

Jaka Vadnjal¹

INNOVATIVE BUSINESS GROWTH STRATEGY: INTRODUCTION OF CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The paper investigates the possibility of corporate entrepreneurship introduction as a possible growth strategy in a large commercial company. The basic ways of corporate entrepreneurship principles implementation options and conditions in a corporation are discussed. 4 factors are introduced which are of crucial importance for its implementation, and human resource factor was chosen to be measured. The research explores, which of two major groups of employees express higher level of entrepreneurialism: office workers or field work/sales force. The hypothesis postulates that employees from field sales force would be more appropriate to serve as corporate entrepreneurs than employees working in offices, mainly back office. The hypothesis was confirmed by the survey results. Cluster analysis was applied and two groups of employees turned out as a result. Therefore, it can be concluded that employees from field sales force team are expected to be more appropriate for taking over franchises as corporate entrepreneurs. This can be explained mostly by the readiness of field sales workers to have flexible hours with clearly defined focus and variable rewarding system.

Keywords: entrepreneurship; international corporation; growth strategy; human resources; corporate entrepreneurship.

Жака Ваднял

СТРАТЕГІЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНОГО РОСТУ БІЗНЕСУ: ВПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ВНУТРІШНЬОКОРПОРАТИВНОГО ПІДПРИЄМНИЦТВА

У статті досліджено внутрішньокорпоративне підприємництво як можливу стратегію росту всередині великої комерційної компанії. Описано умови та способи розвитку внутрішнього підприємництва. Як найбільш значний чинник його розвитку визначено кадровий. Досліджено, яка група персоналу більш схильна до підприємництва – офісні співробітники чи ті, хто залучені до виїзних продажів. Попередня гіпотеза: друга група може бути більш схильною до внутрішнього підприємництва, особливо у порівнянні зі співробітниками бек-офісу. Результати кластерного аналізу підтвердили висунуту гіпотезу. Таким чином, якщо корпорація приймає рішення про розширення шляхом франчайзингу, найбільш вдалими кандидатурами для внутрішньокорпоративного підприємництва є менеджери з виїзних продажів. Частково це може бути пояснено схильністю даної групи персоналу до гнучкого графіку роботи та оплати за результатами. Ключові слова: міжнародна корпорація; стратегія росту; людські ресурси; внутрішньокорпоративне підприємництво.

Табл. 2. Літ. 33.

Жака Ваднял

СТРАТЕГІЯ ІННОВАЦІЙНОГО РОСТА БІЗНЕСА: ВНЕДРЕНИЕ ВНУТРИКОРПОРАТИВНОГО ПРЕДПРИНИМАТЕЛЬСТВА

В статье исследовано внутрикорпоративное предпринимательство как возможная стратегия роста внутри большой коммерческой компании. Описаны условия и способы развития внутреннего предпринимательства. Как наиболее важный фактор его развития определён кадровый. Исследовано, какая группа персонала более склонна к предпринимательству – офисные сотрудники или те, кто занимается выездными

¹ GEA College of entrepreneurship, Piran, Slovenia.

продажами. Предварительная гипотеза: вторая группа может быть больше склонна к внутреннему предпринимательству, особенно по сравнению с сотрудниками бек-офиса. Результаты кластерного анализа подтвердили данное предположение. Таким образом, если корпорация принимает решение о расширении путём франчайзинга, наиболее подходящими кандидатурами для внутрикорпоративного предпринимательства являются менеджеры по выездным продажам. Частично это может быть объяснено склонностью данной группы персонала к гибкому графику работы и оплате по результату. Ключевые слова: международная корпорация; стратегия роста; человеческие ресурсы; внутрикорпоративное предпринимательство.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurial organization is defined (Morris et al., 2008) as one that proactively seeks to grow and is not constrained by resources currently under its control. Organizations are recognizing a strong need for corporate entrepreneurship, largely as a result of rapidly growing, new and sophisticated competitors, a sense of distrust of traditional management, and an exodus of many of the best employees, who are leaving organization to start their own companies. Today's organizations are therefore seeking avenues for developing in-house entrepreneurship; as otherwise will result in stagnation and personnel loss. Organizations are therefore encouraged to develop entrepreneurial spirit within organizational boundaries, thus allowing for an atmosphere of innovation to prosper. This new corporate revolution represents an appreciation for and a desire to develop and encourage corporate entrepreneurs within the organizational structure.

