Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy

Editorial: Publishing in Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy

Journal:	*Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*
Manuscript ID	EEP-21-0092
Manuscript Type:	Research Articles
Keywords:	entrepreneurship education, research translation, publishing
Abstract:	In this editorial the editors of Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy reflect back on the journal's first four years of production and the impact the journal has had. They also reflect back on the submission trends of unsuccessful submissions, offering insights into why articles are commonly rejected. Last, they discuss research translation, its importance, and strategies for scholars to help disseminate their work to a wider audience.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Editorial: Publishing in Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy

The year 2022 marks the start of the 75th year of entrepreneurship education (EE) in higher education, a field that continues to experience unprecedented levels of scholarly and practitioner attention (cf., Katz, 2003; Morris and Liguori, 2016). The start of 2022 also marks the beginning of the 5th volume of this journal, *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy* (EE&P), the official journal of the United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (USASBE), and sister journal to *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* (ET&P). USASBE's mission is to advance entrepreneurship education through bold teaching, scholarship, and practice, and EE&P is one of its major initiatives supporting this mission.

Reflecting on EE&P's launch in January 2018, we set out to achieve the following objectives: (a) attract the most impactful EE scholarship from around the world to publish in EE&P, and (b) ensure the journal becomes the premier outlet to push our field forward. Moreover, at the time of launch, EE&P aimed to exemplify two requisite qualities: inclusion and translation. We defined inclusion as "recognizing that entrepreneurship spans disciplinary boundaries and levels, so EE should be explored as a part of every educational system, locally and globally, at the micro and macro levels, in every field" (Liguori et al., 2018, p. 6). While EE&P has, in many ways, exerted deliberate action in support of this quality (see Table 1), given the magnitude of the challenge, there remains much opportunity for more action to achieve the journal's objectives.

Table 1: Example Activities in Support of Inclusion towards a Multi-disciplinary Approach

Inclusion Initiative	Timing	Inclusion-Related Outcomes
Special Issue: Engineering Entrepreneurship Education	Volume 3 Issue 1	- Authors represented multiple institution types (research, balanced, teaching). - Authors spanned multiple disciplines, including business, mechanical, biomedical, electrical, and computer engineering. - Authors spanned multiple countries.
Special Issue: Unsettling Entrepreneurship Education	Volume 3 Issue 3	- Focused on "creating space for reflection and opening up possibilities for new EE teaching and research approaches" (Berglund et al., 2020, p. 209) - Authors spanned multiple countries, including Finland, Sweden, Poland, the UK, and the U.S. - Editors spanned three countries.

Special Issue: Interdisciplinary Entrepreneurship Education	For release in 2022 (Vol. 5)	• Alignment with the theme of the 2020 USASBE Conference. • Editors represented the six host institutions. • Special Issue featured authors and programs representing the arts, design, engineering, liberal arts, physical sciences, STEM, and business.
Special Issue: STEAM Entrepreneurship Education	For release in 2022 (Vol. 5)	• Authors spanned multiple disciplines, including art, music, engineering education, technology, analytics, fine and performing arts, business, etc. • Work specifically explored women's inclusivity, as well as the diffusion of entrepreneurship education within non-business curriculums.
Special Issue: Rural Entrepreneurship Education	Call for papers launched Jan. 2022	• Focus on multi-stakeholder networks and the role of entrepreneurship education for marginalized groups in rural areas (O'Brien et al., 2019), such as Native American youths (Tingey et al., 2020). • Relevant insights from other disciplines (e.g., rural geography and sociology, economic and community development, public policy, etc.) are explicitly encouraged.
Inclusive of work from a variety of methodological designs	Ongoing	• Wraae et al. (2021) employed the use of reflective videos • Hanson (2021) and Bandera et al. (2021) relied on a Delphi technique • Podidko et al. (2021) used an Experiential Pattern-Matching method • Winkler et al. (2018) and Zawadzki et al. (2020) focused on an action-research design • Baluku et al. (2019) employed the use of multigroup analysis

Translation stressed that articles published in EE&P "should impact the practice of teaching and learning entrepreneurship" (Liguori et al., 2018). Table 2 illustrates several examples where EE&P translation and impact has begun to emerge, though in compiling this it became evident entrepreneurship education is not immune from the challenges facing impact and translation of

social science research more broadly. These issues include (a) the majority of academic scholarship is focused on a singular stakeholder and singular measure - academics and citations, respectively (Aguinis et al., 2014), (b) there remain few incentives and limited time for researchers to focus on practical relevance (Eckhardt and Wetherbe, 2014), and (c) much of the translation we do see emerge from social science research is indirect through textbooks (Aguinis et al., 2019), essentially creating a standstill between theory and practice (Pittz et al., 2021).

