



**Doermer School of Business
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne**

Course Syllabus for
BUFW M-528-01 Corporate Entrepreneurship - 13811

Type	Time	Days	Where	Date Range	Schedule	Instructors
Class	6:00 pm - 8:45 pm	W	KT128 (may change)	Aug 25, 2014 - Dec 21, 2014	Lecture	Dr. Zelimir W Todorovic

OFFICE PHONE: 481-6940

OFFICE: Neff 340L

OFFICE HOURS: Mondays 3:30pm – 4:20 p.m.
(or by appointment)

E-MAIL: todorovz@ipfw.edu

WEBSITE: <http://users.ipfw.edu/todorovz/>



COURSE PREREQUISITES: Per DSB requirements or with permission of professor.

Recommended Text: Morris, Kuratko and Covin, *Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 3rd edition (South-Western Cengage Learning) (Note: Sold at Amazon for \$65.99, follow link: <http://www.amazon.com/Corporate-Entrepreneurship-Innovation-Michael-Morris/dp/0538478926>.)

Please See back of this document for other readings you may be interested in (free access at

Entrepreneurship is an essential and indispensable element in the success of every business organization regardless of size or age. Corporate entrepreneurship (or intrapreneurship) refers to activities involved in creating and exploiting new, innovative resource combinations in the context of existing corporations. From the wide span of corporate entrepreneurship field, this course focuses primarily on managerial efforts aimed at the identification, development and exploitation of technical and organizational innovations, the management of new product or process developments, and on effective new venture management in the context of large corporations in manufacturing as well as in service industries. The essential objective of the course is to develop an awareness and understanding of the range, scope, and complexity of the issues related to the creation of an organizational environment that is supportive of entrepreneurial endeavors as well as to gain insight concerning the effective implementation of technological and organizational innovations in a corporate setting.

Course Objectives	Program Goals
To develop an integrated approach to the analysis and understanding of businesses and industries in their competitive environments.	- To develop the ability to solve problems innovatively, based on a knowledge of the tools, concepts, and theories of each of the functional business disciplines;
To enable students through case studies, critical incidents and videos to assume the roles of professional managers and allow them an opportunity to define and analyze problems and make decisions.	- To develop the ability to apply specialized skills to managerial problems inherent in a rapidly changing global environment;
To develop an ability to formulate astute strategic plans in running an organization in the globally	- To develop the ability to effectively harness and use information technology

competitive environment.	- To develop effective written, oral and presentation skills;
To develop a framework for critically evaluating the contributions of others	- To develop the interpersonal and team leadership skills needed to build an organizational environment that is effective and conducive to collaboration;
To prepare students to function in the business environment	- To develop a sense of professional and social responsibility in the conduct of managerial affairs.

Course Requirements

GENERAL

This course is intended to be a challenging and exciting elective course for the graduate business school curriculum, which also counts as one of the three required courses for the **MBA Track in Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation**. It is first and foremost a course about “entrepreneurship” and about “managing innovation within organizations.”

Corporate Entrepreneurship refers to entrepreneurship within existing for-profit or not-for-profit organizations. It is the practice of seeking innovative uses, markets, or owners of the organization’s existing products, services, and technologies. It draws the creativity of the organization’s personnel to new business possibilities that go beyond the current business model of the organization. It engages the entrepreneurial spirit in spawning a new vision from within the organization.

Corporate entrepreneurship, which requires the development of Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), has often been credited with making the US economy prosperous. By equipping students with these skills, they will be able to participate in the economic renewal of this region and the state.

This is an overview, a “big picture” course of corporate entrepreneurship, and as such it is not designed to cover all aspects of corporate entrepreneurship. More than a few of your previous courses have been highly structured and related closely to a well-developed body of theory. Some provided quantitative techniques for students to engage. Others related to information and specific skills the faculty believe students need to acquire. This course shares few of these traits. Problems and issues often arise from the tasks of crafting and implementing entrepreneurial thinking within the confines of an organization. This task covers the whole spectrum of business and management. Many variables and situational factors must be dealt with simultaneously.

