

Maturing intrapreneurial competencies among the employees of medium and large enterprises: Impact study of need for achievement and quality of work-life

Yamini Chandra*
Kamayani Mathur**

INTRODUCTION

Some intrapreneurs seem to just emerge, but often they have to be recognized, nurtured, and developed by organizations. Both these processes lead to the creation of new value, answering the gap to the existing product/services. Entrepreneurial firms (or entrepreneur) have the opportunity to “*create, discover and exploit opportunities*” (Karagouni & Protogerou, 2015, 70). Intrapreneurs are supposed to be “*rebels, breaking the rules and swimming against the corporate tide*” (Corbet, 2018). Some have focused on the importance of entrepreneurship inside corporate giants, which has its positive effects on the leadership strategy and firm’s performance (Kaya, 2015). Corporate entrepreneurship (or intrapreneurship) has been taken interest in, in recent times. Corporate organizations have the capacity to nurture an idea, helping it to get converted into a business idea. The support mechanism here (in terms of giving required resources) works tremendously well. Even though the prime interest of these

*Corporate Interface, EDII,
Gandhinagar

**Faculty, Gujarat University,
Ahmedabad

This is a revised version of a paper presented at ANVESH 2018 and published in the conference proceedings.

organizations is the *“health and growth of the existing business”*, they can further contribute to the *“nation’s economic output and jobs,”* while complementing and competing with one another (Sathe, 2003). Corporate entrepreneurship is a *“behavioral concept”* where all organizations with an *“entrepreneurial intensity”* come in continuum extending from “highly conservative” to *“highly entrepreneurial”* (Barringer & Bluedorn, 1999). While these organizations operate as two contrasting scenarios during this process focusing on both, *“preserving the existing business and stimulating change through innovation”*, here the role of differentiators is crucial to enriching *“marketing skills, creative flair, and product engineering and strong coordination between functional areas”* (Porter & Strategy, 1980). But it is also very important to state that such an activity/process actually requires a systematic top to bottom approach *“from idea to innovative idea”*, understanding reality, mixing existing systems, *“structures and company culture that nurtures transformative ideas and products”* (Corbett, 2018).

All these have further led the organizations to strategically deal with today’s competitive environment, regardless of their sizes and stages of development and the products/services they are dealing in. Webster (1988) has suggested a way to develop viable strategic solutions to address how small and medium sized enterprises can achieve superior performance in highly volatile environmental conditions. Literature has emphasized various dimensions prevailing in intrapreneurship, such as *“innovativeness”*, stating that small enterprises prefer both discontinuous and continuous innovations; this requires a novel approach in developing *“technical or commercial skills”* which could support problem solving (Reid & Brentani, 2004;176). *“Pro-activeness”* and *“risk-seeking behavior”* (Geenhuizen, et.al, 2008) have been observed as growing larger where innovation is more discontinuous with more risks involved (Miller, 1983; 780). Medium sized family firms have their unique ways of offering resources which can improve the performance of new products. They have the power to allocate financial resources and foresight to see the positive outcomes emerging from the release of a new product. Often due to technological specialization, stages of venture, and different sizes of operation, small and medium enterprises either stand out differently or lack the capacity to respond adequately to market opportunities.

In a scenario where entrepreneurship is given much limelight, intrapreneurship has also started getting the same share of voice. In his own words, Steve Jobs has defined it as, *“...as a group of people going, in essence, back to the garage, but in a large company...”*². Companies actively promote intrapreneurship under their umbrella, and thereby support

¹ Retrieved as on Sep 2017 through <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/1>

² Retrieved as on Sep 2017 <https://techstory.in/defining-intrapreneurship/>

their employees in sparing a proportion of resources (time) to innovate ideas, providing the advantage and primarily, access to capital (financial, human resource, and technology), existing customer base, infrastructure, and cross functional expertise. One example of an intrapreneurial venture is Ferrovia; it has cultivated internal talent to drive innovation, and developed a sustainable infrastructure which includes environmental services, construction of toll roads, and airports for cities. With an aim to create new business models for Ferrovia, the company created a 4-month ShuttleX Innovation Program. In her own words, Gemma Moore, Open Innovation Culture Leader of the organization, says, *“We called it ShuttleX because it was created with an aim to collect the challenges that come from our business units, and provide solutions to those challenges by creating multidisciplinary teams that work from ideation to validation and implementation. The goal is to identify and design new businesses, while learning a process that enables Ferrovia to do this systematically...”*

