

Intrapreneurship in terms of Change Management

DOI: 10.26466/opus.644237

*

Bülent Güven*

* Dr., Özel Sektör, Malatya/Türkiye

E-Posta: guvenbul@gmail.com

ORCID: [0000-0003-0321-9414](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0321-9414)

Abstract

Intrapreneurship, which represents entrepreneurial activity within an existing enterprise, is a means of sustaining businesses' activities in a highly competitive environment. Certain mechanisms are necessary to support and sustain the development of entrepreneurship spirit within the organization. An organization that wants a creative and innovative workforce that will be appropriate to develop and change the organization in this respect. The aim of this research is to determine the relationship between intrapreneurship and change management. In accordance with this purpose, determining the level of intrapreneurship in the enterprises and determining the level of organizational change constitute another aim of the research. In the research, a survey was conducted with the managers (white-collar) in the textile sector. As a result of these analyzes, it is found that there is a positive relationship between intrapreneurship and organizational change. In addition to that the perception of organizational change of employees increases, the entrepreneur behavior increases.

Keywords: *Intrapreneurship, Entrepreneurship, Change, Organizational Change.*

İçgiriřimcilik Açısından Deęiřim Yönetimi

*

Öz

Mevcut bir iřletme içerisinde giriřimcilik faaliyetlerini ifade eden içgiriřimcilik, řiddetli rekabet ortamında iřletmelerin faaliyetlerini saęlıklı bir řekilde sürdürmelerinin bir vasıtasıdır. Örgüt içerisinde giriřimcilik ruhu oluşabilmesi için onu destekleyen ve sürekli gelişmesini saęlayan belli bařlı mekanizmalar gereklidir. Yaratıcı ve yenilikçi bir işgücüne sahip olmayı amaçlayan bir örgütün öncelikle örgütün bu yönde geliştirilmesi ve deęiřtirilmesi uygun olacaktır. Bu arařtırmanın amacı içgiriřimcilik anlayışı ile deęiřim yönetimi arasındaki iliřkiyi belirlemektir. Bu amaç doęrultusunda iřletmelerdeki içgiriřimcilik düzeyini belirlemek ve örgütsel deęiřim düzeyini belirlemek arařtırmanın diđer bir amacını oluřturmaktadır. Demografik deęiřkenler açısından içgiriřimcilik ve örgütsel deęiřim düzeylerindeki farklılıęı belirlemek de çalıřmanın amaçları arasındadır. Çalıřmanın amacı doęrultusunda veri toplamak amacıyla anket uygulanmıřtır. Arařtırma da tekstil sektöründe faaliyet gösteren bir fabrika da yönetici(beyaz yakalı) pozisyonunda çalıřanlarla anket yapılmıřtır. Yapılan analizler sonucunda içgiriřimcilik ile örgütsel deęiřim arasında pozitif iliřkilerin olduęu tespit edilmiřtir. Ayrıca Çalıřanların örgütsel deęiřim algısı yükseldikçe içgiriřimcilik davranışı arttıęı ortaya çıkmıřtır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: İçgiriřimcilik, , Giriřimcilik, Deęiřim, Örgütsel Deęiřim..

Introduction

In today's world, where resistance to change has become impossible, to gain sustainable competitive advantage in the global competitive environment, intrapreneurship activities, in which employees are encouraged, have become more and more important in order to reach the targeted business performance and organizational goals. Today's organizations are looking for different solutions in order to be able to sustain their economic lives, extend their life span in the competitive and dynamic business environment conditions. The ability of businesses to maintain their competitive edge, success, and even ability to sustain their activities, depends on being proactive, taking risks, and innovating in terms of product, market and technology.

For the organizations, it is important to capture the change in terms of effectiveness of the system and even to make constant change part of its reality. Growing up to the pace of change for organizations, the concept of intrapreneurship is important for employees in terms of issues such as taking risks, being competitive, aggressive, and autonomous.

