

Strategic Determinants of Intrapreneurial Orientation at the Kenya Institute of Management, Kenya

Mbaka Zephaniah¹, Dr. Winnie Njeru², Gitonga Samuel³

¹Department of Business and Economics, University of Embu, Kenya

²Lecturer, School of Business, University of Nairobi, Kenya

³Lecturer, Department of Business and Economics, University of Embu, Kenya

*Corresponding Author

Mbaka Zephaniah

Email: zmbaka@gmail.com

Abstract: The global business environment is today faced with uncertainty and various complexities. Innovation, taking risk and ability to pioneer has been proven to contribute immensely to the financial wellness and strategic value of big corporations as well as small and medium enterprises. The study objective was to assess the strategic determinants of intrapreneurial orientation at the Kenya Institute of Management. The study population comprised employees with strategic roles at the Kenya Institute of Management. A Census survey was used. Primary data was collected through a structured questionnaire measured on a five point Likert type scale. Out of the 108 questionnaires administered, 81 usable questionnaires were received representing a response rate of 75%. Descriptive and inferential analysis were used to analyse the data. The results revealed that intrapreneurial orientation is composed of three indicators; proactiveness, innovation and risk taking. The results suggest that the main strategic determinants of intrapreneurial orientation are management support, rewarding intrapreneurial effort, work discretion, time availability and organizational boundaries. The study concluded that. Future research should assess additional strategic determinants and intrapreneurial orientation. Further studies on intrapreneurship need to be conducted in different sectors.

Keywords: Intrapreneurial orientation, entrepreneurship, strategic determinants, competitive advantage

INTRODUCTION

The infusion of intrapreneurial way of doing things through corporate structure is in the current business world an increasingly relevant concept to organizations. The global environment is today faced by uncertainty and various complexities. Change is a phenomenon that organizations can no longer run away from as customer demands, competition and economic turbulence continue to affect business firms [1]. Innovative ability has now become the new competitive arena. In every industry, innovation and differentiation is now a key pillar to business growth and sustainability [2].

In this new front of competing for diversification and new business approaches, organizations are borrowing from the principles of intrapreneurship to stay upfront in their strategies. Previous studies suggest that intrapreneurial activities go on inside any organization with no consideration to size or business activity, which creates an innovative culture through activities such as; development of new products, and improvement of organizational processes and service [3]. Innovation, taking risk and ability to forerun has been proven to be vital to the financial wellness and strategic value of enterprises [4].

Antoncic [5] describes intrapreneurship as the process through which employees working for an organization take on opportunities with no consideration to the limitation of resources at their disposal by showing deliberate intentions and characteristics that are out of the usual way of carrying out operations at the company. Intrapreneurial activities are, therefore, directed towards forming an entrepreneurial culture within an existing organization. Intrapreneurship can also be explained to be a way that offers a firm a strategic solution for refining its business agenda in order to meet growing customer demands and expectations. Intrapreneurial activities are also key to increasing the organizational competitive position through the improvement of organizational flexibility and creativity [6].

The advantages drawn from the intrapreneurship activities include firm survival, organisational growth and sustainability, revenue growth, self-renewal, vitality, implementation of novel ideas by employees and strategic value of organisations. High levels of IO in the firm helps in catalysing performance and acquisition of competitive advantage [7, 8] and differentiated products, markets and good financial performance [9]. Although these findings have been associated with firms in developed economies, observations based on various studies indicate that

learning institutions globally have also embraced these benefits by embracing in intrapreneurial orientation [10].

Organizations often focus on standardizing their internal systems and structures, leading them to a steady state of equilibrium. Departments in organizations are the most common form of rigid structures; employees in these units do not look beyond their units [11]. Competition for resources makes the organization to only direct funds to mainstream investments, ignoring individual employees' initiatives. There are no incentives for enterprising employees and the management does not mentor intrapreneurial employees. Very little time is left to employees to engage in idea searching and innovation [12]. While it is an uphill task to initiate the idea of intrapreneurship within organizations in Africa and the developing countries, ignoring the idea is suicidal to the survival of firms.

Tertiary learning institutions in both public and private sectors are being encouraged to foster intrapreneurial behaviour and innovativeness to ensure success of higher education sector by becoming intrapreneurial. The institutions will also become more responsive to the changing economic, social and technological realities. The emphasis of fostering intrapreneurial spirit in employees of institutions in the tertiary education sector in Kenya is pivotal in growing the industry and making the institutions in the sector competitive [13].

