

1996–2008 Winners in brief

The table below provides a brief presentation of all Award Winners until 2008.

Twice the Prize was shared between two scholars (Acs/Audretsch and Beccatini/Sabel) and once the Prize was awarded to a specific research effort (Diana) involving five scholars (Brush/Carter/Gatewood/Greene/Hart).

Normally, the Prize is awarded to one person only, but in the case of the Acs/Audretsch shared Prize the contribution that was awarded was inseparably tied to the joint effort of the two scholars. When the Prize was shared by Beccatini/Sabel it was rather the case that the analysis of a particular phenomenon, namely the advantages of a geographical agglomeration of specialized small firms (“Industrial Districts”), was rewarded. A similar reasoning lay behind the Award to the five scholars behind the Diana project.

Regarding where the Winner has his/her main affiliation at the time of receipt of the Prize there is a heavy US domination. Nine times out of thirteen the Winners came solely from US institutions. In two cases single Winners were from other countries (the UK and Sweden). One of the Winners (Reynolds) held professorships both in the US and the UK when he received the Award, and Beccatini from Italy shared the Prize in 2002.

Keeping in mind the difficulties of drawing a sharp demarcation line between micro and macro oriented research on entrepreneurship and small businesses, we deem that five Prizes have been awarded to research dealing with the macro importance of new and small firms, two Prizes (Baumol and Kirzner) to research focusing on the role and aggregate importance of entrepreneurship (*viz.* the entrepreneurial function) in the economic system, and six Prizes to scholars conducting micro level analyses of entrepreneurship and small businesses.

Although all Winners have had a profound impact on entrepreneurship and small business research, how this has come about differs considerably. In some cases scholars have posed the right ques-

tions at the right time and also framed their analysis in a way that has speeded diffusion of their ideas. As a result, they have kept the research community busy for decades collecting data, testing hypotheses, amassing evidence, and in some cases leveling heavy criticism against the original work.

Virtually every Winner through 2008 can be labeled a pioneer in some important respect. In most cases those pioneers have not only contributed in terms of their own research but they have also been active in promoting entrepreneurship education and the field itself in a wider sense by starting journals, organizing conferences and writing influential surveys setting the agenda for further research from that point onwards.

Several scholars have been awarded at least partly for their instrumental role in helping entrepreneurship research progress towards more of a “normal science” using systematically collected and valid data for hypothesis testing, thereby making the work in the field more cumulative. David Storey and Paul Reynolds are perhaps the two most obvious examples of Winners who have contributed to the field in this way.

There are also examples of Award Winners who were highly renowned scholars in a core scientific discipline, and then ventured into the study of entrepreneurship using the same well-established methodological toolbox. Hence, making the study of entrepreneurship an important subfield within a core discipline, and thereby raising the legitimacy of entrepreneurship as a field of research. A prime example is Howard Aldrich, who was a leading organization sociologist before he began to study entrepreneurship.

In several cases people have been awarded for the study of specific issues or topics. The Diana group and Beccatini/Sabel are perhaps the most obvious cases in point. Other examples include Bill Gartner for his extensive studies of new venture creation and entrepreneurial behavior, although he is also rewarded for bridging different research paradigms and the communities of scholars that represent

them. Acs/Audretsch can also be said to be largely rewarded for the study of a specific issue, namely the crucial importance of new and small firms in innovation.

Finally, we have the Prizes to the two economists William Baumol and Israel Kirzner. It is well-known that there is no role for the entrepreneur in the basic microeconomic model of the firm, or in the standard aggregate (exogenous or endogenous) models of economic growth. Baumol, being a highly reputed mainstream economist forcibly pointed this out back in 1968 and has insisted ever since in numerous scholarly books and articles that without the entrepreneur economics is incomplete. Kirzner has been a heterodox economist throughout his career working in the Austrian tradition. Building on von Mises' and Hayek's analyses of competition and the role of knowledge he has analyzed the workings of the capitalist system where the entrepreneur is the lead character.

This brief overview of previous Award Winners shows that there is great diversity in their work and achievements: both quantitative and qualitative work, both micro and macro oriented focus, a wide range of publication outlets from easily accessible books and reports to highly specialized scholarly articles, from the development of new datasets to conceptual and methodological improvements, from having great impact on the research community to having impact on policymaking, and the promotion of education and training in entrepreneurship.

