



FORCE

FOCUS ON RESEARCH IN CONTEMPORARY ECONOMICS

ANALYSIS OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP ACCORDNG TO VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES IN MATURE ORGANIZATIONS: A RESEARCH IN THE BANKING SECTOR

Bayram Alamur & Gülten Eren Gümüştekin |

To cite this article: Alamur, B., & Gümüştekin, G. E. (2022). Analysis of intrapreneurship according to various demographic variables in mature organizations: a research in the banking sector. *Focus on Research in Contemporary Economics (FORCE)*, 3(1), 321-344.

To link to this article: <https://www.forcejournal.org/index.php/force/article/view/47>



©2020 The Author(s). This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC-BY-NC-ND) 4.0 license.



Published online: 10 June 2022.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

ANALYSIS OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP ACCORDING TO VARIOUS DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES IN MATURE ORGANIZATIONS: A RESEARCH IN THE BANKING SECTOR

Bayram Alamur* & Gülten Eren Gümüştekin

ABSTRACT

Unless organizations renew themselves, their life will come to an end as it is in the life cycle of products. On the contrary; innovation prepares the organizations for the future and provides dynamism to them. However; some of the problems of most organizations are synergy at the beginning, failing to spread their wills to next steps and limiting themselves with the forms of bureaucracy. This situation leads to many negative results such as operational blindness and holds members of organizations off innovation. It can be said that there are many criteria of achieving maturity stage of organizations. Some of these criteria are sectoral maturity, the number of employees, age, size, growth rate, sales rates, centralization degree, productivity and cash flow of organization. These criteria are able to be increased with different classifications. "Renewing" or "Falling" stages follow the maturity stage of organizations and the intended one is "Renewing" stage with the increase of productivity.

While entrepreneurship shows itself and emerges the presence of organization when there is no organization, intrapreneurship protects and improves the existing. Intrapreneurship and innovation, which is one of the sub-branches of intrapreneurship, are not going to take part in mature organizations in time. This research is done for the detection of intrapreneurship of members in mature organizations.

KEY WORDS:

Intrapreneurship, Mature Organization, Strategic Innovation, Banking Sector

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Bayram Alamur, Department of Management, Balıkesir University, Balıkesir.
E-mail: alamur_bayram@hotmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, the effective use of human resources has been accepted by everyone in order to talk about the efficiency and effectiveness for organizations. Channeling the energies and synergies of human resources to the right area and seeing themselves as a part of the organization they are in will secure the future of the organization. The production of innovations through this resource is one of the few important points that organizations will care about in order to survive in a rapidly changing world. At this point, intrapreneurship offers organizations the opportunity to produce innovations through their own resources. In this study, it is aimed to determine the level of intrapreneurship of banking sector employees and to examine their intrapreneurship according to various demographic variables.

2. LIFE OF ORGANIZATIONS AND THE CONCEPT OF MATURE ORGANIZATION

Organizations are social forms that emerge as a result of entrepreneurship to achieve a goal. Although a period of time is not determined for their life at first, a significant part of them have to end their activities in the early stages of their lives. Organizations also go through a similar life cycle stages just like the life stage of a living thing.

Adizes; stating that there are life cycles of people, products, markets and even societies, he emphasized that the existence of stages such as birth, growth, maturity, old age and death and different behavior models will emerge in each life cycle. (Adizes,1979:4). Lester, another researcher on the subject; defines the organizational life cycle as a structure that appeals to intuition and states that organizations gradually pass through a life as predicted by the science of biology. (Lester et al. 2008:37).

According to some authors, the concept of 'maturity' can also be used for certain sectors. What is meant here is that the sector has maturity characteristics due to its unique conditions. (Freitas et al. 2013:446).

For example, it is assumed that the banking sector has turned into a mature sector. Maturity stage as a stage encountered after the establishment and growth stages of the organization.

According to Cameron and Whetten, while effectiveness for each of the departments and units is absolutely critical, effectiveness at all levels is bound to decline as the organization matures (Cameron and Whetten, 1981:266). As an organization matures, the spirit of entrepreneurial discovery transforms into satisfaction, and a slow and gradual transformation over time begins regarding risk adaptation, inward focus. The driving force of the past becomes insufficient to produce alternative futures, basic abilities become fundamental rigidities. (Kuhn and Marsick, 2005:32).

2.1. Intrapreneurship in Mature Organizations

Sometimes 'intra-organizational entrepreneurship' (Meydan, 2011:25-40) (Basım and Şeşen, 2009:41-60), entrepreneurship in company (Yaşlıoğlu and Aydınlik, 2013:171-180), 'internal entrepreneurship' (Yazıcıoğlu et al. 2011:273-283) tried to be explained with concepts such as and it generally accepted as intrapreneurship.

Intrapreneurship is a popular concept that has gained importance for businesses. In today's world, where global competition is increasingly intensified, the business environment adopts as an important goal to develop the entrepreneurial element and employees within the organization. (Zahra et al. 2000:947-946). Pinchot (1985), one of the authors who first addressed the concept, describes entrepreneurs who realize intrapreneurship as 'key individuals with extraordinary dreams apart from their job descriptions'.

There are many definitions related to the concept of intrapreneurship, most of which are in the foreign literature. Some of these definitions are as follows;

- According to Bosma and others (2010:8) Intrapreneurship refers to 'the presence of a sense of responsibility and initiative by employees in large organisations, usually for new or innovative business and service practices'.
- According to Fry (1993:373), intrapreneurship is 'innovative products and processes developed by creating an entrepreneurial culture within an existing organization'..
- Leslem (1986:10), 'it is a phenomenon that sharpens the functional division between management and investment, and bridges investment and development'.

