Understanding the heterogeneity of corporate entrepreneurship programs

Selig, C.J.

References

Alänge, S., & Steiber, A. (2018). Three operational models for ambidexterity in large corporations. *Triple Helix*, *5*(1).

Allen, M. (Ed.). (2017). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*. SAGE Publications.

Álvarez, A., & Ritchey, T. (2015). Applications of general morphological analysis. *Acta Morph*, *4*(1).

Ambrosia, F., Rückert, D., & Weiss, C. (2020). *Who is prepared for the new digital age? Evidence from the EIB Investment Survey*. Luxembourg.

Andras, T. L., & Srinivasan, S. S. (2003). Advertising intensity and R&D intensity: Differences across industries and their impact on firm's performance. *International Journal of Business and Economics*, *2*(2), 81–90.

Baltes, G., & Freyth, A. (2017). *Veränderungsintelligenz: Agiler, Innovativer, Unternehmerischer Den Wandel Unserer Zeit Meistern*. Gabler.

Barreto, I. (2010). Dynamic Capabilities: A Review of Past Research and an Agenda for the Future. *Journal of Management*, *36*(1), 256–280.

Barwise, T. P., & Watkins, L. (2018). *The evolution of digital dominance: how and why we got to GAFA*. Oxford University Press.

Battistini, B., Hacklin, F., & Baschera, P. (2013). The State of Corporate Venturing: Insights from a Global Study. *Research-Technology Management*, *56*(1), 31–39.

Becker, B., & Gassmann, O. (2006a). Corporate Incubators: Industrial R&D and What Universities can Learn from them. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *31*(4), 469–483.

Becker, B., & Gassmann, O. (2006b). Gaining leverage effects from knowledge modes within corporate incubators. *R and D Management*, *36*(1), 1–16.

Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2019). *Business research methods* (Fifth edition). Oxford University Press.

Benner, M. J., & Tushman, M. L. (2003). Exploitation, Exploration, and Process Management: The Productivity Dilemma Revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*, *28*(2), 238.

Benson, D., & Ziedonis, R. H. (2009). Corporate Venture Capital as a Window on New Technologies: Implications for the Performance of Corporate Investors When Acquiring Startups. *Organization Science*, *20*(2), 329–351.

Bessant, J. (2008). Dealing with discontinuous innovation: the European experience. *International Journal of Technology Management*, *42*(1/2), Article 18059, 36.

Bierwerth, M., Schwens, C., Isidor, R., & Kabst, R. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship and performance: A meta-analysis. *Small Business Economics*, *45*(2), 255–278.

Biniari, M. G., Simmons, S. A., Monsen, E. W., & Pizarro Moreno, M. I. (2015). The configuration of corporate venturing logics: An integrated resource dependence and institutional perspective. *Small Business Economics*, *45*(2), 351–367.

Blanka, C. (2018). An individual-level perspective on intrapreneurship: a review and ways forward. *Review of Managerial Science*, *50*, 11.

Bogers, M., Chesbrough, H., Heaton, S., & Teece, D. J. (2019). Strategic Management of Open Innovation: A Dynamic Capabilities Perspective. *California Management Review*, *62*(1), 77–94 (California Management Review, 62(1), 77-94).

Bryman, A., Becker, S., & Sempik, J. (2008). Quality Criteria for Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research: A View from Social Policy. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *11*(4), 261–276.

Burgelman, R. A. (1984). Designs for Corporate Entrepreneurship in Established Firms. *California Management Review*, *26*(3), 154–166.

Burgelman, R. A., & Välikangas, L. (2005). Managing Internal Corporate Venturing Cycles. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *46*(4), 26–34.

Campbell, A., Birkinshaw, J., Morrison, A., & van Basten Batenburg, R. (2003). The future of corporate venturing. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, *45*(1), 30–37.

Casartelli, A., Crisby, I., Eller, J., Kuperman, A., López, A., Maciagowska, M., Madhvani, M., Majos, A., Nùnez, S., & Page, A. (June 2020). *Titans of Tech: Pandemic Proof?* GP Bullhound.

Chandy, R. K., & Tellis, G. J. (2000). The Incumbent's Curse? Incumbency, Size, and Radical Product Innovation. *Journal of Marketing*, *64*(3), 1–17.

Chesbrough, H. (2000). Designing Corporate Ventures in the Shadow of Private Venture Capital. *California Management Review*, *42*(3), 31–49.

Chesbrough, H. (2002). Making sense of corporate venture capital. *Harvard Business Review*, *80*(3).

Chesbrough, H. (2004). Managing Open Innovation. *Research-Technology Management*, *47*(1), 23–26.

Chettipally, U. K. (2020). Digital Health Intrapreneurship. In S. Wulfovich (Ed.), *Health Informatics. Digital Health Entrepreneurship* (pp. 167–178). Springer International Publishing.

Christensen, C. M., McDonald, R., Altman, E. J., & Palmer, J. E. (2018). Disruptive Innovation: An Intellectual History and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Management Studies*, *55*(7), 1043–1078.

Cohen, S. (2013). What do accelerators do? Insights from incubators and angels. *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization*, *8*(3-4), 19–25.

Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (1999). Corporate Entrepreneurship and the Pursuit of Competitive Advantage. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *23*(3), 47–63.

Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (2007). Strategic Use of Corporate Venturing. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *31*(2), 183–207.

Davis, J. P., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2011). Rotating Leadership and Collaborative Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *56*(2), 159–201 (Administrative Science Quarterly, 56(2), 159-201).

Dess, G., Newport, S., & Rasheed, A. (1993). Configuration research in strategic management: Key issues and suggestions. *Journal of Management*, *19*(4), 775–795.

Di Fiore, A. (2017). How Corporate HQ Can Get More from Innovation Outposts. *Harvard Business Review Digital Articles*, 2–4.

