



ISSN: 2278 – 0211 (Online)

## An Exploratory Study Of Factors Affecting Intrapreneurship

**Anupama Gupta**

Research Scholar , Mewar University

**Dr. Nidhi Srivastava**

Deputy Director, Sidana Group Of Institution, Amritsar, India

### **Abstract:**

*Intrapreneurship is defined as entrepreneurial activities inside existing organizations. It is a process in which employees proactively act to implement innovative and creative ideas which improve the processes, products or services of the company. Intrapreneurship has a positive effect on firm's growth, profitability and wealth. This paper explores and deliberates on those factors which stimulate Intrapreneurship in an organization. A pool of variables was formed and refined using literature survey. The questionnaire designed from this pool was administered to the managers of software industry from different organizations. The analysis of data supplies us multi dimensional approach for stimulating intrapreneurial orientation of employees such as organization culture, leadership, entrepreneurial orientation of the organization and flexibility of organization structure. This study also helps us to understand that rewards are not the most significant factor in motivating employees for taking risk and innovation. The implications of the study and future research directions are also discussed in this paper.*

**Key words:** Intrapreneurship, Organizational Culture, Leadership

### **1.Introduction**

Entrepreneurial Behaviour is something not new but known to the corporate world from ages. Schumpeter (1934) has defined entrepreneurship as an individual act, and had indicated - 'everyone is an entrepreneur only when he actually 'carries out new combinations'. 'Act of innovation' represents characteristic of an entrepreneur, but he clarifies that an entrepreneur is not the same as a technological inventor. Entrepreneurship from then on has assumed many forms and many names when explored in the corporate boundaries explained by various researchers using different terms like 'entrepreneurial organization' (Morris, 2001), 'intrapreneurship' (Pinchot, 1985), 'corporate venture' (Ellis & Taylor, 1987), and internal corporate venture' (Burgelman & Sayles, 1986). According to De Jong, Parker S K, Wennekers & WUI, 2011 intrapreneurial behavior refers to the entrepreneurial behavior shown within the existing organization that focuses on the employee initiative-ness in an organization to start or undertake something new although he or she is not being asked to do so. Further De Jong & Wenneker, 2008 identified key elements of intrapreneurial behavior as opportunity pursuit, resource acquisition, risk taking, being proactive and innovativeness. According to Van De Van, 1993 intrapreneurial behavior is a process which occurs in an interaction with the environment. Environment plays an important role in influencing corporate Intrapreneurship. It has been pointed out that the more dynamic hostile and heterogeneous the environment, the more emphasis is on the intrapreneurial activities. As many researchers have explored Intrapreneurship and Corporate Entrepreneurship from different point of view the literature review of these work helped us to identify the broad parameters supporting Intrapreneurship in an industry where continuous innovation and development is required. The literature also helped us to identify that software industry is the most suitable industry for sample selection to conduct our study as research and development (R&D) are the key areas for survival of business. Further, the pool is refined and data structure was analyzed using exploratory factors analysis. The extracted factors' impact on corporate entrepreneurship consequences was also found using regression analysis.

### **2.Literature Review**

As we have already discussed that Intrapreneurship specifically refers to entrepreneurial behaviour exhibited within existing organizations that focuses on the employee initiatives in an organization to start or undertake something new although he or she is not being asked to do so (De Jong, J., Parker, S.K., Wennekers, S., & Wui, C, 2011), we may suggest that Intrapreneurship can be considered as a process. Sharma and Chrisman has describe Intrapreneurship as “. . . the process whereby an individual or a group of

individuals, in association with an existing organization, create a new organization, or instigate renewal or innovation within that organization” (Sharma and Chrisman; 1999:18). Intrapreneurship is a sub-field of entrepreneurship (Antoncic and Hisrich; 2003: 7) and intrapreneurship’s broadest and popular definition is “entrepreneurship in an existing firm” (Antoncic and Hisrich; 2003: 9). Intrapreneurship is basically an individual action. It is conceived as the actions of employees within an organization leading to innovation of product, services or processes (Gapp and Fisher; 2007: 330). Intrapreneurship is the practice of composing new business products and opportunities in an organization by proactive empowerment (Essley and Longenecker; 2006: 19). Intrapreneurship is “the process of uncovering and developing an opportunity to create value through innovation and seizing that opportunity without regard to either resources or the location of the entrepreneur” (Menzel, Aaltio and Ulijn; 2007:734).

