RESEARCH PAPERS OF WROCŁAW UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS No. 148
Management Sciences 5 2010

Przemyslaw Zbierowski
University of Economics in Katowice

ORGANIZATIONAL RENEWAL THROUGH POSITIVE MANAGEMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Summary: The paper presents a combination of organizational entrepreneurship and positive organizational scholarship (POS) as a way of organizational renewal. Entrepreneurship has been considered a stimulus to renewal for some time, and POS is a new way of reaching the same objective. In the paper, we present the theory of positive organizational scholarship, which provides a new perspective for entrepreneurship. The key finding is the matrix of levels (individual, organizational and societal) and issues (causes, institutions and consequences) on the cross-section of POS and entrepreneurship. Finally, we outline the future research directions created by that cross-section.

Keywords: entrepreneurship, small business, positive studies.

1. Introduction

For at least a few decades scholars have tried to answer conceptually and empirically questions about how entrepreneurship works and what the determinants of small business success are. Although their contributions to the field are significant, they fail to produce a single paradigm or statement concerning the nature of entrepreneurship. Also characteristics of successful SMEs are still under investigation. Not earlier than a few years ago the approach of Positive Organizational Scholarship (POS) was born. It offers a new look at old problems, or even more, it proposes to forget about solving problems, and instead, look at organization as a "mystery" and a "marvel" to be embraced. This new viewpoint may bring a contribution to understanding phenomena of entrepreneurship and small business, and to capture new ones, earlier invisible to scholars equipped with traditional approaches and techniques.

Following Cameron, Dutton, Quinn and Wrzesniewski's [2003] suggestion that future investigation should extend the interest to new fields, I attempt to find positive states, dynamics, and relationships in the field of small business and entrepreneurship. The main purpose of the study is to identify positive and entrepreneurial ways of organizational renewal.

2. Positive approach in organizational science

Positive organizational scholarship has its main inspiration in positive psychology, created by the former President of American Psychological Association Martin E. Seligman in 1998. Traditional psychology, since it took the form of a profession after World War II, has tended to concentrate on pathologies of different kind, diseases, inabilities, harm and sadness. Positive psychology proposes a different perspective, not replacing traditional approach, but attempting to supplement it. It shifts focus from what is wrong with people toward emphasizing human strengths that allow people to build the best in their life, as well as thrive and prosper [Seligman and Peterson 2003]. Happiness in positive psychology view is not the result of genes or luck. It can be reached by identifying and using a range of traits and experiences that people possess, such as optimism, wisdom, kindness or trustworthiness. Positive psychology has three main areas of interest: experiences, individual traits, and institutions. The latter is especially important for positive organizational research, as it creates the bridge from positive psychology. The main goal of positive psychology is to create organized systems that actualize human potential. In this view, organizations are the carriers of institutions that enable their members to identify the best in them; allow for utilizing it, by achieving sustainable levels of authentic contentment, gratification, and meaning; and create organizational success measured by excellence, abundance, and human well-being. Also positive experiences and positive traits are reflected in other positive approaches.

Since it was born, positive psychology has grown rapidly [Seligmanet et al. 2005] and has been a field of great interest, with its author being very productive [e.g. Seligman 2002; Seligman and Peterson 2002], and also many others scholars contributing to it or criticizing it [e.g. Snyder and Lopez 2001; Aspinwall and Staudinger 2002; Carr 2004; Kelley 2004; Peterson and Spiker 2005; Alex and Joseph 2005]. It also has built a link to positive approach in organizational science [Seligman and Peterson 2003]. The phenomenon of "negative" focus in psychology has its analogy also in organizational science. Somehow, most organizational theories focus on competition and organizational survival. Those terms suggest the danger from outside – organization has competitors-foes that jeopardize its existence, so it must struggle to survive.

POS has its inspiration in positive psychology, however, it derives from and belongs to a wider group of positive sciences that include appreciative inquiry, community psychology, humanistic organizational behaviour, organizational development, prosocial motivation and citizenship behaviour, and corporate social responsibility. Community psychology focuses on prevention of illness and wellness enhancement, emphasizing positive self-attitudes, personal integration, and mastery in one's environment. Prosocial and citizenship behaviour focuses on motivating actions, providing assistance and benefit to others. They may be applied both outside and inside organization and typically are not formally rewarded. Corporate social

responsibility emphasizes the obligations of an organization to address the needs of society. It is quite well developed both as a scholarly area as well as practice, with a strong contribution from governments and NGOs forcing corporations to focus not only on financial performance, but also on supporting social welfare. In the present social and political climate, there are crucial pressures for greater attention for corporate social responsibility that refers to the obligations towards the enterprise stakeholders [Cowe 2002; Smith 2003]. Also companies are interested in corporate social responsibility as it seems to improve their long-term performance. Indeed, there is a positive relationship between corporate social performance and corporate financial performance [Margolis and Walsh 2001].

