Abstract

This article is an exploratory study, drawing upon qualitative socioeconomic research. The ethnographic trends of intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs can be viewed in the ontology of the intrapreneur and entrepreneur and their propensity toward futuring (Boje,2011). The contribution of this article is in further highlighting the importance of the study into the ontology of the intrapreneur and entrepreneur in order to understand ethnographic trends of intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs. There is a sparcity in the current knowledge addressing the issue, which suggests further study.

Introduction

While researching creative deviance and their fight against social discourse, pushing against counter-culture -- only two academic references came up with an ontological analysis of individuals deemed to fall into this category: Marc Bonnet and Charalampos Mainemelis. Instead, much more was written on the culture of intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs, weaving itself through conversations and stories of and about creative deviance and those who may possess it. The internal and external influences that drive an individual to express and offer their skills and talents to the world provide a comprehensive interplay of ethnographic concepts at work. The opportunities intertwined with individual characteristics, personalities and situational circumstances mark parallels and crossroads that signify a deeper and different culture than organizational management textbooks currently describe. Many ironic opposing traits and forces seem to simultaneously be working together: the collective and the very unique, the clear vision of the unseen, the intangible force, the unspeakable context, rules that were followed but not set, politics without an agenda. These interesting juxtapositions, deemed to be

applicable and relevant to the essence of their being, remain pieces of the unanswered question, "What does it mean to be an intrapreneur and entrepreneur? Without clarification in this area, a fundamental appreciation for creative deviance remains as obscure as the individual's success.

What is the ontology of an intrapreneur and an entrepreneur?

Research has started to recognize that intrapreneurship is an integrative concept that differs from traditional management and entrepreneurship. Management styles, innovativeness, tolerance for risk-taking, and even mindfulness have been included in the analytical constructs to distinguish between the various areas of new development. However, the ontology of the intrapreneur and entrepreneur -- the embodiment of being a risk-taker, job opportunist, sense-maker, having mistrust of the collective, the sense of being in time and space, and connecting to informal cultural-cognitive aspects and indefinable characteristics of creative deviance is minimally included in the process of defining and analyzing intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship. These characteristics require a collective and existential phenomenon that must be observed through movement, enfolding, and assemblage, requiring a more qualitative revelation of inquiry.

Defining intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship continues to be a process. Studies have looked at the personality and psychology (Littunen, 2000, Caird, 1988; Casson, 1982) and others have looked at the organizational dynamics of enterpreneurship within organizations (Goffin and Pfeiffer, 1999; Martin, 1994). Cultural issues have also gained a reputation as an influence for the inception of entrepreneurship (Herbig et al, 1994), but physical, technical and social reality is an ontic framework.

Entrepreneurs have been distinguished between small business owners as those with a more significant motivation and risk-tolerance for innovation and change. Small business owners would be individuals looking to secure income without a more global vision. (Garland et al (1984) and Steward et al (1998). "Entrepreneurship, in its narrowest sense, involves capturing ideas, converting them into products and, or services and then building a venture to take the product to market" (Johnson, 2001, p. 138).

Entrepreneuring is said to bring about new economic, social, institutional, or cultural environment through the actions of an individual or group of individuals. The definition includes a wide variety of change-oriented activities and projects. It differs from a broader set of change initiatives in that it is associated with efforts to create something new – a new idea, a new thing, a new institution, a new market, a new set of possibilities for the entrepreneuring individual or group and/or for other actors in the environment. (Rindova, Barry and Ketchun, 2010).

The entrepreneurial process can unfold in different time situations. It can occur in start-ups or within existing firms or ongoing economic activities. Strategic entrepreneurship that develops in various temporal moments and at various levels in the organization can be termed intrapreneurship. Intrapreneurship is defined as corporate entrepreneurship or corporate venturing. It is the development of a new venture or opportunity within an existing organization that creates economic value and enhances the overall business performance (Zhao, p 26).

