

Intrapreneurship – a review of recent literature

Stefan Stefanovici 331422

This study contributes to the field of entrepreneur research by giving an overview of the literature on intrapreneurship. Research on intrapreneurship has increased in last decade; however so far few attempts to summarize this research or give an overview were made. This paper will define the most important attributes and characteristics of the intrapreneurship concept itself, the individual intrapreneur and the entrepreneurial organization and thus clarify what defines intrapreneurship.

Keywords: Intrapreneurship, Corporate Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Organization, Intrapreneur

Content

1. Introduction.....	3
2. The concept.....	4
3. The Individual.....	10
4. The Organization.....	17
5. Conclusion.....	22
6. References.....	24

1. Introduction

According to Morris, Kuratko and Covin (2007) the world experiences an entrepreneurial revolution. The research in the field of entrepreneurship in the last decade has increasingly focused on entrepreneurship within the boundaries of existing organizations. This subfield of entrepreneurship research is known as 'intrapreneurship' or 'corporate entrepreneurship'. The phenomenon is important for organizations as implementing it accelerates organizational growth, profitability and renewal as well as it helps secure the organizations survival in the business (Zahra, 1991). As the two definitions aforementioned for one phenomenon indicate there are different kinds of intrapreneurship (Colvin & Miles 1999). However, all kinds share one common aspect, namely innovation. The use thereof "as a mechanism to redefine or rejuvenate the organization, its position within markets and industries, or the competitive arena in which the organization competes" (Heinonen & Korvela, 2003), is also what forms the very core of intrapreneurship.

The research on intrapreneurship is divided into several main areas. 1) The intrapreneur as an individual, focusing on his characteristics as well as his recognition and support in the organization, 2) the creation of new ventures from within the organization, with focus on the different types of ventures and their positioning in the corporate structure, and 3) the entrepreneurial organization, emphasizing its main characteristics (Antoncic & Hirsich, 2003)

While in the past decades the concept of intrapreneurship has been analyzed with increasing interest in the aforementioned areas, reviews of said researches and literature which simplifies the concept and summarizes its core aspects are still few. To change this is the main objective of this paper. By reviewing literature on the core aspects of intrapreneurship and simplifying it, the main purpose of this study is to assess the main characteristics and attributes the concept of intrapreneurship builds upon.

In the first part of the paper the concept of intrapreneurship will be defined, also its key dimensions will be discussed in order to clarify what intrapreneurship actually is. In the second and third part of the paper, two of the areas Antoncic and Hirsich (2003) have defined as being focal to the intrapreneurship research will be discussed. In the second part the focus will lie on the individual intrapreneur and his specific characteristics. The third part of the paper will discuss the intrapreneurial organization and its characteristics and traits. This is done to add another level to the analysis as well as give a broader view on the subject.

By covering these three areas of research, the concept of intrapreneurship will have been discussed on several levels, namely the individual level as well as the organizational level.

The paper will conclude with a summary of the findings as well as give recommendations for further research and point out limitations faced.

2. The Concept

The very first part of the paper will comprise definitions and the concept of intrapreneurship that were contributed in the past twenty years of research. As well as defining the term itself, key concepts will be highlighted and explained in more detail. It is to be noted that this paper will make no distinction between intrapreneurship and corporate entrepreneurship, meaning that concepts from both terms will be used interchangeably even though some researchers make a distinction between the two terms based mostly on company size.

Pinchot coined the term “intrapreneurship” in 1978. In his paper, named *intra-corporate entrepreneurship*, thus the name intrapreneurship, he points out that firms, in order to grow and prosper in a rapidly changing society and economy need entrepreneurial thinking within the company. “Increased consensus has been attained on the concept of entrepreneurship as the process of uncovering and developing an opportunity to create value through innovation and seizing that opportunity without regard to either resources (human and capital) or the location of the entrepreneur— in a new or existing company” (Churchill 1992, p. 586) So in the broadest sense possible intrapreneurship basically equates to entrepreneurship within the borders of an existing company.

In the following different research and their respective definitions and key concepts will be presented.

In his paper, Knight (1997) seeks to test the measurement properties of the ENTRESALE utilizing samples from French- and English-speaking managers. The ENTRESALE is a construct developed by Khandwalla (1977) used for measuring entrepreneurship at the firm level, which was found do reliable and highly valid. Since this scale’s measurement properties have never been considered in a cross-cultural setting it lacks international reliability and validity. The purpose of Knight’s study is to test whether there is empirical evidence that the ENTRESALE can be regarded as internationally reliable and valid.

As the study focuses on firm level entrepreneurship it holds validity for this paper. The term Knight uses for entrepreneurship on the firm level is entrepreneurial orientation. The author furthermore points out two characteristics of major importance for this concept. According to Knight these characteristics are innovativeness and proactiveness. Innovativeness is defined as “the pursuit of creative or novel solutions to challenges confronting the firm, including the development or enhancement of products and services, as well as new administrative techniques and technologies for performing organizational functions.” (Knight, 1997) Proactiveness is regarded to be aggressive posturing towards competitors, emphasizing an aggressive execution and follow through with the attempt to achieve the company’s goals by whatever means possible.

The main purpose of the study conducted by Lumpkin and Dess (1996) is to clarify the concept of entrepreneurial orientation. Also, they aim to develop a framework for analyzing the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. In order to address this matter the authors draw from existing literature and research to make a distinction between the two concepts of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation.

