



Perspectives

STRESS PROCESSES: AN ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT IN THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Journal: | <i>Academy of Management Perspectives</i> |
| Manuscript ID | AMP-2016-0184.R3 |
| Document Type: | Symposium |
| Keywords: | Entrepreneurship < Topic Areas, Emotions & mood (e.g. stress, anger) < Individual Level of Analysis < Organizational behavior < Topic Areas, Founder characteristics < Entrepreneurship < Topic Areas |
| | |

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **STRESS PROCESSES: AN ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT IN THE**
4
5 **ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS**
6
7

8
9 Andreas Rauch

10
11 University of Sydney

12
13 Andreas.rauch@sydney.edu.au
14
15

16
17
18 Matthias Fink

19
20 Johannes Kepler University Linz

21
22 matthias.fink@jku.at
23
24
25

26
27
28 Isabella Hatak

29
30 University of St. Gallen & University of Twente

31
32 isabella.hatak@unsig.ch
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

STRESS PROCESSES: AN ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT IN THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS

Abstract

The entrepreneurial process is associated with high uncertainty. Uncertainty is also a major source of stress. Therefore, a core aim of entrepreneurs is to reduce uncertainty to an extent that allows the entrepreneurial process to unfold. However, entrepreneurship scholars have insufficiently addressed stress processes that may be associated with this uncertainty. We argue that uncertainty is the concept connecting both the entrepreneurial and stress processes. We discuss the link between the two processes regarding: (1) opportunity recognition, (2) opportunity exploitation, and (3) associated outcomes. We then illustrate how future research should incorporate the interaction between the two processes using a morphological box and discuss how such research would change the way we specify entrepreneurial process models and study entrepreneurial behavior.

Keywords: entrepreneurial process, uncertainty, stress processes, burnout

INTRODUCTION

Although abundant literature examining stress in organizational behavior exists, this literature does not appear to be applicable to the entrepreneurship context. Thus, to gain a better understanding of stress processes, researchers need to adapt these findings and focus on the processes inherent in entrepreneurship. Stress is a substantial imbalance between environmental demands and the response capability of the focal organism (McGrath, 1970, p.

1
2
3 17). Stress involves stressors, cognitive appraisal, stress responses, and behavioral results
4 (McGrath, 1970). We argue that stress processes are important underlying factors of the
5 entrepreneurial process. The entrepreneurial process comprises the recognition and
6 exploitation of opportunities and associated outcomes (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). In
7 fact, stress processes seem inevitable for entrepreneurs given that they invest energy in
8 actions involving high uncertainty, long working hours, extreme time pressure, role conflicts,
9 and ambiguity (Patzelt & Shepherd, 2011; Wincent & Örtqvist, 2011). Therefore, there are
10 many reasons to assume that entrepreneurs face stress. However, many entrepreneurs are able
11 to successfully reduce the stress associated with entrepreneurial activity (Baron, Franklin, &
12 Hmieleski, 2016; Stephan & Uhlander, 2010). Nevertheless, some studies report that
13 entrepreneurs have high stress reactions (e.g., Prottas & Thompson, 2006; Schjoedt, 2012).
14 Moreover, several stress theories used in entrepreneurship research suggest differing
15 proposals for the relationship between stressors, stress reactions, and the outcomes achieved
16 by entrepreneurs. Theories highlighting the negative effects of stress often note the role of
17 high demands and the perception of environmental stimuli or events (Jackson & Schuler,
18 1985), while other theories underline the positive effects of control and adaptive reactions to
19 stress perceptions (Edwards, 1992; Fay & Sonnentag, 2002).

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 This situation—competing theoretical assumptions and inconclusive empirical
41 findings—prompted us to scrutinize the linkages between stress processes and the
42 entrepreneurial process. We argue that not including stress as a major factor in theories of the
43 entrepreneurial process could lead to spurious relationships because the theories might be
44 imprecise. For example, opportunity recognition has been associated with knowledge and
45 motivation (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). However, high stress hinders information
46 processing and reduces motivation. Omitting stress as a factor affecting opportunity
47 recognition leads to models that are misspecified. Moreover, stress processes in
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 entrepreneurship seem to differ from stress processes in other domains. Linking stress
4
5 processes with entrepreneurial processes might provide explanations for this phenomenon.
6
7 Finally, linking stress processes with entrepreneurial processes allows us to theorize
8
9 reciprocal relationships between these processes. Thus, our model assumes that
10
11 entrepreneurial processes might affect stress processes, and stress might affect entrepreneurial
12
13 processes.
14

15
16 We argue that uncertainty is the concept connecting the stress processes with the entire
17
18 entrepreneurial process. The entrepreneurial process implies high uncertainty *ex ante*
19
20 (Kirzner, 1997; Knight, 1921; McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Uncertainty, however, is also a
21
22 central cause of stress at the level of the individual (Peters, McEwen, & Friston, 2017) and
23
24 can result in severe negative consequences for the entrepreneur. Thus, reducing uncertainty is
25
26 essential for both the entrepreneurial process and the stress process. By linking stress
27
28 processes with the entrepreneurial process via uncertainty, we postulate that entrepreneurship
29
30 research should expressly account for stress processes in both theory and empirical research.
31
32 We account for these linkages by examining how uncertainty and stress affect opportunity
33
34 recognition, opportunity exploitation, and associated outcomes in a reciprocal way. In
35
36 addition, we systematically identify linkages in the course of the entrepreneurship process,
37
38 and we suggest stress theories to assist future research. The insights developed here cumulate
39
40 in a morphological box for the investigation of stress in entrepreneurship. This toolkit
41
42 highlights the elements of uncertainty inherent in both the entrepreneurship process as well as
43
44 the stress processes. In addition, it illustrates the incidents in the entrepreneurship process
45
46 where uncertainty may initiate a stress process in entrepreneurs and where stress processes
47
48 feed back into the entrepreneurship process. Thereby, we provide a novel perspective that
49
50 highlights the interplay between the entrepreneurship process and stress processes. In
51
52 addition, for each linkage the morphological box offers key concepts discussed in previous
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 research and suggests stress theories that are most promising for addressing the interaction of
4 entrepreneurship and stress in each particular phase in the entrepreneurial journey. Thus, our
5 contribution is twofold. The morphological box developed here not only summarizes key
6 insights of past research at the entrepreneurship/stress interface. It also offers orientation and
7 guidance for future research as well as key concepts and powerful theories to build on.
8
9 Employing the tools provided in the morphological box for research on entrepreneurial stress
10 will lead to research findings that are more consistent and conclusive in the future. Finally, we
11 critically reflect on the challenges implied by the development of the new research area
12 proposed. We believe that the results will change the way scholars examine and understand
13 stress in entrepreneurship and how they investigate individual-level contingencies in the
14 entrepreneurial process.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROCESS AND STRESS PROCESSES**

29
30 Both entrepreneurship and stress research introduced process models. Process models
31 try to explain how and why processes unfold over time (Van de Ven, 1992). For instance, 32
33 alternative models of the entrepreneurship process were identified and discussed in a
34 comprehensive review (Moroz & Hindle, 2012). Most of them apply event based process
35 models. In such event-based models, variables explaining one part of the entrepreneurial
36 process do not necessarily explain other parts of the process. This implies that the
37 entrepreneurial process might not necessarily result in a new business venture. One of the
38 most influential process models is the opportunity-driven new means-end framework (Shane,
39 2003; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). It conceptualizes the entrepreneurial process as
40 consisting of the recognition and exploitation of opportunities and their associated outcomes.
41
42 Entrepreneurial opportunities are situations in which entrepreneurs introduce and sell new
43 goods, services, raw materials, and organizing methods at a value greater than their cost of
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 production. Thus, opportunities exist in an objective sense (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).
4
5 Whether these opportunities materialize in the emergence of an organization (i.e., opportunity
6
7 exploitation) depends to a large extent on entrepreneurs' perceptions and interpretations of
8
9 opportunities (i.e., opportunity exploration) and resources available in the environment
10
11 (Edelman & Yli-Renko, 2010). Finally, the actions of the entrepreneur and the environment
12
13 determine the outcomes of opportunity exploitation (Gartner & Carter, 2003). The model
14
15 combines individual and environmental elements of the entrepreneurial process.
16
17

18 Stress is associated with environmental demands and the individuals' interpretation
19
20 and reactions to these demands. Thus, this model of the entrepreneurship process is
21
22 particularly useful to combine with stress processes. Like entrepreneurship, stress is a process
23
24 that evolves over time. Many conceptualizations of stress processes are outcome based, that
25
26 is, they try to predict the consequences of stress processes. There are a number of competing
27
28 stress process models available in the literature. Many of them assume that there are some
29
30 sources of stress, mediating processes, and outcomes of stress processes. For example,
31
32 McGrath (1970) distinguishes four stages of the stress process. The process starts with
33
34 situational demands (stressors) that include physical, psychological, or cognitive demands.
35
36 However, the mere existence of demands does not necessarily result in stress. The experience
37
38 of stress depends on people's perceptions of demands and their capabilities to deal with such
39
40 demands. In other words, an identical situation can be stressful for one person but not for
41
42 another. Depending on this cognitive appraisal, the stress process might generate a stress
43
44 reaction (strain). Finally, the stress reaction may influence a number of behavioral results,
45
46 including performance. For example, stress reactions reduce entrepreneurs' information-
47
48 processing capabilities, which in turn affect the performance of the firm.
49
50
51

52 We next identify and describe the linkages between the entrepreneurial process and
53
54 the stress process.
55
56
57
58
59
60

UNCERTAINTY LINKING THE ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROCESS AND THE UNDERLYING STRESS PROCESSES

The concept of uncertainty provides the link between the entrepreneurial process and stress processes. Uncertainty constitutes a conceptual cornerstone in most theories of the entrepreneur (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006, p. 132). Although there are different definitions in the literature, a general definition of uncertainty refers to the individual's perceived inability to predict something accurately (Milliken, 1987). A core task of entrepreneurs is to reduce this uncertainty. Often, entrepreneurs, in contrast to other people, can reduce this uncertainty to the extent that is required to recognize and exploit opportunities to achieve associated outcomes. However, reducing uncertainty is difficult as uncertainty inhibits actions (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). Moreover, uncertainty is detrimental for entrepreneurial activity because it creates doubts, resistance, indecisiveness, and procrastination (Casson, 1982). One study empirically confirms the notion that uncertainty decreases the entrepreneur's willingness to take action (McKelvie, Haynie, & Gustavsson, 2011). However, by not taking actions and reducing uncertainty, failure and severe stress reactions might occur. Nonetheless, many entrepreneurs succeed in reducing uncertainty. Both the stress literature and the entrepreneurship literature provide overlapping explanations on how this happens.

