



Leading the (r)evolution: Succession and leadership rules for re-entrepreneurs



Robert McEnany^a, David Strutton^{b,*}

^a *Managing Partner, The Levenson Group, 717 N. Harwood Street, Dallas, TX 75201, U.S.A.*

^b *College of Business, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76205, U.S.A.*

KEYWORDS

Entrepreneurship;
Re-entrepreneurship;
Succession;
Leadership;
Schumpeter;
(R)evolution;
Culture

Abstract During the next decade-plus, thousands of Baby Boomer entrepreneurs will retire, usually without formal succession plans. Next-generation relatives, former employees, or outsiders will assume leadership of these now-mature enterprises, hopefully bringing their own visions and initiatives and becoming, in every sense, re-entrepreneurs. Re-entrepreneurship describes a process through which a mature enterprise can be made new again. Re-entrepreneurial leaders will encounter challenges that differ radically from those confronted by traditional entrepreneurial leaders. Re-entrepreneurial initiatives necessarily should begin with new visions of what mature organizations might do to become new again; will succeed only if stakeholders commit to that vision; and should culminate with reimagined, restaged, and revitalized enterprises. To secure re-entrepreneurial outcomes, three framing principles are proposed. Each principle is rooted in the theory of Joseph Schumpeter, the godfather of entrepreneurship and creative destruction. Seven re-entrepreneurial rules follow. While grounded in entrepreneurial theory, each rule is based primarily on experiential lessons shared by re-entrepreneurial executives who have previously assumed leadership succession roles inside mature organizations—and subsequently reimagined, restaged, and revitalized, ultimately renewing their firms.

© 2015 Kelley School of Business, Indiana University. Published by Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

“Dreams can come true again, when everything old is new again.”

Everything Old Is New Again
by Peter Allen and Carole Bayer Sager (1974)

1. Everything old is new again

In their song, Peter Allen and Carole Bayer Sager wrote about romance. Decades earlier, Joseph Schumpeter expressed similar thoughts about business, proposing that nothing mature enterprises could do would deliver more sustainably differentiating value than becoming *new again*. But fashioning

* Corresponding author
E-mail addresses: rmcenany@levensongroup.com
(R. McEnany), david.strutton@unt.edu (D. Strutton)

new again from the well-worn fabric of a mature business enterprise counters the natural order. Schumpeter acknowledged that even the most successful firms typically calcify over time, become institutionally inflexible, and view new ideas suspiciously—including those companies whose founding stems from entrepreneurial vision and values (Surowiecki, 2014).

Entrepreneurial ideas, ideals, and behaviors that once made firms great often succumb, over time, to inertia. After entrepreneurial passion and energy diminish, fortunes often shift for the worse. For example, when its board forced out Steve Jobs, Apple's innovativeness ground to a halt. Apple became an afterthought. Upon Jobs' return, however, the founder renewed Apple's entrepreneurial vision, re-transforming it into one of the world's most valuable firms. The value of a founder's grand entrepreneurial vision is difficult to overstate, as is the difficulty of rekindling the original entrepreneurial flame, especially during periods of leadership succession and transition (The Atlantic, 2014).

The rules developed herein for leading re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions to address this challenge will help next-generation succession leaders of now-mature enterprises satisfy their entrepreneurial aspirations and reignite firms' entrepreneurial fire. While grounded theoretically, these rules are largely derived from the executive experiences of re-entrepreneurial leaders, including the first author. Each leader's career spanned decades prior to his or her succession. Then, through planned or unforeseen transition, each individual assumed a leadership role within a mature enterprise and accepted the firm's entrepreneurial legacy as a platform for renewing the spirit of the firm and creating a fresh, re-entrepreneurial vision.

2. What Schumpeter said then, matters now

Schumpeter (1950) first identified innovation as the core driver of most business success in his paradigm-shifting *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. The overused term 'paradigm-shift' is used consciously here because principles offered in his book split managerial practice into before/after eras. Schumpeter also asserted that mature firms that failed to innovate would fall victim to a "perennial gale of creative destruction." He labeled people who fan this creative gale as *entrepreneurs*. Similarly, we characterize succession leaders who strive to re-create these originating gales inside mature enterprises as *re-entrepreneurs*.

Schumpeter described the entrepreneur's role as moving any firm's assets to where these finite resources will do the most good, and argued that organizations of all types, sizes, and life-cycle stages can behave entrepreneurially. Entrepreneurs, he argued, can exist anywhere—especially in organizations where entrepreneurial behaviors are welcomed, cultivated, and rewarded. This article focuses on how succession leaders of mature enterprises can shape organizational culture to accept and ultimately embrace re-entrepreneurially (r)evolutionary changes.

