

# Dimensión Empresarial

FREE ASSAY ON SCIENCE TOPICS

## INTRAPRENEURSHIP AND EXPECTATIONS RESTRICTIONS

EL INTRAEMPREDIMIENTO Y LAS RESTRICCIONES DE EXPECTATIVAS

RESTRICÇÕES DE INTRAEMPREENDEDORISMO E EXPECTATIVAS

Free essay developed in Hasan Kalyoncu University, [www.hku.edu.tr](http://www.hku.edu.tr), Namık Kemal University, [www.nku.edu.tr](http://www.nku.edu.tr) and University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, <https://www.thk.edu.tr>, Turkey. Reception date 28/10/2019. Acceptance date 15/02/2020

**Olcay Okun**

PhD Business Administration, assistant professor in Hasan Kalyoncu University, Turkey. Mail: [olcayokun@hku.edu.tr](mailto:olcayokun@hku.edu.tr)

**Korhan Arun**

PhD Business Administration, associate professor in Namık Kemal University, Turkey. Mail: [karun@nku.edu.tr](mailto:karun@nku.edu.tr)

**Suat Begec**

PhD Business Administration, associate professor in University of Turkish Aeronautical Association, Turkey. Mail: [sbegec@thk.edu.tr](mailto:sbegec@thk.edu.tr)

### How to cite this article

Okun, Olcay; Arun, Korhan & Begec, Suat (2020). Intrapreneurship and expectations restrictions. *Dimensión Empresarial*, 18(2). DOI: 10.15665/dem.v18i2.2181

### Abstract

This article develops arguments about the factors that promote intrapreneurship in relation to role theory. These are based on contributions from interactional and structural sociology. Fixed theoretical tools for intrapreneurship are not enough. So, the structural and interactionist perspective of sociology is necessary to understand the concept of intrapreneurship. The above approaches depend on individuals, organizations or environments to encourage potential employees to be intrapreneurs. Thus, expectations can be a cornerstone for intrapreneurship because intrapreneurs learn from their roles. Keywords: Intrapreneurship, Role Theory

### Resumen

Este artículo desarrolla argumentos sobre los factores que promueven el intraemprendimiento en relación con la teoría de roles. Estos se basan en contribuciones de la sociología interaccional y estructural. Las herramientas teóricas fijas para el intraemprendimiento no son suficientes. Entonces, la perspectiva estructural e interaccionista de la sociología es necesaria para comprender el concepto de intraemprendimiento. Los enfoques anteriores dependen de individuos, organizaciones o entornos para impulsar a los empleados potenciales a ser intraemprendedores. Así, Las expectativas pueden ser una piedra angular para el intraemprendimiento porque los intraemprendedores aprenden de sus roles. Palabras clave: intraemprendimiento, teoría de los roles.

### Resumo

Este artigo desenvolve argumentos sobre os fatores que promovem o intraempreendedorismo em relação à teoria de papéis. Estes são baseados em contribuições da sociologia estrutural e interacional. Ferramentas teóricas fixas para o intraempreendedorismo não são suficientes. Portanto, a perspectiva estrutural e interacionista da sociologia é necessária para entender o conceito de intraempreendedorismo. As abordagens acima dependem de indivíduos, organizações ou ambientes para incentivar os funcionários em potencial a serem intraempreendedores. Assim, as expectativas podem ser uma pedra angular do intraempreendedorismo, porque os intraempreendedores aprendem com seus papéis. Palavras-chave: intraempreendedorismo, teoria do papel



## LITERATURE

A comprehensive panorama of entrepreneurship and transition to intrapreneurship covers the actions of entrepreneurs within the organizations. Intrapreneurship is vital in today's highly competitive and fast-changing environment for a legitimate route towards increased levels of organizational performance (Hayton et al., 2013). The term intrapreneur was coined in 1978 by Gifford and Libba Pinchot (Hadad & Cantaragiu, 2017; Pinchot & Pinchot, 1978). Pinchot used the term "intrapreneurship" to describe individual intracorporate entrepreneurship. In the literature, however, intrapreneurship is usually studied as behaviors (Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). As a result, intrapreneurship has been developed through individual components (Skarmeas et al., 2016). Another gap in the literature that to make the fruits of intrapreneurship a reality, intrapreneurship is seen as depending on pushing mechanisms by either the entrepreneurs' characteristics or characteristics of entrepreneur organizations (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003). Meaning of intrapreneurship provides people with expectations for themselves, others and the world around them (Salzman, 2018) in other words, when literature mentions entrepreneur organizations that can have a different meaning for the individuals.

