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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this paper is to explore how organisations can identify the untapped potential of intrapreneurial intention amongst employees to increase its competitive advantage. Competitive advantage was therefore seen as an outcome of entrepreneurial actions, which, i.e. can be used for more effective and novel marketing strategies. To reach enhanced competitiveness, many firms make use of the concept of corporate entrepreneurship to boost innovation and firm performance.

To measure an employee’s intrapreneurial intention, this thesis deploys an exploratory approach by developing a research model that immerses organisational factors – an employee’s perception of the company’s Entrepreneurial Orientation, with behavioural attributes, as designed by Ajzen’s Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). The model includes five dimensions of a firm’s Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), including autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness. Behavioural attributes proposed by Ajzen consist of the personal attitude towards intrapreneurship, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control. The quantitative study generated a sample of 394 employees working in different organisations, industries, and on distinct hierarchical levels.

Based on the findings, the authors propose a new framework, in which intrapreneurial intentions are directly influenced by someone’s attitude towards intrapreneurship, and indirectly influenced by an employee’s positive perception of the organisation’s EO. As a result, a company should focus on individual attitudes first to discover a potential for intrapreneurial interests. As a support, a firm’s positive perception of its EO can influence the employee’s attitude towards intrapreneurship, but cannot solely boost intrapreneurial intentions amongst workers.
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1. INTRODUCTION

This part of the thesis introduces intrapreneurship and its implications on a company’s competitive advantage. It further presents the background on two widely known theories – a firm’s Entrepreneurial Orientation and the Theory of Planned Behaviour, which will be used as foundation for this thesis’ study approach. The purpose including the research question concludes this chapter.

“[…] Business enterprise has two – and only two – basic functions: marketing and innovation” – Peter Drucker (as cited in Trout 2006).

With an increase of globalisation, the need for innovation puts high pressures on firms competing in an international marketplace. Simple strategic marketing adjustments, for instance, to sell products effectively through lower pricing or higher quality are not enough, as companies producing in low-cost countries have inundated the market. As a result, one key objective of a business’ marketing strategy is to achieve a competitive advantage (Ghingold & Johnson, 1998). As there are different ways of gaining such competitive advantage, one strategic orientation that receives increasing attention is innovation. As stated by Ghingold and Johnson (1998), debating any subject on behalf of competitive advantage will also have important implications for the function of marketing within the firm. Hereby, it is worth noting, that not only new inventions can make a huge difference for a company’s performance, but enhanced innovativeness of an organisation can be used as a direct marketing tool in these highly competitive times. One perfect example of this novel marketing approach is Nissan. The company’s slogan “innovation that excites” incorporates the firm’s innovativeness into their marketing campaigns and uses innovation to demonstrate customers a sustainable advantage (Nissan Motor Company Ltd, 2018).

Mentioned by Peter M. Senge: “The only sustainable competitive advantage is an organization's ability to learn faster than the competition” (as cited in Jasimuddin, 2012, p. 215). Hence, as the quote states, the most sustainable competitive advantage in a globalised world might be the ability of knowledge transfer within the company. An excellent solution to knowledge transfer is to make use of already existing resources in an organisation. Consequently, the concept of intrapreneurship has become more and more valuable for companies in today’s environment.
1.1 Background

In a broad sense, intrapreneurship can be defined as “entrepreneurship within existing organisations” (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001, p. 496), also named corporate entrepreneurship, or corporate venturing in literature. In other words, intrapreneurship includes developing new ventures, exploiting opportunities, and creating economic value within an existing firm (Parker, 2009). In literature, intrapreneurship has become a firm focus, as it connects employees’ activities to the revitalising process of a company (Hornsby, Kuratko, Shepherd, & Bott, 2009; Krauss, Frese, Friedrich, & Unger, 2005; Skarmeas, Lisboa, & Saridakis, 2016). Consequently, corporate entrepreneurship often results in a firm’s enhanced innovativeness (Bierwerth, Schwens, Isidor, & Kabst, 2015), increased growth (Antoncic, 2007), and better firm performance altogether (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009). As such, intrapreneurial activities are one factor mentioned in literature that can lead to competitive advantage (e.g. Karimi & Walter, 2016; Martin-Rojas, Fernandez-Perez, & Garcia-Sanchez, 2017; Teece, Pisano, & Shuen, 1997; Zahra, 1991).

One can take two approaches when investigating the topic of intrapreneurship. The first one is at the individual employee level. As defined by Krueger (2000), it is not the organisation which innovates, but innovators are the individuals of a firm. Hence, when investigating the phenomenon of intrapreneurship, one must begin by focusing on individual employee behaviour. As argued by Krueger, Reilly and Carsrud (2000), entrepreneurial actions can be described as intentionally planned behaviour and do not occur randomly.

There exist three models in research aiming at measuring intentions in relation to entrepreneurship. Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB) is the most used model for addressing and measuring such intentions and behaviour respectively. As the key component, the two-step model proposes that intention can predict one’s behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). It is based on the observation that individuals make logical decisions to engage in specific behaviours by evaluating the information available to them. The actual performance of one’s behaviour is determined by the individual’s intention to engage in it. The fundamental component of behaviour, namely intention, is influenced by three key determinants: (1) attitude, (2) subjective norm and (3) perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1991). These three aspects of intention are characterised as perception-based. Thus, they differ between distinct situations and individuals (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994). When researching intention, the design of the study must be based on the respondents’ perception of the key determinants.
Shapero’s Model of the Entrepreneurial Event (SEE) (1982), and Ajzen’s TPB are relatively similar, with the main difference that SEE was designed explicitly for measuring the intention of starting an own business (Krueger et al., 2000). However, both theories employ an aspect of self-efficacy and furthermore include measures of attitude. Ajzen (1991) explicitly measures a personal attitude towards the behaviour. Shapero (1982) deploys the same approach by measuring intention through the dimensions of perceived desirability, propensity to act, which defines how attractive it is for someone to start a business in relation to interpersonal as well as extra-personal influences, and perceived feasibility – the reflection of volitional factors of a certain intention including a “can-do” mindset.

Bird’s model (1988), uses another approach by measuring intentions based on two directly influencing dimensions of (1) rational, or analytic oriented processes, and (2) intuitive as well as holistic factors. Further, Bird (1988) suggests that indirectly through these two dimensions, intention is influenced by personal (e.g. experiences, abilities) and contextual (social-, political background) factors.

The second approach, rather than focusing on individuals for investigating intrapreneurship, incorporates the firm level. The company and its strategic performance can play an influencing factor in an employee’s intention to pursue an intrapreneurial project. The firm might adopt an Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) to promote intrapreneurial activities amongst employees (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Literature suggests five main dimensions how a firm’s EO can be described (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Stevenson & Jarillo 1990). These dimensions include autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness. Since intrapreneurs are embedded in a secure and professional environment and do not necessarily have to get active in pursuing their ideas, the EO of a company not only has to be implemented in the strategic outline but also should be fostered by the management to establish a pro-intrapreneurial organisational structure. However, looking at research for validating this statement, current literature (e.g. Andersén & Samuelsson, 2016; Bogatyreva, Beliaeva, Shirokova, & Puffer, 2017; Caseiro & Coelho, 2018; Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; Eshima & Anderson, 2016) strongly focuses on external antecedents of EO as well as finding an explanation of the multidimensional construct, but does not take the employee and the respective perception of intrapreneurship into account.
1.2 Problem Statement

Deriving from above, intrapreneurship is often analysed as evolving from the firm’s perspective. However, current literature does not integrate the two approaches for analysing intrapreneurship at the individual employee level, paired up with the strategic organisational factors of the firm.

Losing a competitive advantage can be highly critical for companies, especially in times of globalised markets (Ghingold & Johnson, 1998). In the past, the downfalls of global players such as Nokia, Blackberry or Kodak have shown, that even companies that seem strategically and operatively ahead of competition can not only confide in past achievements (Derbyshire & Giovannetti, 2017). With the technological progress, it has become vital for firms to recognise opportunities, to independently seek innovation and to interpret trends rightly. As a result, many IT businesses, such as Google, 3M, or Apple are actively involved in the concept of intrapreneurship (Deeb, 2016).

Thus, research has recently been focusing on intrapreneurship and its implications on competitive advantage (e.g. Augusto, Rodrigues, & Caldeirinha, 2012; Lenka, Gupta, & Sahoo, 2016; Venn & Berg, 2013). One contributing factor to keep a competitive advantage is to make use of human resources within an organisation. Talented employees that display intrapreneurial intention are considered a highly important driver of strategic renewal and change within organisations (Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). Successful examples such as the development of the “PlayStation” by an employee at Sony, show that intrapreneurship can heavily contribute to a company’s success. Especially the “PlayStation” case shows perfectly that intrapreneurs often must overcome numerous obstacles to pursue their innovative ideas. When Ken Kutaragi, the initial idea provider for the PlayStation, was working at Sony Corporation, he observed that Nintendo’s products did not have a satisfying quality of sound. By his motivation alone, he developed a CD-ROM based system for gaming. Although the managing board of Sony was unconvinced of his work and Sony was not yet operating in the gaming market, he pressed on against all resistance, and partially due to Ken’s perseverance among others, Sony developed its own blockbuster gaming system, today known as PlayStation. This intrapreneurial success story made up 40 percent of Sony Corporation’s profit of operations by the year of 1998 (Bedda, 2011). This case is undoubtedly an unparalleled example of intrapreneurship, but Sony would have lost out on one of its highest-selling products if the employee would not have been so persistent.
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Therefore, it seems responsibility particularly lies on the companies’ management board to facilitate corporate entrepreneurship and to establish an organisational structure that enables employees to get creative, which can be very cost-intensive and time-consuming. Many studies (e.g. Hornsby et al., 2009; Miles, Snow, Fjeldstad, Miles, & Lettl, 2010) have picked up on the necessity to address the implementation process and the organisational structure that needs to be provided to see intrapreneurial projects going through and to promote innovation. For instance, Alpkan, Bulut, Gunday, Ulusoy and Kilic (2010) investigated the direct and interactive effects of organisational support and human capital on the innovative performance of companies, concluding that the availability of a performance-based incentive system and spare time, which could be used for brainstorming ideas, have no impact on innovativeness. However, the support of the management team for idea development and tolerance for risk-taking can have positive effects on innovative performances.

Furthermore, Park, Jeong-Nam and Krishna (2014) suggest in their study that an organisation’s innovativeness is connected to the relationships a firm cultivates with their employees. Encouraging employees to engage in intrapreneurial activities can lead to a bottom-up information funnel for innovative ideas and information from employees. In accordance with the cited studies above, it seems very promising to conduct further research on the influence of individual employees’ characteristics on their intrapreneurial intention. According to Park et al. (2014), a study investigating effects of employees’ behavioural traits could lead to the generation of practical knowledge for management boards as well as to the enrichment of existing literature.