In the entrepreneurship literature, we find several individual-level explanations as to how entrepreneurs reduce uncertainty. These explanations focus on the role of knowledge and motivation. Knowledge reduces uncertainty; people with more knowledge and information have more accurate perceptions about opportunities and thus avoid the ignorance created by uncertainty (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Motivation, in this context, refers to the ability of individuals to bear uncertainty (McClelland & Winter, 1971; Schumpeter, 1935). Motivation and knowledge affect the entire entrepreneurial process and interact with situational demands.

1
2
3 Thus, the uncertainty associated with opportunity recognition, exploitation, and anticipated
4
5 outcomes depends on the entrepreneur and the environment.
6

7 Uncertainty is also a key antecedent of stress processes creating demands on the
8
9 individual. For example, an information-theoretical approach to stress assumes that stress
10
11 originates in uncertainty (Mason, 1968). According to this approach, people make causal
12
13 inferences about which strategy they should select in order to achieve a certain outcome.
14
15 Stress arises when an individual is uncertain about which strategy to select. For example,
16
17 when one anticipates that outcomes will turn out to be something other than expected. People
18
19 have adaptive responses to stress (McGrath, 1970). For example, the better they adjust their
20
21 beliefs about uncertainty, the better they are able to predict future outcomes, thus reducing
22
23 stress resulting from uncertainty. However, when the uncertainty becomes chronic and cannot
24
25 be reduced it leads continuous and ineffective physiological stress reactions that cause
26
27 depression, cognitive impairment, infarction, and stroke in the long term (Peters & McEwen,
28
29 2015).
30
31

32
33 According to an information-theoretical approach, reducing uncertainty requires
34
35 cerebral energy. If the brain does not succeed in reducing this uncertainty, an energy crisis
36
37 emerges that impairs the memory, thereby making it even more difficult to reduce uncertainty
38
39 (Peters et al., 2017). Three mechanisms help reduce individuals' uncertainty: attention,
40
41 learning, and habituation (Peters et al., 2017). First, attention is an immediate reaction to
42
43 uncertainty. Attention increases the arousal required to retrieve more precise information cues
44
45 from memory and allows a better prediction of outcomes. Second, the brain learns the
46
47 precision of prediction errors, allowing it to discriminate between credible and imprecise
48
49 information. Finally, habituation occurs when people experience uncertainty. Moreover, there
50
51 are individual differences in habituation that are, in part, genetically determined.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Although originating from very different disciplines, both entrepreneurship and stress
4 scholars propose quite similar mechanisms for reducing uncertainty. Specifically, both
5 emphasize the role of information, learning, and attention on the one hand and motivation and
6 habituation on the other hand. We conclude that these shared mechanisms for reducing
7 uncertainty closely link the entrepreneurial process to the stress process. Thus, we argue that
8 underlying stress processes affect the entrepreneurial process. The entrepreneurial process
9 involves specific challenges associated with opportunity recognition, exploitation, and
10 associated outcomes. Each of these challenges demand critical decisions, actions, and
11 outcomes (Shepherd & Patzelt, 2017). The underlying stress processes affect these critical
12 decisions, actions, and outcomes. In turn, entrepreneurs' decisions, actions, and outcomes
13 affect the stress processes in both positive and negative ways. In the following, we interlink
14 each part of the entrepreneurial process with the stress process. Specifically, we focus on
15 opportunity recognition, opportunity exploitation, and associated outcomes.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **The Entrepreneurial Process as Affected by Stress Processes: Key Situations**

34
35 *The recognition of opportunities.* The definition of opportunities introduced above (Shane &
36 Venkataraman, 2000) implies that whether or not a situation is an opportunity cannot be
37 predicted beforehand. Therefore, the recognition of opportunities implies high uncertainty.
38 Specifically, the uncertainty associated with this initial part of the entrepreneurship process is
39 what Milliken (1987) refers to as state uncertainty. State uncertainty is the difficulty of
40 predicting how the components of the environment are changing. Opportunities present
41 themselves through different loci of changes (Eckhardt & Shane, 2003). Such changes are
42 difficult to predict. Accordingly, the recognition of opportunities is associated with
43 uncertainty.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To our knowledge, entrepreneurship research has not addressed the link between stress
4 and opportunity recognition in. Most researchers agree that the recognition of opportunities is,
5 to a large extent, dependent on cognitive processes including prior knowledge (Shane, 2000)
6 and mental structures such as alertness (Gaglio & Katz, 2001). While prior knowledge is a
7 central cognitive resource in the opportunity identification process, mental structures provide
8 a framework representing some aspects of the world. This provides a system of organizing
9 and perceiving new information and retrieving information previously stored in memory.
10 Opportunity recognition is related to four mental structures: higher-ordered structural
11 alignment, prototype models, alertness, and creativity. Higher-ordered structural alignment
12 strives to find similarities between new information and the contexts in which this information
13 is meaningful (Grégoire, Barr, & Shepherd, 2010). Prototype models provide idealized
14 representations of categories which assist in comparing ideas for new products, services, and
15 processes with the existing prototype of an opportunity (Baron & Ensley, 2006). Alertness,
16 that is, complex and adaptive mental schemas about change, industries, and social
17 environments, allows situations to be seen in new and unconventional ways (Gaglio & Katz,
18 2001). Finally, creativity promotes the generation and implementation of new ideas (Amabile,
19 1988). While the link between cognition and opportunity recognition is widely established,
20 the role of stress in this process is unknown.

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 Importantly, the stress literature provides ample evidence that stress affects cognition
43 (Lupien, McEwen, Gunnar, & Heim, 2009). Therefore, stress should affect opportunity
44 recognition as well. In general, stress reduces the ability to process information (Ellis, 2006).
45 In entrepreneurship, this is the information required to understand what is going on in the
46 context of the opportunity. As a result, high levels of stress enhance individuals' perceived
47 uncertainty associated with opportunity recognition. In this respect, it is useful to distinguish
48 between the explicit and the implicit memory. The explicit memory requires the conscious
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and intentional collection and processing of factual information requiring complex and
4
5 flexible reasoning. Such reasoning is typically observed for hippocampus and prefrontal
6
7 cortex-related functions (Sandi, 2013). Explicit memory is required to recognize large
8
9 opportunity sets. Such opportunity sets have been related to long-term superior business
10
11 performance and growth (Gruber, MacMillan, & Thompson, 2008). However, both acute and
12
13 chronic stress negatively influence information-processing capacity as they reduce an
14
15 individual's breadth of attention (see, e.g., Ellis, 2006). Consequently, stressed individuals
16
17 may be less able to increase their knowledge and to apply higher-ordered structural alignment
18
19 skills. This, in turn, may hinder the recognition of opportunities in general.
20
21

22 Notably, stress research shows that high stress enhances the performance of implicit
23
24 memory and well-rehearsed tasks. Sandi (2013) observed this effect for amygdala-dependent
25
26 conditioning tasks and for striatum-related processes. The implicit memory helps perform
27
28 tasks without conscious awareness. Therefore, stressed individuals may be better able to
29
30 perceive relationships between seemingly independent events and trends and to uncover
31
32 emergent patterns in these relations (Baron & Ensley, 2006). Thereby, they make better use of
33
34 their pattern recognition skills, which depend on experience. Thus, there seem to be positive
35
36 as well as negative effects of stress on brain functioning.
37
38

39 It is important to note that several approaches such as activation theory (Gardner,
40
41 1990) and the Yerkes Dodson law (Yerkes & Dodson, 1908) suggest an inverted U-shaped
42
43 function between stress intensity and cognitive functioning. An inverted U-shaped function is
44
45 well established in creativity research. For instance, meta-analytic results reveal that stress
46
47 can enhance creative and imaginative action only if the associated activation is at a moderate
48
49 level (Byron, Khazanchi, & Nazarian, 2010). This is because moderate activation is related to
50
51 effective use of short-term memory, sustained information transfer within memory, and
52
53 maximum use of rehearsal and storage of task-relevant information (Humphreys & Revelle,
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 1984). Studying the effects of cognitive processes such as alertness and pattern recognition in
4
5 conjunction with stress will likely reveal new theoretical insights into opportunity recognition
6
7 processes.