- Başar (2013:21) defines intrapreneurship as 'entrepreneurship within an existing organization (business)'.
- Stoner and Freeman (1992: 157) also describe intrapreneurship as 'the environment within an existing organization where the need for innovation is identified and encouraged'.

Intrapreneurs, on which the literature on intrapreneurship focuses, are individuals and groups within the organization who use independent initiatives in bottom-up innovation practices (Madu, 2011:42).

Enslin (2010) characterizes intrapreneurs as yet unknown heroes of entrepreneurship and defines these individuals or groups as those who think and act like 'entrepreneurs' within existing organizations.

The intrapreneur is a special type of 'entrepreneur' and draws many key behavioral patterns from the 'entrepreneur'; takes initiative, chases opportunities and seeks innovation (Bosma et al. 2010:8). While Kuratko and Hodgetts (1992) define intrapreneurs as 'individuals who set goals on their own initiative and achieve their goals without needing the help of others', they relatively reduced the responsibility of organizations to identify intrapreneurs and provide opportunities.

According to Pinchot (1985), the characteristics of intrapreneurs are as follows;

- Freedom of authority (authority to use initiative),
- Purpose and reward-oriented motivation,
- Confidence strengthened with organizational support,
- Ability to work with multiple environments,
- Project-oriented, time-limited working skills,
- Innovative, questioning, harmonious, open-minded approach,
- Able to take risks within the boundaries drawn by the organization.

According to Altınay (2004:430), intrapreneurs strive to transform the ideas they want to turn into profitable products and services into opportunities, and this effort provides the opportunity to develop 'innovative' solutions to the problems of the business. According to Özkara et al. (2006:221), an entrepreneur is seen as a brave, agile, innovative person who sees and evaluates opportunities and can take risks.

The intrapreneur is, in most cases, a 'salary' individual working within large organizations and concentrated on overcoming key hurdles in achieving set goals. Special constraints (corporate hierarchy, organizational structure, etc.) that are not applicable to the entrepreneur limit the intrapreneur and the intrapreneur operates within these constraints(Letsie, 2013:98).

2.1.1. Dimensions of Intrapreneurship

Although there are different dimensions in the literature, the most common dimensioning is as follows

2.1.1.1. Innovation

Innovation is to increase existing resources by developing new approaches and methods and/or to make them efficient, to contribute to technology and product knowledge while creating products or services in this direction. In terms of intrapreneurship, innovation is a mandatory choice for organizations, especially when the market for products and services narrows, competitive pressure increases and organizations have to survive in dynamic environments.

Although innovation is grouped by some authors as 'product-related' and 'technology-related production process' innovations(Antoncic and Hisrich:2003:17), Innovativeness, which is accepted throughout the literature as the main dimensions of intrapreneurship, should be defined as a holistic approach accepted as a sustainable process and perception in the intrapreneurship process.

2.1.1.1.1. Strategic Innovation

The concept of strategy was first and widely used in military dispatch and administration. Among the features of the strategy, there are principles such as developing long-term policy for the future, being strong, ensuring the appropriateness of purpose and means, effective use of the power at hand, and being flexible and cautious. In an economically, socially and administratively competitive environment, strategy brings with it connotations of innovation, development, activity and harmony with the environment(Bircan, 2002;13). Strategic renewal means re-creating the existing mission and changing it towards creativity, changing the system and adopting an innovation-oriented structure of the organization. (Bozkurt, 2009;39).

Mature organizations are often on the way to providing incremental improvements to existing offerings, with a focus on new products and services, where the spirit of innovation dwindles. Many famous organizations choose this traditional path of business growth, designing an innovative product or service, growing in global markets, and trying to maintain it for as long as possible. (Kuhn and Marsick, 2005:28).

2.1.1.2. Proactivity

Proactiveness, which Ağca and Kurt (2007:96) define as 'searching for opportunities and using initiative in order to catch the change in the environment', should also be expressed as one of the most important elements that an intrapreneur, who has to exhibit the reflection of its sense of entrepreneurship, by taking initiative.

Proactive behavior, which is one of the most prominent functions of entrepreneurship is in essence an act of speed and progress. If entrepreneurial individuals or organizations prefer and implement proactive approaches, the organization will be better equipped to reach the target in the environment they are in and to develop planned responses to the situations they will encounter on the way.

Proactive behavior, which is one of the most prominent functions of Intrapreneurship, is in essence an act of speed and progress. If entrepreneurial individuals or organizations prefer and implement proactive approaches, the organization will be better equipped to reach the target in the environment they are in and to develop planned responses to the situations they will encounter on the way.

2.1.1.3. Risk taking

One of the most important characteristics that an entrepreneur should have is the courage to take risks. An entrepreneur is an individual who sees and feels the opportunities of the risk in front of the threats it contains. According to Kaya (2001:544), the tendency to take risks is the key element used to distinguish between managers and entrepreneurs. From this point of view, it would not be wrong to state that intrapreneurs will take risks similar to the entrepreneurs, and that the risk incurred will be higher than the manager and lower than the entrepreneur.

