

THE EFFECTS OF INTRAPRENEURSHIP ON SOCIAL INNOVATION: A RESEARCH IN ZMİR

Murat ESEN*¹
Reza EKERDİL²

Abstract

Social innovation is a realized action that transfers from profits to social needs by using entrepreneurial skills. Social innovation is an action which is carried out by transferring profits to social needs with the help of entrepreneurial skills. Non-profit organizations and businesses organizations have developed social implementations at local, regional and national level to overcome social problems. To overcome social problems, organizations can encourage their employees' entrepreneurial performance. Intrapreneurship must be supported in an organization to need employees who are more innovative, self-confident, proactive and able to take risk.

Employees are required to be more innovative, self-confident, proactive and likely to take risks in order to support intrapreneurship in an organization. Organizations will both develop their own special abilities and be able to change the way of competing with new products, technologies, social relations in the market. The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of Intrapreneurship on social innovation. In order to test construct validity of the study; factor analysis, correlation analysis were used to measure the severity and direction of the relationship between the variables and regression analysis was used to measure causality between variables. As a result of the research; while "Innovation and Proactivity" which is a sub-dimension of entrepreneurship, is effective on social innovation, the performance of "risk taking and self-confidence", another sub-dimension of entrepreneurship, is not effective on social innovation. Suggestions have been made to the organizations, managers, stakeholders, employees in the light of findings.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship - Intrapreneurship, Social Entrepreneurship - Intrapreneurship, Social Innovation*

* Corresponding Author

¹ Assistant Professor, zmir Katip Çelebi University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 35620, Çi li, zmir, Turkey, murat.esen@ikc.edu.tr

² BSc., zmir Katip Çelebi University, Graduate School of Social Sciences, 35620, Çi li, zmir, Turkey, resat121@hotmail.com

Introduction

Social Innovation had come up and diffused between 1980s and 1990s. Max Wever is the pioneer of Social Innovation and it became a phenomena increasingly. Muhammad Yunus is a Bangladeshi economist who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for founding the Grameen Bank and pioneering the concepts of microcredit and microfinance. While USA, Canada and Europe are on the way of leading in the social innovation and social initiatives, the institutions in various countries have begun to establish programs and centers on social innovation and social initiatives. (Yıldırım, 2016 :53; Özdemir and Ar, 2015: 20). According to the Stanford Social Innovation Review, social innovation is the process of implementing, supporting and inventing original solutions to meet social needs (Aca and Büyüksan, 2016 :206). Social Innovation states practices and approaches related to resolving problems such as economic crises, global warming, lack of energy and resources, discrimination, poverty, health, education, demographic imbalances. According to Mulgan, social innovation is often developed and disseminated by innovative activities and services by non-governmental organizations in order to meet social needs. According to Austin et al., social innovation is facilitated by social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurship can be expressed as innovative implementations which also include nongovernmental organizations, private and public sectors to create social value (Özdemir and Ar, 2015: 20-22). Social Innovation is the creation of new strategies, formations, ideas and organizations to meet, disseminate the needs of the society and increase the welfare of the society (Eren, 2010: 25). Crozier and Friedberg (1993) describe social innovation as "a new model of practice that includes; all stakeholders are involved, individuals move within a particular business cooperation and learn together conceptual and organizational skills. Goldenberg (2004) points out that social innovation, social entrepreneurial targets individuals and societies that are facing social and economic difficulties. Haugh (2005) points out that social innovations are activities that provide income as a result of offering social services via new services and finding

new sources.. Social innovation should be effective, efficient and sustainable in finding solutions to social problems and be carried out to spread throughout the society and also to create values. (Kazanço lu and Dirsehan, 2016: 136 – 137).

The social innovation topics are increasing social welfare, creating new business opportunities, ensuring equal opportunity, reintroduce outcasts to society, guidance and career services for young people, health, education, environment, solving transport problems and meeting needs (Eren, 2010: 27).

