

Mapping the Landscape of Intrapreneurship Research: Theoretical Foundations and Quantitative Analysis

Dr. Justin W. Webb

Belk Distinguished Professor of Business Innovation, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, USA

Dr. Francesca Gino

Professor of Business Administration, Harvard Business School, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Submission Date: 02 April 2025

Accepted Date: 03 May 2025

Published Date: 01 June 2025

VOLUME: Vol.05 Issue06

Page No. 1-6

ABSTRACT

Intrapreneurship, the entrepreneurial activity within established organizations, has garnered significant attention for its role in fostering innovation, competitive advantage, and organizational renewal. This article provides a comprehensive review of the theoretical constructs underpinning intrapreneurship and a hypothetical bibliometric analysis of the academic literature. We explore the evolution of intrapreneurship as a concept, its key dimensions, and the various individual and organizational factors that influence its emergence and success. Through a hypothetical bibliometric mapping, we identify prominent research themes, influential scholars, key publications, and emerging trends in the field. The aim is to synthesize existing knowledge, highlight research gaps, and propose future directions for scholarly inquiry. Understanding intrapreneurship's theoretical foundations and its research trajectory is crucial for both academics and practitioners seeking to cultivate an entrepreneurial spirit within their organizations.

Keywords: Intrapreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, theoretical constructs, bibliometric analysis, innovation, organizational behavior, self-efficacy, proactive behavior.

INTRODUCTION

In an increasingly dynamic and competitive global economy, the ability of established organizations to innovate and adapt is paramount for sustained success. This imperative has brought intrapreneurship to the forefront of strategic management and organizational behavior research [2, 5]. Intrapreneurship, a term coined by Gifford Pinchot III in the 1980s, refers to the

practice of fostering entrepreneurial behavior within existing corporate structures [9]. It involves employees acting as entrepreneurs, developing new products, services, or processes, and creating new ventures or business units from within the organization [4, 11]. This internal entrepreneurial drive is distinct from traditional entrepreneurship, which typically involves starting a new external venture.

The concept of intrapreneurship is closely related to corporate entrepreneurship, often used interchangeably, though some scholars differentiate them by focusing intrapreneurship specifically on individual employee behavior [8, 11] while corporate entrepreneurship encompasses broader organizational-level initiatives [2, 3]. Regardless of the precise definitional nuances, the core idea revolves around injecting entrepreneurial dynamism into large, often bureaucratic, organizations to overcome inertia, stimulate growth, and enhance competitiveness [10].

The importance of intrapreneurship is multifaceted. It is recognized as a critical driver of innovation, enabling companies to respond to market changes, exploit new opportunities, and maintain a competitive edge [2, 5]. Furthermore, intrapreneurship can significantly impact employee engagement, motivation, and retention, providing avenues for personal and professional growth within the organizational framework [7, 13]. Organizations that successfully foster intrapreneurship often exhibit characteristics such as supportive leadership [1, 23], psychological empowerment [13, 20], and a culture that encourages risk-taking and learning from failure [24].

Despite its recognized importance, the field of intrapreneurship research is complex and multidisciplinary, drawing insights from entrepreneurship, strategic management, organizational psychology, and human resource management. A comprehensive understanding requires not only a synthesis of its theoretical underpinnings but also a quantitative assessment of the research landscape itself. Bibliometric analysis offers a powerful tool for mapping the intellectual structure of a field, identifying key trends, influential works, and collaborative networks [14, 15, 16].

This article aims to provide a dual-faceted review of intrapreneurship research. First, it will synthesize the prominent theoretical constructs and dimensions associated with intrapreneurship, drawing from the existing literature. Second, it will present a hypothetical bibliometric analysis to quantitatively assess the evolution and structure of scholarly contributions in the field. By integrating these two perspectives, this study seeks to:

1. Review the core theoretical constructs and conceptualizations of intrapreneurship.

2. Identify key individual and organizational antecedents and outcomes of intrapreneurial behavior.

3. Hypothetically map the intellectual landscape of intrapreneurship research using bibliometric indicators.

4. Discuss current research gaps and propose avenues for future inquiry.

Through this comprehensive approach, we aim to offer a valuable resource for researchers and practitioners interested in understanding and fostering intrapreneurship within modern organizations.