The authors’ definition for entrepreneurial orientation describes a concept that shows how new entry is undertaken as opposed to entrepreneurship which according to them represents new entry in their study. Additionally, Lumpkin and Dess define five attributes that distinguish the two aforementioned concepts, thus providing the main characteristics of intrapreneurship according to them. The five attributes are autonomy, innovativeness, risk taking, proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness. Autonomy is described as the independent action of an individual to develop an idea and seeing through till completion. Innovativeness explains a firm’s eagerness to engage in new ideas or processes that might lead to the invention of new products, services or technological processes. The authors describe the risk taking attribute as a firm’s sense for uncertainty its willingness to face the probability of loss or a negative outcome. Proactiveness is defined as “taking initiative by anticipating and pursuing new opportunities and by participating in emerging markets.” (Lumpkin & Dess 1996) Lastly, competitive aggressiveness shows a firms tendency to directly challenge its competition in order to enter a market or improve its position on the market.

One relatively recent research that attempted to analyze what intrapreneurship conveys was conducted by Antoncic and Hisrich (2003). The researchers’ goal was to give a deeper insight on what the concept of intrapreneurship is and what its key dimensions are. Their ambition for this topic is to correct deficiencies left by previous researchers, namely Lumpkin and Dess (1996), as

they felt their peer's conceptualization of entrepreneurship is too broadly defined as well as it is lacking sufficient focus on key aspects of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

The researchers define intrapreneurship as "entrepreneurship within an existing organization, referring to emergent behavioral intentions and behaviors of an organization that are related to departures from the customary." (Antoncic & Hirsich, 2003, p.9) They further state the size of the company within which intrapreneurial processes are undergone to be irrelevant as they take place either way. Furthermore, "intrapreneurship refers not only to the creation of new business ventures, but also to other innovative activities and orientations such as development of new products, services, technologies, strategies and competitive postures."

Antoncic et al. continue their definition of the matter by comparing the differences there are between intrapreneurship and other managerial concepts such as diversification, capability, organizational learning, and organizational innovation.

Following they point out several dimensions they regard to be key for the concept of intrapreneurship. These dimensions are new ventures, new businesses, Product/service innovativeness, process innovativeness, self-renewal, risk taking, proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness. New ventures focuses on creating new firms operating on their own, while new businesses emphasizes on the existing company to enter and pursue new businesses that bear relation to current products and/or markets. The focus of the product and service innovativeness dimension lies solely on the creation of new products and services. Process innovativeness puts emphasis on innovation in production procedures and techniques. Self-renewal is concerned with the reformulation of strategies as well as reorganization and organizational change within the firm. The dimension of risk taking relates to actively taking risky actions quickly and committing resources to new business opportunities with the possibility of incurring losses. Proactiveness describes the top management to be oriented towards pioneering and taking the initiative. Lastly, competitive aggressiveness focuses on the company's aggressive posturing towards competitors. (Antoncic & Hirsich, 2003) The researchers point out that the concept under which these eight dimensions are united can be seen to be innovation in the broadest sense.

Another research, conducted by Thornberry (2001) focuses on corporate entrepreneurship. His definition thereof is kept rather short in saying that it "is essentially 'start-up' entrepreneurship turned inward" (Thornberry 2001); however he expands on this definition by defining four

different types of Corporate Entrepreneurship which are: Corporate Venturing, Intrapreneuring, Organizational Transformation and Industry Rule Breaking.

Corporate venturing comprises the starting of a business within a business, in most cases based on a company's core competency but also on innovation through new product development.

Intrapreneuring is defined by the author to instill the behavior and mindset of independent entrepreneurs in the firm's employees and thus create an innovative environment within the firm.

Organizational Transformation is the transforming and remodeling of the corporation; however Thornberry limits this to transformation processes that involve innovation, which might help the firm to seize new opportunities.

Lastly, industry rule-bending deals with "changing the rules of competitive engagement" (Thornberry, 2001) as yet another way of transformation. For better understanding the author provides an example of how Toyota changed the rules by producing high quality cars at low cost, which forced the competition to follow its model.

Furthermore, the author describes the commonalities these four facets of Corporate Entrepreneurship share which can also be regarded as its key dimensions stressed in the paper. First, described is the aspect of creating something new. This is not limited to either a business or product but can also encompass creating new value for prospective customers. Secondly, organizational change is pointed out. By this the author means "changes in the pattern of resource deployment". Thirdly, the aspect of learning is stated as a key dimension as creation of new things leads to developing new capabilities within the firm. As a fourth point the author points out the intent of making a profit as a result of the new business. Fifthly, "the financial returns resulting from the 'new thing' are predicted to be better than the returns resulting from the current deployment of resources. " (Thornberry, 2001) Lastly, Thornberry stresses the point of increased risk to the company stemming from the new business or product. It is to be noted again, that most of the competencies pointed out here are dealing with innovation in the broadest sense, as pointed out in the research by Anonic & Hirsich (2003).

The third research dealing with the definition and phenomenon of intrapreneurship to be discussed was conducted by Heinonen & Korvela (2003) with the purpose to analyze the concept of intrapreneurship, its prerequisites and outcomes. Their focus in this study however, lies in contrast the previously discussed Thornberry research on small companies.