8
9 Given the assumed linkages between stress and the entrepreneurial process, we further
10
11 suggest that opportunity recognition should also affect stress. In this regard, it is useful to
12
13 draw on the differentiation between third-person opportunity and first-person opportunity
14
15 (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). In the first case, the individual believes that the opportunity
16
17 he or she recognizes exists for someone (i.e., third-person opportunity), but not for
18
19 everyone—only for those with the right qualities. Stress should not affect such an abstract—
20
21 because it is not first-person centered—belief. According to the transactional model of stress
22
23 (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), stress results from the individual’s appraisal of the stressor
24
25 (primary appraisal: “whether there is something at stake”) and from the social and cultural
26
27 resources at his or her disposal (secondary appraisal: “what can be done about it”). If the
28
29 individual believes that there is an opportunity for someone, then there is nothing at stake. “In
30
31 essence, believing that a third-person opportunity exists does not necessarily mean that one
32
33 believes one possesses the right combination of knowledge and motivation to exploit it”
34
35 (Tang, Kacmar, & Busenitz, 2012, p. 80). Thus, stress reactions are rather unlikely. With
36
37 regard to the second case, recognizing a third-person opportunity can activate an evaluation
38
39 process where the entrepreneur has to decide whether the opportunity is a first-person
40
41 opportunity (Tang et al., 2012), that is, an opportunity for him or her. Depending on the
42
43 individual’s motivation, this evaluation process leads to stress. For example, prior research
44
45 has differentiated between opportunity-driven entrepreneurs who are motivated by the desire
46
47 to pursue an interesting opportunity, and necessity-driven entrepreneurs for whom
48
49 entrepreneurship is often the best, but not necessarily the preferred, occupation (Bosma &
50
51 Levie, 2009). For the latter, the recognized opportunity needs to constitute a first-person
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 opportunity, or an engagement in entrepreneurial action critical to secure income will not be
4 possible. However, as necessity entrepreneurs typically have few resources, recognizing the
5 opportunity as a first-person opportunity can be expected to result in stress (Edwards, 1992).
6
7

8
9 We believe that there are many opportunities in studying stress in relation to
10 opportunity recognition. For example, Shane (2000) argued that opportunity recognition
11 depends on knowledge and that one can systematically search for opportunities (Fiet,
12 Piskounov, & Patel, 2005). Thus, opportunity recognition depends on explicit memory and
13 conscientious processing. This means that stress intensity and information load cannot be too
14 high. For example, opportunities that require well-established knowledge structures, such as
15 high technology products, might be negatively related to stress processes. Other scholars
16 argue that people recognize opportunities based on heuristics and mental schemes because the
17 uncertainty is associated with unpredictable changes in the environment (Baron, 2003), and
18 thus rely on implicit memory. This also might explain why Kirzner (1997) argues that
19 entrepreneurs often recognize opportunities in a “eureka” experience. This approach would
20 suggest that stress is particularly important to recognize narrower opportunity sets. Stress
21 promotes the use of cognitive strategies that imply a more narrow attentional focus.
22
23 Therefore, entrepreneurs might rely on cognitive frameworks that serve as focused guides and
24 templates. It might be interesting to see whether stress intensity associated with uncertainty
25 explains the variance in these two different modes of opportunity recognition.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 ***The exploitation of opportunities.*** Recognition of an opportunity is a necessary but not
47 sufficient condition for entrepreneurship. Once an opportunity has been recognized as such,
48 one has to decide whether to exploit the opportunity. The exploitation of opportunities follows
49 a volitional decision to translate entrepreneurial intention into action (Van Gelderen,
50 Kautonen, & Fink, 2015). Opportunity exploitation is associated with uncertainty.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Specifically, this is the inability to predict the impact of a future state of the environment on
4 the new organization. According to Milliken (1987), this is effect uncertainty. For example,
5 people who start a business venture face the liability of newness involving low legitimacy,
6 limited resources, restricted control, and a lack of constructive feedback (Aldrich & Fiol,
7 1994). Since such liabilities are due to market characteristics, they are, in part, beyond the
8 control of the individual entrepreneur, and thus cause uncertainty and stress. Therefore, it is
9 important to understand the processes that enable entrepreneurs to reduce the uncertainty
10 associated with opportunity exploitation to an extent that allows them to proceed with the
11 entrepreneurial process.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Given this situation, most classical stressor–strain–outcome models predict that
23 entrepreneurs who start exploiting opportunities face high uncertainty. Accordingly, they
24 experience high stress and, thus, display high stress reactions such as psychosomatic
25 complaints, exhaustion, and ill health (Koeske & Koeske, 1993). This positive relationship
26 between stressors and stress reactions is well validated in organizational behavior and is true
27 for both challenge and hindrance stressors (Lepine, Podsakoff, & Lepine, 2005). However,
28 when we quantify the empirical studies included in this exposition¹, we find little evidence
29 supporting the proposition that stress processes affect entrepreneurs. For example, studies
30 examining whether entrepreneurs face more stressors than non-entrepreneurs exhibit a
31 weighted correlation of $r = -.011^2$ (ns., $k = 7$ studies). Moreover, entrepreneurs seem to show
32 less stress reactions than non-entrepreneurs do (weighted $r = -.053$, $p < .05$, $k = 13$).
33
34 Therefore, it is necessary to investigate why well-established relationships in organizational
35 behavior do not apply in the entrepreneurial process. From an entrepreneurship perspective,
36 entrepreneurs exploiting opportunities take actions that help to reduce the uncertainty
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 ¹ The studies included in these analyses are marked with an asterisk in the reference section.

57 ² We translated the mean difference into the r statistic here.
58
59
60

1
2
3 associated with opportunity exploitation. Several frameworks explain how entrepreneurs
4
5 accomplish this.

6
7 First, the attraction-selection-attrition (ASA) framework (Schneider, Goldstein, &
8
9 Smith, 1995) can explain why entrepreneurs experience less stress when exploiting
10
11 opportunities. ASA theory predicts that some people are attracted to entrepreneurship because
12
13 they feel that that their personal skills, characteristics, and motives are in alignment with the
14
15 tasks associated with entrepreneurship. Moreover, those who actually find that they are suited
16
17 to entrepreneurship will choose to enter this area. Finally, those who discover that their skills,
18
19 characteristics, or interests do not align closely with the requirements of entrepreneurship
20
21 withdraw from it, either voluntarily or otherwise. As a result, those who exploit opportunities
22
23 are less vulnerable to stress reactions (Baron et al., 2016). Two mechanisms explain this
24
25 outcome. First, knowledge and information are core characteristics that enable people to
26
27 become entrepreneurs (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006) as they allow the development of better
28
29 predictions, and, therefore, reduce both uncertainty and stress. Thus, people who process more
30
31 knowledge and information are more likely to be attracted to and select into entrepreneurship.
32
33 Second, psychological capital is defined as a positive stage of an individual consisting of self-
34
35 efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). It has
36
37 been related to a number of outcome variables in organizational behavior research, one of
38
39 which is reduced stress (Avey, Reichard, Luthans, & Mhatre, 2011). Therefore, psychological
40
41 capital provides an effective buffer against high levels of stressors experienced in opportunity
42
43 exploitation. One study reports that psychological capital is negatively related to
44
45 entrepreneurs' levels of perceived stress (Baron et al., 2016). Such individual-level
46
47 characteristics are likely more important at the beginning of the entrepreneurial process than
48
49 during the later stages (Przepiorka, 2016).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A second approach would suggest applying a contingency framework to stress and
4 opportunity exploitation. For example, the job-demand-control model (Karasek, 1990)
5 assumes that stress reactions stem from the interaction between job demands and control over
6 those demands. Job demands refer to the work intensity a person experiences, which typically
7 manifests in issues such as workload, time pressure, and conflicting demands. Overwhelming
8 demands are likely to lead to a negative appraisal as, for example, conflicts between old and
9 new roles emerge (Wincent & Ortqvist, 2009) and the venture lacks established routines and
10 procedures. Thus, it is evident that opportunity exploitation is associated with high demands.
11 However, many entrepreneurs find such situational demands attractive and motivating rather
12 than threatening (Cardon, Foo, Shepherd, & Wiklund, 2012). High control allows perceiving
13 such demands as positive challenges. Control refers to decision latitude. Entrepreneurs have
14 high control because they decide to exploit a business opportunity. Thus, the model asserts
15 that there will be interactive effects of demands and control on stress reactions. Specifically,
16 the combination of high demands (both physical and psychosocial) and high control is typical
17 in opportunity exploitation and does not result in stress reactions. This argument is
18 empirically supported by Stephan and Roesler (2010).
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Stress processes can also affect the decision to exploit a business opportunity.
38 Notably, there is a stream of research showing that some people choose entrepreneurial roles
39 because they are not compatible with the requirements of an established organization. For
40 example, entrepreneurship might be attractive for people with attention deficit hyperactivity
41 disorder (ADHD), because entrepreneurship provides tasks that are characterized by fast
42 decision making and high task variability (Wiklund, Patzelt, & Dimov, 2016). ADHD, in turn,
43 is associated with high stress (Drake, Riccio, & Hale, 2017; Salla, Galéra, Guichard, Tzourio,
44 & Michel, 2017). Therefore, stress processes might be associated with the decision to exploit
45 opportunities. In a similar manner, sleep deprivation prompts behavioral tendencies such as
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 impulsivity, which can increase an individual's desire to start an entrepreneurial venture
4
5 (Gunia, 2018). Other mental health issues related to chronic stress might stimulate
6
7 entrepreneurial motives as well. One study, for example, indicated that entrepreneurs report
8
9 more mental health concerns than a comparison group. Specifically, they report more
10
11 depression, ADHD, substance abuse, and bipolar diagnosis (Freeman, Johnson, Staudenmaier,
12
13 & Zisser, 2015). Thus, the causal path may not only work from opportunity exploitation to
14
15 stress but also the other way around: Stress may be related to the decision to exploit an
16
17 opportunity and to start a business venture. To our knowledge, this issue remains unexplored
18
19 in previous stress research relating to entrepreneurship.
20
21

22 In summary, it seems that opportunity exploitation is not related to higher stress
23
24 reactions in entrepreneurs. Thus, there might be profound differences between entrepreneurs
25
26 and employees. While entrepreneurs do not develop severe stress reactions, research on
27
28 employees consistently indicates that job stress causes stress reactions. More research,
29
30 however, is required to explore whether stress affects opportunity exploitation.
31
32
33
34

35 ***The associated outcomes.*** Once the enterprise is established, the situation is quite different
36
37 from that in which one decides to become an entrepreneur. Therefore, we now explore
38
39 whether stress processes and uncertainty are related to positive or negative outcomes of the
40
41 entrepreneurial process. Potential outcomes are failure, closure, and survival (Headd, 2003),
42
43 with the latter not always suggesting that firms are successful. As a matter of fact, only a
44
45 small proportion of firms is successful in the sense that they grow substantially (Henrekson &
46
47 Johansson, 2010). Moreover, some firms persist in the market even though they are relatively
48
49 unsuccessful (Gimeno, Folta, Cooper, & Woo, 1997). Thus, once the firm is established, there
50
51 is uncertainty, and entrepreneurs' attempts to reduce this uncertainty can result in various
52
53 outcomes. Looking at outcomes involves response uncertainty (Milliken, 1987). Response
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 uncertainty describes the inability to predict the likely consequences of a response choice after
4 starting a business venture. Such uncertainty may lead to stress, which may have both positive
5 and negative effects on outcomes. Moreover, outcomes might affect stress reactions.
6
7