Over the last two decade several studies have been realized to examine the antecedents of entrepreneurial activities (Stevenson and Jarrillo, 1990; Guth and Ginsberg, 1990; Covin and Slevin, 1991; Zahra, 1991, 1993; Zahra and Covin, 1995; Sciascia et al., 2006) as well as to verify the effects of such activities on firm’s performance (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Daily et al., 2002; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Keh et al., 2007). In a recent survey of the literature on Intrapreneurship, Stam et al. (2011) identify six groups of important antecedents: dispositional traits, demography, cognitive abilities, job design, work context and broader environment. Of these antecedents, job design and work context are of particular interest for managers that seek to improve the level of Corporate Entrepreneurship within their organization, as they can directly be influenced by organizational policies and managerial actions.

Covin and Slevin (1991) pointed out that internal organizational factors play crucial role in fostering corporate entrepreneurship. Many researchers have provided empirical evidence for the importance of these factors that include: company’s organizational structure (Guth and Ginsberg, 1990; Covin and Slevin, 1991), incentive and control system (Kanter, 1984), managerial support (Stevenson and Jarrillo, 1990) and resources, organization boundary. The study of factors that influence managers’ disposition to support entrepreneurship is also of interest to Zahra et al. (2000) that, focusing on medium sized firms, examine two possible sources of influence: firm’s ownership structure and its governance system. Specifically, their study suggests that senior executives’ support of entrepreneurial behaviors will be higher when they own stock in their companies, or when an important shareholder who appreciates the value of long-term investments encourages executives to undertake entrepreneurial activities. Hornsby et al. (2002) pointed out that at least five internal factors are necessary in order to foster middle managers’ activity, mostly already highlighted before: an appropriate use of rewards, gaining top management support, a supportive organizational structure, risk taking and tolerance for failure, resource availability. Kuratko et al. (1990) also highlighted top management support, reward and resource availability, organizational structure and boundaries, risk taking and time availability as key internal factors able to enhance and support corporate entrepreneurship. Guth and Ginsberg (1990) supported and argued that entrepreneurial behavior in organizations is strictly dependent on the characteristics, values, beliefs and visions of their strategic leaders. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) referred to structural and managerial characteristics of an existing firm as factors that influence how an entrepreneurial orientation is configured to achieve high performance. According to Zahra (1993), CEO’s background and experience may increase the familiarity with certain tasks, thus promoting a firm’s entrepreneurial orientation. Further environmental heterogeneity, defined as the existence of multiple segments and difference of customers’ needs and expectations in those segments (Zahra, 1991), has also been tested to be positively related to entrepreneurial orientation (Miller, 1983; Zahra, 1991; Sciascia et al., 2006), since it induces innovations in order to satisfy the multiple needs existing in the market. Environment also includes culture. Culture is broadly defined as the way in which things are done in an organization (Schein, 1999; Deal & Kennedy, 2000). Lee and Peterson (2000) suggested that a society’s entrepreneurial orientation depends on its cultural foundation. Cultural factors are behind the success or failure of entrepreneurship as discussed by many authors. Factors such as uncertainty avoidance, power distance, masculinity, individualism, achievement are proposed by the author amongst several economic, political/legal and social factors able to moderate the relationship between culture and entrepreneurial orientation.

Based on literature review, the primary factors which are identified in this study are more than 62 but the researcher has classified them in 5 broad categories for the convenience of analysis. These categories are personal traits of employee, organization Culture, Organization Systems or structure, Rewards and Leadership.

### **3. Research Objective & Methodology**

The literature survey reveals that very limited number of empirical research was carried out using environmental factors and employee orientation together to explain the Intrapreneurship. In order to fill this gap, the objective of this study is to explore the factors stimulating entrepreneurial orientation of employees termed as Intrapreneurship in an organization and to find the relative importance of these factors.

