



THE ENTREPRENEURIAL COMPASS

How Entrepreneurs Think,
Decide, and Act Under
Uncertainty

Dean A. Shepherd
Holger Patzelt

OPEN ACCESS

palgrave
macmillan

The Entrepreneurial Compass

Dean A. Shepherd • Holger Patzelt

The Entrepreneurial Compass

How Entrepreneurs Think, Decide,
and Act Under Uncertainty

palgrave
macmillan

Dean A. Shepherd
University of Notre Dame
South Bend, IN, USA

Holger Patzelt
Technical University of Munich
München, Bayern, Germany



ISBN 978-3-032-36428-9

ISBN 978-3-032-36429-6 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-36429-6>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2026. This book is an open access publication.

Open Access This book is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

This work is subject to copyright. All commercial rights are reserved by the author(s), whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Regarding these commercial rights a non-exclusive license has been granted to the publisher.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

If disposing of this product, please recycle the paper.

To the O'Meara sisters—Leonie Shepherd, Marlene Cranstoun, and Pam Kirkpatrick.

Dean A. Shepherd

To all the Küster girls in our family.

Holger Patzelt

Acknowledgements

We thank Ali Ferguson for helping copyedit the book.

Disclaimer: We used AI to help organize the content of this book. This content is ours and is based on our published research.

Contents

1	The Metacognitive Engine: Thinking About Thinking in High-Velocity Environments	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	The Genesis of Inquiry: State Curiosity and the Purpose of Metacognition	2
1.3	The Intergenerational Transmission of Intent	2
1.4	The Structural Framework: Knowledge, Experience, and the Logic of Coherence	3
1.5	The Self-Regulatory Core: Metacognitive Dialogue and Adaptability	4
1.6	The Neurodiverse Metacognitive Engine: ADHD and the Bias Toward Action	5
1.7	Anchoring Thought in Reality: Grounded Cognition and Boundary Objects	5
1.8	Conclusion	6
2	Opportunity Recognition: The Coherence of Discovery and Creation	9
2.1	Introduction	9
2.2	The Dual Convictions: Third-Person Versus First-Person Beliefs	10
2.3	The Formation of Opportunity Beliefs	10

2.4	The Mechanics of Perception: Gists, Representations, and the Alignment of Reality	11
2.5	The Cognitive Architecture: Structural Alignment and the Power of Similarity	12
2.6	The Socially Mediated Filter: Absorptive Capacity and the Value of Ties	13
2.7	Testing the Veracity of the Mind's Eye: Conjectures, Doubts, and Beliefs	14
2.8	Conclusion	14
3	Market Selection and Entry: Calibration Through Experimentation and Speed	17
3.1	Introduction	17
3.2	Staged Commitment: Managing the Ignorance Gap	18
3.3	The Strategic Heuristic: Real Options Reasoning as a Framework for Choice	18
3.4	The Scientist's Mindset: Empirical Validation of One's Business Model	19
3.5	Evaluative Frameworks: Investor Readiness and the Resource-Based Perspective	20
3.6	The Temporal Dynamics of Entry: Novelty and the Ignorance Threshold	21
3.7	Entry Through Collaboration: Strategic Alliances as Entry Scaffolding	22
3.8	Conclusion	22
4	The Biological and Emotional Engine: Physiology, Affect, and Entrepreneurial Well-Being	25
4.1	Introduction	25
4.2	The Reciprocal Feedback Loop: Health and Entrepreneurial Action	26
4.3	Physical Health as an Organizational Determinant: The Somatic Signal to Exit	26
4.4	Physiological Rhythms and Stress	27
4.5	Entrepreneurial Energy: A Dynamic Reservoir and Fatigue	28
4.6	Regulatory Tools: Sleep and Mindfulness in Restoring Cognitive Resources	28
4.7	Individual and Collective Emotional Intelligence	29
4.8	Grief Dynamics and the Anatomy of Failure Recovery	30
4.9	Managing Stigma and Normalizing Loss	30
4.10	Conclusion	31

5	The Entrepreneur's Well-Being: Meaning, Transcendence, and Resilience	33
5.1	Introduction	33
5.2	The Foundations of Meaningful Venturing: Purpose, Mattering, and Comprehension	34
5.3	Motivation-Knowledge Configurations and Existential Trade-Offs	34
5.4	The Mechanics of Resilience: Equilibrating Versus Disequilibrating Adversity	35
5.5	The Defensive Mechanism: Experience as a Buffer for Identity Resilience	36
5.6	Transcendent Affect: The Role of Awe and Empathy in Transformation	37
5.7	Authenticity, Social Acceptance, and the Risk of Fatigue	38
5.8	Redemption Narratives: Mentorship and the Relational Recrafting of Meaning	39
5.9	Conclusion	39
6	The Founding Team: Identity, Conflict, and the Power of Fit	41
6.1	Introduction	41
6.2	The Evolving Collective Engine: The Liability of Newness, Path Dependence, and Satisfying Human Needs	42
6.3	Compositional Archetypes: The Specialist-Generalist Tension and the Logic of Engagement	43
6.4	Collective Intelligence: Transactive Memory System and the Formalization of Roles	44
6.5	Navigating Social Dynamics: Effort, Conflict, and Group Rule-Breaking	45
6.6	The Nuclear Issue: Perceived Justice in Equity Distribution	46
6.7	Equity and Team Identification: The Optimal Ownership Range	46
6.8	The Architectural Emergence of the Venture Culture: Faultlines and Shielding	47
6.9	Conclusion	48
7	The Goal of Growth: Navigating the Founder's Dilemma and Scaling Excellence	51
7.1	Introduction	51
7.2	The Strategic Dilemma: Wealth, Control, and the Duality of Slack	52
7.3	The Multidimensional Nature of Growth: Synchronicity and Measurement	53

7.4	The Life Cycle of Organizational Liabilities: From Newness to Adolescence	53
7.5	Listening: Bidirectional Communication as a Dynamic Capability	54
7.6	Scaling: Definitional Harmonization and the Spreading of Excellence	56
7.7	Knowledge Flows in Expansion: Leveraging Internal and External Resources	57
7.8	The Growth Illusion: Situated Attention and the Speed Trap	58
7.9	Conclusion	58
8	Managing the Entrepreneurial Workforce: Retention, Burnout, and the Employee Lens	61
8.1	Introduction	61
8.2	The Employee Life Cycle in the Shadow of Uncertainty	62
8.3	The Contagion of Passion and Goal Clarity	62
8.4	The Scaling Toll: Burnout and Job Satisfaction	63
8.5	Managing the Exit: Project Termination and Employee Grief	64
8.6	Conclusion	65
9	Developing the Social Aspects of the Venture: Prosocial Motivation, Pathways of Compassion, and Hybridity	67
9.1	Introduction	67
9.2	The Pathways of Compassion: Sustaining Versus Transforming Alleviation	68
9.3	Organizing Hybridity: Balancing Commercial and Social Welfare Logics	69
9.4	The Greed Paradox: Ethical Regulation in the Hybrid Venture	69
9.5	Resource Mobilization and the Mechanics of Shielding	70
9.6	The Fatigue Model: Managing the Cumulative Toll of Prosocial Effort	72
9.7	Conclusion	72
10	The Signal to Stop: Exit, Termination, and the Art of Letting Go	75
10.1	Introduction	75
10.2	The Strategic Calculus of Termination: Modes, Power, and Decision Shocks	75
10.3	The Attentional Filter: Portfolio Strategy and Hierarchical Focus	77

	Contents	xiii
10.4	Barriers to Action: Escalation of Commitment, Stigma, and Decision Incongruence	78
10.5	External Signals: Investor Logic and the Stage of Failure	79
10.6	The High Cost of Persistence and the Phenomenon of “Creeping Death”	80
10.7	Conclusion	81
11	Navigating New Entrepreneurial Perspectives	83
11.1	Introduction	83
11.2	Beyond the WEIRD Horizon: Inclusivity and Local Knowledge	84
11.3	The Shadow Framework: Destructive Entrepreneurship and Moral Regulation	85
11.4	The Intersectional Frontier: Sustainability, Dirty Work, and Meaning	86
11.5	The Digital Engine: Crowd-Based Innovation and Compassion Venturing	87
11.6	Conclusion	88
	Bibliography	91
	Index	99

About the Authors

Dean A. Shepherd is the Ray and Milann Siegfried Professor of Entrepreneurship at the Mendoza College of Business at the University of Notre Dame. His research and teaching are in the field of entrepreneurship; he investigates the cognitive-emotional mechanisms of potential opportunities (noticing, evaluating, and constructing), new ventures (creating, growing, and terminating), entrepreneurial responses to adversity (events, chronic, and failure), and entrepreneurial creation and destruction (personal, social, and ecological value). Dean is a fellow of the Academy of Management. He has been awarded five honorary doctorates (Jonkoping University [Sweden], Technical University of Munich [Germany], Lulea University of Technology [Sweden], Hanken School of Economics [Finland], and Stockholm School of Economics [Sweden]). From the Entrepreneurs Division of the Academy of Management, Dean has been awarded the “Dedication to Entrepreneurship Award,” the “Mentor Award,” and the “Foundational Paper Award” (twice). He is the former editor-in-chief of the *Journal Business Venturing*. He has authored over 20 books and 180 publications in top management and entrepreneurship journals with approximately 100,000 Google citations.

Professor Holger Patzelt conducts research on business ventures, strategic entrepreneurship, and start-up failure. His work covers both psychological aspects, such as cognition and decision-making by entrepreneurs, and economic factors, such as the behavior and success of entrepreneurial organizations. Professor Patzelt obtained his degree in chemistry from TUM and the University of Karlsruhe. He completed his PhD in molecular biology at the University of Heidelberg. Parallel to this, he completed postgraduate coursework in business administration at the Distance Education University Hagen (Fernuniversität Hagen) and a PhD in business administration from the University of Bamberg. He later served as associate director at the Max Planck Institute of Economics in Jena and completed

his postdoctoral teaching qualification (habilitation) at the European Business School in Oestrich-Winkel. He has conducted research at ETH Zurich and the Leeds Business School of the University of Colorado in Boulder, USA.



1

The Metacognitive Engine: Thinking About Thinking in High-Velocity Environments

1.1 Introduction

The activation of the internal drive for entrepreneurial action begins with the *metacognitive engine*, a higher-order cognitive system that allows entrepreneurs to reflect upon and regulate their own thinking processes. In the volatile world of venture creation, the entrepreneur acts as a motivated tactician, consciously choosing between different cognitive strategies based on specific goals and environmental demands. This engine is not a passive processor but a dynamic system triggered by state curiosity, which encourages engagement with novel information and the search for new data. While the blueprints of this engine are often drafted across generations through intergenerational intentions, its implementation relies on structuring metacognitive knowledge across the domains of people, tasks, and strategy. Furthermore, the entrepreneur must navigate high-velocity environments where information is often ambiguous, requiring a constant urge to update their knowledge to resolve inconsistencies between mental models and external signals. By grounding abstract reflections in boundary objects like prototypes or business plans, the entrepreneur facilitates individual and collective sensemaking and transforms private conjectures into testable hypotheses. This cognitive foundation is an essential prerequisite for recognizing value where others see only noise. Mastering this internal dialogue ensures the metacognitive engine remains calibrated for long-term strategic success and adaptability.

1.2 The Genesis of Inquiry: State Curiosity and the Purpose of Metacognition

The activation of the internal engine for action begins not with a formal strategic plan but with the spark of *state curiosity*, a situational motivational state characterized by the intense desire to learn, explore novelties, and actively seek out information. This inquisitive arousal acts as a primary driver of exploration, as curious individuals operate with the anticipation that they will find missing information, motivating them to absorb and engage with novel stimuli more deeply than those lacking this drive. This initial arousal is the prerequisite for *metacognition*, formally defined as a higher-order cognitive process involving conscious reflection upon and control over one's own thinking processes. While basic cognition is the lower-order construct for fulfilling or performing specific tasks, metacognition is the higher-order ability to choose how to approach those tasks in the first place.

Within this framework, the entrepreneur acts as a motivated tactician, a fully engaged thinker who has multiple cognitive strategies available and chooses among them based on specific goals, motives, and needs. This purposeful engine moves the entrepreneur beyond rigid reliance on previously learned responses toward the co-creation of what could be, transforming the decision-making process into a sequence of favorable commitments. Importantly, these abilities are not static traits but learned processes that can be enhanced through training.

1.3 The Intergenerational Transmission of Intent

The transmission of *entrepreneurial intentions*—the conscious state of mind that directs attention toward entrepreneurship as a specific career goal—is not merely an individual phenomenon but a socialized one, in which entrepreneurial parents and grandparents serve as primary architects. Research indicates a strong positive correlation between a parent's entrepreneurial status and the likelihood that their offspring will develop similar intentions. This influence is not limited to the immediate parental unit; grandparents also exert a significant impact, either directly on the grandchild or indirectly by shaping the values of the parents.

These family influences operate as a form of social imprinting, where exposure to a family business increases the perception that entrepreneurship is a feasible and desirable career path. The strength of this intergenerational

transmission is further moderated by national culture, particularly *in-group collectivism*, which emphasizes loyalty and the continuity of family traditions. In environments characterized by high in-group collectivism, the metacognitive engine is calibrated early in life to view the creation of something from nothing not as a radical departure from the norm but as a predictable fulfillment of a family legacy. Thus, the blueprints for the metacognitive engine are often established within the entrepreneur's family system and passed on from generation to generation. However, the functional implementation of the engine relies on a structural framework that effectively organizes knowledge and processing strategies.

1.4 The Structural Framework: Knowledge, Experience, and the Logic of Coherence

The metacognitive engine is fueled by *metacognitive knowledge*, which refers to an individual's conscious cognitive understanding of matters across three distinct domains: people, tasks, and strategy. *Knowledge of people* reflects perceptions about oneself and others in terms of strengths and weaknesses. For instance, the entrepreneur may believe they excel at quantitative market analysis while recognizing a deficit in managing human resources. *Knowledge of tasks* involves an understanding of the nature of specific activities, such as the effort required to calculate complex cash flows versus drafting a visionary mission statement. *Knowledge of strategy* refers to a procedural understanding of when and why to use certain cognitive mechanisms to ensure an approach is appropriate for reaching a desired goal. Complementing this metacognitive knowledge is *metacognitive experience*, which consists of affective conduits through which memories, intuitions, and emotions serve as resources for making sense of a given task. This experience often manifests as a feeling of difficulty or of knowing, serving as a signal that draws in relevant past lessons to inform judgment in uncertain situations.

The metacognitive engine maintains its integrity through cognitive coherence—the extent to which a particular knowledge structure accounts for available evidence in a manner that is simple, comprehensive, and superior to alternative explanations. This logic of coherence allows for pieces of local data to be integrated into a global interpretation of reality. When environmental signals conflict with entrepreneurs' preexisting mental models, a powerful urge to update is triggered. This urge is an internal pressure to resolve inconsistencies via iterative updating to establish new, more plausible beliefs that

align with the changing external environment. Without this regular updating, even broad mental models are likely to miss small but critical changes in the competitive landscape. This structural framework of knowledge and coherence provides the necessary foundation for the more active processes of internal monitoring and self-regulation.

1.5 The Self-Regulatory Core: Metacognitive Dialogue and Adaptability

A functioning metacognitive engine requires self-regulated cognition, which refers to the learned capability to control one's thoughts and emotions to maintain or improve overall functioning and performance. This process is operationalized through a disciplined internal dialogue in which the entrepreneur engages in a series of metacognitive questions. These questions—such as “How is this situation different for my venture from situations I faced in the past?” or “What kind of information is most important to consider here?”—challenge automatic assumptions and move the thinker into a conscious, controlled processing mode. To monitor environmental ambiguity, the entrepreneur must address three levels of doubt: *state uncertainty* regarding their current environment, *effect uncertainty* regarding how changes will impact their venture, and *response uncertainty* regarding what specific course of action to pursue. This self-regulatory dialogue distinguishes between cognition, which involves selecting a specific response like a marketing campaign, and metacognition, which entails choosing the framing logic, such as deciding whether to use a causal or an effectual approach to the problem at hand.

The implementation of this self-regulatory dialogue is vital for the entrepreneur because high-velocity environments demand *cognitive adaptability*—the ability to be dynamic, flexible, and self-regulating in one's cognition. This adaptability improves performance by enabling the entrepreneur to think beyond cognitive biases and adapt decision policies iteratively in response to environmental feedback. Vital to this regulation is emotional intelligence. *Emotional intelligence* is the capacity to perceive, understand, use, and regulate emotional states as essential data. It allows the entrepreneur to view negative emotions like worry or frustration not as distractions but as essential information signals indicating that their current knowledge structures are inadequate and require revision. By treating emotions as feedback, the entrepreneur can avoid the trap of “creeping death”—a slow descent into failure characterized by a known but drawn-out loss of momentum—by acting on these internal

emotional signals while not being overwhelmed by them. The self-regulatory core of the metacognitive engine does not operate as a uniform baseline across all individuals; rather, neurodiversity, such as ADHD, can significantly alter the engine's trajectory and action orientation.

1.6 The Neurodiverse Metacognitive Engine: ADHD and the Bias Toward Action

While traditional models of self-regulation emphasize disciplined internal dialogue, individuals with ADHD symptoms—specifically impulsivity and hyperfocus—often bypass traditional cognitive checks in favor of rapid, proactive action. Impulsivity allows for a greater tendency toward *novelty seeking*, where the entrepreneur puts more weight on the potential upside of an opportunity than on its downside risk. This impulsivity typically results in a bias toward experimentation and action, even under conditions of extreme uncertainty.

Furthermore, the ADHD-driven metacognitive engine is characterized by a high degree of impatience and a low tolerance for boredom, which serve as recurring triggers for engaging in new behaviors at work. While these triggers can lead to challenges in managing routinized entrepreneurial tasks like bookkeeping or administrative work, they also fuel a constant search for new opportunities and the introduction of numerous products or services in parallel. When paired with *hyperfocus*—an intense, energetic activation for a specific venture-related task—the neurodiverse entrepreneur can maintain persistence that mimics passion for the task. These cognitive differences explain how a metacognitive engine is naturally calibrated for high-velocity exploration and constant novelty. As the master of this internal monitoring, the entrepreneur must then find ways to anchor these abstract reflections in the material world.

1.7 Anchoring Thought in Reality: Grounded Cognition and Boundary Objects

The challenge of navigating abstract concepts is managed through grounded cognition. *Grounded cognition* is based on the assumption that mental processes are typically rooted in situated action, bodily states, and sensory simulations. Because abstract ideas often lack clear physical referents, individuals can only truly understand them when their thinking is attached to

sensorimotor, linguistic, emotional, and social experiences. In this context, *sensorimotor experiences* involve in-body feelings and actions that ground concepts internally, linking them to the body's action systems. To facilitate this grounding, the entrepreneur relies on *boundary objects*, which are physical manifestations of ideas that act as bridges between individuals. These objects, which include prototypes, engineering drawings, project timelines, and formal business plans, provide vital points for triangulating something in common, thereby reducing the time required for collective sensemaking about a potential opportunity or the viability of a business model.

By anchoring mental schemas in these tangible artifacts, the entrepreneur moves information away from a purely individual endeavor toward a shared experience. For example, a high-tech prototype serves as a boundary object that allows the entrepreneur and a potential user to communicate about functional validity despite having different "thought worlds." This material grounding ensures that abstract conjectures remain rooted in reality, revealing shortfalls in a business model that might necessitate strategic pivots. Furthermore, engaging with boundary objects helps overcome knowledge boundaries by forcing the entrepreneur to expose the underlying logic of their beliefs and reveal implicit assumptions that would otherwise remain hidden.

The metacognitive engine must ultimately expand to include a *community of inquiry*, a collection of stakeholders, such as potential customers, mentors, and experts, who provide feedback to test the veracity of an idea. This expansion leads to socially mediated metacognition, which occurs when the entrepreneur recognizes that their own knowledge is inadequate for a task and seeks out relationships to complement that knowledge through others. This recognition of one's knowledge limitations can lead to action through *deference*, a conscious judgment to link one's own mental state to the expertise of a stakeholder to evaluate the coherence of a plan. By engaging their social network in this way, the entrepreneur transforms a solitary pursuit into a collaborative project, creating a shared reality that fosters collective efficacy.