8
9 With regard to the link between stress and outcomes, it is important to understand that
10 not all theoretical approaches to stress predict a negative relationship between stressors, stress
11 reactions, and outcomes. Some researchers have suggested an inverted U-shaped relationship
12 between stress and performance, assuming that a moderate level of stress is most beneficial to
13 performance. However, this hypothesis has not received strong support in the stress literature
14 (Fay & Sonnentag, 2002). Moreover, there are theories proposing that stress processes can
15 have positive outcomes. Control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982; Edwards, 1992), for
16 instance, predicts that stress results from discrepancies between current and desired states.
17 Such a discrepancy leads to negative emotions and reduced well-being, and thus, to stress
18 reactions. However, entrepreneurs aim to resolve such discrepancies by activating coping
19 strategies. As a result, stress leads to better decisions and improved performance. Thus,
20 according to control theory, stress has positive long-term consequences for the performance,
21 even if stress may have caused poor performance initially. Accordingly, one study indicates
22 that stress reduces the likelihood of firm failure after 12 years (Rauch, Unger, & Rosenbusch,
23 2007). Thus, negative emotions are sometimes required to carry out entrepreneurial tasks
24 (Hatak & Snellman, 2017; Shepherd & Patzelt, 2017).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The environmental context provides opportunities and sets boundaries for
45 entrepreneurial activities (Welter, 2011). High environmental state uncertainty is unfavorable
46 and challenging. Thus, it should increase stress reactions and negative effects on firm
47 outcomes. However, empirical evidence shows that environmental uncertainty (high
48 dynamism, high complexity, and low munificence) (Dess & Beard, 1984) tends to have
49 positive effects on firm performance (Shane & Kolvereid, 1995; Sharfman & Dean, 1991;
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Swaminathan, 1996). While these approaches typically explain these effects by referring to
4 selection processes, we also know from stress inoculation research that reinterpreting stressors
5 as challenges helps people deal with stressors. Thus, having mastered challenges in the past
6 leads to higher competence to deal with stressors in the future (Meichenbaum &
7 Deffenbacher, 1988). It might be interesting for future research to clarify whether selection
8 processes or stress inoculation processes are better suited for explaining the positive effects of
9 environmental uncertainty on firm performance.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 However, rather than stressing the positive effects of stress, most approaches in
19 organizational behavior predict that stress and uncertainty have negative effects on outcomes.
20 For example, stress reactions are characterized by insensitivity, indifference, and cynicism
21 toward employees and other stakeholders (Maslach, 1982) who, in turn, reduce their
22 commitment to and support for the entrepreneur and the firm, making a decline in firm
23 performance likely. Moreover, prolonged stress reactions reduce entrepreneurs' capacity for
24 the self-regulation necessary for task execution and goal attainment. Inefficient behavior and
25 task execution reduce performance. Finally, uncertainty and associated stress reduce the
26 ability to take action (McKelvie et al., 2011). However, active behavior is a necessary
27 condition for firm performance. Several meta-analyses of organizational behavior reported a
28 negative relationship between stress and performance (Abramis, 1994; Jackson & Schuler,
29 1985; Swider & Zimmerman, 2010).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 In theoretical terms, the classical stressor-strain-outcome models follow the above
45 reasoning and predict that strain is harmful to performance, because it can, for example, limit
46 a person's regulation capacity and the ability to influence the environment and process
47 information (Koeske & Koeske, 1993; Lepine et al., 2005). The results in the empirical
48 entrepreneurship literature are not that straightforward. Specifically, when quantifying the
49 results of those studies in this paper, the relationship between stress and performance is found
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to be insignificant ($r = -.029$, ns., $k = 10$). Thus, the negative relationship between stress and
4
5 performance reported in organizational behavior is not replicated in entrepreneurship
6
7 research. This indicates that there might be a third variable affecting this relationship.
8

9
10 Contingency theories are prominent in the stress literature (Frese, 1985) and have been
11
12 applied to the entrepreneurship domain as well. Specifically, person-environment-fit
13
14 approaches (Caplan, 1987) assume that the individual's ability must match the demands
15
16 associated with the job. Moreover, the individual's needs must match with what the
17
18 environment supplies. No match will create a higher level of psychological strain and a lower
19
20 level of performance if the stimuli to which the individuals respond (e.g., workload or work
21
22 complexity) are important to them. For example, demand-ability-fit implies that the
23
24 entrepreneur possesses the information and knowledge required and, thus, is able to reduce
25
26 the uncertainty and stress associated with the exploitation of a given opportunity. A need-
27
28 supply-misfit may occur if the need to achieve becomes a cause of stress when entrepreneurs
29
30 aim to achieve too much (Boyd & Gumpert, 1983) given the resources they possess. For
31
32 entrepreneurship research, this theoretical approach is attractive since it also takes into
33
34 account the individual motives and capabilities—both of which are core concepts in
35
36 opportunity recognition, exploitation, and associated outcomes.
37
38

39
40 Finally, associated outcomes can cause severe stress reactions among entrepreneurs.
41
42 This is specifically true when they cannot reduce the uncertainty as intended. As indicated in
43
44 the failure literature, these reactions can be quite severe. They include social costs and
45
46 psychological costs, ranging from devaluation, stigma, shame, and grief to severe stress
47
48 reactions, including physiological symptoms and depression (Ucbasaran, Shepherd, Lockett,
49
50 & Lyon, 2013). Shepherd and Wolfe (2015) use the concept of anticipated grief to
51
52 characterize the negative emotions (e.g., anxiety, panic attacks, and depression) associated
53
54 with firm failure, all of which are associated with stress reactions. Conservation of resources
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (COR) theory (Hobfoll, 1989) is a useful approach to explain these negative outcomes. COR
4 is an economic theory explaining the development of strain. The theory assumes that
5 individuals aim to obtain, retain, protect, and build (personal and external) resources, with
6 resources being anything of value to them. Thus, increasing resources is a basic human need.
7 Individuals invest in new resources to achieve resource gains and avoid the loss of resources.
8 The theory connects a potential loss of resources with a negative spiral of further losses that
9 trigger a cycle of stress reactions. According to COR, entrepreneurs with increasing resources
10 are better off than entrepreneurs with decreasing resources are, as the latter are vulnerable to
11 becoming trapped in loss spirals. Furthermore, the theory describes the causes of stress
12 reactions in economic terms. Testing the theory with independent farmers indicates that
13 financial problems cause stress reactions that in turn lead to further financial problems one
14 year later (Gorgievski-Duijvesteijn, Giessen, & Bakker, 2000). Therefore, in contrast to
15 stressor-strain-outcome frameworks, the theory predicts a reverse negative path from
16 performance to stress reactions. Notably, there is also literature, which suggests that failure is
17 required for learning and helps entrepreneurs to pay attention to a focal task and act on it.
18 Thus, managing failures successfully might lead to positive outcomes in the long term
19 (Shepherd & Patzelt, 2017). This literature is not well established and it might be interesting
20 to focus research efforts on further investigating how much failure is tolerable for
21 entrepreneurs to create such positive outcomes.

22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 In summary, there are high demands associated with the outcomes of opportunity
45 exploitation caused by high response uncertainty, resource loss, and the investment of high
46 energy. However, these demands do not necessarily lead to negative outcomes, as there are
47 benefits, such as being able to bear this uncertainty and having high decision latitude
48 associated with entrepreneurship, which may outweigh the negative effects of high demands.
49 Moreover, there are contingency variables that affect the stress-outcome relationship. The
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 picture is possibly more consistent when one looks at the effects of being unsuccessful, which
4
5 might imply negative effects on stress processes. Even here, however, there is some evidence
6
7 indicating that previous failure leads to positive effects.
8
9

10 11 **BUILDING A MORPHOLOGICAL BOX TO LINK THE STRESS PROCESS WITH** 12 13 **THE ENTREPRENEURIAL PROCESS** 14

15
16 Table 1 presents the three stages of the entrepreneurial process (see column 1) and the
17
18 phases of the stress processes (see row 1). In the cells of the emerging matrix, we summarize
19
20 (in normal type) key linkages between the entrepreneurship process and the stress processes
21
22 (see row 2/column 2 to row 12/column 5). Our aim here is to present examples of such core
23
24 linkages rather than provide an exhaustive list. In addition, we present the reverse mechanism
25
26 describing how stress processes affect opportunity recognition, exploitation, and associated
27
28 outcomes (column 6). For each of the three phases of the entrepreneurship process, we further
29
30 list stress theories that may provide common ground for systematic future research on stress
31
32 in entrepreneurship (column 7). While all linkages have their roots in the concept of
33
34 uncertainty that is inherent in both the entrepreneurship and stress processes, the underlying
35
36 stress theories each emphasize specific aspects of an entrepreneur's activity and are especially
37
38 useful for specific phases of the entrepreneurship process. Accordingly, we do not understand
39
40 the eight theoretical perspectives on stress as alternatives, but rather as elements in a toolkit
41
42 with a sound theoretical foundation that support the coherent future development of empirical
43
44 research in the field.
45
46
47
48

49
50

Table 1 here

51
52
53 The areas of the table that are in italics can be interpreted as a morphological box
54
55 (Zwicky, 1969). This is a method originally developed in innovation management facilitating
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the development of a new field of research. By eliminating all combinations that receive no
4 theoretical support from the grid box, this approach helps to reduce the complexity of
5 exploring the interplay of variables potentially relevant to explain a specific phenomenon.
6
7 Employing the morphological box can substantially foster and guide the development of
8
9 research at the intersection of the entrepreneurial process and stress processes as a new area of
10
11
12
13
14 research.