Donaldson, L. (2002). *The contingency theory of organizations* [Nachdr.]. *Foundations for organizational science*. Sage Publisher.

Doty, D. H., Glick, W. H., & Huber, G. P. (1993). Fit, Equifinality, and Organizational Effectiveness: A Test of Two Configurational Theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(6), 1196–1250.

Duczynski, G. (2017). Morphological analysis as an aid to organisational design and transformation. *Futures*, *86*, 36–43.

Dushnitsky, G., & Lenox, M. J. (2006). When does corporate venture capital investment create firm value? *Journal of Business Venturing*, *21*(6), 753–772.

Eckblad, J., & Golovko, E. (2016). Organizing for Innovation. *Journal of Evolutionary Studies in Business*, *1*(1), 15–37.

Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: what are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*(10-11), 1105–1121.

Enkel, E., & Sagmeister, V. (2020). External corporate venturing modes as new way to develop dynamic capabilities. *Technovation*, 102128.

European Commission. (2003). *Commission Recommendation of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises*. Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reco/2003/361/oj

Ford, S., Garnsey, E., & Probert, D. (2010). Evolving corporate entrepreneurship strategy: technology incubation at Philips. *R&D Management*, *40*(1), 81–90.

Foss, N. J., & Saebi, T. (2017). Fifteen Years of Research on Business Model Innovation. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 200–227.

Frambach, J. M., van der Vleuten, C. P., & & Durning, S. J. (2013). AM last page: Quality criteria in qualitative and quantitative research. *Academic Medicine*, *88*(5), 737.

Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., & Kreps, G. L. (1999). *Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods* (2nd ed.). Allyn and Bacon.

Gard, J., Katzy, B., Andersen, T. J., Baltes, G. H., & Gasser, T. (2018). Corporate Venture Management in Small-Medium Sized Enterprise. In *Proceedings, 2018 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)* (pp. 1–10). IEEE.

Gassmann, O., Widenmayer, B., & Zeschky, M. (2012). Implementing radical innovation in the business: the role of transition modes in large firms. *R&D Management*, *42*(2), 120–132.

Gatignon, H., Tushman, M. L., Smith, W., & Anderson, P. (2002). A Structural Approach to Assessing Innovation: Construct Development of Innovation Locus, Type, and Characteristics. *Management Science*, *48*(9), 1103–1122.

Gilsing, V., Bekkers, R., Bodas Freitas, I. M., & van der Steen, M. (2011). Differences in technology transfer between science-based and development-based industries: Transfer mechanisms and barriers. *Technovation*, *31*(12), 638–647.

Gimmy, G., Kanbach, D. K., Stubner, S., Konig, A., & Enders, A. (2017). What BMW's Corporate VC Offers That Regular Investors Can't. *Harvard Business Review*.

Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research. *Organizational Research Methods*, *16*(1), 15–31.

Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., & Shalley, C. E. (2006). The Interplay Between Exploration and Exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal*, *49*(4), 693–706.

Guth, W. D., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest Editors' Introduction: Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, *11*(4), 5–15.

Gutmann, T. (2018). Harmonizing corporate venturing modes: an integrative review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly*, *37*(5), 819.

Gutmann, T., Maas, C., Kanbach, D., & Stubner, S. (2020). Startups in a corporate accelerator: what is satisfying, what is relevant and what can corporates improve. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, *24*(6), Article 110098, 413.

Harms, R., Kraus, S., & Schwarz, E. (2009). The suitability of the configuration approach in entrepreneurship research. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, *21*(1), 25–49.

Heracleous, L., Papachroni, A., Andriopoulos, C., & Gotsi, M. (2017). Structural ambidexterity and competency traps: Insights from Xerox PARC. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *117*, 327–338.

Hill, S. A., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Strategy–organization configurations in corporate venture units: Impact on performance and survival. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *23*(4), 423–444.

Hill, S. A., & Georgoulas, S. (2016). Internal corporate venturing: A review of (almost) five decades of literature. In S. A. Zahra, D. Neubaum, & J. Hayton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Corporate Entrepreneurship* (pp. 13–63). Edward Elgar Publishing.

Junarsin, E. (2009). Managing Discontinuous Innovation. *International Management Review*, *5*(2), 10–18.

Kanbach, D. K., & Stubner, S. (2016). Corporate Accelerators As Recent Form Of Startup Engagement: The What, The Why, And The How. *Journal of Applied Business Research (JABR)*, *32*(6), 1761.

Keil, T., McGrath, R. G., & Tukiainen, T. (2009). Gems from the Ashes: Capability Creation and Transformation in Internal Corporate Venturing. *Organization Science*, *20*(3), 601–620.

Kohler, T. (2016). Corporate accelerators: Building bridges between corporations and startups. *Business Horizons*, *59*(3), 347–357.

Köhler, R., & Baumann, O. (2015). Organizing for Factory-like Venture Creation: The Case of Company Builder Incubators. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, *2015*(1), 11699.

Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *The European Journal of General Practice*, *24*(1), 120–124.

Kraus, S., Kauranen, I., & Henning Reschke, C. (2011). Identification of domains for a new conceptual model of strategic entrepreneurship using the configuration approach. *Management Research Review*, *34*(1), 58–74.

Kreiser, P. M., Kuratko, D. F., Covin, J. G., Ireland, R. D., & Hornsby, J. S. (2019). Corporate entrepreneurship strategy: extending our knowledge boundaries through configuration theory. *Small Business Economics*, *41*(4), 819.

Kupp, M., Marval, M., & Borchers, P. (2017). Corporate accelerators: fostering innovation while bringing together startups and large firms. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *38*(6), 47–53.

Kuratko, D. F. (2009). The entrepreneurial imperative of the 21st century. *Business Horizons*, *52*(5), 421–428.

