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**Executive summary**

The aim of this report is to identify different concepts of intrapreneurship and to answer how an intrapreneurship culture can be established in companies. An academic literature review was conducted on the concept, aspects and characteristics of intrapreneurship, determinants of becoming an intrapreneur, employees with intrapreneurship, their behaviours, skills and intentions, the impact of environmental factors on intrapreneurship, and financial outcomes of intrapreneurship. The report addresses current policies, strategies, and programmes relevant to intrapreneurs. Our findings reveal many definitions of the concept, which has been researched from the perspectives of culture, leadership, individual capabilities, and impact on organisational performance. We find that intrapreneurs exhibit characteristics of both employees and entrepreneurs. In addition, intrapreneurship requires specific leadership styles and organisational structures. Our results show that the development of intrapreneurship varies considerably across EU member states, with some of the least entrepreneurial environments being pioneers of intrapreneurship. These developments do not seem to be the result of policy measures, as we did not find any active measures to promote this phenomenon. Of particular concern is the gap among SMEs. These companies lack internal resources and are the most in need of support, but we could not locate any scientific work or policy measures targeting this group. Nevertheless, several frameworks targeting entrepreneurship can serve as a starting point for identifying areas of intervention for intrapreneurship. To this end, we cross-assessed two leading European frameworks in our report. Based on these and our findings, we were able to generate a list of potential intervention areas for strengthening intrapreneurship capabilities, leadership style, and intrapreneurship culture in organisations.

1. **Introduction**

Global competitive environment requires from firms permanent optimisation of corporate management, restructuring and upgrading of competencies on the principles of flexibility, innovativeness and responsiveness (Draeger-Ernst et al., 2003). Key role in these processes belongs to the employees whose role within organisations went through considerable change in recent years (Perez-Uribe et al., 2017). Employees are gaining more discretion and responsibility due to more decentralized decision-making processes. They are expected to be flexible, proactive, and innovative. Rather than being inactive receivers of changing products and jobs, employees need to adopt roles as “innovators” and “differentiators” (Bowen, 2016). More precisely, employees are expected to apply a more intrapreneurial way of working to deal with changing requests and directly influence a firm’s strategic direction (Hart 1992).

In their efforts to avoid liquidation or over-taking modern organisations follow two-tiered strategy (Deloitte, 2015) of maximizing and optimizing current products while embracing innovation as a cornerstone of long-term growth and profitability. In this process, intrapreneurship, sometimes refered to as corporate entrepreneurship has one of fundamental roles. Intrapreneurship is a bottom-up, people-centric method to launching radical innovation within a company. Intrapreneurs are employees empowered by their companies to carry themselves as “entrepreneurs”, and not just mere performers of tasks, thus giving them the adequate power and responsibility to come up and put into practice innovative ideas for business development, such as design and marketing of new products/services to pursue diversification strategies, penetration of niche markets, etc. This process of empowerment does not come without a series of complications from both sides, but it is also necessary for any company that wants to achieve and maintain a competitive advantage in the market.

Due to above reasons companies nowadays are seeking for new methods to innovate that put employee intrapreneurial efforts at the centre and support them in creation, development and scaling of ideas. Intrapreneurship encourages initiative and positions businesses as industry leaders by allowing employees to be creative. While many employees follow the rules, businesses with entrepreneurially minded employees benefit from a variety of factors, including innovative offerings, increased skills and capabilities, and competitive advantages, as well as cost savings, motivational boosts, and faster product and service launches. It is not necessary to 'create' intrapreneurs; they already exist within firms and just need to be recognized and nurtured. Ignoring their efforts or even 'preventing them from achieving their ideas because they differ from the standard results in a reduction in intrapreneurial activities and a decrease in the attraction of such talent.

From the entrepreneurial and business owner perspective, nurturing such pool of talents is not easy as it implies numerous instrumental conditions. Nonetheless, existing literature on the topic recognize intrapreneurship as a key new driver for business excellence and competitiveness. The roadway to implement and nurture an intrapreneurship friendly organizational culture is a two-way process: top down, working on leadership and corporate culture; bottom up, focusing on the research and development of drivers and triggers of intrapreneurial attitudes and sense of initiative among workers.

Technological innovations, increased competition on the world market and demographic needs are not only placing changing demands on companies, but also on employees (Mouzakitis, p. 3915). New structures must be created to foster and train these competencies by the companies (Mouzakitis, p. 3915; Staudt et al., p. 12). For competitiveness and innovation, research and development are as much important as the rapid dissemination of technical and organizational innovations in individual companies. The basis for this is the competence of managers and employees. However, such employees, who have the ability and willingness to innovate, are not simply there but have to be trained (Staudt et al., p. 18).

Although, the practical relevance of VET in Germany, for example, is strongly neglected. Majaumdar expresses it even more drastically: “a high percentage of youth unemployment is yielded from the inability of education and training systems to adopt provision of skills according to anticipated changes in the labour market simply because labour intelligence is weak or does not exist” (Majumdar, p. viii). In Germany, educational training in the dual system is declining and there is an increase in school-based and academic training which includes a lack in practical relevance (Gonon, p. 342; Staudt et al., p. 78). Instead of spending most of their time in the training company learning practical skills, trainees spend most of their training time learning outdated theoretical knowledge (Staudt et al., p. 78). In addition, the studies at universities usually have no practical relevance (Staudt et al., p. 90). Spain has also recognized the importance of professional practice and initiated an educational reform that focuses on this, oriented on other European Member States (Milolaza, p. 13). The high youth unemployment rate in Spain at 26,3% in 2013 shows the importance of such reforms (Milolaza, p. 19).

Even though the lack of practical relevance in education is a major problem, skills that are not updated during a career are also an equally major problem. If skills are not updated, their value deteriorates over time, the employability of the individual decreases and the individual's ability to innovate is lost (Staudt et al., 201). A concept that aims at pure knowledge transfer is therefore no longer appropriate (Staudt et al., 218ff). Direct implementation in practice, i.e. in the respective company, is indispensable. An integrated human ressources, company and organisational development is needed (Staudt et al., p. 286).

But it is not only the practical relevance of training that should be considered; the ability to deal with uncertainty and build resilience is also becoming increasingly important under these uncertain market conditions. More and more frequently, it is necessary to manage career transitions: “Approaching a new career requires self-efficacy, agency, motivation and the ability of self-construction” (Barabasch, p. 29). Required characteristics that are similar to those of intrapreneurs: innovativeness/creativeness, proactiveness, opportunity recognition/ exploitation, risk-taking/tolerance of failure, and networking (Neessen et al., p. 553ff).

Consideration of organizational and process changes in operations reflects the growing complexity of dynamically changing market conditions. Self-regulation and initiative must be developed and utilized (Staudt et al., p. 233). In other words, the restructuring and expansion of competencies are required according to the principles of flexibility, innovativeness and responsiveness (Draeger-Ernst et al., 2003).

In summary, intrapreneurship education reflects practical relevance and can prepare pupils and students for career transitions during their working life. Such an orientation should ideally already become a mandatory part of school curricula (Barabasch, p. 37). Additionally, such an intrapreneurship VET program is quite relevant for those who are already employed for updating their skills, handling career transitions and fast changing environments with the aim still being employed until their pension.

The situation in Europe with respect to intrapreneurship seems more optimistic than in other parts of the world. One of recent WEF (2018) reports suggests that European Union economies have a high rate of intrapreneurship when compared with other parts of the world. Having reached high levels of development, European economies tend to be innovation reliant, in fact, innovation efforts are reaching previously unattained levels, with $100B of capital invested, and both start-up incubators and venture capitals now matching those of the US, and most importantly, a clear accent on tech and digital companies (State of European Tech, 2021). Despite that, there are capability gaps to be fulfilled when talking about Europe’s digital potential, since a WEF (2018) document reports that its digital potential is only accomplished to a 12%, while the United States sports an 18% rate. The differences exist among countries, as Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (2021) report suggests. In some countries, intrapreneurship is paramount, such as Croatia, there are those with high entrepreneurship but low intrapreneurship intensity, as it is for Latvia, and those which show low performance in both, which would be the case of Italy or Poland.

The above is particularly case with respect to micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs). According to the one of recent World Trade Organisation (WTO, 2016) reports, more than 90% of firms involved directly in trade of developed world countries can be regarded as micro, small and medium sized enterprises (MSMEs). Yet, most of professional and academic interest in the context of intrapreneurship has been targeted at large corporations. This is particularly worrying as resource constraints in combination with competitive pressures threaten the very existence of these enterprises. Using internal resources optimally to enhance competitiveness is thus crucial. This calls for the development of innovative pedagogies on the basis of innovative management models and with understanding of barriers and enablers of intrapreneurship in MSMEs.

The aim of this report is to identify different concepts of intrapreneurship and to answer how an intrapreneurial culture was established in different companies, or how such a corporate culture was introduced. This report also focuses on the differences between large and small/medium enterprises in promoting intrapreneurial behaviour. A scientific literature review was perfomed on the concept, aspects and characteristics of intrapreneurship, determinants of becoming an intrapreneur, intrapreneurial employees, behaviour, capabilities and intentions, the impact of environmental factors on intrapreneurship, financial outcomes of intrapreneurship, and the measurement of intrapreneurship at the individual level. In addition, the report addresses the issue of international intrapreneurship in the context of firm export performance and digital transformation. Finally, the report looks into current policies, strategies and programmes relevant for intrapreneurs. Such comprehensive overview allows formulation of GENIE intrapreneurship model and outlines the mechanism for stimulation of intrapreneurship within MSMEs.