Conditions in the global business environment demand that established firms adopt different entrepreneurial strategies (Ahuja & Morris Lampert, 2001) as a path to innovation as a prerequisite for sustainable growth and success. For example, "entrepreneurial strategies suggest ways to revitalize existing organizations and make them more innovative" and "entrepreneurial strategies allow people to be innovative, creative, and responsible for decisions that they make" (Meyer & Heppard, 2000). By pursuing entrepreneurial strategies, firms place themselves in the positions to regularly and systematically recognize and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities. Pinchot (1985) coined the term "intrapreneurship" (as a synonymous for "corporate entrepreneurship"), short for intracorporate entrepreneurship, which describes the practice of entrepreneurship within organizations. Intrapreneurship and/or corporate entrepreneurship is increasingly becoming a term used in the business world to describe organizations willing and creating working environment to pursue opportunities, initiate actions, and emphasize innovative products or services.

Corporate entrepreneurship can also be defined as (Sharma & Chisman, 1999) "the process whereby an individual or a group of individuals, in association with an existing organization, create a new organization or instigate renewal or innovation within that organization". Corporate entrepreneur is a person within a large corporation who takes direct responsibility for turning an idea into a profitable finished product or service through assertive risk-taking and innovation (Hayton, 2004).

This paper goes on as follow. After the introduction a literature survey is presented in order to set up and justify the proposed hypothesis to be confirmed or rejected through data gathering and analysis. After a brief presentation of sampling and justification of methodology, the results are extensively discussed in order to set up a framework for final conclusions and implications of this particular study.

2. Literature overview

Corporate entrepreneurship is often understood as the result of successful search for entrepreneurial opportunities arising from market asymmetries or technological knowledge. Exploiting these asymmetries leads entrepreneurial firms to be able to gain entrepreneurial profits. Firms with an entrepreneurial orientation are able to continuously identify and exploit such opportunities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). In order to be able to do so, firms should be able and willing to take risks, be innovative and proactive (Miller, 1983). The reward for such an orientation is superior financial and market performance including profitability (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2001; Chandler et al., 2000; Loof & Heshmati, 2002; Zahra & Covin, 1995; Kavun et al., 2013). Underlying an entrepreneurial orientation is a tendency to pursue the creation and acquisition of new knowledge and integration of new knowledge and capabilities with existing resources in new combinations. Therefore, corporate entrepreneurship is dependent upon a firm's ability to continuously learn and sustainably develop (Floyd & Wooldridge, 1999; McGrath, 2001), by creating and exploiting new combinations of knowledge. Management of corporate entrepreneurial processes is distinct from traditional management because of the conditions of greater uncertainty and knowledge-intensity (Kanter, 1985). The trend towards network organizations represents a major opportunity for corporate entrepreneurship. First, network organizations provide many preconditions necessary for corporate entrepreneurs to thrive: a license to build relationships laterally, horizontally and with external parties, as a means of getting things done; a reasonable level of discretion to pursue an idea before having to justify it; and a greater openness in head office to new ideas. Second, and more relevant for this paper, network organization provides a ready metaphor for understanding the roles that corporate entrepreneurs can take (Birkinshaw, 1998).

