

DIALOGUE

Epistemology, Opportunities, and Entrepreneurship: Comments on Venkataraman et al. (2012) and Shane (2012)

Two reflection pieces, one by Venkataraman, Sarasvarthy, Dew, and Forster (2012) and one by Shane (2012), were recently published in *AMR*. Both articles focus on the impact of Shane and Venkataraman's (2000) *AMR* article on the field of entrepreneurship. Since some of our prior work (e.g., Alvarez & Barney, 2007, 2010) was informed by Shane and Venkataraman's (2000) original article, and since these reflective pieces also mention our work, we felt it was appropriate for us to write this commentary.

Before discussing Venkataraman et al. (2012) and Shane (2012), we want to first acknowledge the impact of Shane and Venkataraman's (2000) *AMR* article. While we disagree with many of its conclusions, we appreciate how it helped stir debates about opportunities, their formation, and their exploitation in the entrepreneurship literature. Their article is clearly worthy of the *AMR* Decade Award.

We first consider Venkataraman et al.'s (2012) essay and then Shane's (2012).

VENKATARAMAN ET AL. (2012)

This article takes Shane and Venkataraman's (2000) argument as given and asks, "What are some potentially fruitful ways that the study of opportunities may evolve going forward?" Venkataraman et al.'s (2012) read of the literature is consistent with those arguing that opportunities are both objective and subjective phenomena—formed both by exogenous shocks to existing industries and enacted subjectively by entrepreneurs themselves (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). Their discussion of intersubjectivity helps clarify the process by which opportunities are created. In addition, their recognition of other important nexuses for the field of entrepreneurship—besides the individual-opportunity nexus emphasized in Shane and Venkataraman (2000)—and their call for entrepreneurship to embrace its social consequences ring true and represent

important advances of the ideas first proffered in 2000.

Of course, we have some issues with their article. First, we continue to be confused as to why Venkataraman et al. use the terms *found* and *made* to describe "discovery" and "creation" processes, especially since Venkataraman (2003) was—as far as we know—the first person to use *discovery* and *creation* to label these processes. Theoretical developments subsequent to Venkataraman's 2003 article (e.g., Chiasson & Saunders, 2005), including ours (Alvarez & Barney, 2007), also have used Venkataraman's labels. Why the recent change? Of course, if there are real, theoretically relevant differences in these sets of terms, they need to be highlighted and subjected to debate. If not, parsimony suggests the need to pick one set.

This is not an insignificant issue. Label proliferation has impeded the development of other management fields (Barney, 2003). What we fear is that if no substantive differences actually exist between these concepts, some poor Ph.D. student somewhere will someday write a paper titled, "How Found Is Different from Discovery and Made Is Different from Created."

Second, Venkataraman et al. (2012: 23) mischaracterize an important distinction in Alvarez and Barney (2010), suggesting that our article argues for two kinds of realist epistemologies—presumably critical realism and evolutionary realism. The intent in our 2010 article was to suggest that the "opportunities are objective" view (i.e., discovery) adopts a critical realist perspective, whereas the "opportunities are enacted within environments that have both objective and subjective properties" view (i.e., creation) adopts an evolutionary realist perspective (Alvarez, Barney, & Anderson, in press; Campbell, 1960). This is a relatively small issue in Venkataraman et al. (2012). However, it is significantly more important in Shane's (2012) reflective essay.

SHANE (2012)

Whereas Venkataraman et al. (2012) focus on how the study of opportunities may yet evolve, Shane (2012) clarifies and extends, but ulti-

mately reinforces, the original article's arguments. Shane begins by suggesting that debates about the objectivity and subjectivity of opportunities may reflect an omission in Shane and Venkataraman (2000) because of "the lack of clarity about what I meant . . . by 'entrepreneurial opportunities' in 'Promise' [the original article] and in subsequent writings" (Shane, 2012: 15). Shane hypothesizes that a distinction between "entrepreneurial opportunities" and "business ideas" would resolve the apparent conflict. For Shane, "business ideas are entrepreneurs' interpretation of how to recombine resources in a way that allows pursuit of . . . [an] opportunity" (2012: 15). Shane then goes on to restate a sentence from Alvarez and Barney (2007) and Klein (2008), using the term *business ideas*, that apparently eliminates differences between these two articles and Shane and Venkataraman (2000).