1. **Intrapreneurship concepts and European context**

The concept of intrapreneurship has been present in the literature and among practitioners for some time. It is often associated to domains of interest such as: people empowerment, HR practices, and most recurrently, open innovation. The first mentioning of term is commonly attributed to education entrepreneurs Gifford Pinchot III and Elizabeth S. Pinchot in 1978 but it gained wide popularity after Steve Jobs’ mentioning in a 1985 Newsweek article. In his reference to the team behind the development of the Macintosh he used the phrase: *A group of people who, in essence, go back to the garage, but in a big company*. Reference to intrapreneurial practices can be traced to 1940s and military project Skunk Works. From there, the term has been used in military environments also for special, non-bureaucracy-regulated division within an organisation tasked with secret or state-of-the-art projects.

The concept is framed differently depending on the environment to which it applies. Academic sources provide many different conceptualisations, nonetheless the common denominator remains the fact that intrapreneurship is the professionalization and capacity building of employees to “carry themselves” as developers, innovators and agents of change, rather than performers. The term intrapreneurship has been widely defined gaining traction over the last years, giving the term a plethora of areas to cover (Box 1).

**Box 1: Areas covered by intrapreneurship concept**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***inititatives*** | viewing the firm as a whole as an individual actor |
| ***processes and structures*** | for managing intrapreneurs within an organisation |
| ***activities and behaviours*** | of intrapreneurs, their teams and their sponsors |

Source: Soltanifar and Pinchot, 2020

The intrapreneurship can be defined as a process of employee recognition and exploitation of opportunities for organisational renewal, new product development or new business venture, higher competitiveness and productivity (Neessen et al., 2019). According to Antoncic and Hisrich (2001), the most comprehensive definition of intrapreneurship is that as entrepreneurship within an existing organization. However, the phenomenon of intrapreneurship is also described by the terms corporate entrepreneurship, corporate venturing, intrapreneuring and internal corporate entrepreneurship (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001). However, entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship are not necessarily the same thing. While there are some analogies, intrapreneurship presents unique features that demand a different set of considerations. By definition, intrapreneurs takes on challenges that resemble the distinctive features of entrepreneurship (i.e., the assumption of risk and lack of certainties) without loosing their employee status.

|  |
| --- |
| **Box 2: Kelly Johnson’s view of intrapreneurship** |
| Clarence Leonard “Kelly” Johnson was first team leader of Lockheed Skunk Works project. In 2003 he was ranked 8th on the list of 100 most important, most interesting and most influential people in the first century of aerospace. During his engagement with Skunk Works he developed his famous *14 rules of management* among which are particularly relevant following:   * *The division must be delegated practically complete control over the project, only reporting to higher-rank members of the organisation* * *There must be a minimum number of reports, but important work must be recorded.* * *There must be mutual trust, close cooperation and liaison on a day-to-day basis between both parts in order to cut down misunderstanding and correspondence.*   Source: Wikipedia |

Intrapreneurship fosters an entrepreneurial culture by allowing internal workers to put their entrepreneurial abilities to work for the company's and employee's advantage. It provides employees with the freedom to try new things as well as the opportunity to advance within the company. Within the environment of the firm, intrapreneurs can develop and apply their creativity to improve existing goods and services. The intrapreneur can test hypotheses and discover which ways are most effective for solving challenges as part of a team. Intrapreneurship, in essence, is based on creating an atmosphere that allows for the emergence of new ideas within the organizations (Morris & Kuratko, 2000). Instead of letting another organization profit from their ideas, intrapreneurs can use what they've learned as part of an organization's team to start their own company and reap the rewards of their innovative work. It promotes autonomy and independence while seeking to solve problems in the most efficient way possible. The intrapreneur is not subjected to the same risks or earn the same rewards as an entrepreneur. The intrapreneur, on the other hand, has access to a company's resources, talents, and competencies. Table 1 explains main differences and commonalities between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.

**Table 1: Main differences and commonalities between entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Differences** | |
| Entrepreneurs must come up with their own ideas and resources, | Intrapreneurship is frequently built within employees’ traditional domain of interest, with access to colleagues and business resources to help them throughout their intrapreneurial project’s development. |
| Entrepreneurs can pursue whatever project they choose | Intrapreneurship focuses on ideas that will help the firm and its consumers in the long run. An intrapreneur may invent a new sort of deliverable product, optimize a current process, or even come up with a whole new service line. By investigating new income streams and diversifying their firm, intrapreneurs frequently assist their organizations in reversing the symptoms of tunnel vision[[1]](#footnote-1). |
| **Commonalities** | |
| * Goal-oriented mind-set * Great sense of initiatives and sense of self-awareness and efficacy * Openness to new experiences and opportunities for self-empowerment and professional growth * Problem solving attitude * Curiosity and enthusiasm * Learning to learn predisposition | |

Intrapreneurship is the most effective instrument for exploiting new discoveries and opportunities in the company that are aligned with the business's aims and objectives. Intrapreneurship is necessary as a way that allows current businesses to have more autonomy, freedom, and resource utilization, as well as to innovate by utilizing their creative energies (Aca & Kurt, 2007). One can say that intrapreneurship is the spark of innovation, which leads to long-term competitive advantage (Naktiyok & Bayrak Kök, 2006). Intrapreneurship can have a positive impact on an economy, productivity, and the development of business competitiveness levels (Aca & Yörük, 2006).

Intrapreneurship is valuable for gaining a competitive edge in the sector. It empowers managers and staff to unleash their entrepreneurial spirit, allowing them to try new things and not miss opportunities even in the face of adversity, thus allowing the company to become more competitive. With intrapreneurship in place, organizations and employees are being given more organized and dynamic settings, as well as policies that allow for entrepreneurship within organizational structures (Feyzbakhsh et al., 2008: 172). Having a successful intrapreneur in a firm can help generate new ideas within a company that has the resources and technology to do so, reducing the undesired risks of beginning from scratch. It can also reduce competition because ideas and breakthroughs occur within the organization.

Thanks to intrapreneurial policies, employees are consistently motivated to perform better and feel more comfortable sharing their valuable thoughts and opinions with those who would listen. Working in an environment where you enjoy your work and feel secure and appreciated can enhance your creativity, confidence, the way you process information. Motivating employees or staff to perform their best may result in increased productivity and creative thinking in the workplace. Moreover, collaboration between a corporation and its employees can reduce additional external spending and lead to internal promotions rather than external recruits. Intrapreneurship is a motivator that promotes better teamwork and long-term professional partnerships (Willow, 2021). Therefore, it is critical to have policies and practices in place that enable employees to understand the impact of their work on potential innovation. This will encourage them to come up with innovative ideas. It is proven that the employers who encourage intrapreneurship benefit from it more since it leads to the company's overall success. Companies that do not promote intrapreneurs, nonetheless, risk losing them to competitors.

By widening the scale of the analysis consulting non-academic sources, intrapreneurship is often embedded into the phenomenon of Open Innovation (*The era of Open Innovation*, Henry Chesbrough), which refers to a business innovation practice leveraging on development opportunities coming from centres of responsibilities that are external to R&D departments of the firms. The open innovation model allows companies to access innovations *for sale* on the market and integrate them with their own business model. Such a process allows as well to shorten the penetration time of industries, as in some cases, most of the pre-commercialization procedures, such as the prototyping of certain products, are carried out by external entities such as start-ups[[2]](#footnote-2).

The concept of open innovation is in contrast to the paradigm of close innovation, i.e., research and development activities are delegated to specific and well-identified centers of responsibilities (i.e., engineers, scientists, R&D in general). In that sense, intrapreneurs are the carrier of a unique set of know-how most of times not even detained by the management: this knowledge comes from their experience and expertise in dealing with certain problems by relying on tangible capabilities, their own lessons learnt, intangible and *soft* skills acquired and strengthened during time. An essential precondition for the coexistence of “traditional” employees and intrapreneurs is an openness towards de-centralisation, whereby decision-making power is not only given to top management of the company, but to all people demonstrating high sense of initiatives and managerial attitude.

Despite merits for organisations, intrapreneurship seems to happen less often than one would expect. Piechuch et al. (2021) show that entrepreneurial companies do not predominantly employ people with entrepreneurial potential, only 11% out of 320 employees are real intrapreneurs. The lack of taking risks and the lack of a successful implementation of their idea are the main reasons for this. Many employees use the ideas incompetently, so a lot of frustration builds up for the idea giver. Furthermore, the same survey shows that there is a lack of a reward system for good ideas that encourages entrepreneurial behaviour. Factors that encourage intrapreneurial behaviour in the examined companies involve use of a broad network, satisfaction with the system and the work atmosphere, personal commitment and adequate knowledge.

However, situation in Europe seems more optimistic. According to the WEF (2018) report, EU economies have somewhat higher rate of intrapreneurship when compared with other parts of the world. Having reached high levels of development, European economies tend to be innovation reliant, in fact, innovation efforts are reaching previously unattained levels, with $100B of capital invested, and both start-up incubators and venture capitals now matching those of the US, and most importantly, a clear accent on tech and digital companies (State of European Tech, 2021). Despite that, there are capability gaps to be fulfilled when talking about Europe’s digital potential, since a World Economic Forum (2018) document reports that its digital potential is only accomplished to a 12%, while the United States sports an 18% rate.