#### **Questionnaire Design and Data Collection**

A pool of 55 independent variable items and 7 dependent variable items was prepared after the literature survey. The items were converted to questions using Likert scale. Questionnaire was pretested and modified using opinions from academicians and practitioners in the field of Intrapreneurship. The questionnaire was then administered to the managers at middle level across various software firms known for intrapreneurial practices and having a good track record of innovations in the industry. Total 334 responses were obtained. Out of those 333 were found valid for the purpose of data analysis.

#### 4.Hypothesis

We propose following hypothesis:

$H_1$  :There is a positive and significant relationship between Extracted Factors and Intrapreneurship

##### 4.1.Data Analysis

Correlation matrix (R Matrix) shows determinant greater than .000 (Determinant = .000) which rule out the possibility of multi-collinearity in this data. Exploratory factor analysis for the independent variable items followed by reliability analysis was performed first to explore the data structure. The KMO test gives the result of .917 showing pattern of correlations are relatively compact and so factor analysis should yield distinct and reliable factors. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, tests the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix is an identity matrix. For this data Bartlett's Test is highly significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) that means R matrix is not identity matrix and factor analysis is appropriate.

Table 1 & 2 about here

<b>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy</b>		.916
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	10947.033
	df	1891
	Sig.	.000

Table 1: KMO And Bartlett's Test

S.No	Factor	Cronbach's Alpha
1	ENTP_ORG	0.742
2	ORG_CUL	0.906
3	LEADER	0.821
4	MOT_REW	0.744
5	FLEX_ORG_ST	0.759
6	REW_POL	0.792
7	SYST_INNOV	0.664
8	EMP_DEV	0.759
9	ENTP_EMP	0.803

Table 2: Reliability Analysis Of Factors

After a sequential and iterative process of factors extractions, checking reliabilities of extracted factors, removing the cross-loading items and then factor extraction and re-checking reliabilities, the final solution with 51 items spread across nine factors was accepted. Principal Component Analysis was used for extraction and Oblique Rotation was used in factor extraction due to presence of moderately high correlations between factors. Cronbach Alpha of the extracted factors ranged from 0.664 to 0.906.

To analyze the impact of extracted factors on entrepreneurial orientation of employees multiple regression was used. The entrepreneurial orientation of employees was taken as dependent factor and remaining 8 extracted factors as independent variables. The result is presented in the table.

Table 3 & 4 about here

Factors with symbols	Factor Value	Mean	Std. Deviation
Culture	0.68	3.97	0.73
ORG_CUL	0.60	3.69	0.85
	0.59	3.73	0.79
	0.55	4.30	0.67
	0.59	4.13	0.81
	0.67	3.56	0.64
	0.67	4.18	0.73
	0.63	4.03	0.66

	0.69	3.54	0.83
	0.66	3.56	0.78
	0.67	4.22	0.86
	0.67	3.83	0.72
	0.68	3.95	0.80
	0.65	3.66	1.28
<b>Leadership</b>	0.64	4.00	1.16
LEADER	0.72	3.95	0.96
	0.61	3.93	0.84
	0.65	3.83	0.74
	0.68	3.97	0.73
	0.64	4.09	0.77
<b>Motivational Rewards</b>	0.66	3.64	0.91
MOT_REW	0.62	3.17	0.76
	0.71	3.08	0.85
	0.67	3.46	0.77
	0.60	2.69	0.89
<b>Flexible Organisation Structure</b>	0.60	3.97	0.72
FLEX_ORG_ST	0.60	3.59	0.85
	0.53	3.59	0.79
	0.64	3.79	0.76
<b>Reward Policy</b>	0.64	4.08	0.74
REW_POL	0.68	3.83	0.75
	0.72	3.68	0.72
	0.66	3.75	0.68
	0.61	3.71	0.62
<b>Entp orientation of employee</b>	0.68	4.10	0.81
ENTP_EMP	0.73	4.24	0.78
	0.69	4.01	0.82
	0.78	4.14	0.93
	0.64	4.42	0.84
<b>Entp orientation of organisation</b>	0.74	4.20	0.74
ENTP_ORG	0.66	4.18	0.63
	0.60	4.06	0.75
	0.65	4.14	0.69
	0.56	3.85	0.62
	0.63	4.01	0.88
<b>Factors with symbols</b>	<b>Factor Value</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Deviation</b>
<b>Org. systems &amp; innovation</b>	0.67	3.99	0.75
SYST_INNOV	0.63	3.94	0.69
	0.56	3.46	0.81
	0.63	4.06	0.73
<b>Employee development</b>	0.63	4.16	0.73
EMP_DEV	0.54	4.23	0.63
	0.67	4.11	0.73