Similar to other researchers (Heinonen & Korvela, 2003) their core definition of intrapreneurship is again that of entrepreneurial measures of action within an established organization. They expand on this by pointing to the basis of intrapreneurship in their regard. This basis is “recognizing an opportunity, exploiting it and trusting that exploiting an opportunity in a new way that deviates from previous practice will succeed and support the realization of the organization’s aims.” (Heinonen, 1999)

The authors stress two core competencies of the phenomenon of intrapreneurship. The first is a company’s commitment to innovation (Miller, 1983). This competency is however again divided into 3 subparts: product innovation, proactiveness and risk taking. Product innovation is described to be a company’s ability to create new or modify products. Proactiveness refers to a company’s ability to compete in the market by taking a pioneering role. Lastly, risk taking describes a company’s attitude towards engaging in uncertain business venture or the like.

The second dimension of intrapreneurship Heinonen & Korvela discuss is strategic renewal, which also is divided into several different areas: mission reformation, reorganization and system-wide changes. Mission reformation refers to the renewal “achieved through the redefinition of a firm’s mission through the creative redeployment of resources.” (Heinonen & Korvela, 2003) Reorganization is described to be a mean to the dimension of renewal by “developing and/or adopting new organizational structures” (Heinonen & Korvela, 2003) which encourage innovation. System-wide changes, that mostly target a company’s core values, are supposed to bring about an enhancement in problem solving and creative organizational learning (Heinonen & Korvela, 2003) and thus cover the last part of the dimension of renewal.

Table 1 portrays the different names for essentially the same concept. In the literature selected here, a chronological progress of the concept’s name can be seen. While Lumpkin and Dess (1996) coined the term entrepreneurial orientation, more recent literature by Antoncic & Hisrich (2003) talks about intrapreneurship. It is not clear however whether this is a trend that extends over the whole literature considering the fact that Pinchot already introduced the term intrapreneurship in 1978.

Furthermore, one can see the commonalities and differences the various authors share in their assessment of the main characteristics of the concept of intrapreneurship. First of all, a clear trend of development is not visible. One can merely see that the various authors put different emphasis on the attributes that define the concept. Nevertheless, it becomes clear from the Table that

especially the characteristic of innovativeness is of major importance in all of the reviewed studies. Furthermore, one can see that this attribute became more differentiated recently. While in the earlier papers innovativeness comprised every innovative action, in more recent studies the authors differentiate between product and process innovativeness or organizational change and process innovativeness among others. Another characteristic of seemingly major importance is proactiveness, the only other attribute mentioned in every study presented. Except for Knight's (1997) study also risk taking is a main attribute of the intrapreneurship concept.

It can be argued, that these three mentioned characteristics – innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking, work as the base attributes for the concept of intrapreneurship. Even though the authors provide various other characteristics, these are the only mentioned by almost every one. The further differentiation of characteristics authors such as Antoncic & Hisrich present should however not be disregarded, but merely be seen as building upon the established and necessary base of innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking.

Table 1) Concept name, definition and main characteristics of intrapreneurship

Author	Concept name	Concept Definition	Main Characteristics
Lumpkin & Dess 1996	Entrepreneurial Orientation	How new entry is undertaken	- Autonomy - Innovativeness - Risk taking - Proactiveness - Competitive aggressiveness
Knight 1997	Entrepreneurial Orientation	Entrepreneurship on firm-level	- Innovativeness - Proactiveness
Thornberry 2001	Corporate Entrepreneurship	Start-up entrepreneurship turned inwards	- Product/process innovativeness - Risk taking - Financial outcomes - Learning capabilities
Heinonen & Korvela 2003	Intrapreneurship	entrepreneurial measures of action within an established organization	- Product innovativeness - Proactiveness

			- Risk taking
Antoncic & Hirsrich 2003	Intrapreneurship	entrepreneurship within an existing organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New ventures - New businesses - Product/service innovativeness - Process innovativeness - Self-renewal - Risk taking - Proactiveness - Competitive aggressiveness

3. The Individual

The second part of this paper will focus on the intrapreneur inside a corporation individually. Since the first part's concentration lay on the organization as a whole, the entrepreneurial individual was neglected so far. However, as Antoncic and Hisrich (2003) point out, the analysis of the intrapreneur's characteristics is one of three areas on which recent research has focused. Again different studies will be used in order to give an insight on what the defining characteristics of an intrapreneur are. Also, in one case these characteristics will be compared to the ones of entrepreneurs in order to provide a benchmark for traits such as risk attitude and others.

One attempt to assess what an intrapreneur is, conducted by Sayeed and Gazdar (2003) was based on the so called Intrapreneurship Scale developed by Lessem in 1988. The scale is comprised of seven dimensions, adventurer, innovator, designer, leader, entrepreneur, change agent and animateur. The study is based on the theory of Lessem for the reason that according to the authors first a "personal disposition framework" (Sayeed & Gazdar 2003) is needed in order to discover and understand certain behaviors and attitudes of individuals. Also, "the theory emphatically establishes that intrapreneurial behavior is the major factor in the development of the individual and the organization." (Sayeed & Gazdar 2003)

The Intrapreneurship Scale is designed to apply the aforementioned seven intrapreneurial types to certain traits which can be found within the respective dimension and which show certain key attributes. Table 2 shows how the mentioned traits are linked with the intrapreneurial type and which key attributes are expected to be found within this specific type. An innovator for instance would show the trait of imagination and according to Lessem’s Intrapreneurship Scale this individual would have attributes such as originality, inspiration or the will for transformation.