The field closest to positive organizational research and mostly contributing to it, is organizational development and, especially, appreciative inquiry. Appreciative inquiry (AI) is the movement within organizational development that seeks the best in people in order to strengthen the ability of an organization to change and develop. It is a practical philosophy that assumes that the organization is a "mystery" and "marvel" to be embraced, not a problem to be solved [Cooperrider and Srivastava 1987, p. 131] – this assumption is also applied to positive organizational scholarship. Appreciative inquiry argues that organizations have a positive core whose unleashed positive power may cause them to thrive. Similarly to positive psychology, it pays attention to positive experiences (former successes), positive traits (positive core of an organization, and people's positive power), and positive institutions (ways to release positive energy). Recent research revealed that two qualities of appreciative inquiry are particularly fruitful for organization's transformative potential [Bushe and Kassam 2005]. These two are a focus on changing how people think instead of what people do, and a focus on supporting self-organizing change processes that emerges from new ideas. Research has also shown that appreciative inquiry may be used in practice to promote democratic organizing, to involve multiple stakeholders and generate strategic policy even in the reality of command-and-control organizations [Powley et al. 2004]. There is also much practice-based evidence for huge improvement potential of AI [Faure 2006].

Much work has been done in those different areas, focusing on positive aspects of individuals, groups, and organizations. POS therefore cannot be called a new approach. It attempts to utilize the fruits of all those scholarly efforts, integrating organizational links encompassed by them. Just as positive psychology and appreciative inquiry, positive organizational research focuses on positive traits, experiences, institutions, and outcomes. It takes a broader perspective, focusing not only on the issues concerning individuals (as positive psychology) and organizational change, transformation, and development (as appreciative inquiry), but extends its interest to various organizational phenomena.

Positive organizational scholarship is a kind of the new philosophy of organization. While it does not reject the organizational and social phenomena, such as greed, selfishness, manipulation, distrust or anxiety, it emphasizes the "positive"

ones, such as appreciation, collaboration, virtuousness, vitality, meaningfulness, trustworthiness, resilience, wisdom, loyalty, respect and honesty [Cameron et al. 2003] (consider Table 1). POS proposes new a approach both in ontology and epistemology of organizational science, sheds new light on what organization is and how to get to know it. It is not a single theory, but a viewpoint that puts emphasis on positive and dynamic social and organizational phenomena, encompassing attention "to the enablers (e.g., processes, capabilities, structures, methods), the motivations (e.g., unselfishness, altruism, contribution without regard to self), and the outcomes of effects (e.g., vitality, meaningfulness, exhilaration, high-quality relationships) associated with positive phenomena" [Cameron et al. 2003, p. 4]. POS also stresses the dynamics with a special emphasis on nonlinear positive dynamics – "positive spirals" [Fredrickson 2003].

Table 1. Emphasis in traditional and positive organizational scholarships

	Traditional approach	POS
Traits of organizations	greed, selfishness, manipulation, secrecy, single-minded focus on winning	appreciation, collaboration, virtuousness, vitality, meaningfulness, creating abundance
Indicators of success	wealth creation	abundance, human well-being
Traits of organizations' members	distrust, anxiety, self-absorption, fear, burnout, feelings of abuse	trustworthiness, resilience, wisdom, humility, high levels of positive energy
Social relationships	conflict, lawsuits, contract breaking, retribution, disrespect	compassion, loyalty, honesty, respect, forgiveness
Typical theories in organizational scholarship	problem solving, reciprocity and justice, managing uncertainty, overcoming resistance, achieving profitability, competing successfully against others	excellence, transcendence, positive deviance, extraordinary performance, positive spirals of flourishing

Source: [Cameron et al. 2003].