As such, much room remains for the continued measurement of the impact of a given piece of scholarship.

Table 2: Examples of Translation and Impact in EE&P

Article Title	Citation	Translation / Impact Outcomes
From Offline to Online: Challenges and Opportunities for Entrepreneurship Education Following the COVID-19 Pandemic	Liguori and Winkler (2020)	23,000+ downloads 261 Google Scholar Citations - Basis for webinars at Academy of Management Entrepreneurship Division, National Association for Community College Entrepreneurship, International Council for Small Business, and USASBE
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Entrepreneurship	Neck and Corbett (2018)	~9,000 downloads 240 Google Scholar Citations - Global reach
Simulations in Entrepreneurship Education: Serious Games and Learning Through Play	Fox, Pittaway, and Uzuegbunam (2018)	~7,000 downloads 2,800+ reads on ResearchGate 86 Google Scholar Citations - Informed the development of a new book: "Technology in Entrepreneurship Education: Adopting Creative Digital Approaches in Learning and Teaching" (Eds. Denis Hyams-Ssekasi & Naveed Yasin)
The Heptalogical Model of Entrepreneurship	Murphy, Hood, and Wu (2019)	~3,300 downloads - Model used at more than 10 universities in the U.S., Europe, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East 500+ student team outreach projects have used the model as a diagnostic tool with practicing entrepreneurs

Rahama Wright and Shea Yeleen	Balachandra and Stoddard (2018)	- Teaching case downloaded by >500 faculty from around the globe - Featured in the Harvard Business Review Case Collection - Non-blinded, non-fictional

n.b. Citation and download statistics are as of Nov. 15, 2021.

At its onset, EE&P began publishing three types of articles (viz., research articles, teaching cases, and learning innovations). Looking to the future, the teaching case article type is being phased out, so the journal can refine its focus to research articles and learning innovations. This means new case submissions are no longer being accepted, and all presently accepted or in-progress cases will phase out across Volume 5. This decision was a difficult one, but collaboratively made after much discussion, it was one that USASBE, SAGE Publishing, and EE&P leadership felt best positioned the journal to achieve maximum impact for the future. While a strong belief remains that teaching cases are both valuable and impactful, many new and emerging case publication pathways and platforms may better meet the present and future needs of case writers, case teachers, and students.

EE&P's editorial team is committed to ensuring research published in the journal is meaningful and impactful and will use a developmental approach to work with authors throughout the review process so that they may communicate their ideas and insights to others in the most impactful manner. We therefore only send out for review those papers we are reasonably confident can be assessed as suitable for publication by our global base of qualified peer reviewers. While desk rejection is an inevitable part of academic publishing, EE&P's leadership knows it is always a disappointment for the authors. Still, collectively we believe that the desk reject decision may also serve the authors' interests. Receiving this decision fast (rather than 'reject after review') will help authors continue working with their paper and enable a shorter time lag to resubmit to an alternative outlet. We also want to highlight the importance of carefully reviewing EE&P's submission guidelines and thoroughly proofreading manuscripts prior to submission. Building on 4 years of experience, our section editors offer some insights and recommendations on how to best prepare a research or learning innovations manuscript for submission to EE&P. In addition, we want to offer some tips on how to maximize the impact of your research, once published.

Research Articles

EE&P seeks original, impactful research contributions that will add to the growing body of knowledge in EE, broadly defined. Research articles may be empirical or conceptual. A range of empirical methods are welcome (quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, meta-analytic, etc.). All submissions should strive to make a meaningful contribution to a specific issue or topic

within EE. Our Research Editors, Francisco Liñan, Ulla Hytti, and Andreas Walmsley, continue to be impressed by the quality of scholarship and contributions made to EE&P since its inception. We believe EE&P is leading the way in contributing to an original and rigorous body of knowledge on EE, both its theory and practice. We aim to build on EE&P's successes and provide a supportive platform for those engaged in EE scholarship to share their work. Based on our experience and striving to ensure a positive experience for authors and reviewers, we indicate below the four main reasons for desk-rejecting a research article submission.

