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Abstract

Based on extensive literature review and empirical validation this paper aims to develop and test an integrative model of corporate entrepreneurial behavior. Indeed, how much do we know about the tactics that corporate entrepreneurs employ to promote entrepreneurial projects?

Entrepreneurial behavior is generally defined as the discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities. Still, more investigation is needed to understand the specific actions behind the words discover, evaluate, or exploit, especially in the context of an existing corporation.

First, the paper accumulates and confronts findings from research on corporate entrepreneurship and venturing, independent entrepreneurship and specific relevant organizational behaviors.

Second, as a result, it offers an integrative four-category model that allows a systematical consideration of corporate entrepreneurial behavior.

Third, the proposed model is enriched and challenged by an analysis of case studies used for the purposes of teaching corporate entrepreneurship in top business schools.

The analysis provided evidence that most of the activities corporate entrepreneurs engage in could be assigned to one of the four dominating activities which are discovery, evaluation, enrolment and exploitation and that a four-category integrative model might be used for a systematic analysis of corporate entrepreneurial practices. On top, the paper offers several insights into the strategies intrapreneurs employ to develop their projects.
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INTRODUCTION

In recent time corporate entrepreneurship has received valuable attention as an activity important for firms vitality (Dess, et al., 2003). Indeed, being innovative, risk-taking and ready to pioneer has proved to contribute well to the financial performance and strategic value of big corporations as well as small and medium enterprises (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Dess, et al., 1997; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). At the same time, how much do we know about the way entrepreneurship affects day-to-day activities of a firm? To date, most theoretical development and empirical research in the field tends to treat the organization as a “black box” (Monsen & Boss, 2009) and while research on financial benefits from corporate entrepreneurship flourishes, there have been few attempts to systematically describe the activities and techniques corporate entrepreneurs engage in. What are the tactics that corporate entrepreneurs employ to promote the entrepreneurial projects? What are the specific entrepreneurial behaviors that firms seek to encourage?

Entrepreneurial behavior is generally and commonly defined as the discovery, evaluation, and exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Still, while this conceptualization may be technically accurate, behavioral aspects of entrepreneuring have not been the subject of considerable research yet (Schildt, et al., 2006). More investigation is needed to understand the specific actions behind the words discover, evaluate, or exploit (Kuratko, et al., 2005), especially in the context of an existing corporation.

Aiming to answer these challenging issues this paper focuses on the corporate entrepreneurial behavior displayed by individual employees.

First, through an extensive literature review regarding entrepreneurial behaviors of individual employees we try to assemble a variety of activities associated with being a corporate entrepreneur. We gather findings from several streams of literature on individual aspects of corporate entrepreneurship (CE) and corporate venturing (CV), contrasting them to the firm-wide changes induced by corporate renewal (CR).

Second, drawing on the vast body of literature relevant to entrepreneurship within organizations, we introduce a four-category integrative model of entrepreneurial behavior of individual employees. This model represents corporate entrepreneurship as discovery, evaluation, legitimation (enrolment) and exploitation of opportunities. We engage in the discussion opened by Kuratko et al. (2005) and provide a list of specific activities that can be assigned to each of the stages. The model is further tested on the empirical basis using case studies on corporate entrepreneurship.

The paper is structured as follows: first it provides a definition of corporate entrepreneurship and defines the scope of discussion in this paper; second, it accumulates findings from different streams of literature that provide insights into the nature of corporate entrepreneurial behaviors; the third chapter develops an integrative model resulting from the literature review; fourth section enriches and challenges the proposed model using case studies. We conclude by a short discussion on advantages and limitations of the proposed approach and suggest some avenues for the future research.
1. CE: DEFINITION AND THE SCOPE OF REVIEW

1.2 The definition

Being a complex phenomena corporate entrepreneurship tends to be analyzed at different levels, such as organizational, venture or individual levels (Carrier, 1996). The seminal article of Sharma & Chrisman (1999) underlines this idea: most of the definitions presented there belong to the organizational level, several – to the project level and only few have mentioned the individual component of the concept.

In general, according to the focus of the change Guth & Ginsberg (1990) propose to set apart two types of corporate entrepreneurship that lead to the change within the firm (innovation and venturing) or of the firm (corporate renewal).

Aiming to analyze individual practices of corporate entrepreneurs, this paper focuses on the first type of CE that leads to the change within the firm. Indeed, corporate renewal (1) involves different (whole-organization instead of within organization) level of analysis; and (2) focuses on corporate change rather than individual behavior; and therefore does not provide the necessary input for the purpose of this study.

Therefore, further we discuss practices associated with innovation and venturing within established organizations. Innovation stands for creating and introducing products, production processes, and organizational systems (Zahra, 1995), with emphasis on development and innovation in technology (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). Venturing activities refer to creation of new businesses (new product lines and new markets) within firms using new structures, resources and opportunities that fall outside the purview of a company’s base businesses (Verbeke, et al., 2007). More precisely, Antoncic & Hisrich (2001) argue that in large corporations corporate venturing can also include formation of more formally autonomous or semi-autonomous units or firms (incubators), corporate start-ups, autonomous business units, and newstreams.

Thus, even a focused view on corporate entrepreneurship envelops a very heterogeneous terrain. Aiming to provide a general definition, Burgelman (1983a) describes corporate entrepreneurship as a process requiring “new resource combinations to extend the firm’s activities in areas unrelated, or marginally related, to its current domain of competence and corresponding opportunity set”.

To integrate both corporate and individual aspects we refer to the insights from Zahra (1991) who called CE a combination of formal and informal activities; Hornsby, et al. (2002) who discussed ability of a firm to acquire innovative skills and capabilities; Vesper who underlined employee’s initiative from below in the organization (Vesper, 1984, quoted in Sharma & Chrisman, 1999) as well as insights from Antoncic & Hisrich (2003). Finally, we propose to formulate the definition in the following way:

*Corporate entrepreneurship is a combination of formal and informal activities aimed at creating new business ventures, but also at other innovative activities such as development of new products, services, technologies, administrative techniques within established firms based on new resource combinations, acquisition of skills and capabilities and individual initiative to extend firm’s activities in areas unrelated or marginally related to the current domain of competence.*
Also for the purposes of the research terms “corporate entrepreneurship” and “intrapreneurship” are not differentiated (see for discussion Amo, 2006).

Further we define the scope of the analysis and discuss which domains might provide insights into corporate entrepreneurial practices of individual employees.

1.2 The scope of the analysis: individual level in CE

Traditionally, corporate entrepreneurial research has borrowed heavily from the “mother” construct of independent entrepreneurship.

At individual level, one of the inherited discussions included stable psychological and cognitive characteristics of enterprising individuals that were expected to differentiate them from the traditional management and the rest of the world (Alvarez & Barney, 2007; Davidsson & Wiklund, 2001; Gartner, 1988; Hayton & Kelley, 2006).

Many studies on psychological characteristics within the domain of corporate entrepreneurship often assume that the profiles of independent and corporate entrepreneurs do not differ significantly (Carrier, 1996). As such, Hornsby et al. (1993) included in their model such characteristics as risk-taking propensity, desire for autonomy, need for achievement, goal orientation, and internal locus of control.