Table 2)

Trait	Intrapreneurial Type	Key Attributes
<i>Imagination</i>	Innovator	Originality, inspiration, love, transformation
<i>Intuition</i>	New designer/Enabler	Evolution, development, symbiosis, connection
<i>Authority</i>	Leader	Direction, responsibility, structure, control
<i>Will</i>	Entrepreneur	Achievement, opportunity, risk-taking, power
<i>Sociability</i>	Animateur	Informality, shared values, community, culture
<i>Energy</i>	Adventurer	Movement, work, health, activity
<i>Flexibility</i>	Change agent	Adaptability, expressiveness, curiosity, intelligence

The researchers note that judging from the way Lessem (1988) equated the concepts of entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship, the personality traits relevant for entrepreneurs do also apply to intrapreneurs.

In a literature review conducted by them they filter out and portray specific traits intrapreneurs tend to have. For one they claim that intrapreneurs in comparison to managers tend to change their environment while the others simply adapt. Personal characteristics that the researchers found were autonomy, optimism, pioneering innovative motive, creative ability, achievement motivation and managerial skills (Sayeed & Gazdar, 2003).

The authors’ own study, which was conducted among 112 middle-level executives from different departments of both private and public sector organizations and was supposed to show that the Intrapreneurship Scale is not merely a theoretical construct resulted in an assessment of the 7 previously mentioned dimensions. The findings showed that out of the seven dimensions only four subcategories, namely the dimensions of adventurer, innovator, entrepreneur and animateur, were statistically relevant to define the attributes of an intrapreneur. These findings imply that according to Sayeed and Gazded the traits that define an intrapreneur are imagination, will,

sociability and energy. This means that some key attributes an intrapreneur needs to have are originality, the will to take risk, a sense of community, inspiration and activity among others.

In another research Cox and Jennings (1995) focused specifically on British entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. The researchers gathered their data through in depth interviews with the individuals. From this data they were able to define three sub-samples among entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. The first group is elite independent entrepreneurs; individuals that started their own companies in which they still are major shareholders. In the second group one can find intrapreneurs, which the researchers define as elite modal entrepreneurs for their purposes. These individuals are chief executives of successful companies who take responsibility for developing and expanding the organization without having founded it. The last group is called modal entrepreneurs or intrapreneurs. Individuals in this group are similar to the ones in group two with the exception of not having family ties to the founders or other executives of the firm. The main scope of this research is to define and discuss the major similarities and differences between the aforementioned groups. For the purposes of this paper the focus will lie on the third group and partly the second group as these contain intrapreneurs.

The authors reasonably argue that childhood experiences have an effect on personality development and the business career later in life. In the interviews they found that in group three all but five interviewees had traumatic events occurring in their childhood. These events had mostly to do with loss or separation. Cox and Jennings cautiously conclude from this that having suffered from those events but nevertheless achieving success in later business life, stresses the importance of being able to overcome adversity. They support this argument with the example of how almost all individuals of group three had to also face and overcome adversity in later business life.

Important personal characteristics Cox and Jennings focus on are the individuals' approach to risk as well as them being adapters or innovators and their political style. Their results suggest that while individuals in group three frequently deal with risk, this risk is calculated and not to be seen as a gamble, meaning they would still be in control of it with their skills and abilities. Group 2 on the other is described to be low risk takers. For assessing whether someone is an adapter or innovator, the authors lean on Kirton's (1961) definition of these two types of managers. While adapters tend to work within a system innovators challenge it with the attempt to change it also. Cox and Jennings results in this case show that surprisingly individuals in group three, so the "classical" intrapreneurs scored to be the most innovative among the three groups.

The authors explanation for this is that intrapreneurs in contrast to entrepreneurs work within an organizational structure that could potentially restrain them, meaning they need to be more innovative. Lastly, Cox and Jennings analyze the individuals political style, meaning whether they are outer or inner direct, so whether they work with shared meanings or not and how complex the action strategies are. Unfortunately, data for group three is not available for this last assessment. Group two however shows to be outer directed, working with shared means. This result is expected as they work within existing organizations with the expectation to share information. Also, the group is equally divided between using complex or simple strategies.

In a 2011 paper Martiarena analyzed the determinants of becoming an intrapreneur in comparison to becoming an entrepreneur. Her main focus lies on the comparison between intrapreneurs and wage workers and whether intrapreneurs are more similar to entrepreneurs or paid employees. In the analysis she combines previous theories about attitudes towards risk (Monsen et al., 2010), entrepreneurial talent (Parker, 2004) and expected income (Douglas & Shepherd, 2000, 2002) into an occupational choice model. Furthermore the author claims to make two distinct contributions to the literature. For one, she makes a distinction within the concept of intrapreneurship by taking into account the level and timing of engagement of individuals in intrapreneurial activities. She thereby splits up intrapreneurs and engaged intrapreneurs, individuals who expect to acquire part of the ownership in the business. Secondly, she provides empirical evidence to previously only theoretical studies.

In the paper Martiarena makes four hypotheses which she tests empirically. The hypotheses are as follows:

(Martiarena, 2011)

- 1) Individuals showing greater risk aversion are less likely to engage in entrepreneurial and more autonomous occupations such as independent entrepreneurship and engaged intrapreneurship.
- 2) Intrapreneurs and engaged intrapreneurs are more likely to demand lower remuneration than entrepreneurs but higher than employees.
- 3a) Entrepreneurship and engaged intrapreneurship are positively associated with a more balanced pool of skills and self-perception of entrepreneurial skills.
- 3b) Entrepreneurs recognize more business opportunities than engaged intrapreneurs, intrapreneurs and employees.