Entrepreneurial culture needs to be implemented in existing companies to be an essential part of existence or growth at new and changing markets. Today companies need to stimulate employees with innovative and entrepreneurial skills and give them opportunities to realize their ideas at a workplace. Corporate entrepreneurship is stimulating organizations for learning and increasing human and intellectual capital (Dess et al., 2003). Recently there has been a growing interest in the use of corporate entrepreneurship as a means for corporations to enhance the innovative abilities of their employees and, at the same time, increase corporate success through the creation of the corporate ventures (Ireland et al., 2009). Companies that follow a strategy of corporate entrepreneurship often pursue growth through new venture opportunities and strategic renewal. They effectively follow this strategic sustainable advantages and yield above-average returns utilizing 5 dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship including autonomy, innovativeness, proactiveness, competitive aggressiveness and risk-taking (Dess & Lumpkin, 2005).

Kuratko et al. (2005a) contend that middle-level managers endorse, refine, and shepherd entrepreneurial opportunities and identify, acquire, and deploy resources needed to pursue those opportunities while other employees have experimenting roles corresponding to their competences. Narayan et al. (2009) demonstrated that organizations pursuing corporate entrepreneurship strategies exhibit a cascading yet integrated set of entrepreneurial actions at the senior, middle, and first-levels of management.

Specific organizational antecedents of managers' entrepreneurial actions have been identified in literature: top management support, work discretion, rewards/reinforcement, time availability, organizational boundaries (Kuratko et al., 1990; Hornsby et al., 1999, 2002). Management support refers to the extent to which one perceives that top managers support, facilitate, and promote entrepreneurial behavior; including championing of innovative ideas and providing resources people require to take entrepreneurial actions (Lyon et al., 2000; Antoncic & Hisrich, 2002; Kuratko et al., 2001; Hornsby, et al., 2009; Morris et al., 2008) and has been found to have a positive relationship with organization's entrepreneurial outcomes. Managers differ in their structural ability to use top management support as a resource for entrepreneurial action. The more senior a manager is, the closer he/she is to top management. This closeness enables greater awareness of the nature of that support (Floyd & Lane, 2000; Floyd & Wooldridge, 1994). While first-line managers may be aware of top management support they do not have the structural "proximity" to have a fine-grained knowledge of the nature of that support (Hales, 2005).

A commercial service firm operating in several countries of Central and Eastern Europe region was facing a challenge of redefining and adapting its growth strategy. The main distribution channel had so far been a number of small retail shops called "One-stop-spot", located mostly in well-populated places like supermarkets, where customers can get all relevant information to make a purchasing decision at the later appointed visit at their homes done by a sales person. There was an identified need to expand the number of one-stop-spots to enhance the geographic coverage of the service. An option of franchising these shops was put on forward as a possible idea for solving this issue. However, franchising could not be expected as an of-the-shelf solution but just as framework for conceptualizing this strategy thus, a certain level of entrepreneurial spirit is expected from future franchisees in order to be able to penetrate the competitive market which was the main objective of the planned growth.

For the case of this particular research aiming to recognize possible franchisees – entrepreneurs, their entrepreneurial spirit is measured on the basis of the perceived level of self-initiative (Lee & Peterson, 2001), creativity (Ko & Butler, 2007), leadership skills (Fernald et al., 2005), motivation for setting up new business (Shane et al., 2003), self-efficacy (Zhao et al., 2005) and entrepreneurial and managerial skills (Pansiri & Temtime, 2008). In order to recognize entrepreneurial potential from existing middle managers, future candidates to become franchisees – entrepreneurs, a research project was proposed to benchmark individuals against the "prototype". The key objective of the study was to examine which employees of the targeted company seemed to be more appropriate to take over the management on new, independent and self-standing outlets (possibly franchises) of the One-spot-stop. This was the first research attempt within the target company. However, several studies have been conducted in the past in different sectors, including services (Phan, 2009). These represent a sound theoretical base for the design of the present research.

On the literature basis, subjective experience of the researcher and some research from known companies, encouraged by some previous results in consulting the same target company the main hypothesis was pointed out.