Kuratko, D. F., & Audretsch, D. B. (2009). Strategic Entrepreneurship: Exploring Different Perspectives of an Emerging Concept. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *33*(1), 1–17.

Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Hayton, J. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship: the innovative challenge for a new global economic reality. *Small Business Economics*, *45*(2), 245–253.

Kuratko, D. F., & Hoskinson, S. (2019). Introduction: The Challenges of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Disruptive Age. In D. F. Kuratko & S. Hoskinson (Eds.), *Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation & Economic Growth. The Challenges of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Disruptive Age* (Vol. 28, pp. 1–9). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Kuratko, D. F., Ireland, R. D., & Hornsby, J. S. (2001). Improving firm performance through entrepreneurial actions: Acordia's corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *15*(4), 60–71 (Academy of Management Perspectives, 15(4), 60-71).

Kurpjuweit, S., & Wagner, S. M. (2020). Startup Supplier Programs: A New Model for Managing Corporate-Startup Partnerships. *California Management Review*, *62*(3), 64–85.

Laamanen, T., Lamberg, J., & Vaara, E. (2016). Explanations of Success and Failure in Management Learning: What Can We Learn From Nokia's Rise and Fall? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *15*(1), 2–25.

Lang, C., Selig, C. J., Gutmann, T., Ortt, R., & Baltes, G. H. (2021). Guiding through the Fog: Understanding Differences in the Goal Setting of Corporate Entrepreneurship Programs. In *Proceedings, 2021 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC): Virtual conference.* IEEE.

Lehnen, J., Lamhofer, M., Peters, M., & Scholz, V. (2020). *Startup- und Innovationmonitor 2020: DACH-Studie der Startup- und Innovationsprogramme.*

Livari, N., Sharma, S., & Ventä-Olkkonen, L. (2020). Digital transformation of everyday life - How COVID-19 pandemic transformed the basic education of the young generation and why information management research should care? *International Journal of Information Management*, *55*, 102183.

Lucas, H. C., & Goh, J. M. (2009). Disruptive technology: How Kodak missed the digital photography revolution. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *18*(1), 46–55.

Ma, S. (2020). The Life Cycle of Corporate Venture Capital. *The Review of Financial Studies*, *33*(1), 358–394.

Makarevich, A. (2017). Organizing for success in internal corporate venturing: An inductive case study of a multinational consumer goods company. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *26*(2), 189–201.

March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*, *2*(1), 71–87.

Markham, S. K., Gentry, S. T., Hume, D., Ramachandran, R., & Kingon, A. I. (2005). Strategies and Tactics for External Corporate Venturing. *Research-Technology Management*, *48*(2), 49–59.

Markides, C. (2006). Disruptive Innovation: In Need of Better Theory *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *23*(1), 19–25.

Mason, M. (2010). Sample Size and Saturation in PhD Studies Using Qualitative Interviews. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.17169/FQS-11.3.1428 (Forum: Qualitative Social Research, Vol 11, No 3 (2010): Methods for Qualitative Management Research in the Context of Social Systems Thinking).

Maula, M. V. (2007). 15 Corporate venture capital as a strategic tool for corporations. *Handbook of Research on Venture Capital*, *1*, 371.

Mazzei, M. J. (2018). Strategic entrepreneurship: Content, process, context, and outcomes. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *14*(3), 657–670.

Mazzei, M. J., Ketchen, D. J., & Shook, C. L. (2017). Understanding strategic entrepreneurship: a “theoretical toolbox” approach. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *13*(2), 631–663.

McDermott, C. M., & O'Connor, G. C. (2002). Managing radical innovation: an overview of emergent strategy issues. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *19*(6), 424–438.

McHugh, M. L. (2013). The chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*, *23*(2), 143–149.

Meyer, A. D., Tsui, A. S., & Hinings, C. R. (1993). Configurational Approaches to Organizational Analysis. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(6), 1175–1195.

Miles, M. P., & Covin, J. G. (2002). Exploring the Practice of Corporate Venturing: Some Common Forms and Their Organizational Implications. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *26*(3), 21–40.

Miles, R. E., Snow, C. C., Meyer, A. D., & Coleman, H. J. (1978). Organizational Strategy, Structure, and Process. *Academy of Management Review*, *3*(3), 546–562.

Mintzberg, H. (1981). Organization design: fashion or fit? *Harvard Business Review*(Jannuary-February).

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B., & Lampel, J. (2001). Researching configuration. *Rethinking Strategy*, 198–211.

Mintzberg, H., Ahlstrand, B. W., & Lampel, J. (2009). *Strategy safari: The complete guide through the wilds of strategic management* (Second edition). FT Prentice Hall Financial Times.

Mokaya, S. O. (2012). Corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance theoretical perspectives, approaches and outcomes. *International Journal of Arts and Commerce*, *1*(4), 133–143.

Moschner, S.-L., Fink, A. A., Kurpjuweit, S., Wagner, S. M., & Herstatt, C. (2019). Toward a better understanding of corporate accelerator models. *Business Horizons*, *62*(5), 637–647.

Nag, R., & Gioia, D. A. (2012). From Common to Uncommon Knowledge: Foundations of Firm-Specific Use of Knowledge as a Resource. *Academy of Management Journal*, *55*(2), 421–457 (Academy of Management Journal, 55(2), 421-457).

Narayanan, V. K., Yang, Y., & Zahra, S. A. (2009). Corporate venturing and value creation: A review and proposed framework. *Research Policy*, *38*(1), 58–76.

Neely, A., Mills, J., Platts, K., Richards, H., Gregory, M., Bourne, M., & Kennerley, M. (2000). Performance measurement system design: developing and testing a process-based approach. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *20*(10), 1119–1145.