METHODS

This study employs a two-pronged methodological approach: a theoretical review of intrapreneurship constructs and a hypothetical bibliometric analysis of the relevant literature.

Theoretical Review

The theoretical review component involves a systematic examination of seminal and contemporary academic literature to identify and synthesize the core theoretical constructs of intrapreneurship. This includes tracing the historical development of the concept, analyzing various definitions, and delineating its key dimensions (e.g., innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, self-renewal) [2, 5, 9]. Furthermore, the review focuses on identifying the individual-level characteristics (e.g., proactive personality [12], self-efficacy [20, 21]), organizational factors (e.g., leadership [1, 17, 23], organizational support [20], culture [24]), and contextual influences (e.g., public sector [25], digital transformation [4]) that are theorized to impact intrapreneurial behavior. The selection of literature for this review is based on its relevance to defining, conceptualizing, and explaining the mechanisms of intrapreneurship, drawing heavily from the provided reference list.

Hypothetical Bibliometric Analysis

For the hypothetical bibliometric analysis, we outline a methodology consistent with established practices in the field [14, 15].

1. **Data Source and Search Strategy:** The primary data source for this hypothetical analysis would be a reputable academic database such as Web of Science (WoS) or Scopus, known for their comprehensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature. A targeted search query would be constructed using keywords such as "intrapreneurship," "corporate entrepreneurship," "internal entrepreneurship," "employee entrepreneurship," and "corporate venturing." The

search would be limited to article titles, abstracts, and keywords to ensure high relevance. A hypothetical publication window (e.g., 1985-2024) would be set to capture the evolution of the field since Pinchot's seminal work [9].

2. Data Collection: The search results, including metadata such as authors, affiliations, publication year, journal, abstract, keywords, and citation counts, would be exported for analysis.

3. Bibliometric Software: Specialized bibliometric software, such as VOSviewer or CiteSpace, would be hypothetically employed for data processing and visualization. These tools facilitate various analyses, including co-authorship networks, co-citation analysis, keyword co-occurrence, and thematic mapping [16].

4. Types of Analysis: The hypothetical analysis would encompass:

- o Publication Trends: Annual publication output to illustrate the growth and maturity of the field.
- o Most Productive Authors and Institutions: Identification of leading researchers and their affiliated organizations.
- o Most Influential Publications: Ranking of articles by citation count to pinpoint highly impactful works.
- o Key Journals: Identification of core journals that frequently publish intrapreneurship research.
- o Co-authorship Network Analysis: Visualization of collaboration patterns among researchers.
- o Keyword Co-occurrence Analysis: Mapping of frequently used keywords to identify dominant and emerging research themes. This can reveal clusters of related topics and the evolution of research interests over time [16]. Visualizations like Sankey diagrams could be used to show thematic shifts [18].
- o Citation Analysis: Examination of highly cited articles and authors to understand the intellectual backbone of the field.

The hypothetical results presented in the subsequent section are illustrative, reflecting common patterns observed in bibliometric studies within management and entrepreneurship domains.

RESULTS

(Note: As this is a hypothetical article, the results presented here are illustrative and based on common findings in the literature. Actual research would involve empirical data collection and analysis.)

Theoretical Constructs of Intrapreneurship

The theoretical review reveals that

intrapreneurship, since its inception by Pinchot [9], has evolved from a broad concept of internal venturing to a more nuanced understanding encompassing individual, team, and organizational dimensions. Early conceptualizations often highlighted key behavioral characteristics such as innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking [2, 5]. Innovativeness refers to the pursuit of new ideas, products, or processes; proactiveness involves anticipating and acting on future opportunities; and risk-taking signifies a willingness to commit resources to uncertain ventures [26].

At the individual level, intrapreneurial behavior is often linked to proactive personality [12] and self-efficacy [20, 21]. Employees with higher intrapreneurial self-capital—a construct encompassing self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience—are more likely to engage in intrapreneurial activities [21]. Psychological empowerment is also a significant mediator between organizational support and intrapreneurial behavior, suggesting that when employees feel a sense of meaning, competence, self-determination, and impact, they are more inclined to act intrapreneurially [13, 20].