The Kenya Institute of Management falls under the tertiary education sector which is under the regulation of the Training, Vocational Education and Training Authority. The TVET sector has been depressed in terms of growth and profitability. The intense competition has particularly increased rivalry among the industry players with the privately owned institutions of higher learning experiencing low business. The level of innovation and differentiation of services among training institutions has been cited as the main factor that has made the sector to stagnate [10].

The Kenya Institute of Management has tried to encourage innovation through rewarding of intrapreneurial efforts. In 2014, the institute formed an innovation committee whose mandate was to identify innovative ideas by employees and vetting them in the aim of rewards. The committee has since been unable to identify any substantive intrapreneurial effort from the institute's employees. There are clear indications that intrapreneurial orientation at the institute has not been fully embraced [14].

The Concept of Intrapreneurial Orientation

The concept of intrapreneurship has been drawn from the notion of independent entrepreneurship. According to Hisrich and Peters [15], entrepreneurship refers to the process of creating a new thing through the allocation of needed time, resources and taking risk so as to benefit from monetary value and personal satisfaction. To some extent the definition of entrepreneurship, by Hisrich and Peters, applies to intrapreneurship [16].

The difference is brought by the existence of organisational boundaries in regards to intrapreneurship, which implies less autonomy, limited risk, and minimal rewards compared to entrepreneurship. The concept of intrapreneurship traces its roots from the popular and better understood discipline of entrepreneurship. From a broad perspective, intrapreneurship refers to practice of entrepreneurial concepts in an existing firm [17].

Strategic Determinants and Intrapreneurial Orientation

Conducive intrapreneurial climate exists when certain strategic factors are in place in the organization. These are mainly the organizational based characteristics which are now referred to as strategic determinants [18]. When the determinants exist at an optimal level, intrapreneurship opportunities are usually available. When combined with the individual intrapreneurial characteristics in employees, there is high probability that there will be exploitation of the opportunities. The end result of the existence of strategic determinants in the firm is intrapreneurial orientation of its staff [19].

When the strategic determinants of IO are limited in an organization, intrapreneurial activities in the organization are minimal. Intrapreneurial orientation, being related to entrepreneurial orientation, only thrives when certain catalysts exist in the organization. These catalysts are what are referred to as "Strategic determinants of IO" in the study [20].

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intrapreneurship closely relates to entrepreneurship and thus there are a lot of behavioural characteristics shared by the two constructs. Just like is the case with entrepreneurship, the key activities associated with intrapreneurship include; perceiving an opportunity, generating ideas, building of new products or brands and applying the necessary resources to implement the new idea. Behavioural aspects borrowed from entrepreneurship include personal initiative, actively searching for information, innovative thinking, championing for new working methods, taking charge and risk taking [21].

Intrapreneurial orientation (IO) refers to the tendency of employees to behave in an enterprising manner. IO includes acts of creativity, sense of initiative, proactiveness, determination, autonomy, responsibility and risk taking. However, proactiveness, risk taking and innovation are seen as the main roots of intrapreneurial behaviour. The three will therefore be the basis of measuring intrapreneurial orientation in this study [22].

Hornsby *et al.*, [23] and Kuratko *et al.*, [24] highlighted five strategic determinants of intrapreneurial tendencies: management support, work discretion, time availability, organizational structure and reward systems. De Coning [25] recommends that the top managers should do away with unnecessary bureaucracy that hinders employees from identifying and exploiting new opportunities. According to De Coning, elements such as visions that are futuristic may deter progressive thoughts until the stated future time is ripe. The top leadership should also act as role models to their juniors. The author further notes that when top managers fail to support employee initiatives and does not offer room for mistakes, intrapreneurial behaviour is impeded. Employees only make use of their entrepreneurial abilities when they are mentored, coached and offered an enabling environment [20].