If only it were that easy. While encouraged by Shane's recognition of the importance of incorporating the subjective in the analysis of opportunities, a careful reading of Shane's definition of a business idea suggests that it is still based on the assumption that opportunities exist before entrepreneurs are aware of them and, thus, are objective in this sense. This is even more clear as Shane (2012: 18) discusses the relationship between objective opportunities and subjective business ideas. If opportunities are not objective, Shane warns us, all sorts of dire theoretical consequences follow, including that there is no such thing as entrepreneurial failure.

We do not agree with Shane's concerns. With respect to the concern that there can be no entrepreneurial failure without objective opportunities, consider the following:

Creation opportunities are social constructions that do not exist independent of entrepreneur's perceptions (Aldrich & Kenworthy, 1999; Berger & Luckmann, 1967). However, when entrepreneurs act to exploit these socially constructed opportunities, they interact with an environment—the market—that tests the veracity of their perceptions (Alvarez & Barney, 2007: 15).

In other words, entrepreneurs who are trying to enact opportunities can fail. This is the case even if the market that leads to entrepreneurial failure is itself a social construction, although markets may also have objective properties (Alvarez & Barney, 2010: 565).

In particular, the epistemological assumptions that Alvarez and Barney (2007, 2010) and Alvarez et al. (in press) build on—evolutionary realism—do not deny the existence of objective phenomena—like gravity and scientific progress—their impact on the process of forming opportunities, nor do they deny their impact on returns to exploiting these opportunities. Like Shane we agree "that scientific advance, political and regulatory changes, and demographic and social shifts . . . make it possible to introduce new and potential profitable resource combinations" (2012: 15). However, that these "objective" conditions exist and can have an important impact on the ability of entrepreneurs to generate profits from their actions does not deny that entrepreneurs sometimes enact the opportunities they intend to exploit. It also does not deny that exploiting these enacted strategies can sometimes fail.

Indeed, given that the individual-opportunity nexus perspective is so firmly grounded in a critical realist epistemology (Alvarez & Barney, 2010)—an epistemology that asserts that a scientific proposition is meaningful if and only if its elements can be empirically examined using objective data (Ackroyd & Fleetwood, 2000; Fleetwood, 1999)—making the proposition that "opportunities are objective" so central to this theory is surprising to us. This is because the proposition that opportunities exist independent of their observation is not testable, according to critical realist epistemology. Critical realism suggests that one can only know if an opportunity exists by observing and then measuring it. Thus, according to critical realism, making propositions about the existence of opportunities that have yet to be observed and measured is not an empirically meaningful exercise.

Since the opportunities are objective proposition is not testable, it must be an assumption of individual-opportunity nexus theory. Assumptions are not tested empirically but, rather, are evaluated in terms of their fruitfulness—that is, the extent to which they help generate theoretically interesting and testable propositions (Merton, 1968). Fruitfulness implies comparing the theoretical and empirical implications of one assumption with the theoretical and empirical implications of another assumption—a test that Shane unfortunately rejects by assuming that the individual-opportunity nexus approach, as defined by

Shane and Venkataraman (2000), is the only way to study entrepreneurial opportunities.

We also found quite surprising Shane's (2012) assertion that, to become a distinct field, entrepreneurship must explain and predict empirical phenomena that strategic management does not. This makes the distinctiveness of a field like entrepreneurship dependent not on research actually done by entrepreneurship scholars but, rather, on research in another field—in this case, strategic management—that is *not* done. If strategic management scholars spot an interesting phenomenon that has so far only been studied by entrepreneurship scholars and then, applying strategic management theories, explain and predict this phenomenon, by Shane's logic (2012)—and to some extent Venkataraman et al.'s (2012: 25) logic—the distinctiveness of the domain of entrepreneurship goes away.

The slipperiness of this approach to defining entrepreneurship's unique domain can be seen in Venkataraman and Shane's (2000) efforts to identify five research questions supposedly asked by entrepreneurship scholars and not asked by strategy scholars. Unfortunately, many of these supposedly unique entrepreneurial questions have been addressed by strategy scholars, most well before 2000. Space limits us to one example: their second unique entrepreneurship question (strategic management only studies firms while entrepreneurship examines prefirm, intrafirm, and interfirm phenomena) fails to recognize a substantial theory of the firm literature in strategy (which asks when economic exchanges are best managed without a firm), the literature on strategy implementation (which focuses on intrafirm processes), and the larger literature on strategic alliances (which examines exchanges managed across firms instead of within a single firm or across markets). References to these bodies of literature are omitted because they are so vast.