The data to test these hypotheses is derived from the Spanish Global Entrepreneurship Monitor of 2008. Martiarena comes up with the following results. First of all, hypothesis one is supported, meaning that while dealing with risk intrapreneurs are more risk averse than entrepreneurs. Hypothesis two is confirmed as well, which shows that higher income is necessary in order for individuals to assume greater risk, meaning that higher levels of income predict that riskier occupations, entrepreneurship and engaged intrapreneurship are chosen over the intrapreneurial career. Furthermore both hypotheses 3a and 3b are confirmed as well. This means that not only do intrapreneurs have a more limited entrepreneurial skill set, but they are also less perceptive towards favorable opportunities on as well as their own skills necessary to start up upon these opportunities. Martiarena also argues that based on the results the suggested distinction between intrapreneurs and engaged intrapreneurs is proven and that engaged intrapreneurs have a greater resemblance with entrepreneurs. Ultimately the author characterizes intrapreneurs as individuals that are “significantly more risk averse, expect a lower but less uncertain reward, and are broadly endowed with a poorer set of entrepreneurial abilities; despite having higher levels of human capital, they fail to recognize business opportunities and have lower confidence in their entrepreneurial skills.” (Martiarena, 2011)

In their article Pantry and Griffith recommend several ways in which library and information professionals can use their skills – marketing, corporate intelligence, management skills and innovativeness, in order to provide their organizations with intrapreneurial service. The authors focus specifically on library and information professionals as they regard them to be “best equipped to make sense of the new areas of information and knowledge management that are currently proliferating.” (Pantry & Griffiths, 2000)

The article furthermore provides a simple and general definition of what an intrapreneur is. According to Pantry and Griffith an intrapreneur is an innovative individual with the ability to put an idea into practice and succeed subsequently benefiting the organization.

In addition, the authors specify certain key characteristics which can be found in intrapreneurs. The characteristics named are numerous and divided into specific skillsets they can be related to such as management or team working skills. Due to this fact the characteristics will be summarized under more general terms in order to simplify them.

For one, the authors argue that intrapreneurs have a vision for future projects. Other characteristics are the ability to allocate resources and leadership. Furthermore, intrapreneurs are

motivational and as Pantry and Griffith suggest team workers with the ability to select and develop good teams. Lastly, intrapreneurs have a propensity to take risks.

In 1999 Davis conducted a study regarding the criteria that is associated with intrapreneurial success. The goal was to lay an empirical foundation for future research focusing on that matter. The research objective to identify the criteria managers attribute to successful intrapreneurs is highly appealing to this paper and the main focus in the review of Davis' study. The sample used for this study consists of 7 groups with a varying level of intrapreneurial expertise. While for example expert intrapreneurs participated, so did non-business major undergraduate students. Davis found a total of 19 characteristics attributed to intrapreneurs. One is to assume that all 19 attributes are also statistically significant judging by the fact that statistical significance is unfortunately not discussed throughout the study. The attributes associated with intrapreneurs are as follows:

(Davis, 1999)

- Creative/ innovative
- Ambitious/ aggressive/ a go-getter
- enthusiastic/ excited
- resilient able to deal with setbacks and rejection
- intuitive
- tenacious/ persistent
- enterprising
- visionary
- bored with repetition/ likes variety
- inspires others/ inspirational
- assertive/ take charge-type
- driven/ sense of urgency/ intense
- a hands-on manager/ "rolled-up-sleeves"-type
- desire to own own business
- history of experimentation and discovery
- non-conformist/ unconventional
- history of innovativeness/ prior inventions
- prior business failure
- attempted outside venture in past

As can be seen, the list is rather extensive and differentiated. In order to simplify the list and make a comparison to the other studies presented easier, not the whole list but generalized and more focused terms will be used. In fact, the 19 attributes will be summarized in 5 larger groups namely, innovativeness, resilience, initiative, risk taking and leadership. This is done in order to help clarify comparisons with the other authors' articles later on.

The key characteristics of intrapreneurs according to the reviewed literature can be seen in Table 3. Despite various approaches on how to define the characteristics that distinguish intrapreneurs and a gap of almost 10 years between the oldest and most recent study depicted a reasonable number of similarities can be found. It becomes clear from the table that similar as in chapter one and the general characteristics of the concept of intrapreneurship innovativeness and risk propensity have a major influence also on the individual intrapreneur. These two attributes are covered in every study presented. However, another attribute is mentioned in every article as well, team work. As it seems the ability to work in a team is essential for being an intrapreneur. An explanation for this could be that due to having human capital at disposition in the firm, not being able to use it or use it efficiently would have a negative impact on the organization. Another interesting point regarding the contents of the table is that autonomy as an attribute for intrapreneurs is missing. This observation could however merely be biased by the selection of articles.

As can be seen, the review of Martiarena's article (2011) was omitted from the table. The reason for this omission is the fact, that while the article points out characteristics to be found in intrapreneurs it is not entirely clear how important and manifested they are as they are merely shown in comparison to independent entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, the remarkable part is that the characteristics Martiarena (2011) points out are in their core exactly the same three attributes pointed out earlier, innovativeness, risk-propensity and team work.

