STRATEGIC ENTREPRENEURSHIP JOURNAL

Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal
Strat. Entrepreneurship J., **9:** 205–225 (2015)
Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI: 10.1002/sej.1196

WHAT IS AN ATTRACTIVE BUSINESS OPPORTUNITY? AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF OPPORTUNITY EVALUATION DECISIONS BY TECHNOLOGISTS, MANAGERS, AND ENTREPRENEURS

MARC GRUBER[1]*, SUNG MIN KIM[2], and JAN BRINCKMANN[3]
[1]*College of Management of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Lausanne, Switzerland*
[2]*Quinlan School of Business, Loyola University Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*
[3]*ESADE Business School, Ramon Llull University, Barcelona, Spain*

The subjective belief that an opportunity allows value generation is a key driver of entrepreneurial action. We advance research on opportunity evaluation by investigating how people may diverge in their views of what defines an attractive business opportunity; that is, we seek to understand heterogeneity among individuals' 'opportunity templates.' Using unique data from a conjoint experiment with 141 respondents (6,728 opportunity evaluations), our analysis reveals significant differences in the opportunity preferences of individuals with technological, management, and entrepreneurship experience. We also find that people with specialist experience (technology) emphasize fewer opportunity dimensions than people with generalist experience (management, entrepreneurship). Copyright © 2015 Strategic Management Society.

INTRODUCTION

The subjective belief of an entrepreneur that an opportunity allows value generation is a key driver of entrepreneurial action throughout the new firm creation process, and it is crucial to our understanding of entrepreneurial behaviors and outcomes (Krueger, 1993; McMullen and Shepherd, 2006; Barreto, 2012). Thus, it is not surprising that a rapidly increasing number of studies seek to shed light on how entrepreneurs evaluate business opportunities and, in particular, how their person-specific endowments affect their judgment as to what constitutes an attractive opportunity (Keh, Foo, and Lim, 2002; Haynie, Shepherd, and McMullen, 2009; Foo, 2011; Wood, McKelvie, and Haynie, 2014). For instance, work in this domain has shown how novices and experienced entrepreneurs diverge in their views as to what an attractive business opportunity is (Baron and Ensley, 2006), which helps explain why a given opportunity may not be equally appealing to all people (Choi and Shepherd, 2004; Dimov, 2010).

What is surprising, however, is the fact that although an individual's cognitive resources are considered fundamental to opportunity evaluation decisions (Haynie *et al*., 2009), the existing literature offers limited insights into how *heterogeneity* of people's experience endowments affects their subjective judgments of opportunity attractiveness—i.e., their opportunity 'prototypes' (Baron and Ensley, 2006) or opportunity 'templates' (Barreto, 2012). Because we know from related work on strategic decision

Keywords: opportunity evaluation; experience; heterogeneity; conjoint analysis; knowledge
*Correspondence to: Marc Gruber, College of Management of Technology, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Odyssea 3.04, Station 5, 1015 Lausanne, Switzerland.
E-mail: marc.gruber@epfl.ch.

making that substantial differences exist in how people with prior entrepreneurial experience and with prior managerial experience engage in decision making (e.g., Busenitz and Barney, 1997), one can assume that people with different experience backgrounds will draw on distinct opportunity prototypes or templates when evaluating business opportunities. And yet we know neither the extent to which such heterogeneity exists among people's business opportunity templates nor which aspects of opportunities are particularly appealing to people with different experience backgrounds.

In this article, we address this key desideratum of entrepreneurship research by investigating how people with heterogeneous experience may diverge in their views as to what constitutes an attractive business opportunity. In doing so, we not only provide new insights into their distinct business opportunity templates, but also highlight the fact that different experience types lead to different paths on the opportunity road.

Drawing on cognitive theory (e.g., Gagné and Glaser, 1987) and, in particular, work on mental models (e.g., Johnson-Laird, 1983; Evans, 1993), our analysis focuses on three main types of experience backgrounds that are frequently encountered in new firm creation—i.e., people with experience in *management,* in *technology*, and in *entrepreneurship*. Introduced by Schumpeter (1939) in his seminal examination of the entrepreneurial capacities of different types of organizational agents, this particular distinction is arguably one of the classic conceptualizations of human capital endowments in the field of entrepreneurship. It is also popular in the strategy literature, where Penrose (1959: 36) pointed out that 'entrepreneurial versatility is a somewhat different quality from managerial or technical versatility. The latter two qualities are primarily questions of administrative and technical competence, the former is a question of imagination, which may or may not be 'practical.' '

Core to our theoretical development are recent insights from research on entrepreneurial cognition (Baron and Ensley, 2006; Wood *et al*., 2014) suggesting that agents' experience will shape their understanding of what an attractive business opportunity is (their opportunity template). Specifically, our theoretical development will proceed in two key steps. First, in a baseline analysis, we analyze the extent to which heterogeneity of opportunity evaluations by individuals with technological, managerial, and entrepreneurial experience exists and whether this heterogeneity persists over time (as observed in the divergence of opportunity evaluations by more or less experienced individuals).

Second, we seek to understand which opportunities are systematically preferred by individuals with technological, managerial, and entrepreneurial experience. We not only explore preferences for particular opportunity characteristics, but also investigate whether systematic differences exist in their overall, multidimensional opportunity templates (i.e., set of opportunity characteristics).

Our empirical analysis of business opportunity evaluations is based on a unique dataset that combines experimental and questionnaire data. We use choice-based conjoint analysis, a technique particularly suitable for research on evaluation tasks, because it allows an experimental variation of the characteristics of evaluation objects (e.g., Priem and Harrison, 1994)—in our case core dimensions of business opportunities. In particular, conjoint experiments enable us to gain insights concerning the conscious and subconscious mental models that individuals draw on as they evaluate business opportunities (Haynie *et al*., 2009; Wood *et al*., 2014). In total, our data captures 6,728 opportunity evaluation decisions nested in a sample of 141 individuals. We combine the conjoint data with questionnaire information on the experience backgrounds of all individuals participating in the study.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Opportunity evaluation in discovery and creation settings

Following economic theorizing, business opportunities can be understood as market imperfections that allow agents to obtain economic benefits by introducing new and/or improved offerings to better serve customer needs (Alvarez, Barney, and Anderson, 2013). Given that the exploitation of opportunities typically requires agents to commit substantial amounts of resources (in terms of time, attention, financial investments, social capital, etc.), their evaluations are critical in determining whether it is worthwhile for the agent to (further) exploit the opportunity, adapt the chosen course of action, switch to an alternative opportunity, or abandon the entrepreneurial endeavor altogether (Lumpkin, Hills, and Shrader, 2004; Haynie *et al*., 2009; Wood and McKinley, 2010). Because opportunities are

DOI: 10.1002/sej

multidimensional constructs (Baron and Ensley, 2006), the evaluation of the potential value inherent in a business opportunity relies on subjective judgments regarding different characteristics of an identified opportunity (Simon, Houghton, and Aquino, 2000; Mitchell *et al*., 2002; Dimov, 2007). In their evaluation activities, agents interpret the signals they acquire from information channels (Fiet, 2007; Wood and McKinley, 2010)—such as information relating to market demand and the level of competition in the venture's industry.

At this point, it is important to recognize the different informational settings agents may find themselves in when creating their new firms. Specifically, in recent years, the entrepreneurship literature has developed different epistemological perspectives for the concept of opportunity, distinguishing between opportunities that are offered exogenously and can be identified through discovery (the 'discovery approach') and opportunities that are created by the social (inter-) actions of entrepreneurs (the 'creation approach') (Alvarez and Barney, 2007; Alvarez *et al*., 2013).

Specifically, in the *discovery* approach, agents identify business opportunities by being alert to exogenous changes that establish the possibility of obtaining economic benefits. They observe the external environment and assess business opportunities arising from changes in technology, customer preferences, and/or other attributes in their context (Kirzner, 1979; Fiet, 2007). Because opportunities are created by exogenous changes, they are objective phenomena and, in principle, observable (Alvarez and Barney, 2007). Thus, in this approach, agents are considered to either have sufficient information on the major dimensions of specific opportunities when assessing the opportunity's potential for value creation (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000) or can scan specific information channels in order to obtain missing pieces of information (Fiet, 2007). In other words, agents develop an understanding of the opportunity and form their opportunity beliefs by interpreting environmental information cues (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006). Given that the opportunity is discovered and critical information cues are presented to them, they expend limited cognitive or analytical effort when imposing their opportunity template(s) on the opportunity-related information (Barreto, 2012).

In the *creation approach* (Alvarez and Barney, 2007; Alvarez *et al*., 2013), would-be firm founders embark on their formation process with a set of aspirations, but limited information as to whether a market exists for their product, whether any revenues can be achieved, whether the revenues will exceed the costs and, hence, whether they are on a path toward a business opportunity (Sarasvathy, 2001; Alvarez *et al*., 2013). From this perspective, agents create their opportunities by combining what they have at hand (Baker and Nelson, 2005), by experimenting with a given set of means, and by actively engaging with customers and other stakeholders. In other words, following a creation perspective, business opportunities are created based on social interaction (Sarasvathy, 2001; Fauchart and Gruber, 2011). When judging the merits of diverse courses of action to create a business opportunity, an agent's informational setting is characterized by missing and equivocal information. Although over time further information is obtained (e.g., through market feedback), in the early stages of firm formation, agents face information deficits regarding the future development of their business and will aim to control the current resource configuration and deployment through social interactions and iterations (Sarasvathy, 2001; Alvarez *et al*., 2013). Nonetheless, similar to agents in the discovery process, individuals will continuously make conscious or subconscious judgments about their next step(s) to create value-generating configurations (Wiltbank *et al*., 2006; Wood and McKinley, 2010). They will interpret their settings and give meaning to the current data by imposing their opportunity templates on the opportunity-related information (Fiske and Taylor, 1991; Barreto, 2012).[1]

Opportunity evaluation and individuals' mental models

Cognition research indicates that through their everyday experiences, individuals develop cognitive schemas or scripts that encode information about concepts (in our case business opportunity templates), including their features and the relationships between those features (Fiske and Taylor, 1991).