H1: People working for "mobile team" would come out as more suitable to become future leaders and managers of new retailing set-ups of a main company. That

means they express higher level of self-initiative, creativity, leadership skills, motivation for setting up new business, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial and managerial skills.

3. Methodology and sampling

A qualitative study was conducted with senior management of the investigated company in order to clarify growing objectives of the firm and expectations of the study. A questionnaire was designed to assess mostly entrepreneurial characteristics and ambitions of the targeted individuals. The following groups of variable were covered in the questionnaire: the level of self-initiative, creativity, leadership skills, motivation for setting up new business, self-efficacy, entrepreneurial and managerial skills. All questions were designed in the form of 5-level Likert scale measuring the level of agreement with particular statements. It was expected that the filling-in of questionnaire should not take more than 20 minutes of the respondents' time.

About 200 individuals from the current sales force were invited to fill in the questionnaires at a corporate training event. This was a very opportunistic approach where everybody participated and was difficult to ignore the questionnaire, so the 94% response rate was achieved. On the other hand, one could argue the respondents might have not cooperated voluntarily. The responses were analyzed with the standardized tools of multivariate statistic ANOVA, clustering and χ^2 -test analyses. In the next section the results of the cluster analysis are presented and discussed.

4. Results

For the purpose of searching for the expected two groups of respondents (entrepreneurs and administrators) cluster analysis was performed on the variables describing entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals. Cluster analysis is used to design several groups of the respondents. For the purpose of this research QUICKCLUSTER program from SPSS, was used. This was the non-hierarchical method which automatically proposes a number of clusters. The significance of differences on variables in the Table 1 was checked with the Leven's statistics and ANOVA test. The results of the cluster analysis are collected in Table 1.

Table 1. Cluster analysis

	Cluster		Total sample		ANOVA	
	ENT N=148	ADM N=40	Mean	STD	F	Sign.
I can achieve my own and company's goals even if I don't get instructions from managers.	4,35	3,90	4,26	0,66	8,05	0,006
I am always looking for innovative approaches, in order to achieve goals faster and easier.	4,46	3,70	4,30	0,75	19,62	0,000
It is better to take actions and fail than not acting at all.	4,59	4,05	4,48	0,58	16,04	0,000
I am willing to start my venture and take responsibilities for success and failure.	4,73	2,85	4,33	0,98	154,42	0,000
If I get an opportunity to be franchisee and open a (franchised) outlet, I would take this opportunity immediately.	4,09	2,60	3,77	1,17	35,32	0,000
If I get an opportunity to be franchisee and open a (franchised) outlet, I would take this responsibility immediately (employees, finance, sales).	3,92	2,40	3,60	1,31	26,88	0,000
I enjoy field-working and direct marketing.	4,54	2,75	4,16	1,02	100,68	0,000