This course is designed to help prepare students for the present business environment. Consequently, professional behavior by the students, including timely material completion, regular attendance and participation is expected. Because this course emulates real business environment, students **are intentionally exposed to ambiguity including that of class design**. This may include introduction of cases, text/lecture discussion notes etc., without prior warning. This ambiguity is necessary for two principal reasons: (1) More closely emulate true business environment, and (2) allow for a more flexible connection with the client organizations, which are crucial elements of this course.

Further, working in groups is an everyday component of real life business world environment, but is often undervalued in a university setting. As a result, this course emphasizes group management by its members, even though student contribution to this course is on individual basis. Students are expected to come to class having read textbook material. Class lectures are designed to supplement the textbook material not review it.

PARTICIPATION

Participation in the course is crucial element of learning. To be fair to those who participate in class discussions, participation a significant proportion of the final course grade.

Highest range (A)	- Excellent Performance, someone at this level regularly initiates and contributes towards the understanding of the material. Their comments make deep and make significant contributions to our class discussions. These students attend all classes and are always prepared.
Medium range (B)	- Very good performance, Student attends all the classes and makes a greater than average contribution to class discussions. These students are well prepared for class room discussions.
Low range(C)	- Person at this level makes only sporadic contributions, but they are present at most lectures
Lowest range (D)	- Person attends majority of the classes, but make little or no contribution

Please note that this is a subjective determination (as it is in business world also). Participation mark will be ascertained at the **sole discretion** of the instructor using the above template:

RESEARCH ARTICLE PRESENTATIONS – Waived in place of Intellectual property development voted unanimously by the students!

Each student will be asked to do three “article review” presentations. No written hand in is required. These presentations are expected to last up to a maximum of 15 minutes, after which there will be a class wide discussion. Students are asked to choose one of the articles referenced at the back of this syllabus.

Students are expected to discuss the following:

- What is the research question the article is designed to answer?
- What is the theoretical base of the article?
- What is the seminal literature that the article employs?
- What methodology does the article employ?
- What are the main theses of the discussion on which the article is based?
- Present and discuss any figures and constructs the article is arguing?
- How convinced / not convinced are you by the arguments presented in the article?

FINAL TERM REPORT

You will be asked to write a paper of about 16-20 pages (double spaced) in length, not including any exhibits and figures. Exhibits and figures may be included in the body of the paper (preferred), and the paper length may be adjusted for the length of their inclusion. The paper you write will be based on the theory covered and three to five interviews with managers and leaders in our community. The purpose of this paper is to help you develop conceptual thinking and communication. Papers which are deemed “good enough” may be invited for presentation on National or International conferences. Student authors of the papers have the option to decide if they want to go to the conferences, and may choose to apply to the University for Funds for these conferences.

Written Report

Your written report should have the following sections:

- Abstract
- Introduction
- Literature Review
- Methodology
- Findings and or Discussion
- Conclusions
- References

A good report will build from existing arguments made in the literature, and provide a contribution to our understanding of those arguments. A good report will be well written, and have a good number of references, often relying on key articles.

At the back of this syllabus, students will find a list of articles supplied by the professor for student convenience.

Oral Presentations:

Oral presentations consist of a 20-minute presentation followed by a 10-minute question-answer session. All presentations should incorporate the use of attractive, effective PowerPoint slides.