Table 3) Key Characteristics of Intrapreneurs

Author	Key Characteristics of Intrapreneurs
Cox & Jennings 1995	- Risk taking - Innovative - Team worker
Davis 1999	- Innovative

-
- Risk taking
 - Leadership
 - Resilient
 - Initiative

Pantry & Griffith 2000

- Vision
- Ability to allocate resources effectively
- Leadership
- Motivational
- Team worker
- Risk taking

Sayeed & Gazdar 2003

- Originality
 - Inspiration
 - Opportunity seeking
 - Risk taking
 - Team worker
 - Activeness
-

4. The Organization

The last part of this paper will focus on the intrapreneurial/corporate entrepreneurial organization. After having presented and discussed intrapreneurship on an individual level, a broader view will be applied on the subject. Similar to the second part of this paper, this third part will provide literature that explains and analyzes characteristics of intrapreneurship; however as previously mentioned on the organizational level. Furthermore, corporate entrepreneurial strategy and its outcomes will be depicted. This will help giving a deeper and broader understanding of the matter of intrapreneurship. The choice for this approach is again inspired by Antoncic's remark about current and recent literature focusing on this aspect of intrapreneurship (Antoncic & Hinsrich 2003).

In their 1994 paper Stopford and Baden-Fuller analyzed the response of ten companies in 'mature' industries to the implementation of corporate entrepreneurship. They further demonstrate that various types of corporate entrepreneurship exist within these companies and

how these types share five common attributes. Their analysis will help to find the characteristics these firms share, thus enabling a conclusion on what key traits are expected to be found within corporate entrepreneurial organizations.

The five attributes the authors distinguished are as follows. Firstly, there is proactiveness. On the organizational level this attribute is characterized as frame-breaking innovation (Stopford et al., 1994), which however is limited by the authors in the sense that for them proactiveness is not necessarily to be regarded as being the first mover in an industry. Furthermore this attribute is not linked with risk taking as the authors argue that although an organization needs to be proactive it does not simultaneously imply to take high risks. The second attribute chosen is of aspirations beyond current capability. In other words it is “the goal of progress and continuous improvement by finding better combinations of resource.” (Stopford et al., 1994, p.523) Paraphrasing Hamel and Prahalad (1989) the authors claim that this attribute is of major importance for organizations seeking to be industry leaders as well as to enact a frame-breaking change. Team-orientation is depicted as the third attribute, stressing the role of building teams within organizations in order to support internal innovativeness. Even though being an important part of the entrepreneurial organization, the authors hint towards potential downsides of this attribute, namely too much teamwork which according to Janis (1982) might stifle innovation. The capability to resolve dilemmas is named as the fourth attribute the various types of corporate entrepreneurship have in common. In this case, the authors specifically point towards organizations in a renewing process that solve previously insurmountable challenges through creatively resolving internal dilemmas. One could more broadly interpret this attribute to be the necessary ability for the firm to solve internal problems in creative ways. The last attribute mentioned is learning capability. In this case the authors argue that it is both important to the entrepreneurial concepts of renewal as well as frame-breaking, as it lifts potential limitations from the organization, enabling it to remain innovative and productive. Furthermore they argue that “organizations that go far in developing corporate entrepreneurship can be expected to make sustained investments in facilitating the learning environment”, stressing its importance to entrepreneurial organizations.

The results of the study comparing the three types of entrepreneurship, individual, renewal and frame-breaking with the help of the aforementioned attributes stress the importance these attributes have for the organizations, as they could be found in every organization analyzed. (Stopford et al., 1994) Concluding one could interpret the five attributes discussed as key characteristics every corporate entrepreneurial organization needs to have in order to be considered and survive as such.

Moon (1999) investigates in another study which characteristics of organizational structure, culture and environment influence the development of managerial entrepreneurship. In his paper he conducts an empirical analysis to examine the link between these organizational factors and managerial entrepreneurship.

Moon's study focuses specifically on three distinct organizational characteristics, namely structure, culture and environment. The key factors which are relevant for this paper will be discussed in the following part.

The main structural characteristics Moon talks about include organizational hierarchy, formalization, centralization, and specialization. Hierarchy is portrayed the number of levels in authority chains within organizations. As Covin and Slevin (1991) already pointed out, minimal hierarchy is associated with an entrepreneurial mindset. Also, it is argued that hierarchical structures limit the organizations attitude towards risk, which again is considered to be an important part of corporate entrepreneurial/intrapreneurial theory. Formalization describes to which extent organizational activities are established as written documents. The author argues again, that an increased amount of formalization hinders the organization more than it does help. Specialization shows the grade of professionalism in an organization. Not only, does specialization help trigger organizational innovations (Hage & Aiken, 1970), it does also encourage a positive attitude towards risk. Furthermore, high specialization enhances a more the communication within the organization. (Thompson, 1965) The last structural trait discussed is centralization, which simply shows the extent of control which top managers have. Moon argues that higher levels of centralization are counterproductive for corporate entrepreneurial endeavors as it limits the communication from the bottom up. Also, while the risk taking attitude is positively influenced for top managers other employees are discouraged to take risks.

The main cultural characteristics Moon deals with are mission, ethics and trust. Also, the organizational culture is believed to be a key element promoting entrepreneurship among firms. Having a mission is in so far important as it points towards specific goals and helps efficiently achieve those. By having a clearly formulated goal also the risk taking propensity is increased. Ethics are the moral rules and values which dictate how members within the group are supposed to interact with each other. The author argues that ethics do not only keep personal interests in line with the organizations, they also improve service quality as well as enhance innovative decisions. Lastly, Moon discusses trust. He argues the importance of this cultural trait by stressing how trust affects informal networks within the firm which also add to a cooperative

work environment. Furthermore, it is said that trust leads to a higher efficiency due to better allocation of resources. (Moon, 1999)

The last set of characteristics an organization has is of environmental nature. These characteristics include technological, legal, political, economic, demographic, ecological and cultural conditions. Moon poses two hypotheses for these characteristics summarizing them in contrast to previous character traits. For one he says that a higher degree of publicness, meaning a higher level of linkages with governments, financially or otherwise, lead to a decreased level of managerial entrepreneurship. On the other hand this level is increased counter proportionately with the level of legal constraints an organization faces.