Several authors, though, engage in comparing corporate and independent entrepreneurs. Works of Antoncic & Hisrich (2003), Hisrich (1990), Morris (1994), Jennings et al. (1994) offer several insights that allow to differentiate between both. For example, they propose to differentiate on the basis of their motives, time orientation and desire for status and autonomy.

Within the domain of independent entrepreneurship previous research using only personal factors has proven an insufficient explanatory power (Krueger, et al., 2000; Wiklund, et al., 2003) and its focus shifted towards influence of cognitive processes and task-specific factors (Baum, et al., 2001; Busenitz & Barney, 1997; Wright, et al., 2000), and entrepreneurial decision making process (Sarasvathy, 2001). Further, Davidsson & Wiklund (2001) argued that that the next steps in research on individual level of entrepreneurship might be focused on the process aspect: entrepreneurial decision making and venture development.

The question, therefore, is whether corporate entrepreneurial research could profit from borrowing the recent findings from the “mother” domain, and whether the differences, should they exist, are significant. Although Phan et al. (2009) argue against borrowing findings from other contexts than those of corporate entrepreneurship in suggesting appropriate strategies, we propose to refer to it as a reference point in obtaining an additional input on corporate entrepreneurial activities. Moreover, Liao & Welsch (2008) suggest that creating a business entails many common core processes irrespective of organizational and industry setting.

Another perspective within the individual level research on intrapreneurship represents it through specific lenses of different organizational behaviours, such as visionary leaders, change agents, corporate entrepreneurs and innovation champions (Carrier, 1996). Corporate entrepreneur is also sometimes described as an innovator (key attributes: originality, inspiration, love, transformation); new designer, enabler; leader; entrepreneur; animateur; adventurer; or change
agent (Sayeed & Gazdar, 2003). This latter study parallels stable traits and attributes of personality with the types of the intrapreneurial role: key attributes of an innovator are originality, inspiration, love and transformation; for new designer they are evolution, development, symbiosis and connection.

Further example is a work by Hayton & Kelley (2006) who proposed to use competencies instead of personality traits. Competencies involve combinations of knowledge, skills, and personality characteristics that are related to superior performance in a job or situation. They underlie the decisions and deployment that can determine success or failure (Greene, et al., 1999). Authors have identified that for an intrapreneurial project four main types of behavior are conductive: the technical innovator (invention), the innovation champion (organizational support), the executive champion or sponsor (resource accumulation), and the knowledge broker (coalition building and networking). They also identified leadership as a key competence of championing and sponsoring.

Thus, the literature on individual level of corporate entrepreneurship highlights the argument that in order to tackle the individual aspect of intrapreneurial behavior one needs to pay attention to both elements: individual entrepreneurial cognitions and entrepreneurial processes and behaviour (Ireland, et al., 2009).

Further we explore recent findings on entrepreneurial behaviors within the literature on corporate entrepreneurship and venturing, combining it with the insights borrowed from independent entrepreneurship domain and other perspectives stemming from organizational behaviours point of view associated with corporate entrepreneurship.

2. Behavioral aspect of CE: a literature review

The review of literature regarding the behaviors of entrepreneurs relies on the basic streams outlined in the previous section: corporate entrepreneurship in general and corporate venturing in particular, independent entrepreneurship literature and other perspectives such as championing literature, literature on sponsoring and transformational leadership and knowledge brokering.

2.1 General CE perspective

General discussion on behaviors of corporate entrepreneurs has covered several aspects and emphasized different actions.

For Hornsby (1999) the key patterns concern work-related ideas (thinking, proposing, implementing), talking about them in other departments and bypassing normal channels in pursuing them. The core attribute of these ideas is “being implemented” – with or without official approval.

Kuratko et al. (2005) outlined the following essential dimensions: endorsing, refining and navigating entrepreneurial opportunities through organizational bureaucracies and individual networks, identifying, acquiring and deploying resources needed to pursue these opportunities. Thus, they have shown how entrepreneurs actively engage in different types of creativity
Unsworth, 2001) while leading their projects, that they interact within the environment within
the organization and initiate an active search for and acquisition of the needed resources.

Kanter (2004) based on her empirical research proposed a more detailed picture. She described
three basic phases a prototypical innovation might need to go through: project definition (the
acquisition and application of information to shape a manageable, salable project), coalition
building (the development of a network of backers who agree to provide resources and support)
and action (the application of the resources, information, and support to the project and
mobilization of an action team). Although she does not explain the way ideas of opportunities
come into existence, her approach is not contradicting other authors. Further, she also
emphasized the political side of intrapreneurship (gather relevant political information, engage in
horse-trading, mobilize key players, filter interference), team and leadership aspects (build team,
sell idea to the team) and project/product communication within and outside the company.

The general perspective on corporate entrepreneurial practices can be augmented by a more
specific perspective describing new venture development.

2.2 Corporate venturing perspective

Studying new corporate venturing activities Russell (1999) has accumulated findings from this
stream of literature into three basic stages: (1) initiation of new ideas either through the creative
acts or some form of environmental scanning (or a combination of both) and making ideas
accepted by organizational participants as formal new ventures, (2) development stage is
characterized by structuring the ideas, increasing organizational awareness of their potential,
acquiring the support and resources for further elaboration, and enabling a core of committed
people to coalesce around the idea to contribute to its continued evolution; (3) implementation
refers to incorporating successful new ventures as ongoing operations of the organization.

CV activities are often characterized by higher visibility and formality. Both Day (1994) and
Burgelman (1983b) propose that giving a venture its impetus (gaining formal go-ahead from the
organization) is a critical stage for this kind of projects. Day (1994) mentions as important also
necessity to provide the venture with legitimacy internally and externally. Zott & Huy (2007)
report that building legitimacy to acquire resources during the early stages of venture creation
might be critical. The strategies used for this purpose differ. They include manipulating and
creating rules, norms, and values, creating identities through “storytelling”, and leveraging
friendship and obligations. Flexibility in presenting information to resource holders, that is,
managing impressions is also one of the important tactics of legitimacy building (Zott & Huy,
2007).

At the same time longitudinal study of Garud & Van de Ven (1992) has suggested the trial-and-
error nature of this process leading not only to reformulation of the project, but also to multiple
refocusing of the new venture during its development. These authors have mentioned the
importance of the influence of external events (actions of competitors, legal regulation,
management change).

Further, we integrate in our framework findings from independent entrepreneurship literature.
2.3 Independent entrepreneurship perspective

Several approaches exist that describe “independent” entrepreneurship as a process (Alsos & Kolvereid, 1998; Baron, 2002; Bhave, 1994; Carter, et al., 1996; Delmar & Shane, 2003; Katz & Gartner, 1988).

In 1988 Katz and Gartner argued that building a new organization an entrepreneur goes through the sequence of generating an idea, setting up the firm, hiring employees, and trading products. Consequently the field then advanced to a more systematic consideration of the behavioral aspect of entrepreneurial process. We, therefore, resort to the findings of IE field to bring an additional insight into the entrepreneurial process.