Like nations, formerly entrepreneurial but now-traditional enterprises are seldom murdered; instead, many such firms commit prolonged suicide. They outlive founders' visions, lose the entrepreneurial edge that drove their original success, and die gradually.

Planning for re-entrepreneurial leadership succession increases the likelihood that enterprises can, in future forms, thrive. But most entrepreneurial firms have no formal succession plans (Marshall et al., 2006). Odds are, at best, their transitions will prove disorderly (Morris, Williams, Allen, & Avila, 1997). This article is intended to help succession leaders balance their desire to integrate re-entrepreneurial aspirations with the need they inevitably face to respect habituated practices, which at one time made mature enterprises successful.

3. Re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions described

Re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions ideally unfold in settings where succession leaders initiate thoughtful actions to integrate redefined and re-energized entrepreneurial vision into mature enterprises. Re-entrepreneurial succession leaders (hereafter, RSLs) succeed by rediscovering, rebuilding, or reigniting an entrepreneurial (r)evolutionary spirit (i.e., an outcome that would enhance focus, energy, and intensity) among key personnel en route to making mature enterprises new again. Of course, full realization of re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution also requires thoughtful consideration of additional aspects of business models, including financial goals, resources and relationships, supply chain relationships, legacy technologies/processes, customer segments that have become more or less important, and personnel issues. But such aspects are idiosyncratic to particular industries and organizations, and beyond the scope of this discussion. We acknowledge, as a limitation, that these and related issues should be considered in the future.

4. An inductive method, grounded in theory

The most useful insights about how to cultivate re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution during leadership succession inside mature enterprises should reflect the experiences of leaders who have already successfully navigated those turbulent waters, even if it was not called re-entrepreneurship at the time. For this reason, an inductive method was employed to create our framework and its principles, rules, and practical tips. Specifically, our case was developed by (1) summarizing conversations about re-entrepreneurship held with RSLs; (2) mining these dialogues for relevant lessons, which were condensed into progressive insights through which succession leaders might achieve re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution; and (3) classifying each insight into one of three categories: principles, rules, or practical tips. In all, three principles, seven rules (each accompanied by actionable guidelines), and a ‘visioning’ discussion emerged (Table 1).

These recommendations are likewise grounded in succession theory developed by Le Breton-Miller and Miller (2011). They contended that leadership succession success/failure pivots largely on whether succession leaders can effectively balance short-, medium-, and long-range considerations rather than overly focus on any single temporal concern. In sum, leaders who can master multi-temporality are prerequisites to successful transition. During leadership transitions, the need to address multi-temporality

issues is more pressing in family and/or formerly entrepreneurial or, as we posit, re-entrepreneurial firms (James, 1999; Lowenstein & Thaler, 1989; Lumpkin & Brigham, 2011). This is because ‘retired’ founders, founders who remain engaged, and/or current managers/employees often hold large financial, emotional, and reputational stakes in the firm (Chrisman, Chua, & Steier, 2011; Gómez-Mejía, Takács Haynes, Núñez-Nickel, Jacobson, & Moyano-Fuentes, 2007). Based on these concepts, we believe:

- Success prospects of formerly entrepreneurial but now mature firms experiencing leadership succession events are enhanced when residual managers/employees sense that the new (re-entrepreneurial) leader is capable of moving the enterprise toward a more positive future.
- Prospects for successful redirection (because mature firms typically must revisit their formerly entrepreneurial strategies) within firms undergoing succession experiences are enhanced when re-entrepreneurial leaders appropriate and demonstrate respect for the heritage, accumulated wisdom, and firm’s founder(s) while they—that is, the RSLs—are developing their own guiding visions.
- Perseverance with which managers/employees execute newly installed re-entrepreneurial vision is elevated when re-entrepreneurial leaders judiciously integrate management measures that feature clearly described financial and nonfinancial expectations, appropriate team-building practices, and attractively achievable incentives as motivations.

Table 1. Leading the (r)evolution

LEADING THE (R)EVOLUTION Rules for Re-Entrepreneurs		
PRINCIPLES	RULES	PRACTICAL TIPS
Check Your Ego	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 2. Respect the past, ease its passing • Rule 3. Enter listening and learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be public in praise of the past • Moderate your transition timing • Listen most intensely to those who disagree • Don't think less of yourself; just think about yourself less
Resist Inertia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 5. Pull core teams together quickly • Rule 6. Set clear, realistic and specific expectations • Rule 7. Share the wealth 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discern whom you can trust to support change • Disarm resentment with inclusion • Provide a clear platform for decision-making • Increase the pace and pressure gradually • What gets measured gets done • Connect support to reward
Practice Patience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 1. Decide where to stop, when to begin anew • Rule 4. Promote “The Future” relentlessly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't announce your vision prematurely • Be flexible in visioning, open to course-correction • Know that mature firms may punish missteps mercilessly • Stories make people care, including what happens without new vision and energy

We present means to effectively manage multi-temporality and related emotionally laden issues in our re-entrepreneurial framework. The following insights and recommendations should profit RSLs as they address past, present, and future considerations in an attempt to re-entrepreneurially (r)evolutionize the mature firms they now lead.

