

THE EFFECTS OF CULTURAL AND STRUCTURAL ROLES IN PROMOTING ACADEMICIAN INTRAPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOR IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Rajani Mariam K Korah, REVA University, Bengaluru
Subhasree Kar, REVA University, Bengaluru

ABSTRACT

It is around four decades since Intrapreneurship was identified, recognizes and implemented across different sizes of organizations. Consequently much research work has been undertaken in this domain but higher education is one area that still remains new to researchers. Culture not only varies to a larger extent across organizations but also within organizations. The structural roles supported by the organizations also contribute to the success of intrapreneurship. This paper reports the effects of cultural, structural and other aspects on the Intrapreneur Behavior. An indicator to measure the Cultural aspects and another to measure the structural roles were developed. In addition Gender, Age, Income, Level and type are the other exogenous variables contemplated. The main indicator is the freedoms and four indicators were considered. The results of the study indicate that intrapreneur behavior (endogenous) is more uniformly affected by the exogenous variables.

Keywords: Intrapreneurship, Intrapreneur Behavior, Intrapreneur Culture, Intrapreneur Structural Roles, Academician, Higher Education.

INTRODUCTION

Changing environmental scenario drives organizations to have competitive advantage. The most preferred means to achieve this is by innovation and this is true of educational institutions also. Successful intrapreneurial implementations in this context include quality, quantity, formal controls, organizational support, employee training and organizational values (Zahra, 1991; Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001; Demirbag et al., 2006; Guth and Ginsberg, 1990). Organizations have identified many areas of intrapreneurship to become successful. There is a general tendency and ability to engage in intrapreneurship activities by the organizations that have rich resources compared to organizations with light resources (Ireland, et al, 2009). Researchers have adopted many means to measure the success of Intrapreneurs. This aspect inter alia focuses on different levels, focal areas, culture, and structural roles. Intrapreneurship research has evolved into three focal areas. One of the focal area identifies and encourages intrapreneur (Pinchot, 1985; Luchsinger and Bagby, 1987; Ross, 1987; Knight 1989; McKinney and McKinney, 1989; Jones and Butler, 1995; Jennings et al., 1994) recognizing the intrapreneur's characteristics. The behavior of the intrapreneurs is a major characteristic that impacts the activities of the intrapreneurship in any organization. The first focal area recognizes and supports the entrepreneurs, the main emphasis being on the intrapreneurs characteristics. The other focal area touches the formation of new ventures (Vesper, 1984; Burgelman, 1985; Carrier, 1994; Krueger and Brazeal, 1994). Yet another area emphasises on the entrepreneurial organizations (Rule and Irwin, 1988; Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990; Merrifield, 1993; Stopford and Baden-Fuller, 1994). The intrapreneurship is affected to a larger extent by multiple factors. The level of intrapreneurship is affected by

three key variables: individual, organization, and external environment (Mohanty 2006). The development of intrapreneurship varies on the area and the type of the organization and also on different levels. Intrapreneurship occurs on two levels: the level of the organization and on the level of the individual (Antoncic and Antoncic 2011). Culture is another major dimension which highly supports the growth and adaptation of intrapreneurship. Dess and Lumpkin (2005) propose that organizational culture is a strong stimulus for innovation that impacts the intrapreneurship process. Despite a higher number of research on Intrapreneurship covering different areas of work, the domain of higher education is relatively new and needs exploration. Educational institutions have started to recognize the importance of intrapreneurship. Academicians form the backbone of the developmental works of intrapreneurs and Intrapreneur behavior remains inextricable, linked to the process of intrapreneurship.