Your grade on the presentation will be based on the following factors:

1. The clarity and thoroughness with which you identify and articulate the problems that needs to be addressed
2. The caliber (depth and breadth) of your analysis
3. The breadth, depth, and practicality of your arguments, degree of detail and specificity of recommended actions or outcomes, caliber of supporting arguments
4. The caliber of your PowerPoint slides
5. The degree of preparation, professionalism, energy, enthusiasm, and skills demonstrated in delivering your part of the presentation

GRADING FORMAT

Participation	20%
Research Article Presentations (10% per paper, three papers during semester)	30%
Final Term Paper (Report 35%) (Presentation 15%)	50%
<hr/> <i>Total</i>	<hr/> <u>100%</u>

GRADING SCALE

A+ = 97-100%	A = 93-96%	A- = 90-92%
B+ = 87-89%	B = 83-86%	B- = 80-82%
C+ = 77-79%	C = 73-76%	C- = 70-72%
D+ = 67-69%	D = 63-66%	D- = 60-62%
F = <60%		

DYNAMIC GROUP DISCUSSIONS

The value of group dynamics is often underestimated. Eventhough you are engaged in individual projects, the ability to work, discuss or consider issues within a team is invaluable. Dynamic discussion times represent a safe time for conflicting opinions and views to be presented in a safe environment

OTHER

Students are responsible for all the material in the textbook, cases and classroom discussions. Students are expected to check the website 24 hours before each class. Website will be used to communicate any changes in topics, meeting times or events. As much as all effort has been made to describe M590 in this syllabus, this syllabus is subject to change at the sole discretion of the instructor.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The Academic Honor Code will be in effect throughout all aspects of this course. All violations of the university's policy on academic integrity will be dealt with swiftly and fairly. Students found guilty of academic dishonesty, which includes (but not limited to) cheating, plagiarism, or collusion, are subject to disciplinary action. For detailed information on academic integrity, refer to the university's Academic Honor System.

STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

The University complies with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. Students with disabilities who seek academic accommodations should register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC) and bring a letter to the instructor from the SDRC indicating the approved academic accommodations. This should be done within the first week of class.

Enjoy the Journey!

NOTES

Course Outline (Subject to change throughout the term)

SECTION 1: Understanding Corporate Entrepreneurship

Wednesday, August 27, 2014

Introduction to the course
Understanding Corporate Entrepreneurship
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Microsoft (p.23) (time permitting)

Wednesday, September 3, 2014

Understanding Levels of Corporate Entrepreneurship
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Challenge of Entrepreneurial Growth (p.53) and P and G (p.82) (time permitting)

Wednesday, September 10, 2014

Group Work - Projects (Dynamic Group Discussions)

SECTION 2: Creating an Entrepreneurial Organization

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

Understanding the Forms of Corporate Entrepreneurship
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: World's Best companies (p.111) (time permitting)

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

Organizational Culture
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Apple, (p.326) (time permitting)

Wednesday, October 1, 2014

Human Resource Capabilities
Chapters 6 and 7
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: 3M (p.201) (time permitting)

SECTION 3: EO Presentations

Wednesday, October 8, 2014

Student Presentations
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Intuit Welcome Failure, (p.296) (time permitting)
Organizational Structure

Wednesday, October 15, 2014

Student Presentations
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: V-team Structure, (p.269) (time permitting)

Wednesday, October 22, 2014

Student Presentations
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Future of Blackberry, (p.454) (time permitting)

Wednesday, October 29, 2014

Student Presentations
Discussion: The innovator's NoteBook: Innovation at Somsung, (p.392) (time permitting)

Wednesday, November 5, 2014

Group Work - Projects (Dynamic Group Discussions)
Wednesday, November 12, 2014
Practice Presentations - All Teams / Students
Wednesday, November 19, 2014
Practice Presentation – All Teams / Students
Wednesday, November 26, 2014
Thanksgiving Holiday
Wednesday, December 3, 2014
Group Work - Projects (Dynamic Group Discussions)
Wednesday, December 10, 2014
Final Presentations, All Teams / Students
Wednesday, December 17, 2014
Wrap-up

POOL OF POTENTIAL READING MATERIAL

Atiq, M. and M. Karatas-Ozkan (2013). "Sustainable Corporate Entrepreneurship from A Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility Perspective: Current Research And Future Opportunities." International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation **14**(1): 5-14.