The risks that the intrapreneur individual undertakes in the innovation process are those that are likely to turn into efficiency and benefit within the scope of proactivity skills, but also include harm and danger. The fact that the risks taken by the entrepreneur and the intrapreneur are different risks should also be expressed at this point. The risk taken by the entrepreneur is crucial and acute for the continuation of the organization. The risk taken by the intrapreneur carries the possibility for the organization to consume the resources allocated for intrapreneurship activities without adding value. The intrapreneur may cause a certain amount of budget-resource loss with the risk he has taken. The type and intensity of the risk to be taken by the intrapreneur is not allowed to be the risks that will endanger the existence of the business, otherwise the intrapreneur will have started to use the rights and authorities that the entrepreneur should use.

2.1.1.4. Autonomy

When autonomy is considered in an organizational sense, it can be characterized as a concept that expresses acting independently from the suffocating organizational barriers that stifle individuals and groups. (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996:140).

Autonomy is to have a sense of independence and authority on the way to success in many situations such as forming ideas, making decisions, developing new forms of action, working units. Many organizations may prefer to reduce the level of hierarchy within the organization and to assign more authority to their activity units in order to establish autonomy in order to increase intrapreneurship within their bodies(Ağca and Kurt, 2007:96).

3. RESEARCH

3.1. Purpose and importance of the research

The aim of the research is to determine the intrapreneurship of the employees in the mature organizations to be researched and to analyze it according to various demographic variables. At this point, it is important in terms of research results and applied field.

3.2. Research population and sample

Within the scope of this study, field research was conducted to test the hypotheses developed after the literature review. In this study, in which the data were collected by the survey method, the bank enterprise operating in the

service sector was taken as a basis. The universe of the research consists of the employees of the Mediterranean Regional Directorate of a national bank and the branch employees affiliated to this regional directorate.

While determining the number of samples related to the study, Yazıcıoğlu and Erdoğan (2004) acted on the basis of the numbers related to the sample sizes that should be drawn from different sized universes for sampling errors of $a = 0.05$ and ± 0.05 regarding the number of samples that should be drawn according to the population number. The number of samples to be collected despite the population sizes stated by the researchers is given in the table below.

Table 1: Sample Sizes for $a=0,05$

	+0.05 Sampling
universe size	$p=0.5 \quad q=0.5$
100	80
500	217
750	254
1000	278
2500	333
5000	357
10000	370
25000	378
50000	381
100000	383
1000000	384
10000000	384

Source: Yazıcıoğlu Y. and Erdoğan, S. (2004).

There are 39 branches and a total of 429 personnel operating in 5 different provinces under the responsibility of the regional directorate, which is the subject of the research. Questionnaires were delivered to bank employees through face-to-face interviews and also online. All of the employees were tried to be reached, 380 people were reached, and 317 survey forms, which were returned and available, form the basis of our research.

3.3. Research limitations

One of the most important limitations of the research is the difficulties encountered in reaching the target audience and collecting data, which are encountered in many survey studies. While the target audience of the survey was determined as the Mediterranean Regional Directorate of a private national

bank, the attitudes of the management and employees regarding allocating time in their busy working schedule and their limitations in sharing information are the most important factors limiting the survey. Another important factor is the time constraint in the process of delivering the questionnaire to the target audience, ensuring that it is answered, and taking it back again. Another important limitation of the research is that it was conducted in only one regional directorate and branches affiliated to it, depending on time and cost criteria, within the framework of a sample that can be considered narrow considering all the employees of the bank.

The fact that the research is carried out in a single sector is a limitation, and it is thought that it is possible to compare the results by including different sectors in the research to be done in other studies.

3.4. Research hypothesis

The research hypothesis is set up as follows.

H1. There is a significant relationship between the intrapreneurship of mature organizational employees and demographic variables.

3.5. Data collection

The questionnaire form used in the research consists of two parts, the information form with demographic questions and the intrapreneurship scale. In the questionnaire form used in the research, a scale consisting of five-interval metric expressions containing different dimensions to measure intrapreneurship was used. In the literature review, it was seen that the scale used for intrapreneurship was mostly developed by Naktiyok (2004), and the scale consisting of 21 expressions and 4 dimensions developed by Durmaz (2011), was used by making use of this scale. 5-point Likert type scale was used in the research, starting from "Strongly Disagree" and continuing to "Strongly Agree". In the first part, there are questions to determine the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants such as age, marital status, gender, educational status, total working time in the profession, the unit they work and their positions in the workplace; In the second part of the questionnaire, there are 21 statements to measure intrapreneurship.

Statistical package programs were used to evaluate the information obtained through surveys as a result of the research by transferring them to the computer environment and the data were analyzed by statistical package program. In

addition, in order to test the effects on the variables, reliability analysis, explanatory factor analysis, multiple regression analysis, one-way analysis of variance (anova) and T-test analyzes were used in the study.

3.5.1. Internal Consistency Analysis and simplification of the scale

Reliability, which is one of the features that the scale should have, is an indicator of the stability of the measurement values obtained in repeated measurements under the same conditions with a measurement tool (Öncü, 1994). Reliability can be calculated by various methods in statistics and the numerical value obtained is called the reliability coefficient. The most commonly used method for calculating the reliability coefficient is the Cronbach's Alpha coefficient obtained with the SPSS package program. This coefficient varies between 0 and 1 (Avcı, 2005: 164).

