

## A RESEARCH ON INNOVATIVE CORPORATE GOALS AND INTERNAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP RELATIONSHIP

**Mahmut Tekin**

Selçuk University

**Ahmet Gözen**

Çimento, Konya Türkiye

**Hatice Gözen**

Selçuk University

### ABSTRACT

*Change is a key element for businesses that interact with the inner and outer environment. Change-inducing innovation; New product, service, production method or organizational structure. This innovation-based structure provides revenue for the enterprise through internal entrepreneurship, marketing and management processes. With innovation, an entrepreneurial organization should take advantage of the opportunities that the environment offers to change. But the changes; Making business life more complex and pushing businesses to differentiate and focus with innovation. In this context, the performance of the enterprise is kept high by keeping the internal entrepreneurship for the enterprises, producing a new idea and applying this idea and project to the new models, under the roof of the company. With the entrepreneurship, the organizational goals of the operator lead to the plans of the employer and help the business reach its strategy and objectives. In this study, the literature on innovative corporate goals and internal entrepreneurship was searched and the relationship between organizational entrepreneurship with innovative corporate objectives was searched.*

**Key Words:** Internal Entrepreneurship, Innovation, Innovative Corporate

### INTRODUCTION

Today, the basic rule which determines the life is change. Enterprises that are in interaction with the outside , are not able to continue their lives without being affected by the changes. For this reason, an entrepreneurial organization has to recognize and live in harmony with the parameters of change which has offered by environment. Because these changes make the area of activity more complex and push the businesses to innovate and differentiate.

Businesses operating in an environment where new opportunities and threats can emerge at any moment, should be able to control both threats and opportunities in order to be successful. Controlling threats and taking advantage of opportunities requires entrepreneurial thinking and entrepreneurial management practices.

For this reason, entrepreneurial activities are not limited to bringing together production factors or establishing a new business. But also activities and changes should be covered in all existing organizations. The main aim of this study is to be able to determine the effect of the internal entrepreneurship of the employees who have adopted institutional objectives.

The study of "internal entrepreneurship" in this subject was taken into consideration by the study done by Atılhan Naktiyok (2004).

Business Objectives:

It is difficult and risky to define the objective and mission of the business. But this allows a company to set goals, to develop strategies, to focus on resources and to start to work. It singly makes it possible for a company to be managed for performance (Drucker, 2012: 172). Two researchers identified four factors needed for effective MBO programs which is based on a comprehensive review of the MBO (managing by objectives) programs in management.

These factors are;

1. organizational commitment
2. mutual goal setting
3. frequent performance evaluations
4. The degree of freedom for success in individual goals. (Smither et al. 1996: 362-363)

## **1.OBJECTIVES OF OPERATIONS**

Goal setting has a vital importance for the decision process. Because the other phases of the decision process will be addressed in the direction of the determined objective. Managers from the bottom to the top level are concerned with this goal-setting phase. The manager at each stage has been left with the task of determining this purpose in this or that shape. While top managers of the organization are more of a strategic nature, dealing with the whole enterprise and dealing with long-term goals, the middle level managers are more likely medium –short run and on practice oriented, and finally the junior-level managers are concerned with short and very short term objectives related to practice oriented entirely (Koçel, 2011 : 117-118).

Non-rational and hard-to-achieve objectives should not be set when operational objectives are determined,. Non-rational goals can also cause employees to fail as well as disrupt motivation. For this reason, business objectives should be determined within certain rules. It is useful for businesses to use a method called SMART analysis in this context. The meanings of the mentioned analytical components are as follows:

S (Specific): The objectives should be written in a concise manner and should indicate what,when and how the situation changed.

M (Measurable): Objectives should be determined in a way that they can be improved and the process can be measured.

A (Achievable): There must be some difficulties for employees to be motivated, but they should be achievable.

R (Realistic): The necessary organizational priorities should be focused.

T (Time-bound): The time frame required for the target to be achieved must be determined.

Different distinctions have emerged in the literature regarding the classification of business objectives. For example, Gatewood seperated the aims as social goals, corporate goals, business goals, and functional goals. Here, it is possible to address the objectives of the business as financial and strategic purposes. (Akgemci, 2013: 32-33)

1.1.1. Financial objectives: The financial objectives of an enterprise are usually related to the efficiency of its activities and increase this efficiency. It is difficult to find a suitable measurement method for each operation that will evaluate financial objectives, but there is a generally accepted measure. Ansoff has taken into consideration the profitability of the businesses for evaluating their financial objectives.

1.1.2.Strategic objectives; It shapes and directs the practices of the enterprise towards the future, as well as expressing the results that the operator intends to achieve in the long run. Some of the features that strategic objectives should carry are; It must be compatible with the mission, vision and principles, contribute to realize the mission of the organization, be assertive, realistic and accessible, and be capable of transforming the organization from its present state to its future desired state.

### **1.2. Corporate Goals**

The corporate strategy is related to business as a whole. Corporate strategy is handled by the top management for the whole organization. (Gatewood et al 1995: 280-281).

The strategy and structure of an organization should be to create value from functional and organizational sources. Functional level strategy is an action plan that strengthens the coordination and internal abilities of an organization as well as its functional and organizational sources.

Business level strategy; A network that combines functional internal competencies in order to put the organizations as having a competitive advantage in their domain. Institutional level strategy; A plan that uses and develops internal qualifications not only to protect organizations and to grow their existing domain and also to expand new domains. (Jones, 2001: 203-204).The corporate strategy includes financial flows decisions, a company's products and business units with other resources (Wheelen and Hunger, 2006: 165).

Objectives are situations that are desired to be achieved by carrying out certain activities. In terms of organization or business management, corporate goals are the reasons for the activities of organizations and even the reason for their existence. Corporate goals include a tool that informs the management of the extent to which the entity has reached its goals and mission as well as being an element that guides the project or its plans.