**Figure 1: Intrapreneurship and early-stage intrapreneurial activity (TEA) rate for people aged 18 to 64 in 15 European economies**

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2021

Additionally, when observing the recent Global Entrepreneurship Monitor report (2021) data on intrapreneurship and total early-stage entrepreneurial activity under three-and-a-half years old (TEA) for selected European economies, the following conclusions can be extracted:

* The wide range of situations within the European environment, with economies in which intrapreneurship is paramount, such as Croatia, those with high TEA entrepreneurship but low intrapreneurship, as it is for Latvia, and those which show low performance in both, which would be the case of Italy or Poland.
* Analysing and considering only out-of-company entrepreneurship does not make for a good portrayal of intrapreneur-rich economies such as Germany or Sweden, in which entrepreneurship is evenly split between in-company and out-of-company projects.
* The lack of a clear correlation between a high rate of combined intrapreneurship and TEA and having a strong, high in GDP per capita economy becomes evident when seeing the performance of countries like Germany and Austria.
* Having high TEA does not necessarily entail high intrapreneurship. Therefore, the establishment of a definite interrelationship between both is not possible.

1. **Intrapreneurship in academic literature**

The concept of intrapreneurship has attracted considerable interest among scholars and practitioners since the early 1980s. Intrapreneurship was regarded as important for corporate strength and economic wealth generation (Dess et al. 2003) and it is considered as contributing to the development of a firm’s corporate strategy by constructing new capabilities for revitalization, strategic transformation and increase in organisational profits and growth across both advanced and advancing economies (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001). Intrapreneurship was found to facilitate export performance (Dung and Giang, 2021) Due to its importance, intrapreneurship has been increasingly researched in recent years in various fields, such as entrepreneurship or marketing, strategy, and finance.

Intrapreneurship can be a tool for stimulating large corporations’ ability to innovate and compete effectively, improve employee productivity, improve financial performance, and reduce business risk (Serpa,1987). In this regard, Zahra (1991) proposed a model that identifies potential environmental, strategic, and organizational factors that may encourage or suppress intrapreneurship. The results of the study suggest that: (1) intrapreneurship is intensified by environmental dynamism, hostility and heterogeneity; (2) increased intrapreneurship is related with growth strategies, while strategy of stability is not encouraging for it; (3) formal organizational structure components (the scanning, formal communication, and integration) are positively associated with intrapreneurship; (4) clearly defined organizational values are positively related to intrapreneurship; and (5) intrapreneurship activities are associated with company financial performance and reduced systematic risk.

Existing research (Chen et al., 2016; Saeed and Ziaulhaq, 2019) suggests that intrapreneurship does not happen by itself, and that culture, leadership and human capital (intrapreneurial capabilities) are the keys to promoting innovative activities of intrapreneurs. The cultural perspective of intrapreneurship suggests that different cultural values influence the decision to start new businesses, and not all societies promote entrepreneurship and innovation with equal effectiveness. These differences in sociocultural context may affect, among other things, the status and social recognition of intrapreneurs but also their relevance for organisational performance. Turró, Urbano, and Peris-Ortiz (2014) examined the impact of cultural values on intrapreneurship using the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor database (GEM) and found that factors such as living in an entrepreneurial culture and media exposure as well as the number of procedures required to start a new business or access to finance (formal factors) seem to be important for intrapreneurship.

Organisational perspective (Hirsich, 1990) adds that intrapreneurial organisations involve clear visions, goals and action plans, rewarding attitude and environment where suggestions, experimentation and creativity are encouraged. This takes place within flat organisational structure consisting of many networks, teamwork, sponsors and mentors. Close working relationships among actors allow visions and goals to be realised in an atmosphere of trust and consultation. Intrapreneurs expect to be rewarded appropriately for their performance. However, while traditional managers are primarily motivated by promotion and typical corporate rewards, intrapreneurs thrive on their independence and the opportunity to create. In terms of their time orientation, intrapreneurs fall between entrepreneurial and traditional managers, depending on their urgency to meet self-imposed and corporate schedules. Their primary mode of action is between managerial delegation and entrepreneurial direct involvement, i.e., they are directly involved rather than delegating. Intrapreneurs are moderately risk averse and try to hide risky projects until the last possible moment.

Intra-organisational perspective is also concerned with the concept of intrapreneurial characteristics and capabilities. Over the years, the role of employees in organizations has changed. Employees are gaining more discretion and responsibility due to more decentralized decision-making processes (Foss et al. 2015). Accordingly, employees are expected to be flexible, proactive and innovative and to adopt their roles as “innovators” and “differentiators” (Bowen 2016). Rather than being passive recipients of changing jobs and products, employees need to adopt roles as “innovators” and “differentiators” (Bowen, 2016). More precisely, employees are expected to implement a more intrapreneurial way of working to deal with changing requirements and directly influence a firm’s strategic direction (Hart 1992). For example, Heinze and Weber (2016) found that intrapreneurial employees implement new logics in organizations by using opportunistic tactics, and leverage small changes to stimulate larger changes in the broader organization.

There are also opposing views. Martiarena (2013) suggests that intrapreneurs are more similar to employees than entrepreneurs. They are more risk averse, expect lower but less uncertain rewards, and are generally equipped with fewer entrepreneurial skills. Moreover, they more often fail to recognise business opportunities and have less confidence in their entrepreneurial skills. However, the study also shows that "engaged intrapreneurs," who expect to be involved in the business, exhibit what are commonly considered to be characteristics of entrepreneurs. Douglas and Fitzsimmons (2013) theorise that entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship are different behaviours that vary in terms of their salient outcomes for the individual. The salient outcomes of entrepreneurial behaviour have been argued to include autonomy, income, exposure to work effort, exposure to risk, and all other net benefits (Douglas and Shepherd, 2000). The results of research suggest that self-efficacy is significantly related to both entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial intentions, while attitude to risk relate only to intrapreneurial and attitudes to income, ownership, and autonomy relate only to entrepreneurial intentions.

**Box 3: Leadership and individual characteristics for an intrapreneur-friendly environment**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Leadership** | **Individual** |
| * The organisation works at the frontiers of technology and new ideas are encouraged and supported, * Experimentation must be encouraged, * An organisation should ensure that there are no initial opportunity parameters that inhibit free creative problem solving, * The organisation's resources must be available and easily accessible, * A multidisciplinary approach and teamwork must be encouraged, * The spirit of intrapreneurship must be voluntary, * The intrapreneur must be adequately rewarded for all the energy and effort he or she puts into creating the new venture, * A business environment conducive to intrapreneurship has sponsors and trailblazers with the planning flexibility to set new goals and directions as needed, and * The intrapreneurship activity must be supported and welcomed by top management. | * Creativity * Comprehensive understanding of internal and external environment * Vision and flexibility * Teamwork orientation * Multidisciplinarity * Openness to discussion * Perseverance * Coalition building |

Source: Hirsich (1990)

Parker (2011) explored whether new start-up opportunities are commercialized via nascent intrapreneurship or nascent entrepreneurship. The results of his study suggest systematic alterations between the drivers of nascent intrapreneurship and nascent entrepreneurship and recommend that individual, organizational and product characteristics all influence decisions to exploit prospects via intrapreneurship or entrepreneurship. Among the key results is the finding that “entrepreneurs incline to leverage their general human capital and social ties to organize ventures which sell directly to customers, whereas nascent intrapreneurs disproportionately commercialize unique new opportunities which sell to other businesses. In addition, while middle-aged people are especially likely to engage in some kind of start-up effort, both younger and older people is significantly more likely to be nascent intrapreneurs conditional on engaging in start-up activity at all. Parker (2011) argues that this might be because people who don’t have the resources (the younger) or the propensity (the older) to involve in independent start-up activities can be persuaded to do so within a corporate environment.

Intrapreneurship is used to promote internal change among workers, thereby improving the work environment and strengthening teamwork. In this context, the role of leadership has also been examined. There are several leadership styles, but Walumbwa and Lawler (2003), and Watts et al. (2020) suggest transformational leadership and its four dimensions are the critical factor encouraging employees to approach existing procedures differently, critically, and innovatively. Namely, those four dimensions are: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. This kind of leadership contributes to resolving corporate problems by influencing and encouraging employees to be creative, analyse problems from different angles and think about new solutions (Gumusluoglu and Ilsev, 2009; Khalili, 2016). Boukamcha (2018) also support previous findings by highlighting the relevance of transformational leadership’s components in triggering the intrapreneurship patterns.

Omerzel, Antončič and Ruzzier (2011) point out the fact that the most important factor in the success of the firm is knowledge accompanied by the creation of ideas. In that context, firms which want to succeed in the global, hyper-competitive market, are under large pressure to use all the resources with maximum efficiency (Suresh, 2007), especially knowledge. Consequently, knowledge management and staff development become important issues for intrapreneurship. Several mechanisms have been suggested. Marquardt (1996) emphasise the importance of the ability of the organisation to produce and learn collectively. Aránega, Del Val Núñez, and Castaño Sánchez (2020) show the effectiveness of the mindfulness as an intrapreneurship tool to develop self-awareness, cope with emotions and improve the work environment. Positive effects were observed also through e-mentoring (Leppisaari and Tenhunen, 2009) involving support from experienced entrepreneurs in practical professional development.Diffusion of knowledge and innovativeness can be amplified by higher mobility of workers since part of the knowledge is embodied in individuals and moves with them. Braunerhjelm, Ding and Thulin (2018, p.5) argue that “increased labour mobility is a way to enhance intrapreneurial activities through improved matching, higher allocation efficiency and extended network effects”.

1. **Intrapreneurship drivers and inhibitors**

Having people within the organisation with technical and experience-based knowledge represents added value, as it provides for unconventional – and potentially highly insightful – perspectives(s) for tackling of any given issue. When given the opportunity to set on their own realistic objectives and workloads for them and their teams, these pools of talents can maximise their effectiveness, impact and potentials[[3]](#footnote-3). Yet, such shift from *management-centred* to *employee-focused* innovation, can backfire when employers put too much pressure and overall expectations upon their human resources, overestimate their confidence in process and people management, put too much enthusiasm over the idea of delegating important activities to their staff with no accurate and precise planning.