The concept of Intrapreneurship was first used by Gifford Pinchot in 1985. Intrapreneurship refers to entrepreneurship within an existing organization (Pinchot, 1985:15). Zahra (1991) defines it as a process of creating a new business within an established organization, in order to increase organizational profitability, strengthen company's competitive and achieve strategic renewal (Ferreira, 2002: 2). Kuratko etc. (2000), refers to a process in which new jobs are created to improve organizational profitability and increase the competitiveness of the company, innovations in an existing organization are carried out through individuals, organizational renewal and entrepreneurial spirit within the organization are encouraged. Covin and Slevin (1989), "Restraint firms (avoidance of risk taking, non-innovative and non-reactive) are the difference between entrepreneurs firms (risk taking, innovative and proactive) firms "(Gürel, 2012: 59). According to Antoncic and Hisrich (2001: 497 – 498 ; 2003: 9), intrapreneurship is expressed as entrepreneurship in an existing organizational structure. (A ca and Kurt 2007: 89), An organization in the current activity is defined as entrepreneurship. Intrapreneurship is defined as the entrepreneurship within the organizations in operation, the dissemination of entrepreneurship ideas, the sum of entrepreneurship and innovation activities and the employees acting as entrepreneurs (Kızılo lu and brahimo lu, 2013: 106).

The researchers have used various concepts to figure out different aspects of the Intrapreneurship such as intrapreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, internal corporate entrepreneurship, exopreneurship, corporate ventures, new ventures. Intrapreneurs are individuals who have the characteristics of an entrepreneur like innovative, energetic, creative, flexible, risk-taking etc. (Serikan and Arat, 2013: 58). In general, typical entrepreneurial personality traits are the ability of risk taking/risk bearer (McClelland, 1961; Brockhaus, 1980; Hull et al., 1980; Ahmed, 1985; Sexton and Bowman, 1985; Cromie, 2000), innovative (Schumpeter, 1934; Kirton, 1976; Stewart et al., 2003; Cromie, 2000; Mueller and Thomas, 2000), creative (Amabile et al., 1996; Gibb, 1993), self-confidence (Sexton and Bowman, 1985; Cromie, 2000), being proactive (Bateman and Crant, 1993; Becherer and Maurer, 1999), which have begun to be characterized by the approach of David C. McClelland in 1950 (Eren, 2010: 74).

Proactivity refers to an effective change of environment by individuals and providing the needs and problems of future or the functioning related to predictions of changes (Kaygın, 2012: 98). Risk is known as the concept of expressing fear, anxiety, worry to arouse the danger in the human mind and is referred as possible events that are expected to occur in the future, even if they are not certain. Besides, there is an uncertain form in the process and the result except of unwanted situations (Timuro lu and Çakır, 2014: 122). Innovation is defined as the creation or development of new products or services by an organization. It is expressed that, new ideas which are new products, new services, new techniques, new strategies, new technologies, are developed by employees in the presence of an innovation (Çerli et al., 2011: 180). Self – confidence refers to the feasibility goals in achieving belief. (Pçio lu and Ta er, 2011: 124). Self-confidence is conceptualized as self-sufficiency and perceived competence. It is the individual's confidence in his/her one's own judgment, ability, power and decisions. However, some researchers distinguish self-confidence from self-efficacy in skills and abilities as they believe that self-confidence represents a particular

form of self-efficacy and is considered about the individual's ability, the choice of activities, how much effort he or she will endeavor to perform these activities. Moreover, it is thought to be important in determining the struggle, ideational and emotional reactions. However, self-efficacy theory is often used as the theoretical basis in self-confidence research (Akin, 2007: 168).