15
16 Generally, to fully understand a phenomenon, all configurations of relevant variables
17
18 that can be underpinned by theory have to be tested empirically (Chin, 1988). Researchers
19
20 wishing to develop a coherent body of knowledge at the intersection of the entrepreneurial
21
22 and stress processes must first test if the theoretically linked variables in stress process theory
23
24 empirically relate in the manner theoretically postulated in the different phases of the
25
26 entrepreneurial process. However, depending on the selected stress theory underpinning the
27
28 research, each link can take a different role in a conceptual model.
29

30
31 With the morphological box approach, we can reduce the high number of
32
33 configurations to those that the eight stress theories underpin. This is because the eight stress
34
35 process theories model each link in a specific way (i.e., not all linkages can theoretically be
36
37 modeled as situational demands, appraisal, response, behavioral outcome, or reverse
38
39 mechanism), and they can take only one of those roles in each model. Accordingly, in the
40
41 morphological box for stress research in entrepreneurship, we find six possibilities of how to
42
43 theoretically model stress processes in the entrepreneurial process. The morphological box
44
45 provides guidance for coherent future research on stress in entrepreneurship.
46
47
48

49 **DISCUSSION**

50
51 Stress associated with work affects one in four adults, and current trends suggest that
52
53 the number of adults suffering from stress-related conditions caused or made worse by work
54
55 is increasing (EU-OSHA, 2014). Even though stress is evident in entrepreneurship as well,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 entrepreneurs often manage the demands associated with the entrepreneurial process
4
5 successfully. These observations imply that the stress theories that originate in organizational
6
7 behavior cannot simply be transferred to the entrepreneurship context. Key to our model for
8
9 understanding stress is the concept of uncertainty, which provides a linkage between stress
10
11 processes and the entrepreneurial process consisting of opportunity recognition, opportunity
12
13 exploitation, and associated outcomes.

14
15 Resulting from uncertainty associated with opportunity recognition, stress can impair
16
17 cognitive processes such as information processing which negatively affects explicit memory
18
19 but may have positive effects on entrepreneurs' implicit memory. Consequently, we propose
20
21 that opportunity recognition may result from unconscious awareness associated with
22
23 experiences rather than from a conscious and intentional analysis of the environment. Further,
24
25 we postulate that stress resulting from uncertainty can actually motivate people to start a
26
27 business. This is because stress has been associated with mental health conditions, which, in
28
29 turn, relate to start-up action. With regard to the uncertainty associated with opportunity
30
31 exploitation, while entrepreneurs face high demands, the empirical evidence suggests that
32
33 entrepreneurs have less stress reactions than non-entrepreneurs do. This might be because
34
35 people who possess knowledge and psychological capital are attracted to entrepreneurship.
36
37 Finally, with regard to outcomes of the entrepreneurial process, it seems that stress resulting
38
39 from uncertainty can lead to both positive and negative outcomes. Especially in the long run,
40
41 entrepreneurs are likely to develop strategies to cope with stress, which has positive
42
43 implications for performance, even if stress may have led to poor performance initially.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Theoretical and Practical Contribution**

51
52 Out theorizing suggests important implications for the field of entrepreneurship. First,
53
54 by connecting the entrepreneurial process with the stress process via the concept of
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 uncertainty, we developed an individual level approach to entrepreneurship. The importance
4
5 of the concept of uncertainty has been acknowledged in the decision-making context and in
6
7 the context of actions reducing uncertainty. This theorizing focused on outcomes on the level
8
9 of the firm. Other approaches discussed uncertainty with regard to markets and economies.
10
11 Our approach highlights that uncertainty has positive and negative consequences for the
12
13 individual entrepreneur and shows that uncertainty at the level of the individual entrepreneurs
14
15 is ultimately associated with stress. Failing to account for underlying stress processes
16
17 associated with uncertainty may lead to misspecified theories and spurious relationships.
18
19

20 Second, our approach suggests reciprocal relationships between stress processes and
21
22 the entrepreneurial process. Most entrepreneurship theorizing has argued for one dominant
23
24 causal path, specifically, that uncertainty affects individuals' decisions, actions, and outcomes
25
26 (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006). In contrast, the stress literature in entrepreneurship has
27
28 emphasized the other causal path from the entrepreneurial process to stress, for example, in
29
30 studies looking at whether or not entrepreneurs experience more stress reactions than non-
31
32 entrepreneurs do. Our review concludes, however, that the causal path works in both ways:
33
34 Stress and uncertainty affect the entrepreneurial process, and the entrepreneurial process
35
36 affects uncertainty and stress. The concept of uncertainty allows connecting both causal paths
37
38 in a dynamic way. For example, stress might be a consequence of entrepreneurial action but it
39
40 might also lead to recognizing opportunities and for the decision to exploit an opportunity
41
42 (compare above). Thus, we argue that entrepreneurship may provide opportunities for people
43
44 who otherwise would have difficulties working in an established organization. In addition,
45
46 there is some indication that stigmatization resulting from failure can, in some contexts,
47
48 stimulate entrepreneurial behavior (Simmons, Wiklund, & Levie, 2014). Finally, we argue
49
50 that stress can have positive outcomes in the long term. Thus, we think that there are ample
51
52 opportunities to look at how stress can facilitate entrepreneurship and vice versa. Moreover,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the entrepreneurial process is dynamic and involves feedback loops (Frese, van Gelderen, &
4 Ombach, 2000). For example, depending on the outcome of the evaluation of an opportunity,
5 entrepreneurs either exploit this opportunity and start reducing uncertainty or continue
6
7 searching for opportunities (Ropo & Hunt, 1995).
8
9

10
11 Moreover, in the later stages of the entrepreneurial process, unsuccessful exploitation
12 encourages entrepreneurs to adjust or abandon the serving business model. Thus, the
13 outcomes of stress reactions affect the entrepreneurial process. The feedback changes the
14 values for the next iteration in the stress process. Accordingly, the stress process becomes
15 circular and self-reinforcing (Selye, 1957). That situation arises if stress reactions lead to
16 reduced performance, which implies a resource loss that in turn triggers further stress
17 reactions. Such feedback loops are in line, for example, with the COR approach, control
18 theory, and the transactional model of stress, and have been identified in organizational
19 behavior (Fay & Sonnentag, 2002) as well as in the entrepreneurship domain (Gorgievski-
20 Duijvesteijn et al., 2000). Thus, when researching the linkages between the entrepreneurial
21 process and stress processes, a dynamic perspective is imperative.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Additionally, the challenging stimuli that entrepreneurs perceive over the course of the
36 entrepreneurship process change substantially, implying that the stress processes and their
37 effects differ across different stages of the entrepreneurship process. However, most previous
38 studies report snapshots from different phases of the entrepreneurial process. For example,
39 while the study by Rauch (2014) focuses on relatively new enterprises in the firm formation
40 phase, other studies do not focus on any specific phase of the entrepreneurial process (e.g.,
41 Jamal, 1997).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 A third contribution refers to contingencies affecting both the stress process and the
51 entrepreneurial process. Stress-related contingencies might be one reason why effect sizes
52 reported in meta-analyses conducted in the domain of entrepreneurship are heterogeneous
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and, thus, not generalizable (Frese, Bausch, Schmidt, Rauch, & Kabst, 2012). These effect
4
5 sizes can be attributed to the fact that firm performance and competitive advantage are
6
7 unstable and affected by causal and complex issues surrounding performance (March &
8
9 Sutton, 1997). In addition, the majority of contingency studies in entrepreneurship research
10
11 focus on the external environment in which the entrepreneur's firm is embedded
12
13 (environmental uncertainty). However, the current research indicates that scholars questioning
14
15 how stress processes influence the entrepreneurship process should also consider individual-
16
17 level contingencies such as perceptions of low control as a core variable of the job-demand-
18
19 control model. Such, contingency variables help to disentangle the discussion of whether
20
21 entrepreneurs suffer from more severe stress reactions than other groups in the working
22
23 population.
24
25

26
27 Finally, the results of this review may also have practical implications for a broader
28
29 context. For example, Hajkovicz (2015) discusses seven patterns of global change that
30
31 provide powerful trajectories of change that have the potential to throw companies,
32
33 individuals, and societies into freefall. These megatrends include, for example, technological
34
35 changes, demographic changes, the way people and companies interact in a globalized world,
36
37 and the difficulties of ensuring resource security. Such trends may very well create
38
39 uncertainty and stress, thereby creating challenges for individuals, organizations, and
40
41 societies. Our review provides some suggestions as to how to address these challenges at the
42
43 individual level. For example, individuals must be encouraged to perceive such challenges as
44
45 opportunities that one may take advantage of. Our review reveals that knowledge, learning,
46
47 and information, as well as motivation and habituation, the latter being also related to
48
49 psychological capital, are critical factors dealing with uncertainty and stress. Such factors
50
51 might be enhanced, for example, by reassessing educational priorities or incorporating change
52
53 into educational curricula. In turn, we need a research agenda examining what helps
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 individuals to set off into venturing, entrepreneurship, and intrapreneurship. Entrepreneurs are
4 agents of change and, as our review indicates, they are able to reduce uncertainties in
5 opportunity recognition, opportunity exploitation, and outcomes. We must examine critically
6 whether the nature of entrepreneurship can transfer to other non-business contexts, thus
7 enabling societies to deal with the megatrends described by Hajkovicz (2015).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Future Research**