[1] As will be explained in detail later, these observations also have implications for our empirical approach. In particular, our conjoint experiment provides participants with information on the features of different opportunities. This information represents the information that is currently available to the participant. Thus, regardless of the underlying nature of opportunities (from an epistemological or phenomenological perspective), the participants in our conjoint experiment are acting on the basis of the best information currently available to them.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

People with experience in a given domain will differ in their cognitive representations (mental models) of certain concepts, as they encode information and process pieces of information in more abstract, complex ways than people who lack experience in that domain (Gagné and Glaser, 1987). In particular, their mental models help individuals organize perceived reality, to form explanations of system functioning and make predictions of distant or near-future outcomes (Johnson-Laird, 1983; Rouse and Morris, 1986; Evans, 1993). In other words, mental models can be regarded as simplified representations of the environment that underlie an agent's beliefs and evaluations and, specifically, judgments regarding the attractiveness of opportunities (Wood *et al*., 2014).

As discussed, the evaluation of opportunities involves judgments about different opportunity characteristics. Depending on their *a priori* beliefs about which opportunity characteristics are key for value creation, individuals may ascribe different meanings to pieces of opportunity-related information and, given such differences in their opportunity templates, arrive at diverging judgments about the value-creation potential of an opportunity. For instance, a large market may be seen as a desirable opportunity characteristic by some people, but not by others.

In spite of its importance for understanding entrepreneurial action, however, research that links the cognitive structures of individuals to their opportunity preferences remains scant. The few existing studies in this realm provide important insights into how person-specific factors shape opportunity evaluations, although they have not examined how heterogeneity of experience affects people's opportunity templates. For instance, using a case method, Keh *et al*. (2002) examine how individuals' cognitive dispositions in terms of number of biases (e.g., overconfidence) affect opportunity evaluations under risky conditions. Haynie *et al*. (2009) use conjoint analysis to show that entrepreneurs view those opportunities as attractive candidates for exploitation that are complementary to the knowledge, skills, and abilities they already possess, because such opportunities could be exploited in a more effective way.[2] Most recently, Wood *et al*. (2014) employed conjoint analysis in their examination of how person-specific factors (such as knowledge relatedness and fear of failure) affect a person's willingness to pursue an opportunity.

In this article, we examine the opportunity preferences of three main types of agents that have been extensively examined in the entrepreneurship and strategy literatures: people with managerial experience, with entrepreneurial experience, and with technological experience (Schumpeter, 1939; Dougherty, 1992; Busenitz and Barney, 1997; Baron, 1998).

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

In this study, we develop three sets of hypotheses in order to provide a thorough investigation of the 'experience background-opportunity evaluation' relationship.

Our first set of hypotheses seeks to establish a general relationship suggesting that individuals with different experience backgrounds will differ in their opportunity evaluations, and it investigates whether such differences become more pronounced with increasing experience.

Our second set of hypotheses focuses on the content of individuals' opportunity evaluations. That is, we examine particular characteristics of opportunities and seek to uncover systematic differences in the types of opportunity characteristics that people with technological, management, and entrepreneurial experience will prefer.

Finally, our third hypothesis investigates whether systematic differences exist in the overall, multidimensional opportunity templates (i.e., the set of opportunity characteristics) preferred by people with technological, management, and entrepreneurial experience.

Heterogeneity of experience and business opportunity evaluation

We begin our investigation of the 'experience background-opportunity evaluation' relationship with a general (baseline) analysis of the heterogeneity of experience endowments among organizational agents and their effect on opportunity evaluation decisions. In particular, we argue that individuals

[2] Two additional empirical studies exist that examine opportunity evaluation, but not from the explicit perspective of an individual's experiences: research by Baker, Aldag, and Blair (2003) show gender differences in opportunity evaluation, whereas Foo (2011) studies the role of emotions in opportunity evaluation.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

with different types of experience endowments will have systematically different opportunity preferences. This is because knowledge derived from prior work experience is, to a significant extent, shaped by the types of activities in which an individual regularly engages (Sørensen and Fassiotto, 2011). While some individuals have developed extensive experience in solving particular organizational problems (such as evaluating business opportunities), others may not have been confronted with a problem of that particular nature (Dougherty, 1992; Eisenhardt, Kahwajy, and Bourgeois, 1997). Thus, people working in different areas possess different problem-solving experience and insights, and they are also subject to different blind spots (Gagné and Glaser, 1987; Finkelstein, Hambrick, and Cannella, 2009). Depending on their type of work experience, individuals will have different perspectives on the drivers of firm-level value creation and are likely to have different insights and assumptions concerning which opportunity characteristics can lead to firm-level value creation. Following this line of reasoning, our first baseline hypothesis predicts:

Hypothesis 1a (H1a): Individuals with different types of experience are likely to evaluate a given business opportunity differently.

The arguments presented thus far emphasize the effects of heterogeneous experience in opportunity evaluation. It is also important to examine whether such heterogeneity is likely to persist, or become even more pronounced, with individuals' increasing work experience. Cognition scholars suggest that the intensity of exposure to a particular domain or function shapes an individual's mental models or schemata, as they become more refined with more frequent usage (Matlin, 2005). For example, Lurigio and Carroll (1985) find that experienced individuals possess more complete and detailed schemata than inexperienced individuals. Experienced individuals also integrate domain-specific knowledge in more meaningful ways than those with little experience, draw on clearer concepts, create richer connections between concepts, and are able to apply domain-specific problem-solving procedures they have developed over time (Adelson, 1981; Gobbo and Chi, 1986).

Taken together, these findings suggest that heterogeneity of opportunity evaluation is driven by the domain-specific experience and accumulated knowledge of individuals who specify and reinforce their cognitive schemata and evaluation procedures over time. Thus, our second baseline hypothesis predicts that the aforementioned differences become more pronounced with increasing years of work experience.

Hypothesis 1b (H1b): Opportunity evaluations by individuals with different types of experience are more likely to diverge with greater years of work experience.

Technological, managerial, and entrepreneurial experience

The previous section examined two fundamental effects of heterogeneity of experience endowments on opportunity evaluation decisions. Extending our theorizing, we explore the *content* of individuals' business opportunity preferences by investigating the opportunity evaluation decisions of people with technological, managerial, and entrepreneurial experience and asking whether they have systematic preferences for particular opportunity characteristics.

Technological experience represents a specialized, functional type of experience (Kirzner, 1979). While greater expertise in this functional area is beneficial for performing the corresponding specialized activities, there is also evidence suggesting that individuals gravitate toward interpretations of organizational problems that mirror their functional backgrounds (Dearborn and Simon, 1958; Finkelstein *et al*., 2009). In contrast, *managerial experience* and *entrepreneurial experience* represent general types of experience endowments. Whereas managerial experience provides individuals with knowledge regarding how established business organizations operate and can be administered, entrepreneurial experience connotes knowledge in launching and establishing a new firm. All three types of experience are acquired by investing a substantial amount of time in studying, observing, and engaging in activities in the respective domain (Becker, 1964). Hence, these types of knowledge have a high tacit component and, thus, cannot be readily acquired (Sørensen and Fassiotto, 2011).

Technological experience

Prior research has shown that people with functional backgrounds in technology possess distinct cognitive frameworks or thought worlds that shape their understanding of how firms function (Dougherty,

DOI: 10.1002/sej

1992; Griffin and Hauser, 1996). Building on this body of work, we expect that an individual's background in technology also provides a lens through which he/she evaluates the attractiveness of business opportunities; that is, in his/her view, promising opportunities should possess certain features, but not others. In order to understand which features of opportunities could be relatively more salient to technologists, it is necessary to look more closely at technologists' thought worlds.

Technology professionals are hired primarily from science and engineering schools. These schools focus their education on scientific methods and solving technical problems (Bailyn and Lynch, 1983). Their education and socialization in technology not only promote skills in accomplishing technology-related tasks, but also foster commitment to technology and self-selection of activities in which the acquired competences can be applied (Feldman, 1976; Blau, 1999). Although it has become somewhat of a cliché that technologists typically have a lower inclination to deal with market-related issues and believe that products can be sold based purely on criteria such as product characteristics or functionality, many examples exist that suggest a strong focus on technology-related aspects (Jolly, 1997). Initial insights on the question of which attributes of business opportunities may be relatively more critical for technologists are offered by Dougherty's (1992) qualitative study on innovation projects. This research identifies a product-centric orientation of technologists, as they 'define the market in terms of what the product does, and may overlook business aspects such as how many people will pay how much for the product' (Dougherty, 1992: 189). As a consequence, experienced technologists may see greater challenges, or greater upside potential, in the product-related aspects of business opportunities. With these arguments in mind, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a (H2a): Individuals with experience in technology will be more sensitive to product-related dimensions in their evaluations of business opportunities than individuals without this type of experience.

Managerial experience

The second type of experience examined in this study is management experience—i.e., a general type of experience endowment that comprises knowledge of how to manage and operate a business (Schumpeter, 1939; Busenitz and Barney, 1997).

Management professionals oftentimes acquire their education at business schools. By attending business school, they obtain a general understanding of how different firm functions contribute to value creation and how firms should be managed to achieve superior performance outcomes in a competitive market system (Walsh, 1995). Although business school curricula comprise a range of courses (from human resource management to organizational behavior and strategic management), underlying and guiding the structure and content of the curriculum is the fundamental goal of increasing a firm's competitive performance. This primary goal is discussed most explicitly in strategy courses, where market- and resource-based approaches to strategic management start with the premise that competitive advantage must be achieved so that a firm can survive and prosper (Barney and Hesterly, 2009). Given that firm performance is ultimately decided vis-à-vis competing firms, management students will be oriented strongly toward navigating their firms in the competitive landscape.