5. Leading re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions: Framing principles

Even when RSLs have done due diligence and negotiated for months, presumably understanding most challenges set before them, leadership transitions inevitably bring surprises. The RSLs may have spent years thinking about how things would be different if they were the boss, and be eager to initiate previously suggested innovations or proposals for

improvement that were ignored by prior leaders. In addition, they might already know who the best employees are, whose loyalty will not prove prohibitively expensive to rent, which customer relationships are strongest, vendors who functioned as trusted partners in the prior regime's success, and the financial platforms on which former leaders depended for years. However, what even experienced RSLs cannot know or expect is how occupying succession leadership roles changes *them*. RSLs change because their perspective—at times, even regarding seemingly small decisions—has radically changed. RSLs learn, instantly, the degree to which their “point-of-view pivots on their point-of-viewing.” [Unless cited otherwise, this and subsequent quotes are from experts or are an amalgam of expert conversations.]

Previously, the RSL likely held a prestigious job—but just a job. Then, suddenly, he or she is burdened and bolstered by explicit commitments they have made to others. The RSL is invested, financially and emotionally, in creating new futures for himself/herself, the enterprise, and stakeholders. “Notions of skin-in-the-game no longer suffice. An arm, leg, perhaps other body parts are now engaged.” Partners, department heads or practice leaders, rank-and-file employees, customers, vendors, and financial partners now depend on the RSL to not miss a payment.

Yesterday, the RSL “worried about getting proposals submitted on time and whined about working on Saturday.” Today, the RSL “stresses about making payroll when a client payment is late.” Previously, the RSL aligned, perhaps grudgingly, with others' leadership and goals; now stakeholders place hopes, perhaps reluctantly, in the RSL's leadership because the RSL alone ultimately determines how a stodgy firm will learn to thrive again. Expert advice: “Breathe deeply and slowly.” Or, as yoga instructors say: “Breathe in hope; breathe out fear.”

Practically, RSLs must address three obstacles—effectively, three *don'ts* related to their ego, their impatience, and their own and others' inertia—that will likely arise as they seek a middle path between honoring the enterprise's heritable best and re-entrepreneurialing the rest toward a renewed culture that permits firms (paraphrasing Robert Louis Stevenson) to make the most of their best and the least of their worst.

5.1. Check your ego at the door

During re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution, “not-to-do lists may prove as crucial as to-do lists.” Shortly before or after entering their new roles, RSLs “may be tempted to announce a new sheriff has arrived.”

Don't. “There is no need to meet with every client, send letters to every vendor, or necessarily issue press releases, at least not at first.” Avoid “I,” when possible, at the start. “People never want to wade through your *ego* to get to your *info*.”

Issuing “‘here-I-am’ pronouncements” may make you feel good when you do it; remember, however, “this is not about you.” Re-entrepreneurial “transitions begin with assuring the firm's continuity.” Former J.C. Penney CEO Ron Johnson might have benefitted from such advice. For most people, any change represents a threat and is viewed with caution. “Former colleagues or direct reports, customers or vendors who knew the RSL as an employee do not know you as the leader.” Trust must be re-established now that RSLs represent the new. Humility rather than hubris or haste will earn space, respect, and insight as necessary for RSLs “to slow baste decisions before pursuing disruptive change.”

Avoid being a falsely humble egoist. Never play “‘ah, shucks, little ole me’” games “because RSLs may prove more persuasive than they thought possible.” At the same time, as RSLs enter the role, one playground rule resonates: “Nobody likes bossy little boys or girls.” Fine lines divide self-confidence from arrogance; cross those lines, and RSLs annoy legacy managers. RSLs generally will not succeed by ordering people around. Prospects improve when RSLs “lead, coach, and motivate subordinates, edging others gradually toward their personal vision.”

5.2. Don't let inertia erode your will

Ironically, as RSLs “tap the brakes on their ego,” the undertow of old comfort zones may become harder to resist. Facing scores of new decisions, human nature may draw RSLs toward those they are most used to making. Weaker-minded RSLs may freeze, holding things constant in the comfort zone of familiar issues and expected outcomes.