In management of intrapreneurs there are some things to consider. The intrapreneur is not a lone player in the environment; rather, he or she works as part of a company and consequently is impacted by it. Aside from personal traits, an intrapreneur's success is also influenced by the organization's structure. Therefore, their relationship with the organization should be considered. The organizational dimension refers to the organization's flexibility, information flow throughout the company, and decision-making centralization (Van Wyk and Adonisi 2008; Zur and Walega 2015). Intrapreneurship is positively associated to open channels of communication and giving processes that allow ideas to be assessed, selected, and executed (Castrogiovanni et al. 2011; Marvel et al. 2007). Job satisfaction and self-efficacy are both positively connected to the extent of formalization (Duygulu and Kurgun 2009; Globocnik and Salomo 2015). Here below, we propose a set of key intrapreneurship’s drivers extrapolated as lessons learnt from case studies of interest (Nestlè’s InGenius, Vodafone’s Launchpad, Engie’s Innovation Trophies):

Table 2: Intrapreneurship drivers

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Driver | Descriptor |
| *1. Achievable expectations* | The main purpose of nurturing intrapreneurship in SMEs is to change the culture of the company. Quality ideas develop over time, no need to stress internal communication or to force excessively the process from a top-down perspective…the environment might not be ready yet. |
| *2. Participation, but not by any means* | Ideally it would be nice to include all employees in the internal development of intrapreneurship, but this discretion…intrapreneurship comes with personal traits and attitudes that not all people might (be willing to) have. |
| *3. Nurturing leadership mind-set* | Employees should be given the chance to inspire and be a problem solver for others inside the organization. In that sense, intrapreneurship comes with the building and empowerment of both technical (hard) and soft skills |
| *4. Overcoming fear to fail* | Employees should be able to look into challenges as an opportunity of grow, and not as threats / obstacles – upon calculated risk |
| *5. Avoiding the one-man shows* | Success is a team effort. A good practice is to build teams from different lines of business and countries. Intrapreneurs should be confident (and effective) in dealing with demographic and cultural diversity, including relating with peers and senior management |
| *6. Curiosity* | Employees should be given the opportunity to actively listen to others and be inspired by their ideas. In that sense, o good idea might be start inviting different profile to board’s meetings so as to share consensus and knowledge on what is going (and why) during high-level decision making. |
| *7. Openness to ideas from outside* | Many intrapreneurship programmes have been open to external professionals and start-ups, which has facilitated exchange of ideas and free flow of knowledge. Workers might know something about the production that engineers did not considered / ignore, sales people might know something about the product that Marketing team might not have considered, etc. |
| *8. Networking* | Employees should be given the chance to create productive and effective business relationships. As representatives of their organisation, intrapreneurs should be empowered with the opportunity to talk and decide on behalf of their company for what specifically concerns their responsibility. |
| *9. Focus* | Intrapreneurship programmes operates at their best when they are challenge-based and the challenges are aligned with the company (or line of business) strategy as a whole (i.e., avoiding energy and focus-dispersion effect) |
| *10. Critical filtering* | For micro- and SMEs’ environments, it is recommended to commit to one intrapreneurial project at a time, specifically in the case if intrapreneurial projects have never been implemented before, as on opportunity to beta-test potentials of the programme, lacking resources, needs-assessment |
| *11. Feedback Loop* | In order to avoid frustration and maximise learning, feedback must be given to all ideas, both promoted and rejected. Data shows that 98% of ideas are rejected, and although this might generate a sense of frustration, it is important to keep in mind that this is a very typical phenomenon in idea funnel modelling |
| *12. High confidence and self-esteem* | In order to develop successful ideas, companies should encourage employees to believe in themselves and their potential. Coaching sessions with veteran employees / senior members are recommended |
| *13. Collaboration* | Employees should cooperate and share with others challenges, opportunities and victories. The success of one intrapreneurs might inspire others, and pose as a role model for the entire organisation. |
| *14. Risk aversion* | Eliminate ideas that prove to have no appeal. 5 out of 25 projects added annually to an innovation portfolio lose their raison d'être. Closing them in time can increase profits and prevent large companies from losing hundreds of thousands of euros. Failure is part of the learning curve, make of this event the opportunity for growth of the aspiring intrapreneurs |
| *15. Adaptability* | The company should promote the development of trans-functional skills among employees. A good intrapreneur should have different skills and acquire great flexibility (i.e., multitasking) when he/she will be asked to deal with new responsibilities that until today were out his/her domain of interest |
| *16. Make it happen* | If some valuable idea springs from employees, allocate the necessary resources to further investigate their feasibility. Don’t leave your intrapreneurs alone in their development: provide for the support they need to transit into the development phase. |
| *17. Transparency* | A company that promotes corporate entrepreneurship should be realist even when the desired results are not being achieved: as you proudly communicate successes, be honest and transparent in communicating failures. This will inspire a shared attitude of reliability and trustworthiness (even more so when things don’t go as desired). |
| *18. Long term vision* | There are excellent platforms for intrapreneurship programmes (i.e. Pollen8, Idea Drop, HYPE, Wazoku, Innovation Cloud), but they are only tools to facilitate implementation. The programmes should be much more than a tool…promoting intrapreneurship means embarking in a long, strenuous, and challenging journey that starts with a clear empowering vision for the organisation and its people |
| *19. Pragmatism* | Employees should not feel afraid of taking risks and be a “first mover”. Which in turn requires openness from the management and an overall exercise in humility from their side (no room for egos) |
| *20. Resilience* | Employees should not be afraid of failure and should see it as an opportunity for growth. |

Receiving management assistance is critical for employees interested in engaging in intrapreneurial activities. Management support refers to management's willingness to facilitate and promote intrapreneurship (Marvel et al. 2007), which includes motivating employees and acknowledging that their activities may involve some risk-taking (Kelley and Lee 2010), as well as establishing a norm within the organization (Garcia-Morales et al. 2014). One of the major elements that influence the intrapreneur is work discretion and offering employees freedom in their work. Giving employees the opportunity to develop their own job and decentralizing decision-making leads to increased intrapreneurial activity (Sebora et al. 2010). Another dimension of managing intrapreneurship is rewards and reinforcement. Rewards should be aligned with objectives and based on outcomes (Marvel et al. 2007; Sebora et al. 2010). Employees are more inclined to participate in creative ventures when they are rewarded accordingly (Monsen et al. 2010). Their job satisfaction is also influenced by a reward.

In addition to managerial support, organizational structure, autonomy, and rewards/reinforcements, providing the necessary resources is also important. Organizational elements that influence the intrapreneur are largely job resources. These resources consist of both time and money. These resources should balance the demands of a job while lowering the expenditures connected with it (Demerouti et al. 2001). Puech and Durand (2017) investigated how long it took for intrapreneurs to become intrapreneurs. They discovered that the quality of time is more essential than the quantity, particularly during the starting period, when it is not always clear what activities the intrapreneur should pursue. Other elements include, for example, the organization's tolerance for failure and the mood within the business.

Even though established businesses have an abundance of resources, achieving intrapreneurial success still comes with a heap of obstacles. Launching a new venture comes with its own set of dangers in an established company. Even if a company has a lot of resources, it may not have the right organizational climate and culture to support intrapreneurs (Duncan et al., 1988). If management does not encourage intrapreneurship and innovation within the organization in a proactive manner, it will not occur on a regular and effective basis. Furthermore, it can be tough to spot intrapreneurs at times. Employees in this category are typically self-starters who are ambitious and goal-oriented. They can frequently solve problems on their own and generate ideas that result in process improvements. Internal entrepreneurs must be recognized and rewarded. However, most businesses do not have adequate mechanisms in place to fairly promote and reward intrapreneurs.

Draeger-Ernst et al. (2003) illustrate five different problem areas that hinder intrapreneurship as: old business models and the associated culture, frustration about recurrent changes, competitiveness between different divisions, missing common and consistent engagement of implementation, missing support by the middle management and lower hierarchy levels. The following areas are classified as enabling management processes: planning, organisation; leadership/staff function, control and change. The following four content-related influencing factors for intrapreneurship are defined: strategy, organisational culture, structure and human resources. These structural elements are intended to create the optimal framework for intrapreneurship. At the same time, Draeger-Ernst et al. (2003) also answer the question of how the company can design these influencing factors of intrapreneurship and how such an intrapreneurial concept can be implemented in a company. This process includes four phases: initialisation, modelling, integration and embeddedness.

Huang et al. (2021) come up with four main types of intrapreneurship enablers defined as self-attitudes, skills, judgement and personality traits (Figure 1) which are further attenuated with organisational enablers (Figure 2) and facilitated with managerial support, time devoted for development of innovative ideas and brainstorming, rewarding system and autonomy. For supporting these the study summarises three essential enablers: establishing an adequate information and communication technology infrastructures, forming a valuable relationship from employee to employee and from employee to organisation. Huang et al. (2021) identify also three main non-technological challenges for companies to foster intrapreneurial behaviour: establishing an intrapreneurial culture, building a suitable work relationship and offering incentives. The technological challenge for the companies is to offer an IT-based tool for collecting employees´ ideas and the further development of these. Such a platform could include external resources as well. Specially for small businesses with low budgets, such an IT-based platform can be challenging. “*Thus, future research may probe into the design of viable platforms facilitating intrapreneurial behaviour particularly for MSMEs*”.