1.8 Conclusion

The structural framework of the metacognitive engine is fueled by metacognitive knowledge regarding people, tasks, and strategy, which is complemented by metacognitive experience. This regulatory system ensures the entrepreneur does not merely react to their environment but actively shapes their own cognitive responses to it. The engine maintains its integrity through cognitive

coherence, driven by an urge to update that seeks to resolve inconsistencies between internal models and external signals. The internal mechanics of the metacognitive engine are further influenced by neurodiversity, such as ADHD, which can create a natural bias toward rapid action and hyperfocus. Moreover, by mastering their internal dialogue, the entrepreneur is prepared to bridge the gap between abstract thought and concrete action. This foundation is the prerequisite for moving from general mechanics to identifying specific, actionable opportunities. The next chapter explores how this engine specifically identifies and evaluates market signals to form the beliefs required to initiate a venture. It examines the transition from third-person possibilities to the first-person conviction that an opportunity is achievable. Ultimately, it moves toward a judgment that the entrepreneur must act.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





2

Opportunity Recognition: The Coherence of Discovery and Creation

2.1 Introduction

Opportunity recognition is the foundational process of identifying situations in which new goods, services, or organizing methods can be introduced to create value. This process is rarely a lightning strike of inspiration; rather, it involves a disciplined two-stage belief formation. First, the entrepreneur develops a third-person opportunity belief, which is the conviction that a situation represents an opportunity for “someone.” This initial belief must then transition into a first-person opportunity belief, a specificity-driven conviction that the opportunity is achievable and desirable for “me.” To navigate radical uncertainty, the entrepreneur employs structural alignment, looking beyond superficial features to identify causal relationships linking technologies to target markets. This chapter examines how practitioners navigate the distance between current knowledge and stable operations by treating opportunities as entrepreneurial conjectures. These conjectures are tested through strategies that seek both confirmation and disconfirmation to establish a model that accounts for the available data. Furthermore, we explore how an individual’s goal orientation—whether focused on mastery or avoidance—impacts this recognition process. Ultimately, successful opportunity recognition is a matter of cognitive coherence, whereby an individual iteratively updates beliefs until they form a stable, actionable vision of the future.

2.2 The Dual Convictions: Third-Person Versus First-Person Beliefs

Opportunity recognition is the foundational driver of *value creation*, defined formally as the process by which individuals identify situations in which new goods, services, raw materials, markets, and organizing methods can be introduced through the formation of new means, ends, or means-ends relationships.¹ To be an entrepreneur is to act on the possibility that one has identified a path worth pursuing. This process is inherently judgmental and takes place under conditions of radical uncertainty, where the traditional calculus of risk and return is often obscured. For a potential opportunity to lead to action, an individual must move through a two-stage process of belief formation. Stage I involves the development of a *third-person opportunity belief*, which is the conviction that a specific environmental or technological change represents a viable opportunity for someone with the requisite knowledge and motivation. This stage involves first-person attention, whereby an individual either acknowledges a signal from the environment or remains ignorant—that is, lacks information or awareness that an opportunity exists. Individuals who lack the necessary knowledge and motivation will typically fail to notice these signals and will no longer attend to them.

Once an individual escapes ignorance and forms a third-person belief, they must transition to Stage II, which involves the formation of a *first-person opportunity belief*. This is the belief that the opportunity is not only desirable and feasible for someone but that it is specifically achievable and worthwhile for me or my venture. This evaluative process is a function of the individual's willingness to bear perceived uncertainty. Metacognitive experience serves as the critical catalyst for this belief formation by acting as an affective conduit through which previous memories and intuitions, such as a feeling of knowing, are employed as resources to qualify judgment (see Chapter 1). While these dual convictions define the entrepreneur's psychological state, the functional realization of these beliefs is governed by intergenerational drivers of intent.

2.3 The Formation of Opportunity Beliefs

The transition from a third-person opportunity belief to a first-person opportunity belief is not merely a cognitive calculation but is also filtered through an individual's goal-orientation profile. Managers who lead adaptive firms

¹ This definition is based on Shane and Venkataraman (2000).

typically possess a *mastery goal orientation*—a purpose toward personal development and growth that guides their engagement in tasks and achievement-related behavior. This orientation prioritizes learning, skill development, and the belief that one's abilities are malleable. For these individuals, identifying an opportunity is an invitation to experiment; they view obstacles and even early failure not as red flags to stop but as essential data points for refining their entrepreneurial conjectures. In contrast, those with an *avoiding goal orientation* desire to avoid experiencing disapproval about their competence and receiving negative judgments about it. Individuals with such an orientation focus on avoiding negative judgments and failure, which often leads to a resistant pattern of behavior in which they ignore market signals suggesting a need for adaptation.

These orientations ultimately determine the “calibration” of the metacognitive engine. While the desire to demonstrate competence to others is common across most entrepreneurs, it is the addition of mastery that enables the entrepreneur to actively seek feedback and vary strategies in newly entered markets. Conversely, an *avoiding goal orientation* creates a passive recipient of information, in which the fear of embarrassment or the perceived “work” of change leads the entrepreneur to focus only on markets that fit their existing limited abilities. By understanding these motivational profiles, we can see how two entrepreneurs facing identical environments might arrive at radically different first-person opportunity beliefs.

2.4 The Mechanics of Perception: Gists, Representations, and the Alignment of Reality

The mental operations underlying opportunity recognition rely on coherence theory. *Coherence theory* is based on the assumption that individuals seek to incorporate new environmental signals into a seamless and consistent view of reality. This process can be viewed as either a bottom-up or a top-down progression. In a bottom-up process, the environment itself stimulates a gist, regardless of the number of objects present. This gist functions as an information-guidance system, directing attention toward salient stimuli to form a simplified picture of the environment that informs beliefs. This sensory representation is then stabilized within a coherence structure, where it can be compared to representations held in short-term memory to detect changes. The final stage of this perception involves matching these sensory representations with meta-representations, which are general statements and propositions about reality derived from prior experience.

In contrast to this bottom-up process, a top-down process begins with an individual's deeper knowledge structures, which generate narrow preconceived notions that focus attention only on expected aspects of the environment. While this approach allows for the rapid formation of first-person opportunity beliefs, it often leads to *attentional blindness* such that the individual discounts unexpected signals that do not align with their existing models. When environmental signals conflict with preexisting mental models, a powerful urge to update is triggered. This urge is an internal pressure to resolve inconsistencies through iterative updating, establishing new beliefs that parsimoniously account for the available evidence. This search for *cognitive coherence*—the extent to which a knowledge structure accounts for evidence in a manner that is simple and superior to alternatives—outweighs any belief established up to that point. As the individual manages these perceptual shifts, they must utilize a more detailed cognitive structure to align their internal capabilities with external market needs.

2.5 The Cognitive Architecture: Structural Alignment and the Power of Similarity

A critical mechanism in opportunity recognition is structural alignment—making sense of potential matches between a new means of supply and a target market. The alignment comes in two distinct forms: superficial and structural. *Superficial similarity* arises when the basic elements of two situations resemble each other. In technology transfer, high superficial similarity occurs when the parts and components of a technology or the context of its development resemble the basic elements of a market. For example, a video game system developed for teenage drivers is superficially similar to a toy market for children. This mode of reasoning is often the default for the human mind, as it guides the retrieval of information from memory with little cognitive effort. However, an overemphasis on superficiality can lead to faulty reasoning, in which an individual becomes blinded to outward appearance despite a lack of true market fit.

In contrast, *structural similarity* arises when two situations share the same logical relationships between their components. This sharing involves aligning higher-order structural relationships, including causal chains, goal statements, and scientific mechanisms that explain how a technology works to solve a problem. For instance, motion-sensing technology used in flight simulators shares a high degree of structural similarity with the concentration needs of

children with ADHD, even though the contexts are superficially distant.² High structural alignment occurs when a technology's capabilities closely match the root causes of a market's problems. While processing structural relationships is cognitively demanding, it is essential for making the creative mental leaps required for revolutionary innovation. These leaps allow for the identification of nonobvious opportunities in which structural parallels exist in the absence of superficial ones. This ability is deeply rooted in the idiosyncratic knowledge possessed by the entrepreneur, as unique backgrounds and professional experiences enable individuals to make mental connections between seemingly unrelated stimuli. While structural alignment focuses on the internal cognitive matching of means and ends, the actual information used for alignment is often mediated through social ties.

2.6 The Socially Mediated Filter: Absorptive Capacity and the Value of Ties

Social ties—ranging from weak to strong—provide the raw data on markets, clients, and institutions required to reduce the entrepreneur's ignorance gap. However, the perceived value of this information is contingent upon the entrepreneurial venture's *absorptive capacity*, defined as its ability to recognize, assimilate, and apply new knowledge to commercial ends. When the venture's absorptive capacity is high, it acts as a magnifying glass for the metacognitive engine, allowing the entrepreneur to better value information from heterogeneous, frequent communication with social ties.

Furthermore, the strength of these ties interacts with the entrepreneur's *generalized trust in others* (i.e., the non-relationship-specific tendency to think positively of others and to attribute good intentions and sincerity to them) to shape the opportunity-recognition process. Entrepreneurs with high generalized trust are more likely to believe in the reliability of information coming from weak ties, allowing them to resolve entry uncertainty more rapidly. This social mediation ensures that the cognitive architecture is not a closed system; instead, it is an information-combination contingency in which the entrepreneur's trust and the venture's capacity to learn determine whether a market signal is recognized as a valid opportunity or dismissed as noise. This external validation through social networks provides the final set of evidence needed before the entrepreneur begins the formal process of testing their conjectures.

²For more information about these examples of structural alignment, see Gregoire et al. (2010).

2.7 Testing the Veracity of the Mind's Eye: Conjectures, Doubts, and Beliefs

The identification of an opportunity initially manifests as an entrepreneurial conjecture. An *entrepreneurial conjecture* is an inference that the future value of a new product or service will exceed its costs. Because such a conjecture is uncertain, the entrepreneur must test its *veracity*—whether the conjecture can be conclusively falsified. The approach to testing depends on whether the entrepreneur begins with an initial belief or an initial doubt. An *initial doubt model* is characterized by skepticism, with the entrepreneur suspending belief until enough information is gathered to accept or reject the conjecture. This model employs negative test strategies that search for disconfirming evidence outside the bounds of the conjecture. Conversely, an *initial belief model* uses the conjecture as a foundation for action, with the entrepreneur employing positive-test strategies to seek confirming evidence. While this model can lead to confirmation bias, believing that something unproven is possible is a key mechanism for creativity and discontinuous innovation.

The effectiveness of these strategies depends on the scope of the conjecture relative to the opportunity. Underestimation occurs when the conjecture is too narrow, while overestimation occurs when it is too broad. Misestimation and disjointed estimation represent more complex forms of misalignment where portions of the conjecture fall entirely outside the actual opportunity space. To navigate these states, the entrepreneur must use feedback, which can be outcome-based (“Did it work?”) or cognitive (“Why did it work?”). Cognitive feedback is superior for learning, as it conveys information about the optimal relationship between decision criteria and task performance. By iteratively seeking feedback, the entrepreneur engages in socially mediated metacognition, recognizing the limits of their own knowledge and seeking a community of inquiry to test and refine their conjectures. The success of this testing process is further shaped by the entrepreneur’s internal attentional, motivational, and knowledge structures.

2.8 Conclusion

To validate convictions for action, the entrepreneur treats identified opportunities as conjectures that must be tested through disciplined positive and negative test strategies. This process is not merely about finding “the truth” but about establishing cognitive coherence, with the entrepreneur iteratively

updating their beliefs to account for all available data. This coherence is reached when significant contradictions between internal plans and external signals no longer exist. The resulting internal stability is what allows the entrepreneur to commit resources in the face of radical uncertainty, transforming a private belief into a public endeavor. Recognition is also socially mediated, as the venture's absorptive capacity and the entrepreneur's trust in others filter the value of information received through social ties. When these opportunity beliefs stabilize, the entrepreneur must transition from the mind's eye to the material world. Recognizing an opportunity is only the beginning; the entrepreneur must then determine the optimal timing and mode of market entry. The next chapter details the staged commitment and the scientific experimentation required to turn entrepreneurial conjectures into realities. We explore how to reduce the ignorance gap through disciplined exploration and the strategy of "reserving the right to play." This transition focuses on moving from the mental formation of beliefs to the physical commitment of assets.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





3

Market Selection and Entry: Calibration Through Experimentation and Speed

3.1 Introduction

The transition from a mental conjecture to a market reality is managed through a staged commitment model that systematically reduces the entrepreneur's ignorance gap. This model involves a controlled sequence: prospecting to detect grassroots signals, developing to assess value through intensive experiments, and exploiting to establish full-scale operations. Central to this transition is real options reasoning (ROR), a strategic heuristic that treats early investments as small “probes” to reserve the right to play while bounding failure and truncating downside costs. By adopting a scientist's mindset, the entrepreneur treats their business model as a set of hypotheses to be tested through lean learning cycles rather than a fixed plan to be executed at all costs. This chapter explores the critical factors governing the timing of exploitation, for which the cost of acquiring more knowledge outweighs the potential gain of delaying entry. We examine the trade-offs between entering early versus late and how to calculate the ignorance threshold. Furthermore, we explain how the entrepreneur must manage investor readiness across the technology, market, and management dimensions while leveraging strategic alliances as scaffolding for entry to access essential resources.

3.2 Staged Commitment: Managing the Ignorance Gap

The transition from identifying a potential opportunity to initiating full-scale market entry is a multistage process of information acquisition designed to reduce the entrepreneur's ignorance gap. This gap represents the distance between the entrepreneur's current incomplete knowledge and the knowledge required to produce a product or service with stable revenue streams.

In high-velocity environments, where data quickly becomes obsolete, this journey moves through three recognizable stages: prospecting, developing, and exploiting. *Prospecting* refers to the initial grassroots exploration to detect signals of potential opportunities in either a physical location or a conceptual domain. At this stage, uncertainty is at its maximum because the entrepreneur lacks sufficient information about the environment to give meaning to technological or market changes. The objective of prospecting is not to confirm success but to determine if a viable venture—a metaphorical “mine”—even exists. Once a signal is detected, the process transitions to the developing stage, which involves more intensive, detailed exploration to reduce uncertainty about the opportunity's specific value. This stage is characterized by focused knowledge accumulation through experimentation, such as conducting market research on customer demand. The focus shifts from identifying the existence of an opportunity to assessing its feasibility and desirability: “Is what is there worth pursuing?” Finally, *exploiting* entails establishing full-scale, efficient operations for products or services derived from the opportunity. This stage requires the highest level of resource commitment, often involving irreversible investments in infrastructure, production systems, and routines.

As a project progresses through these stages, the influence of macroenvironmental factors diminishes, as success becomes increasingly dependent on internal capabilities and disciplined management of operational efficiency. Building on this staged commitment, the entrepreneur must employ a specific strategic logic to manage the financial and emotional costs of these sequential investments.

3.3 The Strategic Heuristic: Real Options Reasoning as a Framework for Choice

ROR is a strategic heuristic utilized to manage radical uncertainty by treating initial investments as small staged probes into the future. This approach provides a counterweight to the pervasive antifailure bias by reframing failure

as a cheap and necessary means of gathering information rather than a permanent stigma. In the context of market selection, ROR allows an individual to reserve the right to play by making relatively minor investments that serve as options to explore a specific location or knowledge domain without committing to a full-scale launch. By viewing a portfolio of projects as a bundle of options, the entrepreneur can bound failure, effectively limiting financial exposure and truncating the downside costs of initiatives that fail to meet their milestones.

This ROR approach is dynamic, requiring constant reevaluation of an option in response to emerging feedback. If initial trials during the prospecting or developing stages disconfirm critical assumptions, ROR directs the entrepreneur to pull the plug on the project. This decision is a mechanism for containing downside loss, ensuring that human and financial capital are redirected toward more promising leads in the entrepreneur's portfolio. However, a fundamental tension often exists between those who "own the option" (upper management who decide on resource allocation) and those who "are the option" (project team members who manage operations). While the former may ruthlessly terminate underperforming projects, the latter often experience *grief*—the negative emotional reaction to the loss of something important to them. To mitigate these indirect costs, the organization must foster a culture that normalizes failure and redeploys talent quickly to maintain morale and learning. The execution of a staged commitment model is not merely a strategic choice; it requires a scientist's mindset.

3.4 The Scientist's Mindset: Empirical Validation of One's Business Model

The scientist's mindset operationalizes the principles of ROR by treating business models as sets of hypotheses to be tested through lean learning cycles. A *business model* is a conceptual tool describing the logic of how a company creates, markets, and delivers value to generate sustainable revenue. At its inception, every business model contains a leap of faith—a set of untested assumptions regarding whether a product or service solves a customer problem and whether a viable business can be established. The scientist's mindset follows a disciplined five-step process: (1) forming hypotheses that reflect the assumptions underlying the opportunity, (2) searching for disconfirming evidence to puncture holes in these hypotheses rather than seeking support (avoiding confirmation bias), (3) building expertise through effort rather than just time, (4) testing critical assumptions first to discover fatal flaws before

sinking significant capital, and (5) testing cheap assumptions to learn at the lowest possible cost.

Within this framework, the entrepreneur prioritizes activities that provide the most significant reduction in ignorance for the least amount of capital—for example, customer interviews or the development of low-cost boundary objects, such as rudimentary prototypes. These boundary objects facilitate collective sensemaking by providing a shared reference point for stakeholders to evaluate an idea's feasibility. If testing disconfirms a hypothesis, the entrepreneur may pivot—a course correction that changes the venture's strategic direction based on social interactions and feedback. Success in this mindset is defined by the speed of the lean learning cycles, in which the results of one experiment inform the next, allowing for parallel learning across multiple opportunities. While this scientific approach tests the entrepreneur's internal logic, the external assessment of the venture's potential is governed by specific dimensions of readiness and resource characteristics.

3.5 Evaluative Frameworks: Investor Readiness and the Resource-Based Perspective

When moving toward full-scale entry, the entrepreneur must calibrate the venture's investor readiness across three critical dimensions: technology, market, and management. *Technology readiness* is established when prototypes have been successfully beta-tested for reliability in external environments. *Market readiness* requires concrete proof of customer demand, often demonstrated through surveys, preorders, or actual sales. *Management readiness* centers on a founding team that possesses both specialized industry expertise and a proven record of venture creation.

Beyond these readiness milestones, experts rely on five attributes derived from the resource-based perspective to assess an opportunity's long-term attractiveness: value, rarity, inimitability, limits on competition, and relatedness.¹ *Value* reflects the potential for resources to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of venture processes, while *rarity* refers to whether the information underlying the opportunity is unavailable to others. *Inimitability* is the degree to which competitors find it difficult or costly to develop substitutes, and *limits on competition* reflect the defensibility of the future market position. Finally, a critical yet often overlooked attribute is *relatedness*—the extent to which the new opportunity aligns with the entrepreneur's existing knowledge,

¹ For more on the resource-based view, see Barney (1991).

skills, and abilities. High relatedness facilitates the effective integration of future resources with current endowments, reducing the costs associated with learning and organizational adaptation. Furthermore, the entrepreneur must minimize *decision incongruence*—the gap between the decision-making rationale conveyed to others (e.g., investors) and the rationale informing actual decisions. Decreased decision incongruence is itself a resource, as it increases the ability to gain buy-in and legitimacy from key stakeholders, which are essential for resource mobilization during expansion. The synthesis of these evaluative dimensions and the staged search process ultimately dictates the timing of market entry.

3.6 The Temporal Dynamics of Entry: Novelty and the Ignorance Threshold

The ignorance threshold governs the decision of when to stop exploring and begin exploiting. This threshold is a unique critical time point at which the expected incremental gain from acquiring more knowledge no longer justifies the potential loss in performance caused by delaying entry. For opportunities characterized by high novelty, for which situational unfamiliarity is extreme, the urgency to enter is often diminished. In these cases, the “veil of doubt” requires a longer period of exploration to reduce the *mortality risk*—the likelihood of downside loss—which is expected to decrease as knowledge accumulates. Conversely, for opportunities with low novelty, stakeholders raise fewer issues of legitimacy, and the entrepreneur may expedite exploitation because the need to preempt competition outweighs the benefits of further delay.

Mastering this timing requires an assessment of uncertainty. In a high-velocity environment, the entrepreneur may rely on systematic search when the landscape is stable but must adopt an adaptive decision-making style when complexity increases. This adaptation often involves attentional oscillation between top-down processing (using established mental models to notice incremental changes) and bottom-up processing (capturing environmental signals to spot discontinuous shifts). If the entrepreneur fails to reach the ignorance threshold and entry is stalled, the venture risks becoming a permanently failing organization that squanders resources without a clear signal to stop. By estimating this threshold, the entrepreneur ensures the transition from a speculative conjecture to a market reality occurs with maximum efficiency and strategic impact. For many entrepreneurs, overcoming the ignorance threshold does not immediately lead to independent market introduction;

instead, they utilize strategic alliances as scaffolding to access the knowledge and resources required for full-scale operations.