Intrapreneurship is defined as entrepreneurship for processes that are gone on inside a current firm, regardless of its size. It creates new business ventures, also supports other innovation types in an organization such as the improvement of new products, services, technologies, administrative techniques, strategies and competitive advantages (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2003: 9). An intrapreneur can be defined as a person who is creative and innovative to transform a dream or an idea into a profitable venture by operating within the organization environment (Pinchot, as cited in Carland, 2007: 84). It is important to have skills for leadership because intrapreneurship is made up different form and cross management skills of different actors. For instance, in small companies intrapreneurship is much easier than large companies since conditions are much more appropriate. Organization culture should be based on the company intrapreneurship level for individual advancement, good teamwork and beneficial knowledge development in the organization. Past studies show that both individual and organization performance effect intrapreneurship activity. There are two constructions of intrapreneurship; organization and individual level. It begins with innovation that starts from an idea to add value to market. The intrapreneurship can also make this process in the current company. Pinchot and Pellman (1999) emphasize that innovation can not be done without an intrapreneur. Intrapreneur works on value business venture in the current company, entrepreneurship by construct works on independents and self-account. Both intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship emerge with new ideas by using talent, to create opportunities and turn them into profitable new realities, strive for change and develop. Intrapreneur doesn't have much to lose as he takes

his salary even if he is not successful, but entrepreneur will lose everything if he cannot be successful. Entrepreneurship cannot be promoted as a position in firms, also not be designated as leaders. Anybody who has entrepreneurship spirit in firms, can perform at any level as an intrapreneur. Intrapreneurship comes from individual's own efforts, actions and achievement. Not only individual efforts but also trust, character and culture are very important to intrapreneurship success. In addition, organization culture is also important to succeed in intrapreneurship. The organization culture is crucial to determine ideas, decisions and actions of an intrapreneur. There can be intrapreneurship without intrapreneur. It is facilitated by organizations' activities that involve all employees from different units of organization. It also defines goals, strategies and duties. There should be help and support between employee and managers in the organization for improving the intrapreneurship. In the context, the social connections will reach the single goal for achievement on behalf of organization. The foundation values of intrapreneurship in firms are norms, symbols, attitudes, perceptions and basic assumptions among employees within organization (Menzel et al., 2007: 733-741).

In recent times, entrepreneurship has moved into the nonprofit arena via social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurship is known as differing form of other forms of entrepreneurship in the relatively higher priority given to promoting social value and versus capturing economic value. Social entrepreneurship is defined as a process that is included in both innovation and resources to use opportunities to catalyze social change or address social needs. (Mair and Marti, 2006: 1 – 37). Social entrepreneurship contributes to nonprofit sectors by using new innovations and services for creating social enterprises. In this way, social entrepreneurs create their own new revenue sources from profit activities to provide self- sustaining activities and service social needs. Social enterprises achieve to be more entrepreneurial and innovative in helping their participants via earned income activities for starting social enterprises (Tan, 2010: 1 -2).

Social entrepreneurs use commercial activities as a tool to realize missions. Contrary to companies, profit is not a goal, but it is a positive impact on society. In other words, profit is not transferred to the boss or the shareholders, it is used for organization purpose. Another different point; he is not responsible for shareholders, but he is accountable to public. Social entrepreneurs try to make profit in market conditions and profits are transferred to public for social issues or demands (Ilık, 2013: 123).

Mair and Marti (2006: 37), view social entrepreneurship as a process of creating value, exploring and exploiting opportunities to create social needs, the creation of new organizations which have got new products and services. Social entrepreneurship can occur in existing organization where it may be called social intrapreneurship. Like intrapreneurship in the business sector, social intrapreneurship appeal to both new venture creation and entrepreneurial process innovation. It means that social entrepreneurship can occur as intrapreneurship in new organization or in an established organization.

Tracey etc. (2011), view the intrapreneurs can draw on the macro level discourse surrounding social innovation to pursue the organization, break the resistance of organization (Newth and Woods, 2014:200). Management structures and processes can play key role in disseminating and promoting social intrapreneurship in organization such as intrapreneurial teams, increasing new employee who are innovative and have entrepreneur – mindsets.