Table 3: Item Mean And Factor Analysis Result  
Overall KMO: 0.916

Model	Standardized Coefficients
	Beta
ENTP_ORG	.509**
ORG_CUL	.681**
LEADER	.258*
MOT_REW	.054
FLEX_ORG_ST	-.028
REW_POL	-.052
SYST_INNOV	.209*
EMP_DEV	.034

Table 4: Regression Results

Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Orientation Of Employees (Intrapreneurship)

Note: \*\*  $P < 0.01$ ; \*  $P < 0.05$

R Square: 0.401

high rate of innovation in the organisation
increase in services in last 2 years
development of new products to replace old one
customer feedback for innovation
employee encouragement for innovation
emphasis on continuous development
importance of being successful
see problems as solution
preference for freedom to work
ability to achieve objectives with the guidelines
enthusiasm to tackle problems
Using different approaches to solve even in case of failure
problem solving attitude
strict hierarchial structure
tolerance for flexibility and resource sharing
seriousness towards suggestions of lower level employees
flexibility towards job design
job rotation of employees
clear assignment of task and responsibilities to employees
flexibility for employees to solve and manage their work
value based reward system for unlimited earning potential
support for unofficial & uninitiated activity for benefit of org
time given to work on own projects for org benefit
setting & assessment of risk taking behaviour of employees
broad range criteria for evaluation of new initiative
lack of resources to work on new idea without approval
goal setting is done with mutual agreement of employee and management
financial & non financial rewards for entrepreneurial behaviour

rewards for taking calculated risk
financial grants for individual projects
recognition for innovative idea & suggestion
leader is charismatic
leader explores new opprtunities
leader is enthusiastic for organisation
leader developed intrapreneurial philosophy amongst employees
leader is visionary and flexible
leader encourages teamwork
leader vaguely understands work environment
leader takes calculated risk for opportunities
actively searching opportunities
systematic adjustments to problems with caution
bold decision making despite uncertainty
importance to compromise amongst various stakeholders
dependence on outside resources for management control
belief in innovation for organisation future
encouragement to expand capacities to achieve more
nurtures new and expansive patterns of thinking
treatment to employees with confidence & trust
evaluation of goals showing riska taking behaviour
broad range criteria for evaluation of new initiative
lack of resources to work on new idea without approval
encourages life-long learning
encouraged to continually look at things in new ways
organization's assessment of potential employees focuses on entrepreneurial behaviour
Employees are encouraged to actively communicate and share ideas with each other
orientation programme for new employees to share vision of organisation
continual recruitment of individual entrepreneurs
strong emphasis on teamwork
encourage different views to stimulate innovation
clear-cut vision to ensure an innovative company
treatment to employees with confidence & trust
Failure is NOT condoned

*Table 5: Questionnaire Items*

#### 4.2.Results

The pool of 62 items from literature survey was refined into 51 attributes spread across nine factors using principal component analysis – Oblique Rotation. All these nine extracted factors were found reliable. Out of the eight independent extracted factors, four factors were found having significant impact on Intrapreneurship in an organization. These are: Entrepreneurial Orientation of Organization, Organization Culture, Leadership and Motivational Rewards.