Continuation of Table 1

I prefer working 8 hours in the field than in the office.	4,20	2,35	3,81	1,17	68,27	0,000
I have many suggestions how to improve company performance (innovation etc.).	3,73	3,15	3,61	0,82	8,52	0,004
I am trying to implement my ideas about improving company's performance.	4,00	3,25	3,84	0,74	19,52	0,000
I have high understanding of products that I am selling.	4,50	4,10	4,41	0,56	8,81	0,004
When talking / advising to clients, I always do my best.	4,64	4,25	4,55	0,58	7,43	0,008
I am participating on a sufficient number of trainings/seminars to be able to perform my job well.	4,18	3,60	4,05	0,96	6,04	0,016
Company is offering me enough trainings / seminars to be able to perform my job well.	4,39	3,70	4,24	0,98	8,47	0,005
My colleagues often ask me for advice as I have a lot of knowledge.	4,15	3,45	4,00	0,84	12,12	0,001
I have leadership abilities.	4,36	3,00	4,07	0,82	81,40	0,000
My employees estimate me as good leader.	4,16	3,05	3,92	0,96	27,50	0,000
Desire for success – higher performance	4,38	3,00	4,09	0,98	46,33	0,000
Independence – working for yourself	3,64	2,42	3,38	1,12	23,95	0,000
Authority, power – to be a leader	4,34	2,95	4,04	1,04	40,14	0,000
Money – higher income	2,82	2,93	2,85	1,11	0,16	0,692
Career – better future in own venture	3,91	2,35	3,57	1,20	36,93	0,00
Status, prestige – progressing on social scale	4,47	3,35	4,23	0,97	27,27	0,00
Flexible schedule	4,24	2,50	3,87	1,03	89,87	0,00
In my home town, there are good possibilities to start a venture.	4,15	2,15	3,73	1,18	92,52	0,00
I am planning to establish my own company in 3 years.	4,41	3,05	4,12	0,93	52,60	0,00
I have skills and competences to start a business.	1,96	3,10	2,20	1,17	17,90	0,00
Fear of failure could stop me from starting a new business.	3,75	3,25	3,65	0,86	5,76	0,02
Your energy level	4,28	3,90	4,20	0,70	4,98	0,03
Desire for success	4,18	3,10	3,95	0,85	34,79	0,00
Risk taking	4,41	3,65	4,24	0,73	20,47	0,00
Creativity	4,41	3,70	4,26	0,76	15,66	0,00
Need for social life	4,36	3,35	4,15	0,83	31,28	0,00
Money	3,45	2,70	3,29	0,94	11,41	0,00
Uncertainty tolerance	4,51	4,25	4,45	0,62	2,79	0,10
Good relationships with co-workers	4,36	4,05	4,30	0,64	3,98	0,05
Self-esteem	3,72	2,60	3,48	0,96	27,41	0,00
Need for power	4,04	4,30	4,10	0,79	1,71	0,19
Competitiveness	3,81	3,10	3,66	0,87	11,59	0,00
Initiative	4,20	3,05	3,96	0,82	47,05	0,00
Persistence	4,62	4,00	4,49	0,62	19,34	0,00
Adaptability, flexibility	4,49	4,04	4,40	0,63	9,11	0,00
Innovativeness	4,14	3,10	3,91	0,90	26,55	0,00
Leadership	4,26	2,90	3,97	0,85	70,31	0,00
I am good at estimating costs for starting a business venture.	3,86	3,05	3,69	0,87	16,14	0,00
I am good at preparing a financial plan for starting a business venture.	3,75	2,85	3,56	0,97	15,85	0,00
I am good at collecting information for starting a business venture.	3,84	2,90	3,64	0,89	21,29	0,00
I am good at estimating sales amount for starting a business venture.	3,68	2,65	3,46	0,81	34,04	0,00
As entrepreneur I would perform well in HRM department.	4,22	3,10	3,98	0,78	49,66	0,00
As entrepreneur I would perform well in marketing and sales.	4,18	2,85	3,89	0,87	58,84	0,00

Source: Own research, 2011.

Note: ENT (repreneurs), ADM (inistrators).

There is a need to point out that the values of ANOVA test presented in Table 1 are exclusively used for describing purposes only because particular clusters are computed so that the differences between clusters are as big as possible and the distances between cluster contest are the largest possible. The degrees of statistical significance therefore cannot be interpreted as a confirmation of hypothesis validity, but only as description or confirmation of utilisability of the chosen statistical method for classification of employees in the two expected groups. The test of variance homogeneity or the Leven statistics tests the null-hypothesis of equality of variance of different variables (Hair et al., 1998). It shows relatively high value on 5 variables which points out a possibility of existence of certain number of latent variables. The possibility of heteroscedasticity would make sense to test with Box M-test which would probably lead to the consequence that for future research would demand a redefinition of the variable matrix or exclusion of certain variables that would perform some interdependence.