This paper explores the process of sustainable entrepreneurship from the perspective of strategic corporate social responsibility (CSR). Drawing on insights from entrepreneurship studies that focus on opportunity creation and enactment, along with the extant literature on CSR, the authors propose a conceptual framework for sustainable entrepreneurship that combines an entrepreneurial approach with sustainability. The authors suggest that sustainability should be embedded in the business operations of companies and that sustainable business practices should be driven by an entrepreneurial approach in order to create shared value -- that is, value for the business as well as for society. Shared value creation is the outcome of sustainable corporate entrepreneurship. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Belousova, O. and B. Gailly (2013). "Corporate entrepreneurship in a dispersed setting: actors, behaviors, and process." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal **9**(3): 361-377.

Although conceptual models of the corporate entrepreneurship process are numerous, our current empirical knowledge regarding it remains fragmented, especially concerning the contributions of individual employees to corporate entrepreneurship. Thus, two important questions remain unanswered: How do employees from different managerial ranks of an organization contribute to the corporate entrepreneurship process, and how do these contributions change as the project unfolds over time? In the current research, we aim to answer these questions and offer an integrative framework for the corporate entrepreneurship process that would account for dynamic contributions of multiple actors through their activities and behaviors. We approach

these questions in a specific context by studying three cases within a large company in a dispersed corporate setting. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Biniari, M. G. (2012). "The Emotional Embeddedness of Corporate Entrepreneurship: The Case of Envy." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **36**(1): 141-170.

This article argues for the emotional embeddedness of the entrepreneurial act as a moderator of its social embeddedness. Building on the theoretical grounds of the sociology of emotions, we propose the study of entrepreneurial affect as an element of the social-emotional interaction between the entrepreneur and the others who are influenced by the entrepreneurial process. The empirical context of corporate entrepreneurship is used to illustrate how the emotion cycle around the entrepreneurial act, involving the emotions of corporate entrepreneurs and others, indicates the emotional embeddedness of the latter. The emergence of envy toward members of two venturing programs is used to exemplify low levels of emotional and consequently social embeddedness.

Chung, L. H. and P. T. Gibbons (1997). "Corporate entrepreneurship: The roles of ideology and social capital." Group & Organization Management **22**(1): 10-30.

It is suggested that entrepreneurial behavior within an organization can only be effectively created and controlled through an appropriate corporate culture. Corporate culture is viewed as a social structure that possesses 2 facets that are central to entrepreneurship: 1. A superstructure that provides an ideology to which organizational participants can commit to. 2. A sociostructure that facilitates the emergence of social capital, which can provide a form of sustainable competitive advantage.

Dess, G. G., R. D. Ireland, et al. (2003). "Emerging issues in corporate entrepreneurship." Journal of Management **29**(3): 351-378.

Research on corporate entrepreneurship (CE) has grown rapidly over the past decade. In this article, we identify four major issues scholars can pursue to further our understanding about CE. The issues we explore include various forms of CE (e.g., sustained regeneration, domain redefinition) and their implications for organizational learning; the role of leadership and social exchange in the CE process; and, key research opportunities relevant to CE in an international context. To address the latter issue, we propose a typology that separates content from process-related studies and new ventures vs. established companies. We close with a reassessment of the outcomes in CE research, which becomes particularly salient with the increasing importance of social, human, and intellectual capital in creating competitive advantages and wealth in today's knowledge economy. Throughout the article, we use the organizational learning theory as a means of integrating our discussion and highlighting the potential contributions of CE to knowledge creation and effective exploitation. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Finkle, T. A. (2011). "Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Silicon Valley: The Case of Google, Inc." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **36**(4): 863-884.

In May 2009, Sergey Brin and Larry Page, co-founders of Google, Inc., were trying to determine how they were going to navigate Google through the worst recession since the Great Depression. Their primary problem was how to maintain the company's culture of corporate entrepreneurship and innovation in the face of stagnant profits and a host of other issues. Google sought answers on how to increase corporate entrepreneurship and innovation during the worst economic

environment that the company had ever experienced. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Heavey, C. and Z. Simsek (2013). "Top Management Compositional Effects on Corporate Entrepreneurship: The Moderating Role of Perceived Technological Uncertainty." The Journal of Product Innovation Management **30**(5): 837-855.