Term "positive" may be applied to a wide range of phenomena: states, processes and relationships of individuals, groups and organizations, where positivity has its occurrence, causes and consequences. Another level of analysis, although not purely organizational, may be the level of society. The expression "positive" is however not entirely clear and has been a matter of discussion and critique [George 2004]. POS authors understand "positive" as "(…) affirmative bias and orientation, not a substitute for other more common organizational phenomena", and state that POS "focuses on phenomena that are displayed not in accordance with the situation broadly constructed, or, in other words, phenomena that are unexpectedly positive" [Cameron et al. 2003, p. 5]. In this new viewpoint, POS is normative in its efforts, it uses not only categories of "effective" and "ineffective", but also distinguishes "good" from "bad" and decides to focus on what is good in people and organizations. "Positive"

here has a different meaning from the one used in traditional organizational studies, where it labels something that works properly – achieves goals, makes profit etc. For POS it means something "good" (opposite to "bad"), and something working unexpectedly well (more than "effective").

Table 2. Areas of focus of POS

	Individual	Organizational	Societal
Causes (experiences and traits)	trustworthiness, resilience, wisdom, humility, high levels of positive energy, unselfishness, altruism, positive experiences	appreciation, collaboration, virtuousness, vitality, meaningfulness, creating abundance, experiences of past successes	compassion, loyalty, honesty, respect, forgiveness
Institutions (enablers)	positive norms, attitude towards work, meaning of work, positive motivation, leadership behaviours	processes, capabilities, structures, methods virtuousness, flexible organization design	good laws, wisdom of society, support and positive perception and feedback
Consequences	human fulfilment, ennobled human behaviours, human well--being, knowledge and wisdom	excellence, transcendence, positive deviance, extraordinary performance, positive spirals of flourishing	social welfare and stability, happiness

Source: [Cameron et al. 2003].

To identify positive phenomena in a better way, I built a matrix of levels and issues in positive organizational studies (see Table 2). Cameron, Dutton, Quinn and Wrzesniewski [2003] suggest three levels of positive phenomena: individual, organizational, and societal. They also ask if relationships observed at one level may be extrapolated also to another, which especially concerns the organizational outcomes of individual phenomena. On the other hand, POS concentrates on causes, enablers, and consequences of positivity. Crosstabulation of levels and issues gives a better insight into positive phenomena. The list is however not complete, we think that it may be filled endlessly.

3. The field of entrepreneurship in the POS viewpoint

As said before, positive organizational research gives an opportunity for a new insight into well-known issues. Therefore, it may be fruitful to wear POS lenses and look at the fields of entrepreneurship and small business. I attempt here to answer the question about the nature of entrepreneurship and key success factors of small businesses, and identify what in this fields is consistent with positive approach.

Although for a few decades now scholars conceptually and empirically have been investigating entrepreneurship, there is a lack of one definition accepted by all of them and a leading paradigm. Different researchers have emphasized different viewpoints and focused on various phenomena of entrepreneurship. Morris [1998] found 77 different definitions, reviewing journal articles and textbooks over a five-year period. Meyer, Neck and Meeks [2002] point out that the lack of one definition leaves open multiple paths of inquiry and various perspectives of what entrepreneurship is. Schumpeter [1934] and Drucker [1985] emphasize innovation as the most important phenomenon; Kirzner [1973] and Venkataraman [1997] stress the role of opportunities; for Gartner [1988, 1990] the essence of entrepreneurship is the creation of new ventures. Perhaps, the unifying concept may be that by Meyer, Venkataraman, and Gartner [1999] attempting to develop a domain statement for research in entrepreneurship. They argue that entrepreneurship is about creation; therefore, the research domain of the entrepreneurship field involves: (1) the creation of new ventures and organizations, (2) the creation of new combinations of goods and services, methods of production, markets, and supply chains, (3) the recognition and exploitation of new and existing opportunities, and (4) cognitive processes, behaviors and modes of action to exploit new and existing opportunities. One can find here a creation of new ventures, innovation, recognition of opportunities and actions directed to exploit them. Basing on the aforementioned and many other conceptual and empirical works in the field of entrepreneurship, we draw a list of major issues of interest of this field: opportunities and giving strategic events a sense of opportunities; innovativeness, propensity to take risk, and proactiveness; growth development, and transformation; using resources not directly controlled; long-term orientation; and multidimensional wealth creation.

I attempt to look at traditional issues in the field of entrepreneurship from the point of view of positive organizational scholarship, and give them new, POS meanings and reinforce old, positive meanings that they have (consider Table 3). It forms a kind of entrepreneurship-positive organizational scholarship dictionary.