For the objective interpretation the values of the responses equal or greater than half of the standard deviation away from the mean value are underlined (Birley & Westhead, 1994) in Table 1. Thus, it can be stated that both clusters do have certain characteristics. However, majority of significant characteristics or meanings do prove that administrators are far away from becoming entrepreneurs. On the other hand we should be aware that these revealed characteristics may be a consequence or a result of the unbalanced sample. This is the reason why they do not deserve further discussion in this paper.

As shown in Table 1, entrepreneurial employees are more inclined to go for fulfilment and search for new approaches. They wish to take over full responsibility to accomplish all given tasks. They like to work with customers and are prepared to invest a lot of energy into customers' relationships. They seek all the time for improvements and use a great deal of their natural innovativeness and creativity. They express a clear and explicit interest to open and lead an outlet in the form of franchise or in a different legal setup. All the differences in mean value between mobile and fixed network participants are statistically significant at the 5% confidence interval which contributes to the confirmation of the hypothesis. Entrepreneurial employees in all aspects express higher level of leadership skills, with higher level of respect against coworkers, self-esteem for managerial abilities and opinion of subordinates about their own leadership abilities. All mean differences are statistically significant at the 5% confidence interval thus contributing to the confirmation of the proposed hypothesis.

People from the entrepreneurial cluster in most cases express higher motivation for entrepreneurship. They are more confident about their better use of abilities. They express higher appreciation for independency and flexible working hours, opportunity to be a leader they have higher desire for better earnings and see better options for their careers development and opportunity to climb the social ladder. On the other hand, "entrepreneurs" feel less fear of failure and regard themselves more competent to run own business. In their environment they are alert for more business opportunities. All the differences in means are statistically significant at least at the 5% confidence interval, which leads to the conclusion that the hypothesis may be entirely confirmed.

Employees of the entrepreneurial cluster highly appreciate self-efficacy elements like their level of energy, need for achievements, readiness to take risks, creativity and innovativeness, social skills and good relationships with coworkers. They are more self-conscious, competitive, persistent and flexible. All the differences in means are statistically significant at least at the 5% confidence interval, which suggest the conclusion that the hypothesis may be entirely confirmed.

Employees from the entrepreneurial cluster are more self-conscious regarding the ability to evaluate costs, preparation of financial plans, collecting information and ability to forecast business activity. Higher than their colleagues from the administrative group they evaluate their own abilities to be successful in managing human resources and marketing, once they will serve in their own company, as is evident from Table 2. All mean values are statistically significant at least at the 5% confidence interval which means that the hypothesis can be confirmed.

Specifically, (1) the positive relationship between managerial support and entrepreneurial action is more positive for senior and middle level managers than it is for lower-(first) level managers, and (2) the positive relationship between work discretion and entrepreneurial action is more positive for senior and middle level managers than it is for the first-level managers. These findings suggest that managerial level provides a structural ability to make more of organizational factors that support entrepreneurial actions.

In Table 2 the classification of employees into the field sales force and back-office team is presented. It comes out that the great majority of the mobile team is in the entrepreneurial cluster, while the greatest proportion of the back-office support is in the administrative cluster. The relative distribution frequencies were tested, which even proved the statistically significant differences ($\chi^2 = 8,61$; $DF = 2$; $\alpha = 0,013$) which shows very good fit between the two sub-samples, entrepreneurs/administrators and field-sales/back-office team members. Thus, the hypothesis can be confirmed that the employees of the mobile network are more appropriate to become corporate entrepreneurs than the employees in the back office.

Table 2. Classification of employees into clusters

	Cluster 1 Entrepreneurs		Cluster 2 Administrators		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
	Field sales force	119	67,05	8	4,55	127
Back-office team	16	9,09	35	13,64	51	22,73
Other	6	3,41	4	2,27	10	5,68
Total	141	79,55	47	20,45	188	100,00

Source: Own research, 2011.

Conclusions and implications

The key objective of the study was to examine which employees of the studied company seemed to be more appropriate to take over the management on new, independent and self-standing outlets (possibly franchises). Generally, behaviour of two different types of sales force was examined: back-office people and people working out in the field visiting customers and closing deals.

