



Call for Papers for a Special Issue on:

MAPPING THE LANDSCAPE OF HYBRID ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND UNDERSTANDING ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP RESEARCH

Guest Editors

Timothy B. Folta, University of Connecticut, timothy.folta@uconn.edu
Moren Lévesque, York University Schulich School of Business, mlevesque@schulich.yorku.ca
Matthias Schulz, University of Göttingen, matthias.schulz@uni-goettingen.de
Christian Schwens, University of Cologne, schwens@wiso.uni-koeln.de
Karl Wennberg, Stockholm School of Economics, Karl.Wennberg@hhs.se

Submission Deadline June 1st, 2025

BACKGROUND

This SI seeks papers contributing to our understanding of hybrid entrepreneurship, which refers to employees starting a venture concurrent to maintaining a wage job. Hybrid entrepreneurship is prevalent in many contexts, and represents a significant proportion of start-up approaches in countries such as Germany (62%), Sweden (58%), and the US (59%) (Metzger, 2020; Folta et al., 2010; Gänsler-Stickler et al., 2022), and worldwide (Minniti, 2010). Since hybrid entrepreneurship might enable individuals to “test the entrepreneurial waters” before committing to entrepreneurship (Folta et al., 2010, p. 253), numerous articles probe deeper into the decision to engage in hybrid entrepreneurship (Klyver et al., 2020); examine spillover effects from hybrid entrepreneurship to other activities (Marshall et al., 2019; Fini et al., 2022); investigate revenues, earnings, and business longevity of hybrid entrepreneurs (Åstebro et al., 2014; Schulz et al., 2017; Raffiee & Feng, 2014); consider their well-being (Ardianti et al., 2022); contrast time allocation decisions (Burmeister-Lamp et al., 2012; Lévesque & Schade, 2005); study their responsiveness to public policies (Schulz et al., 2016; Schulz et al., 2021); and detail earnings trajectories subsequent to exit from hybrid entrepreneurship (Mahieu et al., 2022). This scholarly interest coincides with increased practice of hybrid entrepreneurship, spurred by changes in the economy and society such as remote work and a proliferation of technologies enabling flexibility to pursue venture opportunities while a wage worker. These economic and societal changes not only have potential to influence the mechanisms by which individuals are influenced to enter or exit entrepreneurship, but also aspects like employee mobility in established firms or societal inequality.

AIMS AND SCOPE

This SI seeks to broadly investigate the relevance of hybrid entrepreneurs for a range of ongoing conversations in the wider field of entrepreneurship. As hybrid entrepreneurs may benefit from potential synergies with their parallel wage jobs, outcomes such as **firm-growth** (e.g., Bird & Zellweger 2018; Clarysse et al., 2023), **innovation** (e.g. Autio et al., 2014; Xiao et al., 2022), **well-being** (e.g., Stephan et al., 2023; Wiklund et al., 2019), and others warrant examination in light of the phenomenon of hybrid entrepreneurship. For example, the hybrid entrepreneur may experiment

in the newly founded business and some of the new knowledge gained may spillover to their employer (Marshall et al., 2019). Considering hybrid entrepreneurship may also expand our understanding on how **team dynamics** shape the entrepreneurial process (e.g., Brattström, 2024; Fox et al., 2023), as decision-making in teams may depend on if and how many of a startup's members are hybrid (rather than direct) entrants.

Furthermore, due to income security provided by their parallel wage job, hybrid entrepreneurs can engage in more experimentation with innovative and high-risk technologies than direct entrants, which may inform research on **technology and entrepreneurship** (e.g., Andries et al., 2021; Wright et al., 2007). Whether hybrid ventures are candidates for risk capital is an open question due to diverging arguments. On the one hand, hybrid entrepreneurs' ability to experiment with innovative business ideas (Schulz et al., 2016) may increase their attractiveness to venture capitalists or business angels (e.g., Cumming & Zhang, 2023; Petty et al., 2023). On the other hand, their simultaneous engagement in wage work may signal a low commitment to investors. Moreover, while most existing studies focus on hybrid entrepreneurship in developed economies, hybrid entrepreneurship might be even more important in **developing economies**, where poverty, inequality, and financial constraints dominate the entrepreneurial landscape (e.g., Bailey & Lumpkin, 2023; Halvarsson et al., 2018; Packard & Bylund, 2018).