Inertia presents in other forms. “Don't judge new situations through the lens of the old-and-gone” or familiar criteria. There are few new problems, only old solutions that, in enterprises requiring re-entrepreneurship, no longer work. RSLs should avoid trying to understand or solve new problems by using default processes or past solutions. Instead, they should “analyze each new situation on its own terms and future impact” on current and prospective success.

Changing how things are done frequently leads to explicit or sub-rosa conflict. RSLs “may be tempted to cave and allow the firm to return to old ways to maintain peace with people or groups who appear

irreplaceable” at the time. Don’t. Before changing anything, take the time to parse out the importance and consequences of decisions that most need to be made. “Only then can RSLs create and sell solutions to existing personnel unencumbered by the need for compromise.”

5.3. Don’t be impatient

As mentioned, RSLs may have mentally visualized the (r)evolutionary directions in which they would steer the firm. An expert observation: “Everyone knows patience is a virtue. But waiting sucks.” We conceive of re-entrepreneurship itself as an activity that paradoxically rewards patience and action: thinking like people of action while remaining patient enough to act, at opportune moments, like people of thought.

Three bad things may happen if RSLs take their vision public too soon; that is, without establishing success prerequisites and securing genuine buy-in, not just resentful acquiescence, from legacy personnel. First, RSLs forego opportunities to learn what they don’t know about how things really get done: the unknown-known(s) (Rumsfeld, 2013). Second, RSLs secure less insight about whether the needs of key personnel that they thought were satisfied actually remain up for grabs. Third, RSLs may sacrifice, on the altar of expediency, the chance to rally unexpectedly valuable key players behind a fresh vision for the future. Patience is a virtue, yet patience can be a vice. However, judicious patience followed by action when the time is right is rarely wrong. Or, to paraphrase John Wooden: Move quickly, but with patience.

6. Leading re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions: Guiding rules

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn (1973, p. 337) asked: “If you want to change the world, who do you begin with, yourself or others?” The answer is self-evident: the place for succession leaders to begin a re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution in any mature firm is within themselves. Seven rules, along actionable guidelines, follow. It is worth noting that each rule is independently grounded in expert informants’ experience and their willingness to share. But the 1st, 2nd, and 4th rules are similar to tenets offered in the famous book, *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies* (Collins & Porras, 1994). Specifically, those three rules are consonant with *Built to Last’s* imperative: “Stimulate progress, preserve the core.”

6.1. Rule #1: Before beginning anew, think about where to stop

Otto von Bismarck was a fierce, patient and, in our view, extraordinarily entrepreneurial leader. During his rise and throughout his long rule, the Iron Chancellor was driven by only one vision: unifying an independent German state led by Prussia. This singular vision, which never changed, informed every leadership decision he made (Stone, 1994). In service of his vision, Bismarck first instigated war against Austria to secure Prussian independence. Bismarck quickly prevailed, but never occupied Austrian territory; the act was incompatible with his vision. To unify Germany’s principalities, he next launched war against, and swiftly defeated, France—offering munificent peace terms. Bismarck never again initiated aggression against an external foe. He had achieved his original vision and stopped at that.

When RSLs plan ahead, visioning compelling ends, they become less distracted by emotion and desires to freelance. Clarity of purpose minimizes uncertainty, lowers anxiety, and quells discord within mature organizations. Endings are critical to successful re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutions. Once their aims are achieved, RSLs are free to envision new, more challenging goals. Unlike Bismarck, RSLs should always designate a victory-declaring stopping point at which they reinvent steps and processes to become new again. “Re-entrepreneurship has no end.” But it should have bounded beginnings.

As re-entrepreneurial visioning begins, mature enterprises “require ideas bigger than new ownership to focus upon and rally around. Vision is important.” Yet, RSLs should proceed deliberately when developing a vision. By turns, our experts suggested first, “crafting visions carefully is more important than hitting the ground running”; second, “there’s no delete key to tap if early mistakes occur”; and third, that “faith must be restored or earned” before visions are developed or executed.

Three visioning guidelines emerged: First, crystallizing a vision requires simplification and clarification. “Specific visions are less bad than vague visions.” And “fewer/shorter is less bad than more/longer.” Second, RSLs “are not marrying, rather simply dating, any initial vision that they pursue.” If an end is not working, end it. Third, begin knowing that mature organizations can be unmerciful. Maturity inside enterprises tears away illusions like thinner strips paint, and with that, RSLs’ “ability to thrill or fool people whom they now lead. Don’t try.”

6.2. Rule #2: Respect the past to ease its passing

Entering, RSLs “should give mature enterprises and founders who realized their visions all honor due.” After all, mature entrepreneurial enterprises often were highly successful at one time. Simple, respectful acts may prove foundational to successful re-launches.

