensive data cleaning, reconstruction of analytic steps, and multiple robustness tests, activities that make replication “resource-intensive and often prohibitively time-consuming” (Bergh et al., 2017; Crawford et al., 2022). These high demands discourage many researchers, especially early-career scholars, from undertaking replication work (Newbert et al., 2022).

Advances in artificial intelligence may lower these barriers. AI-based tools can automate key elements of the replication workflow, including detecting coding inconsistencies, reconstructing datasets from documentation, and extracting variables from unstructured data. By reducing the technical and temporal burden of replication, AI may make replication more feasible and increase the overall volume of verification work in the field. To ensure that AI expands rather than complicates replication, both editors and authors can adopt transparent and responsible practices. Editors can require clear documentation of AI-assisted analyses and encourage the use of auditable tools, while authors can apply AI to streamline replication workflows and document preprocessing steps, model parameters, and validations. When integrated thoughtfully, AI may enhance “scalability” without compromising reproducibility.

Encouraging doctoral students to engage in replications early in their academic career may provide multiple benefits to the field (Schwab et al., 2023). First, engagement in such efforts encourages budding scholars to digest and expand on previously published findings by isolating their focus to phenomena rather than an additional hurdle of adding to theory. Journals such as the *Journal of Management Scientific Reports* have begun to embrace such contributions in their efforts to “publish rigorous empirical research designed to provide evidence that confirms, refines, or refutes existing theories.” For example, one recent effort replicated how linguistic styles culled from previous crowdfunding research held in the university crowdfunding context (Kanwal et al., 2025). Our review of replication efforts to date suggests fecund ground remains for such studies.

Sir Issac Newton once famously noted, “If I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of Giants.” Yet, our examination of replication efforts in entrepreneurship suggests the footing for the accumulation of knowledge in many research streams in our field is lacking. It is our hope that our analysis and suggestions encourage future efforts to help support our collective knowledge in the field of entrepreneurship.


### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**


The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.


## Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## ORCID iDs

Sebastian Kruse  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1587-7994>

Jeremy C. Short  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3026-2613>

Liljan Ruth Maren Schrameier  <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3146-1581>

## References

- Abbasianchavari, A., & Block, J. (2022). Perceptual factors explaining the gender gap in entrepreneurial propensity: A replication and extension. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 17, e00303.
- Adbi, A., & Shukla, D. (2023). Registration at founding and firm performance: Generalization and extension replication from global data. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 54, 365–384.
- Administrative Science Quarterly. (2024). *Data and methods transparency*. Sage Publications. Retrieved March 18, 2025 from, <https://journals.sagepub.com/pb-assets/cmscontent/ASQ/Data%20and%20Methods%20Transparency%20Policy%20040324-1712174442.pdf>
- Agrawal, A., Catalini, C., & Goldfarb, A. (2015). Crowdfunding: Geography, social networks, and the timing of investment decisions. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 24(2), 253–274.
- Aguinis, H., Banks, G. C., Rogelberg, S. G., & Cascio, W. F. (2020). Actionable recommendations for narrowing the science-practice gap in open science. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 158, 27–35.
- Aguinis, H., Cascio, W. F., & Ramani, R. S. (2017). Science’s reproducibility and replicability crisis: International business is not immune. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 48, 653–663.
- Aguinis, H., & Glavas, A. (2012). What we know and don’t know about corporate social responsibility: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 38, 932–968.
- Ahlers, G. K., Cumming, D., Günther, C., & Schweizer, D. (2015). Signaling in equity crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39, 955–980.
- Ahuja, G., & Lampert, C. M. (2001). Entrepreneurship in the large corporation: A longitudinal study of how established firms create breakthrough inventions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), 521–543.
- Allison, T. H., McKenny, A. F., & Short, J. C. (2013). The effect of entrepreneurial rhetoric on microlending investment: An examination of the warm-glow effect. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28, 690–707.
- Altmeier, A., & Fisch, C. (2024). The relationship between business angels’ psychological attributes and investments in successful portfolio ventures: an empirical investigation using Twitter data. *British Journal of Management*, 35, 629–643.
- Ambad, S. N. A., & Abdul Wahab, K. (2017). The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: Evidence from Malaysian large companies. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 17(2), 259–280. <https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.524.2016>
- Amrhein, V., Trafimow, D., & Greenland, S. (2019). Inferential statistics as descriptive statistics: There is no replication crisis if we don’t expect replication. *The American Statistician*, 73, 262–270.
- Anderson, B., Wennberg, K., & McMullen, J. S. (2019). Editorial: Enhancing quantitative theory-testing entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34, 1059–1090.
- Anglin, A. H., Allison, T. H., McKenny, A. F., & Busenitz, L. W. (2014). The role of charismatic rhetoric in crowdfunding: An examination with computer-aided text analysis. In *Social entrepreneurship and research methods* (pp. 19–48): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Aragón-Correa, J. A., Hurtado-Torres, N., Sharma, S., & García-Morales, V. J. (2008). Environmental strategy and performance in small firms: A resource-based perspective. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 86(1), 88–103.