3.7 Entry Through Collaboration: Strategic Alliances as Entry Scaffolding

A *strategic alliance* is a cooperative relationship between two or more organizations that actively work together to develop and commercialize a product. These alliances can be categorized into upstream, horizontal, and downstream structures. *Upstream alliances* are typically with universities or research institutions, focusing on basic research and the acquisition of technological knowledge. *Horizontal alliances* are cooperative relationships with competitors or similar-stage firms that allow developmental risks to be shared. However, both of these collaborative entry paths carry the risk of *partner opportunism*—when established incumbents attempt to appropriate the entrepreneur’s intellectual property or exert excessive control. The technological capability specialization of the entrepreneur’s venture serves as a primary defense mechanism against this risk. Specifically, when the venture’s capabilities are highly specialized, the entrepreneur can more effectively mitigate the coordination costs and cultural incompatibilities associated with university partnerships.

In contrast, in *downstream vertical alliances*, such as those with large pharmaceutical firms or industry incumbents, possessing *less* specialized technological capabilities can paradoxically increase the venture’s bargaining power. A broader capability set allows the entrepreneur to better counteract attempts at overcontrol, as it signals a higher degree of independent viability. By strategically allying with incumbents to access complementary legal, regulatory, and distribution assets, the entrepreneur can bypass the need to make costly duplicative investments, thereby accelerating the transition from a validated business model to a competitive market presence.

3.8 Conclusion

Successful entry requires the entrepreneur to calibrate investor readiness, ensuring the venture possesses resource attributes like value, rarity, and inimitability. This temporal management prevents the venture from becoming a “living dead” organization by making sure exploitation begins at the peak of strategic advantage. By utilizing ROR, the entrepreneur reserves the right

to play while bounding failure, effectively turning a high-risk venture into a manageable portfolio of staged investments. This disciplined approach ensures capital is only fully committed once the “fog of uncertainty” has sufficiently cleared through validated learning. Furthermore, specialized technological capabilities allow the entrepreneur to mitigate the risk of partner opportunism in strategic alliances. While these approaches govern the “how” and “when” of entry, they are ultimately fueled by the human engine behind the venture. The rigorous demands of entry and exploration place significant pressure on the emotions and physical health of the entrepreneur. The next chapter delves into the emotions, biological rhythms, and recovery mechanisms required to sustain the entrepreneur through the volatility of venture creation. We move from the calculus of entry to the biological requirements of the entrepreneur themselves, including examining how physiological health and emotional intelligence function as essential assets for enduring the entrepreneurial marathon.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





4

The Biological and Emotional Engine: Physiology, Affect, and Entrepreneurial Well-Being

4.1 Introduction

Entrepreneurial action and physical health exist in a reciprocal feedback loop, in which the intensity of venturing both consumes and shapes an individual's vital resources. The biological engine of the entrepreneur manifests in physiological markers, such as the diurnal rhythm of cortisol and the depletion of cognitive resources under extreme task demands. To prevent systemic exhaustion or fatigue, the entrepreneur must treat their well-being as a strategic asset, utilizing regulatory tools like high-quality sleep and mindfulness to facilitate resource recovery. This chapter shifts the focus from external strategy to the internal biological and emotional landscape of the entrepreneur. We examine the entrepreneur's ability to perceive and understand emotions as essential data for decision-making through individual and collective emotional intelligence. The chapter also details the psychological weight of failure, introducing grief dynamics and the process of anticipatory grieving for those facing the end of a project. The entrepreneur must learn to oscillate between a loss orientation and a restoration orientation to recover and learn effectively. By maintaining an authentic self-view, the entrepreneur can ensure setbacks remain predictable stages of learning rather than permanent personal stigmas. Ultimately, biological and emotional health are the foundation of excellence.

4.2 The Reciprocal Feedback Loop: Health and Entrepreneurial Action

The internal engine for action is powered by more than just cognitive schema; it is driven by a biological core, in which physical health and entrepreneurial behavior exist in a continuous, reciprocal feedback loop. Entrepreneurial action is not merely a consumer of an individual's health resources but an active shaper of them, as the intensity of venturing can both deplete and replenish physical and mental vitality. Within this system, entrepreneurial emotion—alternatively referred to as affect—encompasses the general constellation of an individual's feeling responses, including dispositional affect, specific emotions, and moods. *Dispositional affect* refers to a person's stable, underlying affective personality that leads to a consistent perspective. In contrast, specific *emotions* are intense, short-lived reactions to specific stimuli, and *moods* represent low-intensity, diffuse, and enduring reactions to general stimuli.

Because venture creation involves the investment of cognitive, behavioral, and financial resources into uncertain opportunities, the entrepreneur's health functions as a dynamic variable that fluctuates according to the venture's specific task demands. The entrepreneur must therefore treat their physical and psychological well-being as a critical initial strategic asset that requires the same disciplined management as financial capital. When these biological signals are ignored, the resulting meaning vacuum can lead to chronic fatigue and systemic exhaustion, impairing the very metacognitive functions required for performance. While much of the architectural focus in entrepreneurship has been on the entrepreneur's mental health and cognitive resilience, the physical body represents a literal and finite constraint on the venture's survival.

4.3 Physical Health as an Organizational Determinant: The Somatic Signal to Exit

Physical health issues—ranging from chronic back pain to intensive treatments like chemotherapy—are more than personal misfortunes; they are significant origins of venture distress and subsequent exit. Empirical evidence suggests that the entrepreneur's physical health functions as a critical component of entrepreneurial human capital. When this somatic asset is compromised, the

entrepreneur's probability of exit increases significantly, even if the business model remains viable.

Therefore, the entrepreneur's physical health serves as a fundamental gatekeeper for entrepreneurial action. Unlike mental health issues, which may often be masked or managed through cognitive reframing, severe physical illness often imposes an involuntary stop signal that depletes the entrepreneur's ability to engage in essential venture-related tasks, such as paperwork, customer interaction, or strategic pivoting. Consequently, their somatic state must be viewed as an organizational determinant that dictates the venture's life cycle. By recognizing physical health as a primary risk factor, the entrepreneur can better appreciate why maintaining biological rhythms is a strategic necessity rather than a personal luxury. This realization leads us from the broad impact of physical health to the specific physiological markers that govern daily performance.

4.4 Physiological Rhythms and Stress

The performance of the entrepreneur's biological engine manifests in physiological markers, primary among them being the diurnal rhythm of *cortisol*—the body's chief stress hormone. In a healthy, adapting system, cortisol levels typically peak shortly after an individual wakes up and gradually decline throughout the day. However, research indicates that low cortisol levels and a flattening of this expected daytime rhythm serve as potential indices of risk in human adaptation and performance. Monitoring these hormone concentrations provides a biological dashboard for the metacognitive engine, allowing the entrepreneur to distinguish between predictable time-dependent changes and total systemic stress.

Furthermore, the relationship between stress and entrepreneurship is complex, with certain covariances attributable to both genetics and one's immediate environment. Chronic stress in the entrepreneurial context often arises from the pervasive uncertainty regarding whether a product solves a customer problem or if a viable business can even be established. If the entrepreneur lacks the resources to navigate these stressors, they may experience *venturing fatigue*, characterized by a psychological detachment from stakeholders and a desensitization to the problems the venture was designed to solve. To prevent this biological engine from overheating under the pressure of rapid change, the entrepreneur must employ specific regulatory tools designed for resource recovery and exhaustion mitigation.

4.5 Entrepreneurial Energy: A Dynamic Reservoir and Fatigue

Beyond physiological hormones, the heart of the venture is fueled by entrepreneurial energy, defined as the level of energetic activation the entrepreneur feels specifically for building their venture. This energy is stored in a dynamic entrepreneurial energy reservoir that fluctuates based on the entrepreneur's daily interactions and their ability to deliver on self-promises and customer expectations. When this reservoir is full, the entrepreneur experiences a well-being phase characterized by high engagement and a productive belief in the venture's future. However, as the entrepreneur consumes energy to meet stakeholder demands, the reservoir can drop to a state of *entrepreneurial fatigue*—a persistent and extreme lack of energetic activation in which building the venture no longer feels meaningful.

The entrepreneur can manage their energy through three distinct phases: eudaimonic, destructive, and diverting. In the *eudaimonic* phase, the entrepreneur maintains energy by balancing intense venture activities with recovery outside the venture. If the entrepreneur becomes disillusioned or feels unable to fulfill their role expectations, they may enter the *destructive* phase, in which their belief in the venture spirals negatively, potentially leading to total exhaustion. In the final *diverting* phase, energy is redirected toward alternative careers or side projects, making the entrepreneur's exit more likely. Understanding these energy cycles is essential for the entrepreneur to recognize when they are merely tired versus when they are entering a state of systemic fatigue. To prevent this depletion from becoming permanent, the entrepreneur must utilize specific regulatory tools designed to facilitate resource recovery and refuel the internal engine.

4.6 Regulatory Tools: Sleep and Mindfulness in Restoring Cognitive Resources

Sustaining long-term performance requires moving beyond a simple “grind” mentality toward a sophisticated approach to action centered on recovery and self-regulation. Primary among these regulatory tools is the management of sleep, which serves as the fundamental physiological mechanism for restoring the cognitive resources depleted during intense decision-making periods. Insufficient sleep does not merely cause tiredness; it creates specific cognitive deficits that make the entrepreneur more prone to impulsive errors and the experience trap, whereby they over-rely on outdated heuristics.

Complementing sleep is the practice of *mindfulness*—a cognitive approach that involves present-moment awareness (without rehashing the past or worrying about the future), observing one's thoughts and feelings in a non-judgmental way, and acknowledging reality to accept it. Mindfulness allows the entrepreneur to detach from immediate stressors and facilitates self-acceptance. This self-regulation is further driven by the desire to fulfill three basic psychological needs: relatedness, competence, and autonomy. *Relatedness* is the feeling of being connected to and understood by others. *Competence* refers to the psychological need to feel effective and to interact successfully with one's environment. *Autonomy* is the degree to which an individual feels they have decision-making control and can choose their own path toward a personal objective. When these needs are thwarted, the entrepreneur must invest significant effort to restore them, leading to potential burnout if the effort is not balanced by recovery rituals. By institutionalizing these rituals, the entrepreneur ensures their internal engine remains resilient, preventing the destructive accumulation of stress. Beyond biological recovery, the entrepreneur requires a high degree of emotional intelligence to process the complex emotional data generated by the venture and its stakeholders.

4.7 Individual and Collective Emotional Intelligence

The processing of emotional data occurs at both the individual and group levels, which are linked through bridging mechanisms in a meso-level theoretical framework. At the individual level, *emotional intelligence* is the capacity to perceive, understand, use, and regulate one's own emotional states and others' emotional states as essential information signals. This individual capacity allows the entrepreneur to treat negative affect, like frustration or worry, as data indicating that their current knowledge structures are inadequate and require revision. At the group level, emotional intelligence refers to the venture-level capacity to acknowledge, monitor, and attend to the emotions of all venture members.

These individual and collective capacities jointly influence sensemaking dynamics, which include scanning for environmental signals, interpreting those signals, and engaging in learning and action. For instance, collective emotional intelligence improves the venture's ability to use emotional signals to focus attention on critical information during environmental scanning. When the venture faces a crisis, these affective capabilities ensure organizational members do not succumb to *threat rigidity*, where the range of noticed

information narrows to the point of organizational paralysis. Instead, the group utilizes its combined emotional intelligence to maintain cognitive flexibility, allowing it to adapt its decision policies iteratively in response to environmental feedback. The effectiveness of this affective processing is often most visible in the aftermath of a project failure, when both the individual and the venture must process the loss of something centrally valued.

4.8 Grief Dynamics and the Anatomy of Failure Recovery

Failure often triggers *entrepreneurial grief*, which refers to a negative emotional response to the loss of a business or entrepreneurial project that was centrally valued. Recovery from this state is not a linear path but is governed by a dual-process model in which the entrepreneur oscillates between two orientations: a loss orientation and a restoration orientation. A loss orientation involves directly confronting the pain of the failure, breaking emotional bonds with the lost entity, and engaging in deep rumination about the causes of the event. While essential for learning, an extended focus on a loss orientation can lead to a destructive cycle of rumination such that the individual is unable to move forward. Conversely, a restoration orientation involves proactively managing secondary stressors, such as restructuring one's life, learning new skills, and deliberately distracting oneself from the loss.

The ultimate goal is to achieve a transition orientation, where the entrepreneur and venture members oscillate effectively between these two states to maximize learning while minimizing recovery time. Successful recovery allows the entrepreneur to revise their existing knowledge to improve their ability to manage future events. This recovery process is further enhanced by venture reflection, the extent to which venture members collectively reflect upon and adapt their strategies following a significant event. As the entrepreneur navigates this internal recovery, they must also address the external social dimensions of failure, specifically how to manage their personal and organizational images.

4.9 Managing Stigma and Normalizing Loss

The stigma of failure complicates the decision to terminate a failing venture, as entrepreneurs typically fear the “spoiled” image associated with bankruptcy or cessation. To mitigate this fear, the entrepreneur needs to engage

in impression-management strategies designed to protect their psychological well-being. These strategies include avoiding interactions with stakeholders who attribute failure to the entrepreneur's shortcomings and instead seeking out interactions with those who hold a positive impression. The entrepreneur may also attempt to define failure in a positive light, for instance, by framing a Chapter 11 bankruptcy as a strategic reorganization required for future success rather than a permanent defeat.

A vital component of this management is the use of parting ceremonies. These ceremonies serve to make the most of failure by transforming it into a predictable stage of the innovative process. By creating an organizational culture where mistakes are documented and success is celebrated, the venture team fosters psychological safety, enabling members to learn from failure without the threat of personal disgrace. Furthermore, if the entrepreneur can maintain an authentic self-view—an alignment between their internal values and their external venture activities—they will be more resilient against social disapproval. By integrating these stigma-management tools with the dual-process model of recovery, the entrepreneur ensures the venture remains steady and healthy, preserving the personal resources required for the next meaningful challenge.

4.10 Conclusion

Managing the heart of the venture requires a sophisticated understanding of grief dynamics, requiring the entrepreneur and their team to oscillate between loss and restoration orientations to recover from failure. This internal recovery is complemented by stigma management and parting ceremonies designed to protect the entrepreneur's social and psychological well-being. By maintaining an authentic self-view, the entrepreneur ensures failure remains a predictable stage of learning rather than a permanent personal disgrace. Through the disciplined use of regulatory tools—from sleep to mindfulness—the entrepreneur prevents the systemic depletion of biological resources required for complex decision-making. Maintaining this biological and emotional self provides the necessary foundation for the search for deeper meaning. Beyond physical health lies the existential requirement for meaningful venturing, which sustains the entrepreneur through the most challenging horizons. The next chapter explores how the facets of purpose, mattering, and comprehension build resilience. We move from the “how” of biological health to the “why” of existential significance, examining how the venture serves not just as a profit engine but as a meaningful extension of the entrepreneur's life story.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





5

The Entrepreneur's Well-Being: Meaning, Transcendence, and Resilience

5.1 Introduction

Entrepreneurial action can generate a subjective sense of meaning in life through the facets of purpose, existential mattering, and comprehension. For the entrepreneur, the search for meaning acts as an existential requirement for sustained functioning, allowing the venture to serve as an extension of the self. This chapter explores how individuals build resilience by using their capability endowments to maintain functioning during and following adversity. We distinguish between equilibrating mechanisms, which restore stability after a sudden shock, and disequilibrating mechanisms, which are used to intentionally disrupt persistent, oppressive adversity. A central theme is the role of self-transcendent emotions, specifically awe, which transports the entrepreneur beyond their default mode of thinking to perceive transformational opportunities. We also examine the entrepreneur's process of maintaining authenticity in the face of stakeholder pressure and social resistance. To achieve fully meaningful venturing, the entrepreneur must navigate complex motivation-knowledge configurations, resolving trade-offs between personal goals and market impact. We also detail how self-compassion and redemption narratives provide vital safety nets that prevent the depletion of psychological resources.

5.2 The Foundations of Meaningful Venturing: Purpose, Mattering, and Comprehension

The activation of the metacognitive engine serves as a prerequisite for *meaningful venturing*, which we formally define as entrepreneurial action that generates a subjective sense of meaning in life for the entrepreneur. While our previous discussion focused on the biological maintenance of the self, the search for meaning represents an existential requirement for sustained human functioning, influencing cognitive, social, and physical health. Meaningful venturing is evaluated through three formative facets: purpose, mattering, and comprehension. *Purpose* refers to the extent to which the entrepreneur experiences their life and work as being directed and motivated by valued life goals. This facet provides the “why” behind the venture, offering a sense of intentionality that guides the entrepreneur through periods of high uncertainty. *Existential mattering* captures the degree to which the entrepreneur feels that their existence and their venture’s work are valuable, important, and make a difference to others in the world. *Comprehension* represents the entrepreneur’s perception that they can make sense of their past, present, and imagined future, successfully integrating their venture’s narrative into a coherent whole.

The entrepreneur derives meaning through these facets because entrepreneurship provides an unusual degree of autonomy and potential for self-expression, allowing the venture to serve as an extension of the self. However, achieving a fully meaningful state is often a struggle, as gains in one facet may necessitate losses in another. For instance, the entrepreneur may achieve mattering by pivoting a business model to meet market demands yet do so at the expense of their original personal purpose. Alternatively, performing personally satisfying activities may enhance purpose but diminish mattering if the resulting offering fails to solve a concrete problem for the target market. Because these facets are dynamic, the entrepreneur must understand how their underlying motivation and knowledge structures influence the “meaning trade-offs” they will inevitably encounter.

5.3 Motivation-Knowledge Configurations and Existential Trade-Offs

The way the entrepreneur experiences meaning is systematically influenced by their motivation-knowledge configuration at the start of the journey. These configurations are defined by whether motivation is intrinsic (the inherent

enjoyment of the task) or extrinsic (driven by separable outcomes like wealth or status) and whether knowledge is demand-side (understanding market needs) or supply-side (understanding product development).

When the entrepreneur has an intrinsic-demand configuration, they begin with a strong purpose and sense of mattering but often face weak comprehension. While they feel authentic and see their potential impact, the concrete “how” of product development remains a source of high perceived uncertainty. To resolve this uncertainty, they must engage in supply-oriented action that makes work tasks more concrete, allowing them to integrate the venture into their broader life narrative.

In contrast, with an intrinsic-supply configuration, the entrepreneur possesses high comprehension and purpose but struggles with mattering. Their expertise in development allows them to craft a cohesive narrative. Still, their lack of demand-side knowledge means they may “fall in love” with their product without understanding its significance to others. To move toward fully meaningful venturing, the entrepreneur requires demand-oriented action—engaging with external stakeholders to validate the usefulness of their offering.

When the entrepreneur is driven by extrinsic motivation, they face more complex hurdles, often feeling inauthentic. An extrinsic-demand configuration means the entrepreneur must find ways to discover enjoyable tasks within the venture to improve their well-being and sense of purpose. In contrast, an extrinsic-supply configuration requires the entrepreneur to use market feedback to enhance the authenticity of their mission. When they can improve the authenticity of their mission, the entrepreneur is transformed into a resilient force capable of navigating both sudden shocks and persistent states of hardship.

5.4 The Mechanics of Resilience: Equilibrating Versus Disequilibrating Adversity

Resilience is the process by which the entrepreneur builds and uses capability endowments to positively adjust and maintain functioning during and following adversity. Entrepreneurial behavior serves two distinct roles based on the nature of the adversity: equilibrating and disequilibrating. When *adversity is an event*—a low-probability, high-impact shock like a natural disaster or firm failure—entrepreneurial action acts as an equilibrating mechanism. In this role, the entrepreneur works to return themselves and their community to a valued status quo or a new baseline of functioning. This process is often fueled by *compassion venturing*, through which the resilient entrepreneur improvises

and arranges resources in novel ways to alleviate the suffering of victims. By making a difference, the entrepreneur experiences positive emotions that reinforce their own resilience, creating a feedback loop that maintains emotional and behavioral functioning.

Conversely, when *adversity is a persistent state*—for example, systemic poverty, institutional oppression, or chronic resource scarcity—entrepreneurial action acts as a disequilibrating mechanism. In these contexts, the status quo is dysfunctional, and the goal of action is to shake up existing structures to enhance well-being. The entrepreneur disequilibrates persistent adversity by ignoring or circumventing constraints through *bricolage or jugaad*, which involves making do with available resources and using assertive defiance to improvise solutions. This action perforates the structures of adversity, carving out a space where the entrepreneur and their community can experience a better life. This capacity to disrupt persistent states and imagine radical alternatives is often triggered by the experience of self-transcendent emotions.