Key personnel will understand that succession events are usually accompanied by reinvigorating change. But the past is powerful. Mature firms “are memory-bearing institutions.” Even perceptive people often cling to past habits and feel threatened by changes—or change agents—that upset their routines. Yet they, and RSLs, should disabuse themselves of any belief in permanence. Re-entrepreneurial visions would rarely succeed without an organizational-cultural revolution. Three actions may elevate the chance that your re-entrepreneurial revolution will survive the inevitable resistance. First, “determine in consultation with the former leader how best to legitimately honor him/her.” Second, “get him/her to literally sign on to your necessarily tentative plans.” Third, before entering as the RSL, “take contractual measures to limit the founder’s unsolicited future involvement.”

Experts offered three additional past-related guidelines. First, “watch your timing.” When material changes are necessary but not universally acceptable, RSLs “should avoid appearances of transitional vacuums” while consciously moving forward patiently. Otherwise, personnel “fill vacuums with negative thoughts or deeds.” “Initiate small changes; enact gentler reforms at the start,” framing reforms within known, currently comforting processes or cultural traditions. Experts agreed: “Be discerning.” Radically new beginnings are sometimes necessary, “but never change everything.” Continuing parts of, and thus demonstrating respect for, the past is desirable.

Second, “publicly support the past.” Distribute “statements underscoring respect for the founder, for his or her leadership, accomplishment, and legacy.” Demonstrate humility and gratitude for opportunities that the founder fashioned for you. Avoid creating resentment; “resentment is what bleeds when pride is hurt.” Resentment injures those exposed to it. Resentment also corrodes its container: here, the mature enterprise. “Turning the other cheek to overtly expressed resentment is ultimately self-defeating.” Responses such as “termination, reassignment, or marginalization are self-evidently always available” to RSLs. Serious conflicts rarely end absent the prospect or use of such measures. Times will arise when hard leadership

must be experienced, but we contend that for RSLs, it should not be at first.

Third, RSLs should strive to “see themselves as others see them.” RSLs should recognize the importance of “nuanced decisions that reflect their character while knowing whose character is most critical.” RSLs should “display gratitude.” They, after all, are primary beneficiaries of founders’ entrepreneurial success. With apologies to Barack Obama, founders really did build this; beneficiaries, as receivers, are morally obligated to honor and express their appreciation.

6.3. Rule #3: Enter listening and learning

Experts agreed: re-entrepreneurial “success is grounded in persuasion and motivation.” To become more persuasive, “lay out important choices as situations where value (i.e., dollars, customers, jobs, promotions, mature enterprises themselves) will be lost if the bad choices are made.” Framing decisions negatively increases positive anxiety that “nudges deciders in directions that persuaders seek.” They gravitate naturally toward the right choice; for example, the one that alleviates anxiety. The approach is quiet, subtle, understated hardball—but effective.

Yet, nice-guy RSLs can win. Persuasiveness might be elevated through less-stressful tactics. One approach entails, simply, “a demonstrated willingness and ability to listen.” Re-entrepreneurship and persuasion are each, in part, contests of appearance. When leaders, succession or otherwise, say less and listen more, they appear powerful and knowledgeable (Strutton, 2004), especially in the uncertain context that RSLs generally enter. Screenwriters may agree. Consider Denzel Washington’s character in the film *American Gangster*, who observed: “The loudest man in the room is the weakest man in the room.”

RSLs should also speak less for purposes of listening more and thereby getting smarter. Power flows from actionable knowledge. RSLs should listen to learn how things really work, or once worked, before initiating change. RSLs’ entry into re-entrepreneurial roles unquestionably changes their relationships with stakeholders. Another reason to listen rather than speak is irreducible: “Once words come out, they cannot be taken back.” Verbose leaders are rarely seen as wise or polished. “Labels like know-it-all, arrogant, or worse” are likely to arise.

How should RSLs listen? Two words, each familiar, suffice: “with humility.” RSLs may learn how difficult it is to discover even simple truths in the new setting they plan to change. Experiencing doubt

about whether you know all you need to does not signal weakness, but sanity. Never fear doubt; embrace it to identify and eliminate its causes through listening.

Four guidelines resonate: First, “listen most intently to those with whom you most disagree, especially about future directions.” Smart people learn more from antagonists than fools from friends. Second, an RSL’s willingness to listen open-mindedly with complete attention and no pre-judgment toward another demonstrates regard and respect. Few people listen passionately to others; rather, the human tendency is to concurrently script verbal or mental responses. Third, “listen more, say less until in your new role you learn who you can trust or whose trust is not too dearly priced.” Fourth, humans are unique in their ability to learn from the experience of others—and ignore the lessons. “RSLs should become remarkable in their ability to not ignore.”