Hybrid entrepreneurship also applies to individuals pursuing entrepreneurship on a part-time basis, such as **portfolio entrepreneurs** (Baert et al., 2016; Santamaria, 2022; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2008); independent contractors (e.g., Uber drivers) in the **digital economy** (Nambisan, 2017; Steininger, 2019); and parents pursuing entrepreneurship during a **job-protected leave** (Thébaud, 2015; Chatterjee et al., 2022). In addition, **remote work** seems to offer increased flexibility to launch hybrid ventures. Research opportunities also derive from the potential to gain a better understanding of the differences between high potential hybrid ventures, where entrepreneurs may transition to full-time engagement in the venture, versus low potential ventures that merely reflect a secondary income or interest, or tax benefit. Beyond the creation of new ventures, hybrid entrepreneurship matters for established organizations as well. The increasing possibilities to engage in remote work, along with the flexibility in work time allocation, naturally lead us to expect that the number of employees of established organizations engaging in hybrid entrepreneurship may significantly increase (Raffiee & Feng, 2014). If such side-hustles increase employees' work performance and innovativeness (Sessions et al. 2022; Marshall et al. 2019), increasing rates of hybrid entrepreneurship also have relevance for **larger corporations, SMEs, and family firms** (e.g., Minola et al., 2021; Soleimanof et al., 2019).

We also invite papers broadening the theoretical lenses to illuminate research on hybrid entrepreneurship, including theories around entrepreneurial learning (Politis, 2005), effectuation (Sarasvathy et al., 2020; Sarasvathy, 2021), opportunity evaluation (Scheaf et al., 2020), or decision-making under risk (Kahnemann & Tversky, 1979). Hybrid entrepreneurship may also be connected to risk-hedging (Raffiee & Feng, 2014; Burmeister-Lamp et al., 2012), decreasing marginal returns to time invested in the venture (Lévesque & MacCrimmon, 1998; Lévesque & Schade, 2005) and creating liquidity constraints (Petrova, 2012). Relying on these theories may be especially useful to investigate hybrid entrepreneurship in contexts that have received less attention such as the role of hybrid entrepreneurship in developing countries, specific geographical areas, or how the implications of hybrid entrepreneurship differ across industries.

We welcome papers using and/or triangulating diverse methodological approaches as more data and qualitative and quantitative research is needed to diagnose the different phenomena where individuals engage in entrepreneurship next to another activity. To date, many studies on hybrid entrepreneurship have conducted quantitative analyses with large-scale data (Folta et al., 2010;

Gänsler-Stickler et al., 2022; Raffiee & Feng, 2014). While helpful in providing valuable insights, broadening the methodological toolbox can help us glean more differentiated insights to move extant theorizing forward, such as through simulations or qualitative research. Moreover, diagnosing performance consequences of hybrid entrepreneurship (compared to direct entry) is difficult because of selection issues. Causal identification through, for example, controlled experiments or natural experiments may help us better discern causality in the different choices of entrepreneurial entry, and their performance consequences. Formal modelling and machine learning tools may also help to build grounded theory of hybrid entrepreneurship.

SOME POSSIBLE TOPICS (BUT NOT LIMITED TO)

- What are differences among rates of hybrid entry across countries? To what extent do cultural differences and institutional conditions shape hybrid entrepreneurship? Does the motive (i.e., test entrepreneurial waters, make secondary income, pursue an interest) for hybrid entry differ across countries?
- How and in which way is hybrid entrepreneurship able to overcome/reduce inequality and weak institutions in different countries or regions?
- Do investors evaluate hybrid ventures less favorably than direct entrants?
- Are teams fundamentally different in hybrid ventures compared to full-time ventures? Are hybrid entrepreneurs prone to team up to increase the time spent on the venture, and/or distribute different kinds of risks?
- How do hybrid entrepreneurs grow their business? Do they have a higher likelihood of attracting risk capital, perhaps because they focus on more innovative and R&D-intensive business ideas? Or do venture capitalists or business angels “shy away” from hybrid ventures because of a perceived lack of entrepreneurial commitment?
- Do businesses started out of hybrid entrepreneurship internationalize earlier and more rapidly as they operate in knowledge-intensive niche markets?
- How do hybrid entrepreneurs differ from direct entrants when making decisions? Does simultaneous engagement in a wage job facilitate rational decision-making (e.g., by providing a secure income stream to make a living) or rather impede rational decision-making (e.g., by increasing time constraints).
- Can hybrid entrepreneurs more effectively engage in social or sustainable entrepreneurship than full-time entrepreneurs, perhaps because they have a resource flow from their wage job?
- Should policymakers be encouraging hybrid entry?
- What implications can we draw from hybrid entrepreneurship to deepen our understanding of overall patterns of entrepreneurship in an economy (such as the roles of financial constraints, labor market dynamics, and work’s changing nature)?
- When should hybrid entrepreneurs abandon their wage job and commit fully to entrepreneurship? When should they abandon the venture?
- How do new technology trends/developments impact the emergence of hybrid entrepreneurship and how do hybrid entrepreneurs rely on technology differently?