This emphasis on outperforming the competition and achieving competitive advantage is likely to be reinforced in their everyday work as managers, as their firms' performance relative to other firms in the industry is a primary indicator of their own job performance (Finkelstein *et al.*, 2009). Preliminary support for this line of reasoning can again be gleaned from the innovation management literature, suggesting that the thought world of people with management (planning) backgrounds is shaped by 'competitive changes, new niches' (Dougherty, 1992: 188). Building on and extending these ideas, we predict that individuals with management experience will find competition-related characteristics more salient when evaluating business opportunities.

Hypothesis 2b (H2b): Individuals with experience in management will be more sensitive to competition-related dimensions in their evaluations of business opportunities than individuals without this type of experience.

Entrepreneurial experience

People with prior entrepreneurial experience possess first-hand experience of the firm-creation activity, which provides them with an in-depth understanding of what it takes to start a new firm (McGrath and

DOI: 10.1002/sej

MacMillan, 2000). Existing research indicates that there are key idiosyncratic characteristics of entrepreneurial experience that people with managerial experience do not possess (Busenitz and Barney, 1997).

Specifically, an increasing number of studies indicate that persons with entrepreneurial experience can be viewed as having a set of common characteristics that together form an entrepreneurial mind-set, which prompts them to search for a greater number of opportunities and to pursue only the very best ones (McGrath and MacMillan, 2000; Gruber, MacMillan, and Thompson, 2008; Ucbasaran, Westhead, and Wright, 2009).

The most relevant insights for the present study can be garnered from research by Baron and Ensley (2006), who find that people with entrepreneurial experience have developed particular 'opportunity prototypes,' that is, insights on the features that constitute an attractive business opportunity. Drawing on the results of Baron and Ensley (2006: 1139), it seems that experienced entrepreneurs would be more sensitive to the 'ability to generate positive cash flow' and 'speed of revenue generation'—that is, factors and conditions related to actually starting and running the firm. Notably, their opportunity prototypes do not entail features such as novelty or competitive superiority, which could also suggest that they would not emphasize these attributes.

Building on and extending these early insights, we argue that in their opportunity evaluations, experienced entrepreneurs emphasize factors that allow quick cash generation. We posit:

> *Hypothesis 2c (H2c): Individuals with experience in entrepreneurship will be more sensitive to dimensions related to cash generation in their evaluations of business opportunities than individuals without this type of experience.*

Experience and overall opportunity preference patterns

Our theorizing in the previous section has focused on those opportunity dimensions we expect to be relatively more salient. The overall evaluation of a business opportunity will depend, however, on the overall perceived attractiveness of the opportunity as a multidimensional construct. In more technical terms, the attractiveness of a business opportunity as perceived by an evaluator will depend on the additive function of benefit contributions rendered by each individual dimension—and not only on the most salient dimension. Following this general reasoning, we argue that there will be key differences in the opportunity preferences of individuals with generalist types of experience in management and entrepreneurship and individuals possessing technological experience, which is a specialist type of experience.

Individuals with managerial experience and individuals with entrepreneurial experience possess more holistic knowledge of what it means to run a business (Dougherty, 1992) and, thus, they should have fairly comprehensive understandings of the requirements that have to be met in order for an opportunity to be an attractive candidate for exploitation (Finkelstein *et al*., 2009). For instance, people with these types of experience may not only consider the competitive situation, but will also be likely to take market characteristics, cash generation characteristics, product characteristics, etc., into account, as they know that several elements are key to determining the value-creation potential that is inherent in an opportunity. As a result, we expect that while individuals with managerial experience will be more sensitive to competition-related dimensions (H2b) and while individuals with entrepreneurial experience will be more sensitive to dimensions related to cash generation (H2c), people with these types of experience will also consider other dimensions of business opportunities when making decisions regarding the attractiveness of a particular opportunity. In other words, they will possess a *balanced* opportunity template.

In contrast, individuals with functional experience in technology seem to have a more focused understanding of the overall requirements that have to be met to make an opportunity attractive (Dougherty, 1992). For instance, they may be particularly concerned about certain dimensions of business opportunities, while placing much less importance, or none at all, on other dimensions. Thus, we expect that the overall opportunity template of people with specialist experience will be more *rugged* than that of persons with managerial or entrepreneurial experience—that is, they emphasize particular dimensions, while largely neglecting others.

Taken together, these arguments indicate a key difference in the opportunity templates of individuals with generalist, managerial, or entrepreneurial experience and individuals with specialist, functional experience in technology. We predict:

> *Hypothesis 3 (H3): The opportunity preferences of individuals with managerial experience and of*

DOI: 10.1002/sej

individuals with entrepreneurial experience will be more balanced than the preferences of people with technological experience.

METHODOLOGY

Empirical data: choice-based conjoint method and questionnaire

To examine opportunity evaluation decisions, we conducted a choice-based conjoint experiment with a sample of individuals possessing different experience backgrounds (technology, entrepreneurship, management). Choice-based conjoint analysis allows an experimental variation of business opportunity characteristics (Hauser and Rao, 2003) and is particularly suitable for research on evaluation tasks (e.g., Priem and Harrison, 1994; Choi and Shepherd, 2004), including the evaluation of business opportunities (Haynie *et al*., 2009). In particular, this method allows researchers to simulate respondents' decision processes in real time and is, in several ways, superior to commonly used *post hoc* methods that collect data on self-reported decisions (e.g., examining the importance of different attributes with Likert scales).

In a conjoint experiment, respondents are asked to evaluate a choice set consisting of several profiles. Each profile (the description of an opportunity) is portrayed with multiple attributes (such as market size and product innovativeness). The profiles differ in the levels of each attribute (e.g., market size of $10 million in one profile and of $100 million in another). From the respondent's choices, conclusions can be drawn about the contribution of the various levels of each attribute to the overall attractiveness of a certain profile. In particular, this approach enables the quantification of trade-offs between different attributes under investigation. Given these benefits, conjoint analysis is used widely in empirical research on entrepreneurial decision making, especially in the context of evaluating business opportunities (e.g., Haynie *et al*., 2009; McKelvie, Haynie, and Gustafsson, 2011; Wood *et al*., 2014). As intangible opportunity attributes are typically more abstract and complex than tangible product attributes (Dimov, 2011), we ensured that participants could easily understand the opportunity attributes.

In addition to the conjoint experiment, we administered a questionnaire to capture key information about the respondents. In particular, we asked about their education and work experiences so we could assess their experience backgrounds.

Development of choice sets for the experiment and analysis of conjoint data

In order to identify dimensions that hold relevance for the evaluation of business opportunities, we conducted a review of research in the management and entrepreneurship literatures. Drawing mainly on the work by Baker *et al*. (2003) and Baron and Ensley (2006), we identified six salient groups of business opportunity attributes that were deemed most relevant in prior research (i.e., market growth, market size, number of competitors, time to first sale, desirability of the product, and innovativeness of the product). Following guidelines laid down for conjoint analysis, building on prior measurements, and incorporating suggestions from practitioners, we specified three attribute values for each of these six dimensions. As usual for conjoint analysis, additional factors associated with the opportunity were kept invariant and included in the scenario description (e.g., patentability of the technology, amount of financial resources needed, business-to-business setting[3]). Hence, each business opportunity was presented as a unique combination of business opportunity cues regarding the six identified dimensions (see Figure 1).

Note that the information provided on the characteristics of business opportunities creates the basis for judging its attractiveness, i.e., it represents the information base of our participants at that particular point in time and represents the best information currently available to them. As discussed, regardless of the underlying nature of opportunities from an epistemological or phenomenological perspective, individuals have to make such judgments (consciously or subconsciously) in order to decide whether they want to pursue the venture. Also note that we did not ask respondents to arrive at a decision about whether they would *actually* pursue this opportunity, because such a decision would co-depend on a variety of personal and situational factors that are beyond the control of an experiment

[3] While prior research on opportunity evaluations used a business-to-consumer (B2C) context (e.g., Choi and Shepherd, 2004), we chose a business-to-business (B2B) context because it allows us to describe some of the opportunity dimensions with greater accuracy (e.g., the number of customers), as it is more limited than in a B2C context). We comment on this choice in the limitations section.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

(McMullen and Shepherd, 2006). Rather, respondents were tasked to assess the business opportunities' attractiveness, which provides more general information on their opportunity templates.

To examine the adequacy of the provided information, we tested the conjoint assumptions as a prior condition and evaluated alternative models based on a comprehensive literature review and a pilot test with 16 experienced entrepreneurs. The results of the pilot test supported the use of an additive model for the decision process. Based on the feedback received during the pilot test, we made minor modifications to the wording of some attribute values. Table 1 shows the final set of opportunity attributes and their values.

Using the OPTEX procedure in SAS 9.1 (Kuhfeld, 2005), we developed 12 choice sets of four opportunity alternatives each (i.e., four opportunities with different characteristics) for the conjoint study. The resulting choice design has highly satisfying properties (i.e., D-Efficiency of 100%, A-Efficiency of 100%, and G-Efficiency of 100%, with an average prediction standard error of 0.13). An example of a choice set is shown in the Appendix.

Following the standard procedure of conjoint analysis, the coefficients of opportunity evaluation decisions are estimated using fixed conditional logit models (McFadden, 1972). The fixed parameter model allows opportunity evaluations to vary not only across opportunity attributes and experience types, but also across individuals within each type, forming distributions of evaluation parameters at the individual level. The conditional logit model is based on random utility theory

Respondents were given the following scenario to evaluate each choice set:

Scenario: Imagine that you want to start a new business. You have done substantial research on several business opportunities (interviews with potential customers, competitors, and industry experts and an analysis of industry-related data). Your venture project has the following basic characteristics:

- The venture project is based on a patented technology. A working prototype of the product exists.
- Potential users are small- to medium-sized firms.
- The required amount of initial financial resources will be around $100,000 for all of the proposed opportunities. Additional financing might be needed for all opportunities at later points in time.
- All of the proposals are well researched and managed by competent individuals.
- The execution capabilities to exploit the proposed opportunities can be adequately developed in time.