- Ardianti, R., Obschonka, M., & Davidsson, P. (2022). Psychological well-being of hybrid entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 17, e00294.
- Arend, R. J., Cao, X., Grego-Nagel, A., Im, J., Yang, X., & Canavati, S. (2016). Looking upstream and downstream in entrepreneurial cognition: Replicating and extending the Busenitz and Barney (1997) Study. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54, 1147–1170.
- Arenius, P., & Minniti, M. (2005). Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 233–247.
- Arregle, J.-L., Hitt, M. A., Sirmon, D. G., & Very, P. (2007). The development of organizational social capital: Attributes of family firms. *Journal of Management Studies*, 44, 73–95.
- Arteaga-Fonseca, J., Rutherford, M. W., Moore, C. B., & Pollack, J. M. (2025). Human capital theory and venture capital firms: Exploring “Home Runs” and “Strike Outs”—A replication and extension of Dimov and Shepherd (2005). *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 49, 1470–1495.
- Assenova, V. A., & Sorenson, O. (2017). Legitimacy and the benefits of firm formalization. *Organization Science*, 28(5), 804–818.
- Autio, E., Sapienza, H. J., & Almeida, J. G. (2000). Effects of age at entry, knowledge intensity, and imitability on international growth. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 909–924.
- Babson College. (2025). Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference (BCERC). Retrieved May 20, 2025, from <https://www.babson.edu/entrepreneurship-center/thought-leadership/babson-college-entrepreneurship-research-conference-bcerc/>
- Bacq, S., Hartog, C., & Hoogendoorn, B. (2016). Beyond the moral portrayal of social entrepreneurs: An empirical approach to who they are and what drives them. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(4), 703–718.
- Baker, M. (2015). Over half of psychology studies fail reproducibility test. *Nature*, 27, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.18248>
- Baker, H. K., Nofsinger, J. R., & Ricciardi, V. (2023). *Advanced introduction to behavioral finance*. Elgar advanced introductions. Edward Elgar.
- 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.
- Baum, J. A. C., Calabrese, T., & Silverman, B. S. (2000). Don't go it alone: Alliance network composition and startups' performance in Canadian biotechnology. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 267–294.
- Baum, J. A., & Silverman, B. S. (2004). Picking winners or building them? Alliance, intellectual, and human capital as selection criteria in venture financing and performance of biotechnology startups. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(3), 411–436.
- Belleflamme, P., Lambert, T., & Schwienbacher, A. (2014). Crowdfunding: Tapping the right crowd. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29, 585–609.
- Ben-Hafaïedh, C., & Hamelin, A. (2022). Questioning the growth Dogma: A replication study. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(2), 628–647.
- Bergh, D. D., Sharp, B. M., Aguinis, H., & Li, M. (2017). Is there a credibility crisis in strategic management research? Evidence on the reproducibility of study findings. *Strategic Organization*, 15, 423–436.
- Bettis, R. A., Helfat, C. E., & Shaver, J. M. (2016). The necessity, logic, and forms of replication. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37, 2193–2203.
- Birley, S. (1985). The role of networks in the entrepreneurial process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(1), 107–117.
- Block, J., Fisch, C., Kanwal, N., Lorenzen, S., & Schulze, A. (2022). Replication studies in top management journals: An empirical investigation of prevalence, types, outcomes, and impact. *Management Review Quarterly*, 58(2), 867–885.
- Block, J., Hansen, C., & Steinmetz, H. (2022). Are family firms doing more innovation output with less innovation input? A replication and extension. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(4), 1496–1520.

- Block, J., & Kuckertz, A. (2018). Seven principles of effective replication studies: Strengthening the evidence base of management research. *Management Review Quarterly*, 68, 355–359.
- Boeker, W., & Wiltbank, R. (2005). New venture evolution and managerial capabilities. *Organization Science*, 16(2), 123–133.
- Bowen, H. P., & De Clercq, D. (2008). Institutional context and the allocation of entrepreneurial effort. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 39(4), 747–767.
- Brandt, M. J., IJzerman, H., Dijksterhuis, A., Farach, F. J., Geller, J., Giner-Sorolla, R., Grange, J. A., Perugini, M., Spies, J. R., & van 't Veer, A. (2014). The replication recipe: What makes for a convincing replication? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 50, 217–224.
- Brüderl, J., & Preisendörfer, P. (1998). Network support and the success of newly founded business. *Small Business Economics*, 10(3), 213–225.
- Brush, C., Eddleston, K. A., Edelman, L. F., Manolova, T. S., McAdam, M., & Rossi-Lamastra, C. (2022). Catalyzing change: Innovation in women's entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 16, 243–254.
- Burtch, G., Ghose, A., & Wattal, S. (2013). An empirical examination of the antecedents and consequences of contribution patterns in crowd-funded markets. *Information Systems Research*, 24(3), 499–519.
- Busenitz, L. (1996). Research on entrepreneurial alertness. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34, 35–44.
- Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, 9–30.
- Calic, G., & Shevchenko, A. (2020). How signal intensity of behavioral orientations affects crowd-funding performance: The role of entrepreneurial orientation in crowdfunding business ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, 115, 204–220.
- Camuffo, A., Furlan, A., Romano, P., & Vinelli, A. (2008). Breathing shoes and complementarities: Strategic innovation in a mature industry. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 12, 139–160.
- Camuffo, A., Gambardella, A., Messinese, D., Novelli, E., Paolucci, E., & Spina, C. (2024). A scientific approach to entrepreneurial decision-making: Large-scale replication and extension. *Strategic Management Journal*, 45, 1209–1237.
- Carpenter, J., Rücker, G., & Schwarzer, G. (2011). Assessing the sensitivity of meta-analysis to selection bias: A multiple imputation approach. *Biometrics*, 67, 1066–1072.
- Carree, M., van Stel, A., Thurik, R., & Wennekers, S. (2002). Economic development and business ownership: an analysis using data of 23 OECD countries in the period 1976–1996. *Small Business Economics*, 19, 271–290.
- Carree, M. A., & Verheul, I. (2012). What makes entrepreneurs happy? Determinants of satisfaction among founders. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 13, 371–387.
- Certo, S. T., Covin, J. G., Daily, C. M., & Dalton, D. R. (2001). Wealth and the effects of founder management among IPO-stage new ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 641–658.
- Chan, H. F., Moy, N., Schaffner, M., & Torgler, B. (2021). The effects of money saliency and sustainability orientation on reward based crowdfunding success. *Journal of Business Research*, 125, 443–455.
- Chandler, J. A., Doiguchi, T., & Petrenko, O. V. (2022). Revisiting the effect of internationalization on firm governance: A replication and extension study. *Management International Review*, 62, 351–391.
- Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., & Vrontis, D. (2023). Entrepreneurial behavior of family firms in the Indian community: Adoption of a technology platform as a moderator. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 17, 433–453.
- Cherchem, N. (2017). The relationship between organizational culture and entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: Does generational involvement matter? *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 8(2), 87–98.