Intrapreneurship involves risk taking and hence mistakes are inevitable. Just like entrepreneurs, it has been confirmed that intrapreneurs highly value autonomy and independence, which arises from the fear to be controlled by others. Autonomy is a key catalyst for both entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs [16]. Time is an important factor in the process of idea incubation and their implementation. Hornsby *et al.* [26] observes that companies should allow employees time to exercise intrapreneurial activities even as they work on the set organizational objectives. Kuratko *et al.* [27] further notes that employees will only adopt intrapreneurial behaviour if they have availability of uncontrolled time. Enthusiastic intrapreneurs make use of their spare time to pioneer and actualize their innovative idea. Therefore, availability of time is core to employees both for their routine duties and intrapreneurial endeavours.

An organizational structure refers to organisation of workflow, communication and authority

in a firm. Altinay & Altinay [28] noted a positive correlation between decentralization of the structure and intrapreneurial tendencies. The researchers explained that the association can be attributed to enhanced autonomy and freedom in the use of resources, which supports employees to identify, start and test new ventures. According to the study, a flattened and informal structure aids in transfer of information, empowering of employees, encouraging employee participation and initiative and hence facilitating intrapreneurship. Firms are expected to put in place a reward and reinforcement system that encourages intrapreneurship. Such a system should encourage and motivate employees to exhibit an innovative and entrepreneurial behaviour [29]. According to Hornsby *et al.* [23] the reward structure should emphasize on individual responsibility as well as offer an effective feedback channel. All incentives given to employees should also be based on results. Markides and Geroski [30] assert that human beings have different aspects that motivate them. Entrepreneurs may derive their motivation from success, pride and rewards that come from starting their own enterprises, however intrapreneurs seek incentives that are not clearly understood.

METHODS

The study targeted 108 permanent staff from 22 division and branches of Kenya Institute of Management. Questionnaire was administered to employees with strategic roles in the institute. Out of the 108 questionnaires, 81 questionnaires were properly filled representing an seventy five percent response rate. The rate of response was considered adequate for analysis. Frankfort *et al.*, propose that a response rate which is over 50% is sufficient and form a good representative for data analysis.

RESULTS

Factor Analysis

This study adopted factor analysis in order to reduce the number of indicators or factors under each research variable and retain the indicators capable of explaining the strategic determinants of intrapreneurial orientation at KIM. Factors with factor loading values less than 0.4 were dropped, while those with values of 0.4 and above were retained. This was in line with recommendations made by Tak [1]. The results for factor analysis are represented in Table 1.

Table-1:

| | Component | | | | |
|--|--------------------|---------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| | Management Support | Rewards | Work Discretion | Time Availability | Organizational Bound. |
| | .832 | | | | |
| The development of new and innovative ideas is encouraged by management. | .803 | | | | |
| The management encourage employees to bend rules and rigid procedures in order to keep promising ideas on track. | .789 | | | | |
| Developing one's own ideas is encouraged for the improvement of the institute business. | .693 | | | | |
| The management mentor innovators by giving direction and advice. | .616 | | | | |
| The management appreciates my innovative capabilities. | | .725 | | | |
| Employees who do well are rewarded when they generate or develop | | .647 | | | |
| The management highly regards innovative ideas. | | .637 | | | |
| I have the freedom to use different work approaches to execute major and routine duties | | | .714 | | |
| The management allows application of own judgement at work. | | | .541 | | |
| I have the autonomy to choose how to organize my work? | | | .482 | | |
| I have enough time to meet my job objectives. | | | | .584 | |
| There is time set aside for innovative activities. | | | | .514 | |
| Does your job position prevent you from being innovative? | | | | | .664 |
| Does the institute's organizational structure hinder innovation outside of your job description? | | | | | .553 |
| Does your job position prevent you from being innovative? | | | | | |
| Eigen Value | 5.1 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| Variance % | 19.7 | 10.4 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.0 |
| Cumulitive Variance % | 19.7 | 30.1 | 37.6 | 44.6 | 50.6 |
| Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. | | | | | |
| Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization. | | | | | |

The results in Table 1 indicate that out of the 26 items tested, 14 of them are the most important, explaining 50.2% of all the indicators of strategic determinants of IO. Further, the factor loadings indicates that management support has more factors influencing IO while organizational boundaries has the least

Descriptive statistics were extracted for purposes of describing and comparing the variables under study. Table 2 presents the distribution of the means of the five strategic determinants of IO.