Opportunity as a heart of entrepreneurship is emphasized very strongly by Kirzner [1973, 1997]. Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton [2002, p. 2] give the definition of opportunity following Casson [1982], and Shane and Venkataraman [2000]: “entrepreneurial opportunities are external environmental conditions suggesting the viability of introducing and selling new products, services, raw materials and organizing methods at prices exceeding their production costs”. Some scholars stress the role of entrepreneurial mindset in seizing opportunities. It means positive interpretation of strategic events as opportunities, not as threats. As Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton [2002], following McGrath and MacMillan [2000] point out, entrepreneurial mindset denotes a way of thinking about business and its opportunities that captures the benefits of uncertainty. These benefits are captured as individuals’ search for an attempt to exploit high potential opportunities that are commonly associated with uncertain business environments.

Table 3. POS in entrepreneurship and small business

Phenomenon	POS meaning
Opportunity	"Positive" and optimistic point of view, unleashing entrepreneurial alertness and mindset, interpreting strategic events as opportunities, not as threats, utilizing knowledge and wisdom of entrepreneur
Strengths	Basing on strengths instead of focusing on managing or overcoming weaknesses, optimistic viewpoint, self-confidence
Proactiveness – opportunity	Proactive pursue and exploitation of opportunities
Innovativeness	Creation and development of new products and processes
Development	Multidimensional transformation and growth towards individual, organizational, and social welfare
Using not controlled resources	Not being constrained by the lack of resources or forced to activity by possessed resources, open creativity with no regard to resource constraints
Wealth creation	Development of culture, leadership and social relations in social dimension, personal development of entrepreneur and organization's stakeholders in personal dimension
Longevity of entrepreneurial dynamics	Entrepreneurship is a dynamic process which is, in part, dependent on learning from previous successes as well as failures. It has a form of "positive spiral"

Source: Author's own study.

Some researchers operationalized the behavior of entrepreneurial firms as consisting of product-market innovation, proactiveness of decision making, and risk-taking. They maintained that the level of entrepreneurship presented by a firm was the aggregate total of these three sub-dimensions: "the extent to which top managers are inclined to take business-related risks (the risk-taking dimension), to favor change and innovation in order to obtain a competitive advantage for their firm (the innovative dimension), and to compete aggressively with other firms (the proactive dimension)" [Covin and Slevin 1988, p. 218]. These scholars also argued that a firm that was truly entrepreneurial should exhibit high levels of each dimension.

The idea that innovativeness is the fundamental undertaking of the entrepreneurial organization was first raised by Schumpeter [1934]. Innovation is here evidenced by the creation and development of new products and processes. In contemporary research within the field, innovation is always put at the very heart of entrepreneurship. Lumpkin and Dess [2001, p. 431] define entrepreneurial innovation as "the willingness to support creativity and experimentation in introducing new products/ services, and novelty, technological leadership and R&D in developing new processes". Also the concept of risk-taking has long been closely associated with entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship used to be defined as activity centered on

the willingness to engage in calculated business-related risks [Brockhaus 1980]. At present, no researchers oppose to the fact that every entrepreneurial activity involves taking risk. Entrepreneurs do not perceive themselves as taking more risk than average. They tend to categorize business situations as possessing less risk than non-entrepreneurs [Palich and Bagby 1995; Busenitz 1999]. Researchers present different approaches and different definitions of proactiveness. Knight [1997] understood proactiveness as aggressive execution, which follows through driving toward achievement of the firm's objectives by whatever reasonable means are necessary. This aggressive behavior may be directed at rival firms. Stevenson and Jarillo [1990] conceptualized proactiveness as the organizational pursuit of business opportunities that were deemed by the firm to be positive or favorable. Similarly, Lumpkin and Dess [2001, p. 431] view proactiveness as "opportunity-seeking, forward-looking perspective involving introducing new products or services ahead of the competition and acting in anticipation of future demand to create change and shape the environment". Proactiveness therefore has two parts: competitive behavior against rivals and active pursuit and exploitation of opportunities.

According to Sexton and Smilor [1997], growth is the essence of entrepreneurship. Moreover, significant differences exist between the problems associated with starting a business and growing one. Attributes closely associated with growth are also development and transformation. As Davidsson [2003] following Kirzner [1973] argues that entrepreneurship drives the market; it makes the difference; it transforms the economy.

Stevenson, Roberts, and Grousbeck [1985] conceptualize entrepreneurship as the pursuit of an opportunity without any concern for current resources or capabilities. There is an argument that not possessing to much resources may be an advantage of entrepreneurs. Highlighting the value-destroying possibilities of firm resources, Mosakowski [2002] argues that large resource endowments hinder the entrepreneurial process. There are four reasons of this situation: core rigidities, reduced experimentation, reduced incentive intensity, and increased strategic transparency. Concluding, Mosakowski [2002] follows Starr and MacMillan [1990] in the suggestion that under certain circumstances, it may be better for an entrepreneurial firm to continue to beg, borrow, or scavenge its resources, instead of accumulating them.

