

3. Dimensions of Intrapreneurship

Dr. K. Chandrasekar

Mr. V. Vivek

Alagappa Institute of Management,
Alagappa University,
Karaikudi.

Abstract:

Intrapreneurship is entrepreneurship within an established company. Because it has the backing of an established firm, intrapreneurship is often simpler for an individual than entrepreneurship. But there are both enablers and obstacles to intrapreneurship. This study is a systematic review of the dimensions of intrapreneurship. Eleven dimensions were identified and the results were discussed

Keywords: *Intrapreneurial Dimensions, Intrapreneurship, Innovation, Business startup.*

3.1 Introduction:

As the country's entrepreneurial ecosystem continues to grow rapidly, there are several prospects for people who want to start their businesses (Colin Mason & Brown, n.d.). Through the innovative practice of intrapreneurship, large organizations may accelerate innovation by better utilizing their entrepreneurial potential. Intrapreneurship is the practice of developing new goods or methods by fostering an entrepreneurial culture within an already established organization (de Villiers, 2022; Rebelo et al., 2021). An intrapreneur is in charge of innovating within a large, well-established company.

The term "intrapreneurship" refers to intra-corporate entrepreneurship (Atheya & Arora, 2015). It is a "hot subject" in management and entrepreneurial research. Intrapreneurship provides organizations with a competitive advantage by encouraging innovation and development (Hill, 2003). This advantage is critical in ever-changing competitive marketplaces where success is defined by being more efficient and faster than competitors, adapting and changing to satisfy client preferences (Hunt & Morgan, 2018).

Intrapreneurship has many characteristics of traditional entrepreneurship. There are some major distinctions as well. Both are initially interested in innovation. Innovation might take the form of brand-new products or services, brand-new procedures, or brand-new management techniques.

The creation of value-added goods or services is a problem for both (Olsen & Tomlin, 2019; Sarkar & Singh, 2005). Perhaps there are more differences than similarities between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Individual entrepreneurship is typically growing, even though intrapreneurship is frequently healing. The firm's antagonism is the contrast

between individual entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship. Entrepreneur aims to survive and establish themselves as a competitive force by overcoming market challenges. Corporate culture, however, can be the main threat to intrapreneurship (Spitzeck et al., 2013).

To ensure survival in cutthroat markets, intrapreneurship is essential for fostering development, profitability, revival, and regeneration (Mahmoud et al., 2022). Because of its numerous positive attributes, including new and sustainable thinking about value creation, the pursuit of more effective use of resources, and the adoption of a more stimulating environment for employees, intrapreneurship may enhance the company's financial performance (Journal et al., 2020)

Intrapreneurship is defined by Gifford Pinchot (Pinchot, 1985) as:

- A set of business practices that frees individuals with entrepreneurial dispositions to innovate quickly within bigger companies for the benefit of those businesses and their clients.
- The acts of a person or group of people who, with or without official backing, behave entrepreneurially to advance the interests of a bigger business and its supply chain.

3.2 Intrapreneurship Dimensions:

The following are the different dimensions of intrapreneurship

- **New venture:**

This feature is particularly related to intrapreneurship because ventures are, by definition, the result of corporative projects of existing firms. When a firm invests in the formation of a smaller organization to capitalize on a market need, this tiny organization is referred to as a venture or corporate venturing (Nedovic-Budic & Godschalk, 1996). A business might be an intern or extern. It is an intern while it is still a part of the parental organization's hierarchy. Even if it is known as a consequence of a larger corporation, the external venture has its separate organization. The company's ability to innovate may be seen in its hunt for fresh answers to client concerns. The most crucial aspect of intrapreneurship is new business venturing, which can result in the establishment of a new company within an old organization by redefining the firm's goods and services and/or entering new markets (Antonicic & Hisrich, 2001).

- **Process Innovativeness:**

Innovation has a crucial role in the theme. The combination of innovation and strategic management distinguishes enterprises from small businesses. Innovation is the means through which an opportunity may be transformed into a new product or service (Bytyqi, 2014). Although new initiatives include risks, these risks can be reduced if they are in line with sound management and operational practices. Innovation in manufacturing processes and new product development are both examples of intrapreneurs. Fresh products and/or the enhancement of services might be considered a crucial component that separates successful outcomes from failed organizations (Bennett, 2010).

- **Self-renewal:**

The renewal of the fundamental concepts upon which organizations are based allows for an imitation of their evolution. It encompasses redefining the business idea, reorganizing, and introducing system wide changes for innovation (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Journal et al., 2020). It contains strategic and organizational transformation subtleties. The renewal represents how the organization has changed as a result of the basic principles upon which it is based. Not only are new product development and market expansion essential, but also ongoing corporate renewal via flexibility and adaptability.

- **Proactiveness:**

Proactivity is a crucial quality for a firm looking to develop, more so than it is for the intrapreneur. Intrapreneurial businesses have a propensity to lead rather than merely follow their rivals, are thought of as innovators, and actively compete with them (Carrier, 2017).