While equilibration typically restores individual functioning after a sudden shock, long-term resilience requires a defensive mechanism to protect the venture's collective self-concept during periods of persistent underperformance.

5.5 The Defensive Mechanism: Experience as a Buffer for Identity Resilience

Central to this defensive mechanism underlying resilience is organizational identity. Organizational identity is the generalized perception among venture members regarding the venture's central, enduring, and distinctive character. In high-velocity environments, negative feedback events, such as product failures, the loss of major customers, or the rejection of funding applications, do not merely threaten financial solvency; they create a "crisis of meaning" by raising systemic doubt about the venture's legitimacy and future. In such contexts, resilience manifests as the ability to mitigate these threats to organizational identity and prevent the erosion of collective purpose.

The effectiveness of this identity defense is heavily dependent on the entrepreneurial team's human capital, specifically their prior founding and industry experience. When the team is experienced, it functions as an interpretive buffer, possessing the mental maps required to channel negative signals into opportunities for legitimizing the venture's distinctiveness. Rather than allowing failure to trigger a drift toward organizational paralysis, the entrepreneurial

team utilizes members' backgrounds to craft a desirable future-oriented image of the venture that maintains stakeholder trust. By strategically (re)positioning the venture within its industry category, the entrepreneur and their team ensure the venture remains a stable interpretive system, even when facing hostile environments or intense environmental change. This defensive preservation of the organizational self provides the necessary stability for the entrepreneur to move beyond survival and engage in the higher-order emotional states required for radical transformation.

5.6 Transcendent Affect: The Role of Awe and Empathy in Transformation

While basic emotions inform daily decision-making, *self-transcendent emotions*—for instance, awe and empathy—are other-appraising, directing attention away from the self toward the needs of others and the broader environment. *Awe* is a complex emotional response that occurs when the entrepreneur perceives stimuli as vast (transcending current knowledge structures) and requiring accommodation (needing to reorganize mental frameworks to interpret the stimuli). Awe-eliciting stimuli, whether environmental (panoramic scenery) or social (heroic moral courage), transport the entrepreneur out of a self-focused status-quo mindset. This experience deactivates the default mode of daily living, allowing the entrepreneur to perceive opportunities that previously resided in cognitive blind spots.

Awe elevates the entrepreneur's perspective by expanding their frame of reference and altering their sense of time. This elevated perspective enables the identification of transformational opportunities, which are radical deviations from existing market trajectories that often fulfill dual economic and social goals. An *altered sense of time*—when time feels “frozen” or stopped—frees up cognitive resources needed for the creative leaps required to solve complex, “wicked” problems. Complementing awe is *empathy*, a primary driver of prosocial action comprised of *empathic concern* (an emotional experience of warmth, compassion, and concern for a target—an individual experiencing adversity), *mentalizing* (inferring a target's thoughts, emotions, and intentions), and *experience sharing* (the process of adopting or taking on a target's feelings). Empathy provides the motivational spark and knowledge of others' sorrows needed to initiate social interventions. However, the implementation of these transcendent insights depends on the entrepreneur's ability to maintain authenticity and navigate social resistance.

5.7 Authenticity, Social Acceptance, and the Risk of Fatigue

The success of a mission-driven venture is contingent upon perceived authenticity, which signals to stakeholders that the entrepreneur's vision is grounded in consistent values. *Authenticity* reflects three distinct dimensions: *consistency* (alignment between internal values and external expressions), *conformity* (adherence to the norms of a social category), and *connection* (association with a specific person, place, or time). Entrepreneurs often engage in authenticity work to resolve tensions between these dimensions, especially when entering rural or highly traditional communities that resist new social identities. By building *connection-based authenticity*—finding common ground through shared relationships—the entrepreneur can legitimate their new role and gain the community buy-in necessary for resource mobilization.

However, the pursuit of authentic prosocial goals carries significant psychological risks, primary among them being *social-venturing fatigue*. This persistent state of physical and mental exhaustion is driven by constant exposure to others' suffering and the intense effort required to implement compassionate responses. Social-venturing fatigue can trigger detachment (physically and emotionally withdrawing from beneficiaries) and desensitization (numbing one's reactions to aversive stimuli). To mitigate these issues, the entrepreneur must leverage psychosocial resources, including entrepreneurial passion, autonomy, and self-compassion. *Entrepreneurial passion* refers to the consciously accessible, intense positive feelings that result from engaging in entrepreneurial activities associated with roles that are meaningful and salient to the entrepreneur's self-identity. *Autonomy* is the degree to which the entrepreneur feels they have decision-making control and the freedom to choose their own path toward a personal objective. *Self-compassion* involves offering help to oneself, particularly when suffering arises from one's own mistakes, failures, or personal inadequacies. Self-compassion involves self-kindness (extending caring and understanding to oneself), common humanity (viewing one's experiences as being part of the larger human experience), and emotional mindfulness (holding painful thoughts and feelings in balanced awareness). By balancing self-regulation with external authenticity work, the entrepreneur ensures resilience, preserving the existential energy required for the next meaningful challenge.¹

¹ For more on entrepreneurial passion, see Cardon et al. (2009).

Managing fatigue and searching for authenticity are not merely internal struggles for the individual entrepreneur; they are socially embedded processes that can recraft the venture's story to restore a lost sense of purpose for the entire workforce.

5.8 Redemption Narratives: Mentorship and the Relational Recrafting of Meaning

During periods of significant venture change or the scale-up phase, the entrepreneur and other venture members often experience a reality shock when the actual work environment conflicts with their pre-entry expectations. To prevent this dissonance from leading to systemic turnover or existential despair, the entrepreneur must help employees recraft their narratives regarding their fit with the organization. This resilience mechanism leverages the power of language to redefine a stressful present into a meaningful past-to-future trajectory.

A vital component of this relational resilience is the use of *redemption narratives*—storylines that acknowledge poor beginnings or “dirty work” but emphasize that these negative experiences will ultimately be worth it when the venture succeeds. This relational resilience is often operationalized by pairing new joiners with experienced mentors who have “ridden out a big storm” and can impart the cognitive blueprints required to navigate volatility. By emphasizing a positive future work environment and ensuring that each employee's personal identity is nurtured, the entrepreneur creates an internal safety net that prevents the depletion of psychological resources. This relational construction of meaning completes the building of resilience, moving from the entrepreneur's internal drive to the collective maintenance of a significant and enduring life story.

5.9 Conclusion

Achieving fully meaningful venturing requires navigating complex motivation-knowledge configurations and resolving existential trade-offs between goals and impact. This process is supported by authenticity work, which ensures the entrepreneur signals consistent values to stakeholders even when those values are under threat. By leveraging psychosocial resources like self-compassion, the entrepreneur creates an internal buffer against social-venturing fatigue

and the “shadow” of persistent failure. Resilience is further enhanced by self-transcendent emotions like awe, which provide the expansive perspective needed to see opportunity in the midst of crisis. Ultimately, meaning is not just a byproduct of success; it is the engine that drives it, providing the comprehension needed to integrate one’s work into a coherent and significant life narrative. This relational construction of meaning completes the building of resilience, moving from internal drive to collective maintenance. While individual resilience is foundational, the entrepreneur rarely acts alone. The journey is fundamentally altered by the collective engine of the founding team, in which diverse identities must converge. The following chapter examines how the founding team manages conflict, transactive memory, and the emergence of the venture culture. It moves from the internal heart of the individual to the collective heart of the team. This exploration focuses on building an organizational engine that is more than the sum of its parts.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book’s Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book’s Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





6

The Founding Team: Identity, Conflict, and the Power of Fit

6.1 Introduction

The founding team is a collective engine that satisfies the entrepreneur's fundamental need for belonging while helping the venture overcome the liability of newness. Teams must navigate the tension between homophily—the impulse to select partners who are similar to oneself—and the cognitive diversity essential for innovative problem-solving and surfacing a wide repertoire of cultural information. This chapter explores how the founding team builds a transactive memory system (TMS), a shared understanding of who knows what that allows for the efficient division of cognitive labor. We examine team dynamics, specifically the distinction between task conflict, which can improve decision-making through information elaboration, and relationship conflict, which often leads to organizational paralysis and resource depletion. To manage these tensions, high-functioning teams utilize shielding to protect the collective from external threats and formalization to ensure venture growth remains coordinated. By mastering these collective mechanics, the team transforms the venture into an interpretive system capable of overcoming initial hurdles. We also address the “nuclear issue” of perceived justice in equity distribution, which dictates whether the team enters a positive or negative interaction spiral.

6.2 The Evolving Collective Engine: The Liability of Newness, Path Dependence, and Satisfying Human Needs

While the spark of inquiry may begin as a private conjecture, the journey toward market reality is fundamentally altered by the formation of a *founding team*, which is a group of two or more individuals who collectively create a venture and share its subsequent management and ownership. This collective structure is vital for overcoming the liability of newness. The *liability of newness* is a notion characterizing the high mortality risk faced by young organizations relative to their mature counterparts due to a lack of established routines and social legitimacy. The liability of newness is driven by three distinct dimensions of novelty: *novelty to the market*, concerning customer uncertainty; *novelty in production*, relating to technological unfamiliarity; and *management novelty*, referring to the team's lack of start-up and industry-specific skills. These liability dimensions require the team to undergo intensive learning and action to establish the properties of an emerging organization, including intentionality, resource building, boundary setting, and exchange. However, newness or youthfulness also provides assets, which include learning advantages in novel areas and a high degree of management flexibility that helps the venture adapt to environmental changes.

The founding team operates within a double life cycle framework, where the team life cycle (formation, collaboration, and dissolution) is embedded within, yet is independent of, the life cycle of any single venture. This non-parallel development means that a high-functioning collective engine can dissolve and reform during a venture's development or embark on an entirely new journey after a prior venture's failure or successful exit.

A critical factor in the success of this recurring engine is *path dependence*, where the conditions under which the team has worked together previously substantially shape the development of future ventures. When the team has a shared history, members are often more aligned in their cognitive processes and use their first venture as a blueprint for team behavior in the next. While this alignment can enhance implementation speed, it also risks creating a narrow focus that might cause the team to miss opportunities or threats outside their established field. By mastering the transitions between venture and team life cycles, the entrepreneur ensures the collective engine remains capable of enduring the complexities of the competitive landscape.

Beyond purely economic and organizational functions, the founding team satisfies team members' fundamental *need for belonging*, which is a powerful

human motivation to form and maintain a minimum quantity of lasting, significant interpersonal relationships. This sense of belonging serves as a critical buffer against the psychological dark side of the entrepreneurial process, offering emotional support that helps sustain effort during periods of extreme uncertainty. When individuals work together, they can often manage the social complexity of growth better than a lone entrepreneur because many brains provide a diverse repertoire of knowledge to solve the entrepreneurial, engineering, and administrative problems of adaptation. Individuals who feel a personal responsibility to create necessary services or products work together to reduce the *ignorance gap* (see Chapter 3), which is the distance between the team's current incomplete knowledge and the knowledge required to achieve stable revenue. Because the efficacy of this collective engine depends on its membership, the team must manage the constant tension between diversity and homophily.

6.3 Compositional Archetypes: The Specialist-Generalist Tension and the Logic of Engagement

The construction of a founding team is frequently governed by *homophily*—the natural impulse to choose cofounders who share similar beliefs, values, and status. While homophily can foster initial cohesion, it often creates cognitive blind spots that limit the venture's innovative capacity. In contrast, superior teams prioritize cognitive diversity, defined as heterogeneity in team members' thinking styles, specialized knowledge, skills, and beliefs. Founding teams generally fall into two distinct compositional archetypes: teams of varied specialists and teams of generalists. *Teams of varied specialists* are composed of individuals with distinct, nonoverlapping expertise in different functional areas, such as marketing, engineering, and finance. These teams are characterized by complementarity, where the strengths of one member compensate for the deficits of another, ensuring no holes in collective competence. Teams of varied specialists recognize the limitations of their own knowledge and utilize an open engagement strategy, interacting with a broad community of inquiry to gather diverse and often unexpected information that allows them to test their conjectures through disconfirmation.

On the other hand, *teams of generalists* are composed of individuals with a broad but similar knowledge base of technology and markets. While having “jacks- and jills-of-all-trades” can be beneficial during the earliest start-up

phase for executing diverse tasks, generalist teams often lack the specific skills needed to scale a business. Generalist teams tend to adopt a focused engagement strategy, relying on a narrow circle of known experts and seeking information that confirms their existing beliefs.

This difference in composition has long-term implications for the venture's social standing. For instance, at the stage of an initial public offering, investors often discount firms led by generalists, preferring consistent and predictable specialist founders. This generalist penalty is driven by concerns over trust, which is the belief that a partner is consistent and will not shift direction unexpectedly. Trust concerns are often exacerbated by ambiguity—uncertainty about entrepreneurs' true identity—and perceived inauthenticity. However, the lead entrepreneur can offset the penalty of being a generalist in one dimension (e.g., industry) by being a specialist in another (e.g., function). Once these members are assembled, the team must implement formal cognitive systems to coordinate their diverse efforts.

6.4 Collective Intelligence: Transactive Memory System and the Formalization of Roles

A high-functioning founding team is not merely a collection of skilled individuals but an interpretive system capable of developing collective intelligence. This intelligence is rooted in a TMS, which is the sum of individual knowledge and the shared understanding of who knows what within the group. A robust TMS allows the team to divide cognitive labor efficiently, facilitating the storage, retrieval, and communication of information across different knowledge domains. The development of a TMS is a primary driver of *entrepreneurial orientation*—the venture's propensity for proactiveness, risk-taking, and innovation—especially when magnified by intrateam trust, which is the shared perception of trustworthiness among members. When the team has worked together previously in other companies, it possesses a shared mental model that promotes implementation speed and internal consistency in the venture's human resource values.

To operationalize this collective intelligence at scale, the team must transition from individual-level intuition to a capability-based approach through the formalization of venture activities. This process involves creating organizational charts that define coordinated work and clearly dividing responsibilities by functional area. A vital tool in this formalization is the implementation of playbooks or manuals. Playbooks ensure that as

new members or volunteers are recruited, they know exactly what they are expected to do upon arrival, preventing the venture from becoming overwhelmed by the chaos of venture growth. These formalized routines move the venture away from entrepreneur-centric management toward a system that notices and interprets environmental signals independently. By defining and distributing work assignments clearly, the venture can maintain high standards of quality and efficiency. As the team begins to act through these routines, the interpersonal dynamics of effort and conflict become the primary determinants of sustained performance.

6.5 Navigating Social Dynamics: Effort, Conflict, and Group Rule-Breaking

The founding team's effectiveness is significantly influenced by the *contagion of effort*, a social process in which members reciprocate the energy, attention, and time invested by their teammates. This reciprocity ensures that even when members are exhausted, the collective momentum of the team sustains the venture, particularly under conditions of threat or environmental hostility. However, the team must also navigate the inevitable *task conflict*, which consists of disagreements over work content and outcomes. Moderate levels of task conflict can be energizing, as they promote individuals' understanding of new information and enhance creative insights. In contrast, the team must minimize relationship conflict, which stems from personal incompatibilities and diverging values, as it leads to organizational paralysis, negative emotions, and the depletion of emotional resources.

The social dynamics of the founding team can sometimes lead to group rule-breaking, defined as the intentional violation of top management's formal policies or decision-making regulations. This group phenomenon occurs through four primary rallying mechanisms: *twisting interpretations* of rules or proposals, *exceptionalizing* to claim a specific situation is unique and thus exempt from standard rules, *claiming chaos* to argue that existing rules are out of date, and *making selective historical claims* to justify actions based on past successes. To protect themselves from sanctions after breaking rules, groups often adopt defensive postures, such as *ignoring* a violation in hopes no one notices, *blaming* external others, *confessing* to seek forgiveness, or *correcting* the rules themselves to align with their actions. These group processes are particularly salient when the team prioritizes the well-being of a specific stakeholder over bureaucratic requirements.

The social dynamics of the founding team can sometimes lead to substantial conflict between the members. Indeed, within the social dynamics of the collective engine, equity distribution stands as the nuclear issue—the far-reaching, emotionally laden decision that opens the mind of the team right to its core.

6.6 The Nuclear Issue: Perceived Justice in Equity Distribution

Equity ownership is an economic transaction and the primary reward for effort, specifying the boundaries of power and control. The architectural stability of the founding team rests not on the actual percentages of the split but on the perceptions of distributive justice among the members—that is, the members' perceptions of fairness regarding the outcomes of the distribution.

Perceived justice functions as a critical social imprint that dictates whether the team enters a positive or negative interaction spiral. High perceived justice triggers a *positive interaction spiral* characterized by an increase in team attraction—namely, intrateam trust and cohesion—and a reciprocal decrease in team repulsion. In this case, members are more committed to team tasks, which ultimately enhances both team and venture performance. Conversely, one member's perception of injustice is sufficient to trigger a *negative interaction spiral*, in which attraction decreases and relationship conflict and social distancing increase. This negative spiral often escalates over time, leading to team member exit even if the venture remains economically viable. This nuclear issue of fairness acts as the fundamental filter for the emerging venture culture: when the baseline of justice is compromised, general tasks and communication suffer regardless of the team's objective competence. Thus, establishing a positive structural-emotional foundation is the primary prerequisite for developing a unified identity that can withstand external pressures.

6.7 Equity and Team Identification: The Optimal Ownership Range

Beyond the baseline requirement of justice, the size of each founder's equity stake directly influences their identification with the founding team—the perception of oneness or belongingness to the collective unit. This identification is a vital asset, as it encourages entrepreneurs to prioritize team goals and

facilitates the coordination required for the rapid exploitation of an opportunity. However, the relationship between equity ownership and identification is not linear but follows an inverted U-shape. There is an optimal range of ownership within which entrepreneurs' identification with the team is highest: as equity increases, identification rises, but it begins to decline at very high levels of ownership.

This curvature suggests that while significant ownership fosters a sense of "us," extreme stakes can lead to a sense of personal possessiveness or isolation that diminishes entrepreneurs' connection to their teammates. This relationship is further moderated by team performance: when the venture is succeeding, the impact of equity stakes on identification is strengthened, as members more readily identify with a "winning" entity. Thus, for the team, the distribution of shares is a tool for maximizing collective identification rather than just personal wealth. By carefully calibrating these stakes to fall within the optimal range, the team ensures its members remain psychologically bonded, providing the resilience required to maintain a strong organizational identity when facing external threats. This sense of oneness creates the interpretive consistency necessary for the emergence of a unified and distinctive venture culture.

6.8 The Architectural Emergence of the Venture Culture: Faultlines and Shielding

The founding team is the primary creator of the *venture culture*, which serves as an informal control system established through social expectations about venture members' attitudes and behaviors. *Culture creation* is a cognitive process involving the production of cultural information by the founding team and its interpretation by venture members. Cognitive diversity plays a complex dual role in this process through two mechanisms: team information surfacing and team information combination. *Team information surfacing* entails identifying and unearthing the cognitive resources (ideas, skills, and values) available in the team. Greater cognitive diversity enhances surfacing, allowing the team to produce a more diverse set of cultural information. However, *team information combination*—the aggregation and conversion of that information into a shared picture—becomes more difficult with high diversity. Dysfunctional conflict can hinder this combination, leading to a less diverse information set as the team settles on the "lowest common denominator." Furthermore, this conflict slows down the speed of production, as team

members must invest significant time in explaining their perspectives and reconciling differences.

Developing and transmitting this culture is further complicated by the emergence of faultlines—hypothetical dividing lines that split the venture into subgroups based on attributes like specialized knowledge or functional background. Faultlines create “camps” (e.g., the “technology side” vs. the “business side”) that diminish the interpretation consistency of cultural information across the overall body of venture members. Subgroup members interact more frequently with their in-group founder, making that cofounder’s specific symbols and rituals more salient, while the cultural signals of founders in other subgroups go ignored. This fragmentation can obstruct the creation of a unified venture culture and the development of *legitimacy*, which is the generalized perception that the venture’s actions are proper and appropriate. To protect the venture’s resources and culture from external interference, team members engage in shielding. *Shielding* involves strategically concealing internal tensions and information from external partners—especially dominant participatory partners who possess leverage—to ensure the venture can acquire resources in a secure environment without compromising its mission. By managing these faultlines and shielding the collective, the founding team transforms the venture into a resilient interpretive system capable of enduring growth.