As a conclusion, this paper takes an integrative approach from the employee’s perspective. Even when companies provide incentives to foster innovative ideas amongst employees, the organisation is thereby pushed into a more expectant and receptive role, rather than a proactive actor, who is able to single out intrapreneurial employees. Thus, as the first step towards a more can-do mentality, this thesis focuses mainly on employees’ intrapreneurial intention in an organisational setting, taking a firm’s EO into account.

1.3 Purpose
The purpose of this paper is to explore how organisations can identify the untapped potential of intrapreneurial intention to increase a company’s competitive advantage. Analysing an employee’s perception of the firm’s EO and its influence on an employee’s intrapreneurial
intention can lead to better strategic incentives to promote corporate entrepreneurship. Based on the current literature, it is the first step in research to ultimately increase a firm’s competitive advantage.

Therefore, an integrative approach is taken in this thesis by designing a model that immerses explicitly organisational factors with behavioural attributes. This will be done by conducting quantitative research by means of an online questionnaire pertaining the intrapreneurial phenomenon (Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013).

1.4 Delimitations
This research study is limited to the use of the TPB (Ajzen, 1991). As such, Bird’s (1988) model of intentionality and Shapero’s (1982) model of the entrepreneurial event are excluded. Bird’s model is not considered appropriate for this study, as the model has never been empirically tested, and has yet to be validated amongst researchers for measuring entrepreneurial intentions (Shook, Priem, & McGee, 2003). Shapero’s model (1982) is focused on opening an own venture outside an existing organisation and thus is less suitable for this study than a more general view of intentions as conceptualised by Ajzen (1991). Thus, it is believed that the TPB has the best fit for fulfilling the research purpose and will be of primary focus. Additionally, it is the most used theory for measuring entrepreneurial behaviour and intention and has previously been applied by a variety of studies investigating similar topics (e.g. Lüthje & Franke, 2003; Liñán, Urbano, & Guerrero, 2011; Kautonen, Gelderen, & Tornikoski, 2013), which proves its validity.
2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents the literature review consisting of the three paradigms regarding a firm’s competitive advantage, the concept of entrepreneurship and its extension, namely intrapreneurship and two models for measuring intentions.

2.1 Competitive Advantage

Three distinct paradigms developed in the literature exist to describe the concept of competitive advantage (Teece et al., 1997). As such, the first paradigm was established by Porter (1985) by its competitive forces approach and was built upon the structure-conduct-performance paradigm of industrial organisations (Bain, 1959; Mason, 1949). It describes competitive advantage as certain activities of a company to generate a defendable position against competitive forces and is, therefore, industry-driven (Porter, 1985).

The second construct of competitive advantage – the strategic conflict approach (Krueger et al., 2000) is strongly related to Porter’s (1985) approach and emphasises on product market imperfections, entry deterrence, and strategic interactions. Within the approach, competitive results derive from effectiveness from which the firm can outperform competitors based on factors such a strategic investment, pricing strategies, or the control of information (Teece et al., 1997).

The third paradigm describes competitive advantage as an outcome of entrepreneurial actions originating from central firm-level efficiency advantages and thus involves corporate strengths and weaknesses. The approach suggests that companies purely develop competitive advantage through efficiency and effectiveness, based on technological and organisational change within the firm (Teece et al., 1997). As such, this approach to describe competitive advantage is strongly linked to entrepreneurship which results in internal innovation.

To gain the sustainable competitive advantage built up by corporate entrepreneurship, companies need to understand employees’ perception of themselves better as well as of their surroundings, especially, since human behaviour is the product of human character and mindset. The human behaviour displayed by employees in a company can be seen as the product of paradigms, namely the ways employees see themselves and the world around them, in this case, their firm’s environment (Moon & Dathe-Douglass, 2015). Conclusively, competitive advantage through corporate entrepreneurship will be the principal focus of this thesis.
2.2 Entrepreneurship and Corporate Entrepreneurship

As the construct of corporate entrepreneurship is defined by the phenomenon of entrepreneurship, first, it is important to understand the core of entrepreneurship.

2.2.1 The Concept of Entrepreneurship

Research on entrepreneurship and the way the concept has been interpreted by scientists can be categorised into three streams (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). The first stream of research focused on the result – the what of entrepreneurship. One of the most compelling examples to mention is the Schumpeterian view of entrepreneurship, where the outcome of an entrepreneur’s activity is analysed (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). In that sense, entrepreneurship is viewed as a process by which the whole of the economy is advancing through disruptions followed by innovative creations (Schumpeter, 1934). The next stream of entrepreneurship research concentrated on the actor – the entrepreneur itself, and thus analyses entrepreneurship from a psychological and sociology point of view. As such, strong focus lies on individual human beings to answer the question of why in relation to entrepreneurship, by also integrating an entrepreneur’s environment, objectives, motivations, or values into the research (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). Lastly, the third wave of research looks at the entrepreneurial management process, and hence, how entrepreneurship occurs, which will also be the focus of this thesis. Central in this stream of research is finding out how entrepreneurs’ objectives are accomplished (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). It explores how to increase innovation in existing firms, investigates start-ups, the firm’s life cycle, as well as prognosticators of entrepreneurial success (Austin, Stevenson, & Wei-Skillern, 2006).

As a result, there are various perspectives on entrepreneurship, depending on the compound of different variables included, such as the individual, the organisation, or the environment (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Consequently, entrepreneurship is a multidimensional construct and a complex phenomenon. In literature, there is still no common agreement on what entrepreneurship can be defined as (Stevenson & Jarillo, 1990). According to Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994), most researchers agree that all forms of entrepreneurship are built upon innovations to create the possibility of new market positioning, require a transformation in the arrangement of resources and the establishment of new competencies (Stopford & Baden-Fuller, 1994). In a broad sense, entrepreneurship was defined by Wennekers and Thurik (1999) as:
“the manifest ability and willingness of individuals, on their own, in teams, within and outside existing organizations, to:

- Perceive and create new economic opportunities (new products, new production methods, new organizational schemes and new product-market combinations) and to
- Introduce their ideas in the market, in the face of uncertainty and other obstacles, by making decisions on location, form and the use of resources and institutions” (p. 46).

Burgelman (1983) suggests, entrepreneurship can be pursued for a new market entry, or by introducing new goods to a known market; and the launch of a new venture – either within or outside an existing organisation. Thus, his view on entrepreneurship is in line with Wennekers’ and Thurik’s (1999) definition. Similarly, Lumpkin and Dess (1996), created a construct of new entry – interpreted as actions which may be launched by individuals, a small organisation, or by strategic business units of substantial corporations. A new entry is the crucial undertaking of entrepreneurship and stands in strong relation to a business-level strategy. Concerning Churchill (1992), entrepreneurship is defined 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” (p. 586).

As such, entrepreneurship is also seen in the perspective within an enterprise and as further argued, is a key component of high-performing enterprises (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). As a result, there is not one definition which can capture the whole construct around entrepreneurship. In this paper, the authors chose to interpreter entrepreneurship as defined by Wennekers and Thurik (1999) described above.

2.2.2 The Concept of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Whereas entrepreneurship is mostly understood as evolving outside an existing organisation, corporate entrepreneurship includes creating a new venture within an existing firm, to exploit new opportunities and to create economic wealth (Pinchot, 1985). It is often equally used as intrapreneurship or corporate venturing in literature. In the literature, there exists substantial evidence that intrapreneurship helps to renew and rejuvenate, to innovate, and to increase the overall performance of an organisation (Parker, 2009).

More narrowly defined, according to Stopford and Baden-Fuller (1994), there are three different types of corporate entrepreneurship. The first is the creation of new ventures or business units, specifically called corporate venturing, or intrapreneurship. Secondly, it
includes activities related to the renewal or strategic transformation of established businesses, and third, corporate entrepreneurship develops when a firm changes the rule of competition within its industry – if an enterprise develops an innovation that radically changes the marketplace (Stopford & Baden-Fuller, 1994). However, in this paper, the authors do not distinguish between the meaning of corporate entrepreneurship – corporate venturing – and intrapreneurship.

2.3 Competing Models for Measuring Intention

Concerning Bird (1988), entrepreneurial intentions have an essential influence on all firms. In established businesses, managers’ individual values prove to affect an organisation’s strategy (Guth & Tagiuri, 1965). Concerning Krueger et al. (2000), entrepreneurial activity derives from intentionally planned behaviour. Hence, many entrepreneurs show implications of long-term interest and wish of new venture creation. Concerning Ajzen (1991), intentions can anticipate behaviour, whereas contrarily, distinct attitudes can anticipate intentions. Consequently, intentions present crucial mediating factors between the action of new venture creation and potential exogenous elements.

As a result, to understand the repercussion of intentions – a certain behaviour, one must understand antecedents of intentions first. Entrepreneurship is often intentional, thereof the use of intention models which have been empirically tested should represent a suitable instrument for measuring antecedents of entrepreneurship (Krueger et al., 2000). As corporate entrepreneurship is included in the concept of entrepreneurship, the authors believe that entrepreneurial intention models can be applied to the case of intrapreneurship in general terms.

Shook et al. (2003) stated that there are three models which explain and capture how entrepreneurial intentions are generated: (1) Shapero’s (1982) Model of the Entrepreneurial Event (SEE), (2) Bird’s (1988) Model for Implementing Entrepreneurial Ideas, and (3) Ajzen’s (1991) TPB. As this study deploys Ajzen’s TPB for measuring intrapreneurial intentions, it is explained further below in the frame of reference and not in this section of the paper.

2.3.1 Shapero’s Model of the Entrepreneurial Event (SEE)

Shapero’s SEE (1982) has been specifically designed for entrepreneurial intentions. Within these, intentions to start a business emerge from perceptions of desirability and feasibility as well as of propensity to react on certain opportunities. Further, the model states that human behaviour is guided primarily by one’s passivity until it is “displaced” by external factors.
(Krueger et al., 2000). Displacement is often perceived as something negative, such as losing employment but could also be something positive such as an inheritance. A sort of displacement in life can lead to a change in behaviour, whereas a person pursues the best available opportunity amongst certain alternatives.

The choice of pursuing a certain behaviour is based on the relative ‘credibility’ of alternatives as well as some ‘propensity to act’. Credibility only takes place when the behaviour is perceived as desirable and feasible. Hence, entrepreneurial behaviours demand that the credibility and propensity for new venture creation exist before displacement occurs.

As a result, exogenous variables do not directly influence intentions or behaviour. However, they engage through individual perceptions of desirability and feasibility (see fig. 1).

![Figure 1 Shapero’s (1982) Model of the Entrepreneurial Event (SEE)](image)

Perceived Desirability and Perceived Feasibility

Concerning Shapero, perceived desirability can be defined as a “personal attractiveness of starting a business, including both intrapersonal and extrapersonal impacts” (Krueger et al., 2000, p. 429). In other words, perceived desirability relates to the extent to which an individual perceives him- or herself capable of starting an own business. This aspect relates to Bandura’s (1986) construct of self-efficacy – precursors of perceived feasibility and assesses the belief that one can perform a specific action.
Propensity to Act

Shapero defined a propensity to act as a “personal disposition to act on one’s decision, thus reflecting volitional aspects of intentions (“I will do it”)” (as cited in Krueger et al., 2000, p. 29). Consequently, it is almost impossible to realise intentions without a propensity to act. However, it is influenced by control perceptions, which means the extent to which someone wishes to take over control by pursuing the action.

