“A rock pile ceases to be a rock pile the moment a single man contemplates it, bearing with him the image of a cathedral”. -- Antoine de Saint-Exupery

Developing knowledge of entrepreneurial phenomena entails constant interplay between theory and empirics in a cycle of observation, reflection, theory formulation, and testing. These activities cannot all be carried in a single research project. Thus, research projects play different yet equally important roles in a wider ecosystem of knowledge creation. When it comes to their publication, however, focus on novel theoretical contribution implicitly puts projects on different footings. Some projects face a chasm between theory and empirics: their data may be too crude to represent existing theory and too tenuous to articulate a new one. Others are marred by being on an already treaded path, examining already familiar relationships, albeit for much needed addition to the evidence base of the field. Some projects simply do not progress enough by virtue of non-findings, dead-ends or insufficient scale. And yet, they are all invaluable for keeping conversations in the field flowing, for unlocking new research directions, and for staying in sync with changing entrepreneurial phenomena.

J BV Insights offers a forum for rapid dissemination of new research related to entrepreneurial phenomena. The papers featured in the journal will highlight important ideas that cannot yet meet the threshold for completeness, robustness or theoretical explication required of JBV, but will otherwise stimulate further research. Empirical submissions could include unusual findings, atheoretical descriptions, non-findings or replication of established relationships, or single experiments. Theoretical submissions could include thought-provoking examples or juxtapositions. Other submissions include simulations and scale and other methodological developments.

The papers selected for this inaugural issue not only provide insights that open up new research questions but also aim to illustrate the range of contributions that the journal welcomes. This is not meant to be exhaustive set but to provide tangible pointers to potential authors, given that the length and structure of the papers is qualitatively different from more traditional submissions.

Bolivar-Cruz, Batista-Canino, and Hormiga present unusual findings about differences between immigrants and natives in Spain in their perception and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities. They discuss possible theoretical explanations for these findings that open up new paths of inquiry and raise important questions about the context in which entrepreneurship takes place.

Crawford, McKelvey and Lichtenstein present important findings that question some of the implicit assumptions in the entrepreneurship field regarding the nature of the distribution of entrepreneurial outcomes. They open up questions for theoretical development that focus on articulating the process mechanisms that give rise to power-law distributions.

Derbyshire and Garnsey highlight the sensitivities associated with the categorization of empirical data and reinterpret previous findings through a different theoretical lens that zooms in on the important distinction between randomness and chaos. While seemingly random outcomes can be easily deemed to arise from a random process, they can equally stem from a process that is deterministic yet unpredictable.

Engel, Dimitrova, Kapova, and Elfring present a single experiment that points to fruitful relationships between self-efficacy, situational framing, and effectuation, based on some intuitive conjectures. These relationships become a starting point for further theoretical elaboration and testing as well as new research questions.
Honig and Samuelsson revisit the relationship between business planning and venture performance over an extended time frame and thereby put into question some of the received wisdom in the field regarding the merits of business planning. In the process, they also focus on replication of prior studies and highlight sensitivities in data coding that have implications for the direction of causal relationships.

Krause, Acharya, and Covin provide insights into an interesting phenomenon, namely founder comeback. They use a novel analytical technique to identify configurations of conditions under which founder comeback occurs, and thus raise important questions and spur further theoretical development.

We hope you will enjoy reading this inaugural issue and look forward to receiving your submissions.
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