6.9 Conclusion

To become high-functioning, the founding team operates through a TMS, dividing cognitive labor to enhance entrepreneurial orientation and implementation speed. The team must also formalize activities through organizational charts and playbooks to ensure venture growth remains a coordinated effort rather than a chaotic struggle. The ability to elaboratively process information while maintaining emotional stability is the hallmark of a team that survives the liability of newness. Furthermore, by building cognitive diversity and utilizing shielding to protect the collective, the team ensures the venture has the requisite variety to adapt its internal systems to a complex marketplace. The distribution of equity ownership must also be calibrated to fall within an optimal range to maximize collective identification and “oneness” among founding team members. Once a cohesive team and organizational structure are established, the focus shifts to the mechanics of expansion. The entrepreneur must now navigate the founder’s dilemma between wealth and

control while mastering the dimensions of sustainable growth. The next chapter explores the goal of venture growth and the disciplined spreading of excellence within the maturing firm. We move from the formation of the collective engine to its expansion, including how to maintain excellence through the critical stages of emergence, formalization, and scaling.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





7

The Goal of Growth: Navigating the Founder's Dilemma and Scaling Excellence

7.1 Introduction

As the venture transitions into a high-growth phase, the entrepreneur must manage the founder's dilemma, balancing the pursuit of organizational wealth against the maintenance of personal control. This expansion process is centered on the management of organizational slack, which acts as a double-edged sword: while financial slack fuels growth and provides buffers, it can also stifle incentives for entrepreneurial innovation. Growth itself is a multi-dimensional phenomenon requiring a precise implementation approach to ensure overall organizational health. This chapter examines the life cycle of organizational liability, moving from the protected honeymoon period to the liability of adolescence, where mortality risk rises as initial buffers are depleted. We explore organizational scaling as the spreading of excellence and the use of dynamic capabilities to address changing environments. We also discuss a critical capability—organizational listening—which allows the venture to sense and shape opportunities by interpreting stakeholder communication despite the “listener's paradox” created by increasing complexity. To expand effectively, the venture must also leverage absorptive capacity to recognize and apply new external information.

7.2 The Strategic Dilemma: Wealth, Control, and the Duality of Slack

As the venture moves from a private conjecture toward a market reality, the internal drive for action must be tempered by a set of challenges that transcend the individual mind. The transition from an emergent start-up to a high-growth venture requires the entrepreneur to manage the founder's dilemma. The *founder's dilemma* is a fundamental tension that arises as the venture moves from emergence to expansion and is characterized by a conflict between the entrepreneur's desire for organizational wealth and the maintenance of personal control over the firm's strategic direction. Often described as the "choice between being rich or being king," this dilemma is frequently catalyzed by success: as the venture grows rapidly, it requires significant external funding, which results in the dilution of the entrepreneur's equity and influence. This success-driven growth often reveals a mismatch between the needs of the maturing organization and the entrepreneur's specific abilities, prompting investors—who now possess greater control—to replace the entrepreneur-CEO with a professional manager. While such a transition typically increases venture performance and investor satisfaction, it represents an involuntary exit that can trigger a crisis of meaning and identity for the entrepreneur.

Central to the entrepreneur successfully navigating venture growth is the management of *organizational slack*, formally defined as the pool of resources in an organization beyond the minimum necessary to produce a given level of organizational output. Slack represents a double-edged sword in the context of growth because its different forms impact entrepreneurial management in opposing ways. Financial slack, such as cash or unused borrowing power, provides the discretionary means to fuel rapid expansion and provides a buffer against environmental shocks. However, while financial slack buys the right to enter new markets, it simultaneously reduces the firm's incentives to engage in entrepreneurial management, a mode of operation where strategies are driven by the perception of opportunities rather than the resources currently at hand. Conversely, a lack of financial resources often forces an urge to update, prompting the firm to recombine existing assets in creative new ways. Consequently, while resources can buy growth, an overabundance of idle capital may stifle the very innovative judgment required for long-term strategic renewal. While growth is often used as a catch-all term for venture expansion, it is critical to distinguish between the process of scaling and the capability of scalability.

7.3 The Multidimensional Nature of Growth: Synchronicity and Measurement

Venture growth is not a monolithic construct but a multidimensional phenomenon where different indicators often tell conflicting stories. *Concurrent validity* refers to the extent to which different measures of the same construct are consistent with one another. Research indicates that while absolute employee growth and absolute sales growth share a moderate level of variance, profit growth typically demonstrates very little concurrent validity with other indicators, such as growth in assets or workforce size. This lack of synchronicity means that the venture may be expanding its headcount or revenue rapidly, while its profitability remains stagnant or even declines, potentially leading to a living-dead scenario where resources are squandered without reasonable returns.

The interpretation of these growth dimensions is further complicated by decision incongruence—the absolute difference between the entrepreneur's actual decision-making policy and the policy they convey to external stakeholders. High levels of decision incongruence regarding growth strategies can erode legitimacy with stakeholders. By acknowledging the context-specific nature of these measures—distinguishing between relative growth compared to competitors and absolute growth over time—the entrepreneur ensures their action is grounded in a precise understanding of which dimensions are actually being realized. Understanding these numerical dimensions provides the map for expansion, yet the venture's survival remains contingent on its ability to navigate the shifting liabilities inherent in its life cycle.

7.4 The Life Cycle of Organizational Liabilities: From Newness to Adolescence

The path to expansion is characterized by distinct developmental periods of emergence, formalization, and expansion, each presenting unique threats to survival. A new venture begins with a honeymoon period—an initial stage of development characterized by low failure rates. During this phase, the organization is temporarily protected from the full pressures of the external environment. This protection is generally provided by initial resource endowments, such as start-up capital and committed assets, as well as the high levels of enthusiasm and psychological commitment from the entrepreneur(s) and early stakeholders.

The transition from this protected state leads directly into the liability of adolescence. This liability describes a critical juncture where the venture's initial buffers are depleted, and the "honeymoon" with stakeholders ends. At this point, mortality risk, which was previously suppressed, begins to rise rapidly. The venture becomes highly vulnerable because it must transition from informal, entrepreneur-centric interactions to standardized systems and formalized routines to manage increasing social and operational complexity. If the organization has not yet developed these mature capabilities, it faces a high probability of failure, as it can no longer rely on its initial resource stock to shield it from environmental shocks.

Once the peak risk of the adolescent period is reached, the venture enters the broader trajectory described as the liability of newness (see Chapter 6). The liability of newness refers to the propensity for younger organizations to have higher mortality rates than their older, established counterparts. This liability is driven by several internal and external hurdles. The internal challenges arise from the new venture's lack of reliable routines, which are necessary to make day-to-day operations predictable. In this situation, entrepreneurs must manage "social relations among strangers" within the firm, which often leads to conflict and confusion regarding roles and tasks. The external challenges arise from a lack of legitimacy. The entrepreneur must learn about their environment while simultaneously attempting to convince resource providers, customers, and suppliers that their actions are proper and desirable.

Once the honeymoon is over and the peak risk of adolescence has passed, the venture begins an evolutionary path of mortality. In this phase, the mortality risk follows an age-dependent, monotonically declining pattern. As the organization ages, its novelty is eroded through passive learning and information dissemination. Processes become routinized, legitimacy is established through a history of performance, and the venture eventually approaches a benchmark level of risk characteristic of an established business. To survive the "newness" period, the venture must develop a robust listening capability that functions as a dynamic capability. It refers to the venture's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies to address rapidly changing environments and thus acquire and interpret quality information from stakeholders.

7.5 Listening: Bidirectional Communication as a Dynamic Capability

For the entrepreneur and their venture, listening is far more than a passive act of hearing; it is a critical bidirectional communication process that involves receiving messages and signaling comprehension and support to the speaker.

While much attention is given to how entrepreneurs pitch their stories to audiences, listening completes the incomplete picture of the bidirectional exchange necessary for venture growth. Indeed, the entrepreneur needs to listen because doing so facilitates the co-construction of opportunities, enhances design thinking, and generates innovation. By listening attentively to different perspectives, the entrepreneur can uncover novel ideas and insights that might otherwise be overlooked, sparking the creativity needed to set their venture apart in a competitive landscape.

Cognitively, listening requires the entrepreneur to invest resources in actively noticing, encoding, and interpreting stakeholder messages to understand their underlying meaning for building venture capabilities. Behaviorally, the entrepreneur engages in *back-channeling*—using eye contact, facial expressions, and nodding—to signal engagement. This behavior is essential because when stakeholders believe they are being listened to, they become less defensive, more self-aware, and more willing to disclose high-quality information with less “noise.”

The venture also needs to listen because the individual entrepreneur’s listening ability is inherently limited by their personal cognitive resources. As the venture grows, it gains complexity from an increasing number of employees, investors, and customers, which places an immense cognitive load on the entrepreneur. This growth leads to the listener’s paradox: the more the venture grows, the more the entrepreneur needs to listen to stakeholders, yet the fewer personal resources they have available to do so effectively. To survive this aspect of the liability of adolescence, the firm must transition from entrepreneur-centric interactions to systematic organizational listening to acquire and interpret quality information.

Organizational listening is a firm-level capability and is defined as venture members’ collective ability to perform coordinated tasks using resources to notice, interpret, and understand stakeholder communication. This capability manifests in two primary ways: routines and attention structures. Regarding routines, the entrepreneur’s listening behavior is formalized into repetitive patterns of interdependent actions, such as sharing comprehensive notes after every stakeholder interaction. This know-how must be codified into written tools like manuals, blueprints, or software to ensure feedback is archived and utilized throughout the venture. Regarding attention structures, the organization establishes “rules of the game” and structural positions that prioritize listening activities, such as assigning specific members as stakeholder liaisons.

Ultimately, organizational listening acts as a dynamic capability. It allows the venture to sense and shape opportunities by using stakeholder information to adapt nonlistening capabilities, such as R&D, production, or marketing,

to ensure a tight fit with a high-velocity environment. By systematizing these processes, the organization transforms from a series of individual efforts into a resilient interpretive system capable of sustaining excellence at scale.

7.6 Scaling: Definitional Harmonization and the Spreading of Excellence

Scaling is an organizational process in which the entrepreneur rapidly expands the venture's outputs by transforming the internal organization and leveraging digital resources without a corresponding increase in inputs. Scaling differs from "ordinary" growth, which typically requires a linear increase in resources to achieve a linear increase in results. For the entrepreneurial engine, scaling is not just about "running faster" but about "running differently" to generate significant returns to scale. This capability, which we call scalability, is an ordinary organizational capability developed by managing and achieving coherence among the firm's technologies, operations, and business model. It allows the venture to handle increased size or complexity without requiring significant changes to its underlying structural integrity. When the venture is actively engaged in this transformative process, it enters the scale-up phase.

Architecturally, *scaling* is also defined as the spreading of excellence within the organization as it grows, during which excellence manifests in the venture's unique schemas, routines, systems, and norms. To improve scaling, the venture must move away from individual-level intuition toward a knowledge-based approach to action that prioritizes the following four drivers: (1) *Accumulating knowledge*: the venture begins by building its knowledge base through a pervasive culture of learning by doing, which transforms experiential insights into foundational organizational intelligence. (2) *Communicating knowledge*: once accumulated, this knowledge is codified into formal repositories, such as manuals, templates, and spreadsheets, to ensure it is clearly articulated and accessible to the broader workforce. (3) *Relocating knowledge*: the established knowledge repositories—specifically tasks, tools, and people—are strategically moved to ensure high standards of excellence and quality even in geographically distant offices. (4) *Connecting knowledge*: the venture must leverage its social capital to link disparate specialized teams, fostering the collective coordination and synchronized effort required for a structured entity to sustain growth at scale. By systematizing these drivers, the venture transforms from a series of local efforts into a structured entity

capable of sustaining excellence at scale. As the venture spreads its excellence internally, it often looks toward external horizons, leveraging its accumulated knowledge to expand into the global arena.

7.7 Knowledge Flows in Expansion: Leveraging Internal and External Resources

Expanding the venture's footprint, particularly through internationalization, represents a critical growth path that requires the orchestration of both internal and external knowledge sources. The venture's absorptive capacity governs the effectiveness of this expansion. It functions as a critical organizational mechanism for integrating internal and external knowledge sources, allowing the venture to make sense of environmental signals that others might overlook.

This capability primarily originates from the venture's prior related knowledge and experience. It is developed over time as the venture's internal knowledge base grows, which in turn facilitates the venture's ability to effectively scan for and screen external know-how. For a young venture, absorptive capacity is frequently a function of the founding team's experience, which includes the scope, breadth, and duration of their prior work experience, knowledge, and education. Furthermore, individuals with "expert opportunity prototypes"—richly organized systems of thought—possess a specialized form of this capacity that helps them transform information from past business activities into useful knowledge for identifying future opportunities.

Absorptive capacity helps the entrepreneur in several vital ways. First, it reduces the ignorance gap—the distance between the entrepreneur's current incomplete knowledge and the knowledge required for stable operations—by allowing the venture to identify and evaluate new opportunities more effectively. Second, it enhances learning efficiency, as organizational knowledge accumulates most successfully in areas adjacent to existing expertise. This learning efficiency allows the entrepreneur to "learn their way in" to new business domains with greater precision and speed. Finally, it enables the venture to leverage external relationships, such as with alliance partners or university incubators, to access and transform external information into sustainable competitive advantages. By facilitating this continuous knowledge flow, absorptive capacity ensures the venture remains a resilient interpretive system capable of adapting its internal capabilities to fit high-velocity environments.

7.8 The Growth Illusion: Situated Attention and the Speed Trap

As the venture enters a state of persistent rapid growth, the metacognitive engine faces the risk of prioritizing expansion speed over operational efficiency, which leads the entrepreneur to neglect critical signals regarding strategic fit. In a high-growth culture, newness and creativity are so heavily championed that failure is tolerated to a degree that can mask underlying inconsistencies in the project portfolio. This situated attention means that the entrepreneur of the high-growth venture is often less likely to terminate projects that lack strategic alignment with the overall corporate direction, as the momentum of growth acts as a promise of future need fulfillment that overrides present doubts. In this situation, the entrepreneur must refocus their attention on strategic coherence even when the noise of rapid growth suggests everything is succeeding. This calibrated focus ensures the venture's growth remains strategic rather than merely accidental.

7.9 Conclusion

To survive the liability of newness, the venture must develop a robust listening capability to interpret stakeholder signals while overcoming the listening paradox created by increasing organizational complexity. To grow the venture, the entrepreneur must manage the scaling process. Scaling is the spreading of excellence and manifests in the relocation of knowledge repositories and the use of dynamic capabilities to address changing environments. To ensure the venture's excellence flourishes independently of its original entrepreneur(s), specialized teams must be connected through social capital. Furthermore, the venture must manage its absorptive capacity to recognize and assimilate valuable new information from external networks. By balancing internal formalization with external responsiveness, the scaling venture ensures its growth is both sustainable and strategic. However, the architectural success of any venture ultimately rests upon its ability to attract and retain a high-functioning workforce. In the volatile landscape of growth, human resources are the primary source of competitive advantage. The next chapter shifts the lens from the entrepreneur to the employee, exploring the mechanisms that drive commitment and turnover. We examine how the contagion of passion from the entrepreneur can fuel or diminish motivation. This shift explains why rapid growth often carries the seeds of its own demise through employee burnout.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





8

Managing the Entrepreneurial Workforce: Retention, Burnout, and the Employee Lens

8.1 Introduction

The architectural success of any venture ultimately rests upon its ability to attract, integrate, and retain a high-functioning workforce. In the volatile landscape of venture creation, human resources paradoxically represent both the primary source of competitive advantage and a significant point of failure. Unlike established organizations with stable structures, young ventures are characterized by a constant evolution of unwritten practices, routines, and shifting identities. This dynamism creates a unique psychological environment for employees, who must navigate the liability of newness alongside the entrepreneur. For these individuals, the venture is a high-velocity environment where pre-entry expectations frequently collide with “reality shock.” This chapter shifts the lens from the entrepreneur to the employee, exploring the mechanisms that drive turnover intent and the psychological toll of the scale-up phase. We examine how the contagion of passion from the entrepreneur—specifically for inventing versus founding—can either fuel or diminish employee motivation. By understanding these dynamics, the entrepreneur can calibrate leadership to ensure their workforce remains a resilient interpretive system capable of enduring the journey from inception to expansion.

8.2 The Employee Life Cycle in the Shadow of Uncertainty

A defining characteristic of the entrepreneurial workforce is the discrepancy between the honeymoon period of initial attraction and the reality shock of daily operations. In established firms, employees typically adjust their expectations over time such that their turnover intent decreases as they integrate into stable norms. However, in young ventures, employees' turnover intent typically increases over time. This increasing intention to leave the venture is driven by the gap between what an individual expected to encounter and the shifting work environment in the growing venture. In the start-up context, where human resources departments are often underdeveloped and roles are constantly being redefined, this gap can widen rapidly.

The trajectory of this turnover intent is significantly moderated by an individual's prior start-up work experience. Employees who have previously worked in the venture context possess a cognitive blueprint for the magnitude of change and volatility they are likely to encounter. These experienced joiners are better equipped to "ride out the storm" of nascency, as their initial expectations are more grounded in the reality of the entrepreneurial process. In contrast, those with little start-up experience are more prone to disillusionment when informal communication channels are replaced by hierarchies or when scientific goals are superseded by commercial imperatives.

Beyond individual experience, the venture's growth rate serves as a critical organizational signal to the workforce. High growth acts as a promise of future need fulfillment, suggesting to employees that the internal changes they experience are precursors to professional development and long-term security. Conversely, with low growth, the increase in turnover intent is exacerbated, as employees see fewer opportunities to meet their original career goals. This interaction creates a spiraling relationship where employees with low turnover intent drive growth, which in turn reinforces their commitment to stay. Moving from these broad expectations to the daily interactions within the venture, we must examine how the entrepreneur's own psychological state permeates the workforce.

8.3 The Contagion of Passion and Goal Clarity

Leading a new venture is not merely a matter of task management but is a highly emotional process in which the entrepreneur's affect directly impacts employee behavior. *Entrepreneurial passion*—the intense positive feelings the

entrepreneur has for a meaningful role—is not contained within the individual; it often spills over to the workforce through emotional contagion. However, this contagion is not uniformly positive. Rather, its impact on employee commitment is contingent upon the *type* of passion the entrepreneur displays.

Entrepreneurs who exhibit passion for inventing and developing typically enhance employee commitment. When the entrepreneur displays passion for identifying new opportunities or growing the firm, it signals to employees that they are “in the same boat” and that the entrepreneur is committed to a shared future. This affective transfer increases the employees’ own positive affect at work and, importantly, improves their goal clarity. By observing the entrepreneur’s coordinated and passionate pursuit of growth, employees better understand their own duties and expectations in an environment that lacks established routines.

In a counterintuitive twist, entrepreneurs’ passion for founding new ventures—the very act of creating new firms—can actually reduce employee commitment. Employees often perceive this specific form of passion as a signal that the entrepreneur may leave the current venture to start a new one as soon as the current one is established. This perception creates goal conflict, as employees worry about their future security when the “brains behind the venture” seem focused on an exit. This perception leading to goal conflict highlights how venture leadership is as much about managing perceptions of one’s own passion as it is about strategic planning. As the emotional tone of the entrepreneur is established, it must be supported by the structural realities of ownership and rewards.

8.4 The Scaling Toll: Burnout and Job Satisfaction

As the venture transitions from the honeymoon of its early years into the scale-up phase, the architectural demands on the workforce shift from experimentation to rapid expansion. Scaling is a transformative organizational process whereby managers expand outputs without a corresponding *ex ante* increase in inputs, often by leveraging digital resources. While this phase is a primary goal for many entrepreneurs, it is frequently characterized by significant “scaling pains” that take a heavy toll on employees, including increased burnout and less job satisfaction.

These phenomena are especially prevalent in ventures that prioritize speed over efficiency, a strategy often referred to as “blitzscaling.” The rapid change in roles, the integration of large numbers of new joiners, and the increasing

complexity of organizational tasks tax the cognitive and emotional resources of the workforce. If left unmanaged, these stressors can lead to a demise from within, where the very growth that investors celebrate destroys the morale of the team required to sustain it.

Interestingly, there is a sharp contrast between how the entrepreneur and rank-and-file employees experience this phase. As the venture scales, the entrepreneur often reports *less* burnout and *greater* job satisfaction than their subordinates. This distinction suggests that those who drive the scaling process (and possess greater autonomy) are shielded from its most negative effects, while the employees tasked with implementation bear the brunt of the “scalar stress.” To mitigate this toll on employees, the entrepreneur must ensure changes in the business model are harmonized with organizational operations to prevent the systemic depletion of human energy. Moving from growth to the potential end of a project, the entrepreneur must also be prepared to handle the fallout of failure.