In order to talk about the reliability of the scale used in the research, the Alpha coefficient should be 0.65 and above (Kuyumcu, 2011:80). At the same time, it can be said that the closer the Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient is to 1, the higher the reliability of the scale. The following table shows the reliability analysis results for the questions of intrapreneurship in mature organizations.

First of all, internal consistency test was applied in reducing the questions of the scale consisting of intrapreneurship expressions obtained as a result of the literature review. In order to increase the internal homogeneity of the scale, the item-total correlations and statistics showing the internal consistency of the remaining variables (Alpha if item deleted if a variable is deleted) were evaluated. The intrapreneurship scale was included in the questionnaire as 21 questions without any changes as in the literature. By looking at the correlation values of the expressions, 5 expressions with low factor loading were removed and a total of 16 questions were processed for analysis. As a result of the test performed after the reductions were made, the Cronbach's Alpha value for intrapreneurship was determined as $\alpha = 0.823$.

Table 2: Intrapreneurship Scale Reliability Analysis Results

MAIN FACTORS	CRONBACH'S ALPHA	
Intrapreneurship in Mature Organizations	Number of samples: 317	Number of expressions:21
	CRONBACH'S ALPHA: ,823	

Reliability analysis was performed using the SPSS 22.0 package program. As seen in Table 2, the Alpha values obtained as a result of the reliability analyzes applied for intra-organizational entrepreneurship in mature organizations were found to be sufficient in terms of being higher than the lower limit (0.70) required for the scale accepted in the field of social sciences to be considered reliable. With these results, it is seen that the internal consistency ratio of the scale of intrapreneurship questions in mature organizations is high.

3.5.2. Validity of the scale

Validity is the degree to which a measurement tool can accurately measure the feature it aims to measure without confusing it with any other feature (Tekin, 1977). Validity of the scale means that it is free from systematic and random errors. If the scale is reliable, it means that random errors have been eliminated during the measurement process. A scale is reliable if it does not contain random errors. However, this depends on the scale being free of systematic errors. Therefore, for a scale to be 'valid' it must be 'reliable', but being 'reliable' does not mean that it is 'valid' (Yükselen, 2011:115-116). Even if the reliability of the measurement tool is determined with an appropriate method, since the reliability is related to the stability of the measurement tool, the procedure is "What is wanted to be measured with the measurement tool used?", "Can the items accurately measure what is intended to be measured?" cannot answer the questions (Gümüş, 1977). For this purpose, in the study, firstly, studies were carried out to determine whether the meaning validity was provided or not.

3.6. Research findings

In this section, the findings obtained as a result of the research are mentioned. First of all, the demographic characteristics of the participants were examined, and then analyzes such as explanatory factor analysis, difference analysis and regression analysis were applied.

The demographic characteristics of the participants as a result of the research are summarized in the table below.

3.6.1. Demographic characteristics of participants

	EXPRESSIONS	Frequency	%		EXPRESSIONS	Frequency	%
Employee Age	20-25	71	22,4	Working Time in the Workplace	0-5 Years	155	48,9
	26-30	89	28,1		6-10 Years	111	35,1
	31-35	87	27,4		11-15 Years	41	12,9
	36-40	46	14,5		16-20 Years	8	2,5
	41-45	14	4,4		21 Years and Above	2	0,6
	46 years and above	10	3,2				
Education Status	High school	16	5	Position at Work	Authorized	123	38,7
	Associate Degree	22	6,9		Director's Assistant	68	21,6
	Licence Degree	243	76,7		Director	81	25,5
	Master Degree	33	10,4		Manager	22	6,95
	Doctorate	3	1		Security	23	7,25
Working Time in Current Position	0-3 Years	147	46,4	Working Department	Security	23	7,3
	4-7 Years	117	36,9		Operation	116	36,6
	8-11 Years	42	13,3		Agriculture	16	5
	12-15 Years	9	2,8		Individual services	65	20,5
	16 Years and Above	2	0,6		SME\Business	62	19,6
Gender	Woman	146	46,1		Regional	16	5
	Man	171	53,9		Management	19	6
Marital Status	Married	186	58,7				
	Single	131	41,3				

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

In the first part of the questionnaire, a total of 11 questions were directed to determine the demographic characteristics of the research participants. The last two questions of the questionnaire consisting of age, gender, marital status, total working time at the current workplace, position, working time in the current position, education level, department, bank and the region where the bank is located, are the questions of all participants in the same bank. It was not taken into account in the evaluation due to its work in the region. These last two demographic questions can be used in a similar and detailed study.

As can be seen in Table 3, the demographic characteristics of the participants

were tested using frequency and percentage statistics. 53.9% of the research participants are men and 46.1% are women. According to the marital status variable, 186 people and 58.7% of the participants are 'Married', 131 people and 41.3% are 'Single'. When the research participants are examined over the age variable; It is possible to say that the highest number of participants is between the ages of 26-30. The share of this group in the total participant rate is 28.1%, and the total number of participants in this age group is 89. As a result of the examination of the participants over the variable of educational status, it is seen that the group with the highest frequency consists of those who state their education level as undergraduate. The share of those with a bachelor's degree in the total participants is quite high, with 76.7%, and the number of those with a bachelor's degree is 243. When the position variable in the workplace is examined, it is seen that the group with the highest number of participants is those who work in the authorized position with 123 people. This group takes a share of 38.7% from the total. Authorized positions respectively with 81 people and 25.5% share, directors, 68 people and 21.6% share, assistant directors, 23 people and 7.25% share, security employees and finally Managerial positions are followed by 22 people and a share of 6.95%.