- Chen, C. C., Greene, P. G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, *13*, 295–316.
- Ciuchta, M. P., & Finch, D. (2019). The mediating role of self-efficacy on entrepreneurial intentions: Exploring boundary conditions. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *11*, e00128.
- Coad, A., Frankish, J. S., Roberts, R. G., & Storey, D. J. (2016). Predicting new venture survival and growth: does the fog lift? *Small Business Economics*, *47*, 217–241.
- Coad, A., & Srhoj, S. (2023). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and regional persistence of high growth firms: A “broken clock” critique. *Research Policy*, *52*, 104762.
- Coad, A., & Srhoj, S. (2025). Entrepreneurial ecosystems and the persistence of regional high-growth firm shares: A reply to van Dijk, Leendertse, Stam, and van Rijnsoever (2025). *Research Policy*, *54*, 105325.
- Cohen, B. D., & Dean, T. J. (2005). Information asymmetry and investor valuation of IPOs: Top management team legitimacy as a capital market signal. *Strategic Management Journal*, *26*, 683–690.
- Colombo, M. G., Franzoni, C., & Rossi-Lamastra, C. (2015). Internal social capital and the attraction of early contributions in crowdfunding. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *39*(1), 75–100.
- Cooper, A. C., Gimeno-Gascon, F. J., & Woo, C. Y. (1994). Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *9*, 371–395.
- Cooper, A. C., Woo, C. Y., & Dunkelberg, W. C. (1988). Entrepreneurs’ perceived chances for success. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *3*(2), 97–108.
- Coviello, N. E., & Munro, H. J. (1995). Growing the entrepreneurial firm: Networking for international market development. *European Journal of Marketing*, *29*(7), 49–61.
- Covin, J. G., Green, K. M., & Slevin, D. P. (2006). Strategic process effects on the entrepreneurial orientation–sales growth rate relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *30*(1), 57–81.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, *10*, 75–87.
- Cowling, M. (2000). Are entrepreneurs different across countries? *Applied Economics Letters*, *7*, 785–789.
- Cowling, M., Millán, J. M., & Yue, W. (2019). Two decades of European self-employment: Is the answer to who becomes self-employed different over time and countries? *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *12*, e00138.
- Crawford, G. C., Skorodzyevskiy, V., Frid, C. J., Nelson, T. E., Booyavi, Z., Hechavarria, D. M., Li, X., Reynolds, P. D., & Teymourian, E. (2022). Advancing entrepreneurship theory through replication: A case study on contemporary methodological challenges, future best practices, and an entreaty for communality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *46*, 779–799.
- Dahlqvist, J., Davidsson, P., & Wiklund, J. (2000). Initial conditions as predictors of new venture performance: A replication and extension of the Cooper et al. study. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, *1*, 1–17.
- Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2003). The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *18*, 301–331.
- Davidsson, P., Steffens, P., & Fitzsimmons, J. (2009). Growing profitable or growing from profits: Putting the horse in front of the cart? *Journal of Business Venturing*, *24*, 388–406.
- Delmar, F., & Shane, S. (2004). Legitimizing first: Organizing activities and the survival of new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *19*, 385–410.
- Deng, W. (2025). Revisiting the role of gender and beauty in entrepreneurship: A large-scale conceptual replication. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *0*(0), 1–18.
- Dimov, D. P., & Shepherd, D. A. (2005). Human capital theory and venture capital firms: Exploring “home runs” and “strike outs.” *Journal of Business Venturing*, *20*, 1–21.
- Duran, P., Kammerlander, N., van Essen, M., & Zellweger, T. (2016). Doing more with less: Innovation input and output in family firms. *Academy of Management Journal*, *59*, 1224–1264.
- Earp, B. D., & Trafimow, D. (2015). Replication, falsification, and the crisis of confidence in social psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *6*, 621.

