

[Entrepreneur & Management Research] Week 04# – Literature Review as Strategic Mapping

1 — REVIEW OF MEETING 3

Thinking Like a Researcher: Paradigms and Perspectives

- **Research is shaped by paradigms that define how reality is understood** (*e.g., customer satisfaction may be measured quantitatively or explored qualitatively through customer narratives*).
- **Different paradigms lead researchers to ask different kinds of questions** (*e.g., testing whether service quality affects loyalty or exploring how customers experience dissatisfaction*).
- **Paradigm choice influences methods and interpretation** (*e.g., using surveys for causal explanation or interviews for meaning exploration*).
- **Methodological coherence begins with philosophical awareness** (*e.g., matching a study on startup failure with either statistical analysis or founder experience interpretation*).

2 — INTRODUCTION

Literature Review as the Architecture of Research

- **A literature review is the intellectual foundation of research** (*e.g., a study on digital trust must begin by understanding how earlier studies define trust and online behavior*).
- **It positions a study within an existing academic conversation** (*e.g., showing whether customer loyalty has been explained through satisfaction, trust, or perceived value*).
- **It protects research from repetition without contribution** (*e.g., avoiding a study that merely repeats the same model in the same context*).
- **It guides theory choice, methodological direction, and contribution** (*e.g., deciding whether a marketing problem should be framed through relationship marketing, service logic, or consumer psychology*).

3 — WHAT A LITERATURE REVIEW REALLY IS

- **A literature review is a critical reading of prior knowledge** (*e.g., comparing different explanations of customer switching rather than listing them mechanically*).

- **It is not a descriptive inventory of articles** (*e.g., not merely reporting “Study A found X and Study B found Y”*).
- **It synthesizes patterns, contradictions, and limits in existing studies** (*e.g., identifying whether inconsistent findings emerge from different samples, methods, or contexts*).
- **It turns accumulated studies into a platform for new inquiry** (*e.g., using earlier work on SME innovation to justify a study on digital adaptation in local enterprises*).

4 — LITERATURE REVIEW AS STRATEGIC MAPPING

- **A literature review maps the intellectual terrain of a topic** (*e.g., identifying trust, authenticity, and persuasion as dominant themes in influencer marketing studies*).
- **It locates clusters, patterns, and boundaries of knowledge** (*e.g., showing that startup failure research often clusters around learning, resilience, and resource constraints*).
- **It reveals what is over-studied, under-studied, and inconsistently studied** (*e.g., customer satisfaction is widely tested, but post-purchase emotional recovery is less explored*).
- **Strategic mapping allows researchers to position their study with precision** (*e.g., extending digital engagement research by introducing value co-creation as an explanatory mechanism*).

5 — ANALYTICAL READING AND SYNTHESIS

- **Analytical reading asks what a study explains, not only what it reports** (*e.g., asking why trust affects purchase intention, not only noting that it does*).
- **It compares studies across theory, context, method, and findings** (*e.g., contrasting survey studies on loyalty with interview studies on brand attachment*).
- **It seeks patterns, contradictions, and silences** (*e.g., noticing that some startup studies emphasize resource scarcity while others emphasize founder cognition*).
- **It transforms reading into argument-building** (*e.g., using differences across studies to justify a new research direction*).

6 — RESEARCH GAP AS THE INTELLECTUAL CORE

- **A research gap is a meaningful unresolved problem, not just an empty topic area** (*e.g., disagreement over whether digital engagement directly leads to loyalty*).
- **Gaps can be theoretical, methodological, contextual, or empirical** (*e.g., a theory widely used in large firms but rarely tested in SMEs*).

- **A gap must be argued for, not casually declared** (e.g., explaining why existing studies are insufficient rather than merely saying “few studies exist”).
- **A strong gap points directly to contribution** (e.g., showing how a new study on startup failure explains founder learning instead of repeating known causes).

7 — FROM LITERATURE TO CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

- **A literature review should clarify concepts before building models** (e.g., distinguishing customer engagement from customer loyalty).
- **It identifies key constructs and meaningful relationships** (e.g., linking service quality, trust, satisfaction, and loyalty).
- **A conceptual framework should emerge from reviewed knowledge, not arbitrary variable selection** (e.g., adding value co-creation because prior studies suggest it explains the missing mechanism).
- **Strong frameworks are theory-driven and logically structured** (e.g., linking failure experience, reflection, learning, and resilience in entrepreneurship research).

8 — MARKETING EXAMPLE

From Literature Review to a Mediation Model in Marketing Research

- **A marketing literature review can reveal that direct-effect models are often too simple** (e.g., customer engagement does not automatically become loyalty without a value-creation process).
- **It can uncover a meaningful mediating mechanism grounded in theory** (e.g., value co-creation can mediate the relationship between engagement and loyalty through Service-Dominant Logic).
- **It helps explain why prior findings may appear fragmented or inconsistent** (e.g., some studies find engagement increases loyalty, while others find weak or indirect effects because the mediating process is omitted).
- **It supports a more theoretically grounded framework** (e.g., customer engagement → value co-creation → attitudinal loyalty → behavioral loyalty).

9 — ENTREPRENEURSHIP EXAMPLE

From Literature Review to a Mediation Model in Entrepreneurship Research

- **An entrepreneurship literature review can show that practical obstacles do not explain entrepreneurial withdrawal by themselves** (e.g., nascent entrepreneurs often abandon opportunities, but obstacles alone do not fully explain why).
- **It can identify a psychological mediator with a strong theoretical root** (e.g., fear of failure mediates the relationship between obstacles and entrepreneurial action through a social cognitive perspective on achievement motives).
- **It helps move from surface-level explanation to process explanation** (e.g., obstacles affect action because they activate an avoidance mechanism, not simply because they exist).
- **It supports a stronger entrepreneurship framework** (e.g., obstacles → fear of failure → opportunity evaluation and exploitation).