In previous literature, intrapreneurship concepts had four distinct dimensions: new business venturing, innovativeness, self-renewal, and proactiveness (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). Later, studies expanded eight intrapreneurship categories: new ventures, new business, product/service innovativeness, process innovativeness, self-renewal, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003). Autonomy Research showed that intrapreneurship has organizational and environmental characteristics as predictors (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001).

Being cumulative intersection of two or more sets, which are isolated according to a specific characteristic(s) and united by a particular definition, (Rand et al., 1990) scientists have formed the intrapreneurship concepts. To define a concept, the distinctions between descriptions and causes are important. The attributional analysis, in other words, the analysis of causation deals with the conditions

when correspondent inferences are least likely to be made, precisely, when the behavior violates the operative expectancy (Uleman, 2015). These attributional analyses come from impromptu trait inferences, which describe the trait, not the causes of the trait. However, spontaneous represents being unintentional and mostly unconscious that traits are not the only concepts that describe behaviors but goals or behavioral gist. When researchers define the intrapreneurs' traits or organizational context, they are representing the intrapreneurship concept as spontaneous trait transference. In this process, the concept which the researcher tries to reveal becomes associated not with the person who enacts the behavior but with another person (a communicator or informant) who describes that behavior by someone else but does not perform it (Uleman, 2015). From that point of view, intrapreneurship traits may not be the causes; instead, they are descriptions. So, the question is why intrapreneurs have these traits? The purpose of the intrapreneurship behaviors does not solely depend on individuals but also depend on dictations from social factors and organizational expectations. In other words, they play roles, which are expected of them. In this case, intrapreneurship has expected behaviors or roles, which are in the set of Role theory. Role theory concerns organizational social life and behavior patterns or roles (B. J. Biddle, 1986). So, in this paper, intrapreneurship is related to role theory because literature support that intrapreneurship has not only individual facts but also many organizational and environmental characteristics.

Intrapreneurship is entrepreneurial activities conducted within the organization to support organizational strategy (Gaertner, 2014). Research in this area has depended on how employees could be inspired to behave entrepreneurially but within the existing organizational framework (Gundogdu, 2012). However, how employees accomplish or get entrepreneurial roles in the organization never truly exposed to academic research. The literature generally depends on behavioral characteristics or personality traits (Rauch & Frese, 2007) of entrepreneurs but even not general attributes of intrapreneurs have not

been constructed. However, organizations are layered structures. At organization level differentiation among subunits, at the group or team level role specialization in the team or department and individual-level role specialization for the employee (Yukl, 2013). At the organization level, new ventures or innovation can mean improving performance in teams and work units, but at the singular level, it turns to organize activities and to design jobs for increasing efficiency and best using own skills. The present paper seeks to answer three primary research questions: (a) how differentiation among subunits changes intrapreneurship role expectations, (b) how the intrapreneurs' role has been affected from unlike expectations, and (c) are group or team level expectations on intrapreneurs roles distinctive than organization and individual levels.

We contribute to the intrapreneurship literature in three ways. Early research had two essential scales. First, they measured the firm's general orientation towards entrepreneurship. The second scale has been measuring the level of engagement of the organizations in the entrepreneurship activities (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001). The first scale related to the innovative and proactive disposition of management that means organization managed an entrepreneurial culture that inspires employees (Taneja, 2010) or their values. The second scale includes venturing, innovation, and self-renewal activities (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001) or in organizational management terms: the inherent nature of organizations, entrepreneurial talent, long-term orientations, compensating creativity. Role theory creates a new intersection set of these two scales. Because role theory is based on expectations, and these expectations depend on organizational values including.

The second contribution of this theoretical argument that intrapreneurship is transferable, but the varying quantity depends on another quantity. This leads to the second contribution of the paper: are role relationships developed based on shared expectations about the behavior and attitudes of other individuals (Hassard, 1995) rather than organizational culture? Without this concept, the attribution of functions to system parts would be impossible (Parsons, 2014). Intrapreneurship, as role incumbents, not just firm personals, may develop intrapreneurship role depending on the transformation of the behavior by transfer of the knowledge domain of the role senders. Transfer of knowledge and know-how or domain of the intrapreneurship behavior can endure over time (Redding, 1993) to the codomain of the intrapreneur function/selection as a role. Unfortunately, both above theories focus more on intra-firm dynamics for the acquisition of resources and experiential knowledge over time and much less on potential inter-firm relations for access to accumulated resources. Nevertheless, extra-firm interactions are also significant in these interactions and defining intrapreneurship dimensions.