Other examples include a tool developed for an automated software engineering process called ‘Solution BluePrint’ by Zenser Technology, Pune. Zolando, is yet another example, founded in Berlin in the year 2008; it has grown as an online fashion retailer and also supports aspiring intrapreneurial teams to pitch ideas, and get support in terms of funds, time, and other resources. Some Indian companies included a model called ‘Zing’ by Kinetic India; this was an idea proposed by one of their employees, who suggested installing mobile chargers in the new model, which would provide for space to charge mobile devices. Intel is yet another example of a business that pioneered in the field of intrapreneurship. Intel came up with a pilot project installing a point-of-sale (POS) device, an automation project for neighbourhood kirana stores and small retail outlets in Mumbai. Similarly, a mobile value-added service firm called ‘OnMobile Global’ by Infosys Technologies is an example of a start-up incubated under a global giant, which has developed itself into a full-fledged company. The e-choupal division of ITC Group’s agribusiness unit germinated when its manager Sivakumar approached ITC’s chairman “with an idea to procure farm produce from soya farmers in Madhya Pradesh, thereby eliminating the roles of middlemen”³.

Entrepreneurial Motivation and Need for Achievement

One of the key elements behind entrepreneurial performance is motivation. Researchers focused in this area have stated that the single most connecting and aspiring factor working behind entrepreneurship is *“achievement motivation”* (Vijaya & Kamalanabhan, 1998); it is observed as the best predictor of entrepreneurship (Seemaprakalpa, 2016). When the factor of achievement motivation starts to get transformed into dominant concern, it is expressed

³ Retrieved as on June 2017 <https://unyscape.com>

by way of *“restlessness”, “driving energy to aim at attaining excellence”, “moving ahead”, “beating competitors”, “doing things better”* in an efficient way, and finding *“unique solutions to different problems”*. Some of the non-monetary working conditions which boost work motivation in individuals include *“personal”, “job”, “social-interpersonal”* and *“organizational”* concerns (Marris (1978).

Quality of Work-life

The phrase ‘quality of work-life’ is a very prominent feature, which has been popular since the initial days of personnel management, covering a variety of training programmes, techniques, management styles, and theories by which an organization tries to create a conducive work environment for its employees (extending to their families). Organizations are taking utmost care to design jobs where more authority, autonomy, and responsibility can be given to its employees, while positioning themselves as back support. Researchers have debated whether *“good workplaces”* still exist, or the rise of globalization has challenged healthy workplaces making their survival impossible. Quality of work-life, in a way, also enables employees (at any hierarchy) to *“actively participate in building the organization environment by developing an organizational model to produce the organizational achievements”* (Skrovan, 1983).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Intrapreneurs share many attributes of entrepreneurs — they perceive opportunities and approach them with a proactive vision and imagination, just like *‘dreamers’* (Pinchot, 1987). McClelland (1961;1965), the pioneer in this field argued that *“...individuals with high need for achievement are more likely to engage in the instrumental activities that are necessary for success in an entrepreneurial situation, than are individuals who are reportedly observed low in achievement motivation...”* (McClelland, 1965; Collins, et.al, 2004). Researchers have observed that intrapreneurs are *“result-oriented, ambitious, rational, competitive and questioning”* (Ross & Unwalla, 1986), and possess qualities like *“clarity of direction, thoroughness, have participative management style and an in-depth understanding”*, which are collectively needed to achieve goals (individual vis-à-vis organizational) (Kanter, 2004). However, Adrian, et.al, (2014) observed factors like *“innovation”, “management support”,* and *“work autonomy”* to be prominent in diversifying companies. Some of the previous studies in this area further stated that *“motivational traits of entrepreneurs”* remarkably stand out as different in *“identifying and exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities in the marketplace”* (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). Here,

intrapreneurism enables organizations to “*unleash the passion*” of their employees, helping them in “*generating new avenues for business growth*” thereby channeling diverse operational ways in existing business (Seshadri & Arabinda, 2006, p.19).