Because corporate entrepreneurship (CE) is central to firms' ability to compete, adapt, and perform in increasingly turbulent environments, there is a great interest in understanding its origins. To date, prior studies have overwhelmingly focused on the architectural factors -- the structures, cultures, resources, and incentives -- that shape entrepreneurial processes within organizations and the environmental conditions that stimulate entrepreneurial activity. However, some researchers have recently begun to argue that the requirements and challenges of CE fall most saliently on the shoulders of the firm's top management team. Focusing on various aspects of top managers' activities, roles, and processes, this line of research demonstrates the enabling role of top management teams in their firm's pursuit of CE. We extend this research by examining the impact of top management team composition in terms of human capital and social capital on CE. Additionally, because external environment perceptions within top teams shape their sociopolitical process and framing of the issues facing their firms, we submit that a team's level of perceived technological uncertainty moderates the impact of the team's human and social capital on CE. We find support for these arguments using multisource data from a sample of 99 high-technology firms. The discussion finally traces the implications of our theory and findings for research and managerial understanding on CE. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Hornsby, J., I. Peña-legazkue, et al. (2013). "Guest editorial: the role of corporate entrepreneurship in the current organizational and economic landscape." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal **9**(3): 295-305.

The Role of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Current Organizational and Economic Landscape

Hornsby, J. S., J. M. Bloodgood, et al. (2013). "Network legitimacy diffusion: a model for corporate entrepreneurship." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal **9**(3): 307-322.

International corporate entrepreneurship increasingly requires broader internal and external networks and legitimacy seeking in areas where the corporation and the entrepreneur are not well known. In this article, the important factors that influence the degree of legitimacy granted to corporate entrepreneurs are proposed and discussed. Specifically, we identify three primary levels of legitimacy: pragmatic legitimacy, normative legitimacy, and structural legitimacy. A model is proposed that suggests that organizations move through these levels of legitimacy resulting in differing brokering behaviors for network building. In addition, we integrate this effort into a global perspective by focusing on corporate entrepreneurs who seek to engage in international efforts. Implications for future research are provided.[PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Hornsby, J. S., D. F. Kuratko, et al. (2013). "Assessing a Measurement of Organizational Preparedness for Corporate Entrepreneurship." The Journal of Product Innovation Management **30**(5): 937-955.

Research has shown that the manifestation of corporate entrepreneurship is an important strategy for the success of private- and public-sector organizations. The Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessment Instrument (CEAI) is an instrument that was developed to measure the key internal organizational factors that influence a firm's entrepreneurial activities and outcomes. The present

research employs three studies to assess the content, construct, and convergent validity of the CEAI using a well-established framework for scale development and refinement. The CEAI was found to be a relatively stable instrument, although the factor structure that emerged varied slightly from the original instrument. In sum, as a result of our analyses, a more parsimonious and psychometrically sound set of items for each factor was derived yielding an 18-item instrument based upon the original 48-item measure. Our studies of the CEAI present a timely contribution toward advancing research in the area of organizational preparedness for corporate entrepreneurship. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Ireland, R. D., J. G. Covin, et al. (2009). "Conceptualizing Corporate Entrepreneurship Strategy." Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice **33**(1): 19-46.