Table-2: Strategic Determinants of IO Mean Scores

| Determinants | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------|----|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Management support | 81 | 3 | 5 | 3.57 | .627 |
| Work discretion | 81 | 2 | 5 | 3.26 | .891 |
| Time availability | 81 | 2 | 5 | 3.15 | .691 |
| Rewards | 81 | 1 | 5 | 3.45 | .922 |
| Boundaries | 81 | 2 | 5 | 3.13 | .757 |
| Valid N (listwise) | 81 | | | | |

Source: Research data (2017)

The results indicate that Organizational boundaries have the least influence on intrapreneurial orientation with a mean score of 3.13. However, the factor remains significant. Management support has the

highest score among the five strategic determinants. This indicates that for Intrapreneurial orientation to thrive in an organization, the management should provide the necessary support. Rewarding of

Intrapreneuring employees comes second with a score of 3.45. Work discretion, which means ability of employees to work with autonomy, also plays a big role in nurturing the culture of intrapreneurship; the determinant has a mean score of 3.26. Time availability, with a mean score of 3.15 came in as the third most import factor. Time availability refers spare time

available to employees to engage in intrapreneurial activities.

Multiple regression analysis was used to understand the extent to which each of the five strategic determinants influenced the variance in the intrapreneurial behaviour. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table-3: Correlation Coefficient of strategic determinants

| Construct | | Intrapreneurial orientation |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Management Support | Pearson Correlation | .740** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 81 |
| Work Discretion | Pearson Correlation | .607** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 81 |
| Time Availability | Pearson Correlation | .598** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 81 |
| Rewarding Intrapreneurial Efforts | Pearson Correlation | .626** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 81 |
| Organizational Boundaries | Pearson Correlation | .527** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |
| | N | 81 |
| Intrapreneurial Orientation | Pearson Correlation | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | |
| | N | 81 |

** Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)...

Source: Research data (2017)

As it is presented on Table 3, there is a positive significant relationship found between each one of the five strategic determinants and intrapreneurial orientation. The P-values were less than the significance level of 0.05. This means that management support, work discretion, rewards, time availability and organizational boundaries are significant determinants of intrapreneurial orientation at KIM.

In order to ascertain that the five strategic determinants are the key influencers of IO at KIM, multiple regression analysis was carried out. Intrapreneurial Orientation was taken as the dependent variable while the five strategic determinants of intrapreneurship were used as the predicting variables. Table 4 below displays the results of the multiple regression analysis.

Table-4: Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .795(a) | .632 | .613 | .296 |

a Predictors: (constant) Organizational Boundaries, Rewards, Work Discretion, Management Support, Time Availability...

Source: Research data (2017)

The results in Table 4 indicate an R of 0.795 It can therefore be concluded that there is high positive correlation between IO and the five strategic determinants. R squared measures the level of variation of the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables, in this case 0.632. This means

that 63.2% of variation observed in IO is explained by the five strategic determinants.

Table 5 displays results obtained after conducting ANOVA to determine the significance of using the five strategic determinants in predicting IO at KIM.

Table-5: ANOVA

| Model | | Sum Squares | df | Mean Square | F | P-Value |
|-------|------------|-------------|-----|-------------|--------|---------|
| 1 | Regression | 14.736 | 5 | 2.947 | 33.613 | .000(a) |
| | Residual | 8.593 | 98 | .088 | | |
| | Total | 23.328 | 103 | | | |

a Predictors: (constant) Organizational Boundaries, Rewards, Work Discretion, Management Support, Time Availability...

b Dependent Variable: Intrapreneurship

Source: Research data (2017)

The results in Table 5 indicate that the model used in the study is statistically sufficient in examining the strategic determinants of IO at KIM, since the P-Value is 0.001 which is less than the alpha value of 0.05.

Table 6 presents the regression coefficients of management support, work discretion, rewarding intrapreneurial efforts, time availability and organizational boundaries in association with intrapreneurial orientation.