**Figure 2: Individual enablers of intrapreneurship**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. self-attitudes    1. personal initiative    2. entrepreneurial self-efficacy    3. proactivity | 1. capabilities    1. market knowledge    2. technology knowledge    3. innovativeness    4. career adaptability |
| 1. judgments    1. rewards (finance, achievement and satisfaction)    2. risks (job, pay, and reputation)    3. probability of venture success    4. organizational identification | 1. personality attributes/traits    1. flexibility and drive    2. openness    3. conscientiousness    4. extroversion    5. emotional stability |

Source: Huang et al. (2021)

**Figure 3: Organisational enablers of intrapreneurship**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. developmental support and work design    1. management support    2. work discretion    3. managerial coaching    4. developmental advice and monitoring    5. job design and work context | 1. resource availability    1. financial resources (e. g. rewards)    2. technological systems    3. intrapreneurial workshops    4. related knowledge    5. innovation capability |
| 1. managerial style    1. managerial framing    2. transformational leadership    3. managerial receptiveness | 1. innovation culture    1. autonomy    2. tolerance for failure    3. encouraging risk-taking    4. extension of individual network |

Source: Huang et al. (2021)

Deprez et al. (2018) propose a model-based system for nurturing of intrapreneurial culture where first stage involves few employees motivated to observe changing customer needs, market shifts and to search for solutions. For finding and establishing innovations an increasing level of autonomy and decision making is needed. These can be given by team leaders as well as foster his or her self-initiative. The feedback on what is going on with his or her idea and the offer to keep on working on his or her idea is essential for the motivation and can facilitate further ideas. Finally, it is necessary to define why the organisation wants to increase intrapreneurship and with how much capacity. Building from there, second stage of model involves mass-scale instigation of intrapreneurship. Here the emphasis is placed on pioneering efforts of top management to communicate desirability of intrapreneurship, lowering of barriers and formalisation in communication and presentation of ideas. A fair culture also gives effort to intrapreneurship as intrapreneurs would like to be dealt humanely and fair. Final stage of the model involves maintaining of the desired level of intrapreneurship. Here too the focus is on autonomy, rewards, time availability, management support, and boundaries placed on the scope of an initiative.

In creating an intrapreneur-friendly environment, leadership (especially transformational leadership) and the ability to motivate subordinates to be proactive, creative and productive play an important role. Leadership contributes to resolving corporate problems by influencing and encouraging employees to analyse problems from different angles and think about new and creative solutions. New and creative solutions are closely related to knowledge – new insights come from new knowledge what puts knowledge management in the focus of many firms, but also researches. Knowledge can be acquired outside but also created within the firm. Organisations should strive to acquire as much knowledge as possible, irrespective of its source since successful are those firms which continuously generate new knowledge, disseminate it and effectively integrate it into their working practices.

Moriano et al. (2014) introduce distinction between the transformational, transactional and passive-avoidant leadership. The former consists of inspirational motivation, idealized influence (attributed and behavioral), individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation. The transactional leadership style is defined by clear structures and roles, so that the subordinates can achieve goals. The passive-avoidant leadership is characterised by laissez-faire and passive management-by-exception, which includes corrective actions. Such passive leaders avoid specific agreements or do not formulate clear expectations. The study shows that transformational leadership sets the most favorable managerial circumstances for intrapreneurship. In contrast, transactional leadership has a negative effect on intrapreneurial behaviour, because this leadership style leads to extrinsically motivation. The employees are less willing to develop innovative ideas and do not more than it is required. Additionally, the authors demonstrate that there is no significant relationship between passive-avoidant leadership and intrapreneurship. In summary, sharing the mission, providing mentoring or coaching, encouraging new ways of thinking, and trust and confidence are all quite effective ways for managers to encourage intrapreneurial behaviour.

Pérez.de-Lema et al. (2017) identify that teamwork is the most valued cultural factor of intrapreneurship followed by risk tolerance, compensation and incentives, autonomy of workers and support of management and flexibility. They examine how different factors of intrapreneurial culture (autonomy, tolerance to errors and risks, compensations and rewards, teamwork, managerial support and flexibility in organisational culture) influence the innovation on product, processes and management. A tolerance of risk culture, rewards and incentives, teamwork and managerial support and a flexible culture have a positive impact on innovation in products, processes and management. Prada-Ospina (2017) define corporate entrepreneurship (intrapreneurship) as an organisational improvement tool. They show that the following variables of individual and organisational entrepreneurship have a positive impact on organisational improvement and corporate performance: leadership, strategic planning, work climate, improvement options, innovation, incidence of labour climate and resolution of problems.

While large organizations have resources required to support their intrapreneurial processes, small businesses (SMEs) lack the operational and technical ones. Despite enterprises' efforts to leverage into their employees' innovative infrastructures for SMEs, such as digital intrapreneurship systems, are underdeveloped. Because of the necessity for specified duties and deadlines and the lack of support, many smaller organizations find it difficult to incorporate the concept of intrapreneurship into their everyday work routines. Additionally, Huang et al. (2021) identified that an IT based system for collecting and developing such ideas is very essential. However, good software is still lacking here; SMEs, in particular, do not have the capacities, experts and money to invest in the development of such a system. Further research should be undertaken to find more cost-effective ways to collect and share such ideas, especially for SMEs with less resources. Draeger-Ernst (2003) points out as well the integrative approach which is needed for encouraging intrapreneurship. The authors defined management processes, structural and content-related areas as relevant for this goal.

1. **Intrapreneurship management models**

For a considerable period of time, entrepreneurship has been a symbol of achievement, drive, ambition, and economic status. Most of these attributes can be classified as entrepreneurship talents. Intrapreneurship, on the other hand, is rapidly displacing traditional entrepreneurship. It is a more ethical approach of carrying out plans that isn't exclusively concerned with one-time/one-sided economic gain or money. It focuses on a business's long-term viability and ethics. It promotes ethical entrepreneurship, as opposed to obtaining success at the expense or exploitation of others. Intrapreneurship has many different facets and is firmly rooted in the digital world in which we now live. It creates possibilities beyond our greatest thoughts. Whether a large or a small company, intrapreneurship is the most unique and creative method for propelling a company to greatness.

Wolcott and Lippitz have made significant contributions in the field of intrapreneurship by proposing four models after studying well-known organizations that have gained the most from intrapreneurship (2007). These four models of intrapreneurship can be distinguished along two dimensions: Organizational ownership is the first dimension: Who in the company has responsibility for the development of new businesses? Such responsibility may be concentrated in a certain group, or it may be dispersed throughout the organization. The second is the authority over resources: Is there a budget set aside for intrapreneurship, or are new company ideas sponsored on a case-by-case basis from divisional or corporate budgets? These result in the following models:

**Figure 4: Intrapreneurial Management Models**
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Each model reflects a unique approach to intrapreneurship development. Multiple models can be supported at different levels and functions at the same time, especially in large organizations.

**The enabler model** can help companies improve their culture. The enabler model can give clear channels for proposals to be considered and financed when an organization already has significant collaboration and ideation at the roots. The Enabler practices can result in a number of people being effective change agents for firms seeking cultural transformation. The enabler model is well-suited to contexts where concept development and testing can be carried out cost-effectively across the business. As a good example of this model, *Google* allows employees to spend 20% of their working hours on personal projects that, if approved, will be supported by the corporation. This gives the employee more freedom to use their time wisely while also giving the individual a greater sense of value from the firm and faith in their abilities. As a result, their entrepreneurial talents are fostered by giving them more freedom to grow the organization in their own unique way, based on their ability. It's all about broadening employees' skill sets and, most crucially, bringing forth their full potential.

**The producer model** is useful if a corporation wants to conquer new growth sectors, identify breakthrough prospects, or combat disruptive competitors. Business units, in general, are unlikely to embrace disruptive ideas, and they frequently face strong short-term pressures that prevent investments in new growth platforms. The producer model can help with this by providing the essential coordination for efforts involving complicated technology or requiring the integration of specific competencies across several business units. The company *Cargill* provides most workers with the opportunity to participate in critical meetings and conversations in order to have a better understanding of how the organization's system works. This definitely puts the employee's work outcome (success) into perspective. As a result, the employee not only gains essential industry knowledge, but also realizes his or her own value inside the firm, as they can see how crucial their work is, no matter how routine it may appear. It is also a priceless experience that may propel any individual toward a successful career.

**The advocate model** is a solution for firms that wish to accelerate the expansion of established divisions. Due to the model's limited resources, managers must match their initiatives to the needs of current lines of business, and employees must work closely together across the corporation. This improves the likelihood of opportunities being a good fit for a company's operations, but it also necessitates leadership to ensure that projects do not become too incremental. Advocates exist to assist business units in achieving goals that they might not be able to achieve on their own but should seek in order to stay vibrant and relevant. Furthermore, the advocate model (like the producer model) can keep corporate entrepreneurship from succumbing to powerful business units or competing silos. *DuPont* implements the advocate intrapreneurship approach by allowing employees to develop on their own innovative designs. This gives the employee a lot of responsibility while also giving them the chance to come up with innovative product designs that can have a huge impact on the company's performance. At this point, the corporation is not only motivating employees to reach their full potential, but also nurturing their creativity by generating unique product models that can propel the company forward.

**The opportunist model** only works in trusting corporate cultures that are open to experimentation and have various social networks underneath the formal hierarchy (where many executives say "yes" to new ideas). Good ideas can easily fall through organizational holes or obtain insufficient support in the absence of this type of setting. As a result, many businesses find the opportunist strategy unreliable. *Zimmer* provides its workers with the opportunity to network with a variety of MNEs in order to create chances that benefit the firm and allow them to gain valuable experience and truly test their talents. Employees will develop a more entrepreneurial spirit as a result of this, and will be able to comprehend how a certain organizational process works in order to improve their performance not only at this company, but in their future employment as well (Tapalaga, 2019).