Bhave (1994) and later on Carter, Gartner and Reynolds (1996) explored the activities which are undertaken by nascent entrepreneurs aiming to answer not only, what activities are initiated in attempting to establish a new business, but also how many activities are initiated during the gestation of the start-up and when are particular activities initiated or completed? They found that the nature of activities, their number and sequence have a significant influence on the ability of nascent entrepreneurs to successfully create new ventures.

Their study was replicated in Norway (Alsos & Kolvereid, 1998) aiming at finding differences in the sequences of novice, serial and parallel founders. Several differences in the number and speed of activities were registered, but the authors stated that the development of the businesses evolved in a very similar way.

Later another research initiative was undertaken by Delmar & Shane (2003) who have proven that expert entrepreneurs follow a common sequence to venture organizing activity leading them to success. It consisted of following steps: write a business plan, gather information about customers and competitors, talk to customers, project financial statements and budgets, establish a legal entity, obtain necessary licenses and permits, secure intellectual property protection, seek financing, initiate marketing and promotion efforts, and acquire inputs.

Though very action oriented, this list provides a useful reference point for the analysis of entrepreneurial behaviors.

2.4 Other perspectives

Due to its complexity, corporate entrepreneurship is often represented through the lenses of different organizational behaviors, such as innovation champion, leader or others. This section presents an overview and an attempt to synthesize the fragmented findings from the literature.

*Innovation champion*

An *innovation champion* is defined as an individual who informally emerges to actively and enthusiastically promote innovations through the crucial organizational stages, exercises the required social and political effort to galvanize support for the business concept among key stakeholders, creates internal acceptance of the new idea, and represents the venture to resource allocators to ensure sufficient resources are released for development (Howell & Boies, 2004; Howell, et al., 2005; Markham, 1998). Much of the scholar interest concentrates on the agency responsibilities and the leadership roles of the champion(s) (Greene, et al., 1999). Taking somewhat different approach Day (1994) uses the term “corporate entrepreneurship” to define
the process dimension, whereas the “champion” is used for the leader of the intrapreneurial project.

In their study of championing behaviors Howell et al. (2005) proposed to outline 14 patterns of behaviors, emphasizing the conviction and enthusiasm of champions about the idea, their ability to package idea, draw clear strategic mission and fit, not to give up and to persist in pursuing the idea, to find people who can handle problems, involve key players and decision makers. These findings converge well with the findings of Shane et al. (1995) and Markham (2000). Aiming to understand the way project champions influence others, Markham (1998) conducted a longitudinal study of champions and their teams and has found that in spite of a wide-spread image of champions as inertia-fighters, the champions from his sample used rather cooperative tactics and establishing positive relationships with “target people”. Interesting and important work has been accomplished by Howell & Higgins (1990) in creating a typology of product champions’ behaviors. Gupta et al. (2006) outlined several distinct types of champions: new venture creation, product, implementation champions as well as network champions.

Knowledge broker

The role of knowledge broker has extensively been studies within the literature on knowledge management: (Todorova & Durisin, 2007; Zahra & George, 2002) and actor-network theory (Akrich, et al., 2002a; Akrich, et al., 2002b). The focus on learning achieved from CE is recognized as one of the emerging issues within the field (Dess, et al., 2003).

The primary role of the broker is to access new sources of information and knowledge, transferring this knowledge and combining different sources, both existing and new (Hargadon, 2002). Four behaviors are associated with brokering: exploration of diverse knowledge domains; learning from these multiple knowledge domains; linking knowledge from diverse domains to solve novel problems; and implementing ideas (Hayton & Kelley, 2005). This may require engaging into basic research to explore new science and technology as well as learning the lessons from previous implementations. Brokering facilitates exchange of knowledge and information among multiple contributors to formulate a project out of the idea, inside and outside the project. Brokers identify organizational members with needed knowledge and gain timely access to that knowledge. Gatekeeping activity of brokers involves acquiring, translating, and disseminating information about external technical and market developments and linking this information to those within the organization (external gatekeeping). Internal gatekeepers act as a go-between to coordinate the efforts of the project team and the operating units they depend on. Brokers form and cultivate communication networks.

Leader

Dess et al. (2003) define entrepreneurial leadership as establishing the conditions conducive to role performance and social exchange. Authors argued that the CE leadership served to resolve conflicts between old and new priorities and that CE leaders actively engaged in shaping the internal organizational context in ways that foster effective exchanges between all the roles. CE leaders often articulate a vision, gain acceptance of the vision within the organization, and create congruence between the vision and followers’ self-interests. This includes as well developing the consensus and trust needed to support CE among organizational members. Gupta et al. (2004) synthesized findings from entrepreneurial, intrapreneurial and leadership literatures and came up with the following list of tasks: 1) framing the challenge that includes setting ambitious goals at
the same time with limits of what can be achieved; 2) absorbing the uncertainty – creating the vision and burdening the responsibility for being wrong about the future; 3) path-clearing – negotiating within inside and outside environments; 4) building commitment and enabling the energy to accomplish the goals set; 5) setting limits to override the self-imposed ideas of limits by the team members. The authors also suggest that rather than being a team-oriented leadership, entrepreneurial leadership is oriented on negotiating and path-clearing for the goal accomplishment.

Sponsor

Sponsoring is not commonly associated with a behavior of an individual corporate entrepreneur, rather, it is often associated with activity of higher ranks within organization: top management sponsoring and leadership.

*Sponsors* help entrepreneurs gain access to the resources they need for their ventures; ensure there is legitimacy and support for the project; provide advice and guidance to the venture on how to best proceed. Higher-level sponsors can use their power and control over resources to get the support necessary for the projects they value. The sample references here would be Day (1994) and Garud & Van De Ven (1992). Sponsoring role is also associated with transformational leadership and therefore, can be referred to the works of Dess et al. (2003) and Gupta et al. (2004).

Thus, Day (1994) mentions that top managers influence new ventures only indirectly, by creating the “right” atmosphere and engaging into symbolic actions – actions in which the actor displays or tries to draw other people’s attention to the meaning of an object or action that goes beyond the object’s or action’s intrinsic content or functional use – in other words, actions communicating a subjective meaning rather than an “objective” content (Zott & Huy, 2007). In the context of entrepreneurship these actions might include enacting emotions, preferences, and values, as well as logic and precedence, which can influence the decisions of resource holders (Zott & Huy, 2007). On the other hand, besides their resource allocation role, sponsors perform other important roles such as a mentor, a champion, and a critic (Garud & Van De Ven, 1992). These roles are activated in the “crisis” periods of a venture, when it experiences a stable negative outcome. The role of a sponsor might become to examine venture activities and explore different courses of action with entrepreneurs.

Synthesis

The review of the specific behaviors associated with corporate entrepreneurship has shown a lot of overlap. On one hand, sponsoring is expected to have a clear orientation towards resource gathering, knowledge brokering – towards working with knowledge and expertise, leadership – towards working with team. On the other – all of these behaviours are aimed at promotion of the idea within organization, influencing the decision makers within management hierarchy and coordination of the efforts of the project.

