Call for Papers for a Special Issue
"Registered Reports in Entrepreneurship"
Submission deadline: September 30, 2024

Guest Editors: Ana Maria Bojica (University of Granada), Julia Olmos-Peñuela (University of Valencia), Paul Steffens (University of Adelaide) and Ted Baker (Rutgers University)

BACKGROUND

Several inappropriate yet commonplace research practices have come under the spotlight both within and beyond the scientific community because of the substantial biases they can create in the cumulative body of knowledge (Murphy and Aguinis, 2019).These practices include, among others, selective reporting of results (i.e., excluding those that do not support the authors' arguments), HARKing (i.e., hypothesizing after the results are known), and p-hacking (reporting statistical models constructed by selecting variables and functional relationship based on trying to increase measures of statistical significance known as "p-values"). All these practices render reported statistics inaccurate and inferences based on them questionable at best and outright misleading at worst. Previous studies suggest that such research practices are prevalent across many disciplines (e.g., Bedeian et al., 2010; Bergh et al., 2017) and hinder cumulative knowledge development. This has led to a credibility crisis in science, and perhaps more so in social and behavioral sciences.

"Registered reports" is an approach to publication that is designed to address many of these practices. It involves splitting the review process into two stages. In the first stage, the authors submit a research plan that is reviewed before data collection. If this research plan receives an *in-principle acceptance* (IPA), the authors are invited to collect and analyze data in accordance with the accepted plan, and to submit their analyses, results and conclusions for the final review. If the authors execute against the accepted plan, their paper will be published, regardless of whether the findings are statistically significant and regardless of whether any of hypotheses are supported, unsupported or rejected.

Registered reports provide benefits to both individual researchers and the research community. Authors get early feedback towards improving study design and they can move forward without the well-founded and commonplace concern that publication biases in favor of statistically significant results and theory confirmation, which may prevent their research from being accepted for publication if their findings do not conform. The research community, including other researchers and consumers of research, are largely freed from concern that what they read may have been influenced by "HARKing"

and "p-hacking" and other inappropriate practices (Chambers and Tzavella, 2022; Murphy and Aguinis, 2022; Soderberg et al., 2021). Moreover, researchers will not repeat earlier research efforts of others that were not published due to "lack of findings", thereby improving the efficiency of scientific advancement. Everyone who relies on published science research gains from knowing that what they read is more likely to be replicable.

This special issue represents a pioneering initiative by BRQ Business Research Quarterly. Our aim is both to publish good research and to increase familiarity with registered reports practices procedure among the members of our community. To our knowledge, among business and management journals Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Journal of Organizational Behavior, the Leadership Quarterly and Journal of Business and Psychology offer this approach as an "alternative" way to submit a paper. However, registration is an increasingly popular practice in psychology and economics and especially in elite medical journals (Hardwicke and Wagenmakers, 2023; Aguinis et al., 2020). In medicine – where practice depends in important ways on research findings – it has been compulsory among core journals since 2004 (De Angelis et al., 2004). Recognizing the value of this approach, the 2013 Declaration of Helsinki recommended preregistration for all research using observational data.

TOPIC

We are pleased to announce a call for proposals for registered reports of empirical quantitative studies in entrepreneurship for potential publication in BRQ Business Research Quarterly. This call welcomes original quantitative papers that approach any aspects of the multifaceted phenomena of entrepreneurship. We invite scholars to expand upon theories that are currently used in entrepreneurship research and bring in new theories that can help gaining new insights into the complexity of entrepreneurial processes, contexts and outcomes.

As examples of research topics that can be approached, we indicate the following:

- The role of contexts in shaping entrepreneurial processes and their outcomes
- Antecedents and consequences of resourcefulness in entrepreneurial activities and processes
- Resourcefulness and innovation in new venture development
- Resource mobilization strategies in new ventures
- Entrepreneurial team configurations and processes and their impact on new venture development and outcomes
- Entrepreneurial teams and innovation in new venture development
- Antecedents and consequences of sustainability practices in new firms
- The role of innovation in the development of new sustainable business models
- Entrepreneurial networks and social capital and entrepreneurial outcomes
- Founder and organizational identity dynamics in new venture development
- Socioeconomic origins of entrepreneurs and patterns of entrepreneurial activity
- Dynamics of entrepreneurship ecosystems, for example in their effects on the emergence of ventures pursuing radical innovations.