Schmitz and Scheuerle (2012),” in their study of social intrapreneurial organizations, found that these organizations practice far more advocacy than new startup social enterprises” (Nadan et al., 2015: 41). This view considers social innovation where it’s from and how it can be creation of novel combinations of resources to address social issues from market. “Social innovation is large concept and practice that could be implemented through social intrapreneurship or social entrepreneurship. A goal of social innovation is to meet social needs

while the innovation is developed and diffused through organizations, new (social entrepreneurship) or existing (social intrapreneurship)” (Nadan et al., 2015: 40).

Strasbourg Declaration clarifies that social enterprises are recognised as a vehicle for social and economic cohesion across Europe in order to help build a pluralistic and resilient social market economy. (<http://ec.europa.eu/>, Access Date: 21.04.2017) Social entrepreneurs are also drivers of change, creating innovative solutions which are the big challenges that face us today. They are getting role by new forms in economic activities; create jobs, provide innovative products and services, and promote a more sustainable economy. Social enterprises service a model for 21st century business that balances financial, social, cultural and environmental needs. Social entrepreneurs are agents of change, as individuals and groups who are passionate about improving the lives of people and communities.

Research Methodology

The aim of this research is to demonstrate the impact of innovativeness, self-esteem, proactivity, risk taking attitudes, which are considered as intrapreneurship characteristics of bank employees, on social innovation tendencies. The main hypothesis of the research within this scope is that " Intrapreneurship performance has significant and positive effect on social innovation". Within the scope of the basic hypothesis of the research; the following hypothesis were tested considering intrapreneurship performance; intrapreneurship sub-dimension (innovation, proactivity, risk taking and self-confidence) and social innovation (innovation).

Ha: Proactivity will have positive effect on the social innovation.

Hb: Risk Taking trends of private bank employees affect significantly and positively on the social innovation.

Hc: Self - Confidence trends of private bank employees affect significantly and positively on the social innovation.

H_d: Innovation trends of private bank employees affect significantly and positively on the social innovation.

The research was carried out in April - May 2016 in Izmir center where there are 250 bank employees in three private banks' branches. The reasons for conducting the research in Izmir; it is the third largest city of Turkey, has got a large number of bank branches, provides saving time and money. The population in the research area includes bank employees who were chosen randomly and were considered to contribute to the work as voluntary. The survey methods were used. It is possible to measure the attitudes of the individual perceptions after discussing with the bank managers and obtaining the necessary permits. A quantitative approach has been adopted in the research. The questionnaire which includes participants' demographics was reported, then the social innovativeness and entrepreneurial tendencies were measured on a 5-point Likert scale. The rating is appropriate for a likert scale of 5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). 6 items on Social Innovation scale, 6 items on Innovation scale, 6 items on Self-confidence scale, 10 items on Proactivity scale and 4 items on Risk Taking scale were used in the questionnaire. The scale items were reached scale items in doctoral thesis that is entitled "A Model Proposal for Measuring the Effect of Social Innovation Capacity of University Students on Technological Innovation Trends" by Eren (2010). Social Innovation is made up of 6 items by Eren (2010) as result of literature study, 6 items of Innovation (Cited in Eren, 2010): 4 items Janssen (2001), 2 items Jackson Personality Inventory (1994); Proactivity 10 items: 6 items (Cited in Eren, 2010): 6 items Bateman and Crant (1993), 4 items literature study result was established; Risk Taking Tendency 4 items: (Cited in Eren, 2010): 2 items Koh (1996), 3 items Jani nait vd. (2004); Self-confidence was developed for this study as a result of 6 items of literature research.