Finally, we move beyond the two-domain. Role theory is connecting "social" and "psychological" aspects of intrapreneurship. Psychology studies the individual self or mind which explains stages of associationism, parallelism, functionalism, and behaviorism of the intrapreneur as singular; role defining and prioritizing. On the other hand, the social context in which intrapreneur functioning explains the indications of the later stages of the social act; role-taking in this case. Indeed, in this commentary, we argue that role theory has more been explaining the force other than just organizational or behavioral vectors for intrapreneurship.

---

## INTRAPRENEURSHIP

---

Even highly focused on literature, there is no quite a definition of intrapreneurship. Schumpeter (1983, 1993) first mentioned the entrepreneurship in the global economic environment; replacing the products and the processes is undoubtedly take place within organizations, that falls under the intrapreneurship concepts. However, intra-corporate entrepreneurship term first used by Pinchot and Pinchot (1978) as a decentralized work intention. Authors have

been using different terms (Gundogdu, 2012) for intrapreneurship: internal corporate ventures (von Hippel, 1977); internal entrepreneurship (Ma et al., 2016), and corporate entrepreneurship (Azami, 2013; Birkinshaw, 2003; Garvin & Levesque, 2006; Guth & Ginsberg, 1990; Hitt et al., 2001; Zahra, 1991).

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2016) defines intrapreneurship as "the

person who takes the entire responsibility of transforming an idea into a product ready for the market through risk taking and innovation". These terms refer to groups' or employees' entrepreneurial activities within the formal organization and explicitly supported resources (Taneja, 2010).

Previous research has identified several reasons why new opportunities might be exploited via entrepreneurship rather than intrapreneurship. These include agency costs which affect contracts between employees and employers; transferable human capital and limited asset complementarity within existing firms; and organizational limitations of incumbents such as bureaucracy and rigid routines (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Parker, 2011; Zahra, 1991).

Entrepreneurship is not limited to the business context. However, the applications: entrepreneurial capacity, opportunities, and intentions are rarely discussed (McKenzie et al., 2007). The scope of intrapreneurship is constricted to the existing organizational area. On the other hand, the intrapreneur, is not subject to such criteria. The innopreneur, is a prototype, self-developed to meet the needs of the new economy. The innopreneur is the fresh evolutionary model, the cumulative advanced type that emerged from this environment (Gündoğdu, 2012). Intrapreneurship begins with the realization of opportunities. Entrepreneurial capacity in management science related to business management, risk-taking, and networking. Opportunities are related to characteristics of the entrepreneurs, including focusing, process, and timing. Intension links opportunity perception and culture. To the intention, the entrepreneurship is not a function of opportunity but rather is a function of the perception of opportunity (Dana, 1995; McKenzie et al., 2007) As we can understand, culture plays an important role how the entrepreneurs understand the opportunity. So, instead of focusing on the dimensions of entrepreneurship as large as possible, entrepreneurship gains much more from practicing small areas from broader concepts (Spinelli et al., 2012). This way of thinking is also applicable to intrapreneurship that connecting concept from other science, especially social science, is more useful than trying to divide and search these layers as large as possible.

Intrapreneurs are employees who do for corporate innovation what an entrepreneur does for his or her start-

up, Intrapreneurs are the dreamers who do; Intrapreneurs are self-appointed general managers of a new idea; Intrapreneurs are drivers of change to make the business a force for good (Pinchot, 2017). Azami (2013) defined similarities and differences between intrapreneurs and entrepreneurs. Intrapreneurship shares many of the critical aspects of traditional entrepreneurship. Both focus on the creation of value-added products or services and use innovation. Both make risky investments where entrepreneurs risk their own resources vs. Intrapreneurs risk the companies'. It also has some significant differences, which are more dramatic than the similarities. First, intrapreneurs try to overcome the inertia of the organization through corrective action. Second, intrapreneurs must do something despite organizational culture. Third, intrapreneurs can use the company's resources, but entrepreneurs should depend on their or extreme wealth. Fourth, intrapreneurs have not the ownership of the new creation, or they do not have the ownership of the new venture, whereas entrepreneurs can have total property depending on the ratio of the outside source.