In general, the model is very similar to the TPB (Ajzen, 1991). Therefore, researchers who measured SEE (Shapero, 1982) have independently identified identical antecedents of the model, which proves its validity (Davidsson, 1991). As Krueger et. al. (2000) suggest, it provides researchers with a valuable model for an enhanced understanding of organisational emergencies. Negative aspects of the model might be that it is specifically designed for a new venture creation outside an existing organisation (Shapero, 1982). As such, for this research purpose, the model might fail to capture all necessary dimensions to measure intrapreneurial intentions.

2.3.2 Bird’s Model of Entrepreneurial Intentionality

Intentionality defined by Bird (1988) is “a state of mind directing a person’s attention (and therefore experience and actions) toward a specific object (goal) or a path in order to achieve something (means)” (p. 442). As seen below (fig. 2), in Bird’s approach, intentionality is directly influenced by two dimensions: (1) rational, analytic, and cause-effective-and-effect oriented processes, and (2) Intuitive, holistic, and contextual thinking. However, indirectly, intention in Bird’s model is influenced by personal and contextual factors. As such, the personal context is described for instance by former experiences as an entrepreneur, personality characteristics, and personal abilities, such as advertising and promoting a certain idea. Included in the contextual background, are social, economic and political variables, such as disruptions in the marketplace, or government policies (Bird, 1988).
Rational, analytic, and cause-effective-and-effect oriented thinking

An individual’s rational, analytic, and cause-and-effect-oriented reasoning influences one’s intentions. Such psychological means determine for instance opportunity analyses, business plans, and most importantly goal-directed behaviour (Latham & Yukl, 1975; Locke, Shaw, Saari, & Latham, 1981). Specifying aims concerning entrepreneurship includes a hierarchical behaviour between a superior and subordinate. Therefore, a superior for instance lays out specific goals, whereas the subordinate oversees this objective with individual intentions. Intentionality concerning Bird (1988), not only includes setting specific objectives but also involves a great extent of creativity and freedom of the entrepreneur.

Intuitive, holistic, and contextual thinking

The second dimension frames and structures an entrepreneur’s intentionality and behaviour. Intuition, holism, and contextual thinking are based on an entrepreneur’s hunch, vision, and untapped resources, as well as an excitement for the potential venture (Bird, 1988).
Boyd and Vozikis (1994) imply that although Bird’s model built up essential fundamentals for newer intention models such as TPB, the model has never been tested empirically, and hence lacks validity (Shook et al., 2003). Further, the authors argue that the model misses the incorporation of the dimension of self-efficacy. They suggest that the connection between intention and behaviour would add essential insights into cognitive processes by which intentions are established and executed through specific activities (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994).
3. FRAME OF REFERENCE

In this chapter, a more detailed report on the two primary models is given. It illustrates the five dimensions of a company’s EO. Furthermore, the TPB developed by Ajzen (1991) is further explicated.

3.1 Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO)

3.1.1 Defining Entrepreneurial Orientation

Argued by Hamel (2001), in today’s business environment, product and business model life-cycles have become shorter. As a result, prospective profit streams from existing operations are unpredictable, and firms are in need to continually search new opportunities and hence, adopt an entrepreneurial strategic orientation (EO) (Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). Included in the concept of intrapreneurship, EO indicates a business’ strategic focus, including specific entrepreneurial attributes of decision-making practices, techniques, and styles (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

As defined by Miller (1983), an entrepreneurial firm “is one that engages in product market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is first to come up with ‘proactive’ innovations, beating competitors to the punch” (p. 771). This view on EO has been consistent in the literature, e.g. Covin and Slevin (1991), state that EO includes a firm’s eagerness to innovate and revitalise market offerings, take risks to attempt launching new and unclear goods or services, and to be more proactive than rivals towards new opportunities in the marketplace. Miller (1983) sees a necessity for firms to act entrepreneurially regarding intensity and confrontation if they wish to compete with existing rivals. Hart (1992) designed an integrative framework on the strategy-making process, which involves the whole range of organisational actions and specifically includes: planning, strategic management, and decision-making.

Consequently, there are essential strategic management processes (SMP) that underlie entrepreneurial processes (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996), from which strategic decisions are developed (Hart, 1992). As argued by Stevenson and Jarillo (1990), there are organisational processes, methods, and styles which firms employ to act entrepreneurially, which results in the concept of entrepreneurial management.

3.1.2 Dimensions of EO

Common in literature, there are generally five dimensions included describing the concept of EO (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Each dimension is explained in more detail below.
Autonomy

Originally, the term entrepreneurship was known due to independently determined employees who chose to leave their job position to create innovation and new ventures outside the organisation. Reasons for this included preventing constraint from superiors and internal organisational processes (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). As a result, companies intended to act entrepreneurially and were willing to foster the development of new ideas, which are crucial in the process of new venture creation. Hence, firms started to give individual employees and project teams freedom to execute their creative thinking. As such, autonomy is a key characteristic of a firm’s EO.

In this context, autonomy can be defined as “an independent action of an individual or team in bringing forth an idea or vision and carrying it through to completion” (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996, p. 140). In a broader sense, autonomy includes a general aptitude and intention to exploit opportunities. Within the firm context, it can refer to activities performed outside a firm’s fixed structures. Although essential influences such as competitive rivalry, resource availability, as well as internal structures might change the new venture development, those factors are not sufficient to suffocate autonomy which is primarily needed for intrapreneurial actions (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Now, depending on the firm context, e.g. its size, management approach, or ownership; autonomy varies within distinct organisations. To give a concrete example, when the primary decision-maker is the owner, autonomy can still occur, depending on the organisational style, and thus depends on the degree of centralisation or delegation implemented by top-management.

As studies by Miller (1983) suggest, in smaller firms, the chief executive as the firm’s knowledge leader, has the most influence on the level of entrepreneurship. The studies show that if the leader maintains a strong centralised authority, combined with the alertness of newly developing technologies and markets in the industry, companies mostly also have a high entrepreneurial level (Miller, 1983). Larger firms implemented adjustments in organisational structures towards flat hierarchies and dividing authority through operating units to develop intrapreneurship (Pinchot, 1985). Quinn’s studies (1979) further enhance on that aspect, as they show that changes in organisational structures are not sufficient if companies do not give their employees the right amount of autonomy and the courage to execute innovative projects. Even though most of those projects might fail, innovation will flourish at some point (Quinn, 1979). Furthermore, Burgelman’s study (1983) shows that commencing internal corporate venturing
processes were often pursued by corporate R&D departments without official approval of the projects – hence, the departments worked outside the current organisational structure and strategy.

**Innovativeness**

Schumpeter (1934) was one of the first to stress the role of innovation in relation to the entrepreneurial process. As such, his concept of ‘creative destruction’ points out that wealth is created when existing market formations are disrupted by the launch of new products and services which relocate resources away from established firms and results in the growth of new firms. Crucial to this cycle is entrepreneurship and the introduction of innovative goods that drive the dynamic development of an economy (Schumpeter, 1934). Fundamentally, innovativeness is an essential characteristic of entrepreneurship and EO.

Now, defining innovation, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) state that there are two main types of innovation which are mostly used as a classification in research – either product-market innovation or technological innovation. Product-market innovativeness enhances the focus on product design, marketing research, as well as promotion and advertising (Miller & Friesen, 1978; Scherer, 1980). On the other hand, technological innovation mainly involves product and process advancement, engineering, emphasis on research, a focus on technical know-how, and industry insights (Cooper, 1971; Maidique & Patch, 1982). However, these two types of innovation might overlap, for instance, when a technologically advanced product is introduced to meet current market demand. In both types of innovativeness, it becomes evident that an entrepreneurial oriented firm depends on innovation, as it represents significant means by which firms exploit new opportunities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Regarding Miller and Friesen (1982) in their study on “technorization” of firms, higher levels of innovation are positively related to greater dependence on technically trained experts.

**Risk-taking**

The conception of risk-taking ability is often used to describe and analyse entrepreneurship. However, risk-taking has distinct meanings depending on the specific context (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). In relation to the research study of Baird and Thomas (1985), there are three types of risk-taking: (1) Venturing into the unknown, (2) Committing to a large portion of assets, and (3) Borrowing heavily. The second and third type of risk is in line with Miller and Friesen’s (1978) definition of risk-taking: “the degree to which managers are willing to make large and risky resource commitments – i.e. those which have a reasonable chance of costly failures” (p.
They both refer to financial risk, which includes the probability of a negative outcome and heavy losses for the firm.

However, important to mention is that all business actions involve some risks. Concerning Lumpkin and Dess (1996), there is are distinct risk-taking actions. As such, the authors formulate “safe-risks”, for instance including to using a bank account, or for a retailer to restock shelves. Contrarily, high risks include heavily borrowing, investing into unsure technologies, as well as launching new products into a market (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Another critical aspect of risk in relation to entrepreneurship is that in the literature, scientists are not able to identify a consistency of risk-taking patterns (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). There is a discrepancy between the risk-taking behaviour of individuals who are involved in a new market entry (Brockhaus, 1982), as well as the different outcomes of studies investigating the relationship between risk-taking and performance (Begley & Thomas, 1985).

Proactiveness

Apart from Schumpeter (1934) who was the first to emphasise the gravity of initiative during the entrepreneurial process, many other researchers have concentrated on the phenomenon of proactiveness in relation to entrepreneurship.

Penrose (1959) mentions that entrepreneurial managers are crucial for firms to grow, as they can provide the necessary vision and imagination to employ opportunistic behaviour. Opportunity exploitation is also based on the first-mover advantage, which is the best strategy to increment the gain of a market opportunity. By exploiting irregularities in the market, a first-mover can seize extraordinary high profits and receives a head start in the market concerning brand reputation and image (Lieberman & Montgomery, 1988). Respectively, the initiative by forecasting and pursuing opportunities has become an influential factor in association with entrepreneurship (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Proactiveness within the firm context can be defined as: “seeking new opportunities which may or may not be related to the present line of operations, introducing of new products and brands ahead of competition, strategically eliminating operations which are in the mature or declining stages of the life cycle” (Venkatraman, 1989, p. 949), which relates to processes aiming at forecasting future needs. Hence, proactiveness is strongly related and a key determinant of EO, as it enhances a forecasting perspective, in combination with innovative and new venture
actions (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). As a result, a proactive enterprise is one that leads, rather than follows competitors.