First, many of the submissions we receive are desk-rejected simply because they do not align with the journal's scope. Although we take a broad definition of EE, i.e. that goes beyond business start-up and that also encompasses the development of enterprising behavior, EE does need to be at the heart of the submission, not tangential to it.

Second, we aim to publish research of the highest quality, and often the reason for desk rejection is poor methods. Whichever method is being used it needs to be transparent and rigorous, from design through to analysis and interpretation. In qualitative research, we seek that authors explain why particular data were selected, how they were gathered, and – most importantly – how they were analyzed to derive findings. In quantitative research, we expect the sample selection, the measures, the data collection process, and the data analysis to be adequate for the proposed research and clearly justified. The authors should make explicit the precautions they have taken to avoid biases or inaccurate results.

Third, a further common reason for rejecting a paper is a lack of clarity or focus; and related to this, poor links to the literature and relevant theory. Purely descriptive research is unlikely to be published. Moreover, just because something has not been done before does not mean it merits publication. Novelty must be complemented with relevance. We expect manuscripts to contribute to advancing knowledge in a meaningful way.

Fourth, in its aim to be relevant to a broad target audience, we may publish research with a narrow geographical scope. Still, authors should ensure the study's findings/implications are drawn out beyond just the sample case. These implications could transfer, for example, to a wider population, or a theoretical generalization could be offered.

We firmly believe that EE&P can continue to break new ground by publishing original, rigorous, and impactful research. We are delighted to play a part in this endeavor and look forward to welcoming such research contributions to further strengthen the foundations of knowledge in our field.

Learning Innovations

Our learning innovations editors, Erik Noyes and Marco van Gelderen, have been editors for the Learning Innovations section since the start of the journal. We are proud of the inspiring teaching practices that have been published, and we hope that our readership finds them useful when designing their teaching activities. In a time of great interest in entrepreneurship education and a proliferation of methods and approaches, we aim to identify pedagogical interventions that are impactful and transferable, highlighting exciting possibilities in our field. Having led this process for four years, our editors have identified predictors of a desk rejection. The first reason, unsurprisingly, is not meeting the requirements set out in the submission guidelines:

Learning Innovations must be novel in nature and facilitate bold teaching and practice. Authors are asked to answer the following questions:
- What is the learning innovation?
- What are the underlying entrepreneurship and learning theories?
- For whom is the learning innovation intended?
- What are the expected learning outcomes?
- How does the learning innovation work?
- In what context(s) and with what population(s) has the learning innovation been used?
- What are the authors' personal experiences with the learning innovation?
- What worked well and what did not work well?
- How can the learning innovation be applied in other contexts?

A few requirements stand out in terms of the frequency with which they result in a desk rejection. First, a lack of novelty, arguably a prerequisite for innovation. Authors regularly proclaim novelty when we know that this learning innovation has been tried and tested many times. Before submitting, we recommend investigating if the learning innovation has been run and described elsewhere.

Second, a lack of detail about the actual learning innovation and a lack of discussion of the pedagogical ideas behind the learning innovation often lead to desk rejection. While we are interested in powerful, portable pedagogies entrepreneurship educators can use, we see this power generally comes from larger theoretical motivations, framings, and constructs in entrepreneurship research. We notice that the most compelling learning innovations somehow demonstrate theory, which focuses and excites both entrepreneurship students and entrepreneurship educators alike.

Third, a lack of experience of the author(s) with the learning innovation itself leads to desk rejection. Authors are often enthusiastic about what they just dreamed up, with limited implementation of their ideas in practice, and limited evidence about their efficacy. We feel that before sharing ideas, authors should "road-test" them, ideally extensively. In these cases, we ask

authors to resubmit once they have gone through several cycles of experimentation and improvement while gathering evidence of educational impact.

There are also reasons for desk rejection that do not feature in the list of questions above.
- *A lack of relevance for entrepreneurship.* We regularly receive submissions that are only marginally related to entrepreneurship. We realize entrepreneurship has many definitions, some narrow, some very wide. But at the very least authors should make explicit why their learning innovation is a learning innovation relevant to EE.
- *A lack of substance.* Authors sometimes share learning innovations that consist of just one or a few simple procedures which are unlikely to create a deep or lasting impact. Consistent with our aim to feature teaching interventions that are bold, driving positive disruption in entrepreneurship, ideal contributions should have the potential to impact the practice of EE.
- *A lack of transferability, portability, or adoptability.* Sometimes a proposed learning innovation does have substance or impact, but requires vast resources (financial, human, etc.) to adopt and/or are situated in a highly idiosyncratic context. High barriers to adoption go against the goals of the EE&P's Learning Innovations section, which aims to be useful to entrepreneurship educators when designing their own teaching activities. We note, however, that although the potential for educator adoption is important, the possibility of exact replication is not the requirement. Sometimes an approach can inspire a variation of the learning innovation to meet the specific needs of a given student population.
- *Typos, poor formatting and a lack of care in preparing the submission.* Reviewers have strongly indicated their limited, discretionary time is not well spent reviewing poorly written or improperly formatted work (of course, this holds true for research papers as well).