Technological changes in the customer's needs and demands affect the organizations and their structures. Changes make the field of activity more complex and push organizations to innovate by forcing them to venture. The basic ability that organizations need to have in order to adapt and respond to change is the ability to differentiate in product and service fields and evaluate new opportunities. The organization can maintain its position and even be successful in the economic system as long as it is unusual.

An organization that is devoid of organizational and intrapreneur skills cannot adapt to change. Intrapreneurship is a necessary path to achieve desired change and opportunities by achieving sustainable competitive advantage. In order to provide active competitive advantage for organizations that are not able to meet the customer needs and demands of the markets that are shrinking under dynamic competition conditions and existing products and services, it is of great importance that different strategies are introduced in the name of intrapreneurship in product, service and process management. The emergence of new chances and opportunities that appear within the organization as new services and products, and keep pace with change, gives the organizations a competitive edge.

Organizations with the highest levels of intrapreneurship move towards customer-oriented innovations that can adapt to change and teamwork. It is crucial for the success of the organization to provide support to employees by providing a workable environment for the employees who have the spirit of intrapreneurship in the organization. Intrapreneurship can only be achieved by encouraging employees with an innovative attitude to be able to develop to the desired level. An efficient and dynamic organizational change management within the organization is inevitable in order for the intrapreneurship to reach the desired level and emergence of new intrapreneurs.

The aim of this research is to reveal the relationship between change management and intrapreneurship. In this study, the information obtained on the axis of the literature review will be put into a conceptual framework and the empirical research will shed light on the practicality of the theoretical information. Despite the fact that change and entrepreneurship are interrelated issues in the theoretical framework it needs to be supported by empirical studies. In line with this purpose, a factory operating in the textile sector operating in the province of Malatya has been selected in the survey. The demographic findings will be explained. The hypotheses about change management and intrapreneurship will be tested. Finally, the evaluation and conclusion will be the last part of the study.

Intrapreneurship

Entrepreneurship is a term generally used in an individual sense. However, for businesses, it has become a matter of importance for employees to contribute to innovation, service and product development. In 1983, Giffort Pinchot described intrapreneurship as a concept related to a group instead of individuals within the organization (Hisrich and Peters, 1995, p.15). Intrapreneurship is defined as entrepreneurship within the existing business structure of organizations (Müftüoğlu, Ürper, Başar and Tosunoğlu, 2005 p. 65). Intrapreneurship focuses on innovations that are visible or emerging creativity of employees in business in issues like motivation, skills and experience in gathering resources, innovation, creativity, and risk taking (Öktem, Leblebici, Arslan, Kılıç and Aydın, 2003, p. 173). Intrapreneurship, also referred to as company entrepreneurship, aims to activate or reinvigorate the existing

organization through risk taking, innovation and active competition behaviors (Zahra and Covin, 1995, p. 44).

Intrapreneurs are creative individuals who have an entrepreneurial spirit within the organization, who can see and capture the opportunity to innovate, but in the meantime transform these ideas and models into real activities that will increase the profitability and competitive power of the business they are in (Morris and Kuratko, 2002, p.85). Intrapreneurs are those who bring creative and new solutions to the problems encountered by firms (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2000, p. 22). Intrapreneur, revives and sustains his or her entrepreneurial talent and introduces new opportunities in the present enterprise (Top, 2006, p.9). Intrapreneurs develop new investments, inventions, ideas and behaviors and employ these innovations in products, services, management programs, new plans and programs (Naktiyok, 2004, p.64).

Rapidly increasing global competition, inadequacy of traditional business methods, loss of talented personnel, and issues like productivity and efficiency has increased the importance of intrapreneurship (Başar and Tosunoglu, 2006, p.126). Through intrapreneurship activities of motivating business owners and employees, supporting their creativity; it is possible to increase the performance of the business with innovation activities and to provide a competitive edge (Güner ve Serinkan, 2017, p. 494). Organizations that do not attach importance to intrapreneurship is likely to face problems such as stagnation, loss of personnel and decline (Kuratko and Hodges, 1998, p. 55-56).