Intrapreneurship literature has divided into three main areas. The first area researches individual characteristics; the second area focuses on formed new ventures in the existing organization, and third and last area examines the organizations that help to develop intrapreneurs (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003).

As individuals, intrapreneurs are experts in creating new opportunities, discovering current opportunities, and ultimately exploiting those opportunities. Employee intrapreneurship is creating new businesses for the organization for enhancing the organization's ability to react to internal and external advancements (Gawke et al., 2017). Intrapreneurs must be inside-outsiders (Ma et al., 2016). Gifford Pinchot (1985) describes the 10 commandments for succeeding as an intrapreneur (Buekens, 2014) which is still related to characteristics and behaviors of the intrapreneur. E.g., "Come to work each day willing to be fired." Hans Schollhammer classified five types of intrapreneurs; each has a distinctive role as an innovator and a strategy depending on corporate support. These five types are administrative, opportunistic, acquisitive, imitative, and incubate intrapreneurship (Taneja, 2010).

Newly formed ventures to mean new activities related to the existing organization. These activities are

corporate venturing, innovativeness, self-renewal, and pro-activeness. Corporate venturing is creating new brand new business for a current organization. Lee, Lee, and Pennings (2001) claimed that ventures from depending on internal capabilities. Innovation represents new products and services. Self-renewal means renewing key ideas that will transform the organization. Pro-activeness means risk-taking boldness with the initiative of top management.

Antonicic (2001) related the term to organizational size. Additionally, intra antecedents include individual antecedents of entrepreneurship, which researches the personal reasons for innovativeness, and risk-taking behaviors. The intrapreneur acts entrepreneurially in response to organizational inertia, brought about by the size, bureaucracy, or strategic near-sightedness of their firm (Zahra, 2013).

Extra-organizational antecedents do not have the same effects on intrapreneurship. Dynamism, development of technology, industry growth, and new products demand to have positive effects on intrapreneurship. Other variables, such as unfavorable change and competitive rivalry, are viewed as antagonistic (hostile).

Intrapreneurship field accepts the possibility that organizations try to push employees by inspiring or motivating to behave like entrepreneurially (de Villiers-Scheepers, 2011). It is essential to mention that individuals inheriting a highly entrepreneurial culture are merely more likely to exercise their

initiative and ingenuity (Foreman-Peck & Zhou, 2010). Thus, instead of pushing, pulling entrepreneur behaviors from employees by expecting has not been the subject of academic research.

Some researchers investigated the social form of intrapreneurship or social innovations in organizations. Social intrapreneurship has three factors: source, purpose, and nature, which are related to innovating for collective good (Davis & White, 2015; Low, 2016). Reference should be outside of normal task area otherwise responsibility; the purpose is creating positive public or environmental outcomes while advancing core business objectives, and Social innovations are capable of being institutionalized into the way the company works naturally (Davis & White, 2015; Guo & Bielefeld, 2014). Again, these factors describe the intrapreneurship from social façade, but do not give answers to "why."

Depending on how we frame the issue; intrapreneurship has been defined by behavioral concepts, which are trying to explain or distinguish these concepts from other (e.g., proactive behaviors) (Gawke et al., 2017). They defined intrapreneurship as behavior seeking both internal change environment and fit of the organization. As in the organization's nutshell, inducing conformity to social roles is strong (Hogg & Vaughan, 2018). In that sense, given the multi-occupational nature of the intrapreneurship, elucidating various concepts related to roles and role theory is necessary.

---

## ROLE THEORY AS A NEW FRAMEWORK IN THE INTRAPRENEURSHIP CONCEPT

---

The distinguishing characteristic of the intrapreneurship concept is determined by the nature of the objects from which its constituent units are being differentiated. However, the formation of a concept provides scientists with the means of identifying, not only the concretes they have observed, but all the concretes of that kind which he may encounter in the future. Assuming that a concept consists of nothing but its distinguishing characteristic is a mistake because the fact is that in the process of abstracting from abstractions, one cannot know what is a distinctive feature unless one has observed other characteristics

of the units involved and of the existents from which they are differentiated (Rand et al., 1990). In this sense, we should cover all the involved characteristic's aspects of the intrapreneurship that scientists have not researched before. Role theory came to forward as an influential aspect which must be integrated into the concept of intrapreneurship because self-develops via the social process; they take on are developed in interaction; the social process made possible by communication (Stryker, 2006). Additionally, the most universally relevant and vital factor for intrapreneurship is individuals (Aparicio, 2017) as in innovation, or in

other words, intrapreneurship is an individual concept. As a result, intrapreneurs infer their role, make it personal, and get strains from the role.