- Eden, D. (1975). Organizational membership vs self-employment: Another blow to the American dream. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 79–94.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Schoonhoven, C. B. (1996). Resource-based view of strategic alliance formation: Strategic and social effects in entrepreneurial firms. *Organization Science*, 7(2), 136–150.
- Elfenbein, D. W., Hamilton, B. H., & Zenger, T. R. (2010). The small firm effect and the entrepreneurial spawning of scientists and engineers. *Management Science*, 56, 659–681.
- Ernesto, A. J., Ramírez, L. M., Rodríguez-Aceves, L., & Elizabeth, R. L. (2021). Revisiting poverty and entrepreneurship in developing countries. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 26(1), Article 2150003.
- Ethiraj, S. K., Gambardella, A., & Helfat, C. E. (2016). Replication in strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37, 2191–2192.
- Fanelli, D. (2012). Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. *Scientometrics*, 90, 891–904.
- Fassin, Y., Van Rossem, A., & Buelens, M. (2011). Small-business owner-managers' perceptions of business ethics and CSR-related concepts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(3), 425–453.
- Ferrari, A., Mucci, D. M., & Beck, F. (2024). Organizational culture, generational involvement and entrepreneurial orientation components: A replication study. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 16, 868–890.
- Ferreira, M. P., Reis, N. R., & Miranda, R. (2015). Thirty years of entrepreneurship research published in top journals: Analysis of citations, co-citations and themes. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 5(1), 5–17.
- Filatotchev, I., & Bishop, K. (2002). Board composition, share ownership, and “underpricing” of UK IPO firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 941–955.
- Folta, T. B., Delmar, F., & Wennberg, K. (2010). Hybrid entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, 56(2), 253–269.
- Fossen, F. M., Neyse, L., Johannesson, M., & Dreber, A. (2022). 2D:4D and self-employment: A Preregistered replication study in a large general population sample. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 46, 21–43.
- Francis, G. (2012). The psychology of replication and replication in psychology. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 7, 585–594.
- Frank, H., Kessler, A., & Fink, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance—A replication study. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 62, 175–198.
- Fried, V. H., Hisrich, R. D., & Polonchek, A. (1993). Research note: Venture capitalists' investment criteria: A replication. *The Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 3, 37–42.
- Gaucher, D., Friesen, J., & Kay, A. C. (2011). Evidence that gendered wording in job advertisements exists and sustains gender inequality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, 109.
- George, G., & Bock, A. J. (2011). The business model in practice and its implications for entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 83–111.
- Gimeno, J., Folta, T. B., Cooper, A. C., & Woo, C. Y. (1997). Survival of the Fittest? Entrepreneurial human capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42(4), 750–783. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393656>
- Glackin, C. E. W., & Phelan, S. E. (2020). Improving entrepreneurial competencies in the classroom: an extension and in-study replication. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 23, 79–96.
- Gloesberg, A., Phillips, D., Schaefer, J., Pollack, J. M., Kirkman, B. L., McChesney, J., Noble, S. M., Ward, M. K., & Foster, L. L. (2022). The relationship of self-efficacy with entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytic replication and extension. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 18, e00342.
- Gupta, V. K., Turban, D. B., Wasti, S. A., & Sikdar, A. (2009). The role of gender stereotypes in perceptions of entrepreneurs and intentions to become an entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2), 397–417.
- Hansen, C., & Block, J. (2020). Exploring the relation between family involvement and firms' financial performance: A replication and extension meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13, e00158.

- Hardwicke, T. E., Mathur, M. B., MacDonald, K., Nilsonne, G., Banks, G. C., Kidwell, M. C., Hofelich Mohr, A., Clayton, E., Yoon, E. J., Henry Tessler, M., Lenne, R. L., Altman, S., Long, B., & Frank, M. C. (2018). Data availability, reusability, and analytic reproducibility: evaluating the impact of a mandatory open data policy at the journal *Cognition*. *Royal Society Open Science*, 5, 180448.
- Hechavarría, D. M., Terjesen, S. A., Ingram, A. E., Renko, M., Justo, R., & Elam, A. (2017). Taking care of business: The impact of culture and gender on entrepreneurs' blended value creation goals. *Small Business Economics*, 48(1), 225–257.
- Hessels, J., Rietveld, C. A., Thurik, A. R., & van der Zwan, P. (2020). The higher returns to formal education for entrepreneurs versus employees in Australia. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13, e00148.
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of social entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 105–130.
- Honig, B., & Karlsson, T. (2004). Institutional forces and the written business plan. *Journal of Management*, 30, 29–48.
- Honig, B., & Samuelsson, M. (2014). Data replication and extension: A study of business planning and venture-level performance. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 1–2, 18–25.
- Hopp, C., Greene, F. J., Honig, B., Karlsson, T., & Samuelsson, M. (2018). Revisiting the influence of institutional forces on the written business plan: A replication study. *Management Review Quarterly*, 68, 361–398.
- Hsueh, J. W.-J., & Gomez-Solorzano, M. (2019). Social tie heterogeneity and firms' networking strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43, 352–359.
- Hubbard, R., & Armstrong, J. S. (1994). Replications and extensions in marketing: Rarely published but quite contrary. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 11, 233–248.
- Hwee Nga, J. K., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259–282.
- Jessri, M., Kosmidou, V., & Ahuja, M. K. (2020). Employees' decision to participate in corporate venturing: A conjoint experiment of financial and non-financial motivations. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 13, e00161.
- Kacperczyk, A., & Marx, M. (2016). Revisiting the small-firm effect on entrepreneurship: Evidence from firm dissolutions. *Organization Science*, 27, 893–910.
- Kaish, S., & Gilad, B. (1991). Characteristics of opportunities search of entrepreneurs versus executives: Sources, interests, general alertness. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6, 45–61.
- Kanwal, F., Drader-Mazza, N. A., Wolfe, M. T., Chandler, J. A., Short, J. C., & Johnson, N. E. (2025). Do linguistic styles matter in university-based crowdfunding? Replicating and extending findings from rewards- and social-based platforms. *Journal of Management Scientific Reports*, 3(3–4), 260–296.
- Kaplan, S. N., & Strömberg, P. (2003). Financial contracting theory meets the real world: An empirical analysis of venture capital contracts. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70(2), 281–315.
- Katz, J. A. (1993). How satisfied are the self-employed: A secondary analysis approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17, 35–51.
- Kaufmann, P. J., & Dant, R. P. (1996). Multi-unit franchising: Growth and management issues. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11(5), 343–358.
- Kellermanns, F. W., & Eddleston, K. A. (2006). Corporate entrepreneurship in family firms: A family perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30, 809–830.
- Kim, P. H., Aldrich, H. E., & Keister, L. A. (2006). Access (not) denied: The impact of financial, human, and cultural capital on entrepreneurial entry in the United States. *Small Business Economics*, 27, 5–22.
- Knight, G. A., & Cavusgil, S. T. (2004). Innovation, organizational capabilities, and the born-global firm. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(2), 124–141.
- Koellinger, P., Minniti, M., & Schade, C. (2013). Gender differences in entrepreneurial propensity\*. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 75, 213–234.