6.4. Rule #4: Promote the future relentlessly

The pace of modern living is threatening to overwhelm us. A recent multinational study demonstrated that in even the most ordinary of activities, like walking down the street, the greater the modernity of the country, the quicker the gait of its citizens (Gleick, 2011). Yet, our U.S. experts continue to advocate deliberation. RSLs, they say, “should live on the horizon.” Horizons offer vantage points from which to look back to assess what has happened and forward to determine what should be done, thereby understanding as much about the past as prospects sought for the future. Said Winston Churchill: “The farther back you can look, the farther ahead you are likely to see.”

Time for reflection is critical because “successful re-entrepreneurship requires making accurate bets about future human behaviors: which ideas will yield profitable new revenue, which employees will succeed,” and what story will motivate current or potential employees to bring a vision to fruition. Future versions of the story can be refined as necessary, so long as they remain consistent with the vision, because nothing ages faster than the future for entrepreneurs. Stories about the future should then be widely circulated through various media and message forms to key internal audiences, with the candor and transparency that today’s workforces deem indispensable.

Two experts responded similarly when asked what should be told about the future. Each agreed that “no one-size-fits-all re-entrepreneurial story exists.” One referenced the first rule of storytelling:

“Make me care.” How can RSLs make key stakeholders care? “One way is to scare. The other way is to inspire.” Many RSL stories could legitimately feature themes of “impending disaster. If something new and better is not done soon. . . .” Mature enterprises, Schumpeter observed, are routinely threatened by the creatively destructive effects of new competitors or substitute products. But re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutionary stories need not universally threaten. Stories might “challenge or reinforce future values, expectations, and rewards once the future has worked itself out.” In sum, stories can concurrently inspire and threaten. The right stories may prove fundamental to re-entrepreneurial success. After all, absent willing followers—even scared ones—RSLs “are just administrators slowly walking nowhere.”

6.5. Rule #5: Put core teams together ASAP

RSLs manage assets, but they must also lead people. The re-entrepreneurial (r)evolutionary process requires potentially disruptive team-building decisions such as “leapfrogging ‘your people’ over others who have been with the company longer” (a group we call Founding Followers), hiring outsiders, or phasing out legacy employees who no longer fit. Each personnel choice sends messages throughout the organization. Some staff members may get angry, and unintended consequences are likely. As team-building problems are addressed, few entirely right or wrong solutions may be apparent; the most important staffing decisions are accompanied by unique risks and rewards. “Collateral damage is part of the process.” Yet, one consequence may be relief. One expert reported: “Once formerly protected incompetents were dismissed, and that specific uncertainty was resolved, most people relaxed.”

Molding successful re-entrepreneurial teams entails “getting effective, high-ego employees to work together reasonably well; reasonably well is good enough.” Never choose teammates just because they think alike, think like you, or know what you know. When Jesus created his team, he did not select another rabbi.

Three team-building guidelines apply: First, pay attention to chemistry, but not in obvious ways. When possible, “make sure you have a maverick on your team. Find ways to protect that valuable voice.” Second, arriving at a consensus too soon may prove worse than arriving at a consensus too late. When team consensus arrives too fast, opportunities for creative ideas, solutions, or initiatives that can only be wrought through time spent reconciling diverse views diminish. Mary Parker Follett,

Peter Drucker's guru, wrote: "Contentious problems are best solved not by imposing a single point of view at the expense of all others, but by striving for a higher-order solution that integrates the diverse perspectives of all relevant constituents" (Hamel & Breen, 2013, p. 186). Third, "bring your best people together the best you can as teams are assembled." When people complement a team's purpose, assign them, even if you don't like it. Ronald Reagan said it well: "My 80% friend [issues where we agree] is not my 20% enemy [issues where we disagree]" (Emery, 2013). Re-entrepreneurship, as a process, rewards addition more than subtraction. The more you get individual team members pulling together—despite their diverse perspectives—rather than sitting dormant or pulling apart, the sooner things can become new again.

6.6. Rule #6: Establish clear expectations

Experts agreed that RSLs must "create expectations that encourage others to buy into and work toward your vision." Clarity about expectations allows RSLs to coordinate, reward, or sanction behaviors. Expectations reduce uncertainty, and with it, perceived risk. Each outcome is critical because RSLs must manage uncertainty and persuade others, including themselves, to take measured risks despite the inevitable presence of uncertainty.