Instead of just responding to the market, an innovative firm always seeks to anticipate it by actively seeking out new possibilities in developing markets. Pioneering is a concern of the proactive dimension, which has a favorable relationship with marker survival. Being proactive shows a company's willingness to seize chances rather than just reacting to rivals' movements.

- **Risk-taking:**

Taking chances while making financial decisions and adopting strategic measures in the face of uncertainty. Risk-takers who are prepared to invest their time and effort in turning a fantastic concept into an innovative reality within their firm are known as intrapreneurs. It's important to create a risk-taking climate within the organization (Nandan et al., 2015; Uslu, 2017). Employees and management must be willing to take risks and have a tolerance for failure should it occur for this to become a regular component. The risks that come with innovation, the creation of new businesses, and assertive or proactive measures inside the corporation must be taken into consideration. The major aspect that separates intra- and inter-entrepreneurial risks is the presence of the entrepreneurs' financial resources in the latter. An individual may feel considerably safer making dangerous decisions while working for the organization. Entrepreneurs, on the other hand, may reap even bigger financial benefits.

- **Competitive Aggressiveness:**

Competitive aggressiveness is the propensity of a business to confront its rivals. Competitive aggression is an organizational propensity that manifests as a readiness to engage with and outpace rivals (Johnson et al., 2011).

The firm's propensity to engage in aggressive competition with competitors in its industry fairly reflects its entrepreneurial situation. Competitive aggressiveness is the readiness to overthrow and overcome rivals. Proactivity and competitive aggressiveness are two characteristics that apply to business conduct; thus, anyone can mistake one for the other.

As was already noted, competitive aggressiveness relates to the organization's combative stance against its rivals, whereas proactivity refers to the company's pioneering role in capturing market chances (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001).

- **Organizational Culture:**

The right atmosphere is one of the more crucial factors in both business and entrepreneurial success. Conservative judgments are prioritized in the standard corporate culture model, and this constrictive atmosphere can stifle innovation, adaptability, independence, and risk-taking. Both the market environment and the proper internal elements are critical to the company's capacity of innovation (McLaughlin et al., 2006). Establishing a culture that welcomes mistakes and failures is essential, especially in the early phases of a project.

- **Autonomy:**

By avoiding bureaucracy and hierarchies and pursuing an effective innovation process, the company worried about bringing in an entrepreneurial mentality should also be concerned with creating a framework that does not stifle creativity and inventive acts in issue resolution. Although it is always seen as a secondary activity, an organizational structure that promotes intrapreneurship slowly evolves but is incredibly crucial for the firm (Haase et al., 2015; Pellegrini et al., 2019). One of the steps of corporate entrepreneurship management is developing a proper framework to grant intrapreneur autonomy. Its innovation, opportunity identification, and opportunity-taking processes must be consistent and simple.

- **Resources:**

Lack of funds and prioritizing other costs are two of the numerous issues that businesses interested in supporting intrapreneurs encounter. To be an intrapreneur, you need money. Funds are frequently allotted for the immediate or ongoing problem's remedy (Méndez-Picazo et al., 2021). Entrepreneur, however, has greater independence once they have what they need for their initiatives, but the intrapreneur frequently lacks the power to decide on costs alone. It gets harder to obtain resources when you're an entrepreneur. Most of the time, this resource is presented as an investment made personally by the business owner. Unlike the intrapreneur, who often abstains from seeking money directly for business endeavors?

- **Personal competences:**

Since new initiatives require input from several sectors, it is important to support the establishment of multidisciplinary teams, therefore those engaged should be contacted in an organized manner. Along with promoting the sharing of skills and knowledge, the notion of a flatter organization is related to the existence of individuals in a team with varying responsibilities and levels of understanding (Macneil, 2003; Zakaria et al., 2004).

The team's creation is crucial to the intrapreneurship process. But it's important to keep in mind that a team is made up of individuals. Each of them has to be improved to perform at its highest level and benefit the business.

- **Top Management Support:**

Assuring the board's commitment to supporting any changes that will be made is the first stage in every intrapreneur process. Support for the leadership may be provided both physically and through having simple access to both financial and human resources. Because intrapreneurship is a top-down process, this is a crucial dimension. It is a smart move for the business (Bauer, 2014).

3.3 Conclusion:

The intrapreneurship structure fosters innovation through its processes, the management provides a culture and environment that discovers places for the growth of intrapreneurship, and the agents carry out the entrepreneur activities with their creative talents and integration. This article is proposed to define, analyze and cluster the intrapreneurship dimensions.