There are several ways for managers to encourage intrapreneurship within their organization and yet minimize the challenges associated with it. To begin with, they must fully comprehend the concept and establish clear expectations with their team for how intrapreneurs will work, how their success will be measured, and how frequently they should check in on individual projects. Managers should also be able to spot intrapreneurs within the organization and empower them with the appropriate level of autonomy and goal setting. It is critical that managers ensure that intrapreneurs are fairly compensated for their initiative and responsibility.

For a better management of intrapreneurs for a successful journey, managers should consider:

1. Developing and implementing a business culture that empowers employees and encourages proactive intrapreneurship. According to research, a failure-tolerant organizational culture is essential for intrapreneurial participation Organizations can help encourage intrapreneurial growth by encouraging people to take risks. When employees have the opportunity to gain intrapreneurial experience through trial and error, organizations can also assist them in developing intrapreneurial skills and competences (Aramburu and Saenz, 2011).
2. Establishing a clear and straightforward system for measuring and defining what successful ideas imply in the firm. Both employees and entrepreneurs are less likely to fail if they know what they are aiming for (Stam et al., 2012).
3. Establishing internal professional networks to facilitate collaboration and professional ties within the organization. Employees are more likely to retain a positive relationship with their employer when they have trust in the organization and regard their managers as competent and trustworthy. They believe their managers are legitimate and they are satisfied with their organization and management because their relationship expectations have been met (Park et al., 2014).
4. Facilitating professional networking with events that foster innovation and intrapreneurship initiatives, such as seminars and case studies, which allow employees to stand out with their ideas and skills (Gwynne and Wolff, 2005).
5. Assigning mentors to prospective intrapreneurs to act as a guide, and advisor. It is important that the assigned guides must not act as a manager nor a supervisor. It is easier to grow if you have someone to turn to who can offer beneficial advice to intrapreneurs (Wakkee et al., 2010).
6. **Intrapreneurship policy framework**

The businesses operate within entrepreneurial and innovation systems where strategic policy support is needed to boost entrepreneurial success. However, while entrepreneurial policies are vast our analysis was not able to identify any concrete linkages between the concept of Intrapreneurship and EU policies, in particular with reference to SMEs.

Nonetheless, the key drivers of “intrapreneurial attitude” fall under many of the training and education areas identified by the two relevant frameworks. *EntreComp* is the official European competence framework for education and training on entrepreneurial attitude, one of the eight major key competences for Lifelong learning (LLL) as identified by the EU Council – and still of relevance today. In the context of this framework, entrepreneurship is viewed as a *competence* associated to sense of initiative & agency. On the other hand, *LifeComp* is the official European competence framework for education and training on learning-to-learn, personal and social skills – essential pillars of any aspiring intrapreneur.

The *EntreComp* framework finds application not only for the upskilling and capacity building of aspiring and established entrepreneurs, but citizens (and workers) in general as they are taught to be more “entrepreneurial” regardless on their real intention of becoming business owners. The EntreComp in fact is operationalised in many domains of training and education such as people’s engagement in employability and active citizenship The framework is structured in three main training areas, each of which contains five competences and for every competence there is a set of further sub-competences. An 8-layer progression model measure the proficiency that learners can have compared to each sub-competence, for a total of 442 learning outcomes.

***Figure 4: The EntreComp Framework***

**IDEAS & OPPORTUNITIES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competence** | **Hint** | **Description** |
| **1.1 Spotting opportunities** | *Use your imagination and abilities to identify opportunities for creating value* | * Identify and seize opportunities to create value by exploring the social, cultural and economic landscape * Identify needs and challenges that need to be met * Establish new connections and bring together scattered elements of the landscape to create opportunities to create value |
| **1.2 Creativity** | *Develop creative and purposeful ideas* | * Develop several ideas and opportunities to create value including better solutions to existing and new challenges * Explore and experiment with innovative approaches * Combine knowledge and resources to achieve valuable effects |
| **1.3 Vision** | *Work towards your vision of the future* | * Imagine the future * Develop a vision to turn ideas into action * Visualise future scenarios to help guide effort and action |
| **1.4 Valuing Idea** | *Make the most of ideas and opportunities* | * Judge what value is in social, cultural and economic terms * Recognise the potential an idea has for creating value and identify suitable ways of making the most out of it |
| **1.5 Ethical and Sustainable thinking** | *Assess the consequences and impact of ideas, opportunities and actions* | * Assess the consequences of ideas that bring value and the effect of entrepreneurial action on the target community, the market, society and the environment * Reflect on how sustainable long-term social, cultural and economic goals are, and the course of action chosen * Act responsibly |

**RESOURCES**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competence** | **Hint** | **Description** |
| **2.1 Self-awareness and self-efficacy** | *Believing in yourself and keep developing* | * Reflect on your needs, aspirations and wants in the short, medium and long term * Identify and assess your individual and group strengths and weaknesses * Believe in your ability to influence the course of events, despite uncertainty, setbacks and temporary failures |
| **2.2 Motivation and perseverance** | *Stay focused and don’t give up* | * Be determined to turn ideas into action and satisfy your need to achieve * Be prepared to be patient and keep trying to achieve your long-term individual or group aims * Be resilient under pressure, adversity, and temporary failure |
| **2.3 Mobilizing resources** | *Gather and manage the resources you need* | * Get and manage the material, non-material and digital resources needed to turn ideas into action * Make the most of limited resources * Get and manage the competences needed at any stage, including technical, legal, tax and digital competences |
| **2.4 Financial and Economic literacy** | *Develop financial and economic know-how* | * Estimate the cost of turning an idea into a value-creating activity * Plan, put in place and evaluate financial decisions over time * Manage financing to make sure your value-creating activity can last over the long term |
| **2.5 Mobilizing others** | *Inspire, enthuse and get others on board* | * Inspire and enthuse relevant stakeholders * Get the support needed to achieve valuable outcomes * Demonstrate effective communication, persuasion, negotiation and leadership |

**INTO ACTION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competence** | **Hint** | **Description** |
| **3.1 Taking the initiative** | *Go for it* | * Initiate processes that create value * Take up challenges * Act and work independently to achieve goals, stick to intentions and carry out planned tasks |
| **3.2 Planning and Management** | *Priorities, organize and follow-up* | * Set long-, medium- and short-term goals * Define priorities and action plans * Adapt to unforeseen changes |
| **3.3 Coping with uncertainty, ambiguity & risk** | *Make decision dealing with uncertainty, ambiguity and risk* | * Make decisions when the result of that decision is uncertain, when the information available is partial or ambiguous, or when there is a risk of unintended outcomes * Within the value-creating process, include structured ways of testing ideas and prototypes from the early stages, to reduce risks of failing * Handle fast-moving situations promptly and flexibly |
| **3.4 Working with others** | *Team up, collaborate and network* | * Work together and co-operate with others to develop ideas and turn them into action * Network * Solve conflicts and face up to competition positively when necessary |
| **3.5 Learning through experience** | *Learn by doing* | * Use any initiative for value creation as a learning opportunity * Learn with others, including peers and mentors * Reflect and learn from both success and failure (your own and other people’s) |

The *LifeComp* as well stems from the EU Council recommendation to Members States and EU Commission on key competences for LLL, and responds to the need of providing for the training and education system of a common EU reference model which strengthens learners’ adaptability to societies. Similarly, to *EntreComp, LifeComp’s* design is also inspired by an “onion structure”: three training areas for a total of nine competences.

***Figure 5: The LifeComp Framework***

**PERSONAL AREA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Self-regulation** | * Awareness and expression of personal emotions, thoughts, values, and behaviour * Understanding and regulating personal emotions, thoughts, and behaviour, including stress responses * Nurturing optimism, hope, resilience, self-efficacy and a sense of purpose to support learning |
| **Flexibility** | * Readiness to review opinions and courses of action in the face of new evidence * Understanding and adopting new ideas, approaches, tools, and actions in response to changing contexts * Managing transitions in personal life, social participation, work and learning pathways, while making conscious choices and setting goals |
| **Wellbeing** | * Awareness that individual behaviour, personal characteristics and social and environmental factors influence health and wellbeing * Understanding potential risks for wellbeing, and using reliable information and services for health and social protection * Adoption of a sustainable lifestyle that respects the environment, and the physical and mental wellbeing of self and others, while seeking and offering social support |

**SOCIAL AREA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Empathy** | * Awareness of another person’s emotions, experiences and values * Understanding another person's emotions and experiences, and the ability to proactively take their perspective * Responsiveness to another person’s emotions and experiences, being conscious that group belonging influences one’s attitude |
| **Communication** | * Awareness of the need for a variety of communication strategies, language registers, and tools that are adapted to context and content * Understanding and managing interactions and conversations in different socio-cultural contexts and domain-specific situations * Listening to others and engaging in conversations with confidence, assertiveness, clarity and reciprocity, both in personal and social contexts |
| **Collaboration** | * Intention to contribute to the common good and awareness that others may have different cultural affiliations, backgrounds, beliefs, values, opinions or personal circumstances * Understanding the importance of trust, respect for human dignity and equality, coping with conflicts and negotiating disagreements to build and sustain fair and respectful relationships * Fair sharing of tasks, resources and responsibility within a group taking into account its specific aim; eliciting the expression of different views and adopting a systemic approach |

**LEARNING TO LEARN AREA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Growth mindset** | * Awareness of and confidence in one's own and others’ abilities to learn, improve and achieve with work and dedication * Understanding that learning is a lifelong process that requires openness, curiosity and determination * Reflecting on other people’s feedback as well as on successful and unsuccessful experiences to continue developing one’s potential |
| **Critical thinking** | * Awareness of potential biases in the data and one’s personal limitations, while collecting valid and reliable information and ideas from diverse and reputable sources * Comparing, analysing, assessing, and synthesising data, information, ideas, and media messages in order to draw logical conclusions * Developing creative ideas, synthesising and combining concepts and information from different sources in view of solving problems |
| **Managing learning** | * Awareness of one's own learning interests, processes and preferred strategies, including learning needs and required support * Planning and implementing learning goals, strategies, resources and processes * Reflecting on and assessing purposes, processes and outcomes of learning and knowledge construction, establishing relationships across domains |

The EntreComp and LifeComp represent both the most tangible support reference at EU level for intrapreneurship-based capacity building programmes for MSEMs’ employees. Building on their foundations and insights of previous sections this section of report proposes a one-of-a-kind benchmark and cross-assessment between drivers for intrapreneurship and relevant competences / training areas from both frameworks that can act as a trigger.