16
17 The review highlights further areas for future investigation. First, there are blind spots
18 that, to our knowledge, prior research has not addressed. For example, prior research has
19 studied stress of established entrepreneurs and the relationships between stress and outcomes.
20 However, research on the relationship between opportunity recognition and stress is missing.
21 Such research would be relevant to the field because stress and uncertainty are likely to affect
22 cognition and, thereby, the type of opportunity recognized. In turn, opportunity recognition
23 will affect uncertainty and stress. In addition, an area that needs more attention is the
24 relationship between stress and opportunity exploitation. There is an emerging stream of
25 research looking into mental health conditions and opportunity exploitation (Wiklund, Hatak,
26 Patzelt, & Shepherd, 2018). Stress, if not correctly managed, can be a trigger for many mental
27 health problems such as burnout, depression, and other delayed stress reactions. Therefore, it
28 may be useful to examine stress among entrepreneurs. Moreover, entrepreneurship could
29 function both as a way to manage stress in order to avoid such chronic reactions, and as a way
30 to reduce stigmatization associated with chronic stress reactions and impaired mental health.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Second, the majority of studies on the stress processes of entrepreneurs examine
49 isolated aspects of the stress process. For example, they look at whether entrepreneurs face
50 more stress or whether they display more stress reactions. In a similar manner, many stress
51 theories can only map parts of the entrepreneurial process (compare morphological box).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 However, we think that it is important to link the two processes to each other in order to
4
5 provide a more consistent picture. As such, research results strongly depend on the point in
6
7 the entrepreneurship process at which researchers collect the data. Failing to account for such
8
9 process-related changes in the independent and dependent variables might explain conflicting
10
11 results among earlier entrepreneurship studies. There are two options to tackle this problem.
12
13 First, researchers should avoid broadband samples such as comparing any self-employed
14
15 person with other occupations. While there is a long-standing discussion in entrepreneurship
16
17 research about the definition of the entrepreneur (Gartner, 1985), our review reinforces calls
18
19 for researchers to care more about their samples as stress processes have different meanings at
20
21 different stages in the entrepreneurial process. A second option to address the process is to
22
23 collect longitudinal data. Researchers should measure the relevant factors discussed above
24
25 several times in order to obtain a fine-grained picture of how the stress processes unfold in the
26
27 course of the entrepreneurial process. Capturing a clearer picture of entrepreneurs and their
28
29 embeddedness in the ever-changing context throughout the entrepreneurship process and the
30
31 stress processes would also likely reduce the (unobserved) heterogeneity in the samples and
32
33 have a positive effect on the robustness, generalizability, and comparability of the findings.
34
35 Up-and-coming data collection strategies such as smartphone apps or gamification might help
36
37 to meet this challenge and still collect a sufficient number of observations. The use of
38
39 technology devices capturing entrepreneurs' heart rates and galvanic skin responses in
40
41 conjunction with experience sampling methods has the potential to yield relevant findings.
42
43
44

45
46 In short, our morphological box provides a toolkit for researchers and suggests that
47
48 future research should focus on aligning stress processes and the entrepreneurial process more
49
50 closely. Moreover, we suggest several relevant theories with regard to the specific research
51
52 aims.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Conclusion

In order to drive innovation, change, and economic growth, societies and economies rely on entrepreneurs who can successfully develop and run ventures (Block, Fisch, & van Praag, 2017). By venturing into the unknown, entrepreneurs experience high uncertainty (Knight, 1921). At the same time, high uncertainty is a core antecedent of stress. Thus, entrepreneurship affects stress processes. Stress, in turn, affects entrepreneurship, as it influences the recognition and exploitation of business opportunities as well as the outcomes of the entrepreneurial process such as performance and growth. By identifying uncertainty as the nexus between the entrepreneurial process and the underlying stress processes, our exposition provides the basis for a more complete and specific understanding and modeling of the role of stress in entrepreneurship. Our morphological box provides researchers a valuable toolkit to aid future progress in knowledge accumulation at the intersection of entrepreneurship and stress.

TABLE 1
Morphological Box: Linkages Between Entrepreneurship Process and Stress Processes

| STRESS PROCESSES → | | | | | | <i>Stress theories linking the entrepreneurship and stress processes</i> |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Situational demands | Appraisal | Response | Behavioral outcomes | Reverse mechanism | |
| ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROCESS | Opportunity recognition | High demands Mainly state uncertainty | Mental structures Knowledge Information | Impaired explicit memory, creativity Improved implicit memory sets Reduced information processing | Reduced/increased ability to recognize large/narrow opportunities | Translating third-person opportunity into first-person opportunity |
| | | <i>Entropy as stressor</i> | <i>Assessment of noise in the communication channel</i> | <i>Learning, habituation, attention</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Successful past communication is information for next communication</i> |
| | | <i>Source of stressor</i> | <i>Source of activation</i> | <i>Memory, information transfer, mental structures</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Performance impacts on activation level</i> |
| | Opportunity exploitation | Demands Mainly effect and response uncertainty Lack of experiences/routines Resource constraints Liabilities | Attraction based on: Motivation, knowledge, psychological capital, control | Selection Learning | Venture creation and attrition (exit) | Increased stress associated with mental health, ADHD, and sleep deprivation might affect exploitation |
| | | <i>Source of demands</i> | <i>Source of control</i> | <i>Strain in case resources do not meet the demands</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Past performance impacts future levels of demands and control</i> |
| | | <i>Source of attraction</i> | <i>Selection: Whether or not to size an opportunity</i> | <i>Reduced levels of stress</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Selection leads to exit or upward spiral</i> |
| | Associated outcomes | Mainly response uncertainty, Resource loss Failure vs. survival Discrepancies between current and anticipated outcomes Person environment fit | Coping, Selection Self-regulation | Inoculation Reduced action Decisions/ Ability to adjust | Success Failure Survival | Failure and resource loss causes negative emotions, grief and loss spirals |
| | <i>Source of stressor</i> | - | <i>Strain</i> | <i>Performance</i> | - | |

Stressor-strain-outcome models

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|---|------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | <i>Jackson & Schuler, 1985</i> |
| <i>Source of discrepancy</i> | <i>Source of coping strategy</i> | <i>Strain</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Past performance impacts on current discrepancy</i> | <i>Control theory (Carver & Scheier, 1982)</i> | |
| <i>Source of stressor</i> | <i>Assessment of fit</i> | <i>Strain</i> | <i>Performance</i> | <i>Stressor (moderators of effects)</i> | <i>Contingency theories (Edwards, Caplan, & Harrison, 1998)</i> | |
| <i>Area of activation</i> | <i>Area of activation</i> | <i>Firm performance</i> | <i>Strain</i> | <i>Resource loss is stressor (downward spiral)</i> | <i>Conservations of Resources theory (Hobfoll, 1989)</i> | |