SUBMISSION PROCESS AND DEADLINES

- All guest editors are available for any informal enquiries related to the SI (e.g., feedback on potential fit with the SI aims and scope).
- Manuscripts should be submitted through the *ETP* online submission system (<https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/etp>) by **June 1st, 2025**. Submissions need to be prepared in accordance with the *ETP* submission guidelines.

- After submission, each paper will be reviewed according to the *ETP* double-blind review process.
- Authors who are invited to revise and resubmit their papers will be invited to a *Special Issue Workshop* with the guest editors at the University of Connecticut, Werth Institute for Entrepreneurship & Innovation. The Werth Institute for Entrepreneurship & Innovation has also provided funding to cover airfare and accommodation for participants of this workshop, particularly for participants from outside North America and Europe. Participating in the workshop will not be a precondition for acceptance of authors' manuscripts and participating in the workshop does not guarantee manuscript acceptance into the SI. Further details on the workshop will be shared as soon as they become available.
- If a paper is rejected (as a desk reject or in the normal review process) without the option to resubmit, then the paper may not be submitted again to *ETP* as a regular submission.

REFERENCES

- Andries, P., Clarysse, B., & Costa, S. (2021). Technology ventures' engagement of external actors in the search for viable market applications: On the relevance of Technology Broadcasting and Systematic Validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 36(6), 106145.
- Ardianti, R., Obschonka, M., & Davidsson, P. (2022). Psychological well-being of hybrid entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 17, e00294.
- Åstebro, T., & Chen, J. (2014). The entrepreneurial earnings puzzle: Mismeasurement or real? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 29(1), 88-105.
- Autio, E., Kenney, M., Mustar, P., Siegel, D., & Wright, M. (2014). Entrepreneurial innovation: The importance of context. *Research Policy*, 43(7), 1097-1108.
- Baert, C., Meuleman, M., Debruyne, M., & Wright, M. (2016). Portfolio entrepreneurship and resource orchestration. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 10(4), 346-370.
- Bailey, R. C., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2023). Enacting positive social change: A civic wealth creation stakeholder engagement framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(1), 66-90.
- Bird, M., & Zellweger, T. (2018). Relational embeddedness and firm growth: Comparing spousal and sibling entrepreneurs. *Organization Science*, 29(2), 264-283.
- Brattström, A. (2024). Task Re-allocation in New Venture Teams: A Team Conflict Perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 48(1), 205-245.
- Burch, G., Carnahan, S., & Greenwood, B. N. (2018). Can you gig it? An empirical examination of the gig economy and entrepreneurial activity. *Management Science*, 64(12), 5497-5520.
- Burmeister-Lamp, K., Lévesque, M., & Schade, C. (2012). Are entrepreneurs influenced by risk attitude, regulatory focus or both? An experiment on entrepreneurs' time allocation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(4), 456-476.
- Chatterjee, I., Shepherd, D. A., & Wincent, J. (2022). Women's entrepreneurship and well-being at the base of the pyramid. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 37(4), 106222.
- Clarysse, B., Andries, P., Boone, S., & Roelandt, J. (2023). Institutional logics and founders' identity orientation: Why academic entrepreneurs aspire lower venture growth. *Research Policy*, 52(3), 104713.
- Cumming, D., & Zhang, M. (2023). Bankruptcy law and angel investors around the world. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 1-22.
- Gänsler-Stickler, G. M., Schulz, M., & Schwens, C. (2022). Sitting on the fence-Untangling the role of uncertainty in entrepreneurship and paid employment for hybrid entry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 37(2), 106176.
- Fini, R., Perkmann, M., & Ross, J. M. (2022). Attention to exploration: The effect of academic entrepreneurship on the production of scientific knowledge. *Organization Science*, 33(2), 688-715.