Although the concept of first-mover advantage and acting in anticipation is crucial within the entrepreneurial firm, there also exists specific evidence that a company can operate proactively – be thinking forward and acting fast, without being the first-mover. For instance, Miller and Camp (1985) found out that the second company to enter a new market was as much a pioneer as the first entering firm. Thus, one does not have to be the first mover to succeed in achieving proactiveness. Important to mention is the distinction between proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness. Proactiveness in that sense is about how an enterprise relates to opportunities in the market – by taking the initiative and shaping the environment. Therefore, proactiveness is explicitly about meeting demand. Contrarily, competitive aggressiveness is about how a company relates to its competitors. That is, how an enterprise responds to trends and demands which already exist in the industry (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Hence, competitive aggressiveness is about competing for demand and will be described as the last dimension of EO.

**Competitive aggressiveness**

As argued by Porter (1985), an aggressive posture and intense rivalry are crucial for the survival and achievement of new entrants in the market. Competitive aggressiveness in this sense can be described as a company’s disposition to intensely as well as directly confront its competitors so to accomplish a new entry or a vital position in the marketplace through outperforming industry competition. Factors underlying this concept are characterised as being responsive to the market. For instance, by promoting a head-to-head confrontation during a new market entry, or by acting reactively, i.e. by lowering prices because of high competitive pressures (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Competitive aggressiveness is an essential factor and determinant of a company’s EO. Evident, are Porter’s (1985) three approaches to aggressively challenge existing firms in the marketplace. These are (1) reconfiguration, (2) changing the context (redefinition of the product or service and its marketing channels or scope), and (3) outspending the leader of the industry. Hence, competitive aggressiveness regarding a company’s direct responsiveness to achieving competitive advantage is crucial for a firm’s EO. Further, competitive aggressiveness involves the eagerness to act unconventionally instead of relying on traditional practices of competing in the industry (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Specifically, it might include targeting a
rival’s weaknesses (MacMillan & Jones, 1984), or concentrating on high value adding products for the customer (Woo & Cooper, 1981).

According to Covin and Slevin (1989), purely companies with high levels of all – originally three, – dimensions should be categorised as entrepreneurial businesses. Contrarily, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) suggest that this is too narrowly defined. As explained above, there exist many different types of entrepreneurship. Correspondingly, to only include companies with high levels of all dimensions, means that entrepreneurial behaviour is limited to those few companies respectively, which makes it impossible to explain the many types of entrepreneurship. Conclusively, all dimensions are essential to understand the entrepreneurial process, nonetheless, they might appear in different compositions.

In current research, a company’s EO has been investigated on different levels. A recent study by Andersén (2017) investigated the effects of EO on employees in small and medium-sized enterprises. His findings imply that employees encounter a feeling of ambiguity when trying to follow the incentives, which are implemented by the company for Entrepreneurial Orientation, while simultaneously keeping track on their daily tasks.

In comparison, Wiklund and Shepherd (2005) discovered in their research on small businesses that access to capital and the dynamism of the environment combined with EO are important for the firm’s performance. Furthermore, Hornsby et al. (2009) detected that the middle and top managerial level are best suited to provide the organisational capacity to support entrepreneurial activities. Hence, EO is best described by diverse dimensions in distinct combinations.

### 3.2 The Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB)

With regard to Bird’s research model (1988), entrepreneurial intentions have an essential influence on all firms. In established businesses, managers’ individual values prove to affect an organisation’s strategy (Guth & Tagiuri, 1965). Krueger et al. (2000) state that entrepreneurial activity derives from intentionally planned behaviour. Hence, many entrepreneurs show implications of long-term interest and wish of new venture creation. Concerning Ajzen (1991), intentions can anticipate behaviour, whereas contrarily, distinct attitudes can anticipate intentions. Consequently, intentions present crucial mediating factors between the action of new venture creation and potential exogenous elements.
As a result, to understand the repercussion of intentions – a certain behaviour, one must understand antecedents of intentions first. Entrepreneurship is often intentional, hence, the use of intention models which have been empirically tested should represent a good instrument for measuring antecedents of entrepreneurship (Krueger et al., 2000). As corporate entrepreneurship is included in the concept of entrepreneurship, the authors believe that entrepreneurial intention models can be applied to the case of intrapreneurship, and thus serve as an instrument for this study. Ajzen (1991) states that intention is influenced by three key determinants – attitudes, subjective norm, and perceived behavioural control, which can all be characterised as perception-based and are functions of beliefs. Thus, these variables differ between distinct situations and individuals (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994).
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**Attitude**

The first determinant is the attitude towards the behaviour, that is, one’s personal attitude about a possible action in the future. Specifically, this attitude is defined by available beliefs of the behaviour’s consequences, called “behavioural beliefs” (Ajzen, 2005). Now, the stronger someone’s belief of a positive outcome of an action, the more likely is the person to obtain a positive attitude towards the behaviour.

**Subjective norm**

The second variable is defined as subjective norm, which includes the person’s evaluation of social pressures to execute or not to execute the intended behaviour. Defined by Ajzen (2005),
as a person’s “perceived normative prescription”, these include individual people or groups, also called social referents (i.e. family, friends, co-workers, or experts in a certain field), which are in favour or against performing a specific behaviour. Normative beliefs in that sense either incorporate referents which approve a certain action and thus increase a person’s perceived social pressures to perform the behaviour; or contrarily include referents which disapprove of an action which hence results in negative social pressures against performing the behaviour.

Perceived behavioural control

Lastly, the third determinant of the theory includes “perceived behavioural control”, aiming at one’s self-efficacy, a term introduced by Bandura’s construct in 1986 (Bandura, 1986). It incorporates a personal judgment of how well one can execute a certain course of action. For the individual, it is required to evaluate prospective outcomes which might contain ambiguous, and unpredictable factors (Bandura & Schunk, 1981). Respectively, self-efficacy can be described as the capability of an individual’s personal competence and control of a specific situation (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994). Ajzen (2005) describes self-efficacy as “beliefs about the presence or absence of factors that facilitate or impede the performance of the behaviour” (Ajzen, 2005, p. 125). Determinants of such factors can be a mixture of personal past experiences, observations of a referent’s experiences (such as those of friends or acquaintances), and other factors which might increase or decrease the perception of the difficulty for performing the behaviour.

Thus, the chances of performing the behaviour increase with a high amount of the perceived personal resources and fortunate opportunities helping to perform the behaviour, combined with few perceived obstructions against the action.

Criticism on TPB mainly derives based on its limited predictive validity (Sniehotta, Presseau, & Araújo-Soares, 2014). As suggested by Orbell and Sheeran (1998), TPB fails to address that individuals who develop an intention might not necessarily pursue that intention and act upon it in the future. So far, the TPB still fails to close this gap. Furthermore, researchers criticise the theory because it strongly focuses on rational reasoning which excludes the many unconscious influences on a certain behaviour (Sheeran, Gollwitzer, & Bargh, 2013).

Contrarily, TPB is still the most used theory for measuring intentions and hence proves its validity by its high number of research studies (Krueger et al., 2000). As suggested by Davidsson (1991), several researchers, independent from another, found the same antecedents the TPB proposes for intentions. This finding is another proof that the model is consistent and
valid in today’s literature. As argued by Krueger et al. (2000), it serves as a valuable instrument for the understanding of organisational emergence and its processes.

### 3.3 Hypotheses Formulation

As can be seen in figure 4, the two theories were combined in a hypothesised model. Hereby, the five dimensions of EO represent the contextual factors, possibly influencing the three determinants of TPB. Furthermore, a direct and an indirect effect on intrapreneurial intention have been included in the model. It is worth noting, that not the actual EO is measured in the model, but rather the perception of the employees regarding the company’s EO.

#### Contextual factors

**Perception of Company’s Entrepreneurial Orientation**
- Pro-activeness
- Innovativeness
- Autonomy
- Risk-taking
- Competitive aggressiveness

**Figure 4 Hypothesised Model**

#### 3.3.1 Direct Effects of Behavioural Beliefs on Intrapreneurial Intention

Research has shown that intention as a single predictor of planned behaviour is very applicable when the behaviour is rare, or the observation of such behaviour is somewhat intricate (Krueger et al., 2000). Thus, for testing employees’ intrapreneurial intention, the three determinants of TPB, namely personal attitude, social norm and perceived behavioural control influence one’s intention. Focusing on each determinant, an employee’s attitude towards intrapreneurship relates to the extent to which the individual personally holds a positive or negative opinion about becoming an intrapreneur (Ajzen, 1991).
The second determinant of social norm, a person’s referents such as close colleagues or co-workers, with whom the employee is in contact on a regular basis and exchanges views and beliefs, influence one’s behaviour and thus intention respectively (Ajzen, 1991).

The third variable, perceived behavioural control, investigates the extent of an individual’s fear of losing control when having responsibility and its influence on intrapreneurial intention. Researchers have previously applied TPB in empirical studies to similar cases, in which the entrepreneurial intention of students has been tested. (Krueger et al., 2000; Liñán, Rodríguez-Cohard, & Rueda-Cantuche, 2011; Lüthje & Franke, 2003).

Findings of those studies hereby emphasise on the significant role of all three determinants in the determination of entrepreneurial intention. However, it is worth noting, that the aforementioned studies showed that there is a variation across different study fields or educational levels as well as in the magnitude of the influence of each determinant on intention. Considering the findings in the literature and previous studies, the authors transferred those elaborations to intrapreneurial intention and hypothesised the following:

**Hypothesis 1:** (a) attitude, (b) subjective norm, (c) perceived behavioural control will positively relate to employees’ intrapreneurial intention.

### 3.3.2 Indirect Effects of EO on Intrapreneurial Intention

Fishbein and Ajzen (2010) propose that human behaviour can best be predicted from a person’s intentions. The authors furthermore state that “at the core, the processes underlying all human social behavior are essentially the same and can be described by a small set of constructs” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010, p. 17). However, the authors conclude that especially the determinants attitude and perceived behavioural control “are not innate but instead are acquired in daily encounters with the real world” (Fishbein & Ajzen, 2010, p. 224). Hence, it is of prime interest to investigate these two determinants in relation to contextual factors and what the actual extent of their indirect influence might be. Regarding the research approach, Taormina and Lao (2007) propose that measurements of subjective perceptions of the environment are more influential than the actual environmental factors themselves. As a result, the perception of employees on contextual factors should be determined. Karimi et al. (2017) researched the indirect effect of contextual factors on entrepreneurial intention in the form of perceived support and barriers as well as of personality characteristics on the antecedents of the TPB. Their research approach was heavily influenced by the results of Lüthje and Franke...
(2003), who found that students’ perceptions of contextual factors could be differentiated into perceived barriers to entrepreneurship and perceived support for entrepreneurship.

In the matter of intrapreneurship, little research has been conducted with the use of TPB and the integration of external factors. EO has become a strategic approach for companies to innovate and revitalise business ventures and to be more proactive towards new opportunities in the marketplace (Covin & Slevin, 1991). Therefore, it is of vital interest to investigate the indirect effects of EO on intrapreneurial intention through the determinants attitude, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control. In line with all the above-mentioned details, the authors test the following hypotheses.

