

Decision Letter (AMR-08-0442-Original.R3)

From: amr@aom.pace.edu

To: jpc@lubs.leeds.ac.uk, J.S.Clarke@lubs.leeds.ac.uk

CC: adelaide@virginia.edu, szaid@aom.pace.edu

BCC: amr@aom.pace.edu, sthinz@zoominternet.net, Amy.hillman@asu.edu

Subject: Academy of Management Review - Decision on Manuscript ID AMR-08-0442-Original.R3

Body: 22-Feb-2010

Dear Professors Cornelissen and Clarke,

Thank you for the thoughtful comments and changes to your manuscript. I am happy to accept "Imagining and rationalizing opportunities: Inductive reasoning, and the creation and justification of new ventures" for publication in AMR once you address the remaining items that are required to make the manuscript read better. In my mind these are straightforward suggestions, but do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns about these issues.

1) p. 8. "sensemaking refers to a point"—should this be "occurs at a point" or "refers to an act"?

2) Page 15: "In the next section, we unfold these arguments and illustrate our main propositions with case examples of novel ventures in nascent markets that emerged through the confluence of the computing, electronics and telecommunication industries in the mid nineties (Santos & Eisenhardt, 2009). We shed new light on these cases, and demonstrate how they exemplify the main inductive processes and determinants within the initial stages of venture creation."

- You haven't gone quite far enough re: positioning your research vis a vis Santos and Eisenhardt, which should go beyond the simple claim that you are shedding new light on these examples, a claim that doesn't provide any indication of the previous (different) use of the examples. You need to give a brief acknowledgement of Santos and Eisenhardt's theory/ motivation for originally developing these cases to make it straightforward for the reader to recognize that you're shedding new light.

3) p. 15 "Nelson Goodman (1955) gave a well-known account of the basis of inductive reasoning: one that points towards the historical practices and experiences of entrepreneurs and in particular their language use, rather than simply their psychology (Sloman & Lagnado, 2005). Ultimately, Goodman (1955: 117) attempted to explain inductive reasoning in terms of our linguistic practices: "the roots of inductive validity are to be found in our use of language". He argued that induction may consist of a mental habit formed by past observations and experiences, but that language is driving whatever past regularities are selected and thus projected onto a novel or future situation. According to Goodman (1955: 117); induction "is a function of our linguistic practices" with "the line between valid and invalid predictions (or inductions or projections) drawn upon the basis of how the world is and has been described and anticipated in words". Goodman (1955) specifically argued that the entrenchment of language effects inductive reasoning. In short, entire verbal descriptions or specific words are entrenched when they and their metaphorical extensions have historically figured in this usage."

- This paragraph needs tightening, including editing for redundancies. It's about twice as long as it needs to be. For example, I don't see that what the "According to Goodman..." sentence adds.

4) P. 22: Shouldn't it be: "The broader range of diversity of people that entrepreneurs speak to may activate ADDED pressures to make the venture understood and legitimate in the eyes of others...."

5) p. 32 "...it runs the risk of turning the entire edifice into an incoherent theory that lacks specificity and is hard to operationalize in empirical research" is a bit heavy handed,

particularly given that the empirical direction that follows, while laudable, isn't particularly easy or straightforward to make happen. This needs to be toned down a notch.

6) I still think Figure 1 trivializes your contribution. You either need to drop Figure 1, or suggest different parallel wording to describe this illustration that does not include "speech without thought" which I think is particularly problematic.

Now that your manuscript has been accepted, it will enter the production process, which is handled primarily by AMR's production editor, Sandra Tamburrino-Hinz. She will be in touch with you when she is about to begin production on the issue in which your paper will appear. Please also refer to the attached letter to authors regarding details about your accepted manuscript.

Please complete the attached copyright agreement form and mail it to the address on the form to Susan Zaid, Senior Managing Editor, AMR.

I invite you to contact me if you have any general comments or suggestions for improvements based on your experiences as an author who has recently experienced the AMR review process. Again, many congratulations on your exemplary work on this paper.

Thank you for your fine contribution. I am confident that the article will be read and will significantly influence the direction of future research. It's been a pleasure working with you, and I'm very much looking forward to seeing the manuscript in print!

All the best,

Professor Adelaide King
Associate Editor, Academy of Management Review
amr@aom.pace.edu

Date Sent: 22-Feb-2010

File 1: [Editor-Comments-on-Final-Revision-for-AMR--08-442.docx](#)

File 2: [* author-letter-for-final-version-of-manuscript.doc](#)

File 3: [* CopyrightTransferForm-AMR--6-19-2008-.doc](#)