

ENTREPRENEURIAL VS. ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT IN NOT-FOR-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS – PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND UNIVERSITIES

Cezar Scarlat

University “Politehnica” of Bucharest, Romania
cezarscarlat@yahoo.com

Bogdan Brustureanu

National Council for Higher Education Funding (CNFIS), Romania
bbogdan11@yahoo.com

Daniela Borangic

University “Politehnica” of Bucharest, Romania
dana_bora@yahoo.com

Tudorel Popescu

University “Politehnica” of Bucharest, Romania
tudorel.popescu@gmail.com

Abstract:

Amid several ways to describe the managers’ and management typology, there is the entrepreneurial vs. administrative manager / management dichotomy. Hence, the authors propose the model of balanced manager and balanced management. The proposed model is based on the core-concept of opportunity – as developed by Howard Stevenson. Other entrepreneurial attributes centered on the concept of opportunity are used as well. This paper is based on authors’ previous research work as well as H. Stevenson’s theory and model of entrepreneurship. Burton Clark’s studies on entrepreneurial universities are also considered. The main objective of this paper is to develop and test an instrument aiming to assess the entrepreneurial side of managers in two types of not-for-profit organizations: public administration and universities. As a pilot study, managers from two Romanian organizations (one of each category) were surveyed. The results allow extending the concept of entrepreneurial university on entrepreneurial public administration. The immediate consequence is that H. Stevenson’s theory is applicable not only in the case of universities but public administration organizations as well. The implications are important for both theorists and practitioners: new research approach and new facets of entrepreneurial management are explored. The paper conclusions are aimed at improving the current management and performance of the universities and local public administration units, giving directions to stimulate their entrepreneurial behavior. Some directions to continue, extend and deepen the research are proposed as well.

Keywords: entrepreneurial management, administrative management, balanced-management, entrepreneurial university, entrepreneurial public administration.

1. INTRODUCTION: MANAGER TYPOLOGY

There are numerous ways to characterize the managers' and, consequently, the management typology within organizations: based on the manager's personality psychology, management style (authoritarian vs. democratic), people vs. process orientation (Blake-Mouton, 1964) – to count just the best known. Considering the human side of the manager, there are various personality psychology-based theories as follows:

- *Trait theories*: the Five Factor Model or “The Big Five” traits initially advanced by Tupes and Christal (1961) and completed by Costa and McCrae (1987, 1992), Digman (1989, 1990), Goldberg (1992, 1993), Russell and Karol (1994), Cattell (1996) and others; the HEXACO Model of Personality Structure proposed by Ashton and Lee (2007, 2008); the RIASEC vocational model (Holland, 1973) or the Holland Occupational Codes (Gottfredson and Holland, 1989, 1996; Holland Codes, 2012) largely used in vocational counseling;
- *Type theories*: as developed by Carl Jung (Jung, 1921, 1971) according to whom there are eight psychological types (sensation – intuition perceiving, thinking – feeling judging, and extraversion – introversion attitude types); Type A and Type B personality theory developed by Meyer Friedman during the 1950s (Friedman, 1996) according to which intense, hard-driving Type A personalities had a higher risk of coronary disease while Type B people tend to be relaxed, less competitive, and lower in risk (Type AB mixed profile is accepted as well);
- *Psychoanalytic theories*: as funded by Sigmund Freud (Freud, 1956-1974) and his followers; these theories explain the human behaviour based on the interaction of various components of personality;
- *Humanistic theories*: human needs are presented by Maslow (1943) as a hierarchy bottomed with the more basic needs; Maslow's theory is based on Combs and Snygg theory of individual behaviour (Combs and Snygg, 1949).
- To note that some of the theories above are just person-centered trying to explain his/her behaviour, while others considers the personal traits in relationship with a certain purpose (as profession, occupation or career).

An important category of theories on managing the people are based on “managing motivation to expand human freedom” – as described by McClelland (1978).

The Blake-Mouton *managerial grid* neatly presents a typology from the managerial stand point (Blake and Mouton, 1964). This grid is also referred to as the *leadership grid*¹. Although of critical importance, the discussion management vs. leadership is behind the purpose of this paper. Consequently, it is accepted that various leadership styles – from authoritarian or autocratic to participative or democratic – apply to management styles as well. However, Burns (1978) makes a necessary distinction between the *transactional leader* and the *transformational leader*: the first type of leader is given power to perform certain tasks and reward or punish for the team's performance while the second motivates its team to be effective and efficient; transformational leaders are highly visible, use communication as the base for achieving the goals, and they focus on the big picture.