Researchers like Dess et.al, (1997) have said that individuals seeking entrepreneurial life have been observed to exhibit actions meant for benefitting businesses. Some of these motivational characteristics, different among entrepreneurs are “*value for innovativeness*”, “*independence*”, “*outstanding performance*” and “*respect for work*”; of these, “*achievement motivation*” is the most important causative factor leading people towards choosing a career in this field (Vijaya & Kamalanabhan, 1998). On the other hand, ‘*perceived self-efficacy*’, ‘*perceived venture desirability*’, ‘*attitude towards the act*’ and ‘*social norms*’, ‘*parental role and family support model*’ (Chandra & Mathur, 2018), ‘*entrepreneurial inclination*’, and ‘*aspiration to choose entrepreneurship as a career option*’ (Chandra & Mathur, 2017a) have been observed among managers executing dual roles — managerial and intrapreneurial — in organizations. Entrepreneurial organizations are also learning organizations; and some concluded that in order to nurture the entrepreneurial qualities, organizations need to establish a “*psychologically safe heaven*” or “*parallel system*” which helps to “*motivate people to do right things in a right way*” (Schien, 1994). In today’s competitive business environment, a sense of well-being among employees has also been observed to enhance performance efficiency (Poulose & Sudarshan, 2014). Studies have also focused on factors which help in influencing work-life, specifically for women entrepreneurs. Some of these factors were “*role overload*”, “*dependent care issues*”, “*quality of health*”, “*problems in time management*” and “*lack of proper social support*” (Rajendhiran & Silambarasan, 2015). Collins, et.al, (2004) discussed the relationship of “*achievement motivation to entrepreneurial behavior*” and observed a higher correlation and stronger relationship between “*need for achievement and entrepreneurial activity*”.

Objective: On the backdrop of the above discussed literature, the objective of this study was to understand the characteristics which motivate intrapreneurs, the role of “entrepreneurial orientation”, the impact of training, and the role of organizations in shaping entrepreneurial careers of their employees. The study also intends to understand the relationship between strategies and intrapreneurial orientations, indicating the importance given by organizations in providing overall support related to innovation in-house. The next section of this paper will discuss the adopted methodology with results, followed by a discussion.

METHODOLOGY

Sample

To constitute the representative sample, a list of corporate managers designated at middle and senior levels from organizations and business units was prepared after consulting industry association and the ecosystem networks. The objective and background of this study was explained to each individual and each individual's willingness to participate in the study was considered after receiving their consent. Following this, the questionnaire/response sheet was given to them. Some even showed that filling the online form would be more convenient to them. After repeated follow-ups, 149 filled forms were received, and after removing the half-filled forms, a final sample size of 120 corporate managers was selected. Using the quasi-experimental sampling technique, the researcher ensured that even though there were different strata, same numbers of respondents were included in each stratum. The sample was segregated by (a) training received (trained and non-trained) in entrepreneurship development programs, and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large). The age of the respondents ranged between 23–52 years. The other demographics considered were education, family constitution and work experience, among others. To examine the effect of identified variables, the collected primary data was analyzed statistically using two-way (2x2) factorial design (Ms-Excel-2013; SPSS-2.0).

Tools

- 1) Primary data was collected using the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale (Vijaya & Kamalanabhan, 1998) to measure entrepreneurial motivation of the respondents. This scale was developed on a sample undergoing an entrepreneurship development programme, with the assumption and aim that in a country like India, the prominent motivating factor to start any business/entity lies within “*economic compulsion*”, “*presence of knowledge/skills*”, “*need for achievement*”, and “*inspiration*” which may be due to the push and pull factors from the present occupation. The scale contains 27 statements and has five subscales, which are, entrepreneurial, work, social, individual, and economic core, with scores ranging from 1.0–5.0. The high scores predict that the individual is more entrepreneurial in nature. The scale observes total item correlation (0.23 to 0.52) with individual item correlation from (-) 0.11 to 0.55. Internal consistency was found to be 0.84 with factor loading (min-0.37) and (max-0.76). The correlation for inter-item ranged from 0.361-0.450 showing that entrepreneurs’ “motivation scores are slightly higher than the non-entrepreneurs” (Vijaya & Kamalanabhan, 1998, 190).

- 2) The other tool used for primary data collection was developed by National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH), named Quality of Worklife Scale (2002). The scale measures nine constructs (majorly revolving around work-organizational issues), these subscales are “*job level, culture/climate, health and other outcomes, hours of work, work family, supervision, benefits and union*”. The questions (almost half) in the module of Quality of Worklife were taken from the Quality of Employment Survey (1977) on 1,796 respondents; this survey was developed focusing on worker responses (over a period of twenty-five years). The sampling adequacy test using “*Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin values*” was greater than 0.6 (using Barlett’s Test of Sphericity; 912.393, dof. 351, Sig.0.00). Factor analysis (0.5>) falls in the range 0.520 to 0.880; the reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s alpha value) of the questionnaire was 0.88. Factor loadings (0.50>) were signified as practically significant for sample size of 100; indicating that individuals with high scores have a better work life balance.