However, we would like to emphasize that the call is open to any topic related to entrepreneurship. Both studies that involve new data collection efforts and studies using data from secondary sources are encouraged, as long as the authors certify that they have not engaged in any primary data collection efforts or any analysis of the secondary data before registration. In the case of secondary data, authors are asked to take measures to provide assurance that the reported analyses have not been performed in advance (for more details, please, see the guidelines for registering studies with pre-existing data).

SUBMISSION AND REVIEW PROCESS

In the process we will follow, author(s) submit a research plan documenting in detail their research question, theoretical framework, hypotheses, methods and planned analysis, along with any exploratory data collection and analysis they have undertaken (e.g., pre-tests), *before* they start collecting their primary data or analyzing it in the case of using secondary data. The plan is anonymously peer reviewed, following the same procedure as regular papers. However, the review is focused on evaluating the quality of the theoretical arguments and research question(s), and the rigor of the methods proposed to test them. The reviewers are assessing whether – given the theory and methods you propose, will the results be theoretically interesting, *regardless of whether your hypotheses are supported and regardless of whether your models yield statistically significant relationships.* If you have hypothesized a result as an implication of a theoretical argument and tested it in a sound way, the lack of support for your hypothesis or the lack of statistical significance in a model tells us that something is wrong with the theory you have tested.

The outcome of the first review can be either a rejection of the plan, a revise and resubmit invitation or an IPA (Aguinis et al., 2020). An IPA means that, provided the study is executed as described in the approved plan, it will be published regardless of the empirical results obtained and, thus, regardless of whether the proposed hypotheses are supported or whether your model generates any statistically significant results.

Once the authors collect and analyze their data, they write the findings and discussion sections and submit the full manuscript to the journal. This full manuscript is sent out for double blind review, preferably and typically to the same reviewers who evaluated the registered plan. If the authors have done what they promised to do in the registered plan, and adequately reported their results, the paper is provisionally accepted.

At this stage, reviewers are not allowed to ask the authors to test relationships other than those included in the registered plan. This way of proceeding reduces the potential biases (e.g., apophenia, confirmation and hindsight bias) sometimes introduced in reported results by both authors and at the urging of reviewers (Chambers and Tzavella, 2022; Hardwicke and Wagenmakers, 2023; Munafò et al., 2017). However, if they wish to do so, authors are invited to perform additional exploratory analyses and are encouraged to disclose unexpected empirical patterns that emerged in their data analysis, provided these are relevant to their conclusions or important for other scholars attempting additional and replication studies. This means that nothing we would normally learn from a paper going through the traditional process need be lost to authors or readers.

It is, of course, common sense to expect that when conducting data collection and analysis, authors might encounter unforeseen obstacles or insights that demand deviation from the registered plan. This possibility should not deter anyone from registering their study. If such deviations are justified, do not invalidate the accepted research design, and are made transparent in the review process of the eventual manuscript, they will not be an obstacle for the ultimate publication of the study (Toth et al., 2019). However, an IPA can, on rare occasion, be withdrawn if the deviation from the registered plan undermines the quality of the research and sheds doubt on the reliability and trustworthiness of the results.

In support of developing a culture of research transparency and to enable other researchers to attempt replications (Chambers and Tzavella, 2022), the authors of published manuscripts will be required to allow publication of the registered plan.

We look forward to receiving your submissions. Together, we can take a step forward toward creating better scientific understanding of entrepreneurship.

DEADLINES

Submission of research plan for registration: 30 September 2024 at https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/brq

In principle acceptance: 30 June 2025

Submission of full paper: 31 March 2026

Beginning of expected online first publication: 30 September 2026

Publication of special issue is scheduled for the beginning of 2027 (tentative).

The research plan can be submitted using any reference style. If granted an IPA, the registered plan and the final manuscript should follow the manuscript submission guidelines for BRQ Business Research Quarterly at: https://journals.sagepub.com/author-instructions/BRQ.

We welcome informal enquiries on proposed topics and potential fit with the Special Issue objectives. Please direct questions to the Guest Editors:

Ana Maria Bojica (abojica@ugr.es)

Julia Olmos-Peñuela (julia.olmos@uv.es)

Paul Steffens (paul.steffens@adelaide.edu.au)

Ted Baker (tbaker@business.rutgers.edu)

REFERENCES

Aguinis, H., Banks, G. C., Rogelberg, S. G., & Cascio, W. F. (2020). Actionable recommendations for narrowing the science-practice gap in open science. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *158*, 27-35.

Bedeian, A. G., Taylor, S. G., & Miller, A. N. (2010). Management science on the credibility bubble: Cardinal sins and various misdemeanors. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 9(4), 715-725.