3.4 References:

1. Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495–527. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(99\)00054-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(99)00054-3)
2. Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000310461187/FULL/XML>
3. Atheya, R., & Arora, R. (2015). Intrapreneurship: Revitalising Organizations through Intra-Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Asian Journal of Research in Business Economics and Management*, 5(3), 1. <https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7307.2015.00053.5>
4. Bauer, W. (2014). A New Approach to Innovation at Nestlé R&D. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 56(1), 111–116. <https://doi.org/10.1002/TIE.21599>
5. Bennett, R. (2010). Relationship formation and governance in consumer markets: Transactional analysis versus the behaviorist approach. [Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/0267257X.1996.9964425](http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1080/0267257X.1996.9964425), 1 2(5), 417–436. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.1996.9964425>
6. Bytyqi, K. (2014). Principles of State-Building: The case of Kosovo. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263661555>
7. Carrier, C. (2017). Intrapreneurship in Small Businesses: An Exploratory Study. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879602100101>, 21(1), 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879602100101>
8. Colin Mason, B., & Brown, R. (n.d.). ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEMS AND GROWTH ORIENTED ENTREPRENEURSHIP. De Villiers, R. (2022). Highly Innovative Organizations: Entrepreneurs, Intrapreneurs, Teams & Crowds in Partnership. *The Handbook of Creativity & Innovation in Business*, 379–409. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2180-3_18
9. Haase, H., Franco, M., & Félix, M. (2015). Organisational learning and intrapreneurship: evidence of interrelated concepts. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 36(8), 906–926. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-03-2014-0053/FULL/XML>

10. Hill, M. E. (2003). The development of an instrument to measure intrapreneurship: entrepreneurship within the corporate setting.
11. Hunt, S. D., & Morgan, R. M. (2018). The Comparative Advantage Theory of Competition. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299505900201>, 59(2), 1–15.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/002224299505900201>
12. Johnson, J. L., Martin, K. D., & Saini, A. (2011). Strategic Culture and Environmental Dimensions as Determinants of Anomie in Publicly-Traded and Privately-Held Firms. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 21(3), 473–502. <https://doi.org/10.5840/BEQ201121327>
13. Journal, I., Lee, A. C., Martins Do Nascimento, D., Francisco, J., Facó, B., & Gaspar, R. (2020). Intrapreneurship: A conceptual model and its dimensions. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering Research and Science (IJAERS)*, 7(6), 2456–1908. <https://doi.org/10.22161/ijaers.76.51>
14. Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429–451. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(00\)00048-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00048-3)
15. Macneil, C. M. (2003). Line managers: Facilitators of knowledge sharing in teams. *Employee Relations*, 25(3), 294–307.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/01425450310475874/FULL/XML>
16. Mahmoud, M. A., Ahmad, S., & Poespowidjojo, D. A. L. (2022). Psychological safety and individual performance: the mediating effect of intrapreneurial behavior. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 71(7), 2913–2931. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-10-2020-0538/FULL/XML>
17. McLaughlin, P., Bessant, J., & Smart, P. (2006). Exploring aspects of organizational culture that facilitate radical product innovation in a small mature company. <https://dspace.lib.cranfield.ac.uk/handle/1826/1119>
18. Méndez-Picazo, M. T., Galindo-Martín, M. A., & Castaño-Martínez, M. S. (2021). Effects of sociocultural and economic factors on social entrepreneurship and sustainable development. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 6(2), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JIK.2020.06.001>
19. Nandan, M., London, M., & Bent-Goodley, T. (2015). Social Workers as Social Change Agents: Social Innovation, Social Intrapreneurship, and Social Entrepreneurship. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2014.955236>, 39(1), 38–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2014.955236>
20. Nedovic-Budic, Z., & Godschalk, D. R. (1996). Human Factors in Adoption of Geographic Information Systems: A Local Government Case Study. *Public Administration Review*, 56(6), 554.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/977254>
21. Olsen, T. L., & Tomlin, B. (2019). Industry 4.0: Opportunities and Challenges for Operations Management. <https://doi.org/10.1287/Msom.2019.0796>, 22(1), 113–122.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/Msom.2019.0796>
22. Pellegrini, C., Annunziata, E., Rizzi, F., & Frey, M. (2019). The role of networks and sustainable intrapreneurship as interactive drivers catalyzing the adoption of sustainable innovation. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 26(5), 1026–1048. <https://doi.org/10.1002/CSR.1784>
23. Pinchot, G. I. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur*.

- <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=1496196>
24. Rebelo, S., Marques, C. S., & Santos, G. (2021). The Influence of Cognitive Styles as Promoters of Entrepreneurial Orientation and Intrapreneurship as Drivers of Innovation: The Case of Pharmacy Professionals in Portugal. *Sustainability* 2022, Vol. 14, Page 368, 14(1), 368. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU14010368>
 25. Sarkar, A. N., & Singh, J. (2005). New Paradigm in Evolving Brand Management Strategy. *Journal of Management Research*, 5(2), 80–90. <https://www.indianjournals.com/ijor.aspx?target=ijor:jmr&volume=5&issue=2&article=003>
 26. Spitzack, H., Boechat, C., & Leão, S. F. (2013). Sustainability as a driver for innovation - towards a model of corporate social entrepreneurship at Odebrecht in Brazil. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, 13(5), 613–625. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-06-2013-0080/FULL/XML>
 27. Uslu, T. (2017). Agile intrapreneurship in volatile business environment: Changing roles of financial managers and risk takers according to schumpeterian approach. *Contributions to Management Science*, 323–343. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-47172-3_22/COVER
 28. Zakaria, N., Amelinckx, A., & Wilemon, D. (2004). Working Together Apart? Building a Knowledge-Sharing Culture for Global Virtual Teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 13(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1467-8691.2004.00290.X>