RESULTS

The results of statistical analysis are:

Table 1(a): The mean score and SD values for 2x2 ANOVA using Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale on (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Experimental Groups		Mean	Median	SD
Training	Trained	91.85	92	0.7
	Non-Trained	85.79	86	3.02
Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	91.43	93	5.47
	Large Enterprise	94.49	94	2.6
Interaction among Groups	Trained*Medium Enterprises	86.71	87	2.77
	Trained*Large Enterprises	93.76	93	2.82
	Non-Trained*Medium Enterprises	88.7	88	4.22
	Non-Trained*Large Enterprises	92.86	93	1.51

Table 1(b): The 'F' values for 2x2 ANOVA to study the subscales of Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale on (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Dimensions	Variables	Sub-variables	df	Mean	Median	SD	SE	F value
Entrepreneurial Core	Training	Trained	118	85.41	86	3.38	0.22	31.06*
		Non-Trained		93.92	93	2.57	0.17	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	91.43	93	5.47	0.33	9.78*
		Large Enterprise		87.32	87	3.73	0.26	
Work Core	Training	Trained	118	97.56	96	3.95	0.25	20.01*
		Non-Trained		88	88	6.26	0.4	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	95.09	95	6.37	0.38	8.91 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		89.7	92	6.83	6.83	
Social Core	Training	Trained	118	41.09	73	5.01	0.32	19.72*
		Non-Trained		47.91	47	1.9	0.12	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	42.46	44	5.38	0.37	8.11 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		46.04	47	4.29	0.26	
Individual Core	Training	Trained	118	51.68	51	3.05	0.2	35.94 ^{NS}
		Non-Trained		42.08	42	2.79	0.18	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	49.2	51	5.53	0.33	11.85*
		Large Enterprise		43.79	43	4.05	0.28	
Economic Core	Training	Trained	118	89.86	91	6.83	0.44	28.28 ^{NS}
		Non-Trained		108.08	106	7.28	0.47	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	103.39	104	11.91	0.72	11.44**
		Large Enterprise		93.08	95	7.79	0.54	
Total Scores of Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale	Training	Trained	118	291.74	287	13.18	0.85	21.82*
		Non-Trained		265.94	267	12.73	0.82	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	285.63	285	17.97	1.09	10.70*
		Large Enterprise		269.81	273.5	14.4	1	

* Significant (0.05 level), ** significant (0.01 level), NS= not significant

Table 1(c): Summary of 2x2 ANOVA on the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale analyzing (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Groups	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F value
Training (A)	5356.82	1	5356.82	810.94*
Type of Enterprises (B)	127.32	1	127.32	19.27*
A*B	2134.88	2	1067.44	46.90*
Error	10855.79	117	22.76	-
Total	12990.67	119	-	-

* Significant (0.05 level), ** significant (0.01 level), NS= not significant

Table 2 (a): The mean score and SD values for 2x2 ANOVA factorial design to study analyze Quality of Worklife Scale on (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Experimental Groups		Mean	Median	SD
Training	Trained	25.53	27	4.07
	Non-Trained	25.29	27	4.17
Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	26.29	27	3.79
	Large Enterprise	36.8	37	1.57
Interaction among Groups	Trained*Medium Enterprises	29.52	33	7.82
	Trained*Large Enterprises	32.83	35	7.73
	Non-Trained*Medium Enterprises	21.67	16	8.51
	Non-Trained*Large Enterprises	33.28	35	7.54

Table 2 (b): The 'F' values for 2x2 ANOVA on the subscales of Quality of Worklife Scale analyzing (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Dimensions	Variables	Sub-variables	df	Mean	Median	SD	SE	F value
Job Level	Training	Trained	118	25.8	27	3.98	0.26	0.00 ^{NS}
		Non-Trained		25.8	27	3.98	0.26	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	25.47	27	4.08	0.35	1.60 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		26.05	27	3.88	0.35	
Culture / Climate	Training	Trained	118	26.41	33	8.57	0.55	17.79*
		Non-Trained		36.41	35.5	1.58	0.1	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	29.52	33	7.82	0.55	4.62 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		32.83	35	7.73	0.47	
Health Outcomes	Training	Trained	118	18.8	20	2.41	0.16	23.85*
		Non-Trained		22.8	22	0.98	0.06	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	19.82	20	2.31	0.16	7.25 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		21.54	22	2.77	0.17	
Other Outcomes	Training	Trained	118	7	7	1.1	0.07	36.68*
		Non-Trained		11.4	11	1.5	0.1	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	10.25	11	2.62	0.16	12.49*
		Large Enterprise		7.8	7	1.67	0.12	
Hours of Work	Training	Trained	118	5.2	5	0.4	0.03	36.68*
		Non-Trained		8.8	9	1.47	0.1	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	5.79	5	1.34	0.09	12.49*
		Large Enterprise		7.91	9	2.11	0.13	
Work Family	Training	Trained	118	5.2	5	0.4	0.03	36.54*
		Non-Trained		8.8	9	1.47	0.1	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	5.79	5	1.34	0.09	13.39*
		Large Enterprise		7.91	9	2.11	0.13	
Supervision	Training	Trained	118	17.4	21	4.42	0.29	19.06*
		Non-Trained		23	23	1.1	0.07	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	19.13	21	4.05	2.28	4.87 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		21	23	4.26	0.26	
Benefits	Training	Trained	118	17.2	21	5.09	0.33	23.98*
		Non-Trained		25.58	26	1.86	0.12	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	19.55	21	5.04	0.35	6.42 ^{NS}
		Large Enterprise		22.78	26	5.74	0.35	
Union	Training	Trained	118	6.4	8	1.96	0.13	23.95*
		Non-Trained		11.2	10	2.41	0.16	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	7.32	8	1.98	0.14	10.13*
		Large Enterprise		9.91	10	3.57	0.22	
Total scores of Quality of Work Life Scale	Training	Trained	118	155.65	185.5	37.36	2.41	16.75*
		Non-Trained		196.37	197	4.66	0.3	
	Type of Enterprises	Medium Enterprise	118	180.93	197	32.58	1.97	3.76*
		Large Enterprise		169.47	186	33.67	2.35	