Now your task is to assess different business opportunities.

Figure 1. Scenario description

Table 1. Business opportunity attributes and levels

Attributes	Description of attributes	Levels		
1. Expected annual market growth	How fast your target market is expected to grow	–3% to +3%	5% to 10%	More than 35%
2. Market size	The current size of the market you are targeting	10 million	50 million	100 million
3. Number of competitors	Number of direct competitors you will have that target the same market	1 competitor	2–5 competitors	More than 5 competitors
4. Time to first sale	The time it will take you to generate your first sale	Less than 12 months	12 to 24 months	More than 24 months
5. Desirability of the product	How strongly the customer desires products from your product category	'Nice-to-have' product	'Should-have' product	'Must-have' product
6. Innovativeness of the product	How innovative your own product offering is relative to the competition	Offering resembles competitors' offerings	Offering outperforms along established dimensions	Offering outperforms on radically new dimensions

DOI: 10.1002/sej

with the following details: denote the choice set by C_k; k = 1, . . ., 12. Let the items in the k_{th} choice set be k_1, k_2, k_3, and k_4. The random utility $\left(\tilde{U}_j\right)$ for an item j in any choice set can be written as:

$$\left(\tilde{U}_j\right) = V_j + \varepsilon_j$$

where V_j is the deterministic component of utility and ε_j is the random component. Assuming the Type I extreme value distribution for the errors, we can derive the probability of choice of an item in a choice set as:

$$P\left(j \in C_k\right) = \frac{\exp\left(V_j\right)}{\sum_{\ell \in C_k} \exp\left(V_\ell\right)}.$$

We specify the V_j in terms of the attributes of the choice set as:

$$V_j = \beta' X_j$$

where X_j is the profile of the j-th choice set and β is a vector of parameters to be estimated. We estimate βs using the maximum likelihood method and employ the MDC procedure in SAS. For our estimations, we convert the three levels of each of the six attributes into two dummy variables. For instance, for attribute A, the two dummy variables XA_1 and XA_2 are defined as:

Level of Attribute A; market growth	XA1	XA2
Low: growth rate of –3% to +3%	0	0
Medium: growth rate of 5% to 10%	0	1
High: growth rate of more than 35%	1	0

For all six attributes together, we estimate 12 parameters (two for each of the six attributes). These parameters will give us the partworth functions for the attributes.

Sample

In total, the sample consists of 141 respondents. This sample size exceeds the sample sizes of most existing conjoint studies by a factor of two or three. For instance, Franke *et al*. (2006, 2008) analyzed a sample of 51 venture capitalists, Haynie *et al*. (2009) of 73 entrepreneurs, and McKelvie *et al*. (2011) of 90 individuals. Because we wanted to examine how differences in experience affect opportunity evaluation decisions, it was important to gain access to people with different experience backgrounds. Respondents were, thus, drawn not from a single source as in prior research (e.g., venture capitalists only or entrepreneurs only), but from various sources. Using a snowball technique, we asked participants of graduate and executive courses in a U.S. business school for contacts that would match the focal profiles that we sought to examine in our study (i.e., individuals with technology, management, or entrepreneurial backgrounds). We followed up with an entrepreneurship questionnaire and collected complete responses from 141 individuals who match our focal experience profiles (average age: 37 years, 70% male). Since each respondent made 48 choices between four business opportunity sets, we obtained 6,728 opportunity evaluation decisions. In robustness tests, we relaxed the filtering of mutually exclusive (pure) experience backgrounds in the aforementioned domains. Using overlapping experience backgrounds, the sample comprised 7,256 observations from a total of 151 individuals.

RESULTS

Hypotheses 1a-1b: likelihood ratio (LR) test of heterogeneity in opportunity evaluations

To examine heterogeneity in opportunity evaluations, we carried out estimations for: (1) the pooled data; (2) the managers; (3) the technologists; (4) the entrepreneurs; and, in order to highlight differences arising with increasing years of experience, a group of (5) pure novices. Whereas the estimations with the pooled data (1) comprised information from all respondents, the remaining estimations (2) to (5) were based on distinct subgroups among our respondents. Specifically, for the three subgroups managers, technologists, and entrepreneurs, we stratified the sample based on the respondent's type of work experience (i.e., experience in only one of the aforementioned fields and nonzero years of experience). This procedure led to the following subgroups: technologist (N = 192), manager (N = 672), or entrepreneur (N = 3,144), with the average experience being about four years for technologists, 10.21 years for managers, and 8.59 years for entrepreneurs. To define the novice subgroup (5), we examined two different approaches: (1) 'pure novices' with zero years of experience in any field; and a relaxed definition of (2) 'novices' with zero years of experience in their respective field (technologist, manager, or entrepre-

DOI: 10.1002/sej

neur). The results obtained with both approaches were consistent; however, because of their greater clarity, we chose to report the results for the group of 'pure novices' (N = 2,768 out of 6,728 in total).[4]

Our first analysis uses a likelihood ratio test to investigate whether opportunity evaluations, expressed as the coefficients of six attributes of a given business opportunity, are equal across different subgroups. More concretely, we used the following procedure: consider groups A and B; let *L(A)* and *L(B)* be the estimated log likelihood function values for groups A and B; furthermore, let *L(A + B)* be the value of the estimated log likelihood function for the pooled group; we then obtain the test statistic of $-2[L(A+B) - (L(A)+L(B))]$ that is χ^2 distributed (Louviere, Hensher, and Swait, 2000). To test H1a and H1b, we use two different approaches: (1) hierarchical assessment of heterogeneity in opportunity evaluations between subgroups with different types of experience that are nested in the pooled sample; and (2) pairwise assessments of divergence between each subgroup of experienced individuals and the group of pure novices. A positive LR χ^2 would indicate that the estimates of different conditional logit models are significantly different. In this regard, Table 2 presents test results for parameter equality obtained by estimating standard conditional logit models for the pooled and stratified subgroups and by calculating their test statistics for a series of LR tests.

Tables 2a and 2b indicate significant differences (for all cases at the 1% level) in opportunity evaluations among the subgroups. Models with different underlying parameters indicate that respondents with different types of experience (i.e., managers, technologists, and entrepreneurs) and years of experience (i.e., pure novice and experienced) place significantly different relative importance on the opportunity attributes. Given these results, we claim support for both our baseline hypotheses, H1a and H1b.

Hypotheses 2a-2c: experience and sensitivity to opportunity attributes

Table 3 presents the results obtained from standard conditional logit models that include interaction terms capturing each attribute level and the years of experience in management, technology, or entrepreneurship. To investigate the evaluations of people with these types of experience, we define them in the purest possible sense, i.e., these groups have experience only in management, in technology, or in entrepreneurship. We also test the robustness of these analyses using overlapping experience endowments.

The signs of the coefficients in the base model without interaction terms are what one expects: positive for annual market growth, current market size, product desirability, and product innovativeness, but negative for the number of competitors and time to first sale. The estimates also are found to be statistically significant at the 1 percent level (z-value). The coefficients in the full models with interaction terms represent the conditional effects of different knowledge endowments, and the non-interaction terms cannot be interpreted in isolation without accounting for their corresponding interaction terms.

As shown in the full models in Table 3, the patterns of opportunity evaluations are unique and divergent between experience types. As predicted, experienced technologists are more sensitive to product-related dimensions, as their evaluations significantly diverge in the product-related dimension, whereas managers' evaluations significantly diverge in the competition-related dimension. Experienced entrepreneurs' evaluations significantly diverge in the dimensions of 'time to first sale,' 'market size,' and 'market growth,' i.e., dimensions that are important for achieving successful sales and respective cash flows from operations. Thus, we claim support for H2a, H2b, and H2c, respectively.

Interestingly, while some of the directions of the interaction effects are straightforward to understand, others are counterintuitive. Prior research on opportunity evaluations has highlighted this key feature of conjoint analysis, as it captures actual decision tasks and, thus, allows researchers to uncover effects that 'are rather counterintuitive, which adds to the conceptual conversation on opportunity beliefs' (Wood *et al*., 2014: 3). In this regard, three findings stand out. First, we find an interesting pattern for technologists. Accounting for the negative interaction effects (xf1 and xf2 interaction terms: –0.3171 and –0.2797, $p < 0.01$), the combined coefficients imply that they pay more attention to product-related dimensions in their opportunity evaluations, yet with increasing years of experience they value product innovativeness less than novices and other subgroups. For example, with one year of technology experience, the combined effect becomes 0.6110 for the technologist subgroup, which is smaller than

[4] We also used information about the respondents' fields of education as an additional filter (e.g., being a technologist requires an engineering or science degree in addition to nonzero years of work experience in technological areas), but this additional filtering step did not change our findings and conclusions.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

Table 2. Likelihood ratio (LR) test results for overall parameter equality

2a. Hierarchical test of heterogeneity: managers, technologists, and entrepreneurs

Model	Obs	LL(null)	LL(model)	df	AIC	BIC
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
mgtyrs	672	−232.90	−166.28	12	356.57	410.69
tecyrs	192	−66.54	−44.26	12	112.52	151.61
entyrs[a]	3,144	−1,089.63	−100.88	12	1,572.78	1,645.42
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
mgtyrs	672	−232.90	−166.28	12	356.57	410.69
tecyrs[b]	192	−66.54	−44.26	12	112.52	151.61
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
mgtyrs	672	−232.90	−166.28	12	356.57	410.69
entyrs[c]	3,144	−1,089.63	−100.88	12	1,572.78	1,645.42
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
tecyrs	192	−66.54	−44.26	12	112.52	151.61
entyrs[d]	3,144	−1,089.63	−100.88	12	1,572.78	1,645.42
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
mgtyrs[e]	672	−232.90	−166.28	12	356.57	410.69
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
tecyrs[f]	192	−66.54	−44.26	12	112.52	151.61
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
entyrs[g]	3,144	−1,089.63	−100.88	12	1,572.78	1,645.42

Note: Hypothesis 1a: $\beta_{pooled} = \beta_{managers} = \beta_{technologists} = \beta_{entrepreneurs}$.
[a]LR χ^2 (12) = 1274.25, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[b]LR χ^2 (12) = 2911.56, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[c]LR χ^2 (12) = 2823.03, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[d]LR χ^2 (12) = 3155.60, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[e]LR χ^2 (12) = 1362.77, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[f]LR χ^2 (12) = 1695.34, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[g]LR χ^2 (12) = 1606.82, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.