The Dimensions of Intrapreneurship

Researchers have studied intrapreneurship and its peculiar characteristics in different models and dimensions. As shown in Table 1, intrapreneurship consists of seven dimensions:

Table 1. The Dimensions of Intrapreneurship

Renewal Period	Process of creating new products, services, processes, technologies and methods	Covin and Slevin(1991); Lumpkin and Dess(1996); Knight(1997); Antoncic and Hisrich(2001); Morris and Kuratko(2002)
Risk Taking	Making investment decisions and taking strategic actions in an uncertain environment to evaluate new opportunities despite the risks	Miller and Friesen(1983); Covin and Slevin(1991); Lumpkin and Dess(1996-2001); Hornsby et al.(2002); Morris and Kuratko(2002); Antoncic and Hisrich(2003)
Proactive Behavior	The tendency of the organization to pioneer and initiate the first venture, especially by the top management	Miller and Friesen(1983); Covin and Slevin(1991); Lumpkin and Dess(1996-2001); Knight(1997); Morris and Kuratko(2002); Antoncic and Hisrich(2003)
Autonomy	The independence that an individual, group or organization demonstrates an idea or vision	Zajac vd.(1991); Lumpking and Dess(1996); Culhane(2003)
New Venture	Creating new products, new jobs and new autonomous units or semi-autonomous firms within existing organizations	Zahra(1991, 1993, 1995); Stopford and Baden-Fuller(1994); Zahra and Covin(1995); Antoncic(2000); Antoncic and Hisrich(2001)
Renovation	Reformulation of purpose and strategy, re-definition of business concept, reorganization and organizational change	Guth and Ginsberg(1990); Zahra(1991, 1993); Stopford and Baden-Fuller(1994); Antoncic(2000); Antoncic and Hisrich(2001, 2003)
Competitiveness	Attacking aggressively against the racquet or challenging the competitors directly and intensely	Covin and Covin(1990); Lumpkin and Dess(1996); Antoncic(2000); Antoncic and Hisrich(2003)

Source: Ağca and Kurt, 2007, p. 92

Organizational Change

With the impact of economic, technological and social developments, organizations are constantly and rapidly changing and it becomes increasingly difficult to keep pace up with this change. Changing environmental conditions necessitate an effective and strategic management. It is important for the future of the organizations to capture the change and to consider how the organizations can influence it.

If the targeted results are not reached in the organizations and if the organization loses its organizational value and weakens, the change within the

organization is inevitable. The most important reason for this change in terms of private sector enterprises is the intense competition environment (Eren, Alpkın, and Ergün, 2003, p.59). Moreover, changes in the organization may be needed to protect the organization against changes in the outside environment or to provide development (Halis, 2001, p.120). Sadler (1999) lists organizational change objectives as flexibility, changing or restructuring the organizational system, building learning organizations, supporting organizational change and development, and achieving the ideal and individual organizational wages (Dolaşır, 2005, p.12).

Change implies the emergence of new concepts, and development implies that these innovations are positive (Yıldırım, 1998, p.122). Schein (2009, p.134) stated that the organizational change will be occur in two ways: "the general evolution" if all departments and members within the organization participates in the process and uses "specific evolution" only when a specific change is made to a particular area in a certain area. According to this definition, it can be inferred that the process of organizational change constitutes an important step in determining what will be changed in that business, how much of it will be changed, how the change in the internal environment will be met and the roadmap to be followed. Businesses are trying to understand, develop, or change the basic values, behaviors and attitudes and organization of the workplace in order to realize the causes of existence such as increasing profit and market share, increasing production and capacity (Murat ve Açıköz, 2007, p.1).