Alvarez and Barney [2002, p. 98] argue that the continuous innovating is strictly connected with long-term orientation. Specifically, the entrepreneur's ability to continuously innovate is the primary competitive advantage of the entrepreneurial firm, leading to sustainable entrepreneurial firms and sustainable wealth creation. Also Ucbarasan, Wright and Westhead [2003] emphasized the processual perspective rooted in a growing recognition that entrepreneurship is not a single-action event but is a dynamic process which is, in part, dependent on learning from previous successes as well as failures. The finding echoed Stopford and Baden-Fuller idea [1994, p. 528] that enterprises develop corporate entrepreneurship in "long out

processes over many years, not in a one shot, single event". Organizational learning process encompasses change in individual and shared thought and action, which is affected by and embedded in organizational infrastructure [Vera and Crossan 2003], and whih in entrepreneurial context supports opportunity oriented behaviors.

There is no doubt that the issue of wealth creation is the issue of outcomes, or effects of entrepreneurship. An important question concerns an outcome of entrepreneurship. It is a question not only about short-term financial outcomes, but it also considers a broad set of "direct and indirect outcomes of processes of discovery and exploitation, e.g. satisfaction, learning, imitation and retaliation in addition to financial success or failure" [Davidsson 2003, p. 332] at wide range of levels, from the personal level to the societal level. Davidsson's argument here is that ventures are entrepreneurial only if they create wealth at the societal level, even if they fail to do it at the individual level. Those catalyst ventures "although not successful on the micro-level (...) drive the market process precisely because they bring forth such behavior on the part of other actors" [Davidsson 2003, p. 324].

Entrepreneurship is much about starting-up a business and growing one in early stage. Some scholars would even argue that the latter cannot be classified within the field of entrepreneurship [Gartner 1990]. The areas of entrepreneurship and small business seem distinct in their scope, and if we talk about determinants of successful entrepreneurship, it is therefore necessary to ask a question about SMEs' success determinants. Van Praag [2005] provides four criteria of successful small firms: the number of personnel, survival of firm, level of profit of firm, and level of self-employment earnings. Indeed, defining success and measuring performance of small firms is not easy, as those are multi-dimensional and hard to capture categories [Wolff and Pett 2005]. It is also very distinct from corporate performance, traditional performance models for large enterprises do not apply well to small businesses. The dimensions of SME performance include growth, profitability, market expansion, but also qualitative phenomena, such as customers satisfaction or self-assessment of owner-manager who as a starting-up entrepreneur has aspirations, and fulfilling them is just as important as financial indicators. Even the success itself may be considered as a positive phenomenon, as it fits well with positive studies and high performance organization (HPO) theory [Light 2005; Holbeche 2005; Waal 2006].

4. Future directions of entrepreneurship research in POS perspective and policy implications

Except for the aspects mentioned earlier, which were mostly positive phenomena, entrepreneurship and small business of course also have a "dark side" that, for example encompasses risk of entrepreneurial activity, aggressive behaviours/aggressive execution and ends with driving toward achievement of the firm's objectives by whatever reasonable means are necessary, or struggle for financial performance. Nevertheless, the fields of entrepreneurship and small business emphasise mostly

positive issues. Analogically to Table 2, which presented organizational phenomena, we attempt to identify entrepreneurial and small business phenomena in the same matrix of issues and levels of analysis (see Table 4).

Table 4. Positive small business and entrepreneurial phenomena

	Individual	Organizational	Societal
Causes (experiences and traits)	education, courage, creativity, knowledge, experience, autonomy, high levels of positive energy, agility, growth aspirations	experiences of entrepreneurial growth, respect/ties within teams	respect, social wisdom, trust, positive entrepreneurial stories
Institutions (enablers)	entrepreneurial mindset, entrepreneurial intuition, visionary leadership	entrepreneurial orientation, flexible organizational design, self-organization, good social atmosphere	entrepreneurial philosophy, friendly regulations
Consequences	human well-being, personal wealth, wisdom	success, excellence, resilience, extraordinary performance, positive spirals of learning and action, organizational wealth, longevity, vitality, immortality	social welfare (jobs, satisfied needs), better redistribution, social wealth

Source: Author's own study.