When the departments in which the bank employees work are examined, it is seen that the total number of participants is 317, with 116 people, the operation staff has the highest number. The share of this group among all employees is 36.6%. Retail Marketing employees with 65 people and a share of 20.5%, Enterprise-SME employees with a share of 62 people and 19.6%, security employees with 23 people and a share of 7.3%, respectively. There are 19 people, with a 6% share, employees in managerial positions, and lastly, the 16-person cluster and 5% share with the same number and ratio of agricultural unit employees and regional directorate employees.

When the variable of working time of the participants in the workplace is examined; It is seen that the number of those who are in the 0-5 year working range has a high rate of 48.9% with 155 people. When the last one of the demographic variables in our research, 'Time working in the current position', is examined, it is seen that the number of participants in the 0-3 years range is 147 and the ratio of all participants is 46.4%. This ratio is respectively; 117 people with 36.9% in the 4-7 years range, 42 participants in the 8-11 years range with 13.3%, 9 participants with a rate of 2.8% in the 12-15 years range, and the last 2 employees with a current position of 16 years or more follow with a rate of 0.6%.

3.6.2. Explanatory Factor Analysis

Explanatory factor analysis (EFA) was applied to test the construct validity of the scale. Explanatory factor analysis is factor analysis that is used to derive new independent variables (factors) from each other with fewer ($k < p$) and independent from each other by using the covariance or correlation matrix of the data. With this method, fewer factors explaining the original variability from p number of variables are determined, and the factor loads, factor coefficients, factor scores of these factors are calculated, and scores that are highly correlated with the original variables but not among themselves are derived (Özdamar, 1999).

The scales used in the research are theoretically strong as they have been tested in other studies and their validity and reliability have been proven. In addition, explanatory factor analysis was applied to test which factor did not include the survey variables.

3.6.2.1. Intrapreneurship Scale Explanatory Factor Analysis

As a result of the reliability analysis carried out for the intrapreneurship scale, it was seen that the Cronbach's alpha value of the scale was 0.823. The fact that the result is very close to 1 indicates that the scale has a high percentage of reliability.

Table 4 shows the separated dimensions and the values obtained as a result of the explanatory factor analysis of the intrapreneurship scale.

Variables		Factor Loads				Eigen Values	Explained Variance	Cronbach's Alfa
		1	2	3	4			
Factor 1: Proactivity (P)						2,63	16,43	,743
P14	My organization uses the ideas of its employees in long-term planning.	,796						
P15	My organization uses time, money and human resources effectively to evaluate opportunities.	,772						
P3	My organization leaves free space to its employees in a new project.	,669						
P21	My organization supports its employees in developing new applications and innovations	,614						
Factor 2: Autonomy (A)						2,33	14,60	,717
A16	I can make decisions without consulting my superiors while innovating about my business.		,768					
A9	I prefer to take on a mission alone		,714					
A19	In business life, my own thoughts are more important than the opinions of others.		,700					
A17	I can disable my organization's standard procedures when innovating		,605					
Factor 3: Innovation (I)						2,23	13,97	,698
I12	I strive to innovate about my work			,679				
I6	I am open to new ideas			,657				
I7	My organization encourages its employees to be innovative			,630				
I13	My institution attaches importance to R&D activities, technological developments and innovation.			,589				
I5	My institution reduces bureaucracy for the emergence of new ideas			,510				
Factor 4: Risk Taking(R)						1,89	11,82	,599
R10	Environments of uncertainty also create an opportunity to attack.				,774			
R11	I do not refrain from making drastic changes when I am on an important job.				,683			
R20	I like risky jobs with opportunity.				,613			
Total variance explained : 56,82 KMO sample adequacy measurement : ,794 , Chisquare : 1355,615 P:;000								

Table 4: Factor Analysis Results Regarding the Intrapreneurship Scale

The dimensions of intrapreneurship that emerged as a result of factor analysis are as follows:

1.Factor: Proactivity

When the general variance percentages of the proactivity factor are analyzed, it is seen that this factor constitutes 16.43% of the explained variance. All 4 statements in the proactivity dimension of the scale developed by Durmaz (2011) from Naktiyok were included in the questionnaire, and statement number

2 of the 4 statements 'My institution tries to be ahead instead of following other businesses' and statement no. 8 'My institution follows developments. Although they were excluded from the scale because they did not carry a sufficient factor load, statements 14 and 21 in the original scale were included in the same way under the proactivity dimension, while the expression number 3 under the autonomy dimension 'My institution gives free movement to its employees in a new project' is associated with risk taking. The statement numbered 15 under the dimension 'My institution uses time, money and human resources effectively to seize opportunities' was included under the proactivity dimension as a result of the EFA. The statement 'My institution benefits from the ideas of its employees in long-term planning' had the highest factor load of 0.796.

2.Factor: Autonomy

When the general variance percentages of the autonomy factor are analyzed, it is seen that this factor constitutes 14.60% of the explained variance. All 6 statements in the autonomy dimension of the scale were included in the questionnaire, while 2 statements out of 6 were gathered under the other dimensions, while the statements 9-16-17-19 were gathered under the same dimension. As a result of the EFA, no other expressions were included under this factor other than the other factors. The statement number 16, 'I can take decisions without consulting my superiors while producing innovations about my job' had the highest factor load with 0.796.