It is impossible to resist change in dynamic structured organizations whose external environment is constantly changing (Genç, 1993, p.306). When the change is examined in the organizational dimension; a system, a process or an environment in an unplanned way can be expressed as a transition from an existing state to another (Durna, 2002, p.9). On the other hand, making the appropriate decisions requires rapid and consistent action (Genç, 1994, p.379). Therefore, for the organization to change, making the organization ready and willing as a whole will enable both the planned change to be efficient and to be done in a shorter time. The organizational change aimed at a planned change can be regarded as the preparations for restructuring the organization against some important changes that affect its organizational resources such as new competitors, technological changes and leadership styles (İnançoğlu, 2002, p.147).

Accepting change within an organization with a strong culture structure and based on a long history is a challenging process. First of all, the key point of the change process is that the members of the organization should see it as a necessity. Also they have to understand if the change does not occur, the continuity of the organization will be jeopardized and will not be successful in the market. The reasons for the failure of organizational change are that the factors require change are not well defined; a good and strong strategic planning has not been done; there is a lack of continuity of exchange activities or they remain as a short term enthusiasm, and there is a lack of active role of members of the organization in this process (Dolaşır, 2005, p.15). While a hierarchy based on a strong culture in a stable environment is adequate in change, organizations should be open to innovative and risky activities in a cultural change where there is a dynamic and uncertain environment (Halis, 2001, p.119).

Relationship Between Change Management and Intrapreneurship

Competitive global economy causes great changes in organizations. These changes need to be carefully re-formulated while the concept of intrapreneurship that leads them to success and gains a sustainable competitive advantage should be taken into consideration. Firms are trying to find a dynamic balance point between the dilemmas of control, freedom of movement, change and continuity in order to make the entrepreneurship important and internalize within the organization (Şeşen, 2010, p. 35). The intrapreneurship represents efforts that tries to find a way out of the tradition and to change the strategy and organizational structure by risk taking, efficacy and aggressive posture (Demirci, 2006, pp.51-52). Entrepreneurship allows organizations to maintain their dynamism and change in a positive sense, to increase their capacity, to create resources, to improve their performances, to avoid downturns by avoiding stagnation and defeating inertia, and to maintain dynamism and change and to sustain their activities in internal and external markets in a healthy manner (Onay and Cavaşoğlu, 2010, p.59) .

The uncertainty and dynamism of the environment may support or hamper organizations' initiative tendency (Naktiyok and Kök, 2006, p.83). Organizations operating in a dynamic environment often try to be successful by creating effective and proactive capitalist strategies for changes in their sectors.

The changes in the competition and the technological developments that cause those changes are the factors that affect the density of the of intrapreneurship activities (Demirci, 2006, p.77). Ross (1987) has argued that enterprises with a spirit of intrapreneurship will have more effective and longer life, whatever the size of organization is, when compared to the enterprises that fail to take the necessary steps in change and innovation (Şeşen, 2010, p.36).

The main purpose of intrapreneurship is to create a dynamic, flexible and competitive organizational structure and culture that can cope with high market dynamism and competitiveness (Büte, 2008, p.528). By adopting the activities of intrapreneurship, the organizational structure that does not provide benefit will be abandoned or the restructure of the organization will be reinstated. The organization structure which will be more innovative and serving the purposes by better understanding the change process.

Methodology

The aim of this research is to reveal the relationship between change management and intrapreneurship. In other words, the emergence of behavior of intrapreneurship will be analyzed in the context of change. In line with this purpose, an enterprise in textile sector operating in the province of Malatya has been selected in the survey. The participants are in managerial positions (white-collar). A questionnaire was applied in order to collect data in line with the aims of the study. The number of executives (white-collar) employed is 65. The questionnaires were used in the study. The questionnaires developed by Serinkan and Arat (2013, pp. 161-163), which is used in the research of change management and intrapreneurship scale, was developed from various studies. The sample size to be selected was calculated as 56 (The Survey System, 2018) with a 5% margin of error within 95% reliability limits of the research universe. A total of 70 questionnaires were distributed randomly, in consideration of the fact that some participants would not respond with complete or correct answers. However, 54 of the questionnaires answered and returned. The return rate is 90%.