Table-6: Regression Coefficients

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | P-Value |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|---------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .145 | .288 | | .484 | .029 |
| | Management Support | .454 | .105 | .423 | 4.131 | .000 |
| | Work Discretion | .170 | .091 | .184 | 1.965 | .042 |
| | Rewards | .205 | .089 | .187 | 2.239 | .027 |
| | Time Availability | .079 | .087 | .175 | .794 | .029 |
| | Organizational Boundaries | .221 | .111 | .058 | 1.958 | .043 |

a Dependent Variable: Intrapreneurship

Source: Research data (2017)

The results from Table 6 were used to formulate the model. $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1X_1 + \beta_2X_2 + \beta_3X_3 + \beta_4X_4 + \beta_5X_5 + \mu_1$, where Y = intrapreneurship, β_0 = intercept, β_1 - β_5 = regression coefficients, X_1 = management support, X_2 = work discretion, X_3 = rewards, X_4 = time availability, X_5 = organizational boundaries, μ_1 = error term. From the above model equation, the study results were can be summarized as follows $Y = 0.145 + 0.454X_1 + 0.170X_2 + 0.205X_3 + 0.079X_4 + 0.221X_5 + \mu_1$

The regression equation above establishes that considering all factors, (management support, work discretion, rewards, time availability and organizational boundaries) constant at zero, intrapreneurial orientation will be 0.140. The result also show that putting all other independent variables at zero, a unit increase in management support will lead to 0.454 increase in intrapreneurial orientation; a unit increase in work discretion will lead to 0.170 increase in intrapreneurial orientation; a unit increase in rewards will lead to 0.205 increase in intrapreneurial orientation; a unit increase in time availability will lead to 0.079 increase in intrapreneurial orientation; a unit increase in

organizational boundaries will lead to 0.221 increase in intrapreneurial orientation. The results are consistent with the work of Hornsby *et al.*, [23] and Kuratko *et al.*, [24] who found that management support, work discretion, rewarding intrapreneurial efforts, time availability and organizational boundaries are the main strategic determinants of intrapreneurial orientation. The findings are also, partly consistent with Pinchot [31] whose study indicated that Resource availability, work discretion risk taking, knowledge acquisition and rewards as the key determinants of intrapreneurial orientation in an organization

CONCLUSION

Increasing intrapreneurial orientation and coming up with ways of growing intrapreneurship in organizations has been a common discussion by several researchers in the area of strategy [18]. To realize increased Intrapreneurial orientation in organisations, it is important to consistently investigate the strategic determinants of intrapreneurial activities in different organizations. The study established that, intrapreneurial orientation is largely composed of three indicators; proactiveness, innovation and risk taking,

which are the most significant measures of intrapreneurial orientation. The implication is that when individuals in organizations identify and pursue new opportunities, initiate new products, processes and services, operate in uncertain environments then such people have intrapreneurial capability. Employees with high intrapreneurial orientation are crucial in driving the competitiveness of organizations where they work through provision of a way of surviving in the ever changing business environment. Such organizations are more likely to persist through the challenges of business through self-renewal.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The focus of the study was on the strategic determinants of Intrapreneurial orientation at the KIM. The findings show that there is a strong positive relationship between the variables. For this reason, the management of KIM and other institutions under TVET should operationalize initiatives that are geared towards enhancing the score of strategic determinants of IO to guarantee their growth and sustainability. The study shows that management support is the most important of the five strategic determinants of IO and hence the organizations need to give adequate managerial support to intrapreneurs.

In addition, there should be enabling communication structures that allow autonomy and flexibility for employees to engage in intrapreneurial activities. Adoption of commensurate reward system is also recommended. Organizations, however should watch out for other factors that contribute about 39% of intrapreneurial orientation. IO in organizations, including KIM should be applied as a tool of self-renewal.

SUGGESTED AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The research focused on strategic determinants of intrapreneurial orientation. These determinants are only based on internal organizational environment. As noted from the research findings, the determinants influences approximately 61% of IO; therefore, further research should be conducted to establish the other determinants of IO that influences the remaining 39%. The determinants may include individual employee characteristics and external factors.

Intrapreneurial orientation remains a relatively new construct, mainly in the Kenyan context. The current study focused on a tertiary learning institution (KIM) whose institutional characteristics may be different from other organizations in other sectors and industries. For this reason, further studies on intrapreneurship need to be conducted in different sectors in the country. In addition, additional variables

can be added in future studies so as to explain more of the variation in IO.