- Köhler, T., & Cortina, J. M. (2021). Play it again, Sam! An analysis of constructive replication in the organizational sciences. *Journal of Management*, 47, 488–518.
- Kor, Y. Y., & Misangyi, V. F. (2008). Outside directors' industry-specific experience and firms' liability of newness. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29(12), 1345–1355.
- Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 411–432.
- Langowitz, N., & Minniti, M. (2007). The entrepreneurial propensity of women. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 341–364.
- Le Breton-Miller, I., & Miller, D. (2011). Commentary: Family firms and the advantage of multitemporality. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35, 1171–1177.
- Lee, Y., Zhuang, Y., Joo, M., & Bae, T. J. (2019). Revisiting Covin and Slevin (1989): Replication and extension of the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 12, e00144.
- Li, H., Meng, L., Wang, Q., & Zhou, L. A. (2008). Political connections, financing and firm performance: Evidence from Chinese private firms. *Journal of Development Economics*, 87(2), 283–299.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y.-W. (2009). Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33, 593–617.
- Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship: stories, legitimacy, and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 545–564.
- Lu, J. W., & Beamish, P. W. (2001). The internationalization and performance of SMEs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 565–586.
- Lumpkin, G., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 429–451.
- MacMillan, I. C., Siegel, R., & Narasimha, P. S. (1985). Criteria used by venture capitalists to evaluate new venture proposals. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1, 119–128.
- Maguire, S., Hardy, C., & Lawrence, T. (2004). Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, 657–679.
- Markin, E. T., Skorodzyevskiy, V., Zhu, L., & Chrisman, J. J. (2022). Lone-founder firms in China: Replicating Miller et al. (2007) in a different context. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 13, 100451.
- Mauri, A. J., & Michaels, M. P. (1998). Firm and industry effects within strategic management: An empirical examination. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(3), 211–219.
- McGahan, A. M., & Porter, M. E. (1997). How much does industry matter, really? *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(1), 15–30.
- McGee, J. E., Peterson, M., Mueller, S. L., & Sequeira, J. M. (2009). Entrepreneurial self-efficacy: Refining the measure. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(4), 965–988.
- McKelvie, A., Brattström, A., & Dennis Jr., W. J. (2021). What do they think and feel about growth? Examining small business managers' attitudes towards growth in the United States. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 15, e00243.
- McMullen, J. S., Bagby, D. R., & Palich, L. E. (2008). Economic freedom and the motivation to engage in entrepreneurial action. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(5), 875–895.
- Miao, C., Qian, S., & Ma, D. (2017). The relationship between entrepreneurial self-efficacy and firm performance: a meta-analysis of main and moderator effects. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55, 87–107.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29, 770–791.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. H. (1982). Innovation in conservative and entrepreneurial firms: Two models of strategic momentum. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3, 1–25.
- Miller, D., Le Breton-Miller, I., Lester, R. H., & Cannella Jr, A. A. (2007). Are family firms really superior performers? *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 13, 829–858.