In this study, the answers to the questionnaire related to intapreneurship were as follows; reliability questionnaire for the 29 questions with 5 likert scale; Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.966. The reliability analysis for change management were calculated as 0.977 (Cronbach Alpha Value)

for the 33 questions with the likert scale of 5. According to these datas, both scales are highly reliable. The following hypotheses have been developed to explore the relationship between change management and internal entrepreneurship, and the degree level of this relationship.

- H1: There is a meaningful and positive relationship between change management and intrapreneurship and their dimensions.
- H2: Effective change management affects intrapreneurship positively.

Findings Related to the Research

In terms of demographic variables, determining the level of intrapreneurship and organizational change is also among the aims of the study. In line with the demographic information given in Table 2, most of the intrapreneurs working at the firm are between the age range of 36-45 years, and the ratio of undergraduate is 65%. The majority of the intrapreneurs are working in the same business for a long period of time. 89% of the intrapreneurs working in the business stated that the organizational structure has changed.

Table 2. Demographic Findings

Gender	N	%	Educational Status	N	%
Male	41	75,9	High- School	9	16,7
Female	13	24,1	Undergraduate	35	64,9
			Graduate	9	16,7
			Doctorate	1	1,9
Ages	N	%	Time Spent in the Organization	N	%
18-25 years	4	7,4	Less than 1 year	5	9,3
26-35 years	15	28,8	1-3 years	8	14,8
36-45 years	26	48,1	4-6 years	4	7,4
46-55 years	9	16,7	7-9 years	3	5,6
			10 years and above	34	63,0
Change in the Organization	N	%	...workplace she /he is working	N	%
Organization completely changed	2	3,7	1.	23	42,6
A major change took place in the organization	46	85,2	2.	18	33,3
I am indecisive	3	5,6	3.	12	22,2
No major change in business	2	3,7	4.	1	1,9
No change took place in the organization	1	1,9			

As given in Table 3, the arithmetic average of organizational change is 3.93 and intrapreneurship is 3.88. These values reveal that organizational change

and intrapreneurship activities exist intensively in the enterprises among participating intrapreneurs.

Table 3. The Values of Standard Deviation and Arithmetic Mean on Organizational Change and Intrapreneurship

	Number of Questions	Average	Standard Deviation
Intrapreneurship	29	3,8831	0,62424
Organizational Change	33	3,9282	0,70051

Findings Related to Hypothesis

In the light of information presented in Table 4, the organizational change reveals 58.7% of the intrapreneur behavior. As the perception of organizational change of employees increases, the intrapreneur behavior increases. The H2 hypothesis was accepted in the direction of the results in the table.

Table 4. The Regression Analysis of Organizational Change and Intrapreneurship

Independent Variables	B Value	T	P
Stable	1,202	3,793	0,000**
Organizational Change	0,683	8,592	0,000**
Straight. R ²	0,587		
F	73,828		
P	0,000*		
Durbin-Watson	2,229		

As seen in table 5, as a result of the Pearson correlation analysis, there is a significant positive correlation between organizational change and intrapreneurship scale ($r = 0,766$, $p < 0,05$). In addition, significant positive correlations were found between organizational change and all dimensions of intrapreneurship scale ($p < 0,05$). If the results in Table 5 are noted, there is a high positive correlation between organizational change and intrapreneurship and its seven dimensions, and a moderately positive relationship with risk taking and competitive assertiveness dimensions can be observed. The H1 hypothesis has been accepted.