Bergh, D. D., Sharp, B. M., Aguinis, H., & Li, M. (2017). Is there a credibility crisis in strategic management research? Evidence on the reproducibility of study findings. *Strategic Organization*, 15(3), 423–436.

Bosnjak, M., Fiebach, C. J., Mellor, D., Mueller, S., O'Connor, D. B., Oswald, F. L., & Sokol, R. I. (2022). A template for preregistration of quantitative research in psychology: Report of the joint psychological societies preregistration task force. *American Psychologist*, 77(4), 602–615.

Chambers, C. D., & Tzavella, L. (2022). The past, present and future of registered reports. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *6*(1), 29-42.

De Angelis, C. et al. (2004). Clinical trial registration: A statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. *New England Journal of Medicine, 351*, 1250–1251.

Hardwicke, T. E, & Wagenmakers, E. J. (2023). Reducing bias, increasing transparency, and calibrating confidence with preregistration. *Nature Human Behaviour, 7*(1), 15-26.

Munafò, M. R. et al. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *1*(1), 1-9.

Murphy, K. R., & Aguinis, H. (2022). HARKing: How badly can cherry-picking and question trolling produce bias in published results? In *Key Topics in Psychological Methods* (pp. 93-109). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Soderberg, C. K. et al. (2021). Initial evidence of research quality of registered reports compared with the standard publishing model. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *5*(8), 990-997.

Toth, A. A. et al. (2019). An evaluation of the effectiveness of study pre-registration: Best practice recommendations. Paper presented at the 79th annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, MA.

STRUCTURE OF THE RESEARCH PLAN SUBMITTED FOR REGISTRATION

The research plan submission should comprise three distinct building blocks. The initial block will encompass general information about the paper and its submission. The second block shall focus on the front-end of the final paper, comprising the introduction, theoretical framework, and hypotheses. It is crucial to ensure that these sections are developed to the same degree as in a standard paper submission. Lastly, the third block will entail a comprehensive plan for data collection and empirical analyses.

Outlined below is specific guidance on the content to be included in each of the building blocks, based on the template for preregistration of quantitative research elaborated by the joint psychological societies (Bosnjak et al., 2022).

Building Block 1: General Information

Title

Contributors, Affiliations, and Persistent IDs (recommend ORCID iD)
Estimated duration of project (dates)
IRB Status (Institutional Review Board/Independent Ethics Committee/Ethical Review Board/Research Ethics Board)
Conflict of Interest Statement
Data accessibility statement and planned repository
Type of registration
Please choose from the options below the one that best describes your registration:
- Registration prior to construction of datasets
- Registration prior to any human observation of the data
- Registration prior to accessing the data (in this case, see also the following section on registering a research plan with PRE-existing data)
- Registration prior to analyzing the data (in this case, see also the following section on registering a research plan with PRE-existing data)

- Other: please specify; might include if T1 longitudinal data has been analyzed, but T2 has not yet been analyzed.

Abstract
Keywords

Building Block 2: Front-End of the Paper

Introduction
Justify the importance of the research question. Provide a compelling introduction that clearly states the research problem or question, explains its significance, and outlines the objectives of the paper.

Theoretical framework
Describe the theoretical framework or relevant theories that underpin the study. Highlight key concepts and how they relate to the research question.

Hypotheses (H1, H2, …)
Provide hypotheses for predicted results and their complete justification.

Building Block 3: Detailed Plan for Data Collection and Empirical Analyses

Type of study and study design
Indicate the type of study (e.g., experimental, observational, crossectional vs. longitudinal) and planned study design (e.g., between vs. within subjects, factorial, repeated measures, etc.), number of factors and factor levels, etc.

Sample size, power and precision
Relevant sample sizes: e.g., single groups, multiple groups, and sample sizes (or sample ranges) found at each level of multilevel data. Provide power analysis (e.g., power curves) for fixed-N designs. For sequential designs, indicate your 'stopping rule' such as the points at which you intend to be viewing your data and, in any way, analyzing them (e.g., t-tests, correlations).

Participant recruitment and selection
Indicate (a) methods of recruitment; (b) selection and inclusion/exclusion criteria; (c) details of any stratification sampling used; (d) planned participant characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, socioeconomic status, education level, age, health status, geographic location); (e) compensation amount and method (e.g., same payment to all, pay based on performance, lottery), if compensation is given for participating in the study. Indicate any special treatment for participants who drop out (e.g., they are deleted from the data file entirely; there is follow-up in a manner different from the main sample) or whether participants are replaced.