Organizational antecedents play a crucial role. Authentic leadership and transformational leadership have been identified as key facilitators, fostering an environment where employees feel empowered and identified with the organization's goals, thereby promoting intrapreneurial behavior [1, 23]. Organizational support, including resource provision and managerial encouragement, is consistently found to be vital [20]. Furthermore, research has explored the cultivation of intrapreneurship through specific frameworks and addresses challenges in its implementation [24]. Contextual factors, such as the public sector environment, also influence the manifestation of corporate entrepreneurship [25].

Hypothetical Bibliometric Trends in Intrapreneurship Research

The hypothetical bibliometric analysis reveals a significant growth in intrapreneurship research over the past few decades, particularly accelerating in the 21st century.

Publication Growth and Key Periods

The annual publication output shows a steady increase from the 1980s, with a notable surge in the 2000s and an even sharper rise in the 2010s and early 2020s. This pattern indicates a growing academic interest and recognition of intrapreneurship's importance in a rapidly

changing business landscape. The period post-2010 appears to be a phase of accelerated research, possibly driven by increased digitalization and the need for organizational agility [4].

Influential Authors and Publications

Hypothetically, authors such as D.F. Kuratko, R.D. Hisrich, B. Antoncic, and S.A. Zahra would emerge as highly influential, given their foundational contributions to corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship [3, 5, 10]. Their works would likely show high citation counts, indicating their foundational role in shaping the field. Seminal articles defining corporate entrepreneurship and its predictors [2, 5] or early conceptualizations of intrapreneurship [9] would predictably be among the most cited.

Prominent Journals

Journals specializing in entrepreneurship and management, such as *Journal of Business Venturing*, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, and *Journal of Management*, would likely be the most prolific outlets for intrapreneurship research. Broader management and psychology journals might also feature, reflecting the multidisciplinary nature of the topic [6].

Thematic Evolution and Key Keywords

Keyword co-occurrence analysis would reveal the evolution of research themes. Early themes might predominantly revolve around "corporate venturing," "innovation," and "risk-taking." More recent clusters would likely include terms such as "digital intrapreneurship" [4], "psychological empowerment" [13], "work engagement" [7], "authentic leadership" [1], and "organizational support" [20]. The emergence of "intrapreneurial self-capital" [21] signifies a growing focus on individual psychological resources. There would also be a noticeable increase in studies exploring the role of leadership styles (e.g., transformational leadership [23]) and organizational culture in fostering intrapreneurial behavior. Some research would also delve into specific contexts, such as the public sector [25] or even the influence of family dynamics on intrapreneurial intentions [27].

Geographical Distribution and Collaboration Networks

The hypothetical analysis might show a strong concentration of research originating from North America and Europe, with a growing presence from Asian countries in recent years. Co-authorship networks would illustrate increasing

international collaboration, suggesting a globalized research community working on intrapreneurship.

DISCUSSION

The hypothetical findings from both the theoretical review and the bibliometric analysis paint a comprehensive picture of intrapreneurship research. The theoretical constructs highlight a shift from a purely organizational-level focus to a more integrated understanding that emphasizes the individual intrapreneur and the psychological and social factors influencing their behavior within the corporate context [8, 11]. The concept of intrapreneurial self-capital [21] and the role of psychological empowerment [13, 20] underscore the importance of individual agency and internal resources in driving intrapreneurial initiatives. Furthermore, the consistent emphasis on leadership [1, 23] and organizational support [20] as critical antecedents reinforces the idea that intrapreneurship is not merely a spontaneous occurrence but a cultivated phenomenon requiring deliberate organizational design and managerial commitment.

The hypothetical bibliometric results corroborate the theoretical evolution, demonstrating a significant and sustained increase in research interest. The thematic shifts, particularly the rise of "digital intrapreneurship" [4] and the focus on psychological and leadership dimensions, reflect contemporary challenges and opportunities faced by organizations. The increasing interdisciplinary nature of the field, as evidenced by keywords linking to psychology and organizational behavior, suggests a maturing research agenda that seeks to understand the multifaceted drivers and outcomes of intrapreneurship. The growing global collaboration also indicates a shared recognition of intrapreneurship's universal relevance across diverse economic and cultural contexts.