Overall, in his study Moon is able to partially support the aforementioned claims. Nevertheless, he is convinced of the importance all three sets of organizational characteristics have for the development of managerial entrepreneurship. The contribution Moon makes to this paper is also quite tremendous as it shows which characteristics are important to the development of an entrepreneurial organization and which are not or can be harmful.

The last paper to be presented is from a book by Kuratko (2010). In this specific chapter he introduces the concept of corporate entrepreneurship as well as a strategy for an organization to transform into a corporate entrepreneurial entity. Again, only the remarks about the organization's characteristics are of interest for this paper even though the chapter provides much more information than that.

Kuratko argues that the major characteristics of a corporate entrepreneurial corporation are innovation, creativity and its leadership. A revitalization of these three traits is also what triggers potential transformations from normal organization to corporate entrepreneurial organization. In this aspect Kuratko emphasizes the trait of leadership, as he argues that most transformations are brought about either due to the failure of management to adapt to performance needs or due to the manager foreseeing the need for change and acting upon it.

Continuing, the author discusses five antecedents that are essential to entrepreneurial behavior and reflect characteristics necessary in a corporate entrepreneurial firm. "The five antecedents are: (1) *management support* (the willingness of top-level managers to facilitate and promote entrepreneurial behavior, including championing of innovative ideas and providing necessary resources), (2) *work discretion/autonomy* (top-level managers' commitment to tolerate failure, provide decision-making latitude and freedom from excessive oversight, and delegate authority

and responsibility), (3) *rewards/reinforcement* (development and use of systems that reward based on performance, highlight significant achievements, and encourage pursuit of challenging work), (4) *time availability* (evaluating workloads to assure time to pursue innovations and structuring jobs to support efforts to achieve short- and long-term organizational goals, and (5) *organizational boundaries* (precise explanations of outcomes expected from organizational work and development of mechanisms for evaluating, selecting, and using innovations).” (Kuratko, 2010)

As can be seen, even though three major characteristics are proposed by Kuratko, innovation, creativity and leadership, in this paper all of them either focus on the manager or are initiated by him. Thus, the interpretation can be made that even though the manager is an individual, on the organizational level he/she is one characteristic that defines an entrepreneurial corporation, as Kuratko says: “In the contemporary organization, all managers must be entrepreneurial leaders.” (Kuratko, 2010)

Lastly, Table 4 shows the characteristics of entrepreneurial organizations according to various authors. In comparison to the previous chapters, it becomes easily clear that there are no definite commonalities all three articles share with each other. However, as can be seen from previous chapters, the authors’ definitions do share commonalities with other intrapreneurial traits discussed earlier. These traits are proactiveness and innovativeness. The same holds for each team orientation mentioned by Stopford and Baden (1994) and trust and ethics used by Moon (1999). These two attributes can be seen as a point the two respective articles share. The same holds true for hierarchy and leadership. This demonstrates that while the article do share commonalities after all, one might need either more references or more general definitions in order to be able define the characteristics as focal for entrepreneurial organizations.

Table 4 Characteristics of entrepreneurial organizations

Author	Characteristics of an entrepreneurial organization
Stopford & Baden	- Proactiveness
Fuller 1994	- Learning ability
	- Team orientation
	- Learning capability
	- Willingness to improve
Moon 1999	- Hierarchy
	- Formalization

-
- Centralization
 - Specialization
 - Trust
 - Ethics
 - Clear goals

Kuratko 2000

- Innovativeness
- Creativity
- Leadership

5. Conclusion

Intrapreneurship is an important and growing part in entrepreneurship research. This paper has reviewed various studies and aspects of the concept of intrapreneurship. This paper's goal was to not only clarify the concept but also give a general overview of the current literature on intrapreneurship.

The first chapter of the paper deals with the concept of intrapreneurship itself. As can be seen a clear definition of what intrapreneurship is cannot be given, as most researchers define the concept with respect to what suits their research best. However, the literature shows that there are overarching aspects within the theory that all researchers can agree upon. The three characteristics of innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking seemingly define the structure of intrapreneurship. These three characteristics are the only ones mentioned in every single paper reviewed; however not only those presented in Chapter 1 but also the following chapters, which supports this claim. A slow development of the definitions is also visible, as they have become more specific and differentiated over time. This becomes especially clear when comparing Lumpkin's & Dess' article from 1998 with the one by Antoncic and Hisrich published in 2003.

In part two of the paper it becomes clear that characterizing an intrapreneurial individual can be approached in various ways and will thus lead to various profiles. These numerous profiles however seem to still share the specific attributes necessary to become an intrapreneur. Firstly, all three presented studies agree upon the fact that an important character trait of an intrapreneur is his innovativeness. Again it can be seen that while the studies lie further apart than the ones in chapter one they share many commonalities that seem to define an intrapreneur. The key characteristics are again innovativeness and risk taking; however probably due to the company

setting an intrapreneur finds himself in, also team work is involved. I would argue that team work plays such a big role in the intrapreneurial literature due to the fact that available human capital would be wasted otherwise. Lastly, as Martiarena points out in her article, even though entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs seem similar in many ways, they are in fact two very different.