Role theory goes back to George Herbert Mead (2000)'s role theory in 1934 and explains the controlling one's behavior regarding such as role-taking. Complex human relationships involve combinations of physical and psychological behavior (Rand et al., 1990). Role theory predicts that employees behave depending on their respective social identities and the situation (B. J. Biddle, 1986), and the choice is part of the humane condition; its content contained in the subjective experience of the person emerging in and through the collective process (Stryker, 2006).

The impact of cultural structures on persons and interaction and the reciprocal effects of persons and communication on social structures are examined by sociological social psychology (Stryker, 2006). Society does not exist as a static entity; it is continuously being created and recreated as persons act toward one another. Mind and self-arise in response to interruptions in the flow of activities, or problems, and involve formulating and selecting among possible courses of action to resolve the issues (Stryker, 2006). As a result, employees, as individuals, carry out the characteristics of the macro-cultural environment, a nationally representative sample of the population, to their organization (Yijälä et al., 2012). These explanations may help to find out the first main question: How does the differentiation among subunits change the intrapreneurship role expectations? Intrapreneurs are part of their organization from the definition. As a result, they reflect the cultural environment of a larger population that they interfere within, as may they carry out distinguishing characteristics from the others; intrapreneurs tend to solve the problems and act accordance with the macro-group itself. In a nutshell, we can say that different subunits tend to change the entrepreneurship" course of action, and before selecting the problems, they have been dealing. Another aspect of role theory says that roles are personal. Employees learn their roles (Turner, 2006); merge, namely internalization of attitudes and beliefs appropriate to the role; and have transitioned (Allen & van de Vliert, 1984) about the role. Seen, different subunit expectations change or transfer roles of employees as intrapreneurs.

The second main question is: how has the intrapreneurs" role been affected by different expectations? Self-

develops via the same social process; it exists in viewing oneself reflexively by adopting the standpoint of others to attach meanings to self (Stryker, 2006). In the role literature, the behavioral linkage has appeared within the facilitation, which involves environmental manipulation; and reinforcement, which depends on our ability to establish stimulus-response contingencies (Bruce J. Biddle, 1979). In other words, roles are personal and generally limited in some way by contextual specification (Bruce J. Biddle, 1979). This point of view is related to structural theories, rooting the collectivist level of role behavior (Turner, 2006). To illustrate, in social structures for persons, occupying specific positions have expected obligatory and optional behaviors. In this context, role players are guided by a set of expectations that are either internalized or experienced from external sources, or both, and are judged and judge themselves according to how well they conform to the expectations. However, there are several limitations to these presumptions. First, most of the intrapreneurship facets have been developed from entrepreneurship, so many behaviors subsumed under the same aspects. Second, there are always other groups that the intrapreneurs have been involved, of course, not only in workgroups.

The last research question of this paper is: are group or team level expectations for intrapreneurs roles different than organization and individual levels? Antoncic (2007) looked to intrapreneurship concept from the environment and organizational view. He found that organizational characteristics (communication, formal controls, environmental scanning, corporate support, competition-related values, and person-related values) are positively related to intrapreneurship. However, organizations have many divisions and subcultures that these corporate characteristics can be different from one to another. Interactional role theory is the patterning of social interaction among individuals and groups of individuals. This theory discusses that roles arise initially and recurrently out of the dynamics of interaction and that statuses and positions occur to place the role in a social, organizational framework (Turner, 2006). According to Duncan et al. (1988), intrapreneurs are conductors to link creative thoughts to strategic organizational results in an innovative way. Firms must organize their structure and upraise conducive culture. If that is the case, there are very positively or negatively valued identities, which are the roots of spontaneously emerged favorite roles.

How can a theory of roles apply equally well to roles that are and are not formalized in organizational structures? This quote is the answer to the third research question of this paper. Different values of the groups affect the intrapreneurships. As in the case, value dimensions are differing from culture to culture (Gibson, 2011), and value diversity is an essential factor in discerning these dimensions (Lairing &

Selmer, 2011). It is also a natural result to say that distinct cultural subgroups, in the organization, have different values. When we came to the answer of the last research, question the answer is: Yes. Because organizations are not single identity reverse, they may have groups and subcultures, which have different expectations. These expectations can change intrapreneurship roles.