Research Gaps and Future Directions

Despite the substantial body of literature, several research gaps and promising avenues for future inquiry emerge:

1. **Longitudinal Studies:** Most studies are cross-sectional. Longitudinal research is needed to understand the dynamic processes of intrapreneurship development, its long-term impact on organizational performance, and the evolution of individual intrapreneurial behavior over time [7].
2. **Contextual Nuances:** While some studies touch upon specific contexts (e.g., public sector

[25]), more in-depth research is needed across various industries, organizational sizes, and cultural settings to understand how intrapreneurship manifests and thrives under different conditions. For instance, the role of intrapreneurship in specific professional groups like nurses and midwives could be further explored [22].

3. Digital Intrapreneurship: The rise of digital transformation presents a fertile ground for research. Future studies should delve deeper into how digital tools and platforms facilitate or hinder intrapreneurial activities, and the specific skills required for digital intrapreneurs [4].

4. Measurement and Methodological Rigor: Continued efforts are needed to refine and validate measures of intrapreneurial behavior and its antecedents/outcomes. Exploring alternative methodologies beyond self-report, such as observational studies or experimental designs, could provide richer insights.

5. Failure and Learning: While innovation inherently involves risk, research on how organizations learn from failed intrapreneurial initiatives and how this learning contributes to future success is limited.

6. Impact on Employee Well-being: Further exploration of the relationship between intrapreneurship and employee well-being, including potential stressors and positive psychological outcomes, would be beneficial [7].

7. Ethical Considerations: As intrapreneurship empowers individuals, future research could explore the ethical dilemmas or challenges that might arise from increased autonomy and risk-taking within established corporate structures.

Practical Implications

For practitioners, the findings underscore the importance of intentionally fostering an intrapreneurial culture. This involves:

- Supportive Leadership: Leaders must actively champion new ideas, provide resources, and offer psychological safety for experimentation [1, 23].
- Empowerment: Granting employees autonomy, meaning, competence, and impact is crucial for stimulating intrapreneurial behavior [13, 20].
- Resource Allocation: Dedicated time, budget, and personnel should be allocated for intrapreneurial projects, even if they are initially small-scale.
- Recognition and Reward Systems: Organizations should implement systems that recognize and reward intrapreneurial efforts,

regardless of immediate success, to encourage a culture of experimentation and learning.

- Skill Development: Investing in training programs that develop proactive behavior, problem-solving skills, and resilience among employees can significantly enhance intrapreneurial capacity [12, 9].

CONCLUSION

Intrapreneurship is a vital force for innovation and adaptation within established organizations. This article has provided a comprehensive overview of its theoretical constructs, highlighting the interplay of individual traits, psychological states, leadership styles, and organizational support in fostering intrapreneurial behavior. The hypothetical bibliometric analysis further illuminates the growing academic interest in the field, revealing evolving research themes and influential contributions. As organizations navigate an increasingly complex and competitive landscape, cultivating intrapreneurship will remain a critical strategic imperative. Future research should leverage more robust methodologies, explore diverse contexts, and delve into the dynamic processes of intrapreneurship to provide even deeper insights for both scholarly advancement and practical application.

REFERENCES

1. Valsania, E. S., Moriano, J. A., & Molero, F. (2016). Authentic leadership and intrapreneurial behavior: Cross-level analysis of the mediator effect of organizational identification and empowerment. *Int Entrep Manag J*, 12(1), 131–152. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-014-0333-4>
2. Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrep Theory Pract*, 23(3), 47–63.
3. Kuratko, D. F. (2017). Corporate entrepreneurship 2.0: research development and future directions. *Found Trends Entrep*, 13(6), 441–490.
4. Pinchot, G., & Soltanifar, M. (2021). Digital intrapreneurship: The corporate solution to a rapid digitalisation. *Digital Entrepreneurship: Impact on Business and Society*, 233–262.
5. Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *J Bus Venturing*, 6(4), 259–285.
6. Hernandez-Perlines, F., Ariza-Montes, A., & Blanco-Gonzalez-Tejero, C. (2022). Intrapreneurship research: A comprehensive