Risk describes situations where RSLs generally understand the range and probability of possible outcomes. Risk is neither friend nor foe to re-entrepreneurs; it is simply an anticipated fact of business life. Uncertainty is more troubling to the organization, particularly during re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution. "Uncertainty may dominate, and not for the better" during re-entrepreneurial transition. "No one, for example, knows how long changes will last, how employees or customers might react, or whether things will ever return approximately to what they once understood as normal," although many surely desire to know. Uncertainty will dominate until and unless RSLs establish credible competing expectations.

Four guidelines may help. First, expectations, once established, "exist to provide context for decisions; for example, resource allocation. Develop and use expectations as such." Moreover, "not all pre-existing stakeholder expectations exist as current or future obligations," so "avoid rash early promises; often, these can't be kept."

Second, RSLs should create current expectations as if they were looking back from the future at the behavioral and enterprise-wide consequences that flowed from each expectation they established. Expectations always generate consequences. Equally

fundamental: Respect the fact that if the consequences that resulted from imposed expectations arose immediately, two auspicious outcomes would result. First, "employees would make better decisions." Second, RSLs "would create more constructive expectations."

Third, people usually imagine consequences as negative. This view is limiting; consequences can be positive or negative. As many realize, what gets measured gets managed. But there's more to measurement than that, because what gets rewarded (measurement-wise) gets done better. Clearly, mere measurement, as imposed through expectations, is not enough. Precisely delineated rewards or penalties (i.e., consequences) should also be attached to key expectations. Re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution is an ongoing process in which renewed, more rewarding futures can be evoked by RSLs through creation and management of expectations.

Fourth, there is a time to speed up and challenge employees to the point of anxiety through expectations imposed upon them. "Should employees leave or fold, they were not yours or useful, anyway." Proper doses of anxiety can motivate peak performance. "Too little anxiety can breed apathy; too much, paralysis." Employees will often choose nothing if they sense no good choices are available. Re-entrepreneurial expectations, however, create choices. Much of re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution entails "convincing people simply to do their jobs better" or, we add, having RSLs who are willing to challenge and then reward personnel for doing hard jobs well.

6.7. Rule #7: Share the wealth

RSLs "never succeed alone. Success depends in part on how well they motivate and direct others." RSLs "must squeeze, unleash, and discover the best from their best." Tangible and intangible rewards are important to people, and rewards shape behaviors. Therefore, rational people are motivated by tangible—usually financial—incentives. Incentives, especially in mature enterprises, should also include opportunities to achieve, earn recognition and responsibility, and learn. Successful RSLs, according to one expert, "must leverage each."

RSLs can manage incentives by broadcasting or narrowcasting how new reward systems will work. Every expert agreed: RSLs must change the legacy reward systems that once prevailed within mature enterprises. "Failing to do this actually rewards resistance to change."

Work generally must feature three qualities for it to motivate: autonomy, complexity, and connections between effort and reward. When connections

are evident between intense effort and ample reward, strong re-entrepreneurial bonds are forged—the sort that only shared misery or wonderful opportunity generate. Experts were adamant: “Push people hard.” “The degree of difficulty” and/or “importance of tasks” should be explained to personnel and rewarded accordingly, even when motivating incentives lean heavily on yet-unrealized but accessible back-ends. RSLs should be realistic when explaining expectations and prospects. Realism, rather than strategically correct values-based rhetoric, accurately reflects how people and businesses decide and behave. Realism is amoral, rightly focusing on mutual interests and outcomes instead of values in a fundamentally cynical world. “Employees will respond more readily to reality than rhetoric.”

Corinthians 9:9 reads: “Do not muzzle an ox when using it to thresh grain.” Of course, Paul wasn’t writing about oxen. If oxen have the right to expect this from humans, people have an even greater right to expect certain autonomies from RSLs. Anyone who plows or reaps should do so freely with an expectation of receiving fair, and pre-determined, shares. “Employees and partners surely expect to earn fair rewards from their successful efforts.” RSLs who honor this rule can press forward knowing they are doing right and incentivizing followers to assist them materially as they renew entrepreneurial spirits inside mature enterprises.

7. Leading the re-entrepreneurial (r)evolution: Re-visioning

Visioning issues permeated the preceding discussion. Re-entrepreneurial visioning was broadly contextualized, its importance repeatedly emphasized. Various generalizable *do’s* and *don’ts* related to visioning were introduced. Yet here, we can only recommend that RSLs and their teams should invest significant time in crafting a re-entrepreneurial vision that aligns with their personal needs and goals and with the specific circumstances they face inside and outside their mature enterprise.