* Significant (0.05 level), ** significant (0.01 level), NS= not significant

Table 2 (c): Summary of 2x2 ANOVA to study Quality of Worklife Scale on (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large)

Group	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Sum of Squares	F value
Training (A)	181737.62	1	181737.62	421.09*
Type of Enterprises (B)	295.38	1	295.38	0.68*
A*B	44018.3	2	22009.15	21.27*
Error	493592.64	117	1034.79	-
Total	537610.95	119	-	-

* Significant (0.05 level), ** significant (0.01 level), NS= not significant

DISCUSSION

Table 1(a) represents the mean score and SD values used to examine the effects of the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale on (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large). On measuring the independent samples, the 'trained group' (mean=91.85; SD=0.70) was observed as scoring higher, compared to the 'non-trained group' (mean=85.79; SD=3.02). Similarly, the respondents from the 'large enterprises' group (mean=94.49; SD=2.60) was observed as scoring higher, compared to respondents from 'medium enterprises' (mean=91.43; SD=5.47). The mean score and SD value for the interaction effect between trained-medium enterprises were mean=86.71, SD=2.77. The mean score and SD value for the interaction effect between trained-large enterprises were mean=93.76, SD=2.82, and the mean score and SD value for the interaction effect between non-trained-medium enterprises were mean=88.70, SD=4.22 and the mean score and SD value for the interaction between non-trained-large enterprises were mean=92.86, SD=1.51.

Table 1(b) represents the 'F' values for 2x2 ANOVA to study significant effects of all the dimensions of the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale. The statistical differences have been observed in the dimensions of entrepreneurial core for the variables 'training' (F value=31.06, $p < 0.000$) and 'type of enterprise' (F value=9.78, $p < 0.000$). The variables of work core, 'training' (F value=20.01, $p < 0.000$) were observed to be significant, and those of 'type of enterprises' (F value=8.91, $p = 0.24$) were statistically not significant. When calculating the variables of social core, a significant difference was observed in 'training' (F value=19.72, $p < 0.000$) and no significance was observed in 'type of enterprises' (F value=8.11, $p = 0.06$). Similar results were observed with individual core; the variable

'training' (F value=35.94, $p=0.42$) was non-significant, but a significant difference was observed with 'type of enterprises' (F value=11.85, $p<0.000$). For the dimension of economic core, the independent sample 'training' (F value=28.28, $p=0.32$) was observed statistically non-significant. But, the variable 'type of enterprises' (F value=11.44, $p=0.01$) was a significant factor. Lastly, the total scores of the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale showed a significant difference in 'training' (F value=21.82, $p<0.000$) and 'type of enterprises' (F value=10.70, $p<0.000$).

Table 1(c) represents the summary of two way analysis of variance on the samples. A statistically significant difference was observed with the variable 'training' (F value=810.94, $p<0.000$) and 'type of enterprises' (F value=19.27, $p<0.000$). Further, the interaction effect also showed significant difference (F value=46.90, $p<0.000$).