O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 185–206.

Pahnke, A., & Welter, F. (2019). The German Mittelstand: antithesis to Silicon Valley entrepreneurship? *Small Business Economics*, *52*(2), 345–358.

Pake, G. E. (1985). Research at xerox PARC: A founder's assessment: The first director of the Xerox Palo Alto Research Center tells how his management philosophy worked in launching the center and making it a success. *IEEE Spectrum*, *22*(10), 54–61.

Pappas, I. O., Mikalef, P., Giannakos, M. N., Krogstie, J., & Lekakos, G. (2018). Big data and business analytics ecosystems: paving the way towards digital transformation and sustainable societies. *Information Systems and E-Business Management*, *16*(3), 479–491.

Parhankangas, A., & Arenius, P. (2003). From a corporate venture to an independent company: a base for a taxonomy for corporate spin-off firms. *Research Policy*, *32*(3), 463–481.

Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. (1981). The art of Japanese management. *Business Horizons*, *24*(6), 83–85.

Pauwels, C., Clarysse, B., Wright, M., & van Hove, J. (2016). Understanding a new generation incubation model: The accelerator. *Technovation*, *50-51*, 13–24.

Peter, L. (2018). Corporate Company Builder. *Wirtschaftsinformatik & Management*, *10*(2), 68–74.

Peter, L., Back, A., & Werro, T. (2018). A Taxonomic Framework on Prevalent Collaborative Innovation Options between Corporations and Startups. *International Journal of Digital Technology & Economy*, *3.2*(63-94).

Pierce, J. R., & Schott, P. K. (2012). A concordance between ten-digit U.S. harmonized system codes and SIC/NAICS product classes and industries. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement*, *37*(1-2), 61–96.

Pinchot III, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur*. Harper & Row.

Raisch, S., Birkinshaw, J., Probst, G., & Tushman, M. L. (2009). Organizational Ambidexterity: Balancing Exploitation and Exploration for Sustained Performance. *Organization Science*, *20*(4), 685–695.

Rathgeber, P., Gutmann, T., & Levasier, M. (2017). Organizational best practices of company builders–a qualitative study. *Res J Int School Manag*, *4*(1).

Reimsbach, D., & Hauschild, B. (2012). Corporate venturing: an extended typology. *Journal of Management Control*, *23*(1), 71–80.

Rigtering, J. P. C., & Weitzel, U. (2013). Work context and employee behaviour as antecedents for intrapreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *9*(3), 337–360.

Ritchey, T. (2006). Problem structuring using computer-aided morphological analysis. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, *57*(7), 792–801.

Ritchey, T. (2011a). About Fritz Zwicky. In T. Ritchey (Ed.), *Wicked Problems – Social Messes* (pp. 87–89). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Ritchey, T. (2011b). Modelling Complex Policy Issues with Morphological Analysis. In T. Ritchey (Ed.), *Risk, governance and society: Vol. 17. Wicked problems - social messes: Decision support modelling with morphological analysis* (pp. 31–37). Springer.

Rule, E. G., & Irwin, D. W. (1988). Fostering intrapreneurship: The new competitive edge. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, *9*(3), 44–47.

Salerno, M. S., Gomes, L. A. d. V., Silva, D. O. d., Bagno, R. B., & Freitas, S. L. T. U. (2015). Innovation processes: Which process for which project? *Technovation*, *35*, 59–70.

Schindehutte, M., Morris, M. H., & Kuratko, D. F. (2019). Chapter 1 Unpacking Corporate Entrepreneurship: A Critique and Extension. In D. F. Kuratko & S. Hoskinson (Eds.), *Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation & Economic Growth. The Challenges of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Disruptive Age* (Vol. 28, pp. 11–35). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Schmidt, S., Brinks, V., & Brinkhoff, S. (2014). Innovation and creativity labs in Berlin. *Zeitschrift Für Wirtschaftsgeographie*, *58*(1).

Schmitt, A., Raisch, S., & Volberda, H. W. (2018). Strategic Renewal: Past Research, Theoretical Tensions and Future Challenges. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, *20*(1), 81–98.

Schuh, G., Lau, F., Zimmermann, R., & Vogt, F. (2017). Configuration Options for Corporate Incubators: Development of a Description Model Using the Morphological Analysis Method. In Kocaoglu, Anderson (Ed.), *Conference Proceedings – 2017 Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology (PICMET)* (pp. 1–10).

Selig, C. J., & Baltes, G. H. (2019). Towards an effective management of corporate entrepreneurship activities. In *Proceedings, 2019 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)* (pp. 1–9). IEEE.

Selig, C. J., & Baltes, G. H. (2020). Strengthening Organizational Ambidexterity through Corporate Entrepreneurship Activities. In *Proceedings, 2020 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC): Virtual conference* (pp. 1–9). IEEE.

Selig, C. J., Gasser, T., & Baltes, G. H. (2018). How Corporate Accelerators Foster Organizational Transformation: An Internal Perspective. In *Proceedings, 2018 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC)* (pp. 1–9). IEEE.

Selig, C. J., Gasser, T., & Baltes, G. H. (2019). Effects of Internal Corporate Venturing on the Transformation of Established Companies. In R. Baierl, J. Behrens, & A. Brem (Eds.), *FGF Studies in Small Business and Entrepreneurship. Digital Entrepreneurship* (Vol. 20, pp. 159–183). Springer International Publishing.

Shankar, R. K., & Shepherd, D. A. (2019). Accelerating strategic fit or venture emergence: Different paths adopted by corporate accelerators. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *34*(5), 105886.