Social innovativeness scale, Intrapreneurship scale and intrapreneurship sub-dimension scale analysis were examined with Cronbach Alfa in the research, the results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Reliability Analysis Related to Scales

Scale	Cronbach Alpha ()
Intrapreneurship	,956
• Innovation	,916
• Risk Taking	,833
• Proactivity	,925
• Self-confidence	,817
Social Innovation	,857

In addition, factor analysis was used to measure construct validity of the scales. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Factor Analysis and Findings

Factors	Items	Factor Load Range	Explained Variance	KMO	2	df	p
Social Innovation	6	,477 - ,693	%58,755	,867	608,473	15	,000
Intrapreneurship	26	,483-,775	%65,39	,951	4705,791	325	,000
Innovation	6	,581 - ,805	%70,77	,902	1018,489	15	,000
Risk Taking	4	,588 - ,731	%66,71	,794	374,945	6	,000
Proactivity	10	,453 - ,705	%60,43	,922	1602,930	45	,000
Self-confidence	6	,587 - ,987	%76,33	,870	746,531	15	,000

Findings of the research

Correlation analysis was used to determine whether there was a positive or negative relationship between perceived social innovativeness and Intrapreneurship variables, regression analysis was used to determine the effect of independent variables on dependent variables (Table 3 - 4).

Table 3: Variables between Correlation Analysis and Findings

	Variables	AVG	SD.	1	2	3	4	5
1	Social Innovation	4,0007	,71018	1				
2	Innovation	4,1825	,58748	,553*	1			
3	Self-confidence	3,7476	,56318	,299*	,389*	1		
4	Proactivity	3,9987	,54977	,418*	,602*	,552*	1	
5	Risk Taking	3,5430	,88801	,458*	,408*	,427*	,409*	1

*p<0.01 level is significant.

The coefficients of correlation are shown between the variables of intrapreneurship and the variables of social innovativeness used in the research. According to the values (figures) in the chart, there is a weak and positive relationship between the social innovativeness variable and the intrapreneurship dimensions Proactivity ($r = ,418$; $p < 0.01$), a weak and positive relationship self-confidence, ($r = ,229$; $p < 0.01$), risk taking ($r = ,458$; $p < 0.01$), whereas innovation ($r = ,553$; $p < 0.01$) seems to be a moderate and positive relationship.

Table 4: Regression Analysis And Findings For Examining Effects of Intrapreneurship Dimensions on Social Innovation

The dependent Variable: Social Innovation							
Independent Variable	R ²	F		T	p	Durbin-Watson	
Risk Taking	,373	36,488		,268	4,569	,000*	1,967
Innovation				,405	6,240	,000*	
Self-confidence				-,013	-,206	,837*	
Proactivity				,072	1,014	,311*	

*p<0.01 level is significant.

The Durbin-Watson statistic value indicates whether there is between autocorrelation and values, it is 1,967 figures. It can be said that there is no autocorrelation. For this reason, there is no disadvantage in

terms of statistics in evaluating the results of regression. All of the independent variables account for 37% in the change of social innovation.

Hypotheses, demographic variables were added as control variables to test the Ha, Hb, Hc, and Hd but significant results were not obtained.

When the other variables were kept constant, the effect of "Risk Taking" variable on the dependent variable was significant ($p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.268$), while the effect of "Self-Confidence" on social innovativeness was not significant ($p > 0.05$, $\beta = -0.013$, $p = .837$), "Innovation" has a significant effect on social innovation ($p < 0.05$, $\beta = 0.6405$), "Proactivity" has not significant effect on social innovation ($p > 0.05$, $\beta = 0.072$).

In all of these findings, it was found that innovativeness ($\beta = .405$, $p = .000$), risk taking ($\beta = .268$, $p = .000$) were significant and positive effect on social innovation (Hd, Hb). But on the other hand social innovation ($\beta = -.013$, $p = .837$) were not affected by proactivity ($\beta = .072$, $p = .311$) and self-confidence ($\beta = -.013$, $p = .837$).

Steve Jobs who was Apple's former executive, says: "You can not ask your customer what he wants and you can not get the product out because; he or she will want something else when you do what they want". It can be stated how important it is for human needs to change rapidly and the employees of the organization are made up of creative, risk-taking, proactive and original individuals to be able to catch up with this change (Kanbur, 2015:148).