2b. Pairwise test of heterogeneity: novice versus experienced individuals

Model	Obs	LL(null)	LL(model)	df	AIC	BIC
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
novice	2,768	−959.32	−642.09	12	1,308.19	1,379.30
mgtyrs[a]	672	−232.90	−166.28	12	356.57	410.69
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
novice	2,768	−959.32	−642.09	12	1,308.19	1,379.30
tecyrs[b]	192	−66.54	−44.26	12	112.52	151.61
pooled	6,728	−2,331.75	−1,622.06	12	3,268.13	3,349.89
novice	2,768	−959.32	−642.09	12	1,308.19	1,379.30
entyrs[c]	3,144	−1,089.63	−774.39	12	1,572.78	1,645.42

Note: Hypothesis 1b: $\beta_{pooled} = \beta_{novice} = \beta_{experienced\ (managers,\ technologists,\ or\ entrepreneurs)}$.
[a]LR χ^2 (12) = 1627.37, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[b]LR χ^2 (12) = 1871.42, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.
[c]LR χ^2 (12) = 411.16, Prob > χ^2 = 0.0000.

those of managers (0.8741) and entrepreneurs (0.9694). Together, these results suggest that experienced technologists see more challenges than upside potential in business opportunities with highly innovative products.

Second, the positive coefficients of the interaction terms for managers indicate that individuals with greater experience in management become less concerned about the number of competitors when evaluating business opportunities (xc1 and xc2 interaction

DOI: 10.1002/sej

Table 3. Results from conditional logit models with interactions

Variables	Base model	Full models with interactions		
	Pooled	Managers	Technologists	Entrepreneurs
xa1: annual market growth (more than 35%)	1.3145*** (0.1166)	1.3078*** (0.1186)	1.3251*** (0.1193)	1.3564*** (0.1208)
xa2: annual market growth (5% to 10%)	0.7532*** (0.0998)	0.7391*** (0.1014)	0.7396*** (0.1014)	0.7866*** (0.1021)
xb1: current market size (100 million)	0.4282*** (0.0977)	0.4448*** (0.1048)	0.4565*** (0.0970)	0.3938*** (0.0987)
xb2: current market size (50 million)	0.3300*** (0.0844)	0.3268*** (0.0890)	0.3477*** (0.0852)	0.3040*** (0.0842)
xc1: number of competitors (more than 5 competitors)	−1.4000*** (0.1124)	−1.4754*** (0.1170)	−1.4012*** (0.1153)	−1.3476*** (0.1123)
xc2: number of competitors (2–5 competitors)	−0.8172*** (0.0892)	−0.8417*** (0.0943)	−0.8263*** (0.0918)	−0.7966*** (0.0912)
xd1: time to first sale (more than 24 months)	−1.2489*** (0.1191)	−1.2560*** (0.1275)	−1.2622*** (0.1237)	−1.2175*** (0.1216)
xd2: time to first sale (12 to 24 months)	−0.6874*** (0.0851)	−0.6910*** (0.0878)	−0.6972*** (0.0872)	−0.6693*** (0.0879)
xe1: product desirability ('must-have' product)	1.1069*** (0.1059)	1.1166*** (0.1109)	1.1283*** (0.1081)	1.1027*** (0.1080)
xe2: product desirability ('should-have' product)	0.4731*** (0.0919)	0.4667*** (0.0948)	0.4589*** (0.0941)	0.4831*** (0.0947)
xf1: product innovativeness (radically new features)	0.8717*** (0.1300)	0.8774*** (0.1362)	0.9281*** (0.1301)	0.8725*** (0.1332)
xf2: product innovativeness (established features)	0.6497*** (0.1041)	0.6504*** (0.1100)	0.6981*** (0.1041)	0.6436*** (0.1066)
xa1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0122 (0.0293)	−0.0613 (0.0977)	−0.1590*** (0.0464)
xa2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0160 (0.0224)	0.0156 (0.0719)	−0.2089 (0.1386)
xb1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		−0.0115 (0.0185)	−0.1561 (0.1852)	0.2882** (0.1213)
xb2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0079 (0.0224)	−0.0747 (0.0685)	0.2377** (0.0962)
xc1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0644*** (0.0206)	−0.0733 (0.0841)	−0.4095** (0.1680)
xc2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0229* (0.0125)	0.0006 (0.0734)	−0.1779 (0.1141)
xd1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0040 (0.0274)	−0.0863 (0.2526)	−0.2937** (0.1265)
xd2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0041 (0.0228)	0.0542 (0.1058)	−0.1659*** (0.0444)
xe1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		−0.0052 (0.0292)	−0.1336 (0.1409)	0.1237 (0.1089)
xe2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0085 (0.0243)	0.0240 (0.0459)	−0.0976 (0.0727)
xf1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		−0.0033 (0.0361)	−0.3171*** (0.0734)	0.0969 (0.0684)
xf2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs		0.0016 (0.0212)	−0.2797*** (0.0354)	0.0972 (0.0654)
N (=6,728; pooled)	6,728	672	192	3,144
LL	−1,622.06	−1,616.00	−1,609.82	−1,609.99
Prob > LR	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
McFadden's R^2	0.3044	0.3070	0.3096	0.3095

*$p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; ***$p < 0.01$; robust standard errors in parentheses.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

terms: 0.0644, $p < 0.01$ and 0.0229, $p < 0.10$). None of the other interaction coefficients are statistically significant in this column. In their combined effects, we find that entrepreneurs with one year of founding experience are more likely to avoid business opportunities with more than five competitors (as shown in the combined coefficient of −1.7571 with the negative and significant xc1 interaction term: −0.4095, $p < 0.05$) than managers with one year of managerial experience (as shown in the combined effect of −1.4110).

Finally, individuals with more years of entrepreneurial experience are less concerned about annual market growth (xa1 interaction term: −0.1590, $p < 0.01$), yet place greater emphasis on current market size (xb1 and xb2 interaction terms: 0.2882 and 0.2377, $p < 0.05$), number of competitors (xc1 interaction term: −0.4095, $p < 0.05$), and time to first sale (xd1 and xd2 interaction terms: −0.2937, $p < 0.05$ and −0.1659, $p < 0.01$). However, none of the interaction coefficients related to the product are significant. We will comment in more detail on these interesting insights in our discussion section.

To ensure that our findings are robust to alternative definitions of experience endowments, we examined the conditional effects with three subgroups of overlapping experience backgrounds. As we relaxed the filtering of the pure, mutually exclusive subgroups, we were able to use 7,256 observations for our analysis. As reported in Table 4, three-year and five-year thresholds in the respective dominant experience area are used for further comparison. We find that the results in Table 4 are highly consistent with the findings shown in Table 3. In particular, as predicted in H2a, H2b, and H2c, individuals with managerial experience reveal a unique and diverging evaluation in the competition-related dimension of opportunities—i.e., we observe an overall negative preference, yet decreasing emphasis as their years of management experience increase (positive interaction effect). Experienced technologists are still more sensitive to the product-related dimension of 'product desirability' (rather than 'product innovativeness,' see earlier). Individuals with entrepreneurial experience continue to be more sensitive to the time-to-first-sale dimension of business opportunities (i.e., cash generation).

Because the potential presence of heteroskedasticity could influence the interaction effects, we performed robustness tests using a heteroskedastic conditional logit model. Hole (2006) suggests that in moderate samples, the LM, the LR, and the Wald tests based on the Hessian are likely to perform satisfactorily. When we use all three subgroup identifiers (i.e., years of management, technology, and entrepreneurship experience) in a series of heteroskedastic conditional logit models, we find that the parameter of unequal error variances (heteroskedasticity χ^2 of robust LM test) actually decreases from 16.09 in the base model to 11.85 in the manager model and to 14.78 in the technologist model, but slightly increases to 18.04 in the entrepreneur model. Also, when we use each subgroup identifier in its respective interaction model, we find that both the manager model ($p = 0.836$) and the entrepreneur model ($p = 0.471$) do not suffer from heteroskedastic errors. We reckon that the technologist model shows a significant heteroskedasticity due to its smaller sample size; however, the hypothesized interaction effect in the product-related dimension remains the same in its statistical significance and offers support for H2a.

Hypothesis 3: 'balanced' versus 'rugged' opportunity templates

Thus far, our analysis (H2a to H2c) has focused on those characteristics of opportunities that are emphasized by individuals with different types and years of experience. In other words, we examined the marginal effects of the interactions capturing how the increasing years of experience of different types of agents moderate the relative importance of each opportunity attribute. These analyses have yielded important insights with respect to systematic differences in how agents shift their emphasis on opportunity attributes as they gain experience over time in their respective fields. However, these analyses do not yet provide insights on the overall opportunity templates of agents. Hypothesis 3 examines this key question.