- Mollick, E. (2014). The dynamics of crowdfunding: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29, 1–16.
- Monsen, E., Patzelt, H., & Saxton, T. (2010). Beyond simple utility: Incentive design and trade-offs for corporate employee-entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34, 105–130.
- Morris, M. H., Webb, J. W., Fu, J., & Singhal, S. (2013). A competency-based perspective on entrepreneurship education: conceptual and empirical insights. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 51, 352–369.
- Moss, T. W., Neubaum, D. O., & Meyskens, M. (2015). The effect of virtuous and entrepreneurial orientations on microfinance lending and repayment: A signaling theory perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39, 27–52.
- Mueller-Langer, F., Fecher, B., Harhoff, D., & Wagner, G. G. (2019). Replication studies in economics—How many and which papers are chosen for replication, and why? *Research Policy*, 48, 62–83.
- Naman, J. L., & Slevin, D. P. (1993). Entrepreneurship and the concept of fit: A model and empirical tests. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(2), 137–153.
- Naldi, L., Nordqvist, M., Sjöberg, K., & Wiklund, J. (2007). Entrepreneurial orientation, risk taking, and performance in family firms. *Family Business Review*, 20(1), 33–47.
- Naughton, T. J. (1987a). Contrasting models of quality of working life among the self-employed: An empirical test. In *Academy of management proceedings (Vol. 1987, No. 1, pp. 78–81)*. Academy of Management.
- Naughton, T. J. (1987b). Quality of working life and the self-employed manager. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12, 33–40.
- Newbert, S. L., Kher, R., & Yang, S. (2022). Now that's interesting and important! Moving beyond averages to increase the inferential value of empirical findings in entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 37, 106185.
- Nicolaou, N., Patel, P. C., & Wolfe, M. T. (2018). Testosterone and tendency to engage in self-employment. *Management Science*, 64, 1825–1841.
- Norton, S. W. (1988). An empirical look at franchising as an organizational form. *The Journal of Business*, 61(2), 197–218. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2352900>
- Nosek, B. A., Hardwicke, T. E., Moshontz, H., Allard, A., Corker, K. S., Dreber, A., Fidler, F., Hilgard, J., Kline Struhl, M., Nuijten, M. B., Rohrer, J. M., Romero, F., Scheel, A. M., Scherer, L. D., Schönbrodt, F. D., & Vazire, S. (2022). Replicability, robustness, and reproducibility in psychological science. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 73, 719–748.
- Obenauer, W. G. (2024). Designing, executing, and publishing replication research: Best practices for successfully taking replication ideas from conceptualization to publication. *Journal of Management Scientific Reports*, 2, 3–26.
- O'Boyle Jr, E. H., Pollack, J. M., & Rutherford, M. W. (2012). Exploring the relation between family involvement and firms' financial performance: A meta-analysis of main and moderator effects. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27, 1–18.
- Obschonka, M., Andersson, H., Silbereisen, R. K., & Sverke, M. (2013). Rule-breaking, crime, and entrepreneurship: A replication and extension study with 37-year longitudinal data. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 83, 386–396.
- Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442–454.
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 349, aac4716.
- O'shea, R. P., Allen, T. J., Chevalier, A., & Roche, F. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation, technology transfer and spinoff performance of US universities. *Research Policy*, 34(7), 994–1009.
- Parhankangas, A., & Renko, M. (2017). Linguistic style and crowdfunding success among social and commercial entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(2), 215–236.
- Park, U. D., Borah, A., & Kotha, S. (2016). Signaling revisited: The use of signals in the market for IPOs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37, 2362–2377.

- Peng, M. W., & Luo, Y. (2000). Managerial ties and firm performance in a transition economy: The nature of a micro-macro link. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 486–501.
- Peterson, T. O., Aikens, S. D., Silvernagel, C., & Heller, B. (2024). Impact of psychological capital on college students' entrepreneurial intentions: Replication and extension. *Global Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 8(Special Issue 1), 87–102.
- Petrova, K. (2012). Part-time entrepreneurship and financial constraints: Evidence from the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics. *Small Business Economics*, 39(2), 473–493.
- Pittino, D., Martínez, A. B., Chirico, F., & Galván, R. S. (2018). Psychological ownership, knowledge sharing and entrepreneurial orientation in family firms: The moderating role of governance heterogeneity. *Journal of Business Research*, 84, 312–326.
- Raffiee, J., & Feng, J. (2014). Should I quit my day job? A hybrid path to entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(4), 936–963.
- Ramos-Rodríguez, A.-R., & Ruiz-Navarro, J. (2004). Changes in the intellectual structure of strategic management research: A bibliometric study of the Strategic Management Journal, 1980–2000. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 981–1004.
- Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33, 761–787.
- Reader, D., & Watkins, D. (2006). The social and collaborative nature of entrepreneurship scholarship: A co-citation and perceptual analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30, 417–441.
- Reynolds, P. (2017). Tracking the entrepreneurial process with the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics (PSED) protocol. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. Retrieved December 8, 2025, from <https://oxfordre.com/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-86>
- Rodríguez-Peña, A. (2023). Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance relationship under the moderating effect of environmental dynamism: Replication and extension analysis. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 21(4), 550–585.
- Rosenthal, R., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2001). Meta-analysis: Recent developments in quantitative methods for literature reviews. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 59–82.
- Rostam-Afschar, D. (2014). Entry regulation and entrepreneurship: A natural experiment in German craftsmanship. *Empirical Economics*, 47, 1067–1101.
- Rumelt, R. P. (1991). How much does industry matter? *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(3), 167–185.
- Runst, P., Thomä, J., Haverkamp, K., & Müller, K. (2018). Entry regulation and entrepreneurship: A natural experiment in German craftsmanship. *Empirical Economics*, 47, 1067–1101.
- Sambharya, R., & Musteen, M. (2014). Institutional environment and entrepreneurship: An empirical study across countries. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 12(4), 314–330.
- Sanders, W. G., & Carpenter, M. A. (1998). Internationalization and firm governance: The roles of CEO compensation, top team composition, and board structure. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41, 158–178.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26, 243–263.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2008). *Effectuation: Elements of entrepreneurial expertise*. Edward Elgar.
- Schmidt, S. (2009). Shall we really do it again? The powerful concept of replication is neglected in the social sciences. *Review of General Psychology*, 13, 90–100.
- Schmidt, S., Bendig, D., & Brettel, M. (2018). Building an equity story: the impact of effectuation on business angel investments. *Journal of Business Economics*, 88, 471–501.
- Schneck, S., Werner, A., & Wolter, H.-J. (2021). A replication study on growth paths of young firms: Evidence from German administrative data. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 16, e00246.
- Schwab, A., Aguinis, H., Bamberger, P., Hodgkinson, G. P., Shapiro, D. L., Starbuck, W. H., & Tsui, A. S. (2023). How replication studies can improve doctoral student education. *Journal of Management Scientific Reports*, 1(1), 18–41.