As shown in Table 4 when eight (8) independent factors associated to various dimensions of organization were entered into the regression analysis the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) was found to be 0.401 indicating that 40.1% of Intrapreneurship(Entrepreneurial Orientation of employees) is explained by the these Independent Variables. The  $R^2$  change (0.401) is significant. The F-statistics is significant ( $p = 0.000$ ) suggesting that the proposed model was adequate. Thus our hypothesis is proved

that there is a positive and significant relationship between Extracted Factors like culture, Entrepreneurial orientation of organization, Leadership, Organization Systems and Intrapreneurship.

From the regression model, it can be observed that Organization Culture contribute maximum to Intrapreneurship ( $\beta = .681$ ) and entrepreneurial orientation of organization ( $\beta = .509$ ) is second in line and had a significant and positive relationship with Intrapreneurship at 0.01 level. Additionally, that leadership ( $\beta = .258$ ) and innovative organization systems ( $\beta = .209$ ) had a significant effect on Intrapreneurship at the 0.05 level. These results provided full support for the hypothesis of the study. The results also bring the key issue for further study that rewards whether motivational or for policy matter are either not significant or are affecting Intrapreneurship negatively. A use of more sophisticated statistical tools and further study into the matter would enlighten the researcher on this issue.

## 5. Discussion

The analysis strengthens the basic constructs of the Intrapreneurship model. The variables which are used to study are reconfirmed with this result. But in certain area the results are astonishing. The data analysis proves that Rewards Policy and Innovation through organization systems do not play a very important role in developing entrepreneurial orientation of employees. On the other hand Organization Culture and Leadership have a very significant impact of Intrapreneurship. The recent challenges posed to the Global Economies have forced each organization to put their best foot forward. According to Bhardwaj, Sushil & Momaya (2007) the degree of willingness of management to promote entrepreneurial behavior has been considered as the best way to maximize outcome of entrepreneurship and reinvent the organization. This study put a responsibility on the shoulders of the management to equip their workforces with those leaders who are stimulating growth and Intrapreneurship in the organization. The methodology by which leaders promote Intrapreneurship and the diffusion of entrepreneurial mindset within the organization will influence the employee behavior. Employee Development with flexible structures also has some impact on entrepreneurial orientation of employees. Rutherford and Holt (2007) found that autonomy to make own judgments triggers entrepreneurial behavior amongst employees. The highest impact of the factor 'organizational culture' suggests that the first priority for the firms who want to be successful in Intrapreneurship should be to establish a favorable organizational culture having a perceived supportive organizational environment, nurturing lifelong learning, encouragement to innovative thinking, and freedom to employees to share their ideas is given. The next perceived factor is Entrepreneurial Orientation of the Organization, consisting of attributes like independent task handling by employees, continuous improvement in existing product line and introduction of new products/services perceived trust, collaborative work environment and openness in sharing ideas and resources with each other. Leaders' support in terms of instilling a philosophy of Intrapreneurship in the organization by supporting the initiatives and encouraging teamwork, is perceived as a factor supporting Intrapreneurship positively. In addition, perceived motivational rewards in the form of financial grants and time to work on ideas and recognition of the same were found having some impact too.

## 6. Conclusion

In 1976 Norman Macrae published an article in "The Economist". The article predicted a number of trends in business including that "dynamic corporations of the future should simultaneously by trying alternatives ways of doing the things in competition within themselves". Despite repeated attempts since that day onwards we are unable to create a corporate climate conducive to Intrapreneurship especially in India. A series of research work in this direction with industry integration would ensure the growth of organizations stimulating entrepreneurial mindset of employees. A further research covering different industries highlighting the reasons for low Intrapreneurship level could be taken up at the next stage with more sophisticated statistical tools.

## 7. References

1. Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10 (1), 7-24.
2. Bhardwaj, B.R, Sushil, Momaya, K (2007), "Corporate entrepreneurship-Application of moderator method. *Singapore Management Review*. Aug 29 (11),s,47-58.
3. Bosma, N.S., Stam E., and Wennekers, S. (2011). Intrapreneurship versus independent entrepreneurship: A cross-national Analysis of individual entrepreneurial behavior, Tjalling C. Koopmans Institute Discussion Paper Series 11--04, Utrecht School of Economics, Utrecht University.
4. Burgelman, R. A., & Sayles, L. (1987). *Les Intrapreneurs: Strategie, structure et gestion de l'innovation dans l'entreprise*. Paris: MacGraw-Hill.
5. Covin, J.G., & Slevin. D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 16(1), 7-25.
6. Daily, C. M., McDougall, P. P., Covin, J. G., & Dalton, D. R. 2002. Governance and strategic leadership in entrepreneurial firms. *Journal of Management*, 28: 387-412.
7. De Jong, J. and Wennekers, S. (2008) Conceptualizing entrepreneurial employee behaviour, Intrapreneurship, H200802, EIM, Netherlands.