Table 2(a) represents the mean score and SD values to examine the effect of the Quality of Worklife Scale on the identified variables (a) training (trained and non-trained) and (b) type of enterprises (medium and large). Measuring the independent samples 'training', the trained group (mean=23.53; SD=4.07) has reported a higher score compared to the 'non-trained group' (mean=25.29; SD=4.17). Similarly, for 'type of enterprises', the respondents from 'large enterprises' (mean=36.80; SD=1.57) have reported higher scores compared to those from 'medium enterprises' (mean=26.29; SD=3.79). The mean score and SD values for the interaction effect within the samples from trained-medium enterprises was mean=29.52, SD=7.82. The mean score and SD values for the interaction effect between the samples from trained-large enterprises were mean=32.83, SD=7.73. The mean score and SD values for the interaction effect within the samples from non-trained-medium enterprises were mean=21.67, SD=8.51. The mean score and SD values for the interaction effect within the samples from non-trained-large enterprises were mean=33.28, SD=7.54.

Table 2(b) represents the 'F' values for 2x2 ANOVA to study the significant effects of the all the dimensions of the Quality of Worklife Scale. No statistical differences have been observed in the dimensions of 'job level' for the variable of training (F value=0.00, $p=1.00$) and type of enterprises (F value=1.60, $p=0.18$). Further, for the dimension of 'culture/climate' the statistical significant differences were observed among the respondents from training group (F value=17.79, $p<0.000$). However respondents from the type of enterprise group were observed to be scoring statistically non-significant values (F value=4.62, $p=0.06$). Whereas when calculating the scores for the variable of 'health outcomes', the independent sample training was observed to be statistically significant (F value=23.85, $p<0.000$), but the respondents from the sample type of enterprises have reported a non-significant value (F

value=7.25, $p=0.06$). Similarly, the construct of 'other outcomes' was statistically significant for the variable of training (F value=36.68, $p<0.000$) and statistically non-significant for type of enterprises (F value=12.49, $p=0.06$). The construct 'hours of work' has shown similar results for training (F value=36.68, $p<0.000$) and type of enterprises (F value=12.49, $p<0.000$), both being significant. Similarly, variable training for the constructs of 'work family' (F value=36.54, $p<0.000$) and 'type of enterprises' (F value=13.39, $p<0.000$) were observed as statistically significant. The construct of supervision, has shown significant results for training (F value=19.06, $p<0.000$), but, the type of enterprises (F value=4.87, $p=0.21$) was observed to be statistically non-significant. The results of the variable of 'benefits' were similar, where training (F value=23.98, $p<0.000$) has shown significant results, but type of enterprises (F value=6.42, $p=0.13$) has been observed as being statistically non-significant. For the variable 'union', training (F value=23.95, $p<0.000$) and type of enterprises (F value=10.13, $p<0.000$) have shown statistically significant results. Lastly, for the total scores of the Quality of Worklife Scale, the variables training (F value=16.75, $p<0.000$) and type of enterprises (F value=3.76, $p<0.000$) have reported significant results.

Table 2(c) represents the summary of 2x2 ANOVA using the Entrepreneurial Motivation Scale to study its effect on the independent samples 'training', and 'type of enterprises'. The respondents have shown statistically significant results for the independent samples 'type of enterprise' (where F value=0.68, $p<0.000$), 'training' (F value=421.09, $p<0.000$), and the interaction effect between them has also shown statistically significant results (F value=21.27, $p<0.000$).

In India, most companies operate stable businesses quite efficiently. The commercialization of an idea stemming through research and development can be a mediator for holistic growth to both, employees and organizations. Organizations today have realized the prospects of *"intrapreneurship in generating new ideas, creating new business models"*, as well as recognizing and retaining potential talent (Chandra & Mathur, 2017b). Employees who see an opportunity to upgrade in terms of more challenging roles and executing their ideas may often end up quitting their jobs to start enterprises of their own if they are not given proper recognition. In such situations, organizations (in order to retain the best talent) have to provide a positive environment and opportunities to explore and innovate, creating a relationship which is mutually beneficial. Today, the *"need of the hour is for people who are creators rather than followers"* (Barathi, et.al, 2011). The authors of this paper would like to highlight that today, organizations have started enhancing the capabilities of their employees

by identifying, supporting, and encouraging ideas which are innovative, and can further be converted into successful commercialized products or services.