Award Winners 1996–2008

<i>Year</i>	<i>Winner(s)</i>	<i>Birth year</i>	<i>Country</i>	<i>Field</i>	<i>Prize Citation</i>	<i>Remark</i>
Macro importance of new and small firms						
1996	David L. Birch MIT and Cognetics Inc.	1937	USA	Economics	“for having identified the role of new and small firms for job creation”	Great impact on policymaking.
1998	David J. Storey University of Warwick	1947	UK	Economics/ Management	“responsible for the increased focus in research on unbiased large-scale and high-quality empirical work”	Large impact on policies for regional development; outstanding synthesizer.
2001	Zoltan J. Acs University of Baltimore	1952	USA	Economics	“empirical analyses of an impressive number of important questions concerning the role of small firms in the economy”... “the role of small firms in innovation”	Bridge-builders between economics and related fields; founders of <i>SBE</i> , tireless promotion of the field. Impact on policymaking.
	David B. Audretsch Indiana University	1954	USA	Economics		
2002	Giacomo Beccatini University of Florence	1927	Italy	Economics	for revitalizing Marshalls’ ideas of the “advantages of geographical agglomeration of specialized small firms”;	Emphasize the systemic perspective. Impact on policymaking.
	Charles F. Sabel Columbia University	1947	USA	Political science, Law	furthering “our understanding of flexible specialization of co-operating small firms”; “importance of networks”	
2004	Paul D. Reynolds Babson College and London Business School	1938	USA & UK	Sociology	“has taken entrepreneurship research to new levels, given it new directions and organized several innovative and large-scale empirical investigations into the nature of entrepreneurship and its role in economic development”	Initiator and co-ordinator of two massive projects: PSED and GEM. Impact on policymaking. The importance for the field cannot be overrated.
Role and aggregate importance of entrepreneurship/the entrepreneurial function						
2003	William J. Baumol New York University	1922	USA	Economics	”his insistence that the entrepreneur should have a key role in the theory of the firm”; ”his studies of the role of institutions for the channeling of entrepreneurship into productive use”; ”his early formulation of a competition policy emphasizing the disciplinary effect of dynamic entrepreneurship”	A highly reputed mainstream economist who very early on and with great consistency has urged the professions to heed the instrumental role of the entrepreneur in their analyses.

2006	Israel M. Kirzner New York University	1930	USA	Economics	“clarifies the role of the entrepreneur in society and emphasizes that the behavior of a single entrepreneur may be of importance for the renewal and rationalization of markets” ... “the most prominent contemporary advocate of the Austrian School”	Explains the instrumental role of the entrepreneur in the capitalist system, and why the insistence on general equilibrium in economic modeling makes the entrepreneurial function superfluous.
------	--	------	-----	-----------	---	---

Micro level analyses of entrepreneurship and small businesses

1997	Arnold C. Cooper Krannert School of Management, Purdue University	1933	USA	Management	His “pioneering work on technical entrepreneurship, new technology-based firms, and incubator organizations has significantly enhanced our understanding of entrepreneurial phenomena”	Masters both qualitative and quantitative methods. Has improved data quality and insisted on use of sophisticated methods.
1999	Ian C. MacMillan Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania	1940	USA	Management	“instrumental in introducing an international perspective to entrepreneurship research, exemplified by the international comparative studies on cultural differences in entrepreneurship and small business behavior” ; “the integration of two separate research fields: entrepreneurship/small business research and management/strategy research”	Important pioneer.
2000	Howard E. Aldrich University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	1943	USA	Sociology	“has generated significant insights into the knowledge of formation and evolution of new and small firms”; “major contributions ... by integrating the most central research questions of the field into a broader sociological research context”	Leading sociologist highlighting entrepreneurship.
2005	William B. Gartner Clemson University	1953	USA	Management	For his research on “new venture creation and entrepreneurial behavior”; he has shown mastery in combining “the best of two research traditions”: US style positivism and hermeneutics.	Important in promoting entrepreneurship education, and in forming connections between scholars working in different fields.

2007	The Diana Group:					
	Candida G. Brush Babson College	1948	USA	Management	For their unique effort to pool “their competencies to create a research team examining women's entrepreneurship. An important contribution lies in the identification of growth oriented women entrepreneurs and issues of access to and usage of resources”	Impact on policymaking. Particularly in creating awareness of gender differences in the availability of external finance. Partly also on the macro importance of women entrepreneurship.
	Nancy M. Carter University of St. Thomas	1949	USA	Management		
	Elizabeth J. Gatewood Wake Forest University	1944	USA			
	Patricia G. Greene Babson College	1954	USA	Management		
Myra M. Hart Harvard Business School	1941	USA	Sociology Management			
2008	Bengt Johannisson Växjö University	1942	Sweden	Management	“the furthering of our understanding of the importance of social networks of the entrepreneur in a regional context. He has also documented and explained how the social networks of the entrepreneur are related to the ‘life’ of the entrepreneur”	Key contributor to the organization of the European entrepreneurship and small business research fields.

Note: Affiliation and country pertains to the situation at the time of receipt of the Prize. Management and Business administration are treated as synonyms, writing Management throughout.