Table 5. Correlation Analysis between Intrapreneurship Dimensions and Change Management

	Organizational Change	Intrapreneurship	New Venture	Autonomy	Competitiveness	Proactive Behavior	Innovation Tendency	Innovation	Risk Taking
Organizational Change	1								
Intrapreneurship	0,766	1							
New Venture	0,667	0,944	1						
Autonomy	0,727	0,901	0,794	1					
Competitive Entrepreneurship	0,630	0,799	0,741	0,652	1				
Proactive Behavior	0,734	0,894	0,807	0,795	0,629	1			
Renewal Period	0,716	0,924	0,832	0,858	0,664	0,823	1		
Renovation	0,780	0,864	0,760	0,775	0,590	0,832	0,811	1	
Risk Taking	0,458	0,761	0,708	0,661	0,608	0,540	0,649	0,571	1

Discussion and Conclusion

Intrapreneurship and organizational change are important issues for businesses. Because of its significance, those two issues were discussed in this research. Despite the fact that change and entrepreneurship are interrelated issues in the theoretical framework it needs to be supported by empirical studies. In this study, the information obtained on the axis of the literature review will be put into a conceptual framework and the empirical research will shed light on the practicality of the theoretical information. It turns out that in the research conducted, there is a strict and positive relationship between intrapreneurship and change management. It has been observed that the success of the business is due to its continuous change and its preoccupation with intrapreneurship.

The phenomenon of intrapreneurship has emerged as a response to the rapidly developing market structures and competitive products of the globalizing world. Growing of organizations, opening up to new markets, turning opportunities and possibilities into new products and services make the issue of intrapreneurship more important in terms of organizations. There is a pos-

itive relationship between change in organizational structure and intrapreneurship in order for organizations to grow and achieve their organizational goals.

Intrapreneurship topic affecting the goals and objectives of enterprises is influenced by certain factors in an environment where knowledge and technology develop, the complexity and acceleration of change. Where the changes are expressed and the change is a rule, businesses are forced to take an opportunity and avoid threats from these environments, depending on their wishes and desires for change. Organizations cannot achieve the targeted results, and if the organization loses organizational value, it is inevitable to change within the organization. Change in the organizational system is a long time process. The change, internalization and development of members' behavior, values and attitudes is a long-term process. While tangible elements of organization can change in a short time, the change of tangible aspects may require a long process.

For further development of intrapreneurship, it is necessary to provide employees with an innovative work environment. To increase market value, organizations should focus on specific changes in organizational structure in order to reshape the structure of intrapreneurship thinking. The organizational change process must be well planned and well managed. The acceptance of the principle of openness, continuous change and development within the enterprise are important. Establishment of an institutional structure in the organization that promotes intrapreneurship and provides certain changes will be effective in the professional management of this change process.

It is not so easy to see organizational change in large businesses with a long history. For instance, in terms of intrapreneurship, if a business is involved in business relationship with a company that has never been in a new market, a new business, or an organization with a system that is different from itself, then this enterprise will inevitably experience a change as a result of the relationship between them.

The fact that intrapreneurs play an active role in change will facilitate and shorten the process. The transition phase of intrapreneurship would not be complete without internalization. Internalization, on the other hand, is a phase that is not easy at all, it is even spreadable over the years, and may even result in failure. Moreover, all departments of the organization in change

management should work in a coordination. Also, all departments should be open to communication, act in a responsible manner, and believe that change is both useful and necessary for both themselves and their enterprise. If an employee does not exhibit the desired behavior of change; yet shows an attitude that would cause conflict, other employees should intervene by putting psychological pressure on their friends for the success of change. Because of the damage they cause to the team spirit; employers must apply a variety of sanctions.

