



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_BJEMT_4585
Title of the Manuscript:	THE LIKELIHOOD OF CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN LARGE CORPORATIONS
Type of the Article	Research paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT The “innovation concept” does not make sense as it states ‘alone’. A clear link between ‘innovation; and ‘entrepreneurship’ needs to be made first (in essence, keep the reader with limited insight in mind). The last sentence does not ‘tie in’ with what was mentioned at the beginning. Ensure that you have a thorough logical thread. INTRODUCTION The sentence which reads “... if the entrepreneur happens to be the firm’s manager, when the management function is distinguished from the entrepreneurial function, agency problem arises in the new hierarchy” does not ‘tie in’ with what was said previously. There needs to be a clear logical flow of ideas. Although you are very knowledgeable on the topic (evident in your writing style), you need to guide your reader through your ‘conceptual framework’ as what is a ‘given’ to you, is almost like ‘rocket science’ to the reader.	This paper is focused more on how to develop the innovation concept once the firm’s manager has crystallized an innovation concept. If the firm’s manager decides to share the innovation concept to his senior management of the company and the company continues to develop the innovation concept, it would be a typical case of corporate entrepreneurship. However, if the firm’s manager decides to keep the innovation concept to himself and to develop the innovation concept for his own benefits, he would become his own entrepreneur business. If so, there will have no more corporate entrepreneurship. In order to show a logical thread, the Abstract paragraph has been revised. The first three paragraphs in the Introduction Section have been revised to show a logical thread.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	The term “agency problems” is ambiguous. Make use of universally accepted terms, e.g. business problems. The paragraphs listed are not logically ‘flowing’ from one point to another. The reviewer is left ‘confused’ after reading the paragraphs under this applicable heading. RESEARCH DESIGN It is critical that the actual design of the research is described in depth as the studies conducted by the author(s) might want to be conducted by other researchers in a different dispensation. Make reference to the process of the research the progress of the research, the logic of the research and the outcome of the research as defined by Collis and Hussey. Also, what is ‘explanatory research’ and why was this type of research chosen – all of the latter should be justified. The validation of data and the checking of reliability of data do not align with ordinary research protocols. The methodological framework (operational framework) is not supported by the introduction as a very limited conceptual framework is supplied.	The first three paragraphs in the Introduction Section have been revised to show a logical thread. The first three paragraphs in the Introduction Section have been revised to show a logical thread. Revision has been made and additional paragraphs have been added to improve the logic thread in the research design. Cases are not sampling unit. Each case’s conclusions are considered to be the information which needs replication by other individual cases. Emphasis was placed on the reasoning and the selection process of the answers. In other words, the case study was focused in answering “how” and “why” questions. In addition to the verbal comments obtained during the interviews, direct observations and review of personal background through the respondents’ executive profile were used to validate each case. In the conceptual framework, the decision on whether it is a corporate entrepreneurship or a individual entrepreneurship is based on Agency Theory, Manager himself and the Moral Factors. In the operational framework, the Agency Theory is measured by the Conflict of Interest as an independent variable. The Manager himself is measured by the Characteristics of the Manager as an independent variable. The Moral Factors is
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	In essence, this section explains that a total of 2 managers and 1 entrepreneur were interviewed ... there is no justification provided why a certain number of respondents were selected, why certain individuals of certain organisations were selected, why only certain organisations were taken into consideration for this study ... there are too many loose ends. Also, despite the fact that this research is part of case study research, absolutely no ethical considerations were highlighted. RESULTS It is impossible to 'place trust' in the results of a study if the research design and methodology contains various grey areas. Furthermore, due to the limited conceptual framework provided in the introduction, the results can not be taken at 'face-value', as what was found by the author(s) [based on literature – the reviewer took the assumption that this research study was deductive in nature] needs to hold relevancy to the previous listed sections (logical thread).	measured by the Moral Consideration as an independent variable. And the decision on which type of entrepreneurship is measured by the Likelihood of Corporate Entrepreneurship as the dependent variable. Cases are not sampling unit. Case studies could not be conceived as statistical generalization as per Yin (2003). Case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. The sample logic of the three cases are to cover the expectation of the likelihood of corporate entrepreneurship based on the background of each case, namely, low likelihood as the respondent is already an entrepreneur himself, medium likelihood as the respondent is relatively young in working with a large corporation, and, high likelihood as the respondent has been working with a large corporation for more than 10 years. The ethical consideration of this paper is covered by consideration of the moral factors as per Solymossy & Masters (2002). The decision on whether to explore the innovation concept could be affected by moral consideration. An addition paragraph and a results summary have been added to improve the logical thread. As per Yin (2003), conclusion is drawn on each case on whether it supports the individual proposition and an overall conclusion is drawn from cross case analysis. Finally, each proposition will be reviewed for literal replication from the study.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	CONCLUSIONS Due to the fact that the results can not be taken at face-value (see previous comments too), the conclusions which stem from the latter will also have limited 'credibility'.	As mentioned, cases studies could not be conceived as statistical generalization. Case studies are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. The results of the study show that the likelihood of the corporate entrepreneurship is questionable as manager will consider more to explore the innovation concept himself for his own benefits. This would be a relevant information for the large corporation during its formation of entrepreneur strategy and for the government to promote more individual entrepreneurs in the country.
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	ABSTRACT “From the view of entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs notice opportunities, from where they act and create new hierarchies or ventures to organize transactions.” INTRODUCTION “... have increasingly relied on the entrepreneurship function for many a year.” RESEARCH DESIGN Ensure that your sentence structures make sense – after making recommendations, please ensure that this manuscript is sent for proofreading to enhance the quality thereof.	This paper is focused more on how to develop the innovation concept once the firm’s manager has crystallized an innovation concept. As the decision on how to explore the innovation concept is to be taken place when the individual is still holding the manager position of the firm, it is believed the innovation concept is formalized and crystallized during the working as an employee with the firm. The sentence has been revised. The sentence has been revised. Thanks for the comments and will improve the quality of the manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The introduction and literature review should follow a ‘funnel approach’ whereby you provide a general introduction to your main field of study (i.e. entrepreneurship in a corporate dispensation), from where you narrow it down to a more specific topic(s) in the discipline (Innovation and entrepreneurship). Continue to narrow down by placing emphasis on what the study is on (characteristics, of innovation, characteristics of entrepreneurship, etc.). Lastly, make mention as to how the latter is perceived by businesses, in prior studies, and whether there is indeed a ‘gap’ which this paper is focusing on. Your reader(s) should be convinced about your perceptions and this will only be done upon providing a clear conceptual framework on what your study is on.	For improving the logic, additional paragraphs have been added and revisions have been made throughout the manuscript. Hope the readers could follow through and be convinced with the results.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	References Listed references are not in alphabetical order. Please also ensure that all in-text citations are listed in this section.	The References Section has been revised.
--	---	---