8.5 Managing the Exit: Project Termination and Employee Grief

In high-velocity environments, the ability to stop is as important as the ability to start, yet project termination represents a significant trauma for the entrepreneurial workforce. *Termination* refers to the release of a project’s resources and the reassignment of team members to other duties. Because employees often develop psychological ownership over their projects, the decision to stop is frequently experienced as a profound loss that can trigger *entrepreneurial grief*—the negative emotional reaction to the loss of an important entrepreneurial project.

Managing this termination process is a function of the entrepreneur’s hierarchical attention and experience. When the entrepreneur is experienced and has survived multiple project failures, they have higher coping self-efficacy, which allows them to prepare for the emotional and learning consequences of termination. In this case, the entrepreneur is better able to communicate the signal to stop in a way that refocuses employee attention on strategic fit rather than the immediate pain of the loss. However, in a high-growth firm, the entrepreneur is often caught in a “speed trap” that leads them to neglect the qualitative aspects of termination, such as communication with the team, in favor of rapid action.

To minimize the human costs of project termination, the entrepreneur must utilize parting ceremonies and debriefing sessions to normalize the end of a project as a predictable stage of learning. The entrepreneur should help employees recraft their career narratives during these periods of change, emphasizing the value of the experience gained despite the project failure. By pairing new hires with experienced mentors who have successfully navigated a project failure, the entrepreneur can impart a redemption narrative that preserves the workforce's belief in the venture's ultimate future. This disciplined approach to "stopping" ensures that human capital is not just discarded but is redeployed to the next meaningful challenge with new insights.

8.6 Conclusion

Managing the entrepreneurial workforce requires a sophisticated approach that balances the entrepreneur's passion with employees' need for stability and justice. Turnover intent in young ventures is a dynamic phenomenon driven by the gap between pre-entry expectations and the rapid organizational changes inherent in growth. While the entrepreneur's passion can be a powerful motivator, it must be carefully communicated to avoid signaling a premature exit that reduces commitment. The transition to scaling represents a peak period of risk for the workforce, where the pursuit of expansion can trigger a systemic rise in burnout and a decline in satisfaction. Ultimately, the venture's success depends on the entrepreneur's ability to maintain a strong organizational identity and manage the grief of project termination to learn from the experience. By recognizing that the workforce is a resilient interpretive system, the entrepreneur can ensure the venture flourishes. While some ventures spread excellence through economic growth, others focus on horizons that transcend purely economic gains. The following chapter delves into the social aspects of venturing, exploring the trajectories of compassion and hybrid organizing. We move from the mechanics of economic expansion to social compassion, including how the venture can serve both a commercial logic and a social mission simultaneously.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.



9

Developing the Social Aspects of the Venture: Prosocial Motivation, Pathways of Compassion, and Hybridity

9.1 Introduction

The journey toward social impact is driven by a prosocial motivation that directs action toward the alleviation of suffering. Prosocially motivated entrepreneurs can either provide for basic survival needs through proximal-oriented sustaining ventures or focus on long-term solutions and restoring autonomy and self-reliance through transforming ventures. Operating within this social mission requires a hybrid organization that must balance competing social welfare and commercial logics. This chapter explores how to manage these tensions, which are determined by the relative intensity and distribution of each logic. We examine how the social entrepreneur navigates political resourcefulness, using tactical and diplomatic actions like protective shielding to safeguard their mission during expansion. However, the persistence of prosocial effort often carries a psychological cost, leading to social-venturing fatigue characterized by detachment and desensitization. To sustain their mission, the entrepreneur must leverage psychosocial resources to counteract exhaustion and maintain the venture's interpretive focus on beneficiaries. By precisely calibrating these logics and behaviors, the entrepreneur ensures the venture remains a viable engine for enduring social value.

9.2 The Pathways of Compassion: Sustaining Versus Transforming Alleviation

The transition from a generalized desire to help toward the creation of a structured social venture designed to alleviate suffering is driven by the entrepreneur's compassion. *Compassion* is a prosocial motivator that arises when an individual witnesses the suffering of others and feels an urgent need to act to mitigate that distress. In the immediate aftermath of a crisis or within environments of chronic hardship, two distinct trajectories typically emerge: sustaining and transforming. *Sustaining ventures* are organizations primarily focused on providing for basic survival needs, such as food, water, and immediate medical relief, often in a perpetual or long-term capacity. These ventures are characterized by a proximal orientation, meaning they focus on the most immediate and visible symptoms of suffering within a specific local area. While these actions are vital for survival, they carry the inherent risk of creating stagnant relief communities, with beneficiaries developing a long-term dependence on ventures to meet their most fundamental needs.

In contrast, *transforming ventures* adopt a more expansive view of the recovery process, acknowledging that while immediate relief is necessary, the ultimate goal must be the restoration of autonomy and self-reliance. These ventures utilize a “building back better” philosophy, focusing on a broad set of immediate and evolving needs, such as job training, psychological counseling, and legal support for housing disputes. The transforming path is characterized by its progression through multiple stages of recovery, where these ventures' activities shift as impacted communities move from crisis toward stability. For example, a venture might start by providing food but quickly pivot toward helping victims prepare resumes or gain technical skills to secure external employment. By treating beneficiaries not as passive recipients of aid but as active participants in their own recovery, transforming ventures seek to disequilibrate the dysfunctional status quo of adversity and create a new baseline for human flourishing.

This fundamental choice between sustaining and transforming alleviation dictates the venture's entire organizational framework, requiring the social entrepreneur to manage the complex tensions inherent in balancing social and economic goals.

9.3 Organizing Hybridity: Balancing Commercial and Social Welfare Logics

Scaling a social mission requires organizing action capable of operating as a hybrid organization. *Hybridity* is the combination of multiple, often conflicting, institutional logics within a single entity, most notably the integration of a social welfare logic (focusing on impact) and a commercial logic (focusing on economic viability).

Indeed, hybridity should be understood not as a binary state but as a matter of degree determined by two critical dimensions: intensity and relativity. *Hybrid intensity* refers to the absolute strength and prominence of both the commercial and social welfare logics within the venture. A high-intensity hybrid organization is one in which both logics are robust and actively drive decision-making. *Hybrid relativity*, on the other hand, represents the relative distribution, or the “gap,” between these logics, indicating which logic takes precedence during times of conflict.

The successful management of this hybrid framework depends on the entrepreneur’s ability to maintain their *prosocial motivation*—the desire to expend effort to benefit other people or a collective. This motivation is often tested during expansion, as the venture must interact with a community of inquiry comprised of stakeholders, such as investors, government agencies, and non-government organizations, who may hold different or even competing priorities. The entrepreneur must avoid the trap of *mission drift*, where the pressure to achieve commercial success leads to the erosion of the venture’s original social purpose. To maintain this balance, the high-functioning hybrid venture employs structured flexibility, which is a management approach that allows the organization to adapt its operational methods while remaining firmly anchored in its dual goals. This balancing act is further operationalized through the specific ways the venture acquires and manages its essential resources.

9.4 The Greed Paradox: Ethical Regulation in the Hybrid Venture

The tension between the social welfare and commercial logics is often complicated by the presence of *dispositional greed* within the founding team—the insatiable tendency to want more and never be satisfied with current

acquisitions. While greed is typically associated with the pursuit of material wealth, in the hybrid context, it can manifest as an excessive drive for organizational status or “immaterial desires” like fame for the venture’s mission. Unlike managers in established firms who may sacrifice organizational goals for personal greed, entrepreneurs often see their ventures as extensions of themselves. This identification creates a unique paradox: the greedy social entrepreneur may engage in *unethical pro-organizational behavior*—violating social norms or ethical standards specifically to help the venture survive or grow.

The manifestation of this greed into unethical pro-organizational behavior is governed by the situational strength of the founding team’s social context, specifically the role of trust. High levels of affective trust (emotional bonding and vulnerability) can create a “weak situation” in which a greedy member feels free to act unethically for the venture’s sake, believing their teammates will support them regardless of the methods used. Conversely, cognitive trust (belief in teammates’ reliability and competence) acts as a “strong situation” that inhibits such behavior by imposing a logic of accountability and professional standards. By understanding how these trust dimensions moderate greedy impulses, the social entrepreneur can ensure the venture’s commercial logic does not trigger a drift into unethical territory, protecting the venture’s legitimacy as it moves toward resource mobilization.

9.5 Resource Mobilization and the Mechanics of Shielding

As the social venture expands, it must engage in entrepreneurial resourcefulness. Entrepreneurial resourcefulness is the ability to creatively mobilize and combine resources to solve social problems under conditions of scarcity. This resourcefulness often manifests through joint resourcing, a collaborative process whereby the venture and its partners co-create value by pooling their respective assets. In many cases, the social venture relies on an amplified resource provider base, integrating many new or preexisting partners who provide everything from physical locations to specialized consulting services. However, expansion often introduces misalignment, particularly when dealing with dominant participatory partners—large organizations that provide critical resources but also demand a high degree of control over the venture’s decision-making.

To protect the venture's mission and its volunteers from external pressure, team members must often engage in politics. Politics in the social venture, particularly within the context of compassion-driven initiatives, manifests through *political resourcefulness*—the tactical, diplomatic, and politically nuanced actions the entrepreneur takes to negotiate and assert their position relative to powerful external actors. These politics are not merely about personal gain but are essential strategic behaviors used to safeguard the venture's compassion-oriented mission during expansion.

Political dynamics arise primarily from resource dependencies. Because social ventures often emerge spontaneously in response to urgent crises, they frequently leverage collaborations with established organizations to access critical resources. These relationships often form so quickly that there is no time to validate partners or establish regulatory mechanisms, leading to significant power asymmetries. In these imbalanced relationships, *dominant participatory partners*—those who provide critical resources like funding or legal status—often seek to have a say and exert control over the venture's internal decision-making processes.

When unmanaged, dominant partners' meddling can be highly detrimental. It slows organizational progress and can lead to enforced joint resourcing, which severely limits the venture's decision-making autonomy and redirects effort away from the primary mission. For the entrepreneurial team, these power battles cause intense frustration, work overload, and emotional exhaustion. Furthermore, if these tensions become visible to other stakeholders, they can cause "partner leakage," where alternative collaborators withdraw their support to avoid being involved in organizational "drama."

To mitigate these tensions, the entrepreneur can employ three primary political resourcefulness practices: (1) *protective resourcing* by strategically concealing internal tensions and information from external partners to maintain control and shield the volunteer community from disruptive drama, (2) *assertive resourcing* by proactively lobbying to influence partner perceptions and finding ways to bypass or redirect partners' overt participatory actions, and (3) *dialogic resourcing* by using diplomatic strategies to strategically integrate dominant resource holders into collective decision-making while maintaining a balanced collaboration.

Additionally, the entrepreneur can manage these politics by diversifying their resource provider base to reduce reliance on any single entity and by utilizing playbooks and formalized organizational charts to establish clear operational boundaries. These actions allow the venture to transition from a temporary response initiative into an enduring organization. Despite these efforts, however, the social entrepreneur can experience fatigue.

9.6 The Fatigue Model: Managing the Cumulative Toll of Prosocial Effort

The intensity of managing the social venture, characterized by constant exposure to others' suffering and the need to navigate volatile resource environments, can lead to the onset of *social-venturing fatigue*. This condition is a persistent state of physical and mental exhaustion that arises from the sustained expenditure of prosocial effort (see Chapter 4). Social-venturing fatigue functions through two primary psychological mechanisms: detachment and desensitization. *Detachment* involves the psychological withdrawal from beneficiaries such that the entrepreneur begins to view them with less empathy and more as a burden. *Desensitization* is a process of emotional numbing, where the entrepreneur becomes less reactive to the suffering they witness, which can eventually diminish their prosocial motivation or lead to venture exit.

To prevent this exhaustion from destroying the venture's leadership, the entrepreneur must manage target feedback loops, which are the signals of progress (or lack thereof) received from beneficiaries. Visible progress can trigger an upward spiral of positive emotions, replenishing the entrepreneur's energy, while a lack of perceived impact can exacerbate fatigue. By institutionalizing recovery rituals and maintaining an authentic connection to the collective team, the entrepreneur ensures the venture remains resilient, preserving the existential resources required to continue the journey toward meaningful impact.

9.7 Conclusion

Successfully scaling a social mission requires entrepreneurial resourcefulness, specifically through joint resourcing with partners and protective shielding to maintain independence. However, the persistence of prosocial effort carries a psychological cost, often leading to social-venturing fatigue characterized by detachment and desensitization. To sustain the mission, the entrepreneur must leverage psychosocial resources and monitor target feedback loops to ensure an upward spiral of positive emotions. By mastering political resourcefulness, the entrepreneur ensures the venture can acquire necessary assets without compromising its core compassion-oriented mission. The tension between the social welfare and commercial logics is further complicated by entrepreneurial greed, which can trigger unethical pro-organizational behavior if not regulated by trust and accountability. Ultimately, the goal is to move

from temporary relief to an enduring organization that restores community self-reliance. While some social ventures flourish, others inevitably reach the end of their viable life cycle. The entrepreneur must be as disciplined in terminating projects as they were in starting them. The next chapter focuses on exit, termination, and the art of letting go. We examine how to recognize the cues that a project has reached its functional end and explore the signal to stop as a strategic necessity for wealth creation.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





10

The Signal to Stop: Exit, Termination, and the Art of Letting Go

10.1 Introduction

Strategic stopping is an essential mechanism for bounding failure, ensuring that capital and human resources are not permanently tied to fruitless opportunities. While entrepreneurship is often defined by entry, the decision to exit is a key event that separates those who continue to pursue value from those who allow it to be siphoned away. The decision to exit involves various modes, including harvest sales, liquidations, and stewardships. This chapter explores how these transitions interact with internal power structures, where a loss of influence—whether structural, ownership, expert, or prestige—can generate the frustration required to “pack one’s bags.” We examine the powerful psychological barriers to action, specifically escalation of commitment and the stigma of failure. To overcome these hurdles, the entrepreneur must utilize a postmortem learning cycle, ensuring that exit is not an end but a disciplined transition that preserves the well-being and resources required for the next horizon.

10.2 The Strategic Calculus of Termination: Modes, Power, and Decision Shocks

Terminating uneconomic ventures and poorly performing projects is essential to wealth creation and the health of dynamic ecosystems. *Strategic stopping* functions as a vital mechanism for bounding failure, ensuring that capital and

human resources are not permanently tied to fruitless opportunities that lack a clear path to value creation. This decision-making process is rarely a simple binary choice between persistence and termination; rather, it involves a variety of exit modes, each dictated by the venture's performance and the entrepreneur's personal goals. A *harvest sale* represents an exit whereby the venture is sold for a profit to realize gains, while a *liquidation* involves the cessation of operations and the sale of remaining assets. A *stewardship* transfer involves passing the business to family members or employees to maintain its legacy. In contrast, a *distress sale* is a forced exit via which the venture is sold under duress due to poor performance or insolvency.

The entrepreneur's selection of an exit route is influenced by their human capital and the venture's performance relative to their personal expectations. The transition toward exit is often catalyzed by a *shock*, formally defined as a specific discrete event that disrupts the automatic persistence of the venture and forces a conscious appraisal of whether to continue. These shocks interact with internal power structures. In the context of management, *power* is defined as an individual's capacity to exert their will on organizational decisions and actions. This capacity is not a monolith but is composed of four distinct dimensions that calibrate the entrepreneur's influence. *Structural power* is derived from an individual's formal position within the organizational hierarchy, such as serving as the CEO or the chairperson of the board. *Ownership power* stems from proportional shareholding. When the entrepreneur holds large equity stakes relative to other shareholders, they possess greater influence over board decisions. *Expert power* arises from specialized knowledge and the ability to manage environmental contingencies and is often seen in entrepreneurs who are the primary inventors of a product. Finally, *prestige power* is based on social status and reputation. It is often bolstered by media visibility or seats on external boards and enhances the entrepreneur's credibility as a legitimate leader.

When these internal power structures are dismantled, the entrepreneur frequently experiences frustration—a negative affective state caused by the “interdiction” or interruption of a goal-oriented behavioral sequence. This frustration occurs because the entrepreneur's efforts toward their desired vision are blocked by other powerful actors, such as a new board of directors that chooses a different strategic route. Low power transforms an individual's psychology, leading them to perceive negative situations as more threatening because they lack the control to rectify them.

This emotional state of frustration is a primary driver of entrepreneurial exit. Because frustration tends to spill over from one domain to another, when the entrepreneur loses power in their managerial role, they may find

that their frustration eventually diminishes their commitment to their ownership role as well. Consequently, rather than accepting a diminished status, the entrepreneur may choose to “pack their bags” and exit the venture entirely to pursue opportunities elsewhere. By managing these power dynamics and the resulting emotional toll, the entrepreneur ensures the act of stopping becomes a disciplined transition rather than a destructive “creeping death.” While the strategic calculus of termination often treats projects as isolated options, the effective metacognitive engine must evaluate the signal to stop through the lens of portfolio balance and strategic fit.

10.3 The Attentional Filter: Portfolio Strategy and Hierarchical Focus

The entrepreneur (like all people) has limited attentional resources, meaning they must selectively notice and interpret environmental stimuli, such as technical failure or market shifts, to decide which projects no longer serve the venture’s future. This attentional filtering is not uniform but is regulated by the entrepreneur’s focus of attention and the structural distribution of attention within the venture. At the individual level, an entrepreneur’s past project failure experience significantly calibrates their attention. While failure is often seen as a purely negative outcome, entrepreneurs who have navigated multiple failures develop higher coping self-efficacy, allowing them to prepare emotionally for future terminations. This experience reduces the noise of anticipated negative emotions, providing the attentional resources necessary to assess a project’s strategic fit with current markets and future technological developments. Consequently, entrepreneurs with extensive failure experience are more likely to terminate projects that lack strategic alignment, as they view such actions as a necessary rebalancing of their organizations’ portfolios.

Furthermore, the structural distribution of attention within the venture creates a “divergent thinking” gap between hierarchical levels. Entrepreneurs, whose primary role is to craft strategy and sustain long-term performance, are more attentive to strategic fit and portfolio balance—the diversity of risks and time horizons within the firm. They are often willing to invest resources in starting strategically unrelated projects as “probes,” but they become more ruthless regarding termination when those probes fail to migrate toward the firm’s core strategy over time. Conversely, middle managers typically focus on strategy implementation and project-specific characteristics, such as customer preferences and technological solutions. Because they are closer to

projects' daily operations, middle managers may support the continuation of a project even if it lacks strategic fit, believing that localized problems can be solved. To ensure the signal to stop is correctly processed, the venture's approach must bridge these hierarchical perspectives, thereby preventing individual project successes from masking systemic strategic misalignment. This structural tension leads us to examine the psychological barriers that often impede these very decisions.

10.4 Barriers to Action: Escalation of Commitment, Stigma, and Decision Incongruence

Despite the strategic importance of rapid termination, many succumb to *escalation of commitment*, a destructive form of persistence whereby decision-makers increase resources dedicated to a failing course of action. This behavior is frequently driven by self-justification—namely, when individuals feel a powerful internal need to prove they are competent and rational to themselves and others. This need for internal validation leads them to ignore the *sunk-cost effect*, a cognitive bias where the focus remains on the money, time, and energy already invested—resources that cannot be recovered—rather than on the future utility of the focal project. The decision to stop is further complicated by the stigma of failure, as entrepreneurs fear the stigma associated with bankruptcy. Stigma can lead to social disapproval and the loss of status, which many individuals attempt to manage through impression-management strategies designed to protect their psychological well-being. For example, to avoid the immediacy of stigma, some entrepreneurs delay terminating failing projects. Furthermore, the signal to stop is often obscured by decision incongruence, which is the absolute difference between an individual's actual decision-making policy and the policy they convey to external stakeholders. High incongruence can create a “logic gap” that erodes legitimacy, making it difficult for team members to reach a consensus on when a project has failed.

To overcome these barriers, the entrepreneur must foster an organizational culture of psychological safety in which failure is seen as a predictable stage of the learning process rather than a permanent personal disgrace. By encouraging team reflection, where members adapt their strategies based on honest feedback, the entrepreneur can better recognize the cues that a pivot or termination is required. When these psychological and social barriers are not

successfully managed, the venture enters a dangerous period during which stakeholders use information signals to evaluate whether to continue their commitment to the entrepreneur and the venture.