The aspect of the entrepreneur and intrapreneur that has not been magnified to reveal the personal level lies within the propensity toward futuring (Boje, 2011) or venturing. Within this state of being, the ability to see the unseen, or define the

indefinable is prevalent. There are a few common themes that immediately come to the forefront – recognition of the parts to the whole; making sense of the co-posited existence of time and space; maneuvering the elemental power energy toward acceptable change.

Entrepreneurial activities in the informal economy contribute to collective identity theory. It could be within this market that the rules of market are transformed. The formation of a collective identity by informal economy entrepreneurs significantly contributes to the growth of the venture. Thus, research exploring how collective identity influences the different stages of the entrepreneurial process in the informal economy may offer valuable insights (Schoonhoven & Romanelli, 2001).

Shumpeter's early writings in 1951 suggest that those with entrepreneurial drive are high risk-takers, intensely focused, and unwavering in their belief of a vision. Anita Roddick of the Bodyshop stated, "to succeed you have to believe in something with such a passion that it becomes a reality," and Michael Dell suggested that "passion should be the fire that drives your life's work." But Cardon Zietsma, Saparito, Matherne, and Davis suggest that entrepreneurship passion is a "tale of passion". The actual research on this passion has not been systematically studied. (Cardon, Wincent, Singh, and Drnovsek, 2009).

There exists a common theme that motivated innovators possess the desire to actively change the status quo and to regularly take risks to make the change happen (Dyer, Gregersen, and Christensen, 2009, p. 7). They move away from the cognitive bias called the status quo bias or the tendency to prefer an existing state of affairs versus an alternative. Most of the innovators studied embrace the mission of change so much that

they view mistakes as consequences of doing business. Innovators rely on their courage to innovate against what the status quo want in an unmovable desire to take risks. These qualities help them transform their ideas with powerful impact. This aspect of innovative behavior is also recognized by others who identify them as design-thinking, such as Edison. (Brown, 2008).

If in fact, motivated innovators find the status quo as a motivating factor, the question begs to be asked if these individuals can become successful intrapreneurs. What would be the motivational factor to try to fit into an organizational culture in order to find something outside of that which will be accepted? In addition, perhaps a foreign culture offers more motivation to such an individual.

Goffman reminds us that it "is not the individual and his psychology, but rather the syntactical relations among the acts of different persons mutually present to one another" that is important. (Goffman,1967, p. 2). Scenario thinking, peripheral vision and intuitive logic are some of the creative methodologies intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs have incorporated into their practices. These methods of gaining knowledge still include an assumption that future knowledge is a tangibly attainable entity.

By evaluating individuals through weight of use with these methods, we are put back into the ontic, steering away from the undescribed relationships that occur through these methodologies. "A qualitative case study approach is found to be much more meaningful and appropriate as it is capable of providing the unique opportunity to ask the various actors about what disposes them to enact the practices they do, uncover when and how they do them, as well as their aims." (Sarpong, p 13-14).

The evolution of the strategic theory of entrepreneurship has up until recently, developed independently of strategic management. A multi-temporal view of the firm may contribute to a relationship between the two. (Venkataraman and Sarasvathy, 2001). There can be consequences to coordinating value chains, market behaviors towards fit, while linking the interconnection of cultural language and various time concepts in groups. (Mocciaro Li Destric, p. 790).

Boje (2011) articulates that futures are co-generated, non-linear Deleuzian rhizome-assemblages that are not controlled by cycles. Sense-making contains a co-posited view of past, present and future. The entire field of potential unfolds through people and material actants. (Boje, p 24). The reassemblage of the metanoia experience and its relationship to antenarratives highlights the "bet" on the future. "It is the deeper, more profound ontological change of Being-ness in the life-world." (Boje, p. 25)

Through the antennarrative of intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial experience, there exists the possibility of tapping into the ontological elements of these experiences. Futuring dwells in the inherent state of ambiguity and uncertainty. Antenarratives and metanoia experiences both originate from a sense of ambiguity or uncertainty. The retrospective look at a metanoia experience loops back to the individual's transpersonal ontological state, which creates the antenarrative. The ability to recognize that discovery occurs through a moving process in which anticipation of the future is necessary suggests a specific leadership quality not accessible to everyone. (Grant, in Boje, ed., 2011, p. 114.)