Experts agreed: “The ideal re-entrepreneurial vision,” like beauty, “is idiosyncratic.” Ideal visions are necessarily particular to each mature enterprise’s stock of talent, time, or financial resources; to their market and/or technological orientation and organizational/psychological climate; and to the customers, with their competitive and micro- and macro-environmental trends—that is, opportunities and threats that firms might exploit or avoid.

We offer two visioning recommendations. First, when creating visions, RSLs “must step outside their enterprise.” That entails addressing challenging

and fundamental questions: What customer needs does your firm satisfy now? What prospect needs could it satisfy in the future? What is the gap between the needs the enterprise could satisfy in the future and what it does now, and can that gap be bridged? What competitive advantages does your enterprise currently possess? What advantages could it create? What old competencies should be de-emphasized? What new competencies can it create?

This is called outside-in visioning. The questions are easily understood and sensible, and they can be answered. But while Michael Porter (1980) would undoubtedly approve, this form of visioning is hard to master. Humans naturally think inside-out. Still, these visioning recommendations remain useful. Answering each question should help all RSLs as they clarify their personal vision of renewed futures for the mature enterprises they now lead.

Second, another more ecumenical visioning alternative is available: a re-entrepreneurially opportunistic-visionary path. This approach entails identifying opportunities promising potentially large payoffs at manageable costs that mature enterprises could pursue at opportune moments. Even if the long-range vision is cloudy, re-entrepreneurs can seek out such openings, find one, and quickly develop right-now visions and goals appropriate to the opportunity. Dr. Martin Luther King followed this path in 1955–1956 when he opportunistically exploited unanticipated boycotts in Montgomery, Alabama, in service of his overarching vision for equal rights. Consequently, the mature enterprise that was America—188 years old when the Civil Rights Act passed in 1964—slowly became new again. The logic of re-entrepreneurially opportunistic visioning is grounded in the fact that what appears new, even daring, when introduced is usually nothing more or less than a creative re-combination of familiar elements re-introduced at a singularly opportune moment. Throughout history there was only one first arrowhead, wheel, printing press, steam engine, computer chip, etc. Everything else, essentially, derives from some original. Schumpeter, the champion of entrepreneurship and creative destruction, would likely agree.

References

- Allen, P., & Bayer Sager, C. (1974). *Continental American* [Music album]. A&M Records.
- The Atlantic*. (2014, April 16). The big question: What was the worst business decision ever made? Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/05/what-was-the-worst-business-decision-ever-made/359822/>

- Chrisman, J., Chua, J., & Steier, L. (2011). Resilience of family firms: An introduction. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(6), 1107–1118.
- Collins, J., & Porras, J. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: Harper Business Essentials.
- Emery, N. (2013, October 22). Tea Party conservatives should seek out more of Reagan's '80%' friends. *Washington Examiner*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/tea-party-conservatives-should-look-out-more-of-reagans-80-percent-friends/article/2537570>
- Gleick, J. (2011). *Faster: The acceleration of just about everything*. London: Vintage.
- Gómez-Mejía, L. R., Takács Haynes, K., Núñez-Nickel, M., Jacobson, K. J. L., & Moyano-Fuentes, J. (2007). Socioeconomic wealth and business risks in family-controlled firms: Evidence from Spanish olive oil mills. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(1), 106–137.
- Hamel, G., & Breen, B. (2013). *The future of management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- James, H. (1999). Owner as manager, extended horizons and the family firm. *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, 6(1), 41–55.
- Le Breton-Miller, I., & Miller, D. (2011). Family firms and the advantage of multi-temporality. *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, 35(6), 1171–1177.
- Lowenstein, G., & Thaler, R. (1989). Anomalies: Intertemporal choice. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 3(4), 181–193.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Brigham, K. H. (2011). Long-term orientation and intertemporal choice in family firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(6), 1149–1169.
- Marshall, J., Sorenson, R., Brigham, K., Wieling, E., Reifman, A., & Wampler, R. (2006). The paradox for the family firm CEO: Owner age relationship to succession-related processes and plans. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(3), 348–368.
- Morris, M., Williams, R., Allen, J., & Avila, R. (1997). Correlates of success in family business transitions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(5), 385–401.
- Porter, M. (1980). *Competitive strategy: Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors*. New York: Free Press.
- Rumsfeld, D. (2013). *Known and unknown: A memoir*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Schumpeter, J. (1950). *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Solzhenitsyn, A. (1973). *The gulag archipelago*. London: HT Willetts.
- Stone, J. (1994). Bismarck and the containment of France, 1873–1877. *Canadian Journal of History*, 9(2), 281–304.
- Strutton, D. (2004). The courtly path to leadership. *Business Horizons*, 47(1), 7–18.
- Surowiecki, J. (2014, May 19). Epic fails of the startup world. *The New Yorker*, p. 36.