¹ A variety of diagrams representing the Blake-Mouton model are presented at [accessed on February 29, 2012]: http://www.google.co.uk/search?q=Blake-Mouton&hl=en&client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&channel=np&prmd=imvnsb&tbn=isch&tbo=u&source=univ&sa=X&ei=TIJOT6CEN8LW0QWCg_ieBQ&sqi=2&ved=0CCUQsAQ&biw=1280&bih=707.

It makes sense to associate the type of management and the nature of the organization in which it is applied: as example, Table 1 display an organization size-by-scope matrix.

Table 1: Management typology by the nature of the managed organization

| Nature of the organization | | Scope of the organization | |
|----------------------------|-------|--|---|
| | | Profit | Not-for-profit |
| Size of the organization | Small | Small business management (owner-manager) | Small not-for-profit charities and associations |
| | Large | Corporate management (professional managers) | Large not-for-profits: [most of] universities and public administration |

A few comments should be made:

- firms are precisely categorized by size (micro-enterprises, small, medium-size, and large firms); this is not the case of not-for-profit organizations;
- in general, the management of the small organizations is performed by their owners or founders; the management of large organizations requires professional managers, specialized by sectors (business managers, hospital managers, university managers etc);
- there is a tendency to consider that *small business owner-managers* are identical to *entrepreneurs*; the confusion is sustained by many cases of entrepreneurial characters among small business owner-managers.

Stokes and Wilson (2010) make a clear distinction between the two concepts: there are numerous examples of individual entrepreneurs working not only in large companies but also in not-for-profit organizations; on the other hand, a significant proportion of small business owner-managers lack the entrepreneurial traits.

There is a large variety of definitions of *entrepreneur* and *entrepreneurship*². However, it is obvious that to be an entrepreneur involves certain specific features; authors opted for the opportunity-centered standpoint.

This paper aims at identifying the entrepreneurial dimension of managers, based on the entrepreneurial vs. administrative manager / management dichotomy; the model of balanced manager and balanced management is proposed. The study is also focused on the type of management of two large not-for-profit kinds of organizations: universities and local public administration units (Table 1). An instrument was developed in order to assess the

² The purpose of this paper is not to explore the origin and meaning of the term Entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that early economists such as Richard Cantillon (1680–1734) and Jean-Baptiste Say (1767–1832) have contributed to develop the concept. Alfred Marshall refers to the role of *undertaker* in the enterprise: the one who undertakes risks and combines material resources, capital and labor to make profits hopefully (Principles of Economics, 1890). To notice that, over time, the English term *undertaker* was replaced by the French *entrepreneur*. Joseph Schumpeter (1934) considered that entrepreneurship is intimately linked to various types of innovation (product, process, organization, market). Meredith (1982) has identified the entrepreneurial spirit as the first among the six individual characteristics that generate the success in business. The newest, most provocative and most fascinating theory on entrepreneurship is announced by the former biologist and current corporate CEO Thomas Harrison (2005): the entrepreneurial success might be encoded in the human genome!

entrepreneurial side of managers. As a pilot study, managers from two organizations (one of each category) were surveyed.

2. ENTREPRENEURIAL MANAGER VS. ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGER: THE BALANCED MANAGER AND MANAGEMENT

The proposed model is based on authors' previous research work on entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial management vs. administrative management (Brustureanu, 2002; Scarlat, 2003; Scarlat & Simion, 2003; Scarlat et al. 2005; Scarlat & Brustureanu, 2009, 2012) as well as Howard Stevenson's theory and model of entrepreneurship, centered on the core-concept of opportunity (Stevenson, 1983; Stevenson & Gumpert, 1985; Stevenson & Jarillo, 1986, 1990). Other entrepreneurial attributes focused on the concept of opportunity are used as well. Burton Clark's studies on entrepreneurial universities are also considered (Clark, 1998).