Tsoukas (2005, p. 8) points out: "We need further work to refine our conceptual distinctions and build ever more synthetic theoretical framework by drawing on hitherto

separate disciplines and theories." Ontological support and knowledge creation are closely linked. In order to manage non-structured knowledge within practice, both intuition and reason are necessary. From a constructivist view, Tsoukas (1996, p 17) argues "the unarticulated background is an indispensable part of articulated knowledge." The possibility of a clear separation between tacit and explicit knowledge simply does not exist. (Akehurst, et al, p 189).

It is also appropriate to separate knowledge creation from the analysis and conceptualization of knowledge. In the creation process, material and social supports (concrete reality and the social contexts with which we interact) and the human supports of knowledge (behavior and mind) interact, accumulating experience and forming the background (the secondary details) of new knowledge. In the process of analysis and conceptualization, the only support that can reasonably come into play is the cognitive one. From an ontological viewpoint, except for the initial learning stages, explicit knowledge is always present. The material and social context along with behavior and the cognitive mind compose a concrete and infinite reality (Bunge, 1967, 2006). This explicit knowledge could reveal itself through further ethnographic research.

In order to explore why some organizations incorporate intrapreneurship more effectively than others, it is important to look at the practices of mindfulness and how they evolve. To clarify the concepts of mindfulness and routine, the distinction has to be made between awareness and distinction-making and between the level of the individual and the collective level. Mindfulness suggests the awareness of many situational discriminators. It is not clear if individuals need to be fully aware of the distinctions they apply in order to see anomalies. Being mindful is associated with individual cognitive

activity, whereas routines are depicted as collective patterns of behavior. (Winter, 2003). (Gaertner, 262.)

How can we extract the propensity toward futuring (Boje, 2011)?

As we review qualitative and socio-economic methods of extracting the ontological view of intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship, the themes of space, time, being, and the indefinable continue to reveal themselves. Venturing itself is idea based, not always secured by a tangible outcome. It is directional and moving, assembling through various waves of experience and opportunity. One obvious difference between the entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial experience is that entrepreneurs select themselves where intrapreneurs are connecting with their organization. What does it mean to the individual to identify with the label of intrapreneur or entrepreneur? Does this identification affect the outcome of their success and how do we get to distinguish these aspects once we notice a trend?

To understand the organization or individual at a given moment, we need to stop time, separate and analyze. If we want to know how to transform and experience the accumulation and creation of knowledge, we should make an in-depth examination of how physical, technical and social reality is interwoven with human action. The former is essential and allows us to know the state of the organizational and individual; the latter is critical and allows us to understand how change and transformation occurs. (Akehurst, et al, p. 186.)

New venture creation in emerging economies is being driven by product, process and paradigm forms of innovation at a macro level (Bessant, Tidd, 2007) and the ability to quickly and economically translate knowledge into value at the micro one (Eshun Jr.,

2009). The organizational structures of new ventures tend to look toward competition first and quickly develop a dedicated market to establish a business base.

With focus on the outcomes, the individual elements of the intrapreneur is no longer viewed with importance. When innovation focuses toward a product base, the organizational structure becomes aligned with the sales function and less toward production. (Wonglimpiyarat, 2010). With these ventures the sales, senior management and engineering responsibilities blend into one, and social skills once again become more significant than talent or skill. The end result is that the organizational structure moves in the direction of customer and market segmentation first, and over time transitions to a functional structure. (Khaire, 2010).