10.5 External Signals: Investor Logic and the Stage of Failure

The internal decision to terminate a project is rarely a private matter for the founding team; instead, it is a public signal that triggers a specific investor reaction based on the project's development stage. In innovation-driven sectors, the market-value decline following an announcement of a product failure is significantly more severe when the project is in a late development stage rather than an early one. The decline is more severe in this case because early-stage failures are often expected and tolerated as part of the "option-like" nature of entrepreneurial exploration, whereas late-stage failures represent a more definitive loss of both time and capital. For the entrepreneur, the signal to stop must be calibrated to these external expectations to protect the venture's remaining legitimacy and value.

The severity of this negative reaction is further moderated by the venture's managerial capabilities, specifically the top management team's industry experience. Industry experience embeds a reservoir of tacit knowledge regarding technological regulations and competitive conditions in a particular context, which enables the team to "weather the storm" of an early-stage failure. Investors view an experienced team as having the resilience and skills necessary to recover and pivot resources toward other projects in the pipeline. However, this buffer is less effective in late-stage failures, where even high industry experience may be insufficient to counteract the disappointment of a major milestone being missed.

Additionally, the venture's low-discretion financial slack—assets that are tied to specific uses—acts as a critical signal of survival risk during termination. When a project fails, investors assess the venture's ability to redeploy resources. A lack of discretionary slack combined with a late-stage failure can signal imminent venture distress, triggering an even more aggressive decline in the venture's value. The entrepreneur must recognize that their internal hesitation to "pull the plug" is often echoed by external stakeholders who use project milestones to judge the veracity of the entire business model. When these signals are ignored, the venture risks entering the slow and emotionally painful state of systemic decline.

10.6 The High Cost of Persistence and the Phenomenon of “Creeping Death”

Failing to act on negative feedback risks the creation of permanently failing organizations, colloquially known as the “living dead,” which squander resources and occupy market positions without reasonable returns. Delaying termination is financially costly, as it diminishes salvageable equity and often requires additional personal investments that effectively entail “throwing good money after bad.”

However, this period of delay represents a double-edged sword. While it increases financial costs, some persistence before failure can be beneficial for the entrepreneur’s anticipatory grieving. Anticipatory grieving involves the processes of mourning, coping, and psychosocial reorganization that begin in response to the awareness of an impending loss. This window of time allows the entrepreneur to gradually withdraw their emotional energy and emotionally prepare for the event, potentially maximizing overall recovery once the failure finally occurs.

For those who do not “own the option” but instead “are the option”—namely, the project team members—delayed termination is often experienced as creeping death. This process involves a slow descent where the likely outcome is known, but the steps toward it are drawn out and emotionally painful. Rather than alleviating negative affect, creeping death generates intense frustration and worry, as employees feel their career opportunities are thwarted and their human capital is tied to an unpromising project. However, in an organizational context where team members are rapidly redeployed after termination, this period of delay can provide a necessary pause for learning.

For termination to be productive, the organization must engage in a disciplined postmortem learning cycle. This cycle involves four primary learning activities: searching to acquire information about why the failure occurred, processing to assimilate that information through analysis and discussion, coding to put lessons learned into written form as playbooks, and practicing to repeat new behaviors until they become effective routines. This cycle is often supported by debriefing sessions in which project participants share experiences to enhance personal learning.

10.7 Conclusion

Irrational persistence is driven by escalation of commitment, self-justification, and the stigma of failure, which the entrepreneur must manage through impression management and fostering psychological safety. When termination is delayed, project members experience a slow and emotionally painful descent known as creeping death. However, this creeping death provides the time to learn from the experience. The decision to stop is also an information-signaling task, as investors use the stage of failure and managerial experience to judge the venture's remaining value. By utilizing a disciplined postmortem learning cycle—searching, processing, coding, and practicing—the entrepreneur ensures that exit becomes a vital source of new knowledge. This approach preserves the equity and human capital required to pursue the next meaningful horizon. The ability to stop and reflect marks the final stage of maturity for the entrepreneur. As one journey concludes, the internal engine for action must be recalibrated for a global and increasingly digitized future. The final chapter explores the future horizons of venturing, addressing the “where,” “what,” and “how” of a new era. We examine non-Western cultural zones and the digital scaffolds that allow for compassion-driven innovation at scale.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.





11

Navigating New Entrepreneurial Perspectives

11.1 Introduction

The future of entrepreneurship points toward horizons that transcend traditional WEIRD (Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic) samples, embracing non-Western cultural zones and local knowledge. The entrepreneur must recognize the strategic value of social harmony in East Asian contexts, debate in South Asian contexts, and self-assertiveness in Arabian contexts. As we discuss in this chapter, global expansion is critical for empowering marginalized groups to address institutional voids and extreme resource scarcity. This chapter also provides a candid appraisal of the destructive underbelly of venturing, discussing the need to remain vigilant against Dark Triad traits and the cognitive process of moral disengagement. We explore how value is increasingly defined by sustainable entrepreneurship and the preservation of nature through the triple bottom line, even within intersectional sources of disadvantage. Finally, we examine how crowd-based digital innovation and digital scaffolding based on the Internet of Things (IoT) are reshaping the approach to entrepreneurial action. These tools enable compassion venturing at scale, allowing the entrepreneur to mobilize resources rapidly during global “poly-crises.” Therefore, the entrepreneur ensures the venture remains an interpretive system capable of providing enduring value for humanity in an ever-changing world.

11.2 Beyond the WEIRD Horizon: Inclusivity and Local Knowledge

The field of entrepreneurship research has historically been dominated by WEIRD samples—data derived from populations that are Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic. Approximately 87% of all samples in top entrepreneurship journals are WEIRD, even though seven countries containing more than half the world's population are predominantly non-Western. *Non-WEIRD* entrepreneurship research is defined as inquiry focusing on contexts that are non-Western, non-educated, non-industrialized, non-rich, and/or non-democratic.

The primary problem with a WEIRD-centric perspective is the assumption of universal generalizability. Theories built on the Western view of the “independent self” may fail in non-Western cultural zones that prioritize interdependence. For instance, in the East Asian cultural zone, successful venturing often relies on *social harmony*—cooperative, conflict-free interactions—and *self-effacement*, which contradicts the individualistic, self-promoting norms celebrated in the West. Similarly, the South Asian cultural zone utilizes debate and argumentation as a relational tool to maintain commerce-based social relations, while the Arabian cultural zone emphasizes self-assertiveness to manage needs directly while maintaining respect.

Furthermore, structural knowledge from WEIRD contexts often does not fit non-WEIRD environments. In regions with low literacy, years of schooling are a poor proxy for human capital; the entrepreneur must instead look at specific skills and ingenious “workarounds.” While WEIRD research emphasizes venture-capital-funded high-tech firms, non-industrialized contexts often center on manual labor, agriculture, and natural-resource exploitation. In non-democratic contexts, where the rule of law may be weak, political connections and informal institutions become essential strategic assets rather than mere noise, as they are often treated in Western models.

Entrepreneurs in WEIRD contexts can learn significant lessons from the resourcefulness and resilience displayed in non-WEIRD environments. Primary among these is the mastery of bricolage and jugaad, which involve making do with the resources at hand and using assertive defiance to improvise frugal quick-fix solutions to complex problems, respectively. While jugaad generates innovations that enhance inclusive growth, it does not provide the sort of proprietary products or processes that could serve as a source of competitive advantage for growing the venture. Indeed, while Western theories often focus on firm growth as the ultimate success metric, non-WEIRD contexts

highlight the importance of inclusive growth—generating noneconomic value and enhanced well-being for the entrepreneur and their community.

Additionally, entrepreneurs in wealthy nations can learn from how those in impoverished regions disrupt the *Matthew effect*—the cycle in which initial advantages lead to cumulative gains for the rich and cumulative losses for the impoverished entrepreneur. By managing a scarcity mindset, impoverished entrepreneurs (e.g., those in Mumbai slums or rural Vietnam) demonstrate how to build connection-based authenticity and legitimize new social identities despite socioinstitutional resistance. These insights are particularly relevant for everyday entrepreneurs in WEIRD countries who face their own versions of resource constraints and stigma.

11.3 The Shadow Framework: Destructive Entrepreneurship and Moral Regulation

Future thinking requires a candid appraisal of the destructive underbelly of entrepreneurship, challenging the implicit assumption that all entrepreneurial action is inherently beneficial. *Destructive entrepreneurship* is defined as action in pursuit of an opportunity with disregard for the likelihood that it will produce social, environmental, or economic outcomes that are more harmful than beneficial. At the micro-level, this destruction is often facilitated by individuals possessing Dark Triad personality traits: Machiavellianism (exploitative social strategizing), narcissism (self-aggrandizement and status pursuit), and psychopathy (impulsivity and a lack of empathy). These individuals frequently use their power for personal domination while disregarding the resulting social costs.

However, the future entrepreneur must also recognize that generally good people can engage in destructive action through impaired regulation. Everyday venturing creates extreme demands on cognitive resources, leading to personal resource depletion. When the entrepreneur's "fuel" for self-control is exhausted, they become vulnerable to the temptation to pursue short-term personal benefits at the expense of others. This depletion is often driven by common entrepreneurial factors taken to the extreme, such as being a jack-or-jill-of-all-trades with an overwhelming multitasking load or experiencing obsessive passion, which creates internal pressure to persist at all costs.

Central to these ethical lapses is moral disengagement, a cognitive process in which individuals deactivate their internal moral standards to behave inconsistently with their values without feeling guilt. This process works

through four primary cognitive loci: (1) *behavior locus*, which entails misconstruing acts through moral justification, euphemistic labeling, or advantageous comparison to make them seem acceptable; (2) *agency locus*, which refers to displacing or diffusing responsibility to avoid personal blame for negative outcomes; (3) *outcome locus*, which involves disregarding, minimizing, or distorting the actual consequences of an action; and (4) *victim locus*, which encompasses dehumanizing those harmed or attributing blame to them to reduce self-censure. Furthermore, the entrepreneur may utilize a creative mindset to generate novel justifications for environmental harm, a specific form of disengagement known as nature disengagement.

The entrepreneur of a social or nonprofit venture faces the additional risk of moral licensing. Because they are engaged in doing moral good, they may believe they have made “deposits in the moral bank,” which then leads them to believe they can “withdraw” from this “account” by acting unethically in other areas. Believing the ends justify the means, they might cross ethical boundaries, such as using deceptive negotiation or exaggerating victim qualifications, to ensure their prosocial mission survives.

To ensure they are thinking and acting entrepreneurially in the future, the entrepreneur must cultivate *cognitive adaptability*—the ability to be dynamic, flexible, and self-regulating in uncertain environments. This requires moving beyond WEIRD samples to embrace diverse non-Western cultural zones and local knowledge. The entrepreneur must continuously question their dominant logic, engage in self-reflection, and utilize metacognitive monitoring to adapt their strategies to changing environmental feedback. By maintaining prosocial solidarity and leveraging digital scaffolding, such as artificial intelligence (AI) and IoT sensors, for compassion venturing, they can transform the internal engine of action into a resilient system that creates enduring value for all of humanity.

11.4 The Intersectional Frontier: Sustainability, Dirty Work, and Meaning

The future of entrepreneurship is increasingly defined by a fundamental shift from purely economic profit toward meaningful venturing, with the entrepreneur’s well-being serving as a primary driver for action. This evolution significantly broadens the conceptualization of who an entrepreneur is and moves past the WEIRD archetype to include everyday entrepreneurs operating under extreme adversity, such as refugees, those at the “base of the pyramid,” and individuals mired in “dirty work.” For these actors, entrepreneurship acts as a

powerful vehicle to escape or perforate structural constraints, offering a route to self-employment, income generation, and increased household bargaining power in contexts where traditional employment is restricted.

To succeed, the disadvantaged entrepreneur must navigate their unique intersectionality by recognizing how overlapping sources of taint, such as social caste, gender, and physical place, compound their marginalization. For example, in highly restrictive patriarchal environments, women often utilize cognitive carve-outs to navigate conflicting societal expectations, reframing their “masculine” entrepreneurial roles as extensions of traditional caregiving to gain community legitimacy. These agentic behaviors allow them to change the structural foundations of poverty and oppression incrementally through the use of bricolage and jugaad to improvise solutions from scarce resources and bypass broken institutional systems.

However, the path to emancipation is frequently blocked by the stigma of failure, which acts as a powerful social sanction. While individuals can use impression-management strategies, such as actively concealing failure or defining failure as a strategic reorganization, to protect their internal well-being, the broader societal antifailure bias remains destructive. This bias frequently creates the “tall poppy syndrome” in regions, whereby high achievers are “knocked” for their fall, which has a negative impact that transcends the individual. Because regions with high entrepreneurship rates exist in a self-perpetuating equilibrium, a culture that stigmatizes failure directly undermines regional performance by reducing the number of people willing to risk entrepreneurial entry.

Looking forward, a younger generation of entrepreneurs is leading a shift toward solving grand social and environmental challenges. Their work is characterized by the pursuit of the triple bottom line, where the preservation of nature, life support, and community is as vital as economic viability. These practitioners leverage prosocial motivation and empathy to identify sustainable development opportunities, focusing on how they can help others and restore their environments rather than solely pursuing self-enhancement. The future of entrepreneurship lies in its capacity to serve as a resilient interpretive system that generates inclusive growth and enduring value for all of humanity.

11.5 The Digital Engine: Crowd-Based Innovation and Compassion Venturing

As we move into an increasingly digitized era, entrepreneurial action is being fundamentally reshaped by crowd-based digital innovation. Digital platforms, AI, and IoT sensors are now essential components of the toolkit for

compassion venturing, enabling individuals to identify needs and mobilize resources rapidly during global poly-crises. Crowd-based innovation refers to the process of leveraging the distributed knowledge and effort of a large group of people via digital networks to solve complex business or societal problems. To leverage this human capital effectively, the entrepreneur utilizes specific digital tools—for example, in the face of a disaster, crowdsourced maps of hazards to plan alternative service routes and Wiki platforms to compile diverse data feeds regarding shelter and hospital availability.

These technologies provide a coherent *digital scaffolding*—a structured process and support system that allows the entrepreneur to accommodate radical uncertainty and the “shattered assumptions” that follow a major disaster. For instance, temporary IoT sensors enable ventures to measure environmental conditions like river heights or road clearances in real time, facilitating improvised responses in disrupted environments where traditional infrastructure has failed. Furthermore, technologies like blockchain offer new ways to enhance transparency and traceability in industries prone to corruption or destructive action, ensuring that resources reach their intended targets.

By integrating these digital capabilities with a calibrated heart and a disciplined head, the entrepreneur positions the venture as a catalyst for prosocial solidarity and community resilience. As the boundary between the “self” and the “venture” continues to evolve, the ability to maintain authenticity and psychological well-being will be the ultimate hallmark of the future entrepreneur.

11.6 Conclusion

Moving forward requires a candid appraisal of destructive entrepreneurship that goes beyond the assumption that all entrepreneurial action universally creates positive value. The entrepreneur must remain vigilant against Dark Triad traits and the cognitive mechanics of moral disengagement, ensuring their internal moral standards remain active. Further, value is increasingly defined by sustainable entrepreneurship, with the preservation of nature and community being as vital as economic growth. By leveraging crowd-based digital innovation and IoT-based digital scaffolding, the entrepreneur ensures the venture remains an interpretive system capable of providing enduring value in an increasingly digitized era. These technologies mobilize prosocial solidarity at scale, transforming solitary profit engines into mission-driven vehicles for inclusive growth. As the journey toward a market reality flourishes, the entrepreneur’s ultimate hallmark will be their ability to maintain authenticity and subjective well-being while navigating the most challenging horizons.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this license to share adapted material derived from this book or parts of it.

The images or other third party material in this book are included in the book's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the book's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.



Bibliography

This book is based largely on our previous research on the topic (which builds on the work of other scholars). The interested reader can explore the nuances of this book and the relevant literature through the following studies.

- Bakker, R. M., & Shepherd, D. A. (2017). Pull the plug or take the plunge: Multiple opportunities and the speed of venturing decisions in the Australian mining industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 60(1), 130–155.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Bastian, B., Hjelle, M., & Shepherd, D. A. (2026). Systemizing entrepreneurial metacognition: Thinking about the past and future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 50(1), 231–274.
- Behrens, J., & Patzelt, H. (2016). Corporate entrepreneurship managers' project terminations: Integrating portfolio-level, individual-level, and firm-level effects. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(4), 815–842.
- Breugst, N., & Shepherd, D. A. (2017). If you fight with me, I'll get mad! A social model of entrepreneurial affect. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(3), 379–418.
- Breugst, N., Domurath, A., Patzelt, H., & Klaukien, A. (2012). Perceptions of entrepreneurial passion and employees' commitment to entrepreneurial ventures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(1), 171–192.
- Breugst, N., Patzelt, H., & Rathgeber, P. (2015). How should we divide the pie? Equity distribution and its impact on entrepreneurial teams. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(1), 66–94.

- Breugst, N., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2020). When is effort contagious in new venture management teams? Understanding the contingencies of social motivation theory. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(8), 1556–1588.
- Breugst, N., Preller, R., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2018). Information reliability and team reflection as contingencies of the relationship between information elaboration and team decision quality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(10), 1314–1329.
- Cardon, M. S., Foo, M. D., Shepherd, D. A., & Wiklund, J. (2012). Exploring the heart: Entrepreneurial emotion is a hot topic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(1), 1–10.
- Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(3), 511–532.
- Chase, S. R., Shepherd, D. A., Parida, V., Patzelt, H., & Wincent, J. (2026). The glass is half full: A gendered model of illegal entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 01492063251397380.
- Choi, Y. R., & Shepherd, D. A. (2004). Entrepreneurs' decisions to exploit opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 30(3), 377–395.
- Choi, Y. R., Lévesque, M., & Shepherd, D. A. (2008). When should entrepreneurs expedite or delay opportunity exploitation? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(3), 333–355.
- Coviello, N., Autio, E., Nambisan, S., Patzelt, H., & Thomas, L. D. W. (2024). Organizational scaling, scalability, and scale-up: Definitional harmonization and a research agenda. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 39(5), 106419.
- Covin, J. G., Garrett, R. P., Jr., Gupta, J. P., Kuratko, D. F., & Shepherd, D. A. (2018). The interdependence of planning and learning among internal corporate ventures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 42(4), 537–570.
- Covin, J. G., Garrett, R. P., Jr., Kuratko, D. F., & Shepherd, D. A. (2015). Value proposition evolution and the performance of internal corporate ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(5), 749–774.
- DeTienne, D. R., Shepherd, D. A., & De Castro, J. O. (2008). The fallacy of “only the strong survive”: The effects of extrinsic motivation on the persistence decisions for under-performing firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(5), 528–546.
- Domurath, A., & Patzelt, H. (2016). Entrepreneurs' assessments of early international entry: The role of foreign social ties, venture absorptive capacity, and generalized trust in others. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 40(5), 1149–1177.
- Domurath, A., Coviello, N., Patzelt, H., & Ganai, B. (2020). New venture adaptation in international markets: A goal orientation theory perspective. *Journal of World Business*, 55(1), 101019.
- Domurath, A., Patzelt, H., & Liebl, A. (2020). Does negative feedback impact new ventures' organizational identity? The role of founding teams' human capital and feedback source. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(3), 105987.
- Domurath, A., Taggar, S., & Patzelt, H. (2023). A contingency model of employees' turnover intent in young ventures. *Small Business Economics*, 60(3), 901–927.

- Grégoire, D. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2012). Technology-market combinations and the identification of entrepreneurial opportunities: An investigation of the opportunity-individual nexus. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(4), 753–785.
- Grégoire, D. A., Barr, P. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2010). Cognitive processes of opportunity recognition: The role of structural alignment. *Organization Science*, 21(2), 413–431.
- Haeussler, C., Patzelt, H., & Zahra, S. A. (2012). Strategic alliances and product development in high technology new firms: The moderating effect of technological capabilities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(2), 217–233.
- Haynie, J. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2012). Cognitive adaptability and an entrepreneurial task: The role of metacognitive ability and feedback. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(2), 237–265.
- Haynie, J. M., Shepherd, D. A., Mosakowski, E., & Earley, P. C. (2010). A situated metacognitive model of the entrepreneurial mindset. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(2), 217–229.
- Hayward, M. L., Shepherd, D. A., & Griffin, D. (2006). A hubris theory of entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, 52(2), 160–172.
- Kakatkar, A., Patzelt, H., & Breugst, N. (2024). Towards a dynamic model of entrepreneurial energy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 48(8), 1037–1081.
- Komba, N. M., Shepherd, D. A., & Wincent, J. (2025). Paddling against the tide: The micro-level strategies entrepreneurs employ to resist endemic corruption in Tanzania. *Journal of Management*, 51(7), 3099–3147.
- Koptysyukh, A., Kibler, E., & Shepherd, D. A. (2025). Politics of entrepreneurial resourcefulness in compassion venture expansion. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 50(2), 10422587251383499.
- Lasпита, S., Breugst, N., Heblich, S., & Patzelt, H. (2012). Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(4), 414–435.
- Lévesque, M., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002). A new venture's optimal entry time. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 139(3), 626–642.
- McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 132–152.
- Mitchell, R. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2012). Capability development and decision incongruence in strategic opportunity pursuit. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(4), 355–381.
- Mittermaier, A., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2023). Motivating prosocial venturing in response to a humanitarian crisis: Building theory from the refugee crisis in Germany. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(3), 924–963.
- Mittermaier, A., Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2022). We cannot direct the wind, but we can adjust the sails: Prosocial ventures' responses to potential resource threats. *Organization Science*, 33(3), 1116–1141.
- Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2024). A fatigue model of social venturing. *Small Business Economics*, 63(3), 1065–1088.