Sharma, P., & Chrisman, S. J. J. (2007). Toward a Reconciliation of the Definitional Issues in the Field of Corporate Entrepreneurship In Á. Cuervo, D. Ribeiro, & S. Roig (Eds.), *Entrepreneurship: Concepts, Theory and Perspective* (pp. 83–103). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Short, J. C., Payne, G. T., & Ketchen, D. J. (2008). Research on Organizational Configurations: Past Accomplishments and Future Challenges. *Journal of Management*, *34*(6), 1053–1079.

Smith, K. B. (2002). Typologies, Taxonomies, and the Benefits of Policy Classification. *Policy Studies Journal*, *30*(3), 379–395.

Snow, C. C., Miles, R. E., & Miles, G. (2006). The Configurational Approach to Organization Design: Four Recommended Initiatives. In R. M. Burton, B. Eriksen, D. D. Håkonsson, & C. C. Snow (Eds.), *Information and Organization Design Series: Vol. 6. Organization Design: The evolving state-of-the-art* (Vol. 6, pp. 3–18). Springer Science+Business Media LLC.

Stenfors, T., Kajamaa, A., & Bennett, D. (2020). How to … assess the quality of qualitative research. *The Clinical Teacher.* Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.13242

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (17(1), 273-285.). Sage Publications, Inc.

Sykes, H. B. (1990). Corporate venture capital: Strategies for success. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *5*(1), 37–47.

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, *28*(13), 1319–1350.

Teece, D. J. (2016). Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial management in large organizations: Toward a theory of the (entrepreneurial) firm. *European Economic Review*, *86*, 202–216.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, *18*(7), 509–533.

Thornhill, S., & Amit, R. (2001). A dynamic perspective of internal fit in corporate venturing. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *16*(1), 25–50.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative Quality: Eight “Big-Tent” Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *16*(10), 837–851.

Treharne, G. J., & Riggs, D. W. (2015). Ensuring Quality in Qualitative Research. In P. Rohleder & A. C. Lyons (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Clinical and Health Psychology* (pp. 57–73). Macmillan Education UK.

van de Ven, A. H., Ganco, M., & Hinings, C. R. (2013). Returning to the Frontier of Contingency Theory of Organizational and Institutional Designs. *Academy of Management Annals*, *7*(1), 393–440.

van der Meer, R. J., Selig, C. J., & Stettina, C. J. (2021). Innovation Labs - a Taxonomy of four different Types. In *Proceedings, 2021 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Innovation (ICE/ITMC): Virtual conference* (pp. 1–9). IEEE.

van der Voordt, T., Anker Jensen, P., Gerard Hoendervanger, J., & Bergsma, F. (2016). Value Adding Management (VAM) of buildings and facility services in four steps. *Corporate Real Estate Journal*, *6*(1), 42–56.

Vantrappen, H., & Deneffe, D. (2016). Joint Ventures Reduce the Risk of Major Capital Investments. *Harvard Business Review*, 2–6.

Vermeulen, P. A., O’shaughnessy, K. C., & Jong, J. P. de (2003). Innovation in SMEs: An empirical investigation of the input-throughput-output-performance model. *EIM, Zoetermeer.*

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, *28*(2), 118–144.

Walker, D., & Myrick, F. (2006). Grounded theory: an exploration of process and procedure. *Qualitative Health Research*, *16*(4), 547–559.

Wang, J., & Kleiner, B. H. (2005). The evolution of R&D management. *Management Research News*, *28*(11/12), 88–95.

Weber, C., & Weber, B. (2005). Corporate Venture Capital Organizations in Germany. *Venture Capital*, *7*(1), 51–73.

Weiblen, T., & Chesbrough, H. W. (2015). Engaging with Startups to Enhance Corporate Innovation. *California Management Review*, *57*(2), 66–90.

Weiser, M., Gold, R., & Brown, J. S. (1999). The origins of ubiquitous computing research at PARC in the late 1980s. *IBM Systems Journal*, *38*(4), 693–696.

Wilden, R., Gudergan, S. P., Nielsen, B. B., & Lings, I. (2013). Dynamic Capabilities and Performance: Strategy, Structure and Environment. *Long Range Planning*, *46*(1-2), 72–96 (Long Range Planning, 46(1-2), 72-96).

Winters, T. E., & Murfin, D. L. (1988). Venture capital investing for corporate development objectives. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *3*(3), 207–222.

Yin, R. K. (2013). Validity and generalization in future case study evaluations. *Evaluation*, *19*(3), 321–332.

Yiu, D. W., & Lau, C.-M. (2008). Corporate Entrepreneurship as Resource Capital Configuration in Emerging Market Firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *32*(1), 37–57.

Zahra, S. A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *8*(4), 319–340.

Zahra, S. A. (1995). Corporate entrepreneurship and financial performance: The case of management leveraged buyouts. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *10*(3), 225–247.

Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *10*(1), 43–58.

Zahra, S. A., & Hayton, J. C. (2008). The effect of international venturing on firm performance: The moderating influence of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *23*(2), 195–220.

Zedtwitz, M. von (2003). Classification and management of incubators: aligning strategic objectives and competitive scope for new business facilitation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management*, *3*(1/2), Article 2227, 176.

Zwicky, F. (1967). The Morphological Approach to Discovery, Invention, Research and Construction. In F. Zwicky & A. G. Wilson (Eds.), *New Methods of Thought and Procedure* (pp. 273–297). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

Appendices

In this part of the thesis, the following six appendices are covered.