Our knowledge of corporate entrepreneurship (CE) continues to expand. However, this knowledge remains quite fragmented and non-cumulative. Herein, we conceptualize CE strategy as a useful focal point for integrating and synthesizing key elements within CE's intellectual domain. The components of our CE strategy model include (1) the antecedents of CE strategy (i.e., individual entrepreneurial cognitions of the organization's members and external environmental conditions that invite entrepreneurial activity), (2) the elements of CE strategy (i.e., top management's entrepreneurial strategic vision for the firm, organizational architectures that encourage entrepreneurial processes and behavior, and the generic forms of entrepreneurial process that are reflected in entrepreneurial behavior), and (3) the outcomes of CE strategy (i.e., organizational outcomes resulting from entrepreneurial actions, including the development of competitive capability and strategic repositioning). We discuss how our model contributes to the CE literature, distinguish our model from prior models, and identify challenges future CE research should address. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Johl, S. K., A. Bruce, et al. (2013). "Remuneration Structure and Corporate Entrepreneurship: A UK Study." International Journal of Business and Management **8**(7): 116-126.

This purpose of this paper is to investigate the effect of remuneration structure and corporate entrepreneurship. To reconcile the inconsistencies and non-conclusive findings from previous studies this study developed two propositions to test: the relationship of Executive Stock Option (ESO) and corporate entrepreneurship and the use of performance criteria in awarding bonuses to executives and entrepreneurial activities. Using the mixed method approach this study selected the top 100 companies in the U.K for the quantitative study and six cases were selected for the case studies. The findings indicated that there is no relationship between Executive Stock Option (ESO) and corporate entrepreneurship activities. However, the finding was partially supported in the use of performance criteria in awarding bonuses to executives and entrepreneurial activities. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Karacaoglu, K., A. Bayrakdaroglu, et al. (2013). "The Impact of Corporate Entrepreneurship on Firms' Financial Performance: Evidence from Istanbul Stock Exchange Firms." International Business Research **6**(1): 163-175.

In this study, it is aimed to show the interaction between financial performance and corporate entrepreneurship which can be identified as whole activities of new product, process, market, technology, strategy and improving management technique. In this respect, alternative two models to explain the interaction which is mentioned above were tested in an empirical research on 140 industrial manufacturing firms which are publicly trading in Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE). Developed models and hypothesis are analysed by means of the Structural Equation

Modelling (SEM) using LISREL. According to research findings it was determined that original dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship which is compound of innovation, risk taking and proactiveness has positive relation and interaction with financial performances of the firms. In addition; in the latest development in the related literature, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness variables which was added to the original dimension later on, did not show any relation with financial performances of firms. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Kuratko, D. F. and D. B. Audretsch (2013). "Clarifying the domains of corporate entrepreneurship." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal 9(3): 323-335.

While there is a broadly held belief in the need for and inherent value of entrepreneurial action on the part of established organizations, much remains to be revealed about how corporate entrepreneurship (CE) is defined in organizational settings. Fortunately, knowledge accumulation on the topic has been occurring at a rapid rate and many of the elements essential to constructing a theoretically grounded understanding of CE can be readily identified from the extant literature. Corporate entrepreneurship may possess the critical components needed for the future productivity of global organizations. However, it is a far reaching concept that encompasses differing aspects and as research continues to increase in this field a stronger perspective of what constitutes corporate entrepreneurship needs to be examined. Our purpose in this article is to outline the various domains that currently exist in the research arena of corporate entrepreneurship. Exploring these domains and gaining a sharper focus on the corporate entrepreneurship process may be a most important step for scholars interested in moving the field forward.[PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Miles, M. P., L. S. Munilla, et al. (2009). "Sustainable corporate entrepreneurship." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal 5(1): 65-76.

Corporate entrepreneurship has, for a number of decades, been viewed as one approach for generating growth through new product, process, market, or strategy innovation. More recently, and largely in response to rising costs and stakeholder concerns, managers have begun to pay increasing attention to issues of sustainability and corporate social responsibility. This paper demonstrates how sustainability can be embedded into a corporate entrepreneurship framework. In addition, managers who embrace sustainability principles are providing a stimulus for corporate entrepreneurship that may result in the discovery or creation, assessment, and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities, an enhanced reputation, and, ultimately, a competitive advantage.[PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Phan, P., M. Wright, et al. (2009). "Corporate entrepreneurship: Current research and future directions." Journal of Business Venturing 24(3): 197-205.