- Schwab, A., & Starbuck, W. H. (2017). A call for openness in research reporting: How to turn covert practices into helpful tools. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 16*, 125–141.
- Sebora, T. C., & Tantiukoskula, S. (2011). Psychological capital and the entrepreneurial intention of college students. In G. T. Papanikos (Ed.), *International Developments in Management Research* (pp. 199–220). Athens Institute for Education and Research.
- Seong, M., & Parker, S. C. (2024). Does gendered wording in job advertisements deter women from joining start-ups? A replication and extension of Gaucher, Friesen, and Kay (2011). *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 18*, 286–305.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science, 11*, 448–469.
- Shane, S. (2009). Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy. *Small Business Economics, 33*(2), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-009-9215-5>
- Shane, S., & Cable, D. (2002). Network ties, reputation, and the financing of new ventures. *Management Science, 48*, 364–381.
- Shinnar, R. S., Giacomin, O., & Janssen, F. (2012). Entrepreneurial perceptions and intentions: The role of gender and culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36*(3), 465–493.
- Shirokova, G., Shakina, E., Bacon-Gerasymenko, V., & Wales, W. (2022). Entrepreneurial orientation as a mediator of ADHD—Performance relationship: A staged quasi-replication study. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 17*, e00312.
- Short, J. C., & Anglin, A. H. (2019). Is leadership language ‘rewarded’ in crowdfunding? Replicating social entrepreneurship research in a rewards-based context. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 11*, e00121.
- Short, J. C., McKelvie, A., Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Chandler, G. N. (2009). Firm and industry effects on firm performance: A generalization and extension for new ventures. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 3*(1), 47–65.
- Skorodziyevskiy, V., Crawford, G. C., Hayes, N. T., Davidsson, P., & Honig, B. (2025). Replicating Davidsson and Honig (2003): Updates on human capital, social capital, and replications in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 49*, 1189–1218.
- Slater, S. F., & Narver, J. C. (2000). The positive effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Business Research, 48*, 69–73.
- Sorenson, O., & Sørensen, J. B. (2001). Finding the right mix: Franchising, organizational learning, and chain performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 22*(6–7), 713–724.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing, 22*, 566–591.
- Stenholm, P., Acs, Z. J., & Wuebker, R. (2013). Exploring country-level institutional arrangements on the rate and type of entrepreneurial activity. *Journal of Business Venturing, 28*(1), 176–193.
- Stephan, M., Demir, C., Lasch, F., Vossen, A., & Werner, A. (2023). Psychological well-being of hybrid entrepreneurs: A replication and extension study using German panel data. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 20*, e00419.
- Stutz, A., Schell, S., & Hack, A. (2022). In family firms we trust—Experimental evidence on the credibility of sustainability reporting: A replication study with extension. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 13*, 100498.
- Sullivan, D. (2015). Are entrepreneurs’ networks dynamic? A replication study testing changes in entrepreneurs’ networks during new venture development. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 20*, 1550016.
- Tang, J., Kacmar, K. M. M., & Busenitz, L. (2012). Entrepreneurial alertness in the pursuit of new opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing, 27*(1), 77–94.
- Thomas, A. S., & Mueller, S. L. (2000). A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture. *Journal of International Business Studies, 31*(2), 287–301.
- Tsang, E. W. K., & Kwan, K. (1999). Replication and theory development in organizational science: A critical realist perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 24*, 759–780.