---

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

---

Under the shared conceptual denominator of entrepreneurship, by the verbatim transcript of intrapreneurship research, we tried to integrate the concretes of intrapreneurship according to common incorporates of the role theory, explicitly. As intrapreneurship has got a lot from entrepreneur concept, conceptual development is not completed as we are expanding our knowledge about new perspectives. One of these perspectives is the role theory.

Intrapreneurship is a form of entrepreneurial activities conducting within the existing organizations (Gundogdu, 2012). Khan et al. (2011), mentioned intrapreneurs as having a great sense of self-motivation. However, this is not the case. Because there are many positive relations between the culture, environment, organization, and intrapreneurship, some researchers found organizational culture crucial for intrapreneurship (Benitez-Amado et al., 2010; Srivastava & Srivastava, 2010). The more solid-state of culture, Hisrich (1990) defined the useful organizational climate characteristics, and he found that not forced, but volunteer intrapreneurship, and wholeheartedly support by top management as the most critical aspects.

Furthermore, Park et al.(2014) mentioned the importance of communication for voluntary intrapreneurs. Some researchers studied environmental effects on intrapreneurship (Antoncic, 2007; Augusto Felício et al., 2012; Rae, 2006). However, the researchers have not related the intrapreneurship effectiveness to any organizational control over environmental factors. Succinctly, the literature on intrapreneurship has researched three main areas, which are extra-organization, organizations, and individuals. Every three approaches to intrapreneurship have their point of view that is socially bounded to role theory. Interactionist approach tries to create and modify conceptions of self and other roles as a critical orienting process in social interaction. So, entrepreneurship culture is a necessary but not sufficient condition. Because intrapreneur culture or climate is still dependent on intrapreneurs, and they try to facilitate intrapreneurship activities. Role theory says that intrapreneurship, regardless of the other factors, is a role, and this process can be thought.

---

## CONCLUSION

---

Intrapreneurship needs entrepreneurs in organizations, and we may not find them. Previous literature explained the characteristics of intrapreneurs or organizations and environment that helps flourishing intrapreneurs from employees. However, according to role theory, organizations should lead employees to learn to be intrapreneurship as a role. Role learning starts with media depictions and familiarity with people before going to a personal stage. So, organizations should hire leader intrapreneurs to make examples or promote

intrapreneurs as figureheads, because roles (in this case, intrapreneurship) are transferable.

Another implication of this article is to help organizations for developing or improving Intrapreneur Programs. To incorporate families into these programs is useful.