Again, the list of positive entrepreneurial and small business phenomena is not complete and should be a matter of further investigation. Issues highlighted here are just the examples of most obvious phenomena, while filling the matrix by finding new elements is crucial for a future research investigation. As Cameron, Dutton, Quinn, and Wrzesniewski [2003, pp. 366-369] conclude, future scholar efforts in POS field should be directed in six directions: level of analysis, measurement, causal associations, enablement, time, and new concepts and new relationships. Similarly, we propose to concentrate the research effort in the field of entrepreneurship and small business from the positive point of view on these six categories. A question should be asked about extrapolating individual effects at the level of organization and society. Entrepreneurial actions of individuals create their personal wealth and wisdom, but do these outcomes also exist at the collective level? There are also important connections between levels, e.g. individuals adopt collective values and organizations exist in certain societal philosophy.

Also, an issue of measurement may be applied to the field of entrepreneurship and small business. Positive entrepreneurial phenomena, such as entrepreneurial mindset, entrepreneurial intuition, or personal wealth, are very difficult to measure. On the other hand, reliable measures of entrepreneurial orientation or entrepreneurial

philosophy of society have been proposed, for remainder there is space for empirical inquiry. The problem of causality have always been emphasized in the field of entrepreneurship. There is also a need to investigate this matter, concerning positive phenomena, especially with regard to process view of entrepreneurship. The causality probably forms positive spirals also here, with causes and consequences reinforcing one another; for instance high level of positive energy accompanied by entrepreneurial mindset leads, in the process of opportunities exploitation, to personal wealth, which in turn reinforces both positive energy and entrepreneurial mindset.

The question of enablers is here the issue of organizational and societal arrangement, supporting positive aspects of entrepreneurship and small business, achieving high levels of resilience buffering individuals from negative effects. The investigation in this respect should focus on how to utilize the best of people, organizations, and societies, and how to enable to achieve the personal, organizational, and societal wealth as the result of entrepreneurship and small firms activieties. Focusing on time may be also a fruitful direction of future research. Entrepreneurial actions should contribute to the longevity and even immortality of organizations. What are then the sustainability of positive entrepreneurial and small business phenomena? Do they last? Is really entrepreneurship a never ending positive spiral of learning and action, of exploring opportunities and exploitation of them?

Following the suggestion of Cameron, Dutton, Quinn and Wrzesniewski [2003], we also attempted to identify new positive phenomena, such as organization's longevity or entrepreneurial social philosophy. This direction is still open. The effort should be also directed at identifying potentially existing relationships among them and at their empirical verification.

The application of positive studies to fields of entrepreneurship and small business has a number of potential policy implications. These may be divided into three areas: educational policy, regulations, and cultural values, which in loose manner correspond to three dimensions of Busenitz, Gomez and Spencer's [2000] country institutional profile for entrepreneurship: regulatory, cognitive, and normative. Entrepreneurship educational policy should be focused on creating programs and training courses emphasizing positive side of being entrepreneur and running a business. School courses overloaded with information about dealing with administrative constraints may create negative view of entrepreneurship and effectively restrain young people from becoming entrepreneurs. Positive approach prompts policy makers to simplify regulations concerning founding and running small business. This has been successfully done in most developed countries, but developing and transition economies should learn this lesson very carefully. The last area is probably the most difficult to cover. Social understanding of entrepreneurship has a lot to do with broad national culture and is not a matter of short-term changes. On the other hand, governments have a wide range of instruments of influencing social perception of entrepreneurship, such as promoting it by emphasizing entrepreneurial successes.

In conclusion, positive organizational scholarship opens a great space for conceptual and empirical investigation in the field of entrepreneurship and small

business. The intersection of the field and new approach should be investigated more closely, as it may bring new and exciting concepts and theories. Finally, brought into practice, those concepts and theories may bring new levels of entrepreneurial activity, success of small firms, organizational thriving and societal welfare.

References

Alvarez S.A., Barney J.B. (2002), Resource-based theory and entrepreneurial firm, [in:] M.A. Hitt, R.D. Ireland, S.M. Camp, D.L. Sexton (eds.), *Strategic Entrepreneurship. Creating a New Mindset*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 89-105.

Aspinwall L.G., & Staudinger U.M. (eds.) (2002), *A psychology of human strengths: Fundamental questions and future directions for a positive psychology*, DC: American Psychological Association, Washington.

Brockhaus R. (1980), Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 23, pp. 509-520.

Busenitz L.W. (1999), Entrepreneurial risks and strategic decision making, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 35, pp. 325-340.

Busenitz L.W., Gomez C., Spencer J.W. (2000), Country institutional profiles. Unlocking entrepreneurial phenomena, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 43, pp. 994-1003.