In their discussion with many stakeholders and heads of business units, the authors have observed that organizations are not competing with each other, instead their focus is to employ people with potential, who in turn enhance the growth of enterprises. Organizations which actively promote intrapreneurship encourage their employees to go for the trial and error method, which can be a complementary element wherein a person is given the chance to explore, fail, and try again without the burden of financial loss. In many instances, intrapreneurship has also seen '*infrastructural deficiencies*', '*resource constraints*', and '*rapid rate of weak work ethic*'. Though men and women today share the same responsibilities, working hand in hand, the differences between the responsibilities given to each gender have been experienced by women in the workplace. Further, a transformation in the mindset has been observed, from being employees to being psychological owners (Seshadri & Arabinda, 2006), here persons with a high need for achievement motivate others also in their journey of attaining success and excellence. Further, '*risk taking propensity*', '*tolerance for ambiguous situations*', '*locus of control*', '*risk tolerance*', and '*entrepreneurial alertness*' have had a positive effect on the entrepreneurial intention.

Researches like Fredrick, et.al, (2006) have observed that successful models for intrapreneurship include "ecosystem venturing, innovation venturing, harvest and private equity venturing". Whereas Hornsby, et.al (1993) identified the importance of personal characteristics like "*risk-taking propensity*", "*desire for autonomy*", "*need for achievement*", "*goal orientation*", and "*internal locus of control*", and also observed these characteristics as having an influence on intrapreneurs. The authors conclude that one of the many things that are taught to entrepreneurs is to never get attached to their idea. An entrepreneurial venture is (mostly) a purely economic entity. The moment they develop maternal and paternal instincts towards their economic entrepreneurial ventures, they open up to dangers. They start neglecting mistakes and failures of their own ventures. Hence, through training programs, entrepreneurs are trained not to be emotional or personal about their work. It has also been observed that in case one venture fails, they move onto another one. If one venture succeeds, they still move on to diversify and make it bigger.

Conclusion: Organizations have an incredibly important role in encouraging and fostering intrapreneurial culture. However, in many instances it has been observed that organizations desire and aspire, but do not necessarily put any real effort towards encouraging such a culture. For organizations to deal strategically with the current competitive world, a parallel

system needs to be developed. Intrapreneurship (corporate entrepreneurship) is one such way, whereby organizations can not only explore and exploit new avenues, but can also open an altogether new world of opportunities for others. But, this comes with the complex challenge of investing heavily in developing an intrapreneurial climate, developing and nurturing ideas to get them converted into commercialized products, and providing a knowledge sharing environment. Pinchot (1987) and others believed that “intrapreneurs are motivated by corporate reward and recognition”. After having thorough interaction with respondents, the authors have observed that the feeling of recognition gives personal satisfaction to people, which is the true motivator for any entrepreneur or intrapreneur. Here, psychological ownership develops, where individuals ‘feel’ that the organization belongs to them; this can also be seen as a motivating factor. Some argue that ‘psychological ownership’ creates a sense of responsibility in the individual, which can be evidenced as stewardship and a sense of social responsibility or purpose for the organization (Burns, 2013). The findings also indicated that a large number of the respondents were achievement driven and were likely to be successful intrapreneurs because of power and affiliation motivation.

Limitations: The major limitation was geographical constraint. This study has only focused on selective medium and large enterprises, but, a more comprehensive study can be done on a larger sample constituting varied sectors across regions.

Significance, Implication, and Future Research Prospects: This study would be helpful for researchers in examining different behavioral aspects and other intimidating factors which have effects on the intra/entrepreneurial intention. The managerial implications of this study would be to understand the challenges faced by intrapreneurs when it comes to risk taking and execution. This study was designed to focus on making contributions to academicians, potential entrepreneurs, and change managers. Future studies can focus on diverse contexts of entrepreneurship and can work on the dynamics of entrepreneurship as practiced by entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs, and the growth of the firm.

REFERENCES

- Adrian, T., Alexandra, C., & Filip, C., (2014). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation in the Renewable Energy Field. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 22, 353-362.
- Barathi, C., Balaji, C.D., & IbohalMeitei, C.H., (2011). Intrapreneurship as Competitive Strategy for Talent Retention – Facilitating Factors and the Indian Context. *Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies*, 02(06), 89-95.

Barringer, B.R., & Bluedorn, A.C. (1999). The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(5), 421-444.

Burns, P. (2013). *Corporate Entrepreneurship: Innovation and strategy in large organizations*. Palgrave Macmillan, 3rd Edition, 99-146.

Chandra, Y. & Mathur, K. (2017a). Entrepreneurial Inclination among Family Owned Firms vs. Corporate Decision Makers. *Research Trends in Economics, Finance and General Management*, Nirma University, 152-167.

Chandra, Y. & Mathur, K. (2017b). Strategic Entrepreneurship within Family Owned Firms vs. Corporate Decision Makers: Opportunity and Challenges. *Nirma University Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 12(01&02), 85-102.