Of course, these observations do not invalidate the effort to define a distinctive domain for entrepreneurship. They only bring into question the effort to define this domain relative to a set of phenomena that have only been examined by entrepreneurship scholars.

Shane (2012: 12) rejects an alternative to establishing the distinctiveness of entrepreneurship—for the field to develop new theories that can be applied to study phenomena of interest

in other fields in new, interesting ways. He rejects this alternative because he has yet to see the development of such theories and cannot imagine what they might look like. We suspect that Shane is limited here by his commitment to the critical realist epistemology. It is not too surprising that a theory of entrepreneurship rooted in a critical realist view of the world would not be unique vis-à-vis strategic management, a field that is also dominated by the same critical realist approach. Perhaps, in his search for new entrepreneurship theories not found in other fields, Shane—blinded by his critical realist assumptions—has been looking in the wrong place.

However, a theory developed in entrepreneurship based on a less widely held epistemological view—say, evolutionary realism—may have very important and very different implications for research on phenomena normally studied by other fields, including strategic management. One of the purposes of our forthcoming article (Alvarez et al., in press) is to trace some of these implications. For example, applying an evolutionary realist view of opportunities to the study of where firm heterogeneity comes from refocuses attention on the processes by which strategies are enacted (Weick, 1969)—a topic that has received relatively less attention in the field of strategic management.

In the end, for entrepreneurship to stand as a unique domain, it needs to generate theories that explain things in other disciplines in ways that scholars in those disciplines have not done previously. Develop and test enough of those theories and entrepreneurship will emerge as a distinct domain.

REFERENCES

- Ackroyd, S., & Fleetwood, S. 2000. *Realist perspective on management and organizations*. London: Routledge.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Kenworthy, A. L. 1999. The accidental entrepreneur: Campbellian antinomies and organizational foundations. In J. A. C. Baum & B. McKelvey (Eds.), *Variations in organization science: In honor of Donald T. Campbell*: 19–33. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2007. Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1: 11–26.
- Alvarez, S. A., & Barney, J. B. 2010. Entrepreneurship and epistemology: The philosophical underpinnings of the study of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Academy of Management Annals*, 4: 557–583.

- Alvarez, S. A., Barney, J. B., & Anderson, P. In press. Forming and exploiting opportunities: The implications of discovery and creation processes for entrepreneurial and organizational research. *Organization Science*.
- Barney, J. B. (Ed.). 2003. *Resources, capabilities, core competencies, invisible assets, and knowledge assets: Label proliferation and theory development in the field of strategic management*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. 1967. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books/Doubleday.
- Campbell, D. T. 1960. Blind variation and selective retention in creative thought as in other knowledge processes. *Psychological Review*, 67: 380–400.
- Chiasson, M., & Saunders, C. 2005. Reconciling diverse approaches to opportunity research using the structuration theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20: 747–767.
- Fleetwood, S. 1999. *Critical realism in economics: Development and debate*. London: Routledge.
- Klein, P. 2008. Opportunity discovery, opportunity exploitation, and economic organization. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 2: 175–190.
- Merton, R. K. 1968. *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
- Shane, S. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 10–20.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25: 217–226.
- Venkataraman, S. 2003. Foreword. In S. Shane, *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*: xi–xii. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Venkataraman, S., Sarasvathy, S. D., Dew, N., & Forster, W. R. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Whither the promise? Moving forward with entrepreneurship as a science of the artificial. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 21–33.
- Weick, K. 1969. *The social psychology of organizing*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Sharon A. Alvarez (alvarez_42@fisher.osu.edu)
The Ohio State University

Jay B. Barney (jay.barney@business.utah.edu)
University of Utah

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0069>



A Narrative Perspective on Entrepreneurial Opportunities

There continues to be considerable interest in entrepreneurial processes, as evidenced in re-

cent reflection pieces in *AMR* (Shane, 2012; Venkataraman, Sarasvathy, Dew, & Forster, 2012). Of particular interest are questions about the sources of entrepreneurial opportunities. For instance, are entrepreneurial opportunities a result of a process of discovery or one of creation? Should we locate agency in specific individuals, or should we conceptualize entrepreneurs as part of a larger process where agency is distributed and emergent?