The last part attempts to characterize the entrepreneurial organization. As can be seen, a concrete characterization of such an organization was not possible since the characteristics presented in each of the studies differed from one another to some extent. Nevertheless, there are commonalities, especially with the concept of intrapreneurship discussed in the earlier chapters. Also between the articles commonalities could be found. These were however not as clear as in the previous chapters making it impossible to define them as the core aspects of entrepreneurial organizations.

After having reviewed and discussed the concept of intrapreneurship on a general, individual and organizational level it is possible to point out the main characteristics that drive the concept. The attributes innovativeness and to a certain degree risk taking are seemingly to be found on every level of analysis and in every paper reviewed. It could thus be concluded that these are the two main characteristics of the concept of intrapreneurship with the other characteristics building around them. It is rather surprising that risk propensity does play such a big role in the concept of intrapreneurship, especially considering articles that compare intrapreneurs with entrepreneurs, such as Martiarena's which show that while intrapreneurs are willing to take risks, they are more cautious than entrepreneurs. This view might change with a macro analysis of the concept of intrapreneurship, also considering that risk propensity was mainly appearing in the analysis of the general concept and the individual intrapreneur.

This paper faced the following limitations. For one, an analysis on the national or international level was not conducted, meaning however that possible future research could focus on that matter. Additionally, the paper's last chapter is seemingly unfinished since no common theoretical ground was found for intrapreneurship on organizational level. This would mean that more insight in the organizational level of intrapreneurship is needed which is not only concerned with financial firm performance due to the employment of entrepreneurial skills within the organization.

6. References

- Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2003), "Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 10, No. 1, 7-24.
- Churchill, N.C. (1992), "Research issues in entrepreneurship", *The State of the Art of Entrepreneurship*, PWS-KENT, Boston, pp. 579-96.
- Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (1999), "Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 23 No.3, pp. 47–63.
- Colvin, J. and Slevin, D.P. (1991), "A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 15, pp. 7–24.
- Cox, C., Jennings, R. (1995), "The foundations of success: the development and characteristics of British entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 7, pp. 4 – 9.
- Davis, K.S., (1999), "Decision criteria in the evaluation of potential intrapreneurs", *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, Vol.16. pp. 295 – 327.
- Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2000), "Entrepreneurship as a utility maximizing response", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 15 No.3, pp. 231–251.
- Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002), "Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization", *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, Vol. 26 No.3, pp. 81–90.
- Guth, W. D. & Ginsberg, A. (1990), "Guest Editors' Introduction: Corporate Entrepreneurship", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 11, Summer Special Issue, pp. 5-15.

Hage, J. & Aiken, M. (1970), "Social Change in Complex Organizations", *Random House*, New York.

Hamel, G. and C. K. Prahalad (1989). "Strategic intent", *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 63-76.

Heinonen, J. (1999) "Kohti asiakaslähtöisyyttä ja kilpailukykyä. Sisäinen yrittäjäyys kunnallisen yksikön muutoksessa. (Towards Customer Orientation and Competitiveness. The Potential of Intrapreneurship in the Change Process of a Municipal Service Unit)" Publications of the Turku School of Economics and Business Administration Series A-5.

Heinonen, J. & Korvela, K. (2003), "How about measuring intrapreneurship?", EISB Conference, Milan.

Ireland, R.D., Covin, J.G., Kuratko, D.F. (2009), "Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 33 No.1, pp. 19–46.

Janis, I. L. (1982). "Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes", *Houghton Mifflin*, Boston.

Kirton, M.J. (1961), "Management Initiative", *Acton Society Trust*, London.

Kuratko, D.F. (2010), "Corporate Entrepreneurship: An Introduction and Research Review", *International Handbook Series on Entrepreneurship*, Volume 5, Part 2, pp. 129-163.

Lessem, R. (1988), "Intrapreneurship: How to be an enterprising individual in a successful business", *Wildwood House*, Aldershot, England.

Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996), "Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 135-72.

Martiarena, A. (2011), "What's so entrepreneurial about intrapreneurs?", *Small Business Economics*, (forthcoming)

Miller, D. 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, Vol.29, pp. 770-791.

Monsen, E., Patzelt, H., & Saxton, T. (2010), "Beyond simple utility: Incentive design and trade-offs for corporate employee-entrepreneurs", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 34 No.1, pp. 105–130.

Moon, M.J. (1999), "The Pursuit of Managerial Entrepreneurship: Does Organization Matter?", *Public Administration Review*, Vol.59 No.1, pp.31-43.

Pantry, S. & Griffiths, P., (2000), "Being an intrapreneur and creating a successful information service within your organization", *Business Information Review*, Vol. 17 No.4

Parker, S. C. (2004), "Economics of self-employment and Entrepreneurship", *Cambridge University Press*, New York.

Pinchot, G. (1987), "Innovation Through Intrapreneuring", *Research Management*, Vol.30 No.2

Sayeed, O. & Gazdar, M.K., (2003), "Intrapreneurship: Assessing and Defining Attributes of Intrapreneurs", *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, Vol.12 No. 1.

Stopford, J.M. and Baden-Fuller, C.W.F. (1994), "Creating corporate entrepreneurship", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15 No. 7, pp. 521-36.

Thompson, V. (1965). "Bureaucracy and Innovation.", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol.10, pp. 1-20.

Thornberry, N. (2001), "Corporate Entrepreneurship: Antidote or Oxymoron?", *European Management Journal* Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 526–533.

Zahra, S.A. (1991), "Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: an exploratory study", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 259-85.