Indeed, Hayton & Kelley (2005) state that different roles may be performed by one person (in a smaller organization) as well as by several persons (in a larger organization or project). Other scholar works use the construct of champion to characterize business innovators, internal entrepreneurs, sponsors, change agents, technical and manager champions, and administrative entrepreneurs (Greene, et al., 1999). Similarly, Garud & Van De Ven (1992) highlight that a sponsor may become a champion in special cases.
This, therefore, suggests that a clear distinction between these roles is not that obvious. Moreover, as a puzzle, these specific perspectives contribute to understanding of the whole picture that is behavior of corporate entrepreneurs. Therefore, we analyze them further as a single behavior, referring to it as Championing as this term receives traditionally a very broad interpretation.

**Discussion**

The review of the different perspectives provides a rich material for further investigation. Still, there are some details that need to be highlighted before we proceed to the integrative framework.

Both, corporate entrepreneurship and corporate venturing literatures described entrepreneurial practiced as highly interactive in terms of promoting the new venture within the hierarchy or providing it with legitimacy inside and outside of the organization. Sarason et al., (2006) have conceptualized the importance of embeddedness of entrepreneurial activity into the context where it takes place. They argued that an entrepreneur influences environment by proposing and promoting the idea, while simultaneously the environment shapes – limits and promotes – the initial opportunity and the entrepreneur. This process is well known and researched in sociology as structuration (Giddens, 1984). As such, an intrapreneur is expected to form a dedicated environment, or a coalition, around the project which will later influence it by providing necessary expertise and resources (Kanter, 2004). Also, Bhave (1994) argued in favor of an iterative and feedback driven process.

These observations go in line with the observation of Whittle & Mueller (2008). Looking at the intrapreneurship process these authors have investigated the fact that the ideas are not being recognized immediately as path-breaking, and that intrapreneurs are not recognized immediately as intrapreneurs: it takes time and effort to establish the idea within organization as a worthy one. To explain this phenomenon they referred to the action-network theory (ANT, Latour, 2005).

ANT argues that for the knowledge (or, in the context of CE we could talk about an idea or an opportunity) to become truth, to become accepted a reliable and robust network around this knowledge is needed. The network here consists of human as well as nonhuman actors, or actants, that possess of equal importance. ANT does not operate through power relationships, but argues that the meaning, or value, of each of the network elements can be recognized only in connection to other elements of this network. For example, a project is more likely to be viewed as legitimate if the network includes authorization of the top management or a well-known expert or external partner. “…there is not a net and an actor laying down the net, but there is an actor whose definition of the world outlines, traces, delineate, limn, describe, shadow forth, inscroll, file, list, record, mark, or tag a trajectory that is called a network” (Latour, 1997). Thus, the network is not a stable category, and each added element may change the definition -meaning or value – of all the existing. The process of re-definition or re-connection of the elements was named “translation” (Latour, 2005). Especially it is true for the management ideas that do not simply get adopted but rather get translated in complex and variable processes at the micro level (Morris & Lancaster, 2006; Zilber, 2006). This translation is necessary to interest, enroll and mobilize networks of people by presenting them information in an understandable and...
attractive way, getting their support for the idea and provoking certain actions (Akrich, et al., 2002a; Akrich, et al., 2002b).

Although stemming from different areas of sociology, both theories fit well with each other. While structuration approach argues that there is a mutual influence of entrepreneur and environment on each other, the actor-network theory highlights the mechanism of this influence.

Therefore, the empirical observation from the field of corporate entrepreneurship and venturing that this activity involves high interaction and negotiation load can be anchored within the well researched sociological tradition. We develop this argument further by building an integrative model of intrapreneurial behavior.

3. INTEGRATIVE MODEL

To integrate the findings from the numerous perspectives discussed in the previous chapter, we propose to develop and use a framework allowing to structure the analysis.

This paper initially took the approach of Shane and Venkataraman (2000), who described entrepreneurial activity as discovery, evaluation and exploitation of opportunities. This conceptualization has received a broad acceptance both in entrepreneurial and corporate entrepreneurial literatures (Ireland, et al., 2009). Nevertheless, the framework of analysis evolved into a four-category model as explained further.

Within the framework discovery includes recognition of the opportunity based on the accumulation of the previous knowledge and an ability of a potential entrepreneur to see the new mean-ends relationships or new value in existing combinations of elements (Mitchell, et al., 2004; Sarason, et al., 2006; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

The process of evaluation is focused on normative evaluation of an idea and its development into a valuable project, capable to compensate for the risk taking, uncertainty, time and effort of an entrepreneur. Evaluation might include assessing strategic, market, and financial variables such as risk, expected demand, industry profits, technology cycles, competition density, and the availability of population learning to conclude about the profitability of the future business (Mitchell, et al., 2004). Although the initial conceptualization implicitly assumed evaluation to be a one-time activity leading entrepreneur towards a decision whether to exploit the opportunity or not (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000), other authors have underlined the non-linear nature of entrepreneurial process and claimed evaluation to be an ongoing activity which results in legitimating and the idea development (Sarason, et al., 2006).

Exploitation covers different action modes directed towards bringing the innovation to the market. It focuses on the ability of the entrepreneur to control resources in order to achieve goals associated with a particular venture. The dominant logic of this phase focuses on acquisition and transformation of authoritative resources (human) to allocative resources (nonhuman) through an iterative and reflexive process (Sarason, et al., 2006). Shane et al. (2003) call this phase execution and describe as an activity related to the resource accumulation, organizational design, marketing communication and product development.
To illustrate the argument about importance of political and interactive activity of entrepreneurs, we have introduced this type of activity into a separate category: *legitimation* / enrolment. Following Sarason et al., (2006) we expect that the process of spreading the idea, translating it for organizational members, enrolling them into the network of the project – in other words, legitimation of the project, dominates the transition between the formal evaluation of the idea and resources gathering phase.

The definitions of the four categories are presented below in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery</strong></td>
<td>Recognition of an opportunity based on accumulation of previous knowledge and ability of an entrepreneur to see the new mean-ends relationships or new value in existing combinations of elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Assessment of feasibility of the idea and its development into a valuable project. Might include assessing strategic, market, and financial variables such as risk, expected demand, industry profits, technology cycles, competition density, and the availability of population learning to conclude about the profitability of the future business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment / legitimation</strong></td>
<td>The process of gathering evidence and support, communicating of the idea and its potential, translating it for organizational members, enrolling them to commit for the project, providing legitimation of the project and helping novel ideas be accepted as valuable innovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploitation</strong></td>
<td>Different action modes directed towards resource accumulation, orchestrating organizational arrangements, marketing communication and product development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although presented, at a first glance, as a temporal sequence, these activities represent dominant logics, accompanying the development of an opportunity (Venkataraman, 1997) and should rather be perceived as a logical sequence. Similarly, Bhave (1994) describes new venture as an iterative, non-linear, feedback-driven conceptual, and physical process. Gartner (1985), relying on the evidence from previous research, has offered a kaleidoscope model to view “enormously varying patterns of new venture creation”. Studies of Delmar & Shane (2003), Carter et al. (1996), Alsos & Kolvereid (1998) have shown that depending on the number of undertaken activities, a number of possible sequences increases geometrically.

The four perspectives are presented in Table 2. The table shows that there are a lot of similarities between different perspectives on entrepreneurial behaviors. The differences, though, exist as well.