With all of these elements interacting, what process can discern the invisible thread that ties them all together? Have the variables in the equation been identified to the micro-level, or do we continue to work within an ontic framework to define a much more involved correlation? Fang Zhao explored the synergy between entrepreneurshp and innovation, arguing that the non-linear dynamics of rapid change rely on the complementary relationship of enetrepreneurshp and innovation. (Zhao,2005.) The multi-temporal view of a firm expands the causal relationship in the management field, such as time-space relationship, the relationship between strategy and entreprenesurship, and the relationship between the static and the evolutionary and dynamic perspectives. (Mociaro Li Destri, p. 776).

According to Savall (2011), silence finds its place among the actor polygon dynamics within socio-economic theory. "The rule of the external intervener is to express it and construe its significance on behalf of the actors." (Savall, in Boje, ed., 2011, p.

375). The Socio-Economic Approach to management was created to monitor the time needed to transform an enterprise into a new competitive environment because expectations and actual reality always differ. (Savall, p.16)

The Austrian approach focuses on adequate causality relations between events and human actions. In order for an individual to act intentionally, the need for stability of the mental frames guiding individual action and the uncertainty derived from the flow of time make up the equation. This view recognizes there exist both unique and typical aspects that are time dependent and others that are relatively time independent. (Mocciaro Li Destric, p. 784).

Planning for innovation suggests innovation, venturing and strategic renewal by establishing the contextual conditions that enable immersion into reality and making transformation possible. New knowledge and the support of it will continue to change. Reality is ontologically infinite. (Bunge, 1967), and provides an endless source of possible inventions, innovations and explanation of change. The infinity of concrete things and reality is the endless source of knowledge, innovation and change.

The first support for the ontological dimension lies within the cognitive analysis of knowledge in organizations by referring to individuals within the organization, its groups and the organization as a whole (Nonaka and Takeuchi, 1995, p 57; Crossan et al, 1999, p 523)(1). The second refers to the various contributions of the organization and the economy. (Akehurst, et al, p 184). Interpreting becomes the externalization stage of knowledge that occurs between the ontological group and organizational levels. (Akehurst, et al, p 188).

In order to better understand the deep underlying essence of organizational behavior, there needs to be more attention toward the mundane and activities that are generally taken for granted by the individual. Heidegger re-emphasized the state of being-in-the-world, including the mindless everyday practical coping skills, habits, customs and unreflective familiarity were much more significant than mental representation. (Chia and Mackay, p. 230). This crossroad between the state of being and activity provides a key toward the undefined part of the ontological state of the individual with action. Scenario thinking then becomes significant as an every day occurrence and organizational practice at the micro-level, revealing specific trends of actions in organizational activities. (Sarpong, p 13-14).

Quantum storytelling (Boje, 2011) represents the in-between ontology and epistemology, what Barad (2003: 829) calls onto-epistemology. Boje suggests that the future-shaping-potentiality of entrepreneurs know the models of becoming-spiral and becoming-assemblage, but when met with the organizational models' linear and cyclic antenarratives of Big Business, the assemblage of know-how gets lost. In order to make a quantum change in the future-shaping-wave of business by transforming dysfunctional linear-cyclic antenarratives, the co-posited processes of timespacemattering in becoming and change will be the new science, that will direct the Being-Becoming to business ventures. (Boje,2011, p. 9).

Being-Becoming is accomplished materially because individual storytellers are of the world and not separate from the world. "This is not storytelling with lots of material props to support the telling, but storytelling itself as world-making itself intelligible in the storytelling. It is just that nature does its storytelling differently than we humans, but is storytelling no less than that, and since as Barad (2003: 828) puts it ―we are port of nature from a post-humanist

onto-epistemology we are also of the storytelling nature in doing, and in an intra-activity, not outside storytelling or observing the world. (Boje, 8)

What ethnographic questions could be explored more deeply if we define intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship ontologically?

Bjerregaard offers some suggestions on the contribution of ethnographic methodologies in advancing organizational research by bringing in concepts of human agency, taking organizational studies beyond behavior and rational positivism into organizational theories. (Bjerregaard, 2011). Adding research specifically focused toward entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial research supports the notion that ontological research remains minimal and necessary to advance ethnographic insights within this area.