Kaynakça / References

- Ağca V. and Yörük D. (2006). Bağımsız girişimcilik ve iç girişimcilik arasındaki farklar: Kavramsal bir çerçeve. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 8(2), 155-173.
- Antonic, B. (2000). *Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and an integrative model development*. Unpublished Thesis for The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Marketing and Policy Studies Weatherhead School of Management, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
- Antonic, B. and Hisrich, R.D. (2000). Intrapreneurship modeling intranational economies: A comparison of Slovenia and the United States. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 5(1), 21-40.
- Antonic, B. and Hisrich, R.D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 497-527.
- Antonic, B. and Hisrich, R.D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10 (1), 7-24.
- Başar, M. ve Tosunoğlu, T.(2006). Değer yaratımında iç girişimciliğin değişen boyutu: Bilgi girişimcilerinin rolü. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*,1(1), 123-136
- Büte, M. (2008). İç girişimciliğe verilen önem düzeyi ve çevresel faktörlerin iç girişimcilik üzerine etkileri. Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi 2. Uluslararası Girişimcilik Kongresi, 7- 10 Mayıs 2008, Bişkek, 528-535.
- Covin, J.G., and Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic management of small firm in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10 (1), 75-87.
- Covin, J.G. and Covin, T.J. (1990). Competitive aggressiveness, environmental context, and small firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14 (4), 35-50

- Covin, J.G. and Slevin, D.P.; (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16 (1), 7-25.
- Culhane, J. H. (2003). *The entrepreneurial orientation-performance linkage in high technology firms: An international comparative study*. Unpublished Thesis for The Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts Amherst: Amherst.
- Demirci, A. E. (2006). *İşletmelerin yenilik faaliyetlerinde şirket içi girişimciliğin temel faktör olarak incelenmesi: Türkiye ve Polonya'da faaliyet gösteren büyük ölçekli kimya-ilaç sektörü işletmelerinde karşılaştırmalı durum değerlendirmesi*. Yayınlanmamış Doktora tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Dolaşır, S. (2005). Değişim yönetimi ve spor örgütleri. *Spor Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(1), 11-15.
- Durna, U. (2002). *Yenilik yönetimi*. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.
- Eren, E., Alpkan L., and Ergün, E. (2003). Kültürel boyutlar olarak işletmelerde içsel bütünleşme ve dışsal odaklanma düzeylerinin performansa etkileri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 4(1), 55-56.
- Genç, N. (1993). Örgütsel kültürün oluşumu ve örgütsel davranışlar üzerine etkisi. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(1-2),306-316.
- Genç, N. (1994). Örgütsel davranış, karar süreci ve karşılıklı etkileşim. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(3-4), 379-383.
- Guth, W. D. and Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest editors' Introduction: Corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11 (5), 5-15.
- Güner, F. and Serinkan, C. (2017). İç girişimcilik ve yenilik ilişkisi: Banka çalışanları üzerinde bir araştırma. Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 9(22), 482-499.
- Gürbüz S.,Bekmezci M. and Mert İ. S. (2010). Örgütsel faktörlerin iç girişimciliğe etkisi: İş tatmini aracı değişken mi?. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(2), 127-135.
- Halis, M. (2001). Durumsallığı açısından Türk örgüt kültürlerindeki yönelimler – ampirik bir çalışma. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2, 109-135.
- Hisrich, R. D. and Peters, M. P. (1995). *Entrepreneurship-starting, developing, and managing a new enterprise*. (Third Edition), Chicago: Irwin Publishing.
- Hornsby J.S., Kuratko D.F. and Zahra, S.A. (2002). Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: Assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17 (3), 253-273.