Hypothesis 3 proposed that the opportunity templates of managers and entrepreneurs will be more balanced than those of technologists, i.e., theirs will take on a more rugged form. We analyze this hypothesis by computing a ruggedness score that is based on the benefit contributions of the different parameter values of the opportunity dimensions, given the average years of experience for each subgroup in our data.

Specifically, the ruggedness score was computed in four steps. Following the procedures outlined in prior conjoint research (e.g., Franke *et al*., 2008), we

DOI: 10.1002/sej

Table 4. Robustness tests with overlapping experience samples and different thresholds

Variables	Greater than 3 years			Greater than 5 years		
	Mgt	Tec	Ent	Mgt	Tec	Ent
xa1: annual market growth (more than 35%)	1.3448*** (0.1145)	1.3263*** (0.1161)	1.3137*** (0.1227)	1.3459*** (0.1137)	1.3338*** (0.1156)	1.3214*** (0.1215)
xa2: annual market growth (5% to 10%)	0.7662*** (0.0991)	0.7540*** (0.0997)	0.7500*** (0.1079)	0.7674*** (0.0985)	0.7588*** (0.0993)	0.7518*** (0.1072)
xb1: current market size (100 million)	0.4983*** (0.1031)	0.4529*** (0.0952)	0.5319*** (0.1049)	0.4998*** (0.1024)	0.4595*** (0.0953)	0.5275*** (0.1027)
xb2: current market size (50 million)	0.3598*** (0.0874)	0.3392*** (0.0835)	0.3907*** (0.0945)	0.3624*** (0.0870)	0.3436*** (0.0832)	0.3915*** (0.0920)
xc1: number of competitors (more than 5 competitors)	−1.5083*** (0.1131)	−1.4063*** (0.1126)	−1.4663*** (0.1203)	−1.5106*** (0.1126)	−1.4133*** (0.1119)	−1.4635*** (0.1175)
xc2: number of competitors (2–5 competitors)	−0.8494*** (0.0907)	−0.8099*** (0.0883)	−0.7316*** (0.0930)	−0.8532*** (0.0905)	−0.8119*** (0.0878)	−0.7435*** (0.0903)
xd1: time to first sale (more than 24 months)	−1.2782*** (0.1251)	−1.2488*** (0.1198)	−1.2512*** (0.1329)	−1.2801*** (0.1242)	−1.2436*** (0.1194)	−1.2580*** (0.1309)
xd2: time to first sale (12 to 24 months)	−0.6831*** (0.0850)	−0.6782*** (0.0850)	−0.6010*** (0.0876)	−0.6808*** (0.0844)	−0.6774*** (0.0846)	−0.6152*** (0.0882)
xe1: product desirability ('must-have' product)	1.1488*** (0.1063)	1.1211*** (0.1040)	1.0502*** (0.1085)	1.1487*** (0.1054)	1.1215*** (0.1032)	1.0629*** (0.1060)
xe2: product desirability ('should-have' product)	0.4771*** (0.0926)	0.4591*** (0.0919)	0.4263*** (0.0990)	0.4774*** (0.0922)	0.4583*** (0.0916)	0.4349*** (0.0962)
xf1: product innovativeness (radically new features)	0.9348*** (0.1337)	0.9116*** (0.1272)	1.0387*** (0.1473)	0.9352*** (0.1328)	0.9070*** (0.1272)	1.0291*** (0.1426)
xf2: product innovativeness (established features)	0.6854*** (0.1087)	0.6742*** (0.1024)	0.7120*** (0.1220)	0.6856*** (0.1078)	0.6665*** (0.1023)	0.7200*** (0.1190)
xa1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0101 (0.0291)	0.0430 (0.0386)	0.0187 (0.0124)	0.0115 (0.0301)	0.0336 (0.0364)	0.0187 (0.0124)
xa2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0136 (0.0221)	0.0434 (0.0263)	0.0135 (0.0103)	0.0140 (0.0227)	0.0384 (0.0255)	0.0143 (0.0101)
xb1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	−0.0143 (0.0184)	0.0490 (0.0489)	−0.0167 (0.0110)	−0.0153 (0.0181)	0.0385 (0.0424)	−0.0174 (0.0108)
xb2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0059 (0.0220)	0.0409 (0.0450)	−0.0109 (0.0093)	0.0057 (0.0218)	0.0312 (0.0392)	−0.0126 (0.0092)
xc1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0694*** (0.0202)	−0.0472 (0.0370)	0.0048 (0.0142)	0.0780*** (0.0197)	−0.0373 (0.0369)	0.0044 (0.0141)
xc2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0262** (0.0123)	−0.0192 (0.0269)	−0.0339** (0.0136)	0.0338*** (0.0123)	−0.0218 (0.0294)	−0.0347** (0.0135)
xd1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0071 (0.0271)	−0.0350 (0.0452)	−0.0083 (0.0128)	0.0091 (0.0269)	−0.0573 (0.0559)	−0.0077 (0.0125)
xd2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0052 (0.0228)	−0.0020 (0.0249)	−0.0287** (0.0112)	0.0033 (0.0231)	−0.0075 (0.0280)	−0.0281** (0.0112)
xe1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	−0.0070 (0.0291)	0.0264 (0.0365)	0.0317** (0.0154)	−0.0064 (0.0300)	0.0338 (0.0453)	0.0318** (0.0153)
xe2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0080 (0.0244)	0.0361* (0.0190)	0.0197 (0.0137)	0.0090 (0.0249)	0.0466** (0.0203)	0.0195 (0.0136)
xf1 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	−0.0062 (0.0359)	0.0267 (0.0509)	−0.0350** (0.0170)	−0.0062 (0.0359)	0.0449 (0.0596)	−0.0359** (0.0166)
xf2 x mgtyrs, tecyrs, or entyrs	0.0004 (0.0211)	0.0070 (0.0333)	−0.0088 (0.0113)	0.0009 (0.0214)	0.0346 (0.0419)	−0.0119 (0.0110)
N (= 7,256; pooled)	576	576	2,192	432	432	1,576
LL	−1,715.57	−1,718.68	−1,710.82	−1,713.81	−1,718.21	−1,711.03
Prob > LR	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
McFadden's R^2	0.3178	0.3166	0.3197	0.3185	0.3167	0.3196

*$p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; ***$p < 0.01$; robust standard errors in parentheses.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

Table 5. Analysis of the ruggedness of individuals' opportunity prototype

	Managers		Technologists		Entrepreneurs	
Maximum opportunity (total benefit)	6.26		6.99		6.10	
Relative benefit contribution of highest level	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%
xa1: annual market growth	2	21.71%	2	21.90%	1	21.47%
xb1: current market size	6	7.42%	6	4.86%	6	6.38%
xc1: number of competitors	3	17.71%	1	33.20%	2	20.75%
xd1: time to first sale	1	22.94%	3	18.48%	3	20.56%
xe1: product desirability	4	15.23%	4	14.65%	4	19.21%
xf1: product innovativeness	5	14.98%	5	6.90%	5	11.63%
Deviation from the average ('ruggedness score')		24.72%		47.18%		30.64%

first computed the overall benefit that the maximum opportunity receives (i.e., an individual's 'ideal' opportunity, see the first line in Table 5). Second, we computed the relative benefit contribution of the highest parameter value of each opportunity dimension. Third, because in a perfectly balanced opportunity prototype each of the n dimensions would contribute 1/n to the overall benefit of that opportunity (in our case 1/6, or 16.67%), we subtracted the relative benefit contribution derived in step 2 from the balanced contribution to arrive at a deviation score for each opportunity dimension. Fourth, the absolute value of each deviation score was summed to produce an overall ruggedness score for an individual's opportunity prototype.[5] As Table 5 indicates, the ruggedness score for technologists is considerably higher than the scores obtained for managers and entrepreneurs, indicating that they place particular importance on a few dimensions while largely neglecting others. Thus, we claim support for H3.

DISCUSSION

By collecting and analyzing a unique dataset capturing the opportunity evaluations of 141 persons with different experience backgrounds, our study has produced three main findings.

First, our baseline results not only provide evidence of heterogeneity in opportunity evaluations by individuals possessing different types of experience (i.e., technology, management, and entrepreneurship), but also demonstrate persistence of this heterogeneity over time. These results are of particular significance given that most research in entrepreneurship has treated experience homogeneously.

Second, although prior research has shown that people from different parts of an organization look at organizational problems from different vantage points (Dougherty, 1992), we have lacked evidence on agents' distinct business opportunity preferences. Specifically, our results document how individuals with different types of experience systematically vary in their preferences for particular opportunity attributes. Beyond several findings that were in line with what one may commonly expect, our analysis has uncovered a number of counterintuitive insights—which is one of the strengths of conjoint-based research (Wood *et al.*, 2014). For instance, in developing H2a, we argued that technologists would be more sensitive to product-related attributes. In fact, we found support for this hypothesis, as the associated interaction is significant. However, beyond greater sensitivity to this type of opportunity attribute, the direction (sign) of the interaction coefficient indicates that with increasing years of experience, technologists attribute less importance to product innovativeness than do other agents.[6] At first

[5] For instance, the ruggedness score for individuals with managerial backgrounds is computed by: (1) subtracting the parameter value of the market growth dimension (21.71%) from the balanced parameter value (16.67%), the parameter value of the market size dimension (7.42%) from the balanced parameter value (16.67%), and so on; and (2) by calculating the sum of the absolute deviations from the balanced values. As reported in Table 5, the resulting ruggedness score for managers is 24.72 percent.