What is it like to be an entrepreneur who becomes a successful intrapreneur in a foreign country? What factors would make it easier or more difficult to become an intrapreneur or entrepreneur in a foreign country? Where does nationality play a role in successful intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship? Is creative deviance shaped or natural and how is it incorporated into organizations? Have creative deviants been forced by social pressures or organizational culture to be entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial? Could job hopping be a positive sign for hiring intrapreneurs?

Some studies look into the impact of immigration trends on credentialization. (Lerner & Gila, 2011). There exists some observation concerning individual access to legitimate means of social systems as a conduit for entrepreneurial or intraprenuerial success. (Merton, 1968). The access to publication due to language barriers has been reviewed, (Carbon, 2009) and the interconnectedness of creative deviance, invention and sabotage as manifestations of evolutionary ideas has been pointed out. (Mainemelis,

2010). Let us explore the deviation and self-sabotage relating to identity of ethnic culture or genetic history.

Behavioral details of intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship continue to be a focus in the psychological research. The absorptive capacity of change agents in mature organizations (Jones, 2006), the emancipation factor of entrepreneurship (Rindova, et. al, 2009) and the entrepreneurial passion (Cardon, et. al, 2009) are all areas that can be explored on a deeper level by evaluating the cultural stories of the intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial populations. The socio-cognitive states of change can be seen within the focus on the plot of managers and rivalry forseen in various cultures (Kostera, 2010), decision-making behavior (Rieple & Vyakarnam, 1994) and the transfer of new ideas from elaboration to a medium. (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997)

Where does gender, age and sexuality cross paths with intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship? Does discrimination in these areas follow trends toward discrimination against creative deviance? Can an intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial mindset be genetically driven? What biological parts of human survival correspond to intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship? Is intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship an evolutionary mindset that developed from the survival state or is intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship an evolutionary form of enterprising?

We can discover the underpinnings of cognitive social capital by enhancing the studies done on regional and local development of entrepreneurship (Malecki, 1993), creation of cognitive social capital (Lee & Jones, 2008) looking at the evolutionary theory of creativity incorporating implementation and elaboration. (Staw, 1990) and tracing any roots of intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship that parallel civilization. The

elaboration of new ideas, its validation and refining and incubation of new ideas (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997) as well as the limitations of domain expertise due to cognitive entrenchment and the trade-offs between expertise and flexibility were recently highlighted (Dane, 2010) and could be broadened with ethnographic trends.

The internal needs of a foreign national, immigrant, or expatriate can offer the pathways to the parallels between intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial insight and change, innovation and metanoia. Can symbols be identified with intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship success (ie. freedom, independence, economic status)? How does intra-community heterogeneity play a role in successful intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship?

New venture creation shows some demographic research through work on negotiation, leveraging cross-cultural identity, and individual's self-concept and boundary spanning. (Yagi,2011), demographics of board members of entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial companies. (Gabrielsson, 2007), understanding segregation in organizations (Bargiela-Chiappini, (2007), and foreign locals (Dan V Caprar, 2011) and multinational identity (Moore, 2011). Gaining the experiential micro-perspective of these demographic groups could illuminate systemic correlations to significant entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial phenonmenon.

Conclusion

The various limits on creativity of employees within a workplace can push the entrepreneurial individual toward small business. Where a talented entrepreneur can thrive quite well, and perhaps devise new organizational structure to spur the economy forward, the innovative individual may not. By limiting the amount of pure talent and

creativity within the organizational workforce, it is expected that companies' innovation will be reduced in accordance with the limitations implemented by the company's restraints. By including business incubation in the larger business strategy, or intrapreneurship, and researching informal business ventures, the foundation for an organizational structure that supports more substantially both entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial individuals may be in the making. However, the research must only begin here.

Without understanding the micro-elements of the ontological differences between intrepreneurs and entrepreneurs through a personal evolutionary and existential context, the equation for innovative success is not complete. When incorporating more emphasis on the relationships in ethnographic practice as connected to the development of mindfulness, space and time within an individual, propositions concerning innovation and the ability to integrate these very personal links of contribution to the aggregate whole can then begin to be validated.