The table presents comparison between four perspectives discussed in Chapter 2: corporate entrepreneurship (innovation aspect), corporate venturing, individual entrepreneurship and the joint representation of different organizational behaviors associated with corporate entrepreneurship which is addressed in the paper as championing. The rows of the table represent four dominating activities: discovery, evaluation, enrolment/legitimation, exploitation.
On the basis of the analysis of Table.2 the following conclusions can be made.

First of all, the classification and analysis presented in the table allow to conclude that CE does not resemble a homogeneous population. While the literature on innovation aspect of corporate entrepreneurship is more oriented towards internal work-related context and operational details, navigating the project through bureaucracies and bypassing normal channels, corporate venturing sources more ideas from environment scanning and aims at gaining organizational commitment to the new idea as a new venture. Corporate venturing activities are often characterized by a more formalized nature (probably due to the scope and the visibility of the projects) as well as a higher external orientation of these activities. This influences both ideas search and ideas development stages.

Further, by choosing different lenses to view CE championing literature explains how corporate entrepreneurs push their projects: the literature emphasized cooperative and positive approach, relying on knowledge, expertise and informal methods of persuasion.

Second, looking closely at the differences between Corporate and Independent entrepreneurship, several features specific to corporate entrepreneurship can also be outlined.

One example is a significant political and negotiation load on corporate entrepreneurship which is not that articulated or stated explicitly for independent entrepreneurship.

Another significant aspect is the position that an entrepreneur takes towards the environment: studies report that in order to exploit opportunities in a full scope, intrapreneurs have to legitimate the project inside as well as outside the organizations, while individual entrepreneurs are expected to take a defensive position, seeking to have a legal protection at each step of the venture unfolding.

The review has also highlighted a difference in modes of action between entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. While entrepreneurs are reported in the literature to engage into negotiation of terms of contract (business plan) with professional investors, intrapreneurs engage in missionary activity and enrolment of organization members into their vision. Thus, it suggests a rather informal nature of the intrapreneurs’ action mode.

We further proceed to the empirical analysis to challenge the theoretical findings with those suggested by the field research. Our main argument and hypothesis is that the introduced four-category integrative model of entrepreneurial behavior represents a complete and exhaustive framework to analyze this type of behaviors. We use the proposed model to analyze case studies regarding corporate entrepreneurial projects to enrich and challenge it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase / Activity</th>
<th>Corporate entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Corporate Venturing</th>
<th>Championing</th>
<th>Individual entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery</strong> (combination of knowledge into a valuable idea)</td>
<td>Identify the problem</td>
<td>Initiate idea by creative acts</td>
<td>Create and articulate vision</td>
<td>Decide to search for opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think about new work related ideas</td>
<td>Match new technical solution to market needs</td>
<td>Engage in innovation-related activities</td>
<td>Gather specialized information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scan environment</td>
<td>Scan environment</td>
<td>Involve with other departments</td>
<td>Identify new mean-ends relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong> (assessment of the feasibility of the opportunity, devel. of an idea into a project)</td>
<td>Focus and target ideas</td>
<td>Estimate market</td>
<td>Frame the challenge (goals and limits) of the project</td>
<td>Create realistic market and technology forecasts; write a business plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather relevant political and insider information</td>
<td>Focus and target ideas</td>
<td>Devote more time</td>
<td>Devote more time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather relevant technical information</td>
<td>Structure ideas, turn a new idea into a project</td>
<td>Search for relevant info, facilities and equipment</td>
<td>Search for relevant info, facilities and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk outside dept about new ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seek intellectual property protection</td>
<td>Seek intellectual property protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment / Legitimation</strong> (Making novel ideas accepted as valuable inno-s)</td>
<td>Communicate the project</td>
<td>Create technical and commercial visibility</td>
<td>Communicate project</td>
<td>Build social ties to resource providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in horse-trading</td>
<td>Get acceptance by org. members as a new venture</td>
<td>Develop and use personal networks</td>
<td>Engage into marketing efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlist support of decision makers &amp; Suggest and sell ideas to management</td>
<td>Increase organizational awareness of the potential of ideas</td>
<td>Enable energy, build commitment, develop consensus and trust</td>
<td>Frame info in a positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filter interference, fight concern</td>
<td>Provide legitimacy internally and externally</td>
<td>Engage in symbolic actions</td>
<td>Refine business concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize key-players</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enlist support of other organizational members</td>
<td>Talk to investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sell idea to the team, keep their confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintain their support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sell idea to higher management levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Show strategic fit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase / Activity</td>
<td>Corporate entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Corporate Venturing</td>
<td>Championing</td>
<td>Individual entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploitation</strong></td>
<td>Build team Bypass normal channels to pursue innovative idea Collect resources Implement ideas even w/o official approval Initiate marketing efforts Loop-back to sponsors Refine, redesign the product</td>
<td>Acquire support and resources Create prototype Cut corners of the procedures Define and create product bundle Enable core of committed people to coalesce around the idea Generate and mobilize necessary resources Give venture its impetus (formal inception) Incorporate successful new ventures as ongoing operations Mentor and monitor venture’s progress</td>
<td>Bypass standard operating / budget / personnel procedures Convince people in other depts to commit their resources Coordinate efforts of the project team &amp; operating units Examine venture’s activity Explore different courses of action Find people who can handle problems Foster exchange between members Implement ideas Overcome organizational inertia Path clearing / negotiating for the project Support innovation materially</td>
<td>Buy or/and rent facilities and equipment Commit full-time to the venture, engage in day-to-day management Commit to creation of legal entity Create and test a prototype Customize and further develop the product Develop marketing policies Engage into marketing efforts Gather resources, talk to investors, invest own money Obtain necessary licenses and permits, secure IP protection Organize team, hire employees Save money to invest Set-up production technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

First, we describe the methodology of data gathering and analysis, then we proceed to the discussion of the findings.

4.1 Methodology

In this paper the empirical analysis is based on using case studies describing corporate entrepreneurial projects. Research using narratives is now starting to be recognized as a valuable input for entrepreneurship domain (Gartner, 2007). Still, to our knowledge, there is no common and robust methodology to work with narratives. We further describe the design implemented in this paper.

Data collection

The case studies that accompanied the analysis of the entrepreneurial behaviors of employees within organizations were gathered by using a Delphi approach.

According to Ziglio (1996) Delphi method is an efficient tool in gathering opinions of geographically dispersed experts, allowing to elicit and develop individual responses, avoid problems of group dynamics, and achieve a consensus in cases where the information is insufficient or not well structured. Virtually every use of the Delphi Method includes two basic phases. First phase, the “exploration” should ensure that the subject under discussion is fully explored. It poses the question in broad terms inviting answers and comments. The second phase, “evaluation” gathers and assesses views and opinions of the experts and allows refining one’s view as the group work progresses. It might take several rounds if significant disagreements are presented.

The exploration phase is of crucial importance – it is important to clearly specify the purpose of the study and to define the panel of expert knowledgeable of the subjects.

First, we made a search for the case studies on corporate entrepreneurship using the database of ECCH (European Case Clearing House, world largest and most up-to-date collection of management case study materials). The pool of case studies was then refined to include only those cases that reflected unfolding of CE (excluding corporate renewal) projects in time.