**Hypothesis 2**: EO relates positively through attitude to intrapreneurial intention

**Hypothesis 3**: EO relates positively through subjective norm to intrapreneurial intention

**Hypothesis 4**: EO relates positively through perceived behavioural control to intrapreneurial intention

### 3.3.3 Direct Effects of Contextual Factors of EO

The contextual factors of a company’s EO may also have a direct effect on the intrapreneurial intention of employees. In context with the research study conducted by Lüthje and Franke (2003), which says that contextual factors can either hinder or facilitate entrepreneurial activities, employees can still be affected by the EO of the company, even though the relationship between one of the behavioural determinants and the intention is negative. For instance, an employee may be willing to pursue an idea despite a rather negative attitude towards intrapreneurship when the company celebrates a culture, in which failure is not seen as something unfavourable, but as something that can lead to further success. Hence, to investigate the direct effect of EO on intrapreneurial intention, the authors as such propose the following:

**Hypothesis 5**: EO directly relates positively to intrapreneurial intention
4. METHODOLOGY

This chapter details the research approach as well as the overall study design and nature of the research. Moreover, information on the data collection, population and sampling are provided.

Research has the purpose to “discover answers to questions through the application of scientific procedures.” (Kothari, 2004, p. 2). To fulfil the purpose of this paper, the authors hereby conducted an exploratory study. The exploratory study approach is mainly used when researchers either try to investigate a problem that hasn’t been studied before or test a new angle on how to approach a researched topic (Shields & Rangarajan, 2013). In this paper, the authors chose the latter strategy by exploring intrapreneurship from the employee’s internal point of view on the external strategic solutions implemented by the company. Therefore, when contemplating this type of research approach, specific features of scientific research should be taken into account. According to Sekaran (2003), research must comply with the following eight hallmarks: (1) purposiveness, (2) rigour, (3) testability, (4) replicability, (5) precision and confidence, (6) objectivity, (7) generalizability and (8) parsimony.

In this study, the authors began their research with a definite objective, namely to investigate the intrapreneurial intention amongst employees in an organisational structure, which fulfils the requirement of purposiveness. By reviewing a plethora of literature of relevant researchers as well as by designing a carefully conceptualized methodology fitting the purpose of the paper, the rigour of the thesis has been improved. Regarding the testability and the replicability of this study, the authors delicately selected the origin of the research and explained in detail every step to ensure a high degree of replicability. Furthermore, the authors acknowledged the importance of precision and confidence in the study. Precision hereby refers to the veridical display of the reality, which is broken down into a simplified yet realistic research scenario. Confidence refers specifically to the probability that the estimations were done in the research are correct, which is also displayed here in a high confidence level of the study.

The conclusions drawn through the interpretation of the results of data analysis were based on the facts of the findings derived from the data that was collected exclusively for this research study. The more the objectivity is kept when interpreting the data, the more scientific the research investigation becomes, and the replicability of the research is preserved. Generalizability refers to the scope of applicability of the research findings in one organisational setting to other settings. This hallmark is of interest because a high level of generalizability creates a higher value and use for managerial implications. However, this
research has been conducted in a certain time frame and thus, the authors weighted carefully out the scope of the research and the feasibility to produce valid and reliable data that can be leading to further research in the future. The final hallmark, mentioned by Sekaran (2003), is parsimony. Parsimony, that is the simplicity in explaining occurrences and phenomena. By designing a new model constructed with the findings of the research, the authors recognize the purport of a simplified study approach and followed suit by avoiding testing an unmanageable number of variables.

Since the authors have been carefully following the proposed hallmarks of scientific research, the method of conducting research must be explained. One of the primary methods of scientific investigation is the hypothetic-deductive method, which was also the preferred approach in this paper. Both deduction and induction are processes, which are regularly used in research. Whereas deduction is a process of drawing conclusions by logically generalising known facts, induction is used by observing a particular phenomenon and drawing conclusions directly on those observations (Rodrigues, 2011).

Theories based on either of the two processes, whether it is deduction or induction, are helpful to explain and predict phenomena. The hypothetico-deductive method is to be known to be clustered into seven steps: (1) observation, (2) preliminary information gathering, (3) theory formulation, (4) hypothesising, (5) further scientific data collection, (6) data analysis, (7) deduction (Sekaran, 2003).

Observation is hereby the first stage of the research project, in which one observes occurring changes and unexplained phenomena, that haven’t been investigated to the fullest understanding. To commence this research project, a vital research gap had to be identified. The topic of competitive advantage has been an attractive research topic throughout the years due to its high impact on economies and on the success of companies in challenging environments. However, the phenomenon of intrapreneurship being used as a paradigm for competitive advantage, is still not fully explained and thus, offers an excellent opportunity to be further investigated. With regard to the preliminary information gathering, an extensive literature review has been conducted to establish a theoretical framework. Hereby, secondary data has been gathered on well-known databases such as “web of science”, “wiley” or “emerald”, in which scientific articles must fulfil high requirements to be published. In search of the adequate literature, keywords such as “intrapreneurship”, “intention” and “corporate entrepreneurship” were introduced to reduce the ample anthology of existing literature. The
screened and selected literature was then used to formulate the paper’s frame of reference. In this thesis, the TPB was enhanced by external EO of the firm to establish the set of criteria that was used for hypothesising and measuring.

To gain valuable primary data for the data collection of the thesis, the authors chose to follow the scientific research design proposed by Sekaran (2003), as can be seen in figure 5.
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Regarding the research approach, the authors opted for a quantitative study, which is used “when one begins with a theory (or hypothesis) and tests for confirmation or disconfirmation of that hypothesis” (Newman & Benz, 1998). Hence, hypotheses were generated based on existing literature and then tested. A hypothesis can be described “as a logically conjectured relationship between two or more variables expressed in the form of a testable statement” (Sekaran, 2003, p. 103). The hypothesis-testing approach was selected to explain the correlational nature of the relationship between intrapreneurial intention and its influencing factors. Due to the character of the study approach, the extent of interference by the authors in a non-contrived setting was minimal. In this paper, given the theoretical framework, the authors formulated directional hypotheses. Since the authors chose a quantitative approach to test the intrapreneurial intention amongst employees, the dependent variable is the intrapreneurial intention, which also represents the primary interest of the authors.
4.1 Data Collection

The data collection method of choice was an online questionnaire survey, which targeted employees currently working in organisations striving for innovation recognition. The type of research was conducted as a cross-sectional study, meaning that data was only collected during a restricted time-period, namely four weeks. The design of the questionnaire primarily consists of closed questions using nominal scales for the demographics and interval scales, namely in the form of a Likert scale, for answering the questions. A neutral option is offered to balance the rating scale. According to Elmore and Beggs (1975), an increase from 5 to 7 or any more points on a rating scale will unlikely improve the reliability. However, due to the use of itemised rating scales the centrality tendency bias must be addressed. The central tendency can be described as the tendency of quantitative data to assemble around a central value (Upton & Cook, 2008).

The questions of the online survey were formed in relation to the frame of references and the proposed new model and the hypotheses that were sought to be tested. Hence the different sections of the questionnaire aimed at investigating the independent variables, namely the attitude toward the behaviour, the subjective norm and the perceived behavioural control. The organisational factors as moderating variables have a strong probable effect on the independent variable–dependent variable relationship (Sekaran, 2003). To measure internal consistency, Cronbach’s alpha was applied to test the dimensionality of the scale (Cronbach & Shavelson, 2004).

Whilst developing the online questionnaire survey, the authors fulfilled the six methodological components, which ought to be applied to the success of online surveys. According to Regmi, Waithaka, Paudyal, Simkhada and van Teijlingen (2016), the crucial factors are a user-friendly design, the careful selection of the survey participants, the avoidance of multiple responses, accurate data management, the consideration of ethical issues and the piloting tools.

The questionnaire consists of three different sections. In the first section, questions were asked on the subject of the three variables from the TPB, namely attitude towards intrapreneurship, subjective norm and perceived behavioural control. The second section of the survey focused on the EO of the firm, hereby three questions per each attribute were included. The last section was composed of control variables in the form of demographics. The questions were inspired and validated by previous studies (e.g. Al Mamun, Kumar, Ibrahim, & Bin Yusoff, 2017; Karimi et al., 2017; Liñán & Chen, 2009; Lüthje & Franke, 2003). The first questionnaire
consisted of 35 questions, through pre-testing the number of items that were included in the survey was reduced to 28 items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Research reference</th>
<th>No. of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapreneurial intention</td>
<td>“After reading the definition of an intrapreneur above, I would consider myself an intrapreneur”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Planned Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards intrapreneurship</td>
<td>“If I had the opportunity and resources, I would like to pursue an innovative project for my firm”; “In my workplace, I look for independence and responsibility”; “Creating something new for my company entails great satisfaction for me”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Behavioural Control</td>
<td>“I believe that my new projects at work would be very successful”; “As an intrapreneur, I would have much control over my own projects”; “Pursuing and executing an own idea for my company would mean overcoming many obstacles”; “My closest colleagues think I should pursue my own ideas at work”; “My colleagues would accept me taking time for creating a project”; Intrapreneurial activity clashes with my firm’s values”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactiveness</td>
<td>“My company fosters me to act in anticipation of future problems, needs, or changes”; “My company encourages me to get things done myself rather than sitting around and waiting for someone else to do it”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>“My company gives me free time to work on individual ideas”; “My company requests that I ask for approval before making a final decision”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>“My company supports me in generating new ideas”; “My company rewards creativity”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk-Taking</td>
<td>“My company supports me completely, even if I fail an uncertain project”; “My company is willing to invest resources into more radical ideas”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Aggressiveness</td>
<td>“My company exploits creating new business opportunities”; “My company is eagerly seeking information to stay ahead of competition”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous intrapreneur Activities</td>
<td>“In your company, have you ever realised your own idea?” -&gt;No: What are the reasons why you have not yet realised an idea? (Lüthje &amp; Franke, The ‘making’ of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT, 2003)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 Questionnaire Design

The final questionnaire, which was written in English, was pre-tested with employees of different nationalities enrolled at local companies in Halmstad and proved to be clear and comprehensible.
4.2 Population and Sampling

Regarding the population in context with the purpose of the study, the European business economy consists of more than 26 million active enterprises with roughly 144 million persons employed (Eurostat, 2018). Therefore, the sample size of respondents to be gathered for the survey was 384, based on a confidence level of 95%. The process of selecting a small group of cases from out of a large group is called sampling (Walliman, 2010). The selected sampling procedure in this paper is a non-probability sampling due to the high difficulty of getting access to the whole population. However, the authors used a form of snowball sampling by distributing the online questionnaire employing social media, i.e. through alumni networks on Facebook, through formal relationship networks such as LinkedIn, Xing, and through former employers and colleague relationships. Potter (1996) explains that with the snowball technique researchers select a sample of key informants who can provide critical initial insights. The initially selected respondent then recruits the next potential respondent, and this process is repeated using the social network of the identified respondents. By including a request for sharing the questionnaire with colleagues, the pitfall of missing potential respondents not using any of the distribution channels has been averted. Two reminders were sent out each week after the mailing. The tool used for analysing the collected data was SPSS.
5. ANALYSES AND FINDINGS

This chapter provides an overview of the data that was collected during the study and details the research approach as well as the overall study design and nature of the research. Moreover, information on the data collection, population and sampling are provided.