[6] Overall, one should keep in mind that we examine the conditional effects in the full models with the interaction terms. For all three experience types, the unconditional effect for product innovativeness is positive, as shown in the base model—i.e., all types attribute positive value to product innovation. The interaction effect for technologists indicates, however, that this effect becomes less pronounced as they obtain experience in their domain over time.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

glance, this finding is striking, but two main arguments provide some rationale for this type of evaluation behavior. First, people with this type of experience probably have learned from their own R&D work that when one performs more innovative types of (technical) experiments, one will also experience more failures (e.g., which is a common occurrence in technology labs). Thus, in their minds, innovative products could be associated with a higher likelihood of failure—which is why their opportunity templates indicate a preference for products that are more similar to the competing offerings (which also provides the bonus of proven customer demand, while customers may refrain from novel offerings). Second, knowing that they have limited understanding of business settings, they may seek to limit the overall newness of their new business endeavor: knowing that new firm creation provides them with novel types of challenges in a number of areas, they at least may want to limit the typical risks and uncertainties associated with novel products (Wincent and Örtqvist, 2009). In addition, we found support for H2b, proposing that managers are more sensitive to opportunity attributes capturing the competitive situation. We were surprised to see, however, that with increasing years of work experience, managers become less concerned about greater numbers of competitors. For them, perhaps, the number of competitors implies that the target market is 'real' and legitimate—i.e., there is business waiting to be made. Also, they may become less concerned over time because they develop better abilities in outmaneuvering other firms (Santos and Eisenhardt, 2009).

Third, examining the overall preference pattern in opportunity evaluation decisions, we find that the opportunity templates of entrepreneurs and managers are more balanced than the template of technologists, i.e., technologists view fewer opportunity attributes as salient in their evaluations. Hence, people with generalist experience evaluate opportunities in a more holistic way than people with specialized, functional experience.

These results offer several new insights for entrepreneurship and strategy research.

Implications for entrepreneurship research

First and foremost, our findings contribute to entrepreneurship theory by providing largely novel evidence on the distinct opportunity preferences held by three main types of organizational actors and, thus, help explain why individuals may arrive at different conclusions regarding the attractiveness of the very same opportunity and why they may decide to pursue, or forego, that opportunity. In other words, our results offer an important explanation as to why some opportunities remain third-person opportunities and why some will be first-person opportunities—i.e., opportunities that will be exploited by the focal agent (McMullen and Shepherd, 2006; Shepherd, McMullen, and Jennings, 2007).

One core finding of research on opportunities has been that a founder's prior knowledge affects which opportunities he/she is able to identify (Shane, 2000; Gruber, MacMillan, and Thompson, 2013). The present study extends this important theme by showing that the founder's existing knowledge and experience also shapes his/her views of what an attractive opportunity is. These divergent preferences are likely to cause observed heterogeneity in new firm creation, resource deployment, and, ultimately, diverging firm-level value creation outcomes. In a nutshell, different experience types lead to different paths on the opportunity road.

Along these lines, the current findings provide insight into the oft-stated comment that prior experience matters in entrepreneurship. This statement is typically offered with few boundary conditions or rationale for what experience matters, when it matters, and why it matters. While it is intuitively obvious that experience is important in new firm creation, we provide theoretical insight and empirical support for three fundamental domains of prior experience, which have implications for how entrepreneurs assess the value of potential opportunities. We have seen that people with specialist and with generalist experience possess fairly different opportunity templates—a key finding that extends prior research showing that agents with generalist experience tend to identify more opportunities than those with specialist experience (Gruber, MacMillan, and Thompson, 2012).

These insights also point to the importance of learning over time and how it affects opportunity evaluation and, more generally, entrepreneurship (Alvarez and Busenitz, 2001). To recall, our analysis indicates that people with different types of experience (i.e., managers, technologists, and entrepreneurs) and years of experience (i.e., pure novice and experienced) place significantly different relative importance on the opportunity attributes. Through their everyday experiences, individuals in these three domains develop distinct opportunity templates that

DOI: 10.1002/sej

encode their learning over time. This finding has at least three important implications for our understanding of entrepreneurial processes. First, it indicates that people in technology, management or entrepreneurship operate in learning environments that will shape a particular outlook on what an attractive business opportunity is. Second, their insights do not converge with increasing years of learning. Third, these observations highlight the important role path dependency plays in entrepreneurship (cf. Dencker and Gruber, forthcoming), as key knowledge that affects the entrepreneurial journey (in our case, opportunity evaluation) is developed in individuals' prior work.

The findings presented in this article also suggest that research on the relationship between the founder's human capital and firm success (or failure) should take into account systematic differences that exist in founders' opportunity choices. Given that the choice of a particular opportunity underlies the value-creation potential that can be exploited, systematic differences in opportunity choices may, to a significant extent, explain differential firm performance outcomes. Existing research in this field, however, typically looks at the skills founders have for setting up and managing firms and neglects (to account for) opportunity choices when explaining new firm performance.

Implications for strategy research

Research in strategy offers plenty of evidence on how the experience of the firm's leaders imprints their organizations (Hambrick and Mason, 1984; Helfat and Lieberman, 2002). Yet, in spite of a long tradition, we have lacked insights on how individuals' experience backgrounds affect their opportunity preferences and the types of growth options that the firm will exploit.

Our findings also contribute to resource-based theory. In particular, Penrose (1959) emphasized that the decision regarding which growth options the firm pursues is not an *ex ante* given *factum*, but relies on managers' subjective judgments and, thus, on their mental models. Except for a few notable studies, however, research has ignored the role of subjective judgment in managerial decisions in favor of objective measures of resource characteristics (Alvarez and Busenitz, 2001; Gruber, 2010; Kor, Mahoney, and Michael, 2007; Foss *et al*., 2008).

Correspondingly, our findings also serve to extend research on firm diversification. In particular, the diversification literature views the relatedness of the firm's technological resources as a key factor determining the direction of diversification moves (e.g., Miller, 2006). Our results complement work in this arena by highlighting the key role human resources (in particular, the experience of managers) play in explaining which new business opportunities are perceived as attractive growth options and which diversification paths are pursued.

Limitations

In interpreting the results of this study, certain limitations must be kept in mind. Although conjoint experiments have several advantages, this method limits the number of decision dimensions that can be examined. For instance, our analysis finds significant effects for market-, product-, and competition-related characteristics of business opportunities; yet it may well be that other market-related (e.g., market maturity), product-related (e.g., ease of use), or competition-related (e.g., size of competing firms) characteristics affect individuals' perceptions of opportunity attractiveness. We encourage future research on such characteristics.

Furthermore, although real-time methods give researchers the possibility of collecting information while the evaluation decisions are being made, one has to remember that an experimental setup simplifies the real-life decision context. In addition, due to the cross-sectional nature of conjoint experiments, we are limited in our ability to understand process stages in the evaluation and, in particular, how more precise information on business opportunities may become available over time. For instance, one can imagine early-stage settings in which the quantity and quality of information pertaining to a particular opportunity attribute may (still) be too low for the agent to accomplish judgmental inferences based on his/her opportunity template (cf. Barreto, 2012; Alvarez *et al*., 2013). Nonetheless, our findings uncovered fundamental preference patterns influencing the evaluation of opportunities. These insights on the heterogeneity of opportunity templates can serve as a platform from which distinct process-related aspects can be studied.

Finally, we note that while prior research on opportunity evaluations has employed a B2C context for the decision-making scenario (e.g., Choi and Shepherd, 2004), our study is based on a B2B context. Hence, the generalizability of our findings to a B2C context needs to be ascertained in future research.

DOI: 10.1002/sej

CONCLUSION

By uncovering key differences in the opportunity preferences of agents with technology, management, and entrepreneurship experience, the present study offers fundamental new insights on how heterogeneity arises in firm creation processes and outcomes. Furthermore, they offer a compelling argument as to why established firms that are run by executives with different types of experience backgrounds may systematically diverge in the type of growth options they prefer to pursue. In this regard, future research may extend the present study by examining other frequently encountered experience endowments in organizations, such as experience in finance, marketing, or operations. Value lies in the eye of the beholder.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The helpful comments of the anonymous reviewers and Coeditor Sharon Alvarez are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

Adelson B. 1981. Problem solving and the development of abstract categories in programming languages. *Memory and Cognition* **9**: 422–433.

Alvarez SA, Barney JB. 2007. Discovery and creation: alternative theories of entrepreneurial action. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* **1**(1/2): 11–26.

Alvarez SA, Barney JB, Anderson P. 2013. Forming and exploiting opportunities: the implications of discovery and creation processes for entrepreneurial and organizational research. *Organization Science* **24**: 301–317.

Alvarez SA, Busenitz LW. 2001. The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management* **27**: 755–776.

Bailyn L, Lynch JT. 1983. Engineering as a life-long career: its meaning, its satisfactions, its difficulties. *Journal of Occupational Behaviour* **4**: 263–283.

Baker T, Aldag R, Blair E. 2003. Gender and entrepreneurial opportunity evaluation. In *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Bygrave WD (ed). Babson College: Wellesley, MA; 689–702.

Baker T, Nelson R. 2005. Creating something from nothing: resource construction through entrepreneurial bricolage. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **50**: 329–366.

Barney JB, Hesterly W. 2009. *Concepts, Strategic Management and Competitive Advantage*. Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Baron RA. 1998. Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: why and when entrepreneurs think differently than other people. *Journal of Business Venturing* **13**: 275–294.

Baron RA, Ensley M. 2006. Opportunity recognition as the detection of meaningful patterns: evidence from comparisons of novice and experienced entrepreneurs. *Management Science* **52**: 1331–1344.

Barreto I. 2012. Solving the entrepreneurial puzzle: the role of entrepreneurial interpretation in opportunity formation and related processes. *Journal of Management Studies* **49**: 356–380.

Becker GS. 1964. *Human Capital*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

Blau G. 1999. Early-career job factors influencing the professional commitment of medical technologists. *Academy of Management Journal* **42**: 687–695.

Busenitz LW, Barney JB. 1997. Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing* **12**: 9–30.