The main hypothesis pointed out was that people working as the so-called "field sales force" would come out as more suitable to become leaders and managers of these

new retailing set-ups of the main company. The set of questions might have been split into 5 subareas in which the following influencing factors were examined: self-initiative and creativity, leadership, motivation, self-efficacy and finally entrepreneurial and managerial skills. The results show that people who are through the clusters analysis classified into the entrepreneurial cluster overcome their colleagues in the administrative cluster in almost all the variables examined. Secondly, the chi-square test proves a very good fit between the compared samples with the division of self-expressed field sales force and back-office team and computed administrative and entrepreneurial clusters. The results proved the hypotheses confirmed. It may be concluded, that employees working in field sales are indeed a more appropriate choice once the new outlets are staffed or franchised.

The company's management should put more emphasis to the examined entrepreneurial factors once they make decisions to which the leadership of new entrepreneurial ventures will be trusted. Those candidates who seem to be the closest match to the profile of the so-called "ideal prototype of the corporate entrepreneur" should enjoy certain advantage over other candidates. From the research point of view an applied tool will be developed in order to assess particular candidates to become new venture vehicles. The tool will be operated within the context of the development of a sustainable HR function with the longer term objective to identify gaps between the desired and available personal characteristics and knowledge and skills of future candidates. Thus, the proposed tool will enable the HR department in the company to systematically design education and training plans but, also individual coaching and tutoring sessions and applied other methods with the main objective to overcome the identified individual gaps and catalyze long-term personal development of the candidates according to the needs of the company in the field of corporate entrepreneurship as the main growing strategy of the firm.

From the viewpoint of possible future research a more indepth analysis of corporate entrepreneurship factors and indicators is possible. There is, however, one main and from several previous pieces of research known pitfall of such studies: only entrepreneurial intentions are measured which would definitely not all come true if a longitudinal research would be possible in which one would examine also the ratio of those respondents who clearly expressed the intention and interest for entrepreneurial path within the existing company and, once formally enabled within the system, actually fulfill these intentions. One special challenge for the researchers would also be to replicate the research methodology on a different sample within the similar company. Several iterations of research would in the long run definitely increase the reliability of the proposed assessment tool for future candidates for corporate entrepreneurs in different companies not only in commercial services but also other industries.

There are two levels of implications. On the first level, the study will be able to give discrete recommendations for the designers of the forthcoming new strategy of the firm. It will draw a picture of the ideal corporate entrepreneur, a role model with several characteristics which will be expected from potential new franchisees – corporate entrepreneurs. On the second level, a tool which would be possible to adapt for the cases of other firms will be developed with possible applications for consulting purposes. On the third level, several needs for specialized training programs in the field of corporate entrepreneurship will evolve from the study.

The value of the study is at least in two points. One is that it appears to be one of the first studies in the country and in the region examining the conditions and possibilities of introducing corporate entrepreneurship as a strategic approach in the commercial sector. This will contribute to higher level of understanding of the role of corporate entrepreneurship in the country and region. A very practical value of the study will be the possibility to design an easy-adaptive consulting tool for possible replication of the introduction of corporate entrepreneurship into another company.

The possible weakness of this research is the limitation that the findings belong only to one company. Thus, possible influences of particular corporate culture cannot be eliminated. Thus, for the generalization of findings and suggested implications, the replication of the research should be performed on one or multiple companies in similar or other industries.