- Folta, T. B., Delmar, F., & Wennberg, K. (2010). Hybrid entrepreneurship. *Management Science*, 56(2), 253-269.
- Fox, B. C., Simsek, Z., & Heavey, C. (2023). Venture team membership dynamics and new venture innovation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*.
- Halvarsson, D., Korpi, M., & Wennberg, K. 2018. Entrepreneurship and income inequality. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 145: 275-293.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263–291.
- Klyver, K., Steffens, P., & Lomberg, C. (2020). Having your cake and eating it too? A two-stage model of the impact of employment and parallel job search on hybrid nascent entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(5), 106042.
- Lévesque, M., & MacCrimmon, K. R. (1998). On the interaction of time and money invested in new ventures. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 22(2), 89-110.
- Lévesque, M., & Schade, C. (2005). Intuitive optimizing: Experimental findings on time allocation decisions with newly formed ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(3), 313-342.
- Mahieu, J., Melillo, F., & Thompson, P. (2022). The long-term consequences of entrepreneurship: Earnings trajectories of former entrepreneurs. *Strategic Management Journal*, 43(2), 213-236.
- Marshall, D. R., Davis, W. D., Dibrell, C., & Ammeter, A. P. (2019). Learning off the job: Examining part-time entrepreneurs as innovative employees. *Journal of Management*, 45(8), 3091-3113.
- Metzger, G. (2020). KfW-Gründungsmonitor 2020–Gründungstätigkeit in Deutschland 2019: erster Anstieg seit 5 Jahren–2020 im Schatten der Corona-Pandemie. KfW Bankengruppe: Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
- Minniti M. (2010) Female entrepreneurship and economic activity. *The European Journal of Development Research* 22: 294-312.
- Minola, T., Kammerlander, N., Kellermanns, F. W., & Hoy, F. (2021). Corporate entrepreneurship and family business: Learning across domains. *Journal of Management Studies*, 58(1), 1-26.
- Nambisan, S. (2017). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(6), 1029-1055.
- Packard, M. D., & Bylund, P. L. (2018). On the relationship between inequality and entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(1), 3-22.
- Petrova, K. (2012). Part-time entrepreneurship and financial constraints: evidence from the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics. *Small Business Economics*, 39, 473-493.
- Petty, J. S., Gruber, M., & Harhoff, D. (2023). Maneuvering the odds: The dynamics of venture capital decision-making. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 17(2), 239-265.
- Politis, D. (2005). The process of entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 399-424.
- Raffiee, J., & Feng, J. (2014). Should I quit my day job? A hybrid path to entrepreneurship. *Academy of management journal*, 57(4), 936-963.
- Santamaria, S. (2022). Portfolio entrepreneurs' behavior and performance: A resource redeployment perspective. *Management Science*, 68(1), 333-354.
- Sarasvathy, S. D., Forster, W. R., & Ramesh, A. (2020). From Goldilocks to Gump: Entrepreneurial mechanisms for everyday entrepreneurs. *Revista de Empreendedorismo e Gestão de Pequenas Empresas*, 9(1), 189-220.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2021). Even-if: Sufficient, yet unnecessary conditions for worldmaking. *Organization Theory*, 2(2).

- Scheaf, D. J., Loignon, A. C., Webb, J. W., Heggstad, E. D., & Wood, M. S. (2020). Measuring opportunity evaluation: Conceptual synthesis and scale development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 35(2).
- Schulz, M., Urbig, D., & Procher, V. (2016). Hybrid entrepreneurship and public policy: The case of firm entry deregulation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31(3), 272-286.
- Schulz, M., Urbig, D., & Procher, V. (2017). The role of hybrid entrepreneurship in explaining multiple job holders' earnings structure. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 7, 9-14.
- Schulz, M., Schwens, C., & Fisch, C. (2021). Bankruptcy regulation and self-employment entry: the moderating roles of income share, parenthood, and hybrid entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 45(6), 1522-1549.
- Sessions, H., Nahrgang, J. D., Vaulont, M. J., Williams, R., & Bartels, A. L. (2021). Do the hustle! Empowerment from side-hustles and its effects on full-time work performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 64(1), 235-264.
- Shepherd, D. A., Wennberg, K., Suddaby, R., & Wiklund, J. (2019). What are we explaining? A review and agenda on initiating, engaging, performing, and contextualizing entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 159-196.
- Soleimanof, S., Singh, K., & Holt, D. T. (2019). Micro-foundations of corporate entrepreneurship in family firms: An institution-based perspective. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 43(2), 274-281.
- Steininger, D. M. (2019). Linking information systems and entrepreneurship: A review and agenda for IT-associated and digital entrepreneurship research. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(2), 363-407.
- Stephan, U., Rauch, A., & Hatak, I. (2023). Happy entrepreneurs? Everywhere? A meta-analysis of entrepreneurship and wellbeing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 47(2), 553-593.
- Thébaud, S. (2015). Business as plan B: Institutional foundations of gender inequality in entrepreneurship across 24 industrialized countries. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 60(4), 671-711.
- Wiklund, J., Nikolaev, B., Shir, N., Foo, M. D., & Bradley, S. (2019). Entrepreneurship and well-being: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(4), 579-588.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2008). Portfolio entrepreneurship: Habitual and novice founders, new entry, and mode of organizing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(4), 701-725.
- Wright, M., Hmieleski, K. M., Siegel, D. S., & Ensley, M. D. (2007). The role of human capital in technological entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(6), 791-806.
- Xiao, T., Makhija, M., & Karim, S. (2022). A knowledge recombination perspective of innovation: review and new research directions. *Journal of Management*, 48(6), 1724-1777.