***Figure 6: The EntreComp LifeComp Framework cross-assessment***
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The cross-framework assessment reveals overlapping areas of two frameworks that can be applied to the intrapreneurship as well. The Figure 6 reveals that many of traits identified in previous sections come to the fore here as well. For example, at strategic and conceptual level of idea generation the two overlap in a way that calls for greater flexibility, leadership mindset and realistic approach. At the same time the two frameworks suggest need for networking, transparency and curiosity. These findings can be taken as guidelines for the development of future policies. The analysis was not able to find national intrapreneurship policy initiatives. To this end, we were able to assess how intrapreneurship is nurtured at country and regional levels in Germany.

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study: Territorial initiatives in Germany – why the difference in entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship rates?** |
| Chart, bar chart, waterfall chart  Description automatically generatedThe trend towards an intrapreneurship culture is strong in Germany. This becomes clear from the intrapreneurship rates ("Entrepreneurial Employee Activity (EEA) rate"). Within five years from 2014-2019, intrapreneurship has increased from about 4 per cent to about 6 per cent in 2019. It concludes that more employees are involved in innovative activities. Active participation in the development or introduction of new products and services to the market, such as the establishment of new business units, are counted among them.  Countries with a high-income, such as Canada or the USA, have a significantly higher start-up rate than Germany. Germany has a start-up rate of 7.6%[[4]](#footnote-4). In terms of start-up rates, i. e. the number of new businesses founded, Germany, with a start-up rate of 7.6%, occupies one of the lower ranks compared to other high-income countries. Other countries, such as Canada, the USA or Portugal, are much further ahead here[[5]](#footnote-5).  In Germany, the labour market is stable, which is why highly qualified employees find a suitable new job very quickly. As a result, the alternative of becoming self-employed is rarely considered. Thus, innovation takes place more within the various companies than in the form of starting a business. Companies encourage the creative, entrepreneurial work of their employees[[6]](#footnote-6).  Intrepreneurs plays a central role in innovativeness, as does the forestry stock of existing companies. This is reflected, for example, in the establishment of new business units, in the orientation of new business strategies or in the development as well as the market launch and the advancement in the sale of new products. In a comparison of the 43 GEM countries on intrapreneurship, Germany ranks third, just behind Croatia and Brazil. According to the working population, 9.2 per cent of the working population are said to have been active in a leading role as an intrapreneur within the past three years.  In what is currently the largest study on the topic of "intrapreneurship", the Institute for Entrepreneurship & Innovation at the University of Bayreuth has published the "Intrapreneurship Monitor 2021". A total of 603 companies in Germany were surveyed in order to reflect the intrapreneurship scene in Germany. In addition to the comprehensive consultation, the communication of the DAX companies was also examined and an extensive series of interviews was conducted. The most important result is that more and more companies are relying on intrapreneurship to ensure their own competitiveness in the long term.  Only 29 per cent of the companies surveyed have their own specialised department or an intrapreneurship programme that takes care of intrapreneurship activities centrally. In contrast, 72 per cent of the companies already pursue intrapreneurship activities in their company either on the employee or organisational level. Based on the size of the companies, it can be said that larger companies in particular are willing and have already created structures for intrapreneurship. Furthermore, it can be seen that companies that have their own internal intrapreneurship department are more likely to be the first to introduce new products in their respective industries (50 per cent) than companies without their own department (30 per cent).  Companies in Germany are increasingly investing in the establishment and implementation of intrapreneurship initiatives. The focus here is on programmes that sensitise employees to the development of their own ideas and approaches to solutions and are intended to promote these skills. The intrapreneurship competences gained in this way allow companies to recognise problems more quickly in the future and to address them in a solution-oriented manner. Compared to the previous year, we see a significant increase here at the employee level. In 2020, only 13 per cent of the companies surveyed stated that they had their own intrapreneurship department. In 2021, this is the case for 35 per cent of the companies surveyed. In addition, 22 per cent of the companies surveyed plan to introduce intrapreneurship activities at employee level. At the company level, 36 per cent of the companies are already pursuing intrapreneurship activities today and are participating in external start-ups, for example. Here, too, 21 per cent of the companies surveyed are planning a substantially stronger expansion of corresponding efforts in the future.  Interestingly, the comparison between family and externally managed companies shows that 37 per cent of all intrapreneurship activities at employee level are carried out by exclusively family-run companies. If we look at the exclusively externally managed companies, on the other hand, we see that this is the case for only 16 per cent of the surveyed externally managed companies. According to the study, German companies are increasingly investing in the development and implementation of intrapreneurship initiatives. The focus is on programmes that empower employees to develop their own ideas and solutions and foster these skills. The intrapreneurship skills thus acquired will enable companies to quickly identify problems and solve them in a solution-oriented manner. In 2020, only 13 per cent of the companies surveyed say they have their own intrapreneurship department. In 2021, this will be the case for 35 per cent of the respondents.  Furthermore, 22 per cent of the companies surveyed plan to introduce intrapreneurship at employee level. At the company level, we find that 36 per cent already carry out intrapreneurship activities and participate in external start-ups, for example. Here, too, 21 per cent of the companies surveyed see a stronger expansion of the corresponding efforts in the future. It is interesting to note that a comparison between family businesses and external companies shows that 37 per cent of intrapreneurship activities at employee level are carried out by family businesses[[7]](#footnote-7).  According to the study by the Institute for Entrepreneurship & Innovation at the University of Bayreuth, the "Intrapreneurship Monitor 2021", the companies surveyed particularly focus on the provision of additional time, material and financial resources to promote intrapreneurship activities. 68 per cent of the companies surveyed emphasised the time released by employees. This is a gain of almost 20 percentage points compared to the previous year. Intrapreneurship and innovation activities provide a way to counteract the Corona crisis. Approx. 25 per cent of the companies surveyed assess the disruptive character of the Corona crisis as consistently positive. Many of the companies surveyed use the corona crisis as an opportunity to optimise their internal processes (42 per cent), to develop new products (35 per cent) or new business areas (35 per cent). Compared to the previous year, the trend has increased significantly. The Monitor gives clear indications that the promotion of entrepreneurial thinking among employees is accompanied by an increase in the amount of money spent by the company[[8]](#footnote-8).  In order for a company to properly promote intrapreneurship, questions arise within the company that every company has to ask itself:   * How can innovation cycles be shortened in bureaucratic structures and processes? * How can hierarchies be dealt with? * Will approval be granted for unexpected special measures that go beyond the scope of certain roles? * How to be more innovative with even fewer resources? |

1. **The digital dimension of intrapreneurship**

Having stressed both how intrapreneurship is a distinguishing element and knowing the inherent digital potential that these economies attain, it is logical to pay attention to the point of intersection between the two, the digital aspect of intrapreneurship, as an item of high interest for research. Gifford and Pinchot (2020) state that digital intrapreneurs make use of their entrepreneurial spirit with a double function: benefitting their company while also making their work relevant due to their digital implementations, which spot and target ICT-based opportunities. It is also important how their activities tend to be grounded on the basis of “creating innovations in their organisations by pursuing new activities that depart from the customary ones” (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2003 as cited in Vassilakopoulou & Grisot, 2020) and at times even against their bosses’ desires, whether contravening directives and/or recomendations or for fear of them not reacting well to their proposals.

When focusing on European intrapreneurship quantitatively, an overview of the current European business ecosystem shows promising in-company entrepreneurship examples in the food industry, like Nestlé’s InGenius and Danone Ecosystem Fund, with more than 60 sustainability projects to date in Europe and America (2021). This is also the case of the energy industry such as Ingenia Business, from Enagás, and the recently redesigned Innovation Trophies, from the Engie, the French colossus.

Technological and digital corporations have been cultivating intrapreneurship since the beginning of the century. Such is the case of Vodafone’s Launchpad platform and of Siemens-Nixdorf’s well-known initiatives, which, over the last two decades have been turning promising employees into intrapreneurs in order to change their business culture. In order to have a more in-depth perspective of the European ecosystem, two case studies of EU-based companies will be presented below in order to analyse how digital intrapreneurship is promoted within their companies.