- Patzelt, H., Behrens, J., Wolfe, M. T., & Shepherd, D. A. (2020). Perceived project transition support and employees' assessments of entrepreneurial project performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(1), 105894.
- Patzelt, H., Preller, R., & Breugst, N. (2021). Understanding the life cycles of entrepreneurial teams and their ventures: An agenda for future research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(5), 1119–1153.
- Preller, R., Breugst, N., Patzelt, H., & Dibbern, R. (2023). Team resilience building in response to co-founder exits. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 38(6), 106328.
- Preller, R., Patzelt, H., & Breugst, N. (2020). Entrepreneurial visions in founding teams: Conceptualization, emergence, and effects on opportunity development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(2), 105914.
- Schreiber, R., Hess, M., Grichnik, D., Shepherd, D. A., Tobler, P. N., & Wincent, J. (2025). An attractiveness bias? How women entrepreneurs' physical appearance affects men investors. *Journal of Management*, 51(7), 3148–3180.
- Seyb, S. K., Shepherd, D. A., & Williams, T. A. (2019). Exoskeletons, entrepreneurs, and communities: A model of co-constructing a potential opportunity. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(6), 105907.
- Seyb, S., Shepherd, D. A., & Maitlis, S. (2025). Meaningful venturing: Examining how entrepreneurs generate meaning in life. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 40(5), 106526.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Shepherd, D. A. (2003). Learning from business failure: Propositions of grief recovery for the self-employed. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2), 318–328.
- Shepherd, D. A. (2009). Grief recovery from the loss of a family business: A multi- and meso-level theory. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(1), 81–97.
- Shepherd, D. A. (2015). Party on! A call for entrepreneurship research that is more interactive, activity based, cognitively hot, compassionate, and prosocial. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(4), 489–507.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Cardon, M. S. (2009). Negative emotional reactions to project failure and the self-compassion to learn from the experience. *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(6), 923–949.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Gruber, M. (2021). The lean startup framework: Closing the academic–practitioner divide. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(5), 967–998.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Haynie, J. M. (2009). Family business, identity conflict, and an expedited entrepreneurial process: A process of resolving identity conflict. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(6), 1245–1264.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Haynie, J. M. (2011). Venture failure, stigma, and impression management: A self-verification, self-determination view. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(2), 178–197.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2018). *Entrepreneurial cognition: Exploring the mindset of entrepreneurs*. Springer Nature.

- Shepherd, D. A., & Pollack, J. M. (2025). A listening model of venture growth: Entrepreneurs' listening abilities and ventures' listening capabilities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 40(1), 106451.
- Shepherd, D. A., & Williams, T. A. (2014). Local venturing as compassion organizing in the aftermath of a natural disaster: The role of localness and community in reducing suffering. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(6), 952–994.
- Shepherd, D. A., Breugst, N., & Patzelt, H. (2023). A founding-team model of creating a venture's culture. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 38(2), 106286.
- Shepherd, D. A., Covin, J. G., & Kuratko, D. F. (2009). Project failure from corporate entrepreneurship: Managing the grief process. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(6), 588–600.
- Shepherd, D. A., Haynie, J. M., & McMullen, J. S. (2012). Confirmatory search as a useful heuristic? Testing the veracity of entrepreneurial conjectures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(6), 637–651.
- Shepherd, D. A., Johansson, J., Malmström, M., & Wincent, J. (2021). Rallying the troops and defending against sanctions: A government body breaking decision-making rules to fund entrepreneurial ventures. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(2), 321–358.
- Shepherd, D. A., Maitlis, S., Parida, V., Wincent, J., & Lawrence, T. B. (2022). Intersectionality in intractable dirty work: How Mumbai ragpickers make meaning of their work and lives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(5), 1680–1708.
- Shepherd, D. A., McMullen, J. S., & Jennings, P. D. (2007). The formation of opportunity beliefs: Overcoming ignorance and reducing doubt. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1–2), 75–95.
- Shepherd, D. A., McMullen, J. S., & Ocasio, W. (2017). Is that an opportunity? An attention model of top managers' opportunity beliefs for strategic action. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(3), 626–644.
- Shepherd, D. A., Osofero, M., & Wincent, J. (2022). A personal adversity model of justifying the costs of entrepreneurial action: The case of oil thieves in the Niger Delta. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 37(1), 106163.
- Shepherd, D. A., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2020). The surprising duality of jugaad: Low firm growth and high inclusive growth. *Journal of Management Studies*, 57(1), 87–128.
- Shepherd, D. A., Parida, V., & Wincent, J. (2021). Entrepreneurship and poverty alleviation: The importance of health and children's education for slum entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(2), 350–385.
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., & Breugst, N. (2024). *66 simple rules for entrepreneurs: A roadmap for improved performance*. Springer Nature.
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., & Haynie, J. M. (2010). Entrepreneurial spirals: Deviation–amplifying loops of an entrepreneurial mindset and organizational culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(1), 59–82.
- Shepherd, D. A., Patzelt, H., Williams, T. A., & Warnecke, D. (2014). How does project termination impact project team members? Rapid termination,

- “creeping death,” and learning from failure. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(4), 513–546.
- Shepherd, D. A., Sattari, R., & Patzelt, H. (2020). A social model of opportunity development: Building and engaging communities of inquiry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(1), 106033.
- Shepherd, D. A., Seyb, S. K., & George, G. (2023). Grounding business models: Cognition, boundary objects, and business model change. *Academy of Management Review*, 48(1), 100–122.
- Shepherd, D. A., Seyb, S., & Souitaris, V. (2024). On the edge of destruction: An impaired-regulation model of destructive entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Management*, 50(2), 722–751.
- Shepherd, D. A., Souitaris, V., & Gruber, M. (2021). Creating new ventures: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 47(1), 11–42.
- Shepherd, D. A., Wiklund, J., & Haynie, J. M. (2009). Moving forward: Balancing the financial and emotional costs of business failure. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(2), 134–148.
- Shepherd, D. A., Williams, T. A., & Zhao, E. Y. (2019). A framework for exploring the degree of hybridity in entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 33(4), 491–512.
- Shepherd, D. A., Wincent, J., & Chase, S. R. (2025). What if we are the WEIRD ones? A call (and roadmap) for more non-WEIRD entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 49(5), 1223–1260.
- Shepherd, D. A., Zacharakis, A. L., & Baron, R. A. (2003). VCs’ decision processes: Evidence suggesting more experience may not always be better. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 381–401.
- Souitaris, V., Nicolaou, N., Waters, J., Shepherd, D. A., & Hashem, N. (2026). Does self-employment increase stress? A co-twin control analysis of Finnish and US twins. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 41(1), 106556.
- Souitaris, V., Peng, B., Zerbinati, S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2023). Specialists, generalists, or both? Founders’ multidimensional breadth of experience and entrepreneurial ventures’ fundraising at IPO. *Organization Science*, 34(2), 557–588.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., Peng, B., & Shepherd, D. A. (2020). Should I stay or should I go? Founder power and exit via initial public offering. *Academy of Management Journal*, 63(1), 64–95.
- Stroe, S., Sirén, C., Shepherd, D. A., & Wincent, J. (2020). The dualistic regulatory effect of passion on the relationship between fear of failure and negative affect: Insights from facial expression analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(4), 105948.
- Tacke, F., Knockaert, M., Patzelt, H., & Breugst, N. (2023). When do greedy entrepreneurs exhibit unethical pro-organizational behavior? The role of new venture team trust. *Journal of Management*, 49(3), 974–1004.

- Ucbasaran, D., Shepherd, D. A., Lockett, A., & Lyon, S. J. (2013). Life after business failure: The process and consequences of business failure for entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 163–202.
- Urbig, D., Buerger, R., Patzelt, H., & Schweitzer, L. (2013). Investor reactions to new product development failures: The moderating role of product development stage. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 985–1015.
- Van Heghe, Y., Knockaert, M., Patzelt, H., & Wiklund, J. (2025). The significance of entrepreneurs' physical health for venture distress and exit. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 22, e00502.
- Weissenböck, E., Breugst, N., Patzelt, H., & Dibbern, R. (2024). Equity ownership and identification with the founding team. *Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 1626–1651.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2009). The effectiveness of alliances and acquisitions: The role of resource combination activities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), 193–212.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2011). Where to from here? EO-as-experimentation, failure, and distribution of outcomes. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 925–946.
- Wiklund, J., Patzelt, H., & Dimov, D. (2016). Entrepreneurship and psychological disorders: How ADHD can be productively harnessed. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 6, 14–20.
- Wiklund, J., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2009). Building an integrative model of small business growth. *Small Business Economics*, 32(4), 351–374.
- Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2016). Building resilience or providing sustenance: Different paths of emergent ventures in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(6), 2069–2102.
- Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2016). Victim entrepreneurs doing well by doing good: Venture creation and well-being in the aftermath of a resource shock. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(4), 365–387.
- Williams, T. A., & Shepherd, D. A. (2021). Bounding and binding: Trajectories of community-organization emergence following a major disruption. *Organization Science*, 32(3), 824–855.
- Wolfe, M. T., & Shepherd, D. A. (2015). “Bouncing back” from a loss: Entrepreneurial orientation, emotions, and failure narratives. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(3), 675–700.
- Zacharakis, A. L., & Shepherd, D. A. (2001). The nature of information and overconfidence on venture capitalists' decision making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(4), 311–332.

Index

A

Absorptive capacity 13, 15, 51, 57, 58
Accumulating knowledge 56
Adaptability 1, 4, 86
Adaptation 11, 21, 27, 43
ADHD 5, 7, 13
Adversity 33, 35, 36, 37, 68, 86
Altered sense of time 37
Anticipatory grieving 80
Assertive resourcing 71
Attention 2, 10, 11, 12, 29, 37, 45, 55, 58, 64, 77
Authenticity 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 85, 88
Autonomy 29, 38
Awe 33, 37, 40

B

Back-channeling 55
Balancing 28, 38, 51, 58, 68, 69
Bias 5, 7, 14, 18, 19, 78, 87
Blitzscaling 63
Bottom-up process 11, 12
Boundary objects 1, 6, 20
Buffer 36, 39, 43, 52, 79

Business model 6, 17, 19, 22, 27, 34, 56, 64, 79

C

Capabilities 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, 29, 51, 54, 55, 57, 58, 79, 88
Cognitive diversity 41, 43, 47, 48
Cognitive schema 26
Coherence 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 56, 58
Collectivism 3
Communicating knowledge 56
Communication 13, 44, 46, 51, 54, 55, 62, 64
Community of inquiry 6, 14, 43, 69
Compassion venturing 35, 83, 86, 88
Competence 29
Comprehension 31, 33, 34, 35, 40, 54
Conformity 38
Conjecture 14, 17, 21, 42, 52
Conjectures 1, 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 43
Connecting knowledge 56
Connection 38, 47, 72, 85
Consistency 38, 44, 47, 48
Crowd-based innovation 88

Culture 3, 19, 31, 40, 46, 47, 48, 56,
58, 78, 87

Culture creation 47

Curiosity 1, 2

D

Dark Triad 83, 85, 88

Dark Triad traits 83

Demand-side 35

Democratic 83, 84

Depletes 27

Depletion 25, 28, 31, 33, 39, 41, 45,
64, 85

Desirable 2, 9, 10, 37, 54

Destructive entrepreneurship 85

Developing 17, 18, 19, 44, 46, 63, 68

Dialogic resourcing 71

Digital 87

Digital scaffolding 83, 86, 88

Dispositional affect 26

Dominant participatory partners 48, 70,
71

Doubt 4, 14, 21, 36

Downstream vertical alliances 22

Dual goals 69

Dual-process model of recovery 31

E

Educated 83, 84

Effort 3, 12, 19, 29, 38, 43, 45, 46, 48,
56, 67, 69, 71, 72, 88

Emotional contagion 63

Emotional intelligence 4, 23, 25, 29

Emotions 3, 4, 23, 25, 26, 29, 33, 36,
37, 40, 45, 72, 77

Empathy 37, 72, 85, 87

Energy 28, 38, 45, 64, 72, 78, 80

Engagement 1, 11, 28, 43, 44, 55

Entry 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 39,
61, 65, 75, 87

Equity distribution 41, 46

Equity ownership 46

Excellence 25, 49, 51, 56, 58, 65

Exhaustion 25, 26, 27, 28, 38, 67, 71,
72

Exit 26, 28, 42, 46, 52, 63, 65, 72, 75,
76, 81

Experimentation 5, 15, 18, 63

Expert power 76

Exploiting 17, 18, 21

Extrinsic 35

F

Failure 4, 11, 17, 18, 19, 23, 25, 30, 31,
35, 36, 40, 42, 53, 54, 58, 61, 64,
65, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 87

Family 2, 76

Fatigue 25, 26, 27, 28, 38, 39, 67, 71,
72

Faultlines 48

Fear 11, 30, 78

Feasible 2, 10

Feedback 4, 6, 11, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26,
30, 35, 36, 55, 72, 78, 80, 86

First-person opportunity belief 9, 10

Formalization 41, 44, 49, 53, 58

Founder's dilemma 48, 51, 52

Founding team 20, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44,
45, 46, 47, 48, 57, 69, 70, 79

Frustration 4, 29, 71, 75, 76, 80

Functioning 4, 33, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42,
44, 48, 58, 61, 69

G

Generalists 43, 44

Greed 69, 70, 72

Grief 19, 25, 30, 31, 64, 65

Grounded cognition 5

Growth 11, 41, 43, 45, 48, 51, 52, 53,
55, 56, 57, 58, 62, 63, 64, 65, 84,
87, 88

H

Health 23, 25, 26, 27, 31, 34, 51, 75

Heuristic 17, 18

Homophily 41, 43

Honeymoon period 51, 53, 62
Horizontal alliances 22
 Human resources 3, 58, 61, 62,
 75, 76
Hybrid intensity 69
Hybrid relativity 69
Hyperfocus 5, 7

I

Ignorance 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21,
 43, 57
 Impression-management strategies 31,
 78, 87
 Impulsivity 5, 85
 Inclusive growth 85, 88
Incongruence 21, 53, 78
 Industrialized 83, 84
Initial belief model 14
Initial doubt model 14
Intentions 1, 2, 13, 37
 Intersectionality 87
 Intrinsic 34, 35

J

Judgment 3, 6, 7, 10, 52
Jugaad 36, 84, 87
 Justice 41, 46, 65

K

Knowledge of people 3
Knowledge of strategy 3
Knowledge of tasks 3
 Knowledge structure 3, 12

L

Leadership 61, 63, 72
 Leap of faith 19
 Learn 2, 13, 20, 25, 31, 54, 57, 65, 81,
 84, 85
 Learning 11, 14, 17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25,
 29, 30, 31, 42, 54, 56, 57, 64, 65,
 75, 78, 80, 81

Legitimacy 21, 36, 42, 48, 53, 54, 70,
 78, 79, 87
 Liabilities 53
 Liability 41, 42, 48, 51, 54, 55, 58, 61
 Liability of newness 41, 42, 48, 54, 58,
 61
 Listening 51, 54, 55, 58
 Living dead 22, 80

M

Management readiness 20
Market readiness 20
 Mattering 31, 33, 34, 35
 Meaningful 28, 31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 39,
 63, 65, 72, 81, 86
 Mental models 1, 3, 12, 21
Metacognition 2, 4, 6, 14
Metacognitive engine 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11,
 13, 27, 34, 58, 77
Metacognitive experience 3, 6
 Metacognitive knowledge 1, 3, 6
 Metacognitive questions 4
 Middle managers 77
Mindfulness 25, 29, 31, 38
 Mindset 19, 20, 37, 85, 86
 Misalignment 14, 70, 78
Mission drift 69
 Monitoring 4, 5, 86
 Moral disengagement 83, 85, 88
 Motivation 10, 33, 34, 35, 39, 43, 58,
 61, 67, 69, 72, 87

N

Narratives 33, 39, 65
 Neurodiversity 5, 7
Novelty 5, 21, 42, 54
Novelty seeking 5

O

Opportunities 5, 7, 9, 13, 14, 18, 20,
 21, 26, 33, 36, 37, 42, 51, 52, 55,
 57, 62, 63, 75, 76, 80, 87
 Opportunity recognition 9, 10

Optimal timing 15
 Organizational identity 36
 Orientation 5, 9, 10, 11, 25, 30, 44, 48, 68
 Ownership power 76

P

Parting ceremonies 31, 65
Passion 5, 13, 38, 58, 61, 62, 63, 65, 85
 Physiological 23, 25, 27, 28
 Pivot 20, 68, 78, 79
 Politics 71
 Poly-crises 83, 88
 Portfolio of projects 19
 Poverty 36, 87
Prestige power 76
 Prosocial 37, 38, 67, 68, 69, 72, 86, 87, 88
 Prospecting 17, 18, 19
Protective resourcing 71
 Psychological dark side 43
 Pull the plug 19, 79
 Purpose 11, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 39, 69

R

Real options reasoning 17
 Recovery 30
 Reflect 1, 19, 20, 30, 81
Relatedness 29
Relocating knowledge 56
 Resilience 26, 31, 33, 36, 38, 39, 40, 47, 79, 84, 88
 Resource 13, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, 28, 36, 38, 41, 42, 44, 53, 54, 70, 71, 72, 83, 84, 85
 Resourcefulness 67, 70, 71, 72, 84
 Restoring 28, 67
 Rich 52, 83, 84, 85
 Risk 5, 10, 21, 22, 23, 27, 42, 44, 51, 54, 58, 65, 68, 79, 86, 87
 Routines 18, 42, 45, 54, 55, 56, 61, 63, 80
 Rule-breaking 45

S

Scaling 56, 58, 63, 69
 Scientist's mindset 17, 19
 Search 1, 5, 12, 14, 21, 31, 33, 34
 Self-assertiveness 83, 84
Self-compassion 38
Self-effacement 84
 Self-justification 78, 81
 Self-regulation 4, 5, 28, 29, 38
 Sensemaking 1, 6, 20, 29
 Shared history 42
Shielding 47, 48, 70
Shock 33, 35, 36, 39, 61, 62, 76
 Shocks 35, 52, 54, 76
 Signals 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 26, 29, 36, 38, 39, 45, 48, 57, 58, 63, 72, 79
 Slack 51, 52, 79
 Sleep 25, 28, 29, 31
Social harmony 83, 84
 Social ties 13, 15
Specialist 43, 44
 Stigma 19, 30, 31, 75, 78, 81, 85, 87
Strategic alliance 22
 Stress 27, 29, 64
 Structural alignment 9, 12, 13
Structural power 76
Structural similarity 12
 Suffering 36, 38, 67, 68, 72
Superficial similarity 12
 Supply-side 35

T

Task conflict 41, 45
Team information combination 47
Team information surfacing 47
Technology readiness 20
 Third-person opportunity belief 9, 10
Threat rigidity 29
 Timing 17, 21
 Top-down process 12
 Trade-offs 17, 33, 34, 39
 Transactive memory system 41

Transforming 2, 15, 31, 56, 67, 68, 88
Transition 7, 9, 10, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22,
30, 44, 52, 54, 55, 65, 68, 71, 75,
76, 77
Trust 13, 15, 37, 44, 46, 70, 72

U

Uncertain 3, 14, 26, 86
Unethical 70, 72
Upstream alliances 22
Urge to update 1, 3, 7, 12, 52

V

Value creation 10, 76
Veracity 6, 14, 79

W

WEIRD 83, 84, 85, 86
Well-being 26, 28, 31, 35, 36, 45, 75,
78, 85, 86, 87, 88
Western 81, 83, 84, 86