Data cleaning and screening
Indicate all steps related to data quality control, e.g., outlier treatment, identification of missing data, how missing data will be handled, checks for normality, etc.

Randomization of participants and/or experimental materials   *(only for experiments)*
If applicable, describe how participants are assigned to conditions or treatments, how stimuli are assigned to conditions, and how presentation of tests, trials, etc. is randomized. Indicate the

randomization technique and whether constraints were applied (pseudo-randomization). Indicate any type of balancing across participants (e.g., assignments of responses to hands, etc.).

Measured variables, manipulated variables, covariates
Clarify which variables are used to operationalize the hypotheses specified above. Please (a) list all measured variables, and (b) explicitly state the functional role of each variable (i.e., independent variable, dependent variable, covariate, mediator, moderator). It is important to (c) specify for each hypothesis how it is operationalized, i.e., which variables will be used to test the respective hypothesis and how the hypothesis will be operationally defined in terms of these variables. The description here shall be consistent with the statistical analysis plans indicated.

Study Materials
Please describe any relevant study materials. This could include, for example, stimulus materials used for experiments or questionnaires used for rating studies.

Study Procedures
Please describe here any relevant information about how the study will be conducted, e.g., the number and timing of measurement time points for longitudinal research, the number of blocks or runs per session of an experiment, laboratory setting, the group size in group testing, questionnaire administration, etc.

Analysis plan

Criteria for post-data collection exclusion of participants, if any
Describe all criteria that will lead to the exclusion of a participant's data (e.g., performance criteria, non-responding, incomplete data). Be as specific as possible.

Criteria for post-data collection exclusions on trial level (if applicable)
Describe all criteria that will lead to the exclusion of a trial or item (e.g., statistical outliers, response time criteria). Be as specific as possible.

Data preprocessing
Describe all data manipulations that are performed in preparation of the main analyses, (e.g., calculation of variables or scales, recoding, any data transformations, etc.).

Reliability analysis (if applicable)
Specify the type of scale reliability that will be estimated, whether it is internal consistency (e.g., Cronbachs alpha, omega), test-retest reliability, or some other form (e.g., a confirmatory factor analysis incorporating multiple factors as sources of variance). In a study involving measure development, researchers should specify criteria for removing items from measures a priori (e.g., largest factor loading magnitude, smallest drop in alpha-if-item removed).

Statistical models (provide for each hypothesis if varies)
Specify the statistical model that will be used to test each of your hypotheses. Give all necessary information about model specification (e.g., variables, interactions, planned contrasts) and follow-up analyses. Include model selection criteria (e.g., fit indices), corrections for multiple testing, and tests for statistical violations, if applicable. Wherever unclear, describe how effect sizes will be calculated.

Inference criteria

Specify the criteria used for inferences (e.g., p values, Bayes factors, effect size measures) and the thresholds for accepting or rejecting your hypotheses. If possible, define the smallest effect size of interest. If inference criteria differ between hypotheses, specify separately for each hypothesis and respective statistical model by explicitly referring to the numbers of the hypotheses. Describe which effect size measures will be reported and how they are calculated.

Exploratory analysis (optional)

Describe any exploratory analyses to be conducted with your data. Include here any planned analyses that are not confirmatory in the sense of being a direct test of one of the specified hypotheses.

SUBMISSION OF A RESEARCH PLAN WITH PRE-EXISTING DATA

If pre-existing data is used in the research plan submitted for registration, in addition to submitting the content indicated in the preceding section, the authors should take one of the following options, depending on the nature of their data.

Option 1) If the data set is cross-sectional or is longitudinal, but all data waves are available and no new wave of data collection is expected in the timeline of the call for papers, prior to submitting the research plan, the authors are required to submit the sample to a third independent party (to be determined) who is responsible to randomly split the dataset into two independent subsamples that include no overlapping observations. The authors are returned one of the subsamples, that remains at their disposal to perform any exploratory analyses deemed necessary. Then the authors are required to register their research plan and, if this plan is granted an IPA, they are required to test their hypotheses and report the results on the second subsample of the data set. The analyses with the second subsample will be published as the main results and the results from the first subsample can be added as a robustness check.

Option 2) If the data set is longitudinal and T1 longitudinal data has been analyzed, but T2 has not yet been analyzed because it is not available, the authors are required to submit the results of T1 together with the research plan. If the research plan is granted an IPA, when T2 becomes available, the authors are required to incorporate it to the data set, perform the planned analyses, report and discuss the results in the final paper submitted.