

Editorial

This issue marks another step in our growth as an international journal devoted to entrepreneurship aspects. This thematic issue is titled *Advancing Research in Entrepreneurship* and consists of nine thematic articles and four nonthematic articles.

Interest in entrepreneurship as a field of research does not cease to grow and flourish. Entrepreneurship research covers a very broad set of questions relating to a variety of academic disciplines. Much research still focuses on the heart of entrepreneurship to explain the logic and actions that underline entrepreneurial behaviour. Following Shane and Venkataraman (2000) ground setting paper, some authors claim the existing entrepreneurship research can be best split into two domains: exploration and exploitations of opportunity (Carlsson *et al.*, 2013). In spite of immense progress made, entrepreneurship research still remains much polyphonic and emerging perspectives although have much in common with each other, have largely developed and evolved independently (Fisher, 2012). That is why constant exchange and cooperation between the international community of entrepreneurship scholars is important.

EBER hopefully contributes to this much needed exchange. From its launch EBER is dedicated to serve as a broad and unified platform for revealing and spreading economics and management research relating to entrepreneurship. Along the way, we have featured several thematic issue devoted specifically to entrepreneurship. We have tried very hard to keep up with the currents global and local (CEE) developments and challenges hoping that this journal will contribute to finding answers to very pressing questions. Authors have recently identified several fields in entrepreneurship research which remain neglected or underdeveloped. These include interactions between entrepreneurship and different types on institutions, the link between entrepreneurship and human welfare, macroeconomic conditions and the role of entrepreneurship in economic growth (Carlsson *et al.*, 2013), as well as the creation of opportunities through human propensities (Ramoglou & Tsang, 2016) and behavioural entrepreneurship research (Fisher, 2012). There are many calls to introduce more structure and consistent theories on one hand and expansion of behavioural aspects of entrepreneurship research on the other. Scott Shane himself admitted that there is still need “identify errors and confusing points” in entrepreneurship research (Shane, 2012, p. 18). Therefore much remains to be done.

In the past much attention has been paid by EBER authors to very current developments in entrepreneurship theory and practice such as international aspects of entrepreneurship (Vol. 2, No. 1 and Vol. 3, No. 2), to social entrepreneurship (Vol. 3, No. 1) as well as to immigrant and ethnic entrepreneurship (Vol. 3, No. 3). In the current issue we hope to make a contribution to the signalled underdeveloped areas of entrepreneurship research.

The thematic section of this issue opens with a paper which refers to the macroeconomic conditions of entrepreneurship. In the paper *Entrepreneurship and Economic Freedom: Do Objective and Subjective Data Reflect the Same Tendencies?* the author, Burak Erkut, tests whether the same tendencies on economic freedom and entrepreneurship are captured and reflected by objective and subjective data collected. This is an important aspect bridging the gap in global reporting systems.

In the next article *Who Doesn't Want to be an Entrepreneur? The Role of Need for Closure in Forming Entrepreneurial Intentions of Polish Students* Aleksandra Wąsowska explores how one of the human factors, need for closure, affects entrepreneurial intentions. This study confirms that personal-level variables strongly influence entrepreneurial behaviours.

The third thematic paper *University Business Incubators: An Institutional Demand Side Perspective on Value Adding Features* written by Sven Dahms and Suthikorn Kingkaew draws on the institutional environment and support for entrepreneurship. In their study, these authors test to what extent geographical location in the world determines the demand for university incubators value adding features among entrepreneurs.

Next, several authors turn our attention to a broad field of firm-level entrepreneurship. Ewa Badzińska presents a synthesis of up-to-date research on the quickly growing field of technological entrepreneurship. In her paper *The Concept of Technological Entrepreneurship: The Example of Business Implementation* the author also illustrates the phenomenon of technological entrepreneurship on a specific business case.

Przemysław Zbierowski remains in the field of firm-level entrepreneurship and delivers strong theoretical argumentation for the potential contributions of positive leadership to the practice of corporate entrepreneurship. The paper *Positive Leadership and Corporate Entrepreneurship: Theoretical Considerations and Research Propositions* provides fresh inspiration for new avenues of research while merging entrepreneurship theory with organizational science and management studies.

The next paper *The Potential of Business Environment Institutions and the Support for the Development of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises* written by Renata Lisowska remains in the area of entrepreneurship institutional support environment. The author has assessed the role of business environment institutions based on research carried out on a sample of 590 SMEs.

The next article *Enhancing SMEs' Growth by Investing in Organizational Capital* written by Urban Pauli verifies the relationship between investments in organizational capital and firm performance. The research performed on a sample of 180 Polish SMEs found that investment in organizational capital in the first stage of firm development is positively correlated to almost all performance indicators.

The next article *Measuring Entrepreneurial Orientation in the Social Context* Rafał Kusa makes a much needed attempt to provide measures of entrepreneurial orientation that would be applicable to social enterprises. The proposed scale draws on existing entrepreneurial orientation scale and modifies it to fit the social context.

The last thematic paper titled *Involving Young People in Polish and Lithuanian Social Enterprises by Fostering Entrepreneurial Skills and Abilities as Entrepreneurial Opportunity at University* written by Jolita Greblikaite, Włodzimierz Sroka and Neringa Gerulaitiene an-

alyzes the state of development of social entrepreneurship in Poland and Lithuania suggesting that specific skills obtained at the university can serve as entrepreneurial opportunity and boost the development of social enterprises in these countries.

The second section consists of nonthematic articles and starts with a paper written by Krzysztof Wach *Innovative Behaviour of High-Tech Internationalized Firms: Survey Results from Poland*. This article presents the results of a study conducted on a sample of 263 Polish high-tech firms and suggests that the innovativeness of a firm contributes to the intensification of the internationalization process.

Michał Młody, on the other hand explores the concepts related to de-internationalization. In his paper titled *Backshoring in Light of the Concepts of Divestment and De-internationalization: Similarities and Differences* the author provides an in-depth analysis of two very current concepts, gaining much interest and attention due to shifting behaviour of international firms.

Next, Honggui G. Li, Zhongwei W. Chen, Guoxin X. Ma in their article titled *Corporate Reputation and Performance: A Legitimacy Perspective* investigate the mediating role of innovation legitimacy in the relationship between corporate reputation and firm growth in the Chinese context.

The last article is written by Tomasz Ingram and titled *Relationships between Talent Management and Organizational Performance: The Role of Climate for Creativity*. The author tests the mediating role of climate for creativity in the relationship between talent management and organizational performance on a sample of 326 large organizations.

We trust that this issue of EBER offers diverse intriguing perspectives and insights into current entrepreneurship theory developments. The presented voices come from different places around the world and enrich our understanding of the fascinating puzzle of entrepreneurship.

Agnieszka Żur
Maria Urbaniec
Thematic Issue Editors

REFERENCES

- Carlsson, B., Braunerhjelm, P., McKelvey, M., Olofsson, C., Persson, L., & Ylinenpää, H. (2013). The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research. *Small Business Economics*, 41(4), 913-930.
- Fisher, G. (2012). Effectuation, causation, and bricolage: a behavioral comparison of emerging theories in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(5), 1019-1051.
- Ramoglou, S., & Tsang, E. (2015). A realist perspective of entrepreneurship: Opportunities as propensities. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(3), 410-434.
- Shane, S. (2012). Reflections on the 2010 AMR decade award: delivering on the promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 37(1), 10-20.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.