2.1. University's and public administration's management

Universities are among the oldest modern institutions. The first reason of their stability seems to be their rigid organizational structure. Conservative structures, the traditional academia have overcome perturbations and turbulences as wars, epidemics, natural disasters, and crisis. Paradoxically, the most advanced nuclei of innovation and knowledge are resistant to change themselves! Nowadays, the universities are under multiple pressure factors, besides the exponential growth of knowledge and technology: business community is asking for more university graduates, better prepared and skilled – in more disciplines and specializations; students themselves are more demanding; the whole society has more needs and expects solutions from universities; government has increased expectations that universities will solve the growing number of society problems; and government has less money to spend for education and research – in spite of growing needs of universities for funding! How will universities play against all these challenges? Is the universities' answer: stability or change? Short or long-term orientation? Administration or management³? Public administration or public management⁴? New public management⁵?

³ There are significant conceptual differences between *administration* and *management*. Both words are close in meaning but the terms “administration” and “management” are different: *administration* essentially involves following prescribed rules, instructions and service; *management* means supervision and control success oriented, achieving results and manager's personal responsibility for the results being achieved. *Management does include administration*, but also involves organization to achieve objectives with maximum efficiency, and responsibility for the results. In the 1990s, the changes in position titles – from “administrators” to “managers” – were not only superficial or a matter of fashion, but they reflect a change in expectations of the person occupying the position, expressing the differences between administration and management (Pollitt, 1993).

⁴ The topic is not only a matter of scientific debate but also a subject of practical importance, mostly for public administration of universities. According to Hughes (1998), the two terms are not synonymous, neither is their application to the public sector. Public administration is an activity serving the public, and public servants carry out policies derived from others; it is concerned with: translating policies into action; procedures; office management. *Public administration* deals with the process, focuses on procedures, while *public management* involves much more: instead of merely following instructions, a public manager focuses on achieving results and takes responsibility for the decisions made. As Hughes notes, the term “public management” is used more and more, while “public administration” seems to be old-fashioned and even obsolete.

⁵ The traditional model of public administration is replaced by the modern and dynamic concept of *new public management*. During the 1990s, a new model of public sector management has occurred in most advanced countries. Its name varied: managerialism, entrepreneurial government, new public management. In U.S.A., the National Performance Review, conducted by Al Gore (1993), has concluded on four basic principles of new public management: (i) Shifting from systems in which people are accountable for following rules to systems in which they are accountable for achieving results; (ii) Putting the customers (citizens' needs) first; (iii)

To note that all these questions equally apply to universities as well as both central and local public administration.

During the decade 2000s, new concepts such as *e-administration* or *e-governance* have spread. They are not a new model of public management/administration but a new manner of new public management, IT&C-based. The transition from old public administration to the new public management – usually called “the reform of public administration” – means a set of measures (Scarlat, Popescu and Warner, 2002, pp. 78–81): less controlled and more performance/result targeted activities; professional managers; higher involvement of the staff in decision making process; continuing improvement of human resources (training and fair compensation, performance-based); higher quality public services; promoting the public-private partnerships; contracting-out, efficiency-based; IT&C support.

It is rather difficult to say which type of management is better; but one type fits better than others in specific circumstances (certain industry, functional area, situation, period, environment). The answer is not easy. Anyway, the answer lies in management analysis.

Two basic management approaches are proposed: the organization strategy and management are resource-dependent and then, based on the existing resources, the objectives are set (i.e. administrative management); the university strategy and management are opportunity-oriented, regardless the resources available at that point in time (entrepreneurial management).

2.2. Entrepreneurial universities

Stevenson (1983) has defined the concept of opportunity in the world of business but this concept is also a key element in the field of scientific research. Research is basically opportunity-oriented (applied research – whose results are eventually commercialized – is even more opportunity-oriented). Laying the foundations of a research team is an entrepreneurial act as well. At a larger scale and in a broader sense, the founders of the great schools were in fact great entrepreneurs. A parallel between them and the founders of great companies is not meaningless.

It is crucial to understand the critical role played by the entrepreneurial culture – on the one hand – and, on the other hand, the significance of the *entrepreneurship as a management typology*, in its cultural sense (not *ad litteram*). It is plainly naive to understand an entrepreneurial university as a “University Ltd.”! As presented previously, the entrepreneurial management is a type of management; it applies to universities as well as other organizations (not-for-profit or profit oriented, equally), as presented in Table 2.