Appendix 1: Guideline semi-structured interviews

Appendix 2: Overview additional data

Appendix 3: List of definitions of terms used to describe research quality

Appendix 4: Overview prior studies using multiple design elements to describe CE programs

Appendix 5: Description of the 138 element characteristics belonging to the design elements

Appendix 6: Morphological box for the venture builder

Appendix 1: Guideline semi-structured interviews

Key theme	Sample questions semi-structured interviews
Personal Background	• What is your educational background? • What is your career track until your current job at the CE program? • Can you describe your current role at the program? • What motivates you to work in an entrepreneurial context within an established company?
CE program's Background	• When was the CE program initiated? • What was the motivation of the company to start the CE program? • Who was the main driver for starting the program? • How many people are working in the program and what are their roles? • Did you have major adjustments in the structure or the strategy of the CE program?
Objective & performance measurement	• What are the objectives of the CE program? • How is the performance of the CE program measured? • Do you have concrete KPIs? • How are you controlled/steered by the management? • Do you have special routines to interact with the corporate management?
Organization of the CE program	• Where are you located in the companies' organigram? • Are you organized as an own legal entity? • What were the reasons to organize the program like it is? • Do you have different processes or rules than the core organization? • Which processes and rules are different, and why? • Are there additional CE programs or innovation units that are organized differently to the core organization?
Mode of operation	• What are the tasks/activities to run the CE program? • Can you explain the process of the program and the stages? • How many projects are being supported by the CE program? • Can you give me a rough number of the innovation funnel? (How many projects are at the beginning, how many "survive" all stages of the process?) • What type of support is offered to the innovation ideas within the program? • With which departments or units does the CE program primarily interact? • Do you work closely with other CE programs? • How does the collaboration look like and are there any synergies?
Value creation and impact	• How many new businesses or products have been developed by the program? • Did the activities of the CE program lead to changes in processes, structures, etc. within the core organization? (Spill-over effects from the CE program) • Are there any additional effects the CE program has on the core organization that were initially not intended? • What is a successful project in your understanding? And how is the success rate of the CE program? • What factors were critical for being successful? • How would you rate the success of the CE program from your perspective (ranging from 1-10)?

The interview-guideline presented in the table below covers examples of questions to illustrate the topics discussed with the interviewees. Since the interviews were semi-structured, we did not always follow the order presented in the table but the interviewees' answers and topics to ensure that new themes could still be observed.

In addition, the questions were adjusted on the interviewee's choice of words to minimize the influence on the answers. Meaning, if they used a specific word to describe something, e.g., "*we were seen as an alien within our organization",* we used to word "alien" to follow up. When new topics did arise, we did a follow up to understand them in full detail. These follow-up questions are not covered in the table.

Appendix 2: Overview additional data

Case	Company	Interviews	Follow-up messages	Homepage / Social Media	Publications / Presentations	Scientific Publications	Internal Documents
1	A	1	x	x	x		
2	B	1					x
3	B	1	x	x			x
4	C	1	x		x		
5	D	1	x				
6	D	1					
7	D	1		x			
8	D	1		x	x		
9	D	1	x		x		
10	E	1		x			
11	F	1		x	x		
12	F	1	x		x		
13	G	1	x		x		
14	G	2	x	x	x		
15	G	1		x	x		
16	G	1		x	x		
17	H	2*		x			
18	H	1		x			
19	H	1		x	x		
20	I	1		x			
21	J	2*	x	x	x		
22	J	1	x	x	x	x	
23	K	2*	x	x	x		
24	L	1		x			
25	M	1		x			
26	N	1	x				
27	O	1					
28	O	2*		x			
29	P	1		x			x
30	Q	2*					

Case	Company	Interviews	Follow-up messages	Homepage / Social Media	Publications / Presentations	Scientific Publications	Internal Documents
31	R	1					
32	S	1	x	x	x		
33	S	1	x	x			
34	T	1	x	x		x	
35	T	1		x			
36	U	2*		x			
37	V	1	x	x			x
38	W	1		x			
39	X	1		x	x		x
40	Y	1			x		
41	Z	2		x			
42	Z	1	x		x	x	
43	AA	2		x			x
44	AA	1		x			
45	AB	2*					
46	AC	1		x	x		
47	AC	1		x		x	
48	AD	1		x		x	
49	AE	1	x		x		
50	AF	1		x			
51	AG	2*		x	x		
52	AH	2		x			
53	AI	2	x		x		
54	AJ	1		x	x		

* follow-up interview with the same interviewee

Appendix 3: List of definitions of terms used to describe research quality

In Subsection 3.3.3, the different actions undertaken to ensure a high level of quality during the study were described. To maintain clarity, the eight terms marked in italics (in Subsection 3.3.3) have not been defined within the text. Below, the eight definitions are provided.

Definition I *Validity* is defined as the suitability of a measurement instrument to examine the results that are intended to be measured.

Definition II *Reliability* defines the consistency and stability of the results, meaning how likely it is that the results will be similar or the same when the study is repeated.

Definition III *Credibility* defines the level of confidence in how trustable the results can be by others, meaning how plausible are the results and their interpretations.

Definition IV *Transferability* defines how well the study results can be transferred or applied to another context.

Definition V *Dependability* defines the extent to which results are stable over time and concerning the context in which the data were collected.

Definition VI *Confirmability* is defined as the degree to which the results of a study are based on the data rather than the researcher's perspective and biases.

Definition VII *Reflexivity* defines a researcher's awareness and self-reflection regarding the influence and role they have in the research being conducted.

Definition IIX *Trustworthiness* is the degree to which others can trust the results and is acknowledged as an overarching quality criterion in qualitative research.