1
2
3 REFERENCES
4
5
6

- 7 Abramis, D. J. (1994). Work role ambiguity, job satisfaction, and job performance: Meta-analyses
8 and review. *Psychological Reports*, 75(3 suppl), 1411-1433. doi:10.2466/pr0.1994.75.3f.1411
9
10
11 Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation.
12
13 *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645-670. doi:10.2307/258740
14
15 Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in*
16
17 *Organizational Behavior*, 10, 123-167.
18
19 Avey, J. B., Reichard, R. J., Luthans, F., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). Meta-analysis of the impact of
20
21 positive psychological capital on employee attitudes, behaviors, and performance. *Human*
22
23 *Resource Development Quarterly*, 22(2), 127-152. doi:10.1002/hrdq.20070
24
25
26 Baron, J. A., & Ensley, M. D. (2006). Opportunity recognition as the detection of meaningful Patterns:
27
28 Evidence from comparisons of novice and experienced entrepreneurs. *Management Science*,
29
30 52(9), 1331-1344.
31
32
33 Baron, R. A. (2003). Cognitive foundations of opportunity recognition: Identifying the opportunity
34
35 prototypes of repeat entrepreneurs. Presented at: *Babson College-Kaufman Foundation*
36
37 *Research Conference*, Babson, 4-7 June.
38
39 * Baron, R. A., Franklin, R. J., & Hmieleski, K. M. (2016). Why entrepreneurs often experience low,
40
41 not high, levels of stress: The joint effects of selection and psychological capital. *Journal of*
42
43 *Management*, 42(3), 742-768. doi:10.1177/0149206313495411
44
45
46 Block, J. H., Fisch, C. O., & van Praag, M. (2017). The Schumpeterian entrepreneur: a review of the
47
48 empirical evidence on the antecedents, behaviour and consequences of innovative
49
50 entrepreneurship. *Industry and Innovation*, 24(1), 61-95.
51
52 doi:10.1080/13662716.2016.1216397
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bosma, N., & Levie, J. (2009). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2009 Executive Report*.
4
5 <http://www.gemconsortium.org/>.
6
7 Boyd, D. P., & Gumpert, D. E. (1983). Coping with entrepreneurial stress. *Harvard Business*
8
9 *Review*, 61(2), 44–64.
10
11 Byron, K., Khazanchi, S., & Nazarian, D. (2010). The relationship between stressors and creativity:
12
13 A meta-analysis examining competing theoretical models. *Journal of Applied Psychology*,
14
15 95(1), 201-212. doi:10.1037/a0017868
16
17 Caplan, R. D. (1987). Person-environment fit theory and organizations: Commensurate dimensions,
18
19 time perspectives, and mechanisms. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 31(3), 248-267.
20
21 doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(87\)90042-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(87)90042-X)
22
23
24 * Cardon, M. S., & Patel, P. C. 2015. Is stress worth it? stress-related health and wealth trade-offs for
25
26 entrepreneurs. *Applied Psychology*, 64(2), 379–420. doi:10.1111/apps.12021
27
28 Cardon, M. S., Foo, M.-D., Shepherd, D., & Wiklund, J. (2012). Exploring the heart: Entrepreneurial
29
30 emotion is a hot topic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(1), 1-10.
31
32 doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00501.x
33
34
35 Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for
36
37 personality - social, clinical, and health psychology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 92, 111-135.
38
39 Casson, M. (1982). *The entrepreneur: An economic theory*. Totowa and NJ: Barnes and Noble
40
41 Books.
42
43
44 Chin, W. W. (1988). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. In G. A.
45
46 Marcoulides (Ed.), *Modern methods in business research* (pp. 295–336). Hillsdale:
47
48 Earlbaum.
49
50 Dess, G. G., & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environments.
51
52 *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 29, 52-73.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 * Dijkhuizen, J., Gorgievski, M., van Veldhoven, M., & Schalk, R. (2016). Feeling successful as an
4 entrepreneur: A job demands-resources approach. *International Entrepreneurship and*
5 *Management Journal*, 12(2), 555–573.
6
7
8
9 Drake, M. B., Riccio, C. A., & Hale, N. S. (2017). Assessment of adult ADHD with college students.
10 *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 0(0), 1087054717698222. doi:10.1177/1087054717698222
11
12
13 Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of*
14 *Management*, 29(3), 333.
15
16
17 Edelman, L., & Yli-Renko, H. (2010). The impact of environment and entrepreneurial perceptions on
18 venture-creation efforts: Bridging the discovery and creation views of entrepreneurship.
19 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(5), 833-856. doi:10.1111/j.1540-
20 6520.2010.00395.x
21
22
23
24
25
26 * Eden, D. 1975. Organization membership vs self-employment: Another blow to the american
27 dream. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 79–94.
28
29
30
31 Edwards, J. R. (1992). A cybernetic theory of stress, coping, and well-being in organizations.
32 *Academy of Management Review*, 17, 238-274.
33
34
35 Edwards, J. R., Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1998). Person-environment fit theory: Conceptual
36 foundations, empirical evidence, and directions for future research. In C. L. Cooper (Ed.),
37 *Theories of organizational stress* (pp. 28–67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
38
39
40
41
42 Ellis, A. P. J. (2006). System Breakdown: The role of mental models and transactive memory in the
43 relationship between acute stress and team performance. *The Academy of Management*
44 *Journal*, 49(3), 576-589. doi:10.2307/20159782
45
46
47
48 EU-OSHA. (2014). *Calculating the cost of work-related stress and psychosocial risks*. European
49 Agency for Safety and Health at Work, Luxembourg. Available at:
50 [https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/literature_reviews/calculating-the-cost-of-work-](https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/literature_reviews/calculating-the-cost-of-work-related-stress-and-psychosocial-risks)
51 [related-stress-and-psychosocial-risks](https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/literature_reviews/calculating-the-cost-of-work-related-stress-and-psychosocial-risks).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Fay, D., & Sonnentag, S. (2002). Rethinking the effects of stressors: A longitudinal study on personal
4 initiative. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 7(3), 221-234.
5
6
7 Fiet, J., Piskounov, A., & Patel, P. (2005). Still searching (systematically) for entrepreneurial
8 discoveries. *Small Business Economics*, 25, 489-504.
9
10
11 Freeman, M. A., Johnson, S. L., Staudenmaier, S. J., & Zisser, M. R. (2015). *Are entrepreneurs*
12 *touched with fire?* Technical Report.
13
14
15 Frese, M. (1985). Stress at work and psychosomatic complaints: a causal interpretation. *Journal of*
16 *Applied Psychology*, 70(2), 314-328.
17
18
19
20 Frese, M., Bausch, A., Schmidt, P., Rauch, A., & Kabst, R. (2012). Evidence-based entrepreneurship
21 (EBE): A systematic approach to cumulative science. In D. Rousseu (Ed.), *The Oxford*
22 *handbook of evidence based management* (pp. 92-111). New York and NY: Oxford
23 University Press.
24
25
26
27
28
29 Frese, M., van Gelderen, M., & Ombach, M. (2000). How to plan as a small scale business owner:
30 Psychological process characteristics of action strategies and success. *Journal of Small*
31 *Business Management*, 38(2), 1-18.
32
33
34
35 Gaglio, C. M., & Katz, J. A. (2001). The psychological basis of opportunity identification:
36 Entrepreneurial alertness. *Small Business Economics*, 16(2), 95-111.
37
38
39
40 Gardner, D. G. (1990). Task complexity effects on non-task-related movements: A test of activation
41 theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45(2), 209-231.
42
43
44 doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(90\)90012-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(90)90012-X)
45
46
47 Gartner, W. B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture
48 creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 696-706.
49
50
51 Gartner, W. B., & Carter, N. M. (2003). Entrepreneurial behavior and firm organizing processes. In
52 Z. J. Acs & D. B. Audretsch (Eds.), *Handbook of entrepreneurship research* (pp. 195-221).
53 Boston and MA: Kluwer.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gimeno, J., Folta, T., Cooper, A., & Woo, C. (1997). Survival of the fittest? Entrepreneurial human
4 capital and the persistence of underperforming firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 42,
5 750-783.
6
7
8
9 * Gorgievski-Duijvesteijn, M. J., Giessen, C. W. M., & Bakker, A. B. (2000). Financial problems and
10 health complaints among farm couples: Results of a 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of*
11 *Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(3), 359-373.
12
13
14
15 Grégoire, D. A., Barr, P. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2010). Cognitive processes of opportunity
16 recognition: The role of structural alignment. *Organization Science*, 21(2), 413-431.
17
18 doi:10.1287/orsc.1090.0462
19
20
21
22 Gruber, M., MacMillan, I. C., & Thompson, J. D. (2008). Look before you leap: Market opportunity
23 identification in emerging technology firms. *Management Science*, 54(9), 1652-1665.
24
25 doi:10.1287/mnsc.1080.0877
26
27
28
29 Gunia, B. (2018). The sleep trap: Do sleep problems prompt entrepreneurial motives but undermine
30 entrepreneurial means? *Academy of Management Perspectives*, in Press. .
31
32
33 Hajkovicz, S. (2015). *Global megatrends: Seven patterns of change shaping our future*. Brisbane,
34 Qld: CISCO Publishing.
35
36
37 *Harris, J. A., Saltstone, R., & Fraboni, M. (1999). An evaluation of the Job Stress Questionnaire
38 with a sample of entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(3), 447-455
39
40
41 Hatak, I., & Snellman, K. (2017). The influence of anticipated regret on business start-up behaviour.
42 *International Small Business Journal*, 35(3), 349-360. doi:10.1177/0266242616673421
43
44
45 Headd, B. (2003). Redefining business success: Distinguishing between closure and failure. *Small*
46 *Business Economics*, 21(1), 51-61.
47
48
49
50 Henrekson, M., & Johansson, D. (2010). Gazelles as job creators: a survey and interpretation of the
51 evidence. *Small Business Economics*, 35(2), 227-244. doi:10.1007/s11187-009-9172-z
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *American*
4
5 *Psychologist*, 44(3), 513-524.
6
- 7 Humphreys, M. S., & Revelle, W. (1984). Personality, motivation, and performance - a theory of the
8
9 relationship between individual-differences and information-processing. *Psychological*
10
11 *Review*, 91(2), 153-184. doi:Doi 10.1037/0033-295x.91.2.153
12
- 13 Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role
14
15 ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision*
16
17 *Processes*, 36(1), 16-78. doi:10.1016/0749-5978(85)90020-2
18
19
- 20 * Jamal, M. 1997. Job stress, satisfaction, and mental health: An empirical examination of self-
21
22 employed and non-self-employed Canadians. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(4),
23
24 18–57.
25
- 26 * Jamal, M. 2007. Burnout and self-employment: A cross-cultural empirical study. *Stress and*
27
28 *Health*, 23(4), 249–256. doi:10.1002/smi.1144
29
30
- 31 * Jamal, M., & Badawi, J. A. 1995. Job stress and quality of working life of self-employed
32
33 immigrants: A study in workforce diversity. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*,
34
35 12(1), 55–63. doi:10.1080/08276331.1995.10600480
36
- 37 Karasek, R. A. (1990). Lower health risk with increasing job control among white collar workers.
38
39 *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 11(3), 171-185.
40
- 41 Kirzner, I. M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: An Austrian
42
43 approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), 60-85.
44
45
- 46 Knight, F. H. (1921). *Risk, uncertainty, and profit*. New York: Kelly and Millman.
47
- 48 Koeske, G. F., & Koeske, R. D. (1993). A preliminary test of a stress-strain-outcome model for
49
50 reconceptualizing the burn-out phenomenon. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 17, 107-
51
52 133.
53
- 54 Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Lepine, J. A., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lepine, M. A. (2005). A meta-analytic test of the challenge
4 stressor-hindrance stressor framework: An explanation for inconsistent relationships among
5 stressors and performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 764-775.

6
7
8
9 * Lewin-Epstein, N. & Yuchtman-Yaar, E. 1991. Health risks of self-employment. *Work and*
10
11 *Occupations*, 18, 291–312.

12
13 Lupien, S. J., McEwen, B. S., Gunnar, M. R., & Heim, C. (2009). Effects of stress throughout the
14 lifespan on the brain, behaviour and cognition. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 10(6), 434-
15 445. doi:10.1038/nrn2639

16
17
18
19 Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital:
20 Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*,
21 60(3), 541-572. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x

22
23
24
25
26 March, J. G., & Sutton, R. I. (1997). Crossroads—Organizational performance as a dependent
27 variable. *Organization Science*, 8(6), 698-706. doi:10.1287/orsc.8.6.698; 15.
28
29 10.1287/orsc.8.6.698

30
31
32
33 Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout: The cost of caring*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall.

34
35
36
37
38 Mason, J. W. (1968). A review of psychoendocrine research on the pituitary-adrenal cortical system.
39 *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 30(5), Suppl:576-607. doi:10.1097/00006842-196809000-00020

40
41
42
43 McClelland, D. C., & Winter, D. G. (1971). *Motivating economic achievement*. New York: Free
44 Press.