Empowering people to get results; (iv) Efficiency principle: producing better for less. In the United Kingdom, new public management is based on “the 3 Es”: Economy, Effectiveness; Efficiency.

Table 2: Understanding the entrepreneurial university

| Typology | | Management type | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | Administrative management | Entrepreneurial management |
| Mission of the organizations | Profit-orientation | Less entrepreneurial (traditional/conservative) companies | Entrepreneurial companies |
| | Not-for-profit orientation | Less entrepreneurial (conservative) not-for-profit organizations – as: <i>Traditional universities</i> | Entrepreneurial not-for-profit organizations – such as: <i>Entrepreneurial universities</i> |

Source: Scarlat & Brustureanu (2009, 2012).

The entrepreneurial university is a complex phenomenon that includes not only the university management but also the whole curricular structure and even teaching methods. Teaching Entrepreneurship itself is part of it. Research work conducted in countries like Slovenia and Romania has demonstrated that the quality of the entrepreneurship education impacts the decision to continue the education (Antoncic et al., 2005). The reform of the higher education system in Romania – which signed up for Bologna Process (Scarlat, 2007) – and other Central and Eastern European countries (File & Goedegebuure, 2003) has lots of lessons to offer in this respect.

As mentioned previously, the entrepreneurial character of an organization is intimately linked to its management. One of the six entrepreneurship dimensions identified by H. Stevenson (Stevenson and Gumpert, 1985) is related to the “Management structure”. An entrepreneurial organization exhibits a flat structure, with multiple informal networks, while the administrator views the relationships more formally – “rights, responsibilities and authority are conferred on different people and segments of an organization”. The hierarchy inhibits the search for and commitment to opportunity, as well as communication and decision-making.

The entrepreneurial university is not a structure going away from the traditional values but a new approach: the entrepreneurial university pursues managerial and scientific opportunities in order to fulfill its mission.

Clark has conducted a comprehensive research over a period of three years (1994–1997) on five West-European universities, aiming to identify their entrepreneurial characteristics: what specific factors made them to behave actively and to succeed on the turbulently developing higher education market (Clark, 1998). He identified five key elements in the process of institutional transformation: (i) the strengthened steering core; (ii) the expanded developmental periphery; (iii) the diversified funding base; (iv) the stimulated academic heartland; and (v) the *integrated entrepreneurial culture*. Here are the names of these five universities: Chalmers University of Technology, University of Joensuu, University of Strathclyde Glasgow, University of Twente, and Warwick University. Scarlat and Brustureanu (2009, 2012) conducted a research on these five universities – qualified as entrepreneurial universities as a result of Clark’s research work. More precisely, the universities’ publicly available strategic documents (vision and mission statements) were investigated in order to identify their entrepreneurial traits. The results were positive: the five universities identified and declared as highly entrepreneurial by Clark are exhibiting entrepreneurial statements and corresponding entrepreneurial traits - connected to the concept of opportunity. All these entrepreneurial universities have developed *opportunity-oriented strategies*, which are declared by their strategic documents as such.

A legitimate question is this: *to what extent the concept of entrepreneurial management applies to public administration?* This progressing study tries to offer an answer.

2.3. Entrepreneurial management

Some authors consider the entrepreneurship just as “a style of management” (Wickham, 2006, pp. 15–17).

As far as organization strategy, there are many ways to define it. Mintzberg has identified a number of ten such “schools”, the “entrepreneurial school” being just one of them: the strategy is a result of a *visionary process*. “In the entrepreneurial mode, strategy making is dominated by the active search for new opportunities” (Mintzberg et al., 1998, p. 133).

Lassen (2007) promotes the concept of *strategic entrepreneurship*: strategic management and entrepreneurship are increasingly becoming interlinked. A model of strategic entrepreneurship is suggested based on the evidences provided by seven case studies evolving around development of technological innovations. The conclusion is that organizations need to become more innovative, in order to perform and grow. Other authors underline the role of innovation as well (Casson et al., 2006).

Entrepreneurship seems to be a modern concept but a number of theories on this concept are older. There have been developed economy-, psycho-sociology- or management-based theories on entrepreneurship. Some authors - as Hisrich and Peters (2002) are focusing on the individual entrepreneur while others are organization oriented.