Intrapreneurs are faced with economic, capital and organizational risks as they are involved in initiative activities on behalf of the organization. For example, Sarasvathy et al. (1998) conducted a research on the risk perceptions of entrepreneurs and bank employees. It was seen that while entrepreneurs were willing to take the risks they tried to control the results and desired large commercial investments. On the other hand, it was found that bank employees found that the highest returns and the lowest risk were evaluated. According to Sarasvathy et

al., this situation was derived from the work experience of entrepreneurs and bank employee (Chell, 2008: 104).

Although the dimensions of innovation, proactivity, and risk taking are related to each other at a high level, the relationships with each other are not constant. In the literature, the proactivity does not include the risk taking and innovation component, the innovation behavior includes the entrepreneurship behavior differently from proactivity, proactivity does not define absolutely foresight or acceptingly the risk. Since risk taking behaviors can be directed at any object, the organization's implications in this situation, will not automatically mean useful innovation (Jongi et al., 2011: 18-19). Because variables are not constant, it can be stated whether or not there is an effect on the sample. For example, when a better person is aiming for environmental adaptation, hence; proactive behavior cannot be called intrapreneurship (Jongi et al., 2011: 18-19).

In this study, it is seen that the bank employees do not ignore the risks, the risk assessment is stemming from a behavior's form of working styles, as a result they do not ignore the risk factor in the social innovation studies. Proactivity and self-confidence trends are not an obstacle for bank in social innovation studies. There is no impact due to the fact that bank employees are strategic, professional and having culture of enterprise, can consider conceptually and cognitive skills in the project approach. It suggests that adhocracy and market culture can be developed as positive relationship between risk and innovation for staff. At the core of this thinking is the rapid development in information technology; reflection of individual and corporate banking activities on the web and mobile phone applications; such as web banking, mobile banking, e-commerce, online credit card usage; It is thought to support bank employees' innovative attitudes and behavioral developments.

Aca and Büyükaşlan (2016: 213) have conducted multiple regression analysis to reveal the relationship between intrapreneurship dimensions (innovation, risk taking and proactivity) and social entrepreneurship. According to article; there is significant and positive

relationship between the social entrepreneurship and the intrapreneurship dimensions (innovation, risk taking and proactivity). This finding is important when it is thought that the actor of social innovation is social entrepreneurs. This data emphasizes that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between social entrepreneurs and intrapreneurship. It can be argued that there is a common relationship between risk taking and innovation tendencies.

Eren (2010: 132 - 158) did a field study on 767 students from 10 different universities (state and foundation universities) in different faculties and departments. He has assessed individual characteristics (creativity, innovation, risk taking, proactivity, control ability, independence instinct) with social innovation; the finding is that individuals who increase tolerance to innovation, risk taking, proactivity, and uncertainty, become strong social innovation tendencies. It was revealed that the risk taking and innovation tendencies are affected by social innovation in this study.

Social innovation is an implementation that deals with social problems from innovation's perspective. The implementations are carried out by intrapreneurship within the organizations. For this reason, the dimensions of intrapreneurship and the dimension of social innovation are discussed.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The basic contribution of the research to the literature; the interaction between intrapreneurship behavior and social innovation is revealed. The trends are examined thanks to the interaction between the social innovativeness variable and the intrapreneurship variables in the research model are bilaterally analyzed. Intrapreneurship dimensions, which are complex and multifaceted, and social innovation have been addressed. The effects of intrapreneurship tendencies on social innovativeness tendencies have been interpreted and have been found to be influenced by intrapreneurship dimensions. The innovativeness which is a sub-dimension of entrepreneurship, is relationship between social innovation

appears highly. It is clear that there is a relation between the innovativeness, which is the sub-dimension of entrepreneurship, and social innovation. In this context; it is found out that there is not a meaningful difference between the fulfilling of bank employees' social mission and objectives and self-confidence and proactivity tendencies which are a sub-dimension of entrepreneurship

Not only intrapreneurship behavior should be viewed as beneficial for the private sector but also public institutions need intrapreneurship behavior to improve service activities. Because public institutions are a part of social and economic life. Both sectors are very important to gain the intrapreneurship behavior.