Chandra, Y. & Mathur, K. (2018). Paradigm shift from Managerial to Intrapreneurial: A study of Need for Achievement and Quality of Worklife among Corporate Managers. *Research Frontiers in Human Resource Management and Marketing Management*, Institute of Management Nirma University, Excel Publishers, 98-119.

Collins, C.J., Hanges, P.J., & Locke, E.A. (2004). The relationship of achievement motivation to entrepreneurial behavior: A meta-analysis [Electronic version]. Retrieved [27-12-2017], from Cornell University, ILR School. Retrieved from- <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/articles/x>

Corbett, A. (2018). The Myth of the Intrapreneur. *Harvard Business Review*, extracted on January 21, 2019, through <https://hbr.org/2018/06/the-myth-of-the-intrapreneur>

Dess, G.G., Lumpkin, G.T. & Covin, J.G. (1997), Entrepreneurial strategy making and firm performance:

Tests of contingency and configurational models. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(9), 677-695.

Fredrick, H., Kuratko, D.F., Hodgetts, R.M. (2006). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, process, practice*. Thomson Learning, 46-61.

Geenhuizen, V., Middel, R.M., & Lassen, A. H. (2008). Corporate Entrepreneurship in SMEs during the Search for Discontinuous Innovations. In 9th International CINet Conference: Radical Challenges in Innovation Management, Continuous Innovation Network, (pp. 827 – 841).

- Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F & Zahra, S.A. (1993). An interactive model of the corporate entrepreneurship process. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 17(2), 46-55.
- Kanter, R.M. (2004). The middle manager as innovator. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(7/8), 18.
- Karagouni, G., & Protogerou, A. (2015). Dynamic Capabilities and Value Co-Creation in Low-Tech Knowledge-Intensive Entrepreneurial Ventures. In *Entrepreneurial Challenges in the 21st Century* (pp. 69-93). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Kaya, N. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship, generic competitive strategies, and firm performance in small and medium-sized enterprises. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 662-668.
- Marris, P. (1978). The Social Barriers of African Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Developing Societies*, as quoted in Thomas A. Timberg, "The Marwaris: From Traders to Industrialists", 19.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 54.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965). Toward a theory of motive acquisition. *American Psychologist*, 20, 321-333.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneuring in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29, 770-791.
- National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (2002). Quality of Worklife Questionnaire. Available at: <http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/topics/stress/qwlquest>. Accessed September, 28, 2014.
- Pinchot, G.H. (1987). Innovation through Intrapreneuring. *Research Management*, 13(2), 10-17.
- Porter, M.E., & Strategy, C. (1980). Techniques for analyzing industries and competitors. *Competitive Strategy*. New York: Free.
- Poulose, S. & Sudarshan, N. (2014). Work life balance: A conceptual review. *International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics*, 03(2), 01-17.
- Rajendhiran, N. Silambarasan, C. (2015). A Study on Work Life Balance among Women Entrepreneurs with Special Reference to Salem City of Tamilnadu, India. *World Academy of*

Science, Engineering and Technology, International Science Index, Economics and Management Engineering, 01(01), 1063.

Reid, S.E. and Brentani, U. (2004) Fuzzy Front End: Discontinuous Innovations. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21 (01), 170-184.

Ross, J.E. & Unwalla, D. (1986). Who is an Intrapreneur? *Personnel*, 63(2).

Sathe, V. (2003). *Corporate Entrepreneurship: Top Managers and New Business Creation*. 1st ed.,

Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schien, E.H. (1994). Organizational and managerial culture as a facilitator or inhibitor of organizational learning. MIT Organizational Learning Network Working paper 10, 004, May.

Seemaprakalpa, M.A. (2016). Achievement Motivation of Women Entrepreneurs. *Indian Research Journal of Extension Education*, 12(1), 23-28.

Seshadri, D.V.R. & Arabinda, T., (2006). Innovation through Intrapreneurship: The Road Less Travelled. *Vikalpa*, 31(01), 17-29.

Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217-226.

Skrovan, D.J. (1983). *Quality of work life perspectives for business and the public sector*. [M] London: Addison-Wesley, 33.

Sumitha, P.V. & Dsouza, P.K. (2015). Role of women entrepreneurs in inclusive growth - A study on work life balance. *IOSR Journal of Business Management*, 8th International Business Research Conference, IES Management College and Research Centre, Mumbai. e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319 7668, 54-62.

Vijaya, V. & Kamalanabhan, T.J. (1998). A scale to assess entrepreneurial motivation. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 07(02), 183-194.

Webster, F.E., Jr, (1988). Rediscovering the marketing concept. *Business Horizons*, 31(May-June), 29-39.