HYPOTHESIS

The review of literature indicates limited research work in Intrapreneurship in Higher Education. Intrapreneurial behavior changes from time to time, from the initiation of ideas *de novo* to its implementation. Other factors also affect the intrapreneur behavior and therefore it is interesting to study the intrapreneur behavior which leads to framing a hypothesis as under:

H₀: *The intrapreneurial behavior of Academicians is affected uniformly by **IntraCul**, **IntraStr**, Gender, Age, Income, Level and Type of the Intrapreneurs.*

METHODS

Data are collected with a questionnaire administered to Academic Intrapreneurs. The participants comprised 600 academicians from different Universities, Affiliated Institutions and Autonomous Institutions of Higher Education in Bangalore. This study is exploratory in nature and primary data is collected from the respondents identifying 25% of the population from the identified quota. The population comprises of 24 Universities, 11 Autonomous Institutions and 205 Affiliated Colleges who have recognized Intrapreneurships in Bangalore. The questionnaire intends to gauge the effect of Age, Gender, Income, Level and Type of Intrapreneurs on the Intrapreneur behavior. Two indicators were developed in addition to these independent variables identified as IntraCult and IntraStr. IntraCult measures the cultural effects such as values, belief, attitudes, behavior and surrounding conditions. IntraStr measures the structural roles such as recognizing teaching experience, recognizing industrial experience, recognizing ideas and support provided. Intrapreneur behavior is measured by the ten freedoms as formulated by Pinchot (1985), of which four freedoms are considered in the study. A detailed account of the classification is shown in Table 1. In essence, **IntraCult** is about the Cultural environment of the Academician Intrapreneurs in higher education and **IntraStr** is about the Structural Roles of the Academician Intrapreneurs in higher education.

| Variable | Operationalization and Measurement |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| Intrapreneur – Freedoms | The freedoms as formulated by Pinchot (1985) of which the following are considered for the study 1)Self Determination 2) Tolerance of Risk 3) Rewards 4) Freedom |
| IntraCul - Cultural indicators | Cultural Indicators comprises of 1)Values 2) Beliefs 3) Attitude 4) Behaviour 5) Surrounding Condition |
| IntraStr – Structural Role Indicators | Structural Indicator comprises of 1)Recognition of Teaching Experience 2) Recognition of Industrial Experience 3) Recognition of new ideas 4) Support provided – Availability of the resource affecting Intrapreneurship |

| | |
|--------|---|
| Gender | Academician Intrapreneur –Male and Female |
| Age | Academician Intrapreneur in three age groups; 25 – 35 Years, 35 – 50 Years and Above 50 Years |
| Income | Academician Intrapreneur in three group classification; 0.25-0.5 million, 0.5-1 million and Above 1 million (Indian Rupees) |
| Level | Academician Intrapreneur in three levels – University, Autonomous and Affiliated Institutions |
| Type | Academician Intrapreneur in four types – Employee, Creator, Doer and Implementer |

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Data are analyzed with Analysis of Variance. The results are in Tables 2 & 3. Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics of the independent variables. Most responses tilt in towards the responses being neutral on the opinion of Cultural Indicators (58.5%) and also Structural Role Indicators (47.33%). A contrasting feature in the opinion of these two variables is discerned. The seven respondents (1.17%) who opine Cultural Indicators being very good (SD = 0.9) and 6 respondents (1%) opine Structural Role Indicator being very poor (SD = 1.265) evidences this. The data has more female respondents (59.83%) compared to male respondents (40.17%). A higher number of respondents (47%) are aged between 35 and 50 years. Lower number of respondents draws income between 0.5 to 1 million (24%). The sample has more responses from affiliated institutions (85%). The SD of these variables is more uniform. The lowest number of respondents are implementer type of intrapreneurs (10.67%) but has higher SD (0.826)

| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----|------|----------------|------------|
| Intra Cult [IntraCul] | Very Poor | 5 | 3.60 | 0.894 | 0.400 |
| | Poor | 123 | 3.07 | .776 | 0.070 |
| | Neutral | 351 | 3.18 | .787 | 0.042 |
| | Good | 114 | 3.07 | .620 | 0.058 |
| | Very Good | 7 | 3.14 | .900 | 0.340 |
| Intra Structural Roles [IntraStr] | Very Poor | 6 | 3.00 | 1.265 | 0.516 |
| | Poor | 117 | 3.13 | .726 | 0.067 |
| | Neutral | 284 | 3.12 | .764 | 0.045 |
| | Good | 177 | 3.18 | .762 | 0.057 |
| | Very Good | 16 | 3.13 | .719 | 0.180 |
| Gender | Male | 241 | 3.15 | .743 | 0.048 |
| | Female | 359 | 3.13 | .770 | 0.041 |
| Age | 25 -35 Years | 198 | 3.16 | .743 | 0.053 |
| | 35 - 50 Years | 282 | 3.12 | .759 | 0.045 |
| | Above 50 Years | 120 | 3.13 | .788 | 0.072 |
| Income | 0.25 - 0.5 million | 298 | 3.14 | .742 | 0.043 |
| | 0.5 to 1 million | 144 | 3.10 | .760 | 0.063 |
| | Above 1 million | 158 | 3.17 | .792 | 0.063 |
| Level | University | 60 | 3.25 | .751 | 0.097 |
| | Autonomous | 30 | 3.23 | .728 | 0.133 |
| | Affiliated | 510 | 3.12 | .761 | 0.034 |
| Type | Employee | 140 | 3.16 | .774 | 0.065 |
| | Creator | 329 | 3.12 | .733 | 0.040 |
| | Doer | 67 | 3.18 | .796 | 0.097 |
| | Implementer | 64 | 3.13 | .826 | 0.103 |

| | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------|------------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| IntraCul | Between IntraCul | 2.769 | 4 | 0.692 | 1.204 | 0.308 |
| | Within IntraCul | 342.024 | 595 | 0.575 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| IntraStr | Between IntraStr | 0.586 | 4 | 0.147 | 0.253 | 0.908 |
| | Within IntraStr | 344.207 | 595 | 0.578 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| Gender | Between Gender | 0.065 | 1 | 0.065 | 0.113 | 0.737 |
| | Within Gender | 344.728 | 598 | 0.576 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| Age | Between Age | 0.198 | 2 | 0.099 | 0.171 | 0.843 |
| | Within Age | 344.596 | 597 | 0.577 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| Income | Between Income | 0.409 | 2 | 0.205 | 0.355 | 0.701 |
| | Within Income | 344.384 | 597 | 0.577 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| Level | Between Level | 1.235 | 2 | 0.618 | 1.073 | .342 |
| | Within Level | 343.558 | 597 | 0.575 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |
| Type | Between Type | 0.344 | 3 | 0.115 | 0.199 | 0.897 |
| | Within Type | 344.449 | 596 | 0.578 | | |
| | Total | 344.793 | 599 | | | |

The analysis show that the Intrapreneur behavior neither varies with *IntraCul*, nor does it vary with *IntraStr*. The academicians intrapreneurs show more uniformity in their approach. However, the interesting feature of this study is that the respondent's opinion is also more uniform among the other variables – Gender, Age, Income, Level and Type of the Intrapreneurs. Intrapreneur in higher education happens in all the levels (University, Affiliated and Autonomous Institutions) but the Intrapreneur behavior remains same across all these levels. The study emphasizes the importance attached to intrapreneurship by all the higher education types. The study indicates that all the variables show uniform approach of the Intrapreneur behavior. The academicians' enthusiasm to exhibit and carry on with intrapreneur exercises is not differentiated by any of the variables considered in the study suggesting the value of the intrapreneurship is always held high despite differences existing between the respondents. Intrapreneurship has been around for nearly four decades and is relatively a new area compared to entrepreneurial activities. However, intrapreneurship activities in higher education are still nascent and not much work has been carried out in this domain. This could be probably a strong reason behind a very high consensus that the study has revealed.