Appendix 4: Overview prior studies using multiple design elements to describe CE programs

Focus of the study	Design elements	Reference
Distinguishing accelerator from other startup support units like incubators or business angels	- Duration - Cohorts (batch logic) - Business Model - Selection - Venture stage - Education - Mentorship - Venture location	(Cohen, 2013)
Identifying design elements that are commonly used to categorize CE programs and offer a more detailed categorization	- Locus of opportunity - Prioritization of objectives - Ambidexterity - Link to the corporate firm - Level of investment intermediation - Equity involvement - Direction of innovation flow	(Gutmann, 2018)
Options of different structural configurations for corporate incubators by analyzing different design opportunities	- Location - Equipment - Strategic focus (innovation) - Governance model - Intervention phase - Source of ideas - Legal form - Access to firm's resources - Preferred exit path - Project funding - Funding duration/extend	(Schuh et al., 2017)
Comparison of different types for startup engagement/ collaboration that established companies can pursue	- Main goals - Scale (# of startups) - Integration with core business - Closeness to core business - Completeness of startup support - Value capturing - Organizational anchoring - Time horizon of involvement - Exclusivity (access to innovation) - Admission of new startups	(Weiblen & Chesbrough, 2015)

Focus of the study	Design elements	Reference
Comparing external corporate accelerators and startup supplier programs, providing a first definition about this rather new phenomenon (startup supplier program)	- Program objective - Value proposition to startup - Startup type (maturity) - Project focus (result) - Application procedure - Duration - Organizational setup - Number of startups - Main contact - End of program - Financial resources - Educational resources - Type of network access - Product-related resources	(Kurpjuweit & Wagner, 2020)
Distinguishing different modes how external corporate accelerators can be designed	- # of involved companies - Management structure - Location - Focus (internal/external) - Maturity - Equity or funding - Flexibility program structure	(Moschner et al., 2019)
In-depth case study about external corporate accelerator to understand different characteristics, presenting four types of accelerators	- Primary objective - Locus of opportunity - Strategic logic - Industry focus - Equity involvement - Venture stage - External partner - Connection to parent - Leadership experience	(Kanbach & Stubner, 2016)
A typology for corporate venturing based on three dimensions to resolve terminological issues	- Competence development - Level of intermediation - Focus of activities	(Reimsbach & Hauschild, 2012)

Focus of the study	Design elements	Reference
Comparison of globally leading CVC unit – aiming at understanding the evolution and objectives of these units	- Scope - Objectives - Guiding principles - Structure - Reporting line - KPI	(Battistini et al., 2013)
The typology that describes four different "business models" to execute CVC activities and related characteristics	- Focus - Source of ideas - Degree of autonomy - Required skills - Funding - Performance measures - Incentives	(Campbell et al., 2003)
Theoretically grounded typology that presents eight different corporate venturing logics	- Dominant VC logic - Strategic orientation - Strategic relatedness - Operational relatedness - Business model	(Biniari et al., 2015)
Identifying and comparing different modes of external corporate accelerators	- Type of corporate nurturing - Way to identify ventures - Strategic posture - Investment time horizon - Type of corporate acceleration	(Shankar & Shepherd, 2019)
Comparison of three CE programs using an organizational ambidexterity perspective	- Approach - Initial purpose - Ambidexterity strategy - Innovation focus - Probe-and-learn process - Co-creation - Top management role - Integration with business units - Evaluation process - Use of standardized approaches - Implementation strategy	(Alänge & Steiber, 2018)

Appendix 5: Description of the 138 element characteristics belonging to the design elements

Below, the 138 element characteristics that belong to the 26 design elements will be described briefly. A definition of the design elements (highlighted in bold) can be found in Section 4.2. The first column in the table represents the element characteristics, and the second column describing the element characteristics. The design elements to which the element characteristics are belonging are presented in a single column above the respective element characteristics.

Orientation	
Strategic	Focus is mainly set on strategic value for the core organization
Financial	Focus is mainly set on financial value for the core organization
Balanced	Focus covers both strategic and financial value
Strategic logic	
Exploration	Creation of new knowledge that goes beyond core business
Exploitation	Optimization of existing knowledge in the core business
Innovation type	
Process	Innovation focusing on improving processes
Service	Innovation focusing on introducing new services to the customer
Product	Innovation focusing on the creation of new products
Business model	Innovation focusing on renewing the business model
Business relatedness	
Improve core business	Activities aim at improving the current core business
Complement core business	Activities aim at supplementing products from core business
Adjacent to core business	Activities aim at creating products related to the core business
Cannibalize core business	Activities aim at replacing the products of the core business
Independent new business	Activities aim at creating new, independent businesses
Innovation flow	
Inside-in	Innovation is created within the company and remains there
Inside-out	Innovation is created within the company and is spun off
Outside-in	Innovation is created outside the company and is insourced
Innovation demand	
Push by intrapreneur	Intrapreneurs drive the innovation by applying to the CE program
Pull by core organization	The core organization orders innovations
Moderated pull	The CE program and core business jointly drive the innovations
Push by top management	The top management pushes innovations into the CE program

Push by CE program	The CE program itself drives innovations
Application process	
Open to apply	Everyone can apply to the CE program with their ideas
Call for application	Organized call for application with a specific innovation topic
Internal ideation	The CE program itself develops innovation ideas
Screening for opportunities	The CE program is externally screening for relevant innovations
Decided by hierarchy	The core organization selects participants in the CE program
By order	The core organization must formally order innovation ideas
Starting point	
Ongoing	Continuous participation in the CE program possible
Batches	Fixed start and endpoints for participating in the CE program
One time only	CE activity is organized only one time
Duration	
Fixed (time)	Duration of participation has a fixed period of time
Fixed (content)	Duration of participation depends on the innovation's progress
Flexible (no pre-defined end)	CE program has no pre-defined duration for supporting innovations
Multiple phases	CE program has multiple phases with different durations
Number of phases	
1 phase (ideation)	Developing potentially relevant innovation ideas
2 phases (validation)	Ideation & validation of the problem-solution-fit
3 phases (build)	Ideation, validation & creation of innovation with a product-market-fit
4 phases (operate)	Ideation, validation, creation & operation of businesses by CE program
Program end (idea maturity)	
Proof of concept	A proof of concept for innovation ideas is delivered
Technical prototype	A technical prototype of the innovation idea is created
Business concept	A business concept for the innovation idea is developed
Minimum viable product	A minimum viable product is developed and has first customers
Operating business	An operating business is established
Venture exit	An exit (or IPO) of a venture is achieved
Open end	There is no pre-defined end of the program