8. De Jong, J.P.J., Parker, S.K., Wennekers, S. & Wu, C., 2011. Corporate Entrepreneurship at the individual Level: Measurement and Determinants. (Working Paper). Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs. Erasmus University & EIM Business and Policy Research.
9. Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. (2000). *Corporate Cultures*. New York: Perseus Publishing.
10. Eesley, D. T. and C. O. Longenecker (January/February 2006), "Gateways to Intrapreneurship", *Industrial Management*, 18-23
11. Ellis, R J., and Taylor, N. T (1987). Specifying Entrepreneurship In N.C. Churchill, J. A. Hornaday, B. A. Kirchoff, O. J. Krasner, and K. H. Vesper (Eds), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, pp. 527-541, Wellesley, MA: Babson College
12. Gapp R. and R. Fisher (2007), "Developing an Intrapreneur –led Three Phase Model of Innovation", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 13(6),330-348
13. Guth, W.D., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest editors' introduction: corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11 (4), 5-15.
14. Guth, W.D., and Ginsberg, A. 1990. Guest editors' introduction: Corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal* 11:5–15.
15. Hornsby, J.S., D.F. Kuratko & S.A. Zahra. (2002) "Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: Assessing a measurement scale." *Journal of business Venturing*, 17(3): 253-273.
16. Kanter, R. M. "Managing Transitions in Organizational Culture: The Case of Participative Management at Honeywell." In *New Futures: The Challenge of Managing Corporate Transitions*, edited by J. Kimberly and R. Quinn. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin, 1984.
17. Kuratko, D. F., Montagno, R. V. and Hornsby, J. S., 1990. Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, Summer Special Issue, pp. 49-58
18. Lee, S. M., & Peterson, S. J. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 35(4), 401
19. Lumpkin, G.T., and Dess, G.G. 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review* 12(1):135–172.
20. Macrae, Norman." The Ecoming entrepreneurial revolution", *The Economist*, December 25, 1976.
21. Mathew w Rutherford, Daniel T. Holt (2007) " corporate entrepreneurship: an empirical look at the innovative Dimensions and its antecedents", *Journal of organizational change Management*, Vol. 20 Iss:3, pp 429-446
22. Menzel, H. C., Aaltio, I., & Ulijn, J. M. (2007). On the way to creativity: Engineers as intrapreneurs in organizations, *Technovation*, 27(12), 732–743.
23. Miller, D. 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science* 29:770–791
24. Morris, M. H. (2001). *Entrepreneurial intensity: sustainable advantages for individuals, organizations and societies*. New York: Quorum Books.
25. Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring*. New York: Harper & Row
26. Schein, E. H. (1999). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
27. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
28. Sciascia S, Naldi L, Hunter E. Market orientation as determinant of entrepreneurship: an empirical investigation on SMEs. *Int Entrep Manage J* 2006;2:21–38.
29. Sharma, P., & Chrisman, J.J. (1999). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23 (3), 11–27.
30. Stevenson, H.H., and Jarillo, J.C. 1990. A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal* 11:17–27.
31. Van de Ven, Andrew H., 1993. The development of an infrastructure for entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 211-30.
32. Wiklund, J. & D. Shepherd. (2005) "Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20: 71-91.
33. Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*. 6. 259-285.
34. Zahra, S. A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*. S. 319-340.
35. Zahra, S.A., and Covin, J.C. 1995. Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing* 10(1):43–58.
36. Zahra, Shaker A. Garvis, Dennis M. (2000). International corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: The moderating effect of international environmental hostility. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 15, pp. 469-92.