A prospect becomes an entrepreneurial opportunity if it meets two conditions: (i) it must represent a desirable future state, which involves growth or at least change; and (ii) the individual must believe it is possible to reach that state. A supplementary condition can be added: it must not be a usual (common) situation. This supplementary condition sets aside an *entrepreneurial opportunity from a necessity*.

Stevenson and Jarillo (1986) conclude that the entrepreneurial process is correlated with the company size: ‘the transition from an entrepreneurial growth firm to a “well managed” business is often accompanied by a decreasing ability to identify and pursue opportunity’. According to Stevenson, the entrepreneurship is defined as “a process by which individuals – either on their own or inside organizations – pursue opportunities without regard to the resources they currently control” (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990, p. 23). The entrepreneurial paradigm is constructed on six propositions (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990, pp. 23–25):

- i. An entrepreneurial organization is that which pursues opportunity, regardless of resources currently controlled
- ii. The level of entrepreneurship within the firm (i.e. the pursuit of opportunities) is critically dependent on the attitude of individuals within the firm, below the ranks of top management
- iii. The entrepreneurial behavior exhibited by a firm will be positively correlated with its efforts to put individuals in a position to detect opportunities; to train them to be able to do so and to reward them for doing so
- iv. Firms which make a conscious effort to lessen negative consequences of failure when opportunity is pursued will exhibit a higher degree of entrepreneurial behavior
- v. Not only the success rate, but the very amount of entrepreneurial behavior will be a function of the employees’ (subjective) ability to exploit opportunities

- vi. Organizations that facilitate the emergence of informal internal and external networks, and allow the gradual allocation and sharing of resources, will exhibit a higher degree of entrepreneurial behavior.

It is essential to emphasize that all propositions are developed *opportunity-centered*. This definition of entrepreneurship has the advantage to include not only individuals, but also organizations, and even large organizations (as corporations) among subjects for entrepreneurial studies.

The authors' approach is to apply the concept of entrepreneurial organization to universities as well as to public administration – focused on the concept of opportunity.

2.4. The model of balanced management: between entrepreneurial and administrative management

A certain organization may strategically decide on one out two possible management approaches that were already exposed (Table 3):

- the organization strategy and management are resource-dependent and then, based on the existing resources, the objectives are set (i.e. administrative management);
- the university strategy and management are opportunity-oriented, regardless the resources available at that point in time; then the necessary resources are to be identified (entrepreneurial management).

Table 3: Entrepreneurial management vs. Administrative management

| Type of management | | Administrative management | Entrepreneurial management |
|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Decision priorities | Opportunity orientation | low | high |
| | Resource orientation | high | low |

This schematic model proved to be unsatisfactory for practical purpose of the research (Scarlat & Brustureanu, 2009, 2012): a significant category of university managers simply did not fit in the above boxes because in some circumstances they behave as administrative managers while in others just the opposite (they are referred to as “real managers”); on the other hand, some managers can not decide which criterion is more important (opportunity or resource) so both are considered as of slight equally importance. This is the case of the *balanced managers* (Table 4). In addition, it is more practical to analyze the manager’s typology and then, at a later stage, to draw conclusions about the management typology.

Table 4: The balanced manager – between entrepreneurial and administrative management

| Type of manager | | Administrative manager | Balanced manager | Entrepreneurial manager |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Decision priorities | Opportunity orientation | lower | average (balanced) | higher |
| | Resource orientation | higher | average (balanced) | lower |

The current study emphasizes a new aspect: besides the relative importance of opportunity vs. resource as decision criteria, it is also important to consider their absolute value (intensity). Consequently, a new conceptual model is proposed, considering the intensity of these criteria as well (Table 5).

Table 5: Complex model of the balanced manager – between entrepreneurial and administrative management, considering the intensity of the decision criteria (opportunity vs. resources)

| Type of manager | | Administrative manager | Balanced manager | Entrepreneurial manager |
|---|------|---|--|---|
| | | Relatively higher resource-orientation rather than opportunity- | Balanced resource-opportunity orientation | Relatively higher opportunity-orientation rather than resource- |
| Intensity of the preferred decision criteria (opportunity, resources) | high | A type (strong administrator) | B type (strong balanced manager) | E type (strong entrepreneur) |
| | low | a type (moderate administrator) | b type (moderate balanced manager) | e type (moderate entrepreneur) |

An intermediary (between high and low) intensity of the preferred decision criteria is considered confusing and therefore useless. The research in progress currently uses this model – in order to assess the type of management in case of university and public administration managers.