Bushe G.R., Kassam A.F. (2005), When is appreciative inquiry transformational, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 41, pp. 161-181.

Cameron K.S., Dutton J.E., Quinn R.E. (2003), Foundations of positive organizational scholarship, [in:] K.E. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, R.E. Quinn (eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship. Foundations of a New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, pp. 3-13.

Cameron K.S., Dutton J.E., Quinn R., Wrzesniewski A. (2003), Developing a discipline of positive organizational scholarship, [in:] K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, R.E. Quinn (eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship. Foundations of a New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, pp. 361-370.

Carr A. (2004), *Positive psychology. The science of happiness and human strengths*, Brunner-Routleldge, New York.

Casson M. (1982), *The Entrepreneur*, Barnes & Noble Books, Totowa, NJ.

Cooperrider D.L., Srivastava S. (1987), Appreciative inquiry in organizational life, [in:] R.W. Woodman, W.A. Pasmore (eds.), *Research in Organizational Change and Development. An Annual Series Featuring Advances in Theory, Methodology and Research*, Vol. 1, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, pp. 129-169.

Covin J.G., Slevin D.P. (1988), The influence of organization structure on the utility of an entrepreneurial top management style, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 25, pp. 217-259.

Cowe R. (ed.) (2002), *No scruples. Managing to Be Responsible in a Turbulent World*, Spiro Press, London.

Davidsson P. (2003), The domain of entrepreneurship research. Some suggestions, [in:] J.A. Katz, D.A. Shepherd (eds.), *Cognitive Approaches to Entrepreneurship Research*. *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth***,** Vol. 6, Elsevier Science, Oxford, pp. 315-372.

Drucker P. (1985), *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, Harper and Row, New York.

Faure M. (2006), *Problem Solving Was Never That Easy. Transformational Change Through Appreciative Inquiry*. Paper presented at European Academy of Management Annual Conference, Oslo.

Fredrickson B.L. (2003), Positive emotions and upward spirals in organizations, [in:] K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, R.E. Quinn (eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship. Foundations of a New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, pp. 136-175.

Gartner W.B. (1988), "Who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question, *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol. 12, pp. 11-32.

Gartner W.B. (1990), What are we talking about when we are talking about entrepreneurship?, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 5, pp. 15-28.

George J.M. (2004), Positive organizational scholarship. Foundations of a new discipline, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 49, pp. 325-330.

Hitt M.A., Ireland R.D., Camp S.M., Sexton D.L. (2002), Strategic entrepreneurship: Integrating entrepreneurial and strategic management perspectives, [in:] M.A. Hitt, R.D. Ireland, S.M. Camp, D.L. Sexton (eds.), *Strategic Entrepreneurship. Creating a New Mindset*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 1-16.

Holbeche L. (2005), *The High Performance Organization. Creating Dynamic Stability and Sustainable Success*, Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford-Burlington.

Kelley T.M. (2004), *Positive psychology and adolescent mental health: False promise or true breakthrough,* Adolescence*,* 39: 257-278.

Kirzner I.M. (1997), *How markets Work. Disequilibrium, Entrepreneurship and Discovery*. The Institute of Economic Affairs, Great Britain.

Kirzner J. (1973), *Competition, and Entrepreneurship*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Knight G.A. (1997), Cross-cultural reliability and validity of a scale to measure firm entrepreneurial orientation, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 12, pp. 213-225.

Ligh P.C. (2005), *The Four Pillars of High Performance. How Robust Organizations Achieve Extraordinary Results*, McGraw-Hill, New York.

Lin C.Y.-Y. (1998), Success factors of small- and medium-sized enterprises in Taiwan. An analysis of cases, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 36, pp. 43-56.

Lumpkin G.T., Dess G.G. (2001), Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance. The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16, pp. 429-451.

Margolis J.D., Walsch J.P. (2003), Misery loves companies. Rethinking social initiatives by business, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 48, pp. 268-305.

McGrath R.G., MacMillan I.C. (2000), *The Entrepreneurial Mindset. Strategies for Continuously Creating Opportunity in an Age of Uncertainty*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

Meyer G.D., Neck H.M., Meeks M.D. (2002), The entrepreneurship – strategic management interface, [in:] M.A. Hitt, R.D. Ireland, S.M. Camp, D.L. Sexton (eds.), *Strategic Entrepreneurship. Creating a New Mindset*, Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, pp. 19-44.

Meyer G.D., Venkataraman S., Gartner W. (1999), Task force on doctoral education in entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship Division of the Academy of Management.