- İnançoğlu, E. (2002). *Çalışma değerlerinin örgütsel değişime dirence etkisi*. 10. Ulusal Yönetim ve Organizasyon Kongresi, Antalya, 142-158.
- Knight, G. (1997). Cross-cultural reliability and validity of a scale to measure firm entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12 (3), 213-225
- Koçel, T. (1998). Girişimcilik ama hangisi?. *Executive Excellence*, 10, 17-18
- Kuratko D.F., Montagno R.V. and Hornsby J.S. (1990). Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(5), 49-58.
- Kuratko D.F., Hornsby J.S., Naffziger D.W. and Montagno R.V. (1993). Implementation entrepreneurial thinking in established organizations. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 58(1), 28- 39.
- Kuratko, D. F. and Welsch, H. P. (1994). *Entrepreneurial strategy text and cases*. Fort Worth, TX: The Dryden Press.
- Kuratko, F. D. and Hodgetts, M. R. (1998). *Entrepreneurship*. Orlando, Florida: The Dreyden Press.
- Kuratko F.K., Hornsby J.S., and Sabatine F.J. (1999). *The breakthrough experience: A guide to corporate entrepreneurship*. Midwest Entrepreneurial Education Center, College of Business Ball State University.
- Kuratko, D. F. and Hodgetts, R. M. (2001). *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach*. South-Western Thomson Learning: Mason, Ohio.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The Moderating Role of Environment and Industry Life Cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429-451.
- Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. (1983). Strategy-making and environment: The third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4(3), 221-235.
- Morris, M. H. and Kuratko, D. F. (2002). *Corporate entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial development within organizations*. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Murat, G. and Açıkgöz, B. (2007). Yöneticilerin örgüt kültürü algılamalarına ilişkin bir analiz: Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi. *Zonguldak Karaelmas Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(5), 1-20.
- Müftüoğlu T., Ürper Y., Başar M. and Tosunoğlu, T. (2005). *Girişimcilik*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Naktiyok A.(2004). *İç girişimcilik*. 1. Baskı, İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

- Naktiyok, A. and Bayrak Kök, S. (2006). Çevresel faktörlerin iç girişimcilik üzerine etkileri. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 8(2), 77-96.
- Öktem M.K., Leblebici D.N., Arslan M., Kılıç M. and Aydın, M.D. (2003). Girişimci örgütsel kültür ve çalışanların iç girişimcilik düzeyi: Uygulamalı bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(1), 169-188.
- Ross, J. E. (1987). Intrapreneurship and corporate culture. *Industrial Management*, 22-28.
- Schein, E.H. (2009). *The corporate culture: Survival guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sharma P. and Chrisman J. J. (1999). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 11-27.
- Serinkan, C. and Arat, G. (2013). *İşletmelerde örgütsel değişim ve iç girişimcilik*. İstanbul: Beta Basım.
- Stopford, J.M. and Baden-fuller, C.W.F. (1994). Creating corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(7), 521- 536.
- Şeşen, H. (2010). *Öncülleri ve sonuçları ile örgüt içi girişimcilik: Türk savunma sanayinde bir araştırma*. Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi, Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü Savunma Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
- The Survey System (2018). *The sample size calculator*. I was accessed from website of <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm> on the date of 15 January 2018
- Top, S. (2006). *Girişimcilik-kesif süreci*. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Zahra, S.A (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.
- Zahra, S.A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8 (4), 319-340.
- Zahra, S. A. (1995). Corporate entrepreneurship and financial performance: the case of management leveraged buyouts. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(3), 225-247.
- Zahra, S.A. and Covin, J.G.(1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(1), 43-58.

- Zajac E.J., Golden B.R. and Shortell S.M. (1991). New organizational forms for enhancing innovation: The case of internal corporate joint ventures. *Management Science*, 37(2), 170-1
- Zahra, S.A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(4), 319-340.
- Zahra, S. A. (1995). Corporate entrepreneurship and financial performance: The case of management leveraged buyouts. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(3), 225-247.
- Zahra, S.A. and Covin, J.G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(1), 43-58.
- Zajac E.J., Golden B.R. and Shortell S.M. (1991). New organizational forms for enhancing innovation: The case of internal corporate joint ventures. *Management Science*, 37 (2), 170-1
- Yıldırım, R. (1998). *Yaratıcılık ve yenilik*. (5.Basım). İstanbul: Sistem Yayıncılık.

Kaynakça Bilgisi / Citation Information

Güven, B. (2020). Intrapreneurship in terms of change management. *OPUS–International Journal of Society Researches*, 16(28), 846-863.
DOI: 10.26466/opus.644237