In this paper, we suggest future research on the processes and knowledge-based resources in corporate entrepreneurship (CE), argue for the need to appreciate the heterogeneity of CE in relation to new contexts, and suggest appropriate strategies for such contexts. First, we highlight the key contributions of the papers in this special issue, with a particular focus on how they provide insights into structural and process contingencies, the role of management at multiple levels, and organizational and managerial capabilities. We then discuss the limits to the applicability of theories developed in other contexts to CE. Finally, we suggest some future research, with particular emphasis on the corporate governance mechanisms that foster CE and the requisite managerial roles and skills in instigating and supporting entrepreneurial activities at different levels of the organization. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Phillips, J. M. and J. G. Messersmith (2013). "ARE PROFESSIONAL SERVICE FIRMS UNIQUELY SUITED FOR CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP? A THEORETICAL MODEL CONNECTING PROFESSIONAL SERVICE INTENSITY AND CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP." Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship **24**(2): 79-96.

We propose a theoretical model in which the distinctive characteristics of professional services firms both enable and drive Corporate Entrepreneurship (CE). Prior research has shown that CE enhances firm performance, but the phenomenon remains unexplored in the professional service industry. This lack of inclusion is unfortunate, because professional service firms (PSFs) play a vital role in the US and global economy. In addition, PSFs differ markedly from traditional non-professional firms in their structure and management, resulting in a unique expression of CE within this context that has not yet been captured. This paper maps the distinct characteristics of PSFs to the well-established domains of CE. This paper further proposes that a firm's level of professionalism is predictive of CE. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Schlosser, F. K. and Z. W. Todorovic (2006). "Entrepreneurial Charisma: A Key to Employee Identification?" Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship **19**(1): 49-62.

Entrepreneurial businesses are an important driver of modern day economies. A firm that adopts a strategy of calculated risks and demonstrates proactiveness and innovation reflects an entrepreneurial orientation (EO). In order to create an entrepreneurial orientation and associated performance outcomes, it is necessary to understand the role of individuals and the interpersonal processes that shape values, norms, and behaviors. Incorporating research from the literature of social psychology, this study examines the effect of individual and organizational variables on employees who work for an entrepreneurial venture. A cross-sectional study of 78 employees of small Canadian businesses empirically demonstrates how an entrepreneurial strategic orientation and a charismatic leadership style encourage employees to identify with the entrepreneurial organization. Empirical results indicate that personality and strategic direction play an important part in creating value for the entrepreneurial firm.

Shepherd, D. A., J. M. Haynie, et al. (2013). "Project Failures Arising from Corporate Entrepreneurship: Impact of Multiple Project Failures on Employees' Accumulated Emotions, Learning, and Motivation." The Journal of Product Innovation Management **30**(5): 880-895.

In this paper, we consider an organizational paradox inherent to corporate entrepreneurship; that is, the pursuit of entrepreneurial projects is necessary for organizational rejuvenation, renewal, and/or organic growth; however, the high failure rate of entrepreneurial projects likely has enduring implications for the project team members and, by extension, the organization. Drawing on the psychology and emotion literatures, we model the human capital costs of corporate entrepreneurship arising from the multiple failures of entrepreneurial projects. Specifically, we explore how and with what consequence negative emotions can accumulate across multiple failures; when this accumulation is most likely to occur; and what the nature of this accumulation is across organizational contexts, employee differences, and time. This theorizing complements extant scholarship focused on the financial benefits and costs of corporate entrepreneurship by investigating the negative impact of multiple project failures on employees. [PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]

Todorovic, Z. W., R. B. McNaughton, et al. (2011). "ENTRE-U: An entrepreneurial orientation scale for

universities." Technovation **31**(2/3): 128-137.