Second, the experts for the procedure were chosen among well-known scholars of corporate entrepreneurship, publishing in top journals, who were currently involved in teaching corporate entrepreneurship in leading MBAs.

The evaluation procedure had two rounds. First, all experts received an email with a description of the purpose of the study and a short preliminary list of cases to help defining the scope of the search. They were asked to have a quick look at the list and add the cases they considered essential, but which had not yet been on this list. In the second round, a list containing all the responses was sent to all experts, asking them, whether they had additional insights or objections regarding the findings.

Out of the contacted 11 experts, 7 answers were collected in the first round (64% response). In the second round one more reply was obtained and one of the participants replied suggesting additional cases.
This number is close to the recommended sample size of between ten to fifteen people for a homogeneous group (Delbeq, et al., 1975). These authors have also suggested that a two or three iteration Delphi is sufficient for most research.

**Data coding and analysis**

To uncover the essential features of the cases and to outline the generalizable features among them, the obtained case studies were coded using NVivo8, a computer-aided text analysis software program, to identify the emerging themes. This software program enabled us to systematically organize and code the data to facilitate extraction of significant statements.

The coding procedure was based on the analysis of the literature on corporate entrepreneurship process. Excerpts from texts were assigned to one or several activities listed in Table.2. If an activity could not be assigned to any presented in the table, it was coded as “other” and kept in the coding framework. The identified activities from all the contributions were grouped and discussed around four stages assumed by integrative model. Activities that were coded as “others” were either assigned to one of the four categories, or left beyond the framework. Samples of coding procedure are presented in Appendix B.

This structured analysis enabled us to identify cross-case patterns and differences. In our analysis we focused on the unfolding over time of the activities undertaken by employees and directed towards development of a new process, product or business within an existing corporation. This included, for example, volunteering for development of an idea, persuading management, gathering finance etc.

### 4.2 Sample description

After the two rounds of survey, 52 cases were suggested for the analysis. Out of them we were able to select 25 that described development of a corporate entrepreneurial project (see Appendix.A for the list of cases). Out of the other cases that were not included in this analysis three cases discussed corporate renewal projects (see Section 1.2 for the scope of analysis), ten cases discussed organization and management of New Business Development units within different companies and did not provide insight into the process of development of a specific venture, or discussed other aspects of corporate entrepreneurship (for example, a role of innovation officers).

The timeline of the selected cases ranged from 1985 up to 2009, uncovering such topics as new product and technology developments, new business founding, launching the product on a new market, or a combination of any of them. The cases were published in a variety of business schools, including HBS, IMD, Stanford, Ivey, Tuck, LBS, as well as journals and books.

Roughly speaking we could assign cases to three categories: “top-down” – when a vision of top management was realized in a project, for which a leader was chosen among employees (8), “bottom-up” – when an idea came from a non-management, or a lower-level management employee (5), and middle-up – when ideas stemmed from a high level manager (head of department, division) (12).
Three of the cases described project that were stopped by the management and the teams were reassigned to other projects; nine projects were reported to be a success; the rest of the cases reported on ongoing projects, whose destinies remained unclear.

4.3 Findings

To analyze the case studies we have implemented each time the integrative framework developed in Chapter 3. The summary of the results is presented in Appendix. C. It describes the core activities as discussed in the literature and lists the cases where these activities were mentioned.

The main hypothesis was that the introduced four-category integrative model of entrepreneurial behavior represents a complete and exhaustive framework to analyze this type of behaviors. Therefore, we tried to find matches between the activities that resulted from the literature review (see Table.2) and activities that were mentioned in cases (see Appendix. B for examples of coding abstracts).

Indeed the model has shown its applicability to most of the situations. The analysis also helped clarifying some wording issues and highlighted overlapping items. Several items emerged within the four categories. We discuss them further.

Discovery of ideas

Three additional activities emerged from the analysis.

Two of these activities are associated with independent entrepreneurship, but have not been explicitly mentioned in the CE literature. The first one is a pre-discovery decision to explore an opportunity or to search for it. Neither vision for the future product or business, nor its potential use is clear yet. Second - identifying new means-ends relationships. The third one can be seen as specific for CE: volunteering to participate in a project or to develop an opportunity additional to the existing job.

In general, we found support for most of the activities suggested by the literature (see Appendix. C). One exception was “involvement with other departments” which symbolizes the idea that new projects start in order to help other departments or as a co-activity of several departments. Quite opposite, “thinking about work-related ideas” was more often focused on the own department (ex. Case 8). Co-working was more emphasized on the later stages of opportunity development.

The analyzed cases have shown that ideas for the projects can arise as visionary, though flaky concepts (ex. Cases 13, 17), as well as come into existence while searching for a particular problem solution. The problems can be of work-related nature and arise internally within company (ex. Case 18) or come from external experience and be developed using the knowledge and opportunities provided at work (ex. Case 24). The ideas arising at this stage can be described as “vision” and are subject to the refinement and refocusing during the later stages of their development.
Several reviewed studies reported that the intrapreneurs could rely on their multifunctional background within organization (such as different functions on the career ladder or trainings) (such as Case 3), significantly high or crossroad position and own proactiveness (ex. Case 18).

**Evaluation**

This activity is directed towards evaluating, focusing, and formulating the initial idea so that it would fit internally to the strategy and capabilities of the company as well as the personal vision and ambitions.

Reviewing the cases we found support that intrapreneurs actively engage in gathering relevant *technical* (needed for development of the idea), *political* and *insider* (needed for getting ideas accepted) and market information. We also found support that intrapreneurs use this information to frame and focus ideas, structure them into makeable products. Only 6 cases out of 25 reported gathering and using political or insider information to develop a project.

Again, several topics emerged.

During the analysis we decided to split the item “structuring idea into a project” into to separate categories: preparing a proposal or preparing business plan. The difference between a proposal and a business plan is in the profoundness of the estimations and forecasts. Also, these two documents serve at different stages of the project development: as described in Cases 11, 13, 16, first a draft proposal is submitted to the management, then – a more profound plan is introduced.

A further emerged activity concerns getting feedback from the customers. Elements that were coded into this item considered active participation of an intrapreneur in getting a feedback of potential customers to develop the product or to focus the idea.

Two other activities are related to acquiring of the skills that an entrepreneur needs to develop an idea into a project. The two strategies are “pairing up” with someone who possesses of a necessary expertise or a skill (such as writing a business plan or dealing with human resources) or learning (such as learning a language or setting-up a web-commerce portal).

**Enrolment and legitimation**

This activity is aimed at communicating the ideas and making them accepted as novel and promising.

All the activities listed in Table.2 in this category were supported by the cases on corporate entrepreneurship (See Appendix C.)

On top, we have identified two additional modes of action employed by intrapreneurs: the first one consists in taking responsibility for the promoted vision (by putting own reputation at stake), the second – in establishing positive and cooperative relationships within organization. These two types of activities provide a useful insight into strategies used by corporate entrepreneurs.

**Exploitation**

This activity refers to the concrete modes of action aimed at exploiting the opportunities. It is focused on getting and mobilizing resources needed to pursue the idea.
During the analysis we outlined two different modes of resource gathering: formal with request for budget from management (called acquiring resources) and more informal, mobilizing and shifting of resources. Both are extensively used by intrapreneurs.