To address these questions, Shane (2012) distinguishes between “opportunities” and “business ideas” to account for both entrepreneurial failures and successes and to advance a notion of entrepreneurial agency emerging at the nexus of individuals and opportunities. Opportunities, for Shane, are objectively given, ones that individuals can seize by generating business ideas that are interpretations “of how to recombine resources in a way that allows pursuit of that opportunity” (Shane, 2012: 15). Venkataraman et al. (2012) take a different route, embracing Simon’s (1996) sciences of the artificial. Building on Davidson’s (2001) “tripod” consisting of interactions among objective, subjective, and intersubjective, the authors conceptualize entrepreneurial opportunities as being both “made” and “found” in and through such interactions.

We are sympathetic to the progressive shift in the conceptualization of entrepreneurial agency—from one that considers it to be located in specific individuals to one that considers it to be an outcome of an ecology of interactions between humans and artifacts. Yet there are unaddressed issues pertaining to the location of boundaries that are germane to entrepreneurial opportunities. Boundaries, after all, are not given but, rather, a key ontological variable constituting entrepreneurial agency.

As a way to address this issue and add to this dialogue, we propose a “narrative perspective” that is informed by actor-network theory (Callon, 1986; Latour, 2005). Such a perspective subscribes to a relational ontology, one where what is “in” and what is “out” is not given but instead emerges in and through actions and interactions (Garud, Kumaraswamy, & Karnøe, 2010). An additional advantage of taking a narrative perspective is that it endogenizes time (Garud & Gehman, 2012), thereby allowing one to examine issues around temporal agency, a facet that Venkataraman et al. (2012) allude to in their re-

view but leave unexplored. Finally, a narrative perspective emphasizes “meaning making” (e.g., Bruner, 1990) as a core driver of the process and provides yet another vantage point on the nature and scope of entrepreneurial opportunities and agency.

NARRATIVE PERSPECTIVE

We use the term *narrative perspective* to suggest a certain stance toward entrepreneurial agency germane to the issue of discovery and creation. Specifically, a narrative perspective considers agency as an emergent property of relational processes involving ongoing associations between humans and artifacts. Moreover, a narrative perspective considers the past, present, and future to be intertwined. And it is in the interaction between relational space and durational time that meaning making occurs. We briefly explicate such a perspective to suggest that entrepreneurial agency is distributed and emergent, as are entrepreneurial opportunities, and that both discovery and creation are involved in dynamic ways as an entrepreneurial journey unfolds.

Relational Approach to Opportunities

A way to appreciate the value of a narrative perspective on opportunities is to contrast it with the positions offered by the “discovery” and “creation” perspectives (Alvarez & Barney, 2007). From a discovery perspective, opportunities are exogenously given (Shane, 2012), which alert individuals can seize (Kirzner, 1997). That is, there is a “context” out there that entrepreneurs tap into. In contrast, from a creation perspective, opportunities are endogenously generated through processes such as creative imagination (Lachmann, 1986) and effectuation (Sarasvathy, 2001). That is, there is a “subtext” of creative energy that is the wellspring of entrepreneurial opportunities.

Both positions are important. Entrepreneurial aspirations (subtexts) are articulated within cultural contexts, and it is the combination of the two—subtexts and contexts—that generates the “texts” manifested in the form of entrepreneurial narratives (Bartel & Garud, 2003; Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001). However, in contrast to the discovery and creation perspectives, rather than treat the context as given or give primacy to the sub-

text as the source of opportunities, the narrative perspective views all three—text, context, and subtext—as constituent elements of distributed yet emergent agency. Context matters as it provides the basis for the subtext (the generative forces for action) to operate, which, in turn, produces new text—that is, the specific manifestation of an entrepreneurial journey (Bartel & Garud, 2003). And as the process unfolds, all three—text, subtext, and context—are transformed in dynamic ways.

Consequently, instead of conceptualizing agency as residing at different “levels,” the narrative perspective embraces a flat ontology (Latour, 2005). Actors are a part of an ecology of interactions between social and material elements (Callon, 1986) that forms the basis for entrepreneurial narratives. These narratives serve as the basis for (1) the constitution of identities (Czarniawska, 1997), (2) the coordination of activities with others (Garud & Gehman, 2012), (3) the creative imagination of a future that has yet to emerge (Brown, Rappert, Adam, & Webster, 2000), and (4) sensemaking of what has transpired (Weick, 1995). Viewed from such a relational ontology, opportunity spaces emerge as social and material elements become entangled (and disentangled), thereby dynamically enabling and constraining the agentic orientations and possibilities of those involved (Garud et al., 2010).