Morris M.H. (1998), *Entrepreneurial intensity. Sustainable Advantages for Individuals, Organizations, and Societies*, Quorum, Westport, CT.

Palich L., Bagby D. (1995), Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risk-taking. Challenging conventional wisdom, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 10, pp. 425-438.

Peterson S.J., Spiker B.K. (2005), Establishing the positive contributory value of older workers. A positive psychology perspective, *Organizational Dynamics*, Vol. 34, pp. 153-167.

Powley E.H., Fry R.E., Barrett F.J., Bright D.S. (2004), Dialogic democracy meets command and control. Transformation through the appreciative inquiry summit. *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp. 67-80.

van Praag C.M. (2005), *Successful Entrepreneurship. Confronting Economic Theory with Empirical Practice*, Edward Elgar, Glos.

Schumpeter J.A. (1934), *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital credit, interest, and the business cycle*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Seligman M.E. (2002), *Authentic happiness. Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*, Free Press, New York.

Seligman E.P., Steen T.A., Park N., Peterson C.M. (2005), Positive psychology progress, *American Psychologist*, Vol. 60, pp. 410-421.

Seligman M.E.P., Peterson C. (2002), Positive clinical psychology, [in:] L.G. Aspinwal, U.M. Staudinger (eds.), *A Psychology of Human Strengths. Fundamental Questions and Future Directions for a Positive Psychology*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, pp. 305-318.

Seligman M.E.P., Peterson C. (2003), Positive organizational studies. Lesson from positive psychology, [in:] K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, R.E. Quinn (eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship. Foundations of a New Discipline*, Berrett-Koehler Publishers, San Francisco, pp. 14-28.

Sexton D.L., Smilor R.W. (1997), *Entrepreneurship 2000*: 401-408. Chicago: Upstart Publishing.

Shane S.D., Venkataraman S. (2000), The promise of entrepreneurship as a field research. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, pp. 217-226.

Smith N.C. (2003), Corporate social responsibility. Whether or how? *California Management Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 52-76.

Snyder C.R., Lopez S.J. (2001), *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Starr J.A., MacMillan I.C. (1990), Resource cooptation via social contracting. Resource acquisition strategies for new ventures, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 79-92.

Stevenson H.H., Jarillo J. (1990), A paradigm of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurial management, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, pp. 17-27.

Stevenson H.H., Roberts M., Grousbeck H. (1985), *New Business Ventures & the Entrepreneur*, Irwin, Homewood.

Stopford J.M., Baden-Fuller Ch.W.F. (1994), Creating corporate entrepreneurship, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 521-536.

Ucbasaran D., Wright M., Westhead P. (2003), A longitundial study of habitual entrepreneurs. Starters and acquires, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, Vol. 15, pp. 207-228.

Venkataraman S. (1997), The distinctive domain of entrepreneurship research, [in:] *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth 3*, JAI Press, Greenwich, pp. 119-138.

Vera D., Crossan M. (2003), Organizational learning and knowledge management. Toward an integrative framework, [in:] M. Easterby-Smith, M.A. Lyles (eds.), *The Blackwell Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden, pp. 122-141.

de Waal A.A. (2006), *The Characteristics of a High Performance Organization*. Paper presented at the Fifth Conference of Performance Measurement Association, London.

Wolff J.A., Pett T.L. (2006), Small-firm performance. Modeling the role of product and process improvements, *Journal of Small Business Management,* Vol. 44, pp. 268-284.

ODNOWA ORGANIZACYJNA POPRZEZ POZYTYWNE ZARZĄDZANIE I PRZEDSIĘBIORCZOŚĆ

Streszczenie: Opracowanie przedstawia połączenie przedsiębiorczości organizacyjnej oraz pozytywnej nauki o organizacji (*positive organizational scholarship* – POS) jako metody odnowy organizacji. Przedsiębiorczość jest od jakiegoś czasu uznawana za agenta odnowy organizacyjnej, POS jest nową metodą prowadzącą do tego samego celu. W opracowaniu przedstawiona jest teoria pozytywnej nauki o zarządzaniu, następnie dziedzina przedsiębiorczości jest ukazana z perspektywy POS. Głównym rezultatem takiego spojrzenia jest macierz poziomów (indywidualnego, organizacyjnego oraz społecznego) oraz zagadnień (przyczyn, instytucji i skutków) na połączeniu obu dziedzin. Opracowanie zakończone jest prezentacją możliwych kierunków badań wynikających z takiego połączenia.