3.Factor: Innovation

When the general variance percentages of the innovation factor are analyzed, it is seen that this factor constitutes 13.97% of the explained variance. All 5 items in the innovation dimension of the scale were included in the survey, and 18 out of 5 items 'Empowering subordinates helps to come up with innovative ideas' was removed from the scale because it did not carry sufficient factor load, but no. 5 under the autonomy dimension 'My institution uses bureaucracy for the emergence of new ideas'. The expression 'reduces' was included under the innovation dimension as a result of the EFA. The expression 'I strive to innovate in my work' had the highest factor load of 0.679.

4.Factor: Risk Taking

The risk-taking factor in the study constitutes 11.82% of the explained variance. All 6 statements in the risk-taking dimension of the scale were included in the questionnaire, and statements 10, 11, and 20 out of 6 were gathered under the risk-taking factor by carrying sufficient factor loads. The statement number 1 'I

take any risk for the success of my mission' and the statement number 4 'I am brave when making decisions under uncertainty' were excluded from the evaluation because they did not have sufficient factor load. The one with the highest load is the expression 'Ambiences of uncertainty also create an opportunity to attack'.

3.6.3. Difference Analysis

In this part of the research, for the main purpose of the research, the information about whether there are statistically significant differences between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship and demographic variables was tried to be determined by difference analysis ("t" test and ANOVA).

The table below summarizes whether there is a significant difference between the four sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship and the demographic variables such as gender and marital status.

Table 5: "T-Test" Between Intraprenaurship Dimensions and Gender and Marital Status

Factors	"t" Test	
	Gender F and Sig.	Marital Status F and Sig.
Factor 1:Proactivity	4,314/,039	7,141/,008
Factor 2:Autonomy	1,474/,226	,011/,917
Factor 3:Innovation	4,916/,027	14,665/,000
Factor 4:Risk Taking	1,627/,203	1,236/,267

As a result of the 't-test' conducted to determine the differences between the four sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship and the demographic variables 'gender' and 'marital status'; It was determined that there were significant differences between the proactivity dimension and both gender and marital status variables, and between the innovativeness dimension and both gender and marital status variables. Another remarkable point is that there was no difference between the dimensions of autonomy and risk taking and these two demographic variables.

Table 6: “Anova Test” Between Intrapreneurship Dimensions and Demographic Variables

Factors	Anova (F)					
	Age	Working Period	Education	Position	Working Period of Current Position	Working Department
Factor 1: Proactivity	,392/,854	,443/,777	2,662/,033	,991/,423	1,344/,253	2,742/,013
Factor 2: Autonomy	1,263/,280	2,507/,042	,837/,503	,339/,889	,713/,584	,712/,640
Factor 3: Innovation	,863/,506	2,401/,050	3,728/,006	,438/,822	,490/,743	1,432/,202
Factor 4: Risk Taking	1,346/,245	3,399/,010	2,401/,050	,720/,609	1,037/,388	1,495/,179

Table 6 summarizes whether there is a significant difference between the four sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship and six demographic variables.

As a result of the difference analysis between the dimensions of intrapreneurship and seven demographic variables; No significant differences were found between age, position and working time in the current position and intrapreneurship dimensions. On the other hand, significant differences were found between the demographic variable of working time and the dimensions of autonomy, innovativeness and risk taking. There are significant differences between education, another demographic variable, and proactivity, innovativeness and risk-taking dimensions. Finally, it is seen that there is a significant difference between proactivity and the department worked.

3.6.4. Review of the research hypothesis

In order to test the developed hypothesis, difference (t test, anova) and regression analyzes were performed. With these analyses, the tables showing the acceptance and rejection of the main hypothesis and its sub-hypotheses are given below.

H1. There is a significant relationship between intrapreneurship and demographic variables

When the relationship between intrapreneurship and demographic variables is examined statistically, it is possible to generate 36 sub-hypotheses from 4 dimensions and 9 demographic variables, but demographic variables that are thought to contribute to the study are included in the subject. Below is the table showing the sub-hypothesis results of the main hypothesis of the relationship between intrapreneurship and demographic variables.

Table 7: Sub-Hypotheses of the H1 Hypothesis

Hypothesis Content	Accept/Reject
H1. There is a significant relationship between intrapreneurship and demographic variables	Accept
H1a1. There is a significant difference between proactiveness, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the age variable.	Reject
H1a2. There is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, autonomy and age.	Reject
H1a3. There is a significant difference between innovativeness, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the age variable.	Reject
H1a4. There is a significant difference between risk taking, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the age variable.	Reject
H1a5. There is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, proactivity and gender.	Accept
H1a6. There is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, autonomy and gender.	Reject
H1a7. There is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, innovativeness and gender.	Accept
H1a8. There is a significant difference between risk taking and gender variable, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship.	Reject
H1a9. There is a significant difference between proactivity, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of educational status.	Accept
H1a10. There is a significant difference between the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, autonomy and educational status.	Reject
H1a11. There is a significant difference between innovativeness, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of educational status.	Accept
H1a12. There is a significant difference between risk taking, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the education level variable.	Accept
H1a13. There is a significant difference between proactivity, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of working time in the workplace.	Reject
H1a14. There is a significant difference between autonomy, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of working time in the workplace.	Accept
H1a15. There is a significant difference between innovativeness, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of working time in the workplace.	Accept
H1a16. There is a significant difference between risk taking, which is one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, and the variable of working time at the workplace.	Accept

In order to test the H1 hypothesis, demographic variables such as age, gender, educational status and working time at the workplace, which are thought to contribute to the research, were included in the hypotheses.