As the profit significant for an organization making innovation by intrapreneurs Cost-Effective is essential. Using role approach organizations may gain time and effort instead of trying dispersed approaches.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, V. L. & van de Vliert, E. (Eds.). (1984). *Role Transitions*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4613-2697-7>
- Antoncic, B. (2007). Intrapreneurship: A comparative structural equation modeling study. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 107(3), 309–325. <https://doi.org/10/cj6gx9>
- Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct Refinement and Cross-Cultural Validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495–527. <https://doi.org/10/fdgt4t>
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10/cm9f7z>
- Aparicio, M. E. (2017). *Driving and Inhibiting Factors for Intrapreneurship—A study of Intrapreneurship Teams* [Master's thesis in Master of Technology Management, Norwegian University of Science and Technology Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology Management Department of Industrial Economics and Technology Management]. <http://hdl.handle.net/11250/2455644>
- Augusto Felicio, J., Rodrigues, R. & Caldeirinha, V. R. (2012). The effect of intrapreneurship on corporate performance. *Management Decision*, 50(10), 1717–1738. <https://doi.org/10/f4gnt5>
- Azami, S. (2013). Intrapreneurship “An Exigent Employment.” *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 2(4), 194–198.
- Benitez-Amado, J., Llorens-Montes, F. J. & Nieves Perez-Arostegui, M. (2010). Information technology-enabled intrapreneurship culture and firm performance. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 110(4), 550–566. <https://doi.org/10/bgb5xp>
- Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent Developments in Role Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 12(1), 67–92. <https://doi.org/10/cchdjf>
- Biddle, Bruce J. (1979). *Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors*. Academic Press.
- Birkinshaw, J. (2003). The paradox of corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategy and Business*, 30 Spring, 46–57.
- Buekens, W. (2014). Fostering Intrapreneurship: The Challenge for a New Game Leadership. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 16, 580–586. <https://doi.org/10/gfs5c2>
- Dana, L.-P. (1995). Entrepreneurship in a Remote Sub-Arctic Community. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10/gd3ww4>
- Davis, G. F., & White, C. J. (2015). *Changing your company from the inside out: A guide for social intrapreneurs*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- de Villiers-Scheepers, M. J. (2011). Motivating Intrapreneurs: The Relevance of Rewards. *Industry and Higher Education*, 25(4), 249–263. <https://doi.org/10/bww7jp>
- Duncan, W. J., Ginter, P. M., Rucks, A. C. & Jacobs, T. D. (1988). Intrapreneurship and the reinvention of the corporation. *Business Horizons*, 31(3), 16–21. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813\(88\)90004-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0007-6813(88)90004-3)
- Foreman-Peck, J. & Zhou, P. (2010). Entrepreneurial Culture or Institutions? A Twentieth-Century Resolution. In J. L. García Ruiz & P. M. Toninelli (Eds.), *The determinants of entrepreneurship: Leadership, culture, institutions* (pp. 125–142). Pickering & Chatto.
- Gaertner, M. A. (2014). *Applying Intrapreneurship to Sustain Corporate Growth: A Business Practitioner's Model* [Ph.D Thesis, University of Maryland University College]. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/1562515706?accountid=25088>
- Garvin, D. A. & Levesque, L. C. (2006). Meeting the Challenge of Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Harvard Business Review*, October. <https://hbr.org/2006/10/meeting-the-challenge-of-corporate-entrepreneurship>
- Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J. & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 88–100. <https://doi.org/10/gcrnt3>
- Gibson, R. (2011). *Intercultural business communication* (Internat. ed., [Nachdr.]). Oxford Univ. Press.
- Gundogdu, M. C. (2012). RE-THINKING ENTREPRENEURSHIP, INTRAPRENEURSHIP, AND INNOVATION: A MULTI-CONCEPT PERSPECTIVE. *EMAJ: Emerging Markets Journal*, 2(1), 61–69. <https://doi.org/10/gcrntz>
- Guo, C. & Bielefeld, W. (2014). *Social entrepreneurship: An evidence-based approach to creating social value* (1. ed). Jossey-Bass.
- Guth, W. D. & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest Editors' Introduction: Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(Summer), 5–15.
- Hadad, S. & Cantaragiu, R. (2017). Corporate social entrepreneurship versus social intrapreneurship: Same idea, different trajectories? *Management & Marketing*, 12(2), 252–276. <https://doi.org/10/gfrkv9>
- Hassard, J. (1995). *Sociology and organization theory: Positivism, paradigms and postmodernity*. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hayton, J. C., Hornsby, J. S. & Bloodgood, J. (2013). Entrepreneurship: A review and agenda for future research. *Management*, 16(4), 381–409. <https://doi.org/10/gfsh4w>
- Hisrich, R. D. (1990). Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American Psychologist*, 45(2), 209–222. <https://doi.org/10/cszstb>
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M. & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Guest Editors' Introduction to the Special Issue Strategic Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Strategies for Wealth Creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6/7), 479–491.
- Hogg, M. A. & Vaughan, G. M. (2018). *Social psychology*.
- Khan, B. A., Budhwani, Z. R. & Shaikh, A.-H. (2011). Practising the intrapreneurship: A case of service-sector firms in Pakistan. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 7(1), 1–11.
- Lauring, J. & Selmer, J. (2011). Multicultural Organizations: Does a Positive Diversity Climate Promote Performance?: Multicultural Organizations: Does a Positive Diversity Climate Promote Performance? *European Management Review*, 8(2), 81–93. <https://doi.org/10/djnpqd>
- Lee, C., Lee, K. & Pennings, J. M. (2001). Internal capabilities, external networks, and performance: A study on technology-based ventures. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7), 615–640. <https://doi.org/10/fkhbpn>
- Low, R. (2016). *Good Intentions Are Not Enough: Why We Fail at Helping Others*. WSPROFESSIONAL. <https://doi.org/10.1142/10294>
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). CLARIFYING THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION CONSTRUCT AND LINKING IT TO PERFORMANCE. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135–172. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.1996.9602161568>
- Ma, H., Liu, T. Q., & Karri, R. (2016). Internal corporate venturing. *Organizational Dynamics*, 45(2), 114–123. <https://doi.org/10/gc93mn>