Additional to the activities described in the literature and presented in Table.2 we identified multiple redefinition and refocusing of the project during its development. It also concerns the necessity to adjust project to new “home” department (should the project be moved) or to the new management (should company go through restructuring before the project matures). Redefining the project (its business model or product bundle) depends as well on the feedback from the market and other environmental influences.

Although sometimes recognized as a tribute to the early stories of intrapreneurship, obeying the management veto and hiding of the project’s progress from management have been identified by the study.

Three cases reported that intrapreneurs were seeking a legal protection – that is one of the items not commonly associated with corporate entrepreneurship.

The last of the activities emerged through analysis of the cases was called “building internal capabilities” – to this category we assigned such behaviors as discussing and coaching new people in the team, patiently letting engineers grow their familiarity with the domain before the envisaged product development started etc.

**Discussion**

Finally, this analysis confirmed that most of the activities corporate entrepreneurs are expected to engage in (see Table.2) can be assigned to one of the four dominating activities which are discovery, evaluation, enrolment and exploitation. That is indirectly supported by the fact that all but one emerging activity could have found home within the integrative model proposed in Section 3.

The only theme that was not assigned to any of the stages was considering a possibility to quit organization. This situation would normally arise as a reaction on the inability of the firm to understand the potential of an idea or of the entrepreneur. Five cases reported this situation. In terms of observable activities this could be translated as “staying with organization”, but it remains unclear, which stage could envelope this decision.

A general challenge that arose during the analysis concerned multiple leaders of an entrepreneurial project: several cases reported that one project could be lead by different people throughout its development. Aiming to uncover all possible practices associated with corporate entrepreneurship, we considered all activities undertaken within a case as contributing to the model. Still, other opinions are possible.

On top, the analysis has shown that corporate entrepreneurs actively work with external environment and knowledge, transmitting it among organizational members, fostering exchange between internal and external contributors. They pair up with missing skills or knowledge, let grow internal capabilities of the team and the project, educate potential customers. It provides a useful insight into how intrapreneurs develop their projects. One more element into this puzzle is added by looking at the political or ambassador activity of intrapreneurs: all the practices suggested by the literature as enrolment or legitimation practices could be found among case
studies. These practices, though, have been gathered across a broad range of disciplines and this suggests indirectly that a general discussion on corporate entrepreneurship might oversee these behaviors.

CONCLUSION

Contribution

This paper makes a number of contributions to the existing research.

First, our review of the literature within the field of corporate entrepreneurship has found only limited systematic research devoted to the behavioral issues of corporate entrepreneurship. While several authors have already paid attention to unfolding in time of corporate entrepreneurial projects (Burgelman, 1983b; Day, 1994; Russell, 1999; Shane, 1995; Shane, et al., 1995), their findings regarding behavioral aspects still appear to be quite fragmented.

Second, this paper presents an attempt to explore which activities, i.e. specific manifestations of entrepreneurial behaviors (Ireland, et al., 2009), could be regarded as essential for corporate entrepreneurship. The paper accumulates and confronts findings from research on corporate entrepreneurship in general and championing, innovation and corporate venturing in particular. To bring an additional insight into the core of entrepreneurial process it resorts to the findings from the research field of independent entrepreneurship. An integrative model is proposed to structure the analysis of different activities. This model is based on the discrepancy in observations from corporate and independent entrepreneurship literatures, anchored within such sociological approaches as structuration and actor-network theory. The model highlights political and legitimating activity of intrapreneurs pursuing the opportunities.

Third, to enrich the discussion and challenge the proposed model the paper then refers to the analysis of the case studies used for the purposes of teaching corporate entrepreneurship in top business schools, assuming that they reflect essential characteristics and manifestations of corporate entrepreneurship. By using the teaching case studies, the paper aims to approach the image of corporate entrepreneurship as discussed with executives and managers taking part in the education programs. The comparison between scientific and managerial views on CE reveals several discrepancies. Even though the reality described in the case studies is simplified for educational reasons, paying attention to these discrepancies might contribute to our understanding of intrapreneurial behaviors.

Limitations

Although providing some insights, the case studies still remain artificially created narratives. They are neither free from the subjectivity of the teller, nor from those of the writer. In his introduction to a special issue on using narratives in entrepreneurial research, Gartner (2007) argues that stories are never complete, in and of themselves. They are told in a particular context, to particular listeners, by a particular story teller, for particular purposes. It follows that from different points of view one story might appear differently. While accepting potential limitations caused by using teaching case studies, we hope that for the purpose of teaching and discussion, critical incidents and lessons learned were highlighted. As stated in Fletcher (2007), through narrative, what starts out as fragmented, messy and nonlinear - becomes connected and integrated.
Still, in the recent years there has been a growing interest to the research of entrepreneurship using narratives. For example, Johansson (2004) argues that this method can be used for conceptualizing entrepreneurship and the way entrepreneurs run their business. Pentland (1999) suggested it is possible to build a process theory studying the narratives. Gartner has not only used the case studies to investigate entrepreneurial success (Gartner, et al., 1999), but also edited a special issue in JBV (2007, V5). We, therefore, accepting all the possible limitations of this method, hope to obtain a useful insight into corporate entrepreneurial behaviors.

Further research

This paper in its first part has offered a literature review on how an entrepreneurial process can be seen from perspectives of different theoretical streams. Still, other potential approaches are possible and future research might describe an intrapreneur from a more practically oriented point of view of different organizational levels or, for example, intrapreneurs in different industries.

Further, this paper has engaged in analysis of teaching case studies, aiming to obtain some empirical evidence on how intrapreneurial process unfolds in time. Still, a similar analysis performed on a real, collected-for-research data could challenge the findings and conclusions made by this paper.

Finally, the paper provided an integrative model of analyzing entrepreneurial behaviors. Further testing and analysis might provide necessary challenge for its robustness and validity.
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### APPENDIX A. THE CASE-STUDIES OBSERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3M Optical Systems: Managing Corporate Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>American Express Interactive</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Resource link</td>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Buddy March</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Corning Microarray Technologies</td>
<td>TSB</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Freymont - a successful internal entrepreneur</td>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Groen: A Dover industries company</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hewlett Packard: The flight of the Kittyhawk</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Intel Corporation: The Hood River project</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Internal entrepreneurship at the Dow Chemical Company</td>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Inxight: Incubating a Xerox Technology Venture</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lucent Technologies: the Future of the New Ventures Group</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Managing internal growth at Nestle - the story of LC1</td>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>2000/2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>UPM Rafsec RFID Venture, 2004</td>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mercury Rising : Knight Ridder’s Digital venture</td>
<td>HBS</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Quantity Surveying services</td>
<td>LBS</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The birth and growth of Toshiba’s laptop and notebook computers</td>
<td>JBV</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The GE Energy Management Initiative</td>
<td>Ivey</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hulki Aldikakti: at home in a corporate giant</td>
<td>Pinchot</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Michael Phillips: Intrapreneuring in service industry</td>
<td>Pinchot</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Art Fry: Persisting with a good idea</td>
<td>Pinchot</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Matt Sanders: Dealing with a set back</td>
<td>Pinchot</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE CODING

Discovery
Thinking about work-related ideas:

Spener often asked, “How can we make HP a major player in the disk-drive industry? Why don’t we have 20% market share? How can DMD become the next printer business for HP?”