There was no significant difference between all the dimensions of intrapreneurship and the demographic variable of age. While the expected situation is that there is a difference between age and these sub-dimensions, no significant difference was found between any sub-dimension and the age variable. When the age ranges of the research participants are examined, it is seen that there is an accumulation of 93% in the 20-40 age range. The banking sector is a sector with a high turnover rate and a high density of young workers. It is thought that the concentration of the participants in the specified 20 age

range will result in such a result.

While there is a significant difference between the gender demographic variable and the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, innovativeness and proactivity, there is no significant difference between the dimensions of autonomy and risk taking. Although the ratio of women and men among the research participants is almost equal.

While there was no significant difference between the educational status variable and only the autonomy sub-dimension, there were significant differences between the innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking dimensions. Considering that 76% of the participants have a bachelor's degree, it can be concluded that those in this education group are prone to innovation, proactivity and risk taking.

While there was no significant relationship between the demographic variables, the variable of working time at the workplace and proactivity, one of the sub-dimensions of intrapreneurship, it was concluded that there were significant differences between the other three dimensions. When the distribution of working time in the workplace is examined, it is seen that the participants in the 0-10 years range are at a very high level, such as 84%. It is expected that the participants, who are in the first years of their professional life, will exhibit a proactive, innovative and risk-taking behavior.

As explained in detail above, it was concluded that there is a significant relationship between demographic variables and intrapreneurship, which is the H1 hypothesis.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As organizations grow, their ability to act decreases, decisions are taken late as they cannot overcome bureaucratic walls, and this result brings inertia. Inertia creates great disadvantages for organizations and even shortens the life of the organization. Even though the inertia of organizations seems to be a normal consequence of their life cycles, a solution to delaying this end or getting out of inertia is through internal entrepreneurship.

Being able to produce innovation for the future of a small or large organization, a country or even the world is an indispensable part of the business. Being able

to produce innovation is as important as bringing this innovation to a sustainable point and maintaining it is of vital importance. For organizations, gaining competitive advantage and surviving is likewise being able to produce innovation, and the most effective way of producing innovation is through internal entrepreneurship. Because in organizations that can include intrapreneurship, the members of the organization will be included in the game, and as a result, both themselves and their organizations will win. On the other hand, intrapreneurship includes autonomy, proactivity, risk taking and innovation, and organizations that can keep these dimensions alive will have another important advantage.

As underlined in the previous sections, intrapreneurship finds a place for itself in an existing organization and plays a role in the renewal and transformation of the organization as a result of an initiative. Researchers concluded that intrapreneurship provides 'revitalization' and 'performance improvement' to businesses. According to Duobiene (2013:591), successful regeneration of mature organizations depends on top management's ability to tolerate mistakes and encourage employees to take risks.

Risk taking and innovation are among the dimensions of intrapreneurship, and according to Thornberry (2001:526), intrapreneurship is a function that can bring flexibility and vitality to organizations that face the risk of recession.

Naktiyok and Kök (2006) state that intrapreneurship helps profitability, strategic renewal, innovation, knowledge acquisition and action for international success. If the literature about the results of intrapreneurship is briefly mentioned; It is stated that intrapreneurship positively affects business performance (Augusto & Caldeirinha, 2012), it affects individual and organizational decisions and product characteristics in order to evaluate different opportunities with entrepreneurship (Parker, 2011), organizations with intense intrapreneur character have more growth capacity than others. (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001), it provides effective use of resources and increases firm performance (Zahra, 1991:262), the intense efforts of internal entrepreneurs on innovation have a significant effect on motivating organizational employees (Yaghoubi et al. 2008:15), and internal entrepreneurship increases employee satisfaction. It has been stated by the researchers that it increases the number of qualified employees and prevents them from leaving the organization (Kaya and Arkan, 2005:8).

It is very important for businesses to get the highest possible benefit from their

internal customers. In terms of business, this resource is the cheapest as well as the only resource that can make a difference from other inputs. One of the ways to use this resource effectively is through intrapreneurship. As emphasized in the literature, intrapreneurship not only increases the motivation and productivity of employees, but also eliminates negative consequences such as leaving the job. At this point, business owners should first transform their organizational culture into a structure that encourages intrapreneurship.

DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICT

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR(S) DETAILS

Bayram Alamur, PhD

Department of Management

Balıkesir University, Balıkesir

E-mail: alamur_bayram@hotmail.com

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1364-5604>

Gülten Eren Gümüştekin

Department of Management

Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale

E-mail: ggumustekin@comu.edu.tr

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0561-1989>

REFERENCES

Adizes, I. (1979). Organizational passages—diagnosing and treating lifecycle problems of organizations. *Organizational dynamics*, 8(1), 3-25.

Ağca, V. & Kurt, M. (2007). İç girişimcilik ve temel belirleyicileri: Kavramsal bir çerçeve. *Erciyes Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, (29), 83-112.

Altınay, L. (2004). Implementing International Franchising: The Role of Intrapreneurship. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 15(5), 426-443.

Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the Intrapreneurship Concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), 7-24.