- Unger, J. M., Rauch, A., Frese, M., & Rosenbusch, N. (2011). Human capital and entrepreneurial success: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*, 341–358.
- Valentine, J., Pigott, T. D., & Rothstein, H. R. (2010). How many studies do you need? *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics, 35*, 215–247.
- van Dijk, J., Leendertse, J., Stam, E., & van Rijnsoever, F. (2025). The entrepreneurial ecosystem clock keeps on ticking—A replication and extension of Coad and Srhoj (2023). *Research Policy, 54*, 105154.
- van Hugten, J., el Hejazi, Z.-N., Brassey, J., Vanderstraeten, J., Cannaearts, N., Loots, E., Coreynen, W., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (2021). What makes entrepreneurs happy? Psychological flexibility and entrepreneurs' satisfaction. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 16*, e00263.
- van Praag, M., van Witteloostuijn, A., & van der Sluis, J. (2013). The higher returns to formal education for entrepreneurs versus employees. *Small Business Economics, 40*, 375–396.
- Van Stel, A., Storey, D. J., & Thurik, A. R. (2007). The effect of business regulations on nascent and young business entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics, 28*(2), 171–186.
- van Witteloostuijn, A., Dejardin, M., & Pollack, J. M. (2021). Replication in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights, 16*, e00271.
- Verheul, I., Block, J., Burmeister-Lamp, K., Thurik, R., Tiemeier, H., & Turturea, R. (2015). ADHD-like behavior and entrepreneurial intentions. *Small Business Economics, 45*, 85–101.
- Verheul, I., Rietdijk, W., Block, J., Franken, I., Larsson, H., & Thurik, R. (2016). The association between attention-deficit/hyperactivity (ADHD) symptoms and self-employment. *European Journal of Epidemiology, 31*, 793–801.
- Weismeier-Sammer, D. (2011). Entrepreneurial behavior in family firms: A replication study. *Journal of Family Business Strategy, 2*, 128–138.
- Wennekers, S., Van Wennekers, A., Thurik, R., & Reynolds, P. (2005). Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development. *Small Business Economics, 24*(3), 293–309.
- White, H. D., & McCain, K. W. (1998). Visualizing a discipline: An author co-citation analysis of information science, 1972–1995. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science, 49*, 327–355.
- Wicherts, J. M. (2011). Psychology must learn a lesson from fraud case. *Nature, 480*(7375), 7.
- Wiklund, J. (2023). Entrepreneurship theory and practice submission guidelines. Retrieved June 16, 2023, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/author-instructions/etp>
- Wiklund, J., Davidsson, P., & Delmar, F. (2003). What do they think and feel about growth? An expectancy–value approach to small business managers' attitudes toward growth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 27*, 247–270.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach. *Journal of Business Venturing, 20*, 71–91.
- Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 31*, 387–406.
- Wismans, A., Kamei, K., Thurik, R., & Torrès, O. (2021). The link between attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder symptoms and entrepreneurial orientation in Japanese business owners. *Management Review Quarterly, 71*, 857–872.
- Wismans, A., Thurik, R., Verheul, I., Torrès, O., & Kamei, K. (2020). Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder symptoms and entrepreneurial orientation: A replication note. *Applied Psychology, 69*, 1093–1112.
- Xu, N., Chen, Y., Fung, A., & Chan, K. C. (2018). Contributing forces in entrepreneurship research: A global citation analysis. *Journal of Small Business Management, 56*, 179–201.
- Yli-Renko, H., Autio, E., & Tontti, V. (2002). Social capital, knowledge, and the international growth of technology-based new firms. *International Business Review, 11*, 279–304.
- Yu, W., Wiklund, J., & Pérez-Luño, A. (2019). ADHD symptoms, entrepreneurial orientation (EO), and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 45*, 92–117.

- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259–285.
- Zahra, S. A. (1993). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior: A critique and extension. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17(4), 5–21.
- Zahra, S. A. (1996). Governance, ownership, and corporate entrepreneurship: The moderating impact of industry technological opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6), 1713–1735.
- Zahra, S. A. (2005). Entrepreneurial risk taking in family firms. *Family Business Review*, 18(1), 23–40.
- Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10, 43–58.
- Zahra, S. A., Hayton, J. C., & Salvato, C. (2004). Entrepreneurship in family vs. non-family firms: A resource-based analysis of the effect of organizational culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(4), 363–381.
- Zahra, S. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (2000). International expansion by new venture firms: International diversity, mode of market entry, technological learning, and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 925–950.
- Zhang, Z., Zyphur, M. J., Narayanan, J., Arvey, R. D., Chaturvedi, S., Avolio, B. J., Lichtenstein, P., & Larsson, G. (2009). The genetic basis of entrepreneurship: Effects of gender and personality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 110, 93–107.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6), 1265.
- Zhou, K. Z., Yim, C. K., & Tse, D. K. (2005). The effects of strategic orientations on technology- and market-based breakthrough innovations. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2), 42–60.
- 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.

## Author Biographies

**Carolyn Krieweth** is an Assistant Professor at RWTH Aachen University, Germany. She received her doctoral degree from RWTH Aachen University. Her research focuses on entrepreneurship and strategy, with publications in journals such as *Journal of Small Business Management*, *European Management Journal*, and *Industrial Marketing Management*.

**Sebastian Kruse** is an Assistant Professor at RWTH Aachen University, Germany. He received his doctoral degree from RWTH Aachen University. His research focuses on behavioral strategy, innovation and entrepreneurship, with publications in journals including *Journal of Management Studies*, *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *MIT Sloan Management Review*.

**Jeremy C. Short** is a Professor and G. Brint Ryan chair in entrepreneurship at the University of North Texas. His research in entrepreneurship, family business, and strategic management includes over 100 publications in journals such as the *Strategic Management Journal*, the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Journal of Management*, and *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*.

**Liljan Ruth Maren Schrameier** received her doctoral degree from RWTH Aachen University. She has extensive consulting experience, including several years at leading consulting firms, such as Boston Consulting Group. Her research interests lie in entrepreneurship, with a particular focus on the psychology of entrepreneurs and business angels.

**Malte Brettel** is a Professor of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Group at RWTH Aachen University, Germany. His research focuses on entrepreneurship, innovation management, and technology commercialization, with publications in leading journals such as *Strategic Management Journal*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, and *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*.