References

Akehurst, Gary, Rueda-Armengot Carlos, Lopez, Salvador Vivas and Marques, Daniel Palacios, (2011). Ontological supports of knowledge: knowledge creation and analystical knowledge. Management Decision Vol. 49 (2), p 183-194.

Barad, K. (2007) Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Bargiela-Chiappini, Francesca, (2007) "Liminal ethnography: understanding segregated organisations", Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, Vol. 2 (2), pp.126 – 143.

Bartone, Paul T., Eid, Jarle, Johnsen, Bjorn Helge, Laberg, Jon Christian Snook, Scott A. (2009). "Big five personality factors, hardiness, and social judgment as predictors of leader performance", Leadership & Organization Development Journal, Vol. 30: 6, p. 498 – 521.

Bargiela-Chiappiri, Francesca (2007) Liminal ethnography: understanding segregated organizations", Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, Vol. 2 (2) p. 126-143.

Bessant, J. and Tidd, J. (2007), Innovation and Entrepreneurship, John Wiley & Sons.

Bjerregaard, Toke (2011). Studying institutional work in organizations: Uses and implications of ethnographic methodologies. Journal of Organizational Change Vol. 24 (1), 2011.

Boje, David (2011). Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook. Routledge.

Boje, David (2011). The Quantum Physics of Storytelling. New Mexico State University Original commences December 17, 2010; Revised February 10, 2011.

Bonnet, Marc and Cristallini, Vincent (2002), Enhancing the efficiency of networks in an urban area through socio-economic interventions. Journal of Organizational Change, Vol 16 (1), p. 72-82.

Bosma N. Stam E. Wennekers S (2010). "Intrapreneurship – An international study" http://www.scribd.com/doc/26821312/Intrapreneurship-An-International-Study-Global-Entrepreneurship-Monitor-GEM.

Brown, Graham, Robinson, Sandra L. (2011). Reactions to Territorial Infringement. Organization Science. Vol. 22 (1), p. 210-225.

Brown, T. (2008). Design thinking. Harvard Business Review, June 2008, 84-95.

Bunge, M. (1967), The Search for System, Springer, New York, NY.

Bunge, M. (2006), Chasing Reality: Strife over Realism, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Caird, S. (1988), A Review of Methods of Measuring Enterprising Attributes, Durham University Business School, Durham.

Caprar, Dan. V. (2011). Foreign locals: A cautionary tale on the culture of MNC local employees. Journal of International Business Studies, Vol. 42 (5), p. 608-29.

Carbon, Claus-Christian (2009). European Publication issues from an Austrian perspective. Psychology Science Quarterly, Vol. 51 (Supplement 1), pp. 69-87.

Cardon, Melissa S., Wincent, Joakim, Singh, Jagdip and Drnovsek, Mateja. The Nature and Experience of Entrepreneurial Passion. Academy of Management, Vol. 34 Number 3 July 2009 p. 511-532.

Casson, M. (1982), The Entrepreneur: An Economic Theory, Martin Robertson, Oxford.

Chia and Mackay, (2007). Post-processual challenges for the emerging strategy-as-practice perspective: Discovering strategy in the logic of practice. Human Relations, Vol. 60, p. 217-242.

Chien-Huang Lin, Ching-Huai Peng, & Danny T. Kao. (2008). The innovativeness effect of market orientation and learning orientation on business performance. International Journal of Manpower, 29(8), p. 752-772.

Chui L, Curtis M.B. (2010) "Intrepreneurs and innovation: Here's a new approach to the adoption of continuous monitoring." Strategic Finance. 92.5 p. 49.

Crossan, M.M., Lane, H.W. and White, R.E. (1999), "An organizational learning framework: from intuition to institution", Academy of Management Review, Vol. 24 (3), p. 522-537.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997) "Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention." New York: Harper Perennial.