10 — SDM EXAMPLE

From Literature Review to a Mediation Model in Human Resource Management Research

- **An HR literature review can show that relational quality at work does not automatically become organizational identification** (e.g., high-quality leader-member exchange does not directly explain why employees feel psychologically connected to the organization).
- **It can uncover a mediating mechanism rooted in theory** (e.g., perceived organizational support can mediate the relationship between leader-member exchange and organizational identification through social exchange and social identity logic).
- **It helps explain why prior HR findings may remain incomplete** (e.g., relational exchange predicts positive outcomes, but the psychological pathway is often underexplained).
- **It supports a more theoretically grounded HR framework** (e.g., leader-member exchange → perceived organizational support → organizational identification).

11 — FINANCE EXAMPLE

From Literature Review to a Mediation Model in Finance Research

- **A finance literature review can show that financial knowledge does not automatically become investment intention** (*e.g., people may understand financial products, but that knowledge alone does not guarantee willingness to invest*).
- **It can identify a mediating mechanism rooted in behavioral finance logic** (*e.g., risk perception and attitude can mediate the relationship between financial knowledge and investment intention*).
- **It helps explain why prior finance findings may look inconsistent** (*e.g., some studies find knowledge improves investment behavior, while others find weak effects because decision processes are omitted*).
- **It supports a more process-based finance framework** (*e.g., financial knowledge → risk perception → attitude → investment intention*).

12 — CONCLUSION

- **Literature review is the foundation of informed research** (*e.g., no study on customer loyalty should proceed without understanding prior explanations of loyalty*).
- **It is a strategic mapping of knowledge, not a summary exercise** (*e.g., tracing patterns, contradictions, and boundaries across studies*).
- **It leads directly to research gap and conceptual framework** (*e.g., showing why a simple direct model is insufficient and how a richer model is needed*).
- **Strong research begins with strong literature review** (*e.g., a sharper review leads to a clearer question, stronger contribution, and better design*).

13 — KEY TAKEAWAYS

- **A literature review positions a study within an existing academic conversation** (*e.g., connecting SME digitalization with prior work on innovation and adaptation*).
- **It must be analytical, comparative, and synthetic** (*e.g., explaining why prior findings differ instead of merely listing them*).
- **Research gap is the core output of a strong review** (*e.g., identifying what remains conceptually, empirically, or contextually unresolved*).
- **Conceptual frameworks must emerge from reviewed knowledge** (*e.g., building models from theory and prior findings rather than arbitrary variable selection*).

14 — CLOSING REMARKS

- **Strong research begins with strong literature review** (*e.g., a sharper review leads to a clearer study on customer trust, startup learning, or employee identification*).
- **Researchers must read critically, not collect references mechanically** (*e.g., asking why studies differ, not only what they found*).
- **Literature review converts prior knowledge into research direction** (*e.g., transforming scattered studies into a coherent gap and framework*).
- **The next step is to build research design from reviewed knowledge** (*e.g., moving from mapped literature to methodological planning*).

See you in Meeting 5, with the topic:

Designing Research Projects

Pada pertemuan berikutnya, kita akan bergerak dari **what is known** menuju **how to investigate systematically**, yaitu bagaimana literature review yang telah dipetakan diterjemahkan ke dalam desain penelitian yang logis, layak, dan konsisten.

Reference

Business Research Methods, Emma Bell, Bill Harley, Alan Bryman, Oxford University Press, 2022, **647 pages**.

Customer Engagement in Service, V. Kumar, Bharath Rajan, Shaphali Gupta, Ilaria Dalla Pozza, *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, Springer, 2019, **138–160**.

Fear of Failure as a Mediator of the Relationship Between Obstacles and Nascent Entrepreneurial Activity—An Experimental Approach, Tobias Kollmann, Christoph Stöckmann, Julia M. Kensbock, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Elsevier, 2017, **280–301**.

Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods in Entrepreneurship, Helle Neergaard, John Parm Ulhøi (Editors), Edward Elgar Publishing, 2007, **520 pp**.

Perceived Organizational Support as a Mediator between Relational Exchange and Organizational Identification, David M. Sluss, Malayka

Klimchak, Jeanne J. Holmes, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Elsevier, 2008, **457–464**.

Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches, John W. Creswell, J. David Creswell, SAGE Publications, 2018, **304 pages**.

Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach, Uma Sekaran, Roger Bougie, John Wiley & Sons, 2016, **448 pages**.

Research Methods for Business Students, Mark N. K. Saunders, Philip Lewis, Adrian Thornhill, Pearson, 2024, **888 pages**.

A Reconceptualization of Fear of Failure in Entrepreneurship, Gabriella Cacciotti, James C. Hayton, J. Robert Mitchell, Andres Giazitzoglu, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Elsevier, 2016, **302–325**.

A Serial Mediation Model of Financial Knowledge on the Intention to Invest: The Central Role of Risk Perception and Attitude, Sang Lim Thien, Rasid Mail, Mohd Rahimie Abd Karim, Zatul Karamah Ahmad Baharul Ulum, Junainah Jaidi, Raman Noordin, *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, Elsevier, 2018, **74–79**.

Value Co-creation and Customer Loyalty, Francisco-José Cossío-Silva, Maria Angeles Revilla-Camacho, Manuela Vega-Vazquez, Beatriz Palacios-Florencio, *Journal of Business Research*, Elsevier, 2016, **1621–1625**.