5.1 Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

The structure of the 28 items, which were included in the questionnaire to measure the nine key constructs in the hypothesised model, was examined in an exploratory factor analysis. The factor loadings for eight items relating to the TPB were acceptable (>0.4) and were used in the analysis for the thesis. One item in the subcategory “subjective norm”, which loaded weakly (<0.4) was omitted from further analysis, as proposed by Karimi et al. (2017). With regard to the topic of EO, nine items were accepted for further analysis. One item, namely “my company requests that I ask for approval before making a final decision” was omitted due to a very low factor loading value of 0.020 as can be seen in table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory of Planned Behaviour</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If I had the opportunity and resources, I would like to pursue an innovative project for my firm</td>
<td>My company fosters me to act in anticipation of future problems, needs, or changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my workplace I look for independence and responsibility</td>
<td>My company encourages me to get things done myself rather than sitting around and waiting for someone else to do it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating something new for my company gives me great satisfaction</td>
<td>My company gives me free time to work on individual ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my new projects at work would be very successful</td>
<td>My company requests that I ask for approval before making a final decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursuing and executing an own idea for my company would mean overcoming many obstacles</td>
<td>My company supports me in generating new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As an Intrapreneur, I would have much control over my own projects</td>
<td>My company rewards creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My closest colleagues think that I should pursue my own ideas at work</td>
<td>My company supports me completely, even if I fail an uncertain project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues would accept me taking time for creating a project</td>
<td>My company is willing to invest resources into more radical ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapreneurial activity clashes with my firm’s values</td>
<td>My company exploits creating new business opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My company is eagerly seeking information to stay ahead of competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Component Matrix (EFA)
To examine the internal consistency of the research study, the authors tested Cronbach’s alpha on the two constructs of TPB and EO. The nine items relating to the TPB, resulted in $\alpha = 0.786$, whereas the ten items corresponding to the literature of EO were tested with $\alpha = 0.865$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory of Planned Behaviour</td>
<td>0.786</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 Cronbach’s Alpha Test Method

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

5.2.1 Demographics

In total, the study was filled out by 428 respondents. After cleaning the data, a sum of 394 complete responses was available for the use of the research analysis. The 394 responses were used for the analyses and for testing the proposed model. As to be seen in table 4, almost 53% are females, whereas around 47% are males. When clustered into age groups, most respondents are between 25 and 34 with a total of 173 answers out of 394; followed by 92 respondents from the second largest group of employees between 35 and 44. The third largest age group comprises 72 respondents between the age of 45 to 54. The two smallest age groups, with a percentage of around 7%, are from respondents between 18 to 24 and of those older than 54.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>52.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>46.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Engagement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Position</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontline Employee</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>82.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Management</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Management</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Size</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>31.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-250</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>24.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;250</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>43.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Furthermore, describing the work environment of the survey participants, as demonstrated in table 4, 325 respondents are categorised as frontline employees. The great number of respondents from this category can be well explained because the study was designed explicitly for frontline workers within the companies, not typically involved in direct management positions.

Besides those, middle management amounts around 12.5% out of the 394 respondents, whereas top management is the smallest category with around 20 respondents, equal to around 5% of the total survey participation.

Now, concentrating on the individual company size of survey participants, the authors chose to categorise firms into small- (0-50 employees), medium- (51-250) and large- (>250) enterprises. As seen in table 4, large corporations with more than 250 employees represent the most significant category in the study with 171 respondents, amounting around 43%. After that, small organisations which amount approximately to 43% of the respondents with 126 answers, constitute the second largest group. Only 97 respondents, amounting around 25% belong to medium-sized firms and hence build the smallest represented cluster.

Concerning the division of different industries, the authors chose to group participants into industries as follows: Agriculture and Mining, Business Services, Computer & Electronics, Consumer Services, Education, Energy & Utilities, Financial Services, Government, Healthcare and Pharmaceuticals, Manufacturing, Media and Entertainment, Non-Profit, Real Estate & Construction, Retail, Software & Internet, Telecommunications, Transportation & Storage, Travel Recreation & Hospitality, and Wholesale & Distribution. Focusing on the most dominant industries represented in this study, industries of Retail, Software and Internet, as well as Education, each amount around 13% of total respondents. Besides that, other industries represented at a rate of approximately 6% each, constitute of Financial Services, Business Services, Healthcare & Pharmaceuticals, as well as Wholesale & Distribution. The only industry not represented by this study is that of Agriculture & Mining.

5.2.2 Standard Deviations and Means

The table below shows each independent variable represented in the study calculated by means and standard deviation. Most importantly, the items had a high rank, with all means being above three. As such, the attitude towards intrapreneurship has the highest average of almost four points, which means a high number of participants positively relate to the topic of intrapreneurship.
Focusing on the last five items related to EO, proactiveness has the highest average rank of 3.73, whereas risk-taking represents the lowest mean of 3.12. Overall, however, as all means are above three, EO is present amongst the companies of survey participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attitude towards Intrapreneurship</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perceived Behavioural Control</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Subjective Norm</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Proactiveness</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Autonomy</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Innovativeness</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Risk-Taking</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Competitive Aggressiveness</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 Means and Standard Deviations among Variables

### 5.2.3 Intrapreneurial Intention and Age

As demonstrated in table 6 below, in general, there is a high intrapreneurial intention amongst all age groups. More than half of the sample either strongly agrees to be an intrapreneur or agrees to be an intrapreneur. Facing distinct age patterns, around 17% of 18-24 years old strongly agree with being an intrapreneur. For the second age group consisting of people between 25-34, this amounts around 14%. As can be observed, the older someone becomes, a strong perception of being an intrapreneur steadily decreases. In the two oldest age groups (45 years and above), only 11% percent strongly agree with the question if they see themselves as an intrapreneur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your age?</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;54</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Intrapreneurial Intention and Age

Furthermore, as demonstrated in table 6, there is a strong ambiguousness in the sample concerning the topic of the self-assessment to be an intrapreneur when related to age. Looking at people disagreeing to be an intrapreneur, in the case of the two youngest age groups between 18-24 and from 25-34 years old, around one third either disagrees or strongly disagrees to be an intrapreneur. Also, in the age group between 45-54, the ambiguousness is around 28% of the sample disagreeing of being an intrapreneur.
All in all, the numbers indicate that on the one hand there exist high intrapreneurial intentions amongst employees. On the other hand, the outcome also demonstrates that many employees do not see themselves as intrapreneurs. For young professionals, this can be related to the fact that many might not be as confident and only have moderate work experience, to consider themselves as innovative creators within the firm. The outcome, however, also demonstrates a trend of decreasing intrapreneurial intention in relation to age.

5.2.4 Intrapreneurial Intention and Work Experience

Now, instead of age, table 7 demonstrates intrapreneurial intention related to the years of work experience in the employee’s current company. Different from the results above, generally it is seen that intrapreneurial intention is not related to the number of years an employee has been working for a specific company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Assessment of being an intrapreneur</th>
<th>Work experience in years at company</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>1-3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7 Intrapreneurial Intention and Work Experience*

In summary, the highest amount of self-assessed intrapreneurs exists throughout employees who have been working in their companies between 4-6 years. In that specific group, 16% strongly agree, and 48% agree of being an intrapreneur. After that, the second largest group of employees which consider themselves intrapreneurs is found in the group between 1-3 years of work experience. 45% of survey participants agree, and 14% strongly agree with the related question. What is interesting is that for the group of employees who have been working in their companies already longer than six years, the self-consideration of being an intrapreneur is not strongly declining. Hence, in the category, 38% agree to be an intrapreneur, and 14% strongly agree to be an intrapreneur. This outcome shows, that intrapreneurial intention, although seeing that it is linked to age, might be less linked to the years of having worked for a specific company.

Looking at participants disagreeing with being an intrapreneur, people who have been employed at the specific company under one year are the most prominent representatives of the sample, who do not consider themselves intrapreneurs. However, as numbers in this group
are still low, with 12% strongly disagreeing and 15% disagreeing with the question, it shows that overall there is not much rejection against the self-assessment of being an intrapreneur. In fact, unrelated to the years of working at a specific company, many participants consider themselves to be intrapreneurs.

5.2.5 Intrapreneurial Intention and Gender

Relating intrapreneurial intention to gender, for both groups among the sample – females and males, around one fourth, is undecided whether to be an intrapreneur or not, which is demonstrated by the percentages in table 8 below. Additionally, however, only 6% of all females and 4% of all males strongly disagree with being an intrapreneur. Also, similar to both genders are in overall agreement of being an intrapreneur, as 42% females and 44% males agree to the question related to intrapreneurial intention. Contrarily, however, looking at the sum of people agreeing and strongly agreeing with the question, females on average have lower intrapreneurial intention. Only 52% of women consider themselves of being an intrapreneur, whereas 61% consider themselves of being an intrapreneur, marking a difference between both genders. As a logic consequence, more females (around 23%) either disagree or strongly disagree with being an intrapreneur, whereas only 18% of men disagree or strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 Intrapreneurial Intention and Gender

5.2.6 Company Size and Age

Table 9 shows that most employees work for a large enterprise. However, analysing the company size and age demonstrates that most of the population between 18 and 24 years old work for small firms, which is an exception to other generations investigated. As such, between 25 and 34 years old mostly are employed at large enterprises (around 46%). Additionally, most people between the age of 45 and 54 (ca. 44%) and over 54 (about 50%) work for large enterprises. Contrarily, in the age group between 35 and 44, the division of company sizes is quite equally spread. Around 30% of each work for small and medium-sized companies, whereas approximately 40% work for big companies.
How many employees are currently employed at your company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>0-50</th>
<th>51-250</th>
<th>&gt;250</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;54</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Company Size and Age

All in all, most employees represented in this study work for larger corporations with more than 250 employees. The smallest amount of the population works for medium-sized companies.

### 5.2.7 Job Position and Gender

Looking at the division between males and females related to the job position (see table 10), it is noticeable that with the level of work involvement, the discrepancy between the genders rises. As such, concentrating on frontline employees, there is no apparent difference between genders. 83% of females are employed as frontline employees, compared to 83% of men represented in this study being frontline employees. Now, concerning middle management, a higher number of females (15%) compared to men (10%) is employed at this level of the organisations. Looking at the top management, however, there are only a few females (2%) employed in top positions, compared to 8% of men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Position in company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frontline Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 Job Position and Gender

These results are in line with the current development of western societies, trying to integrate more women into management positions, which can be seen by a relatively high representation of females in middle management. However, much work is still needed to reach total equality letting more women work in top management positions.