CONCLUSION

This study focuses how intrapreneur behaviour is affected by the cultural and structural indicators *inter alia* the age, income, level, type of intrapreneurship among the academicians. The study reveals that all these affect the intrapreneur behaviour uniformly ($p > 0.05$). In essence, all the variables contemplated in the study showing a higher uniformity in approach blurs the potential of an individual variable over the other in affecting the intrapreneur behaviour. However, Intrapreneurship happens in higher education and its purpose is recognized by the intrapreneurs, irrespective of the level of the institutions or the type of the intrapreneurs. This study contributes to the literature on intrapreneurship. The

topic on intrapreneur being relatively new in origin offers plethora of promises for enthusiastic researchers. Expansion in the variables and covering different regions may provide granular details of the variables affecting Intrapreneur behaviour.

REFERENCES

- Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship; Construct Refinement and Crosscultural Validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495-527
- Antoncic, J.A., & Antoncic, B (2011). Employee satisfaction, intrapreneurship and firm growth: a model. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 111(4), 589-607
- Burgelman, R. A (1985). Managing the new venture division; research findings and implications for strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6(1), 39-54
- Carrier, C. (1994). Intrapreneurship in large firms and SMEs: a comparative study. *International Small Business Journal*, 12(3), 54-61
- Demirbag, M., Tatoglu, E., Tekinkus, M. & Zaim, S (2006). An analysis of the relationship between Total Quality Management Implementation and Organizational Performance Turkish SMEs. *Jornal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 17(6), 829-847
- Dess, G.G., & Lumpkin, G.T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1), 147-156.
- Guth, W.D., & Ginsberg, A. (1990). Guest editors' introduction: Corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic management journal*, 5-15.
- Ireland, R.D., Covin, J.G., & Kuratko, D.F. (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(1), 19-46.
- Jennings, R., Cox, C. and Cooper, C.L. (1994), *Business Elites: The Psychology of Entrepreneurs and Intrapreneurs*, Routledge, New York, NY
- Jones, G.R., & Butler, J.E. (1992). Managing internal corporate entrepreneurship: An agency theory perspective. *Journal of management*, 18(4), 733-749.
- Knight, R.M. (1989). Technological innovation in Canada: A comparison of independent entrepreneurs and corporate innovators. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 4(4), 281-288.
- Krueger Jr, N. F., & Brazeal, D.V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
- Luchsinger, V., & Bagby, D. R. (1987). Entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship: Behaviors, comparisons, and contrasts. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 52(3), 10.
- McKinney, G., & McKinney, M. (1989). Forget the corporate umbrella-entrepreneurs shine in the rain. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 30(4), 77.
- Merrifield, D.B. (1993). Intrapreneurial corporate renewal, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(5), 383-9
- Mohanty, R. P. (2006). Intrapreneurial levers in cultivating value-innovative mental space in Indian corporations. *Vikalpa*, 31(1), 99-106.
- Pinchot III, G. (1985). Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship.
- Ross, J. (1987). Corporations and entrepreneurs: Paradox and opportunity. *Business Horizons*, 30(4), 76-80.
- Rule, E.G., & Irwin, D.W. (1988). Fostering intrapreneurship: The new competitive edge. *The journal of business strategy*, 9(3), 44.
- Stevenson, H.H and Jarillo, J.C. (1990), A paradigm of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial management, *Strategic Management Journal*, 11, 17-27
- Stopford, J.M. and Baden-Fuller, C.W.F. (1994), Creating corporate entrepreneurship, *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(7), 521-36
- Vesper, K.H. (1984), Three faces of corporate entrepreneurship, in Hornaday. J.A. (Eds), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson College, Wellesley, MA, 294-320
- Zahra, S.A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of business venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.

Received: 19-Mar-2024, Manuscript No. AMSJ-24-14626; **Editor assigned:** 20-Mar-2024, PreQC No. AMSJ-24-14626(PQ); **Reviewed:** 10-May-2024, QC No. AMSJ-24-14626; **Revised:** 28-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. AMSJ-24-14626(R); **Published:** 16-Jul-2024