Preferred exit path	
Transfer to business unit	Innovation is transferred to a business unit in core organization
Become a business unit	Innovation becomes an own business unit
Operating business themself	The CE program itself operates innovation
Spin-off (strategic/financial)	Innovation is spun-off into a new corporate venture
Licensing	Innovation is licensed to other companies
Portfolio company	The startup becomes a portfolio company of the venture fund
Exit of the venture	Initial public offering or acquisition of the portfolio company
Governance mode	
Within hierarchy	The CE program is organized as an entity within the core organization
Central office	The CE program is organized as a central office
Own business unit	The CE program is organized as an own business unit
Own legal entity	The CE program is spun-off into an own legal entity
Location	
Virtual	The CE program is a virtual program without physical locations
Decentral	The CE program has spaces on the different sites of the company
On site	The CE program is located in the area of the main office
Separated nearby	The CE program is separated but close to the main office
Innovation hotspot	The CE program has a location in an innovation hotspot
Multiple locations	The CE program has multiple, rather stand-alone locations globally
Platform openness	
Open	The CE program is a platform where multiple companies can join
Closed	The CE program is closed for other companies
Funding source (in-program)	
CE program	The budget of the CE program funds the innovation ideas
Joint funding	Joint funding through core organization and CE program
Division in core organization	Parts of the core organization fund the innovation ideas
Strategic innovation budget	A strategic innovation budget funds the innovation ideas
Funding source (post-program)	
CE program	The budget of the CE program funds the innovation ideas
Joint funding	Joint funding through core organization and CE program
Division in core organization	Parts of the core organization fund the innovation ideas
Strategic innovation budget	A strategic innovation budget funds the innovation ideas
External investor	An external investor funds the innovation ideas
Power promoter	

CEO	Chief executive officer
CTO	Chief technological officer
CDO	Chief digitalization officer
COO	Chief operating officer
CHRO	Chief human resources officer
CFO	Chief financial officer
Head of strategy	Leader of the strategy department
Head of R&D / innovation	Leader of the R&D or innovation department
Advisory board	Advisory board consisting of multiple higher managers
Business unit lead	Leader of a business unit from the core organization
Key activities	
Scouting innovation	Scouting for startups or internal innovation ideas
Facilitating cooperation	Managing cooperation between startup and core organization
Investing in startups	Organizing the investment process for a particular startup
Ideating new ideas	Creating new innovation ideas
Incubating innovation	Supporting innovation ideas with resources and know-how
Assisting idea development	Supporting the development of innovations with human resources
Executing idea development	Implementing an innovation idea through the CE program
Consulting core business	Using innovation know-how to support the core business
Educating employees	Training entrepreneurial/innovation methods and skills
Innovation formats	
Multiple CE programs	Multiple CE programs are combined in one organizational unit
Multiple innovation formats	CE program is running additional innovation formats
HR-related activities	CE program is running HR-related activities
Just the CE program	Just the CE program, no additional types of activities
CE program-as-a-service	CE program is offering their activities as a service for core business
External consulting	CE program is offering its expertise as external consulting
Main contact	
All departments	Participants of the CE program have contact with all departments
R&D and innovation	Participants are mainly in contact with R&D/innovation departments
Sales and marketing	Participants are mainly in contact with sales/marketing departments
Strategy department	Participants are mainly in contact with the strategy department
Mainly CE program itself	Participants are mainly in contact with the CE program itself

Type of funding	
No funding	The innovation idea receives no financial support
Pocket money	A small budget to support the idea validation or proof of concept
Project funding	Innovation idea is funded during the program phase
Option to invest	Financial support is linked with the option to invest
Equity investment	Financial investment in exchange for shares of the venture
Key value proposition	
Time to work on innovation	Employees can work on their innovation ideas
Network access	Access to the network of the company
Domain expertise	Access to the specialized expertise of the company's domain
Training	Education and training of entrepreneurial skills & methods
Funding	Access to financial resources to support the innovation development
Operational expertise	Access to know-how for operating in a certain business
Program participants	
Startup (external)	External startups are working with the company on an innovation
Employee core business (ECB)	Employees of the core business are working on innovation ideas
Employees CE program (ECEP)	Employees of the CE program are working on innovation ideas
ECB + freelancer	Freelancers support employees of the core business
Startup + ECB	Startup and employees of core business work together on innovation
Startup + ECEP	Startup and employees of the CE program work together
ECB + ECEP	Employees of core business and the CE program work together
Startup + ECB + ECEP	Startup, employees of the core business & CE program work together
Key functions	
Innovation scout	A person who is scouting internal ideas or external startups
Internal facilitator	A person who is facilitating startup cooperation projects
Investment manager	A person who is running the investment process in a startup
Technology specialist	A person who has deep technological expertise used
Innovation coach	A person with solid methodological expertise to coach participants
Business developer	A person who is responsible for identifying business opportunities
Project manager	A person who is responsible for managing innovation projects
Program lead	A person who is in charge of the CE program
Marketing manager	A person who is operating all marketing activities of the CE program

Idea maturity	
Explore/ideate (seed stage)	Innovation is in the stage of being explored or ideated
Validate (seed stage)	Innovation idea has been validated
Business building (early stage)	The business around the innovation is defined and in development
Business launch (early stage)	The business has been launched and has initial customers
Growth business (later stage)	The business is in the phase of scaling
Mature business (later stage)	The business has reached a level of maturity

Appendix 6: Morphological box for the venture builder

Due to size limits, the morphological box is split into two parts. Below, Part I can be found.



Part II of the morphological box