Dane, Erik. (2010). Reconsidering the Trade-Off Between Expertise and Flexibility: A Cognitive Entrenchment Perspective. Academy of Management Review, Vol. 35 (4), p. 579-603.

Dushnitsky, G., & Shapira, Z.. (2010). Entrepreneurial finance meets organizational reality: comparing investment practices and performance of corporate and independent venture capitalists. Strategic Management Journal, 31(9), 990.

Dyer, J. Gregersen, H. and Christensen, C. (2009). The Innovator's DNA. Harvard Business Review, December 2009, 1-7.

Endres, A., & Woods, C. (2009). Schumpeter's 'conduct model of the dynamic entrepreneur': scope and distinctiveness. Journal of Evolutionary Economics, 20(4), 583-607.

Eshun Jr., Joseph P. (2009). Business incubation as strategy. Business Strategy Series, 10(3), 156-166.

Gabrielsson, Jonas (2007). Boards of Directors and Entrepreneurial Posture in Medium-size Companies. International Small Business Journal. Vol. 25 95), p 511-537.

Gaertner, Christian (2011). Putting new wine into old bottles: Mindfulness as a micro-foundation of dynamic capabilities. Management Decision, Vol. 49 (2), p. 253-269.

Garland, J. W., Hoy, F., Boulton, W. R. and Garand, J. C. (1984), "Differentiating entrepreneurs from small business owners: a conceptualization," Academy of Management Review, Vol. 9 (2), p. 354-359.

Gharajedaghi, J. (1999), Systems Thinking: Managing Chaos and Complexity, Butterworth Heinemann, London.

Goffin, K. and Pfeiffer, R. (1999), Innovation Management in UK and German Manufacturing Companies, Anglo-German Foundation, York.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday Life. New York: Doubleday.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual. New York: Aldine.

Grant, Kevin (2011) in David Boje, ed. Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook. Routledge.

Herbig, P., Golden, E.J. and Dunphy, A. (1994), "The relationship of structure to entrepreneurial and innovative success", Marketing Intelligence and Planning, Vol 12 (9), p. 37-48.

Hofstede, G. (1991), Cultures and Organizations, McGraw-Hill, London.

Johnson, D. (2001), "What is innovation and entrepreneurship? Lessons for large organizations", Industrial and Commercial Training, Vol. 33 (4), p. 135-140.

Jones, Oswald (2006). Developing Absorptive Capacity in Mature Organizations: The Change Agent's Role. Management Learning, Vol. 37, p. 355-376.

Khaire, M.. (2010).Young and No Money? Never Mind: The Material Impact of Social Resources on New Venture Growth. Organization Science, 21(1), 168-185,306.

Kostera, Monika and Obloj, Krzysztof (2010). Archetypes of rivalry; Narrative responses of Polish radio station managers to perceived environmental change. Journal of Organizational Change Management, Vol 23 (5) p. 564.

Kreuger, Dale. (1998) Personality Characteristics of the Small Business Entrepreneur. Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship, March 1998.

Lee, Robert and Jones, Oswald (2006). Networks, Communication and Learning during Business Start-Up: The Creation of Cognitive Social Capital. International Small Business Journal, Vol. 26, p. 559-593.

Lerner, Miri and Menahem, Gila (2003). Decredentialization and Recredentialization: The Role of Governmental Interventon in Enhancing Occupational Status of Russian Immigrants in Israel in the 1990s. Work and Occupations. Vol. 30 (3) p. 1-28.

Littunen, H. (2000), "Entrepreneurship and the characteristics of the entrepreneurial personality", International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, Vol. 6 (6) p. 295-309.

Mainemelis, Charalampos, (2010). Stealing Fire: Creative Deviance in the Evolution of New Ideas. Academy of Management Review, Vol. 35 (4), p. 558-578.

Malecki, Edward J. (1993). Entrepreneurshp in Regional and Local Development. International Regional Science Review, Vol.16, p. 119-153.