The development of a new scale, ENTRE-U, that measures the entrepreneurial orientation of university departments is described. Governments, industry, and funding organizations challenge universities to become more "entrepreneurial", often in the context of increasing the commercialization outcomes of publicly funded research. The extant literature on corporate entrepreneurial orientation (EO) suggests this orientation is beneficial when organizations face dynamic or hostile environments. However, the EO concept and related empirical research focus on firms in competitive markets. Little is known about the nature of EO in other organizational contexts ENTRE-U was developed to facilitate empirical research on EO within public universities. Interviews and a follow-up focus group with faculty members from departments in computer science, health science, and engineering at Canadian Universities elicited items for the new scale. A survey of university department heads provided data for statistical development of the scale ENTRE-U consists of four dimensions -- research mobilization, unconventionality, industry collaboration, and perception of university policies -- that successfully predict department involvement in commercialization activities.

Todorovic, Z. W. and F. K. Schlosser (2007). "An Entrepreneur and a Leader!: A Framework Conceptualizing the Influence of Leadership Style on a Firm's Entrepreneurial Orientation- Performance Relationship." Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship **20**(3): 289-308.

Previous research has demonstrated a relationship between entrepreneurial orientation (EO) and organizational performance. Utilizing the resource-based theoretical paradigm, past empirical and theoretical research is synthesized towards a common conceptual framework which examines the role of charismatic leadership in the EO-Performance relationship. Incorporating previous leadership research on charisma and Machiavellianism, it is proposed that either egocentric (self-enhancing) or collective (organizational) values of the individuals working at the organization will influence the EO-Performance relationship. This paper asserts that a charismatic leader will stimulate positive employee organizational citizenship behaviour, whereas a Machiavellian leader will stimulate negative employee impression management practices. Understanding the role leadership plays in today's environment, entrepreneurs will be better able to equip their human resource to achieve their vision of tomorrow.

La recherche antérieure a démontré qu'il existe une relation entre l'orientation entrepreneuriale (OE) et la performance organisationnelle. Partant d'un point de vue théorique basé sur les ressources, la recherche antérieure empirique et théorique est synthétisée en un cadre théorique commun qui examine le rôle d'une direction charismatique dans la relation OE-performance. En incorporant la recherche portant sur le charisme et le machiavélisme, nous suggérons que cette relation sera influencée par des valeurs ou bien égocentriques ou bien collectives chez les individus travaillant dans l'organisation. Cet article soutient qu'un dirigeant charismatique stimule chez les employés un comportement de responsabilité organisationnelle positif, tandis qu'un dirigeant machiavélique stimule des pratiques de gestion négatives. S'ils comprennent le rôle du leadership dans l'environnement contemporain, les entrepreneurs seront dans une meilleure position pour équiper leurs ressources humaines en vue de l'avenir.

Urbano, D. and A. Turró (2013). "Conditioning factors for corporate entrepreneurship: an in(ex)ternal approach." International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal **9**(3): 379-396.

In the last years, the business creation and management literature has paid increasing attention to

the entrepreneurship that occurs within organizations. Most empirical studies show a positive relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and performance. The objective of this article is to identify which internal and external factors condition corporate entrepreneurship. The study uses two different theoretical perspectives: Resource-Based Theory (for internal factors) and Institutional Economics (for external or environmental factors). Both theories have been widely used in the strategic management and entrepreneurship literature, however, very few studies in the corporate entrepreneurship field are grounded on them together. The research applies negative binomial regression and uses data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) for the period 2004-2008. Overall the sample has 339.071 observations and it provides information for 9 different European countries (Greece, Spain, Italy, Ireland, the Netherlands, France, the United Kingdom, Denmark and Finland). Results reinforce the importance of internal factors (knowledge, personal networks and being able to identify business opportunities) compared to external (having fear of failure, media impact and the number of procedures to create a company). Contributions of the study are both theoretical and practical. On the one hand, it contributes to the development of the literature in the corporate entrepreneurship field. On the other hand, it provides useful insights for those companies that are interested in entrepreneurship within the organizations.[PUBLICATION ABSTRACT]