Case 8

Matching a new technical solution to market needs:

At this stage all he [Lindström] needed to do was to explore the potential of the product and the needs of the market; what the potential end-users would be.

Case 16

Evaluation
Gathering political and insider information:

Jones perceived that the greatest danger would come from within Gatwick. He had met BAA managers from other divisions, and attitudes at Heathrow and elsewhere seemed far more apathetic toward new business development than at GAL.

Case 18

Acquire relevant skill

Buddy even acquired a rudimentary understanding of the Japanese language and became familiar with Japanese body language. By the time of the Futaba contract, Buddy was well versed with the Japanese and their business methods.

Case 4

Enrolment and legitimation
Enlist/use support of management:

In addition to Clarke’s ISG salesforce, the Digital Division was seeking revenue through Donnelley’s other salesforces, for which Schneider, now the division’s director of marketing, and her product managers provided technical and product support.

Case 19

Engage in “symbolic actions”:

However, as was his wont, he wanted to do something dramatic to push home the importance of his venture. He started a rumor via e-mail two weeks before the March meeting, claiming that a major competitive announcement was in the offing.

Case 11

Exploitation
Acquire / mobilize resources:

He received $100,000 to research the idea further and build a prototype for demonstration.

Case 11

To investigate this issue, Melby assigned two development subteams to explore the technical feasibility of both the glass specifications and the screen frame. Right away both teams began to involve people, resources, and expertise from many other parts of 3M and from the outside.

Case 1
## Appendix C. Summary of the Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discovery</strong> <em>(combination of knowledge into a valuable idea)</em></td>
<td>Combine or use knowledge for novel ideas</td>
<td>3,15,16,17,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create and articulate vision</td>
<td>All but 5,6,14,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the problem</td>
<td>16,17,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce ideas by engaging in related activities</td>
<td>7,10,11,16,17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce ideas by environment scanning</td>
<td>4,10,14,15,19,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduce idea by thinking about work related issues</td>
<td>8,9,10,11,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involve with other departments</td>
<td>1,5,8,9,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Match new technical solution to market needs</td>
<td>1,5,8,9,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>Decide to explore opportunities</td>
<td>1,2,3,10,15,17,18,19,20,21,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify new mean-ends relationships</td>
<td>1,9,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>11,13,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong> <em>(assessment of the feasibility of the opportunity, development of an idea into a project)</em></td>
<td>Estimate market</td>
<td>1,3,8,11,12,13,14,21,22,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Focus and target ideas</td>
<td>3, 6, 8,10,11,12,13,15,17,22,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frame challenge</td>
<td>1,3,5,6,8,12,18,19,20,22,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather relevant political and insider information</td>
<td>4,13,14,17,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather relevant technical &amp; market information</td>
<td>All but 7,9,13,14,16,17,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structure ideas, prepare a proposal</td>
<td>4,8,10,11,13,16,18,20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a business plan</td>
<td>1,3,5,8,11,12,13,16,14,17,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk outside dept about new ideas</td>
<td>4,8,17,20,22,24,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td>Pair up / acquire missing skill</td>
<td>3,4,7,8,9,11,13,17,20,22,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gather feedback from customers</td>
<td>1,6,10,18,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment / Legitimation</strong> <em>(Making novel ideas accepted as valuable inno-s)</em></td>
<td>Communicate the project within organization</td>
<td>1,3,10,17,18,20,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop and use communication networks</td>
<td>1,14,20,21,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enable energy, build commitment, develop consensus and trust</td>
<td>1,3,5,8,9,11,12,13,18,19,22,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in horse-trading</td>
<td>1,6,7,13,17,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in symbolic actions</td>
<td>1,7,8,11,13,16,19,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filter interference, fight concern</td>
<td>1,5,6,8,13,18,19,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Get acceptance / Cooperate with organizational members</td>
<td>1,11,6,2,9,10,12,13,8,16,15,18,19,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase organizational awareness of the potential of ideas</td>
<td>1,13,16,17,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize key-players</td>
<td>1,4,11,20,7,9,10,12,13,8,16,17,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide legitimacy internally and externally</td>
<td>1,3,5,11,6,20,9,10,13,8,16,17,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sell idea to higher management levels / Maintain their support</td>
<td>1,3,5,11,6,20,9,10,13,8,16,17,18,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Selections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell idea to the team, keep their confidence</td>
<td>1,5,9,10,13,16,18,21,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show clear strategic mission and fit</td>
<td>13,17,19,20,21,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggest and sell ideas to immediate management</td>
<td>1,3,4,11,13,8,17,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use support of decision makers</td>
<td>11,6,20,9,10,13,8,16,18,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take responsibility for the vision (put own reputation)</td>
<td>1,4,11,9,19,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish positive relationships within org-n</td>
<td>1,2,7,10,8,15,16,19,21,25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educate market</td>
<td>4,11,6,7,12,16,17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exploitation** (gathering and controlling resources, orchestrating org. arrangements, product development and market making)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Selections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquire resources / Mobilize or shift resources</td>
<td>1,5,11,20,10,12,13,17,21,18,25 / 1,10,8,15,18,19,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build team</td>
<td>1,5,11,20,10,12,13,17,18,21,22,23,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass normal channels to pursue innovative idea</td>
<td>2,3,11,6,9,8,16,14,17,18,22,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bypass standard personnel procedures</td>
<td>11,9,10,13,17,18,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince people in other depts to commit their resources</td>
<td>1,20,9,13,18,19,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate efforts of the project team &amp; operating units</td>
<td>10,12,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create prototype</td>
<td>2,11,20,7,10,13,19,21,22,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut corners of the procedures</td>
<td>1,2,11,10,13,8,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define and create product bundle</td>
<td>1,2,5,7,9,10,12,13,8,16,19,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enable core of committed people around the idea</td>
<td>11,13,8,18,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examine venture’s activity</td>
<td>1,10,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore different courses of action</td>
<td>1,2,4,20,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find people who can handle problems</td>
<td>1,3,7,9,10,18,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster exchange between contributors</td>
<td>1,6,20,7,8,18,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give venture its impetus (formal inception)</td>
<td>3,5,11,10,8,16,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement ideas (w/o or before official approval)</td>
<td>3,17,23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate successful new ventures as ongoing operations</td>
<td>1,16,19,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate marketing efforts</td>
<td>1,2,5,11,6,7,9,10,12,8,16,15,17,19,21,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor and monitor venture’s progress</td>
<td>11,7,16,18,21,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcome organizational inertia</td>
<td>2,3,9,8,16,14,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path clearing / negotiating for the project</td>
<td>3,4,6,7,9,10,13,17,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine, redesign the product</td>
<td>1,2,4,7,10,13,8,16,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support innovation materially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit kill orders</td>
<td>4,19,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hide venture progress from management</td>
<td>1,7,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redefine project structure, placement, business concept</td>
<td>1,2,5,11,20,9,10,8,16,17,18,21,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get legal protection</td>
<td>5,7,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build internal capabilities</td>
<td>1,7,9,14,18,24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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