- McKenzie, B., Ugbah, S. D. & Smothers, N. (2007). "Who Is an Entrepreneur?" Is It Still the Wrong Question? *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 13(1), 23–43.
- Mead, G. H., Morris, C. W. & Mead, G. H. (2000). *Mind, self, and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Park, S. H., Kim, J.-N. & Krishna, A. (2014). Bottom-Up Building of an Innovative Organization: Motivating Employee Intrapreneurship and Scouting and Their Strategic Value. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 28(4), 531–560. <https://doi.org/10/f6mcrs>
- Parker, S. C. (2011). *Intrapreneurship or entrepreneurship? Journal of Business Venturing*, 26(1), 19–34. <https://doi.org/10/bnz52p>
- Parsons, T. (2014). *Essays in sociological theory*. Free Press. <http://www.myilibrary.com?id=893791>
- Pinchot, G. (2017). *The Pinchot Perspective*. The Pinchot Perspective. <https://www.pinchot.com/>
- Pinchot, G. & Pinchot, E. S. (1978). *Intra-Corporate Entrepreneurship.pdf*. Pinchot.Com. [https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6GgwqtG-DKcSlpsbGRBZkZYSIk/view?usp=drive\\_open&usp=embed\\_facebook](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B6GgwqtG-DKcSlpsbGRBZkZYSIk/view?usp=drive_open&usp=embed_facebook)
- Rae, D. (2006). Entrepreneurial learning: A conceptual framework for technology-based enterprise. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 18(1), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10/d8hbxj>
- Rand, A., Peikoff, L. & Binswanger, H. (1990). *Introduction to objectivist epistemology*. New American Library. <http://www.myilibrary.com?id=701543>
- Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2007). Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(4), 353–385. <https://doi.org/10/ct5qt4>
- Redding, S. G. (1993). *The spirit of Chinese capitalism*. de Gruyter.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10/gcw8vc>
- Salzman, M. B. (2018). *A Psychology of Culture*. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=1694194>
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1983). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Transaction Books.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1993). *Theorie der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung: Eine Untersuchung über Unternehmerrgewinn, Kapital, Kredit, Zins und den Konjunkturzyklus* (7. Aufl., unveränd. Nachdr. der 1934 ersch. 4. Aufl). Duncker & Humblot.
- Skarmeas, D., Lisboa, A. & Saridakis, C. (2016). Export performance as a function of market learning capabilities and intrapreneurship: SEM and FsQCA findings. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5342–5347. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.04.135>
- Spinelli, S., Timmons, J. A. & Adams, R. (2012). *New venture creation: Entrepreneurship for the 21st century* (Ninth edition). McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Srivastava, N. & Srivastava, S. (2010). Culture-Intrapreneurship Relationship: Reward as a Moderator. *Management and Labour Studies*, 35(2), 249–266. <https://doi.org/10/gdqdw2>
- Stryker, S. (2006). Traditional Symbolic Interactionism, Role Theory, and Structural Symbolic Interactionism: The Road to Identity Theory. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 231–232). Springer.
- Taneja, S. (2010). *Entrepreneur development*. Himalaya Pub. House. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10415373>
- The American Heritage dictionary of the English language. (2016). Houghton Mifflin.
- Turner, R. H. (2006). Role Theory. In Jonathan H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (1. softcover printing, pp. 233–255). Springer Science + Business Media.
- Uleman, J. S. (2015). Causes and Causal Attributions: Questions Raised by Dave Hamilton and Spontaneous Trait Inferences. In S. J. Stroessner & J. W. Sherman (Eds.), *Social Perception from Individuals to Groups* (pp. 52–70). <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=955740>
- von Hippel, E. (1977). Successful and failing internal corporate ventures: An empirical analysis. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 6(3), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10/cpfcxj>
- Yijälä, A., Lönnqvist, J.-E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. & Verkasalo, M. (2012). Values as Predictors of Anticipated Socio-cultural Adaptation Among Potential Migrants from Russia to Finland: Values and anticipated adaptation. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 22(2), 95–110. <https://doi.org/10/bt8f6f>
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Pearson Educations Inc.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259–285. <https://doi.org/10/ctzd3h>

## OTHER REFERENCES

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language (2016). In: <https://ahdictionary.com/>