A consideration of relationality reinforces the fact that opportunities emerge through a recombination of social and material elements. Many scholars have established this proposition—in economics (e.g., Schumpeter [1942], who drew attention to “recombination”), psychology (e.g., Koestler [1964], who introduced the notion of “bisociation”), sociology (e.g., Hargadon [2003], who established the importance of “brokers”), entrepreneurship (e.g., Baker, Miner, & Eesley [2003] and Garud & Karnøe [2003], who explored processes such as “bricolage” and “improvisation”), and the social studies of science (e.g., Callon [1986] and Latour [2005], who offered the notion of “translation”). This recombination proposition suggests that any act of creation is simultaneously an act of discovery, and vice versa. We discover existing ideas to create others. Or, symmetrically, we creatively imagine new ideas, leading to a discovery of what is possible.

Temporal Approach to Opportunities

Yet another way of reconciling discovery with creation is to endogenize the notion of time. As a starting point, it is important to note that entrepreneurial narratives extend over a period of time (Schumpeter, 1942). That is, besides speculating about what is happening at any given moment in time (Boje, 2008), entrepreneurial narratives make it possible for actors to look back into the past to make sense of what transpired (Weick, 1995) and reach into the future to project what the venture would like to accomplish (van Lente, 2000).

Such temporal “distention” (Ricoeur, 1984) holds several implications for the notion of opportunities. First, no new idea emerges full-blown and ready for implementation. It requires time and effort to take any idea from conception to reality, and the process is never linear. There are false starts and dead ends, ups and downs, and “backing and forthing” as an entrepreneurial journey unfolds (Garud & Gehman, 2012; Van de Ven, Polley, Garud, & Venkataraman, 1999). Such nonlinear dynamics are not necessarily detrimental, to the extent that entrepreneurs live in the “thick of time” (Garud & Gehman, 2012)—that is, they cultivate a temporal orientation that at any moment allows them to look forward and backward in time to generate “options value” from initiatives. Specifically, entrepreneurs who cultivate a broader temporal perspective can generate assets in real time for the future and can then go back to these assets (even those that were abandoned) as and when they become valuable. As is evident, both discovery and creation are involved.

Second, an ability to go back and forth derives from a perspective on time that is not readily evident in the vernacular use of the term *narrative*. Instead of confining us to a chronological view, Ricoeur (1984) suggests that a narrative implicates a different notion of time, one where the past, present, and future are intertwined. Specifically, attention in the present is forged by recollections of the past and anticipations of the future. From such a perspective, the creative imagination of entrepreneurs about the future shapes what facets of the past they choose to “discover” and mobilize (Garud et al., 2010). Symmetrically, the reverse is also true. How an entrepreneur looks at the past may change the nature of the opportunities that he or she con-

ceptualizes unfolding into the future. Embracing such a perspective on time further blurs the distinction between discovery and creation.

Meaning Making and Opportunities

The interaction between the relational and temporal dimensions of narratives generates meaning—as, for instance, in the infusion of a “pet rock” with value. Such meaning making contrasts with information processing associated with the discovery perspective, or *ex nihilo* imagination associated with the creation school. Instead, meaning making involves the definition of an opportunity as entrepreneurs “plot” sets of social and material elements from the past, present, and future into a comprehensible narrative. As Gabriel notes, “Story-work involves the transformation of everyday experience into meaningful stories. In doing so, the storytellers neither accept nor reject ‘reality.’ Instead they seek to mould it, shape it, and infuse it with meaning” (2000: 41).

Moreover, as we discussed earlier, meaning making is not objectively given or subjectively constructed but, rather, part of an ongoing relational process. It emerges in and through interactions between actors and artifacts that become entangled with one another. Actors who become involved have their own narratives to offer, depending upon their recollections of past experiences and their future aspirations. They each try to shape unfolding processes, in particular directions by framing a venture from their own vantage points. Ventures and opportunities sit at the intersection of such distributed efforts, and it is in the interactions between the different frames that a venture progresses over time.