45
46
47
48 McGrath, J. E. (1970). *Social and psychological factors of stress*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, &
49 Winston.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 McKelvie, A., Haynie, J. M., & Gustavsson, V. (2011). Unpacking the uncertainty construct:
Implications for entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(3), 273-292.
doi:10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.10.004

- 1
2
3 McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the
4
5 theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 132-152.
6
- 7 Meichenbaum, D. H., & Deffenbacher, J. L. (1988). Stress inoculation training. *The Counseling*
8
9 *Psychologist*, 16(1), 69-90. doi:10.1177/0011000088161005
10
- 11 Milliken, F. J. (1987). Three types of perceived uncertainty about the environment: State, effect, and
12
13 response uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(1), 133-143.
14
- 15 Moroz, P. W., & Hindle, K. (2012). Entrepreneurship as a process: Toward harmonizing multiple
16
17 perspectives. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 781-818. doi:10.1111/j.1540-
18
19 6520.2011.00452.x
20
21
- 22 * Naughton, T. J. 1987. Quality of working life and the self-employed manager. *American Journal*
23
24 *of Small Business*, 12(2), 33–40.
25
- 26 * Parslow, R. A., Jorm, A. F., Christensen, H., Rodgers, B., Strazdins, L., & D Souza, R. M. 2004.
27
28 The associations between work stress and mental health: A comparison of organizationally
29
30 employed and self-employed workers. *Work & Stress*, 18(3), 231–244.
31
32
- 33 Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. A. (2011). Negative emotions of an entrepreneurial career: Self-
34
35 employment and regulatory coping behaviors. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(2), 226-
36
37 238. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.08.002>
38
- 39 Peters, A., & McEwen, B. S. (2015). Stress habituation, body shape and cardiovascular mortality.
40
41 *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 56, 139-150.
42
43 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2015.07.001>
44
45
- 46 Peters, A., McEwen, B. S., & Friston, K. (2017). Uncertainty and stress: Why it causes diseases and
47
48 how it is mastered by the brain. *Progress in Neurobiology*, 156(Supplement C), 164-188.
49
50 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pneurobio.2017.05.004>
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 * Prottas, D. J., & Thompson, C. A. (2006). Stress, satisfaction, and the work-family interface: A
4 comparison of self-employed business owners, independents, and organizational employees.
5 *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 11(4), 366-378.
6
7
8
9 Przepiorka, A. (2016). What makes successful entrepreneurs different in temporal and goal-
10 commitment dimensions? *Time & Society*, 25(1), 40-60. doi:10.1177/0961463X15577264; 08
11
12
13 * Rahim, A. 1996. Stress, strain, and their moderators: An empirical comparison of entrepreneurs and
14 managers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34(1), 46–58.
15
16
17 * Rauch, A. 2014. *Gruenderstudie 2013/2014 (technical report)*. Leuphana University Lueneburg,
18 innovation incubator. Unpublished manuscript.
19
20
21
22 * Rauch A., Unger, J., & Rosenbusch, N. 2007. The entrepreneur, entrepreneurial stress and long
23 term survival: Is there a causal link? *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol 27, No 4.
24 22–26.
25
26
27
28 Ropo, A., & Hunt, J. (1995). Entrepreneurial processes as virtuous and vicious spirals in a changing
29 opportunity structure. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 19(3), 1-111.
30
31
32 Salla, J., Galéra, C., Guichard, E., Tzourio, C., & Michel, G. (2017). ADHD Symptomatology and
33 perceived stress among French college students. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 0(0),
34 1087054716685841. doi:10.1177/1087054716685841
35
36
37
38 Sandi, C. (2013). Stress and cognition. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, 4(3),
39 245-261. doi:10.1002/wcs.1222
40
41
42
43 * Schjoedt, L. (2012). Job design effects on novice and repeat entrepreneurs' job stress. *The*
44 *International Journal of Management and Business*, 3(2), 35-52.
45
46
47 Schneider, B., Goldstein, H. W., & Smith, D. B. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. *Personnel*
48 *Psychology*, 48(4), 747-773. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1995.tb01780.x
49
50
51 Schumpeter, J. (1935). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung (Theory of economic growth)*.
52 Muenchen: Von Duncker und Humbolt.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Selye, H. (1957). *Stress of life*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
4
5 Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization*
6
7 *Science*, 11(4), 448-469.
8
9 Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*.
10
11 Cheltenham and UK: Edward Elgar.
12
13 Shane, S., & Kolvereid, L. (1995). National environment, strategy, and new venture performance: A
14
15 three country study. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 33(2), 37.
16
17 Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research.
18
19 *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
20
21
22 Shannon, C. E. (1948). A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*,
23
24 27(3), 379-423. doi:10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x
25
26
27 Sharfman, m. P., & Dean, J. W. (1991). Conceptualizing and measuring the organizational
28
29 environment: A multidimensional approach. *Journal of Management*, 17(4), 681-700.
30
31 * Shepherd, C. D., Marchisio, G., Morrish, S. C., Deacon, J. H., & Miles, M. P. 2010.
32
33 Entrepreneurial burnout: Exploring antecedents, dimensions and outcomes. *Journal of Research*
34
35 *in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1), 71-79.
36
37
38 Shepherd, D. A., & Patzelt, H. (2017). Researching the generation, refinement, and exploitation of
39
40 potential opportunities. In D. A. Shepherd & H. Patzelt (Eds.), *Trailblazing in*
41
42 *Entrepreneurship: Creating New Paths for Understanding the Field* (pp. 17-62). Cham:
43
44 Springer International Publishing.
45
46
47 Shepherd, D. A., & Wolfe, M. T. (2015). *Entrepreneurial grief*. Wiley Encyclopedia of
48
49 Management: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
50
51
52 Simmons, S. A., Wiklund, J., & Levie, J. (2014). Stigma and business failure: implications for
53
54 entrepreneurs' career choices. *Small Business Economics*, 42(3), 485-505.
55
56
57
58
59
60 doi:10.1007/s11187-013-9519-3

- 1
2
3 Stephan, U., & Roesler, U. (2010). Health of entrepreneurs versus employees in a national
4
5 representative sample. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(3), 717-
6
7 738. doi:10.1348/096317909X472067
8
- 9 Stephan, U., & Uhlander, L. M. (2010). Performance-based vs socially supportive culture: A cross-
10
11 national study of descriptive norms and entrepreneurship. *Journal of International Business*
12
13 *Studies*, 41, 1347-1364.
14
- 15 Swaminathan, A. (1996). Environmental conditions at founding: A trial-by-fire model. *Academy of*
16
17 *Management Journal*, 39(5), 1350-1377.
18
- 19 Swider, B. W., & Zimmerman, R. D. (2010). Born to burnout: A meta-analytic path model of
20
21 personality, job burnout, and work outcomes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 76(3), 487-
22
23 506. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.01.003>
24
25
- 26 Tang, J., Kacmar, K. M., & Busenitz, L. (2012). Entrepreneurial alertness in the pursuit of new
27
28 opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 77-94.
29
30 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2010.07.001>
31
32
- 33 * Tetrick, L. E., Slack, K. J., Sinclair, R. R., & DaSilva, N. 2000. A comparison of the stress-strain
34
35 process for business owners and nonowners: Differences in job demands, emotional exhaustion,
36
37 satisfaction, and social support. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 5(4), 464-476.
38
- 39 Ucbasaran, D., Shepherd, D. A., Lockett, A., & Lyon, S. J. (2013). Life After Business Failure: The
40
41 Process and Consequences of Business Failure for Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Management*,
42
43 39(1), 163-202. doi:10.1177/0149206312457823
44
45
- 46 *Van Eck, J. (2013). *Level of stress: A comparison of managers and entrepreneurs* (Unpublished
47
48 thesis). University of Groningen.
49
- 50 Van de Ven, E. H. (1992). Suggestions for studying strategy process: A research note. *Strategic*
51
52 *Management Journal*, 13(S1), 169-188. doi:doi:10.1002/smj.4250131013
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Van Gelderen, M., Kautonen, T., & Fink, M. (2015). From entrepreneurial intentions to actions: Self-
4 control and action-related doubt, fear, and aversion. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 30(5),
5 655-673. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2015.01.003>
6
7
8
9 Welter, F. (2011). Contextualizing entrepreneurship - conceptual challenges and ways forward.
10
11 *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(1), 165-184.
12
13 Wiklund, J., Hatak, I., Patzelt, H., & Shepherd, D. (2018). Mental Disorders in the Entrepreneurial
14 Context: When Being Different Can Be an Advantage. *Academy of Management*
15 *Perspectives*, in press.
16
17
18
19
20 Wiklund, J., Patzelt, H., & Dimov, D. (2016). Entrepreneurship and psychological disorders: How
21 ADHD can be productively harnessed. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 6, 14-20.
22 doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2016.07.001>
23
24
25
26 Wincent, J., & Örtqvist, D. (2009). A comprehensive model of entrepreneur role stress antecedents
27 and consequences. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(2), 225-243.
28
29 doi:10.2307/27753902
30
31
32
33 * Wincent, J., & Örtqvist, D. (2011). Examining positive performance implications of role stressors
34 by the indirect influence of positive affect: A study of new business managers. *Journal of*
35 *Applied Social Psychology*, 41(3), 699-727. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00733.x
36
37
38
39 Yerkes, R. M., & Dodson, J. D. (1908). The relation of strength of stimulus to rapidity of habit-
40 formation. *Journal of Comparative Neurology and Psychology*, 18(5), 459-482.
41
42 doi:10.1002/cne.920180503
43
44
45
46 Zwicky, F. (1969). *Discovery, invention, research - through the morphological approach*. Toronto:
47 The MacMillian Company.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Andreas Rauch (Andreas.rauch@sydney.edu.au) is Professor for Entrepreneurship at Sydney University
6 Business School and Guest Professor at the Johannes Kepler University Linz. His research focusses on
7 evidence - based entrepreneurship. He is in the editorial reviewer board of the Journal of Business Venturing
8 and appointed editor of Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice.
9

10
11
12 Matthias Fink (matthias.fink@jku.at) is Professor for Innovation at the Johannes Kepler University Linz,
13 Austria and ARU Cambridge, UK and academic director of MBA programs at LIMAK Austrian Business School.
14 His interests include entrepreneurship as a driver of innovation and change in rural contexts, stress in
15 entrepreneurship, migrant and mature entrepreneurship.
16
17
18
19

20 Isabella Hatak (isabella.hatak@unisg.ch) is professor of SME management at the University of St. Gallen in
21 Switzerland and is also affiliated with the University of Twente in the Netherlands. Her research focuses on
22 the value-creating behavior of the individual entrepreneur and what influences that behavior along the
23 entrepreneurship process.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60