3. METHODOLOGY

In 2002, a questionnaire-based research was conducted to evaluate the university managers' entrepreneurial vs. administrative components (around Stevenson's dimensions of entrepreneurship, Stevenson, 1983; Stevenson & Gumpert, 1985), following the simpler model presented in Table 3 (Scarlat et al., 2005, pp. 25–29). The questionnaire was administered in July 2002 to a sample of 40 university managers. The answers revealed the "real manager" typology: university managers behave administratively when making decisions related to resources; and they present an "entrepreneurial face" while dealing with opportunities, university strategy, and compensation. It is worthy to notice that this *real manager* does not mean *balanced manager* – as described in Table 5.

The major conclusion was that *entrepreneurial management models are applicable to universities and university managers*.

In 2012, the same survey instrument (questionnaire) was slightly improved and adapted – in order to better match the model presented in Table 5. It was used to survey the managers from two not-for-profit Romanian organizations (a university and a local public administration unit from Bucharest). This pilot research project is currently in progress.

4. RESULTS

The expected results are twofold: to validate the model presented in Table 5; to extend the concept of *entrepreneurial university* to *entrepreneurial public administration*. The

immediate consequence is that H. Stevenson's theory is applicable not only in the case of universities but public administration organizations as well.

The implications are important for both theorists and practitioners: new research approach and new facets of entrepreneurial management are explored.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The paper conclusions are aimed at improving the current management and performance of the universities and local public administration units, giving directions to stimulate their entrepreneurial behavior.

An interesting approach could analyze in what measure the entrepreneurial characteristics of a university manager are influencing the entrepreneurial characteristics of a university.

We are also highlighting the importance of these outcomes for the university curricular design within the management field, necessary for management training, for futures university managers as well as for the Life Long Learning development of university managers.

The same recommendations are made for public managers and administrators.

These research conclusions could be extended and applied to other types of not-for-profit organizations.

As the research is currently in progress, it is too early to identify any other further research areas.

REFERENCE LIST

1. Antoncic, B., Scarlat, C., & Erzetic, B. H. (2005). The quality of entrepreneurship education and the intention to continue the education: Slovenia and Romania. *Managing Global Transitions*, 3(2), 197–212.
2. Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150–166.
3. Blake, R. & Mouton, J. (1964). *The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence*. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co.
4. Brustureanu, B. (2002). *Entrepreneurial Orientation as Strategy*. Master degree thesis. University "Politehnica" of Bucharest, Romania and Universidad Jaume I, Castellon, Spain.
5. Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.
6. Casson, M., Yeung, B., Basu, A., Wadson, N. (Eds.) (2006). *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford: University Press.
7. Cattell, H. E. (1996). The original big five: A historical perspective. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 46, 5–14.
8. Clark, B. C. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation*. Paris and Oxford: International Association of Universities and Elsevier Science.
9. Combs, A. W., & Snygg, D. (1949). *Individual Behaviour: A new frame of reference for psychology*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

10. Costa, Jr., P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL, USA: Psychological Assessment Resources.
11. Digman, J. M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality*, 57(2), 195–214.
12. Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41, 417–440.
13. File, J., & Goedegebuure, L. (2003). *Real-Time Systems. Reflections on Higher Education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia*. Enschede, the Netherlands: CHEPS - Center for Higher Education Policy Studies – University of Twente.
14. Freud, S. (1956–1974). *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. 24 volumes. (Translated from German under the general editorship of James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud). London: Hogarth Press.
15. Friedman, M. (1996). *Type A Behavior: Its Diagnosis and Treatment*. New York: Plenum Press (Kluwer Academic Press).
16. Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-five factor structure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(6), 1216–1229.
17. Goldberg, L. R. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48(1), 26–34.
18. Gore, A. (1993). *The Gore Report on Reinventing the Government: Creating a government that works better and costs less*. Report of the National Performance Review. New York: Times Books.
19. Gottfredson, G., & Holland, J. L. (1989, 1996). *Dictionary of Holland Occupational Codes*. Odessa, FL, USA: Psychological Assessment Resources.
20. Harrison, T. (2005). *Instinct. Tapping your entrepreneurial DNA to achieve your business goals*. New York: Warner Books.
21. Hisrich, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship*. Fifth Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
22. Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: a theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall.
23. Holland Codes. (2012, February 29). Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holland_Codes#cite_note-08win-2
24. Hughes, O. E. (1998). *Public Management & Administration. An Introduction*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave.
25. Jung, C. G. (1921, 1971). *Psychological Types*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
26. Lassen, A. H. (2007). Corporate Entrepreneurship: An empirical study of the importance of strategic considerations in the creation of radical innovation. *Managing Global Transitions*, 5(2), 109–131.
27. Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 1001–1053.
28. Maslow, A. (1943). Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 5, 85–92.
29. Meredith, G. G. (1982). *The practice of entrepreneurship*. International Labor Office.
30. McClelland, D. C. (1978). Managing motivation to expand human freedom. *American Psychologist*, 33(3), 201–210.
31. McCrae, R. R. & Costa, Jr., P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90.

32. Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (1998). *Strategy Safari. A guided tour through the wilds of strategic management*. New York: The Free Press.
33. Pollitt, C. (1993). *Managerialism and the public services: Cuts or cultural change in the 1990s*. Second Edition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
34. Russell, M. T., & Karol, D. (1994). *16PF Fifth Edition administrator's manual*. Champaign, IL, USA: Institute for Personality & Ability Testing.
35. Scarlat, C. (2003). *Antreprenoriat si managementul intreprinderilor mici si mijlocii*. Bucuresti: Ed. Printech.
36. Scarlat, C. (2007). Developing new curricula for engineers' entrepreneurial education: a Romanian experience. *World Transactions on Engineering and Technology Education*, 6(2), 275–278.
37. Scarlat, C., & Brustureanu, B. (2009). Opportunity-oriented University Strategy. Proceedings of The 11th International Conference *Society for Global Business & Economic Development (SGBED)*, 27–29 May 2009, Bratislava, Slovakia. In C. Jayachandran, R. Subramanian & J. Rudy (Eds.), “Striving for Competitive Advantage & Sustainability: New Challenges of Globalization”, 4, 2050–2061.
38. Scarlat, C. & Brustureanu, B. (2012). Opportunity-oriented university strategy. A qualitative survey of some West-European universities' strategic documents. *Journal of Global Business and Economic Development (JGBED)*, 1(1) (in press).
39. Scarlat, C., & Simion, C. P. (2003). Entrepreneurial Education in University. In S.E. Zaharia and V. Muresan (Eds.), *L'université – moteur du développement régionale en Europe* (pp. 233–239). Bucharest, Romania: Ed. Paideia.
40. Scarlat, C., Popescu, D., & Warner, M. (2002). *An overview of the implications of EU accession for Romanian public sector institutions*. Bucharest: European Institute of Romania.
41. Scarlat, C., Tone, I., Simion, C. P., & Brustureanu, B. (2005). *EDUCAT. Dezvoltarea spiritului si educatiei antreprenoriale in universitate. Cercetari in managementul afacerilor*, Vol.10. Bucharest, Romania: Ed. Printech.
42. Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Harvard: University Press.
43. Stevenson, H. H. (1983). *A Perspective on Entrepreneurship*. President and Fellows of Harvard College. Harvard Business School note 9-384-131.
44. Stevenson, H. H., & Gumpert, D. E. (1985). The Heart of Entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business Review*, March-April 1985.
45. Stevenson, H. H., & Jarrillo, J. C. (1986). Preserving entrepreneurship as companies grow. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 6, 10–23.
46. Stevenson, H. H., & Jarrillo, J. C. (1990). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal, Summer Special Issue*, 11, 17–27.
47. Stokes, D., & Wilson, N. (2010). *Small Business Management and Entrepreneurship*. 6th edition. Andover, Hampshire, UK: South-Western Cengage Learning EMEA.
48. Tupes, E. C., & Christal, R. E. (1961). *Recurrent Personality Factors Based on Trait Ratings*. Technical Report ASD-TR-61-97, Lackland Air Force Base, TX, USA: Personnel Laboratory, Air Force Systems Command.
49. Wickham, P. A. (2006). *Strategic Entrepreneurship*. Fourth Edition. Harlow: Prentice Hall.