CONCLUSION

In sum, a narrative perspective suggests that discovery and creation are both part of entrepreneurial opportunities. It also suggests that entrepreneurial journeys are dynamic processes requiring continual adjustments by actors. Entrepreneurial agency is evident in the distributed efforts of involved actors to navigate such unfolding processes, who narrate and renarrate their journeys given the possibilities that emerge, the futures they can conceptualize, and the pasts that they recollect.

REFERENCES

- Alvarez, S., & Barney, J. 2007. Discovery and creation: Alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1: 11–26.
- Baker, T., Miner, A., & Easley, D. 2003. Improvising firms: Bricolage, account giving, and improvisational competency in the founding process. *Research Policy*, 32: 255–276.
- Bartel, C., & Garud, R. 2003. Adaptive abduction as a mechanism for generalizing from narratives. In M. Easterby-Smith & M. Lyles (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational learning and knowledge*: 324–342. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Boje, D. M. 2008. *Storytelling organizations*. London: Sage.
- Brown, N., Rappert, B., Adam, B., & Webster, A. (Eds.). 2000. *Contested futures: A sociology of prospective techno-science*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Bruner, J. S. 1990. *Acts of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Callon, M. 1986. The sociology of an actor-network: The case of the electric vehicle. In M. Callon, J. Law, & A. Rip (Eds.), *Mapping the dynamics of science and technology*: 19–34. London: Macmillan.
- Czarniawska, B. 1997. *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davidson, D. 2001. *Subjective, intersubjective, objective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gabriel, Y. 2000. *Storytelling in organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garud, R., & Gehman, J. 2012. Metatheoretical perspectives on sustainability journeys: Evolutionary, relational and durational. *Research Policy*, 41: 980–995.
- Garud, R., & Karnøe, P. 2003. Bricolage vs. breakthrough: Distributed and embedded agency in technology entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 32: 277–300.
- Garud, R., Kumaraswamy, A., & Karnøe, P. 2010. Path dependence or path creation? *Journal of Management Studies*, 47: 760–774.
- Hargadon, A. 2003. *How breakthroughs happen—The surprising truth about how companies innovate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kirzner, I. 1997. Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35: 60–85.
- Koestler, A. 1964. *The act of creation*. New York: Macmillan.
- Lachmann, L. M. 1986. *The market as an economic process*. New York: Blackwell.
- Latour, B. 2005. *Reassembling the social: An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lounsbury, M., & Glynn, M. 2001. Cultural entrepreneurship: Stories, legitimacy and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22: 545–564.
- Ricoeur, P. 1984. *Time and narrative*. (Translated by K. Blamey & D. Pellauer.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sarasvathy, S. 2001. Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26: 243–263.
- Schumpeter, J. A. 1942. *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Routledge.
- Shane, S. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 10–20.
- Simon, H. A. 1996. *The sciences of the artificial* (3rd ed.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Van de Ven, A. H., Polley, D., Garud, R., & Venkataraman, S. 1999. *The innovation journey*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Lente, H. 2000. Forceful futures: From promise to requirement. In N. Brown, B. Rappert, B. Adam, & A. Webster (Eds.), *Contested futures: A sociology of prospective techno-science*: 43–64. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Venkataraman, S., Sarasvathy, S. D., Dew, N., & Forster, W. R. 2012. Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Whither the promise? Moving forward with entrepreneurship as a science of the artificial. *Academy of Management Review*, 37: 21–33.
- Weick, K. 1995. *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Raghu Garud (rgarud@psu.edu)
 Pennsylvania State University

Antonio Paco Giuliani (agiulia2@uic.edu)
 University of Illinois at Chicago

<http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amr.2012.0055>



Response to the Commentaries: The Individual-Opportunity (IO) Nexus Integrates Objective and Subjective Aspects of Entrepreneurship

Shane's 2012 article, "Reflections on the 2010 AMR Decade Award: Delivering on the Promise of Entrepreneurship As a Field of Research," was a reflection on the field of entrepreneurship in the decade following the publication of Shane and Venkataraman's 2000 article, "The Promise of Entrepreneurship As a Field of Research." This retrospective has stimulated the dialogue commentaries by Alvarez and Barney (2013) and Garud and Giuliani (2013). Collectively, the two

We appreciate Joseph Raffiee's suggestions on this dialogue.