### 5.2.8 Realisation of Intrapreneurial Projects

With the questionnaire, the researchers also investigated whether participants already realised an intrapreneurial project throughout their career. As documented in table 11 below, the
majority of 48% believes to have already completed an innovative project from initiation to completion, whereas 37% do not think they realised a project yet. The remaining 15% of the sample is not sure, whether an intrapreneurial project was pursued in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your company, have you ever realised your own idea from initiation to final execution?</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11 Realisation of Intrapreneurial Projects*

Focusing more on why people did not consider themselves of ever having completed an intrapreneurial project, table 12 demonstrates that 22% name the reason for not executing such project as a lack of support from the company, which emphasises the importance of the study.

As such, it shows that employees might see the company hindering creative and innovative ideas to be developed and conceptualised. Another high amount of the sample does not pursue intrapreneurial projects, due to a lack of time. Hence, many employees feel that daily tasks and responsibilities hinder creating something new, as there is not enough time to do both.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the reasons you have not yet pursued a project?</th>
<th>Lack of time</th>
<th>Lack of resources</th>
<th>Lack of support</th>
<th>Not long enough employed</th>
<th>No creative idea</th>
<th>Other*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other: e.g. Restrictions by Management; Insecurity, No interest.*

*Table 12 Reasons for Lack of Realisation of Intrapreneurial Projects*

To name a few typical answers from the questionnaire, table 13 shows some excerpts from employees:

Exemplary answers

1. I have started to create a charitable subproject six months ago, but since then all types of department take forever to sign documents, are very doubtful of what my intentions are and do not take it serious enough.

2. My job does not require great creativity; I just have to deal with the tasks given by my hierarchy.

3. It might happen that I have to be a very little innovative, but it would then be just a tiny thing.

4. I have been with this company for six months only and so much work that there is no time to think about other projects. The CEO is a very controlling person and not open to changes in our own company even if we sell change management to our clients.
My boss refuses to consider any other ideas than hers. Employees are explicitly asked to only think in line with her expectations - or sometimes even asked not to think at all. Any proposals with new or even creative ideas are rejected.

I only stay with the company for one year and do not have the time to focus on new projects myself. Innovations are rather fostered in the IT and R&D segment of the company.

Table 13 Exemplary Answers to Open Question

5.3 Hypotheses Testing

5.3.1 Assessment of Proposed Measurement Model

Structural equation modelling (SEM) is a multivariate statistical analysis technique that has developed into a standard tool for investigating the plausibility of theoretical models that might explain the interrelations among a set of variables. This technique is the combination of a factor analysis and a multiple regression analysis. It starts with the specification of a model to be estimated (Gefen, Straub, & Boudreau, 2000).

Hence, to assess the reliability and the validity of the proposed model, a confirmatory factor analysis was conducted. In this research, an over-identified model was proposed because intrapreneurial intention as a parameter is investigated in more than one way. Thus, when an over-identified model does fit well, then the researcher typically considers the model to be an adequate fit for the data (The Division of Statistics and Scientific Computation, 2012).

By conducting confirmatory factor analysis, the model fit indices are used to interpret the model fit. Consequently, the assessment of goodness of fit of the hypothesised model is a primary goal. For the analysis, the programme Amos, an extension to SPSS, was used. The CFA results showed a relatively good fit between the hypothesised model and the observed data with CFI = .984, TLI = .962 and RMSEA = .053.

Hu and Bentler (1999) suggest that a cut-off value close to .95 for TLI and CFI and .06 for RMSEA are needed to conclude that there is a relatively good fit, which has been achieved by this study with the results stated above. As can be seen in figure 6, the SEM displays the values of the indirect and direct correlations of the hypothesised model.
Regarding the results of the structural equation modelling, the \( \beta \)-values, the standardised estimates and the t-value are displayed in table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses tested</th>
<th>Results of structural equation modelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate (( \beta ))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a: Attitude towards intraprendeurship</td>
<td>Intrapreneurial Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b: Subjective norm</td>
<td>Intrapreneurial Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c: Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>Intrapreneurial Intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td>Attitude towards intraprendeurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Entrepreneurial Orientation</td>
<td>Intrapreneurial Intention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 Results of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM)
5.3.2 Direct Effects of Theory of Planned Behaviour

**Hypothesis 1a: Accepted; Hypotheses 1b and c: Rejected.** As can be seen in table 14, the attitude determinant has a strong positive relationship with the dependent variable intrapreneurial intention. However, the other two determinants, namely subjective norm and perceived behavioural control do not have a positive relationship with the researched parameter. This is a new finding in comparison to results of previous studies on entrepreneurial intention, which state that all three determinants play a significant role in the determination of entrepreneurial intention. Thus, these findings suggest that intrapreneurial intention is more influenced by one’s attitude than by the other two determinants. Hence, the hypothesis that attitude will positively relate to employee’s intrapreneurial intention is accepted.

### Table 15 Effects of EO on Determinants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direct effect</th>
<th>Indirect effect</th>
<th>Total effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards intrapreneurship</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective norm</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived behavioural control</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapreneurial Intention</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Indirect Effects of EO on Intrapreneurial Intention

**Hypothesis 2: Accepted; Hypotheses 3 and 4: Rejected.** When observing the indirect effect on intrapreneurial intention, the EO of a firm shows a moderately positive indirect effect with the value being .325. The determinants of TPB have the highest influence on the subjective norm, but subjective norm does not have a strong relationship with intrapreneurial intention. However, in total, attitude towards intrapreneurship has the most influence on intrapreneurial intention with the estimate of .722. The relationship of EO is positive towards Attitude with an effect of .465. Therefore, the authors conclude that actions to foster intrapreneurial orientation seem to be effective when they target the attitude of employees. The incentives, installed by the EO of the company, have the highest effect on the surroundings of an employee. However, this determinant does not actively influence the intrapreneurial intention of an employee. Since EO has become a strategic approach for companies to innovate and revitalise business ventures and to be more proactive towards new opportunities in the marketplace ( Covin & Slevin, 1991), it is of vital importance that the incentives target the right determinants effectively. Though as the findings show, existing actions do not increase the intrapreneurial intention amongst employees effectively and need adjustments for raising efficiency.
5.3.4 Direct Effects of EO on Intrapreneurial Intention

*Hypothesis 5: Rejected.* As can be seen in table 15, the direct effect of a company’s EO weakly relates to intrapreneurial intention. By interpreting these findings, employees apparently perceive the actions of a company to foster directly intrapreneurial intention as inefficient.
6. DISCUSSION

This chapter provides the new proposed model created by the results and previous analyses. In addition, the findings are compared to existing literature and similarities as well as differences are highlighted.

Based on the results, the authors propose the following framework for explaining an employee’s intrapreneurial intention:

![Proposed Framework of Effects on Intrapreneurial Intentions](image)

As can be seen in figure 7, intrapreneurial intentions are dominantly affected by one’s attitude towards intrapreneurship. The other two dimensions of Ajzen’s TPB (1991) namely subjective norm and perceived behavioural control, have no direct influence on intrapreneurial intentions. This result is in line with other studies relating the TPB to entrepreneurial intentions. For instance, a study by Souitaris, Zerbinati and Al-Laham (2007) investigates a student’s attitude towards entrepreneurship influenced by university incentives of entrepreneurship programmes included in the study programme. The research shows that attitude has the strongest relationship with entrepreneurial intentions, and that attitude can be influenced by external factors, so to increase the initial attitude the student has towards entrepreneurship. Furthermore, a study by Lüthje and Franke (2003), who investigate entrepreneurial intentions amongst engineering students enrolled at MIT, demonstrates that the dimension of attitude has a significant influence on the intention for becoming self-employed; whereas the other two factors of subjective norm and perceived behavioural control show no direct effects. Identical to the study by Souitaris et al. (2007), attitude can be influenced by external factors which...
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increases a student’s entrepreneurial intention (Lüthje & Franke, 2003). A third study by Liñán et al. (2011) identifies environmental, cognitive elements that influence entrepreneurial intentions, to explain regional differences of start-up intentions throughout Spain. In common with the other research outcomes, attitude has the strongest link with entrepreneurial intention and is influenced by certain external factors.

Focusing on the two dimensions of subjective norm and perceived behavioural control, as stated above, the two factors have no or only a weak effect on an employee’s intrapreneurial intention. However, looking at the effects of the perceived EO of the firm and the dimensions of the TPB, subjective norm is most dominantly influenced by a firm’s EO. This outcome represents a logical consequence, since subjective norm represents a person’s evaluation of social pressures to execute or not to execute the intended behaviour (Ajzen, 1991). Hence, the pressure results from the firm’s EO. Though it is noteworthy that it has no indirect effect on the employee’s intrapreneurial intention. In other words, this means that the firm’s strategic outline does put pressures on employees to perform according to its strategic direction; however, it is not connected to intrapreneurial intentions. Facing the dimension of perceived behavioural control, EO has the lowest effect on this dimension. As perceived behavioural control includes one’s locus of control and personal judgement of how well one can execute a certain action (Ajzen, 1991), the outcome can also be estimated as a logical consequence. It means that an organisation’s EO cannot influence an employee to feel capable of pursuing a certain action or behaviour. Hence, if the employee does not feel comfortable to act according to a firm’s entrepreneurial outlook, he/she will not change its behaviour.

Further, concentrating on the concept of EO itself, the proposed model shows that the dimensions of autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness may indirectly affect one’s intrapreneurial intentions through attitude. In this sense, the factor of attitude towards intrapreneurship is the only linkage between a company’s EO and an employee’s intrapreneurial intention. Consequently, EO of the firm does not directly influence someone’s intrapreneurial intention.

There is a bundle of recent studies positively relating a firm’s EO to increased firm performance and success (e.g. Bogatyreva et al., 2017; Caseiro & Coelho, 2018; Eshima & Anderson, 2016). Accordingly, the construct of intrapreneurship also positively relates to innovation and a firm’s competitive advantage resulting in growth, demonstrated in different studies (Martin-Rojas et al., 2017; Karimi & Walter, 2016; Zahra & Covin, 1995). Surprisingly, as the proposed
framework shows, the two constructs closely relating to each other, do not interfere. As there is no direct linkage between EO and intrapreneurial intention it means that a company’s strategic outline does not affect the level of intrapreneurship within the firm, as an employee’s intentions towards intrapreneurship are not affected. As a result, a firm can only increase the level of intrapreneurship through individual attitudes of their workforce.

As shown in a recent study by Andersén (2017), the construct of EO is too much a firm-level factor, so that a firm’s EO might even have negative effects, increasing an employee’s uncertainty of their job expectations. His study shows that not the firm construct itself, but that social support from colleagues reaches a more favourable outcome of promoting EO throughout the firm (Andersén, 2017). Although the results of this study do not show any relationship between subjective norm and attitude, it might be a field for further research. The results might be explained by a great uncertainty concerning this issue of survey participants. Findings show a high number of people being indecisive and answering with an average score of 3 on the scale from 1 to 5. Hence, the proposed framework might change throughout future investigations and might be further expandable.
When thinking back at the “PlayStation” example in the introduction, in which the intrapreneur had to overcome multiple obstacles, it shows that intrapreneurship in a company must be fostered to gain competitive advantage as an outcome of entrepreneurial actions (Teece et al., 1997). However, it might be difficult for companies to find the appropriate tools to encourage intrapreneurial activities. For instance, Alpkan et al. (2010) suggested that a performance-based incentive system and spare time have no impact on the innovativeness. Thus, the question arises, how companies can foster intrapreneurship to boost innovation and firm performance to increase its competitiveness. Moreover, correspondingly, it is highly valuable as well to investigate how employees perceive actions taken by the company to foster intrapreneurial intention amongst their staff.