- literature review. *J Bus Res*, 153, 428–444. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.08.015>
7. Gawke, J. C., Gorgievski, M. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *J Vocat Behav*, 100, 88–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.03.002>
 8. Blanka, C. (2019). An individual-level perspective on intrapreneurship: a review and ways forward. *Rev Manag Sci*, 13(5), 919–961.
 9. 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.
 10. Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Privatization, corporate entrepreneurship, and performance: Testing a normative model. *J Dev Entrep*, 8(3), 197.
 11. Neessen, P. C. M., Caniels, M. C. J., Vos, B., & de Jong, J. P. (2019). The intrapreneurial employee: Toward an integrated model of intrapreneurship and research agenda. *Int Entrep Manag J*, 15(2), 545–571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0552-1>
 12. Crant, J. M. (2000). Proactive behavior in organizations. *J Manag*, 26(3), 435–462.
 13. Mahmoud, M. A., Ahmad, S., & Poespowidjojo, D. A. L. (2022). Psychological empowerment and individual performance: The mediating effect of intrapreneurial behaviour. *Eur J Innov Manag*, 25(5), 1388–1408. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-12-2020-0517>
 14. Donthu, N., Kumar, S., Mukherjee, D., Pandey, N., & Lim, W. M. (2021). How to conduct a bibliometric analysis: An overview and guidelines. *J Bus Res*, 133, 285–296.
 15. Donthu, N., Kumar, S., & Pattnaik, D. (2020). Forty-five years of Journal of Business Research: A bibliometric analysis. *J Bus Res*, 109, 1–14.
 16. Montero-Díaz, J., Cobo, M. J., Gutiérrez-Salcedo, M., Segado-Boj, F., & Herrera-Viedma, E. (2018). A science mapping analysis of 'Communication' WoS subject category (1980-2013). *Comunicar*, 26(55), 81–91.
 17. Huang, Z. (2022). Chief Executive Officer Tenacity and Employee Intrapreneurial Behavior: The Mediating Role of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Front Psychol*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.829567>
 18. Riehmann, P., Hanfler, M., & Froehlich, B. (2005). Interactive sankey diagrams. In: *IEEE Symposium on Information Visualization, 2005. INFOVIS 2005*. IEEE; 2005. p. 233–240.
 19. Baker-Shelley, A., Van Zeijl-Rozema, A., & Martens, P. (2020). Pathways of organisational transformation for sustainability: A university case-study synthesis presenting competencies for systemic change & rubrics of transformation. *Int J Sustain Dev World Ecol*, 27(8), 687–708. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13504509.2020.1762256>
 20. Chouchane, R., Fernet, C., Austin, S., & Zouaoui, S. K. (2023). Organizational support and intrapreneurial behavior: On the role of employees' intrapreneurial intention and self-efficacy. *J Manag Organ*, 29(2), 366–382. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2021.14>
 21. Di Fabio, A., & Duradoni, M. (2019). Intrapreneurial Self-Capital: A Primary Preventive Resource for Twenty-First Century Entrepreneurial Contexts. *Front Psychol*, 10. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01060>
 22. Drennan, V., Davis, K., Goodman, C., Humphrey, C., Locke, R., Mark, A., et al. (2007). Entrepreneurial nurses and midwives in the United Kingdom: An integrative review. *J Adv Nurs*, 60(5), 459–469. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04458.x>
 23. Gerards, R., van Wetten, S., & van Sambeek, C. (2021). New ways of working and intrapreneurial behaviour: The mediating role of transformational leadership and social interaction. *Rev Manag Sci*, 15(7), 2075–2110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-020-00412-1>
 24. Huang, L.-Y., Lin, S.-M. Y., & Hsieh, Y.-J. (2021). Cultivation of Intrapreneurship: A Framework and Challenges. *Front Psychol*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.731990>
 25. Kearney, C., Hisrich, R., & Roche, F. (2008). A conceptual model of public sector corporate entrepreneurship. *Int Entrep Manag J*, 4, 295–313.
 26. Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Frese, M. (n.d.). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: Cumulative empirical evidence.
 27. Wang, D., & Zhang, Z. (2022). Disassembling the influences of perceived family relational conflict on business family offspring's intrapreneurial intentions. *Int Entrep Manag J*, 18(1), 153–189. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-021-00747-5>