Manolova, T., Manev, I., & Gyoshev, B.. (2010). In good company: The role of personal and interfirm networks for new-venture internationalization in a transition economy. Journal of World Business, 45(3), p. 257.

Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure. New York: Free Press.

Mocciaro Li Destri, Arabell and Dagnino, Giovanni B. (2004). Time and Strategy: towards a multitemporal view of the firm. Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 19 (8), p. 776-794.

Moore, Fiona (2011). Holistic ethnography: Studying the impact of multiple national identities on post-acquisition organizations. Journal of International Business Studies. Vol. 42 (5) p. 654-72.

Morris, M., Kuratko, D., Allen, J., Ireland, R., & Schindehutte, M.. (2010). Resource Acceleration: Extending Resource-Based Theory in Entrepreneurial Ventures. Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship, Vol. 15(2), p. 4-25.

Nonaka, I. And Takeuchi, H. (1995), The Knowledge Creating Company. How Japanese Companies Create the Dynamics of Innovation, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Pinchot, G. III. (1985). Intrapreneuring. New York: Harper & Row.

Prabhu, Krish. (2001) "Intrapreneur, Business India." WorldSources, Inc, Emerging Markets Datafile.

Rieple, Alison and Vyakarnam, Shailendra. (1994). Corporate Entrepreneurship: A Review. Journal of Entrepreneurship, Vol. 3, p. 1-20.

Rindova, Violina, Barry, Daved and Ketchen, Jr., David J. (2009). Entrepreneuring as Emancipation. Academy of Management, Vol. 34 Number 3 July 2009, p. 477-491.

Sarpong, David, (2011). Towards a methodological approach: Theorising scenario thinking as a social practice. Vol.13, No 2, p. 4-17.

Savall, Henri, Zardet, Veronique and Bonnet, Marc (2010). Releasing the Untapped Potential of Enterprises through Socio-Economic Management. ISEOR.

Savall, Henri. (2011) in David Boje, ed. Storytelling and the Future of Organizations: An Antenarrative Handbook. Routledge.

Schoonhoven, Claudia Bird, Romanelli, Elaine. (2009) The next wave in entrepreneurial research. Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, Vol. 11, p. 225-259.

Staw, B. M. (1990). An evolutionary approach to creativity and innovation. In M. West & J. L. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies. Chicester: Wiley.

Steward, W. H., Watson, W. E., Garland, J.C. an Garland, J.W. (1998), "A proclivity for entrepreneurship: a comparison of entrepreneurs, small business owners, and corporate managers", Journal of Business Venturing, Vol. 14 (2), p. 189-214.

Tsoukas, H. (2005). Comples Knowledge: Studies in Organizational Epistemology, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Tsui-Auch, Lai Si, (2005). Unpacking Regional Ethnicity and the Strength of Ties in Shaping Ethnic Entrepreneurship. Organization Studies, Vol. 26(8): 1189-1216.

Venkataraman, S. and Sarasvathy, S.D. (2001), "Strategy and entrepreneurship: outlines of an untold story", in Hitt, M.S., Freeman, E. and Harrison, J.S. (Eds), Handbook of Strategic Management, Blackwell, Oxford.

Weber, Klaus, Dacin, M. Tina (2011). The Cultural Construction of Organizational Life: Introduction to the Special Issue. Vol. 22 (2), p. 287-299.

Winter, M. and Winter, S.G. (2002), "Deliberate learning and the evolution of dynamic capabilities", Organization Science, Vol 13 (3), p 339-351.

Wonglimpiyarat, J.(2010). Commercialization strategies of technology: lessons from Silicon Valley. Journal of Technology Transfer, Vol. 35(2), p. 225-236.

Yagi, (2011). Negotiation, leveraging cross-cultural identity, an individual's self-concept and boundary spanning. Journal of International Business Studies. Vol. 42 (5) p. 629-654.

Zhao, Fang, (2005). Exploring the synergy between entrepreneurship and innovation. International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research, Vol. 11 (1), p. 25-41.