We feel this is an incredibly exciting time for Entrepreneurship Education, where there are never-before opportunities to identify and disseminate best practices. Desk rejects are frustrating for authors and editors alike. We hope this editorial will help authors and guide their decisions on whether and how to submit to the Learning Innovation section of EE&P.

Enhancing Your Research Impact

Innovative entrepreneurship education pedagogical approaches, tools and frameworks do not promote themselves, so owning the marketing, dissemination, and reach of scholarly work is rapidly becoming an obligation for authors. Fortunately the conceptualization of impact continues to grow, with universities, publishers, and accrediting bodies are taking a broader and more creative view of research impact (cf., Bendickson, 2021; Fisher, 2020; Linton, 2016). For example, the latest AACSB International accreditation standards that govern the practices of

over 1,700 of the world's top business schools consider impact broadly as scholarship that pertains to the theory, policy, and/or practice of business (AACSB, n.d.). The result is a conversation extending beyond the Ivory Tower onto Main Street, allowing researchers to reconsider where and how they focus publication and dissemination efforts.

There are myriad ways to promote research, and effective tools have been designed for this purpose, which can be found in social and traditional news media outlets. In addition, most universities have teams of public relations specialists who are able to assist scholars in promoting their work to various suitable media outlets. These specialists will typically assist in developing a list of the most appropriate media outlets, then work with the scholar to craft a press release in a tone and format that is most congruent with those outlets.

To accelerate the spread of scholarly findings, researchers must look beyond traditional media outlets to social media as a way to promote work more rapidly. In addition, social media is a great way to connect with academics and peers in the field around the world. Successful leveraging of social media tools allows researchers to share ideas and research findings freely with an interested global community who may otherwise not have an opportunity to connect with the work. While there is not a single defined path for charting an effective social media research presence, authors publishing in EE&P have numerous ways they can promote their work on social media, including:

1. Tagging @EEP_Journal on Twitter, so the journal can help promote the work to its network.
2. Posting links to their accepted work in USASBE's LinkedIn community (https://www.linkedin.com/groups/2115458/), reaching a network of nearly 2,000 entrepreneurship educators around the globe. Given EE&P is an official publication of USASBE, we know that community will welcome authors sharing their work there, but there are many relevant LinkedIn groups that would also likely welcome posts that authors should explore.
3. Tag your co-authors, and the EE&P editors, in posts, so they can help share and disseminate relevant work to their networks. Many of EE&Ps editors are on both LinkedIn and Twitter, so please connect and engage with us.
4. Leverage academic social platforms such as ResearchGate.net, Academia.edu, Kudos.com, Publons.com, and Mendeley.com. These networks are great places to share your work, connect with colleagues, and remain abreast of the trends in your field. EE&P has generous contributor's rights and all author's retain copyright over their original work. Before posting files to these platforms, authors should familiarize themselves with the specific nuances of their rights posted on the EE&P website under submission guidelines (https://journals.sagepub.com/author-instructions/EEX).

Conclusion & Call to Action

EE&P's current and future success rests on a collective vision to push the boundaries of the field of EE. We are at an exciting crossroads and our field is poised to enter its next stage. We firmly believe that EE&P's leadership will help support this evolution as we continue to follow our guiding principles of inclusion and translation of EE. We want to thank the community of EE scholars for pushing us forwards, especially our numerous reviewers without whom we would not be able to do our work. We make no apologies for setting ambitious goals for EE&P; we are convinced that together we can ensure it continues to play a leading role in driving forward EE scholarship and practice. We invite you to join us on this path and welcome your contributions to our ever-emerging field.

EE&P is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), included in CABELLS Journalytics, and indexed in Journal Citation Reports, Scopus, and Google Scholar.