Hence, to investigate the raised questions and concerns mentioned above, the purpose of this paper was to explore how organisations can identify the untapped potential of intrapreneurial intention amongst employees to increase its competitive advantage.

This thesis hereby deployed an exploratory research approach by developing a research model that immerses organisational factors – an employee’s perception of the company’s EO, with behavioural attributes as designed by Ajzen’s TPB (1991) for measuring someone’s intrapreneurial intention. The model included five dimensions of a firm’s Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), namely autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive aggressiveness (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Behavioural attributes proposed by Ajzen (1991) consist of a personal attitude towards intrapreneurship, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control.

The quantitative study, which consisted of a questionnaire with 28 items, generated a sample of 394 respondents working in different organisations, industries, and distinct hierarchical firm levels.

The results concerning the hypothesised model show that an employee’s intrapreneurial intentions are not directly influenced by perceptions of the firm’s EO. However, EO has a
positive direct effect on one’s attitude towards intrapreneurship. Respectively, attitude is the only behavioural factor which influences an employee’s intention towards intrapreneurship. As documented by the authors’ analyses, the direct effect of EO on the employee’s intrapreneurial intention is weak to non-existent. The findings contradict common practices in companies these days, which foster intrapreneurial intention with direct incentives, rather than focusing on the employee’s perception and attitude (Deeb, 2016). Thus, the authors propose a higher focus on the determinants of TPB instead of modifying EO’s incentives. As such, the authors suggest a newly designed framework in which intrapreneurial intentions are directly influenced by someone’s attitude towards intrapreneurship and indirectly influenced by an employee’s positive perception of the organisations EO.

Fulfilling the purpose of this study, an organisation must focus on individual attitudes first to discover the potential for intrapreneurial interests. As a support, a company’s positive perception of EO in relation to the firm’s level of autonomy, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, and competitive advantage can influence the employee’s attitude towards intrapreneurship but cannot solely boost intrapreneurial intentions amongst workers. The targeting of individual attitudes is the first step towards an increased intrapreneurial intention in organisations. Hence, without a positive employee attitude, a company cannot integrate its concept of corporate entrepreneurship effectively to increase its competitive advantage. As a result, a positive attitude towards intrapreneurship is necessary for an employee to create novel marketing strategies based on innovations by the firm.

As explained in more detail further below under limitations, intentions only represent the first step and need to be followed up through specific planned behavioural actions in the respective organisations, which opens room for an extension of the model by additional future studies.

7.1 Theoretical Contributions
A plethora of research has been conducted on entrepreneurship over the last years (e.g. Krueger & Brazeal, 1994; Liñán et al., 2011; Lüthje & Franke, 2003). However, research only of late picked up on the phenomenon of intrapreneurship as can be seen by the rising publications in the very recent years. For instance, studies such as the one conducted by Skarmeas et al. (2016) incorporate intrapreneurship in research by investigating the internal mechanisms through which intrapreneurship influences certain business departments, in this case, current and future export performances. Thus, this study addresses these new developments and extensively
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contributes to the existing literature by explicitly focusing on the employee and the respective perception.

Regarding the company’s EO, recent studies examined its influence on the profitability or growth of the company. For instance, Andersén and Samuelsson (2016) investigated the influence of EO and management accounting on the profitability of SMEs suggesting that both factors independently have a positive effect in non-growing SMEs, but the combined effect has no additional effect. In comparison to the study, the authors of this study took a new and more inward approach by directly linking the perceived level of EO of a company with the intrapreneurial intention of an employee through the TPB. By testing the model from an employee’s perspective, the authors took a new and more inward approach, highlighting the employee’s perception. Hence, with its findings, this thesis provides insightful implications for future research as well as offers insightful implications that can be applied in practice.

7.2 Practical Implications

In addition to the information given in the analysis as well as in the conclusion, the following practical implications aim at providing a guideline to managers interested in improving the level of intrapreneurship in their companies.

One critical finding in this study worth-mentioning is that more than half of all respondents would consider themselves intrapreneurs. This shows that in fact there is a significant potential for companies available. Furthermore, it is of prime importance to highlight, that this percentage of respondents, who categorised themselves as intrapreneurs, was evenly distributed over all groups regarding the years of work experience in a company. Hence, this study suggests that employees, who have been working for several years in a firm, have the same likeliness to consider themselves intrapreneurs than younger employees, who just started working at a company. This potential is sometimes overlooked by managers, and as a result, senior employees are often not supported or promoted, especially when it concerns innovative processes or projects. However, with their experience and their profound knowledge of the company they can certainly bring new aspects and ideas to rigid processes in the organisation.

Studies dealing with a firm’s EO for increased success and growth, in general, do show that EO is positively linked to higher firm performance (Zahra, 1991). However, findings of this paper are somewhat contrary. As the proposed model suggests, an employee is only directly influenced by attitude. However, several studies trying to explain a firm’s EO, do state that
incentives by management have a direct effect on the firm’s intrapreneurial practice. For instance, Lumpkin and Dess (1996), argue that all EO dimensions have a positive influence on a firm’s entrepreneurial level. Yet, this paper demonstrates that the first step to introduce entrepreneurial projects – an employee’s intention to act upon it, does not evolve from a firm’s EO but only from an employee’s attitude.

The authors suggest four main steps towards the development of an intrapreneurial firm and for developing a competitive advantage.

1) **Focus on employees with a high positive attitude towards intrapreneurship**

The biggest positive influencer of intrapreneurial intention is the attitude towards intrapreneurship. Putting this into a managerial view means that potential direct incentives such as offering a percentage of the working time as a free think-tank solution might not immediately result in a significantly higher intrapreneurial intention amongst employees. Instead, it will have no influence, if the employee is not positively linked to intrapreneurial intentions by its attitude in the first place. This finding is in accordance with studies by Alpkan et al. (2010), suggesting that availability of a performance-based incentive system and spare time, which could be used for brainstorming ideas, have no impact on innovativeness. Hence, the management should focus on employees with a positive attitude specifically. These employees, as a result, might pursue intrapreneurial actions in the future.

2) **Focus on individuals rather than groups**

Furthermore, the management must concentrate more on each individual of the firm rather than teams or whole departments, to increase intrapreneurial intentions. Reason for this is that external influences measured by the factor of subjective norm had no direct or indirect influence on someone’s intrapreneurial intention. In other words, this outcome shows that internal colleagues, even the ones strongly working together, do not influence one’s attitude, nor intention in becoming an intrapreneur. However, the company could form teams consisting of employees with a high positive attitude towards entrepreneurship from different departments.

3) **Target employees with a high perceived locus of control**

Additionally, findings show that an employee’s perceived behavioural control, including the locus of control, does not influence intrapreneurial intentions. Hence, even if an employee has enough self-confidence, and thinks he/she would succeed in developing an intrapreneurial
project from beginning to completion, it does not mean that he/she holds an intrapreneurial intention. As a result, and the first step for an increased intrapreneurial level within the firm, the management of a company should identify individuals within the organisation who want to act intrapreneurally, and work with those having a positive attitude. Additionally, the targeted employee by the company should possess a high perceived behavioural control. The reason is that a person’s perception regarding the own capability to do something is fundamental to pursue a project confidently.

4) Apply findings to the recruiting process

As a fourth option, the management could cast potential employees with a high intrapreneurial intention during the recruitment process, because it might be difficult to move an employee from a negative to a positive attitude towards intrapreneurship. As such, the firm could over time employ more employees who aim at pushing the firm forward with new projects and innovative ideas. Hence, in the long run, a new recruiting strategy could influence the firm’s entrepreneurial level and competitive advantage.

7.3 Limitations

The authors encountered limitations in terms of limited diversification of data collection. Since the method of distribution included the snowball sampling on social networks, a considerable number of younger employees was ultimately targeted which led to a higher amount of responses collected from a specific age group. Additionally, due to the cross-sectional character of the research, this study did not measure the actual incentives implemented by the firms to foster intrapreneurial activities. The study could only concentrate on an employee’s perception and his or her intrapreneurial intention. Intention is the key anticipatory indicator for behaviour, but it does not conclude if and to what extent the behaviour will appear in the future. Moreover, since a survey must be designed in a way that respondents are willing to complete the questionnaire, the researchers had only a limited amount of questions that could be included in the research approach. Since the focus of this research was of exploratory nature, questions targeting all involved theories were selected only to test the established hypothesised model.
7.4 Further Research

For future research, three main areas can be identified. The first major research field is the further development of the author’s created model. This study approach took the first step in establishing a model that can be used for research on intrapreneurial intention by combining two of the most common theories. Therefore, a promising approach is to investigate how these established relationships change when one independent determinant is changed or even left out. Moreover, a closer observation of the influence of every single dimension of EO offers an excellent opportunity for further research. An experiment, in which participants are operating in different settings, for instance in a company highly facilitating intrapreneurial inventions versus another firm that acts very passively, could lead to findings enriching this study. Furthermore, to evolve on the proposed framework, it is essential to investigate how an employee’s attitude can be positively influenced to develop intrapreneurial intentions, as attitude is the strongest influential factor of this study. Another study approach could also be the distinction between perceived EO and actual EO. This study shows that the direct effect by the EO of companies is weak on intrapreneurial intention. Hence, this could insinuate that firms miscalculate the effect of their incentives. For this case, a polynomial regression with response surface analysis would be a sophisticated statistical approach, allowing the researcher to investigate the discrepancy between two predictor variables, for instance, perceived and actual EO. This statistical approach has especially become widely known in multisource feedback research (Shanock, Baran, Gentry, Clever Pattison, & Heggestad, 2010).

A second important research area is the expansion of this study towards a more industry or company-specific study approach. This study tested a new angle on how to approach a researched topic, namely by investigating intrapreneurial intention through the eyes of the employees. In further research, this model can be used to test intrapreneurial intention amongst employees in distinct industries. For instance, companies operating in the technology sector are often depending on a very high amount of innovative ideas to stay competitive in a fast growing and challenging environment. It would be exciting to see if employees have a higher intrapreneurial intention in companies operating in a fast-moving market because intrapreneurial thinking is one requirement in the application process.

This leads to the third major research area. In general, the image or the common perception of intrapreneurship should be investigated further. A cross-field study examining how often innovative thinking or intrapreneurial activities are listed as a requirement on the job market could clarify companies’ focus in human resource management. Furthermore, a longitudinal
study enlisting intrapreneurial activities and their success throughout the years combined with how the EO of companies has changed over time is a promising approach to enhance existing literature on intrapreneurship.
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