REFERENCES

1. Tak S. Global business environment: New trends & techniques; 2016.
2. Molina C, Callahan JL. Fostering organizational performance: The role of learning and intrapreneurship. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 2009 Jun 5;33(5):388-400.
3. Karimi A, Malekmohamadi I, Ahmadvpour Daryani M, Rezvanfar A. A conceptual model of intrapreneurship in the Iranian agricultural extension organization: Implications for HRD. *Journal of European Industrial Training*. 2011 Aug 30;35(7):632-57.
4. Hitt M, Ireland RD, Hoskisson R. Strategic management: Concepts and cases. Cengage Learning; 2006 Mar 2.
5. Antoncic B. Intrapreneurship: a comparative structural equation modeling study. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*. 2007 Apr 3;107(3):309-25.
6. Urbano D, Alvarez C, Turró A. Organizational resources and intrapreneurial activities: an international study. *Management Decision*. 2013 Apr 26;51(4):854-70.
7. Ayadurai S, Sohail MS. Corporate Entrepreneurship in multinational Subsidiaries in Malaysia: The Effects on past Performance. In *Twelfth Annual International Conference on Advances in Management 2005* (pp. 1-23).
8. Antoncic B, Hisrich RD. Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of business venturing*. 2001 Sep 30;16(5):495-527.
9. Kuratko DF, Ireland RD, Hornsby JS. The power of entrepreneurial outcomes: Insights from Acordia. *Academy of Management Executive*. 2001;15(4):60-71.
10. Nafukho FM, Muyia HM, Irby BJ. Governance and transformations of universities in Africa: A global perspective; 2014.
11. Cordes-Berszinn P. Dynamic capabilities: How organisational structures affect knowledge processes. Springer; 2013 Nov 29.
12. Goossen RJ, Stevens RP. Entrepreneurial leadership: Finding your calling, making a difference. InterVarsity Press; 2013 Apr 5.
13. Michubu M. Expansion of Higher Education in Kenya: Quality Implications. Saarbrücken: Lap Lambert Academic Publishing; 2015.
14. Kenya Institute of Management. (2016). Annual Report and Consolidation Accounts. Nairobi: KIM.
15. Hisrich RD, Peters MP, Shepherd DA. Entrepreneurship, McGraw-Hill.

16. Kising'u TM. Strategic Determinants of Intrapreneurship of Education Institutions in Kenya.
17. Kuratko DF, Goodale JC, Hornsby JS. Quality practices for a competitive advantage in smaller firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*. 2001 Oct 1;39(4):293-311.
18. Chigamba C, Rungani EC, Mudenda C. The Determinants of Corporate Entrepreneurship for Firms in Adventure Tourism Sector in South Africa. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. 2014 Jun 19;5(9):713.
19. du-Plessis Y. An Innovative and Sustainable Work-Integrated Learning Design for Generation Y Graduate Employability. In *Conference on Business Innovation and Growth 2015 Jul 8* (p. 531).
20. Sylvia Naliaka W. Perceptions of Kenyan Managers on Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation. 2010.
21. Sathe V. Corporate entrepreneurship: Top managers and new business creation. Cambridge University Press; 2007 Feb 15.
22. Fayolle A, Kyrö P, Liñán F, editors. *Developing, Shaping and Growing Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing; 2015 Feb 27.
23. Hornsby JS, Kuratko DF, Zahra SA. Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of business Venturing*. 2002 May 31;17(3):253-73.
24. Goodale JC, Kuratko DF, Hornsby JS, Covin JG. Operations management and corporate entrepreneurship: The moderating effect of operations control on the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurial activity in relation to innovation performance. *Journal of operations management*. 2011 Jan 31;29(1):116-27.
25. De Coning T. Transformational leadership in SMEs. *SA Journal for Entrepreneurship and Small Business*. 1992;4(2):52.
26. Hornsby JS, Naffziger DW, Kuratko DF, Montagno RV. An interactive model of the corporate entrepreneurship process. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*. 1993 Jan 1;17(2):29-38.
27. Kuratko DF, Montagno RV, Hornsby JS. Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic management journal*. 1990 Jul 1:49-58.
28. Altinay L, Altinay M. The influence of organisational structure on entrepreneurial orientation and expansion performance. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 2004 Oct 1;16(6):334-44.
29. Bowen RB. Recognizing and rewarding employees. 2000.
30. Markides CC, Geroski PA. Fast second: How smart companies bypass radical innovation to enter and dominate new markets. John Wiley & Sons; 2004 Sep 24.
31. Pinchot III G. *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur*. 1985.