Choi YR, Shepherd DA. 2004. Entrepreneurs' decisions to exploit opportunities. *Journal of Management* **30**: 377–395.

Dearborn DWC, Simon HA. 1958. Selective perception: a note on the departmental identifications of executives. *Sociometry* **21**: 140–144.

Dencker J, Gruber M. The effects of opportunities and founder experience on new firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*. Forthcoming.

Dimov D. 2007. Beyond the single-person, single-insight attribution in understanding entrepreneurial opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **31**: 713–731.

Dimov D. 2010. Nascent entrepreneurs and venture emergence: opportunity confidence, human capital, and early planning. *Journal of Management Studies* **47**: 1123–1153.

Dimov D. 2011. Grappling with the unbearable elusiveness of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **35**: 57–81.

Dougherty D. 1992. Interpretative barriers to successful product innovation in large firms. *Organization Science* **3**: 179–202.

Eisenhardt KM, Kahwajy JL, Bourgeois LJ. 1997. How management teams can have a good fight. *Harvard Business Review* **75**: 77–86.

Evans JSBT. 1993. The mental model of conditional reasoning: critical appraisal and revision. *Cognition* **48**: 1–20.

Fauchart E, Gruber M. 2011. Darwinians, communitarians and missionaries: the role of founder identity in entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Journal* **54**: 935–957.

Feldman DC. 1976. A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **21**: 433–452.

Fiet JO. 2007. A prescriptive analysis of search and discovery. *Journal of Management Studies* **44**: 592–611.

Finkelstein S, Hambrick D, Cannella AA. 2009. *Strategic Leadership: Theory and Research on Executives, Top Management Teams, and Boards*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, U.K.

Fiske ST, Taylor SE. 1991. *Social Cognition*. McGraw-Hill: New York.

Foo MD. 2011. Emotions and entrepreneurial opportunity evaluation. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **35**: 375–393.

Foss NJ, Klein P, Kor YY, Mahoney JT. 2008. Entrepreneurship, subjectivism, and the resource-based view: toward a new synthesis. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* **2**(1): 73–94.

Franke N, Gruber M, Harhoff D, Henkel J. 2006. What you are is what you like: similarity biases in venture capitalist's evaluations of start-up teams. *Journal of Business Venturing* **21**: 802–826.

Franke N, Gruber M, Harhoff D, Henkel J. 2008. Venture capitalists' evaluations of start-up teams: trade-offs, knock-out criteria, and the impact of VC experience. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **32**: 459–483.

Gagné RM, Glaser R. 1987. Foundations in learning research. In *Instructional Technology: Foundations,* Gagné RM (ed). Lawrence Erlbaum: Hillsdale, NJ; 49–84.

Gobbo C, Chi MTH. 1986. How knowledge is structured and used by expert and novice children. *Cognitive Development* **1**: 221–237.

Griffin A, Hauser JR. 1996. Integrating R&D and marketing: a review and analysis of the literature. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* **13**: 191–215.

Gruber M. 2010. Exploring the origins of organizational paths: empirical evidence from newly founded firms. *Journal of Management* **36**: 1143–1167.

Gruber M, MacMillan IC, Thompson JD. 2008. Look before you leap: market opportunity identification in emerging technology firms. *Management Science* **54**: 1652–1665.

Gruber M, MacMillan, IC, Thompson JD. 2012. From minds to markets: how human capital endowments shape market opportunity identification of technology start-ups. *Journal of Management* **38**: 1421–1449.

Gruber M, MacMillan IC, Thompson JD. 2013. Escaping the prior knowledge corridor: what shapes the number and variety of market opportunities identified before market entry of technology start-ups? *Organization Science* **24**: 280–300.

Hambrick DC, Mason PA. 1984. Upper echelons: the organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review* **9**: 193–206.

Hauser JR, Rao VR. 2003. *Conjoint Analysis, Related Modeling, and Applications.* Kluwer Academic Publishers: Norwell, MA.

Haynie M, Shepherd DA, McMullen JS. 2009. An opportunity for me? The role of resources in opportunity evaluation decisions. *Journal of Management Studies* **46**: 337–361.

Helfat CE, Lieberman MB. 2002. The birth of capabilities: market entry and the importance of pre-history. *Industrial & Corporate Change* **11**: 725–760.

Hole AR. 2006. Small-sample properties of tests for heteroscedasticity in the conditional logit model. *Economics Bulletin* **3**: 1–14.

Johnson-Laird PN. 1983. *Mental Models: Towards a Cognitive Science of Language, Inference and Consciousness*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, U.K.

Jolly VK. 1997. *Commercializing New Technologies: Getting from Mind to Market*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

Keh TH, Foo MD, Lim BC. 2002. Opportunity evaluation under risky conditions: the cognitive processes of entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **26**: 125–148.

Kirzner I. 1979. *Perceptions, Opportunities and Profit.* University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL.

Kor YY, Mahoney JT, Michael SC. 2007. Resources, capabilities and entrepreneurial perceptions. *Journal of Management Studies* **44**: 1188–1212.

Krueger N. 1993. The impact of prior entrepreneurial experience on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **18**: 5–21.

Kuhfeld WF. 2005. *Marketing Research Methods in SAS: Experimental Design, Choice, Conjoint, and Graphical Techniques.* SAS Institute Inc.: Cary, NC.

Louviere JJ, Hensher DA, Swait JD. 2000. *Stated Choice Methods.* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, U.K.

Lumpkin GT, Hills G, Shrader R. 2004. Opportunity recognition. In *Entrepreneurship: The Way Ahead,* Welsch HP (ed). Routledge: New York; 73–90.

Lurigio AJ, Carroll JS. 1985. Probation officers' schemata of offenders: content, development, and impact on treatment decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* **48**: 1112–1186.

Matlin MW. 2005. *Cognition.* John Wiley & Sons: New York.

McFadden D. 1972. *Conditional Logit Analysis of Qualitative Choice Behavior*. Institute of Urban & Regional Development, University of California: Berkeley, CA.

McGrath RG, MacMillan IC. 2000. *The Entrepreneurial Mindset*. Harvard Business School Press: Boston, MA.

McKelvie A, Haynie JM, Gustafsson V. 2011. Unpacking the uncertainty construct: implications for entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing* **26**: 273–292.

McMullen JS, Shepherd A. 2006. Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review* **31**: 132–152.

Miller DJ. 2006. Technological diversity, related diversification, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal* **27**(7): 601–619.

Mitchell R, Busenitz L, Lant T, McDougall P, Morse E, Smith E. 2002. Toward a theory of entrepreneurial cog-

DOI: 10.1002/sej

nition: rethinking the people side of entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice* **27**: 93–104.

Penrose ET. 1959. *The Theory of the Growth of the Firm*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, U.K.

Priem RL, Harrison DA. 1994. Exploring strategic judgment: methods for testing the assumptions of prescriptive contingency theories. *Strategic Management Journal* **15**(4): 311–324.

Rouse W, Morris N. 1986. On looking into the black box: prospects and limits in the search for mental models. *Psychological Bulletin* **100**: 349–363.

Santos FM, Eisenhardt KM. 2009. Constructing markets and shaping boundaries: entrepreneurial power in nascent fields. *Academy of Management Journal* **52**: 643–671.

Sarasvathy SD. 2001. Causation and effectuation: toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review* **26**: 243–263.

Schumpeter JA. 1939. *Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. McGraw-Hill: New York.

Shane S. 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science* **11**: 448–469.

Shane S, Venkataraman S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review* **25**: 217–226.

Shepherd DA, McMullen JS, Jennings PD. 2007. The formation of opportunity beliefs: overcoming ignorance and reducing doubt. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* **1**(1/2): 75–95.

Simon M, Houghton SM, Aquino K. 2000. Cognitive biases, risk perception, and venture formation: how individuals decide to start companies. *Journal of Business Venturing* **15**: 113–134.

Sørensen JB, Fassiotto MA. 2011. Organizations as fonts of entrepreneurship. *Organization Science* **22**: 1322–1331.

Ucbasaran D, Westhead P, Wright M. 2009. The extent and nature of opportunity identification by experienced entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing* **24**: 99–115.

Walsh JP. 1995. Managerial and organizational cognition: notes from a trip down memory lane. *Organization Science* **6**: 280–321.

Wiltbank R, Dew N, Read S, Sarasvathy SD. 2006. What to do next? The case for non-predictive strategy. *Strategic Management Journal* **27**(10): 981–998.

Wincent J, Örtqvist D. 2009. A comprehensive model of entrepreneur role stress antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Business and Psychology* **24**: 225–243.

Wood MS, McKelvie A, Haynie JM. 2014. Making it personal: opportunity individuation and the shaping of opportunity beliefs. *Journal of Business Venturing* **29**: 252–272.

Wood MS, McKinley W. 2010. The production of entrepreneurial opportunity: a constructivist perspective. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* **4**(1): 66–84.

APPENDIX

Illustration of an opportunity choice set

Choice 1:	Choice 2:
Expected annual market growth of –3% to 3%	Expected annual market growth of 5% to 10%
Current target market size of $100 million	Current target market size of $10 million
Currently 2–5 direct competitors	Currently 1 direct competitor
Time to first sales is more than 24 months	Time to first sales is less than 12 months
'Must-have' product	'Nice-to-have' product
Offering resembles competitors' offerings	Offering outperforms on radically new dimensions

Choice 3:	Choice 4:
Expected annual market growth of 5% to 10%	Expected annual market growth > 35%
Current target market size of $50 million	Current target market size of $50 million
Currently more than 5 direct competitors	Currently more than 5 direct competitors
Time to first sales is less than 12 months	Time to first sales is 12–24 months
'Should-have' product	'Must-have' product
Offering outperforms along established dimensions	Offering outperforms along established dimensions

DOI: 10.1002/sej