Avcı, U. (2005). İşletmelerde örgütsel öğrenme-örgütsel performans ilişkisi: konaklama işletmelerinde örgütsel öğrenme-örgütsel performans ilişkisine yönelik inceleme (Doctoral dissertation, Sosyal Bilimler), Isparta

Basım, H. N., & Şeşen, H. (2009). Tükenmişliğin Örgüt İçi Girişimciliğe Etkisi: Sağlık

Sektöründe Bir Araştırma (The Effect of Burnout on Intrapreneurship: A Study in Health Sector). METU Studies in Development, 35, 41-60.

Başar, M. (2013), Girişimcilik. Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayınları, Sayı:3002, Eskişehir, 21
Bircan, İ. (2002). 'Kamu Kesiminde Stratejik Yönetim ve Vizyon', DPT Planlama Dergisi, 42, 11-19.

Bosma, N. S., Stam, F. C., & Wennekers, A. R. M. (2010). Intrapreneurship: An international study.

Bozkurt, Ö. (2009). Yenilikçi Bir Faaliyet Olarak İç Girişimciliğin Çalışanların İş Tatmini Üzerine Etkisi: Sakarya İli İmalat Sanayi Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması (Doctoral dissertation, Doktora Tezi, Sakarya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Cameron, K. S., & Whetten, D. A. (1981). Perceptions of organizational effectiveness over organizational life cycles. Administrative Science Quarterly, 525-544.

Durmaz, I. (2011). Psikolojik güçlendirme algısının iç girişimcilik üzerine etkisi. Yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Ankara: Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Enslin, H. K. K. (2010). An assessment of intrapreneurship in public secondary educational institutions (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University).

Erdoğan, S., & Yazıcıoğlu, Y. (2004). SPSS uygulamalı bilimsel araştırma yöntemleri. Ankara: Detay Yayıncılık.

Freitas, I. M. B., Marques, R. A., & e Silva, E. M. D. P. (2013). University–industry collaboration and innovation in emergent and mature industries in new industrialized countries. Research Policy, 42(2), 443-453.

Fry, F. L. (1993). Entrepreneurship: a planning approach. West Group.

Gümüş, B. (1977). Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme. Ankara, Kalite Matbaası

Kaya, N., & Arkan, A. F. (2005). Örgütsel faktörlerin, şirket girişimciliğinin potansiyel sonuçlarına etkileri: Bilgi teknolojileri ve iletişim sektöründe bir araştırma. İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi İşletme İktisadi Enstitüsü Dergisi: Yönetim, 16(12), 7-16.

Kaya, N. (2001). İşletmelerde girişimcilik özelliği yüksek çalışanların güdülenmesi. 9. Ulusal Yönetim Organizasyon Bildiriler, 24-26.

Kuhn, J. S., & Marsick, V. J. (2005). Action learning for strategic innovation in mature organizations: Key cognitive, design and contextual considerations. Action Learning: Research and Practice, 2(1), 27-48.

Kuratko, D. F., & HODGETTS, R. M. (1992). Entrepreneurship: A Contemporary Approach. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.1-726

Kuyumcu, N. M. (2011). Örgüt ikliminin örgütsel değişim üzerine etkisi ve bir uygulama (Master's thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Lessem, R. (1986). Intrapreneurship: How to be an enterprising individual in a successful business. Wildwood House.

Lester, D. L., Parnell, J. A., & Menefee, M. L. (2008). Organizational life cycle and innovation among entrepreneurial enterprises. Journal of Small Business Strategy, 19(2), 37-50.

Letsie, T. M. (2013). A framework to foster intrapreneurship amongst unit managers working at three public hospitals in Mangaung, Free State (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State).

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.

Madu, U. O. (2011). The Impact of Compensation Practices on Intrapreneurial Behaviour (Doctoral dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand). 1-126

Meydan, C. H. (2011). İş tatmini ve öz yeterliliğin örgüt içi girişimciliğe etkisi: Kamu sektöründe bir araştırma. *Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 20(1), 25-40.

Naktiyok, A. (2004). İç girişimcilik. İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Öncü, H. Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme. Ankara: Master Basım. Özdamar, K., (1999). Paket Programlar ile İstatistiksel Veri Analizi. Kaan Kitabevi, Eskişehir, 535.

Özkara, B., Karayormuk, K., & Köseoğlu, M. A. (2006). 'Girişimcinin Son Köyü: Girişimlerin Sürekliliğinin Sorgulanması' Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Birimler Fakültesi Uluslararası Girişimcilik Kongresi, No:86. Bışkek. 221-233

Pinchot, G. (1985). Introducing the entrepreneur'[product management]. *IEEE Spectrum*, 22(4), 74-79.

Stoner, J. A. F., & Freeman, R. E. (1992). Management. New Jersey.

Tekin, H. (1977). Eğitimde Ölçme ve Değerlendirme. Ankara : Mars Matbaası.

Yaslioglu, M., & Aydınlık, A. Ü. (2013). Kıdemli aile işletmelerinde kurum içi girişimciliği etkileyen faktörler üzerine bir araştırma. *İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi*, 42(2), 171-180.

Yazıcıoğlu, İ., Sökmen, A., & Sökmen, A. (2011). Şirket içi girişimcilik: Adana'daki sanayi kuruluş yöneticileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (25), 273-283.

Yükselen, Cemal. (2011) Pazarlama Araştırmaları. Detay Yayıncılık, 5. Baskı, Ankara, 1-234

Zahra, S. A., Neubaum, D. O., & Huse, M. (2000). Entrepreneurship in medium-size companies: Exploring the effects of ownership and governance systems. *Journal of management*, 26(5), 947-976.