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study: BAYER – breeding your own winning cultivar** |
| In May 2017, perceiving a gap in the development of digital innovation within the company, Bayer R&D, together with MIT Sloan Executive Education, took the decision to develop an intrapreneurship and data science program with the aim of empowering selected R&D individuals (Harris & Werneke, 2021).  The idea of entrepreneurship as “disciplined that could be cultivated and taught” was established early on in the project as one of its pillars, and, in order to apply it, they built an entirely new training framework in close collaboration between the two. Rather than aiming for a few specialised individuals, an approach with “more broadly defined people with enough knowledge to ask the right questions” (Harris & Werneke, 2021) was chosen.  Another characteristic that they shared was the lack of seniority of most of the participants, with the aim of leveraging the synergy between the intrinsic motivation that their early career stage entailed and their exposition to a top-class institution  The program, which has been evolving for each iteration, included 25 training sessions over 6-8 months, concluding with a week at MIT and an opportunity for participants to pitch their ideas to their superiors. This could secure funding for the participants, turning their concepts into actual projects within the organisation.  The three years of the project saw the participants going from 24, to 32 to 50. A central aspect of this growth was the use of project alumni as coaches, since they had already been through that journey, providing another opportunity for them to take leadership roles (Harris & Werneke, 2021)  With the objective of keeping energy, creativity and focus over time, a wide catalogue of activities was developed, ranging from face-to-face workshops, webinars and peer coaching to hackathons or even “data science-themed” radio shows. Participants were also instructed in the management of knowledge replication and amplification by optimising output impact throughout the lifecycle of the project.  As for the results, more than 20 projects were developed successfully, obtaining funding that came from even outside the program itself and of course, around a hundred individuals from Bayer’s R&D division experienced a decisive upgrade in their skillset and specifically their leadership and innovation capabilities.  According to the same source (Harris & Werneke, 2021), a strong emphasis on collaboration both in and out of the organisation was reported, creating a network that was nourished to complement the personal and professional growth of the project participants. A development that was cultivated and shared with thousands of colleagues via multiplication activities. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Case study: INDRA – problem solving expertise comes from within** |
| Perceiving needs for transformation and generation of disruption within the company, Indra, the Spanish IT, defence and transport behemoth, created a platform for open innovation, Indraventures.  The platform has been used as a launch pad for several intrapreneurial initiatives, such as Innovators. With 5 editions to date, Innovators was defined as a “call for ideas” with the objective of allowing employees to “ignite their creativity and define the future with their ideas, through technology and innovation whatever their future career might be” (La Razón, 2021)  The project has proven successful, engaging a third of their 50,000-people workforce for each of the four editions to date, which have provided more than 2,000 ideas from professionals from 40 countries.  With €5,000 and positive reports for their annual review at stake, participants had to provide solutions to a list of previously selected topics with a distinct focus on digital solutions for current and upcoming challenges.  For example, the 2021 editions had the following ones: leveraging data to transform air traffic; lay out business cases for *phygital* environments, which combine physical and digital elements; fostering client loyalty through personalised digital offers; promoting work inclusion of people with disability; and a hackathon focused on the creation of code prototypes that address the previous challenges using both IoT (Internet of Things) devices and Onesait, the open-source platform of the company. (Indra, 2021)  The winning ideas underwent an acceleration process using their own tailor-made business plans, developed by the project creators, who, in turn, were able to devote 10% of their working time for 3 months to these projects. Their ventures were also supported by the business escalation muscle of the company.  Proof of this are 3 winning projects from the 2019 version that have been established as full-fledged products: A system to ensure tracking and safety of medicine purchases in Peruvian public hospitals, using IoT and blockchain; an app to coordinate carpooling daily with workmates; and live tracking software for drone swarms within the same Wi-Fi network. (Indra, 2019)  After identifying the phenomenon of intrapreneurship and its importance in the research, development and innovation processes within the company, several strategies and measures have been undertaken throughout the years with the objective of kindling and nurturing intrapreneurship:  The nineties saw the arrival of a phenomenon within large companies: a tendency towards the outsourcing of intrapreneurial efforts. Consulting firms are paid large sums to conduct market analyses and in-depth need-finding, identify new opportunities, generate promising ideas, and, often, develop ideas into working prototypes (Altringer, 2013). Additionally, promising models and prototypes are often polished by the client company in order to enable any prospective market launches.  As seen in previous case studies, hackathons are a useful resource to prompt nimble, quick decision-making processes and improve the frequency with which promising ideas arise, while also providing a change of scenario for the participants. Moreover, the collaboration between intervening teams is synergised by the hackathon non-stop-until-done mindset. Sometimes, in dynamic tech companies, hackathons are reported to arise spontaneously, out of workshops or on top of someone’s budding personal project. Projects like Facebook’s Timeline and Chat were developed in these events.  Similar to the hackathons are the often-sponsored internal contests, which might range from a division or section scope to a corporation-wide one, and whose prizes are often monetary, reputational (commendation from superiors) or holiday-related. But the most important aspects are the important funding, resource allocation and know-how possibilities that companies put in the hands of the most promising prospects.  Peer coaching has been a particularly interesting tool to nurture intrapreneurship since it is both an element of the process and a by-product itself of said process; coaches tend to be former program graduates or participants and therefore, know how to assist newer participants better than other professionals might do. |

Obviously, the entrepreneurship sphere benefited from the rise of technologies like social media, Artificial Intelligence, big data and all possibilities that they provide. But these possibilities are not only open for entrepreneurs, starting or already owning an enterprise, but also for workers that venture into similar development projects while still being *within* the company, the intrapreneurs. However, intrapreneurship is far from being encouraged in many situations. Early on, Pinchot (1984) mentioned the concept of “Corporate Immune System”, which expresses the fact that corporate organisational structures (bureaucracy, guidelines, hierarchy) might not encourage innovation. Despite the aura digitally-oriented businesses might project, this discouraging phenomenon is quite common in IT or tech companies, sometimes even deterring employees from venturing of projects the likes of which brought us PlayStation or Gmail.

Corbett (2018) stated that game-changing innovation cannot be taken into reality without a company-wide effort behind, with structures and a transformative company culture. Even when acceding to supporting budding ideas or prototypes, there is a risk for innovative employees to be allocated funding or resources as some kind of “one in a lifetime chance”. This is why a common structure that establishes company-wide innovation is paramount, one that develops professionals beyond merely giving them a providential boost.

Due to the intrinsic entrepreneurial nature of minimising risks and maximising success, the default approach of companies to intrapreneurship tends to be very conservative resource-wise and also very punitive towards failure. Moreover, businesses tend to be partial to already known techniques over more disruptive alternatives, stalling the occurrence rate of breakthrough products. This is one of the reasons behind why Altringer (2013) states that there has been a conscious effort to improve the success rate of intrapreneurial projects. This is a logic consequence, taking into account the intrinsic nature of intrapreneurship, full of challenges “including but not limited to the inherent risk of promoting new ideas; complacency and attachment to the status quo; and the actual amount of capable people with the time to effectively build new ideas into workable products”.

1. **Concluding remarks and training concepts**

The roadway to implement and nurture an intrapreneurship friendly organizational culture is a two-way process: top down, working on leadership and corporate culture; bottom up, focusing on the research and development of drivers and triggers of intrapreneurial attitudes and sense of initiative among workers. Although theoretical and empirical contributions on the very concept of intrapreneurship are largely available through specialised business literature, non-academic references seem to lack of a clear framework for intrapreneurship. Interestingly, the concept is more often associated to other keywords or general domain of interest such as: people empowerment, HR practices, and most recurrently, open innovation. In the context of this report, intrapreneurship is argued as an emerging phenomenon fitting the new paradigm and value shift that many companies have started developing since the beginning the last decade. An intrapreneurship-conductive environment stems – and is nurtured by – a series of environmental and cultural triggers, resumed as follows:

* Encourage proactive thinking, sense of initiative and co-participation to decision making
* Support employees’ development of trans-functional skills which are instrumental in strengthening their new status – and related attitudes
* Contribute to the emergence of a business environment that gives the chance to create productive and effective business relationships
* Allow dissenting opinions to be expressed and disclosed – upon critical, rational and motivated assumptions
* Establish cross-functional and cross-hierarchal feedback systems for mutual commitment and value proposition

Organisational focus on intrapreneurship can bring numerous benefits, not only because it allows companies to save money, but also because it helps to improve the business climate and employee confidence/satisfaction. In the future, in addition to supply-side initiatives, there should be a greater emphasis on actively addressing the requirements of European enterprises in order to help them expand, interact with knowledge users and citizens, and maximize the value of Europe's knowledge base. This would entail, for example, participating in organized interaction with citizens, users, investors, enterprises, and business associations, rather than only universities and research-performing organizations.

Several management models exist for organisations interested to nurture intrapreneurship. What must be kept in mind, however, is that these models are developed with eyesight on large corporations, not MSMESs, and that there is no ‘one-size-fits-all’ solution, but rather must be complemented by professionals after a thorough analysis of a specific company or a business model. The existing literature focuses mostly on or driven by large organizations. There is an obvious lack on intrapreneurial abilities of SMEs due to their lack of resources and this must not be overlooked. Further research should focus on the development and promotion of feasible platforms that facilitate intrapreneurial activities, specifically for SMEs.

Based on the review above, the following training concepts are considered important for fostering intrapreneurship in MSMEs:

1. Intrapreneurship hope, hype and reality: Discovering intrapreneurs within organisation
2. Striking the balance: Resource and time management within intrapreneurial MSMEs.
3. Making things happen 1: Nurturing, evaluating and rewarding intrapreneurial culture within MSMEs
4. Making things happen 2: Intrapreneurial attitude, conflict and change management in MSMEs
5. Pitching to your boss: Idea presentation and support gathering
6. Personal development and intrapreneurship: growing self-awareness and mindfulness
7. Innovation management in intrapreneurial organisations
8. Intra-organisational communication and team management
9. Measuring success of intrapreneurial efforts: AARRR model
10. Digital intrapreneurship: prospects and challenges

Further research should investigate the differences between large and small and medium-sized enterprises. Are there differences in establishing intrapreneurship, are fewer resources of SMEs really a big disadvantage of SMEs, is it easier to establish such a dynamic and innovative business model in SMEs because there are fewer hierarchical levels and fewer employees who need to be taught and convinced to act more intrapreneurial?
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