Entrepreneurs can enhance the effectiveness of existing resources and canalize resources in the direction of social goals and missions. We need to design all layers of society to act within social responsibility, not only for once but continuously . For this reason, although life is not fair, it is important that all institutions meet under the umbrella of social values. These values umbrella are necessary: increasing social welfare, combating poverty, preventing youth unemployment, social problems such as education, the environment, health, discrimination etc. to resolve.

There is need for social innovation models which are based on best practices, are provided creating inspiring learning and performance resources for decision making to encourage. Within the scope of the research results, some suggestions are made to lead the top managers, authorized public officials, researchers and stakeholders of all kinds of organizations. Result of the research, there are suggestions for all levels of administrative staff to guide. Social values, social entrepreneurship (social enterprise), and social enterprise are provided service training programs, courses, seminars, workshops, conferences about social innovation to all level employees on behalf of non-profit organizations, businesses organizations and public organizations in order to understand better social problems, create more effective solutions and participate in solutions actively.

Managers can take into account criteria such as innovative, entrepreneurial, risk taking and proactivity, ability to solve social problems and can encourage employees to improve these attributes. Managers can organize reward programs, projects, group activities within the organization. Through events, managers can get new ideas and turn them into new products and services. Social productions will increase both the value of the organization and enable employees to integrate with the society and work more effectively and efficiently.

References

- Aca, V., Deniz Büyükaslan H.. (2016). “Aile İletmelerinde Ç Giri İncili in Sosyal Giri İncili e Etkisi: Afyonkarahisar’da Bir Ara tırma, Kastamonu”, Kastamonu Üniversitesi ktisadi ve dari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 13: 200 – 220.
- Akın, A. (2007). “Öz-güven Ölçe i’nin geli tirilmesi ve psikometrik özellikleri”, Abant Bolu: zzet Baysal Üniversitesi E itim Fakültesi Dergisi, 167 – 176.
- Antonic B., Hisrich R. D. (2003). “Clarifying The Intrapreneurship Concept”, Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, V.10, Issue:1, pp. 7 – 24.
- Antonic B., Hisrich R. D. (2001). “Intrapreneurship: Construct Refinement and Cross – Cultural Validation”, Journal of Business Venturing, Elsevier Science, 16: 495 – 527.
- Cell E. (2008). “The Entrepreneurial Personality A Social Construction Second edition”, USA: New York, Routledge.
- C. Menzel, H., Aaltio I., M. Ulijn J. (2007), “On the way to creativity: Engineers as intrapreneurs in organizations”, Technovation, Elsevier Ltd., doi:10.1016/j.technovation.2007.05.004, 27:732 – 743.
- Eren, H. (2010). “Üniversite Ö rencilerinin Sosyal Yenilikçilik Kapasitelerinin Teknolojik Yenilikçilik E ilimlerine Etkisini Ölçmeye Yönelik Bir Model Önerisi”, Kara Harp Okulu Savunma Bilimleri Enstitüsü Teknoloji Yönetimi Ana Bilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Ankara.

Ferreira, J. (2002). "Corporate Entrepreneurship: A Strategic and Structural Perspective", Working Paper.

Güney, S. (2015)., "Girişimcilik Temel Kavramlar ve Bazı Güncel Konular", Siyasal Kitabevi, Ankara.

Gürel E., Bulgurcu B. (2012). "Çalışma Girişimcilik: Bir Literatür Taraması," Gümüşhane Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Elektronik Dergisi, Sayı 6: 56 – 75.