References:

- Ahuja, G., Morris Lampert, C. (2001). Entrepreneurship in the large corporation: a longitudinal study of how established firms create breakthrough inventions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6–7): 521–543.
- Antoncic, B., Hisrich, R.D. (2002). Intrapreneurship: constructive refinement and cross cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5): 495–527.
- Birkinshaw, J. (1998). Corporate entrepreneurship in network organizations: How subsidiary initiative drives internal market efficiency. *European Management Journal*, 16(3): 355–364.
- Birley, S., Westhead, P. (1994). A taxonomy of business start-up reasons and their impact on growth and size. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(1): 7–31.
- Dess, G.G., Ireland, D.R., Zahra, S.A., Floyd, S.W., Janney, J.J., Lane, P.J. (2003). Emerging issues in corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3): 351–378.
- Dess, G.G., Lumpkin, G.T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1): 147–156.
- Lloyd, W.F., Jr., Solomon, G.T., Tarabishy, A. (2005). A New Paradigm: Solopreneurial leadership. *Southern Business Review*, 30(2): 1–10.
- Floyd, S.W., Wooldridge, B. (1999). Knowledge creation and social networks in corporate entrepreneurship: The renewal of organizational capability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3): 123–144.
- Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L., Black, W.C. (1998). *Multivariate analysis*. Englewood: Prentice Hall International.
- Hales, C. (2005). Rooted in supervision, branching into management: continuity and change in the role of first-line manager. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(3): 471–506.
- Hayton, J.C. (2004). Strategic human capital management in SMEs: An empirical study of entrepreneurial performance. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 42(4): 375–391.
- Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F., Montagno, R.V. (1999). Perception of internal factors for corporate entrepreneurship: a comparison of Canadian and U.S. managers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(2): 9–24.
- Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F., Zahra, S.A. (2002). Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(3): 49–63.
- Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F., Shepherd D.A., Bott, J.P. (2009). Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions: Examining perception and position. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3): 236–246.
- Ireland, R.D., Covin, J.G., Kuratko, D.F. (2009). Conceptualising corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1): 19–46.
- Kanter, R.M. (1985). Supporting innovation and venture development in established companies. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(1): 47–61.
- Kavun, S., Caleta, D., Vrsec, M., Brumnik, R. (2013). Estimation of the effectiveness and functioning of enterprises in boards of corporate security. *European journal of scientific research*, 104(2): 304–323.
- Ko, S., Butler, J.E. (2007). Creativity: A key link to entrepreneurial behavior. *Business Horizons*, 50(5): 365–372.

Kuratko, D.F., Montagno, R.V., Hornsby, J.S. (1990). Developing an entrepreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(1): 49–58.

Kuratko, D.F., Ireland, R.D., Hornsby, J.S. (2001). Improving firm performance through entrepreneurial actions: Acordia's corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4): 60–71.

Lumpkin, G.T., Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 135–173.

Lee, S.M., Peterson, S.J. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness. *Journal of World Business*, 35(4): 401–416.

Lyon, D.W., Lumpkin, G.T., Dess, G.G. (2000). Enhancing entrepreneurial orientation research: operationalizing and measuring a key strategic decision making process. *Journal of Management*, 26(5): 1055–1085.

McGrath, R. (2001). Exploratory learning, innovative capacity, and managerial oversight. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1): 118–131.

Meyer, G.D., Heppard, K.A. (Eds.) (2000). *Entrepreneurship as strategy: Competing on the entrepreneurial edge*. Sage.

Morris, M.H., Kuratko, D.F., Covin, J.G. (2008). *Corporate entrepreneurship and innovation*. Cincinnati, OH: Thomson/SouthWestern Publishers.

Pansiri, J., Temtime, Z.T. (2008). Assessing managerial skills in SMEs for capacity building. *Journal of Management Development*, 27(2): 251–260.

Phan, P. (2009). Corporate entrepreneurship: Current research and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3): 197–205.

Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring*. New York: Harper, Row Publishers.

Shane, S., Locke, E.A., Collins, C.C. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2): 257–279.

Sharma, P., Chrisman, J.J. (1999). Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3): 11–27.

Zahra, S.A., Covin, J.G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(1): 43–58.

Zhao, H., Seibert, S.E., Hills, G.E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6): 1265–1272.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 23.01.2014.