REFERENCES

AACSB. (n.d.). 2020 guiding principles and standards for business accreditation. AACSB Accredited. Retrieved from http://www.aacsb.edu

Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., Alabduljader, N., Bailey, J. R., & Lee J. (2019). A pluralist conceptualization of scholarly impact in management education: Students as stakeholders. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *18*(1), 11–42. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2017.0488

Aguinis, H., Shapiro, D. L., Antonacopoulou, E. P., & Cummings, T. G. (2014). Scholarly impact: A pluralist conceptualization. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *13* (4), 623–639. https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2014.0121

Baluku, M. M., Matagi, L., Musanje, K., Kikooma, J. F., & Otto, K. (2019). Entrepreneurial Socialization and Psychological Capital: Cross-Cultural and Multigroup Analyses of Impact of Mentoring, Optimism, and Self-Efficacy on Entrepreneurial Intentions. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 2(1), 5–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127418818054

Bandera, C., Santos, S. C., & Liguori, E. W. (2021). The Dark Side of Entrepreneurship Education: A Delphi Study on Dangers and Unintended Consequences. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 4(4), 609–636. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420944592

Bendickson, J. (2021). Building entrepreneurship research for impact: Scope, phenomenon, and translation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *59*(4), 535–543. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1905822

Berglund, K., Hytti, U., & Verduijn, K. (2020). Unsettling Entrepreneurship Education. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 3(3), 208–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420921480

Eckhardt, J., & Wetherbe, J. (2014, December 24). Making business school research more relevant. *Harvard Business Review*. https://hbr.org/2014/12/making-business-school-research-more-relevant

Fisher, G. (2020). Why every business professor should write practitioner-focused articles. Business Horizons, 63(4), 417–419. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.03.004

Hanson, J. (2021). Best Practices for Mentoring in Arts Entrepreneurship Education: Findings From a Delphi Study. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 4(2), 119–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420964120

Katz, J. A. (2003). The chronology and intellectual trajectory of American entrepreneurship education: 1876–1999. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283–300.

Liguori, E., Winkler, C., Winkel, D., Marvel, M. R., Keels, J. K., van Gelderen, M., & Noyes, E. (2018). The Entrepreneurship Education Imperative: Introducing EE&P. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 1(1), 5–7. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127417737290

Linton, J. D. (2016). Improving impact of research papers. *Technovation*, *52-53*, 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2016.02.003

Morris, M. H., & Liguori, E. (2016). Preface: Teaching reason and the unreasonable. In *Annals of entrepreneurship education and pedagogy–2016*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Murphy, P. J., Hood, A. C., & Wu, J. (2019). The Heptalogical Model of Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 2(3), 188–213. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127419829394

Neck, H. M., & Corbett, A. C. (2018). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 1(1), 8–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127417737286

O'Brien, E., M. Cooney, T., & Blenker, P. (2019). Expanding university entrepreneurial ecosystems to under-represented communities. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Public Policy, 8(3), 384-407. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEPP-03-2019-0025

Pittz, T. G., Alves, J., El Tarabishy, A., Liguori, E. W., & Passerini, K. (2021). JICSB Translation: Boldly positioning for broader and deeper impact. *Journal of the International Council for Small Business*. https://doi.org/10.1080/26437015.2021.1989637

Pokidko, D., Saade, F. P., & Shir, N. (2021). An Experiential Pattern-Matching Teaching Method: Unpacking the Process of Becoming. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 4(3), 422–454. https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420914658

Tingey, L., Larzelere, F., Goklish, N., Rosenstock, S., Mayo-Wilson, L. J., Pablo, E., … Barlow, A. (2020). Entrepreneurial, economic, and social well-being outcomes from an RCT of a youth entrepreneurship education intervention among native American adolescents. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17(7), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17072383

Winkler, C., Saltzman, E., & Yang, S. (2018). Improvement of Practice in Entrepreneurship Education Through Action Research: The Case of Coworking at a Nonresidential College.

Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 1(2), 139–165.
https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127418773410

Wraae, B., Tigerstedt, C., & Walmsley, A. (2021). Using Reflective Videos to Enhance
Entrepreneurial Learning. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 4(4), 740–761.
https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420936955

Zawadzki, M., Jałocha, B., Mazurkiewicz, G., Pluszyńska, A., & Prawelska-Skrzypek, G.
(2020). Unrooting Management Education and Entrepreneurial Self From Neoliberal Demands:
An Action Research Approach. Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy, 3(3), 265–290.
https://doi.org/10.1177/2515127420912399