Özçelikleli, Taşer At. (2011). The Effects of Business Education On Entrepreneurship Characteristics: An Empirical Study, Online: International Journal Of Business And Management Studies, Vol 3, No 2: 121 – 130.

İplik, V. (2013). "Kurumsal Sosyal Sorumluluğun Değerlendirildiği Çalışma Kavramı ve Yeni Bir Çalışma Alanı Olarak Sosyal Girişimciler", Ankara: T.C Sosyal Güvenlik Kurumu Sosyal Güvenlik Dergisi Cilt 3, Sayı 1: 101 – 131.

Jongedijk J.P.J., S.K. Parker, S. Wenneker, C. Wuiv (2011). "Corporate Entrepreneurship at the Individual Level: Measurement and Determinants,"working paper, Netherlands: EIM Research Reports.

Kanbur E. (2015). "Çalışanların Bireysel Yaratıcılık Düzeylerinin Çalışma Girişimcilik Performansları Üzerindeki Etkisinde Algılanan Örgütsel Destek Aracılık Rolü", Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İktisadi İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bilim Dalı, Doktora Tezi, Tokat.

Kazançoğlu, Taşkın D. (2016). "Sosyal inovasyon ile Sakin emirlerarasındaki İlişkinin Sosyal Girişimciler Açısından İncelenmesi: Seferihisar Örneği", İzmir: Ege Strateji Araştırmalar Dergisi, Cilt 7: 135 – 161.

Kızıllıoğlu M., Brahimoğlu N. (2013). "Çalışma Girişimcilik Olgusunun Yenilik Yapabilme Becerisine Etkisi: Gaziantep'te Faaliyet Gösteren Yenilikçi Örgütlerde Bir Uygulama", Antalya: Uluslararası Antalya İktisadi İdari ve Sosyal Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt 5, Sayı 3:105 – 117.

Johanna M., Ignasi M. (2006). "Social Entrepreneurship Research: A Source of Explanation, Prediction and Delight", Journal of World Business, online, Elsevier, 41:36 – 44.

Nandan M., London M., Bent-Goodley T. (2015). "Social Workers as Social Change Agents: Social Innovation, Social Intrapreneurship and Social Entrepreneurship", Human Service Organization: Management, Leadership & Governance, Online, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC, 39:38 – 56.

Newth J., Woods C. (2014). “Resistance to Social Entrepreneurship: How Context Shapes Innovation”, *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, Onile, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC, Vol. 5, No.2, 192 – 213.

Özdemir, F., Ar M. (2015). “Sosyal Yenilik Üzerine Bir Alan Ara tırması”, ed.: Cevahir UZKURT, stanbul: Giri imcilik ve novasyon Yönetimi Dergisi, Beta Basım Yayım Da ıtım A. , Sayı 1:17 – 43.

Pinchot, III, G. (1985). “Intrapreneuring: Why you don’t have to leave the corporation to become entrepreneur”, Harper and Row Publishers, New York.

Serikan C., Arat G. (2013). “ letmelerde Örgütsel De i im ve ç Giri imcilik”, Beta Basım A. , stanbul.

Tan W.L. (2010).“Nonprofit Organisations and Social Entrepreneurship Intentions”, St. Gallen, Research Collection Lee Kong Chian School of Business.

Timuro lu M. K., Çakır S. (2014). “Giri imcilerin Yeni Bir Giri im Yapma Niyetlerinin Risk Alma E ilimi ile li kisi”, Afyonkarahisar: Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi ktisadi ve dari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 2: 119 – 136.

Yıldırım, H. H. (2016). “Ar-Ge Reform Paketinin Dü ündürdükleri: Sosyal novasyon, Sosyal Giri imcilik ve Sosyo teknokentler,”Sa lık ve nsan Dergisi, Ankara.

http://ec.europa.eu/internal_market/conferences/2014/0116-social-entrepreneurs/docs/strasbourg-declaration_en.pdf, “European Union, Strasbourg Declaration,” (Access Date: 21.04.2017).