Corporate goals are the essential elements of its structure, which distinguishes performance and outcomes from those of other organizations that are needed everywhere and where the continuity of a business directly impacts.

General Objectives:

-Obtaining profits (long-term returns): Profit is the result of an operator's activity at a certain period and it is considered as the difference of total incomes from total expenses. Nowadays profit making is not so easy for businesses. For this reason, businesses are now aiming to earn an average return interms of their competitors rather than directly aiming for profit.

-Providing social benefits: Many of the businesses that have been commemorated with social responsibility projects today and emphasized energy saving, respect for nature, human value and they are the most important messages that they focused on.

- To make the life of the operator sustained: The sustainability, growth and development of the business are indispensable business purposes. They try to maintain dynamic balances by taking continuous inputs from environment and accordingly developing strategies.

- Some special purposes are to increase sales turnover and maximize, to produce new goods and services based on innovation and new ideas, to supply high quality goods and services to consumers, to produce cheaply and to sell cheaply, to provide employment opportunities, to grow and develop, to assist and support the state and society, to provide services, be a national or international business, have a good image and gain a contemporary look, and strengthen international relations by taking care of the employees in the business, providing them with a good salary, providing a safe working environment and taking their share from profits;

The formation of goals is the task of the top management of the organizations. The top managers (members of the general assembly or owners, members of the board of directors and the general manager) decide on what purpose the business or establishment will be in order to realize. The planning process begins when the objectives have been identified. At the beginning of this process is the determination of the mission or task area. In other words, it is necessary to determine what activities are to be worked in order to achieve the aims. The mission or task-setting body is concerned with executing a social function and the reason for the existence of the organization is the fulfillment of this activity. Organizations realize their goals as the result of this activity in society (Eren, 2011: 180-181).

## **2. INTERNAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP (INTRAPRENEURSHIP)**

Internal entrepreneurship is the act of behaving like a classical entrepreneur in a large existing organization or encouraging such behavior. Internal entrepreneurship, also referred to as intra-organizational entrepreneurship; To mobilize and revitalize an existing organization by taking risk, innovation and active competition behaviors. Interventional activities that lead to the creation of a new venture within an existing organization are aimed at renewing the organization main idea and transforming the organization. The company must be flexible and accept to be changeable. Rogers shows that innovative organizations tend to have positive attitudes towards change, decentralized decision making, confusion, informal structure, loyalty, organizational abundance (unused resources), large-scale, system openness in the classic book "Diffusion of Innovations". (Wheelen and Hunger, 2006: 305-306)

Intra-organizational entrepreneurship can be seen as a system that enables the use of creative processes, which allows for planning, designing and implementing the desired innovation activities and introducing change through risk and proactive behavior. The ability to have entrepreneurial activities within an existing organizational structure is explained by the concept of internal entrepreneurship. At the core of the concept of internal entrepreneurship lies properly the turning of entrepreneurial thinking into the organization. Internal entrepreneurs. They act as a bridge between the managers and the innovators in the organization. It is desirable to support and encourage internal self-initiative activities within the organization because of the benefit of the organization. However interventional activities maintain whether together or separately, internal entrepreneurship is the most important part of entrepreneurship in terms of the development of national sense entrepreneurship (Göçmen, 2007: 46).

Internal entrepreneurs are those who see opportunities, are aware of the market and the environment, are strong in character, take risks, and have high organizational and analytical skills. They have the skills to manage the problems with an innovative, creative approach and have the ability to manage changes. Internal entrepreneurship offers opportunities to adapt himself for a highly dynamic, competitive and different environment. It also provides organizations with a variety of applications in their own organizations. Although Many companies do not like to use new technologies and untested products, the view of intra-organizational entrepreneurship gives opportunity Internal entrepreneurship gives companies the ability and opportunity for marketing experience. Internal entrepreneurship increases the value of organizations. This can be used as an area of experience for managers.

## **3. AN EMPIRICAL STUDY OF ADOPTION LEVEL OF CORPORATE OBJECTIVES BY EMPLOYEE ON THE INTRAPRENEURSHIP EFFECT**

3.1.1. Objective: The questionnaire made in two corporate firms to show whether the level of employees' acceptance of corporate objectives (institutional goals-objectives) affected the intra-organizational entrepreneurship and whether this status changed according to education and position; Mostly it has been implemented to managerial personnel.

3.1.2. Research method: A questionnaire on adoption level of corporate objectives by staff on the intrapreneurship effect was prepared.

- The scale that we prepared was used in the corporate objectives section of the questionnaire

- The form developed and tested by Atılhan Naktiyok was used In the internal entrepreneurship section of the survey. According to the researches made by Naktiyok and the way of preparing its scale is as follows; Two scales were used to create the dimensions of the internal entrepreneurship. The first of these formed by Khandwalla and the second was

formed and developed by Zahra. "Internal entrepreneurship scale" has been prepared by taking into account the results of explanatory and confirmatory factor analysis that Antoncic and Hisrich combined these scales under the light of these two views. 39 questions were asked in our questionnaire.

### 3.1.3. Demographic Information

#### 3.1.3.1. Firm

|        | Frequency | %     | Cumul% |
|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| Firm A | 44        | 53,0  | 53,0   |
| Firm B | 39        | 47,0  | 100,0  |
| Total  | 83        | 100,0 |        |

53% (44 people) of employees participating in the study were from company A and 47% (39 people) were from company

#### 3.1.3.2. Gender:

|        | Frequency | %     | Cumul% |
|--------|-----------|-------|--------|
| male   | 81        | 97,6  | 97,6   |
| female | 2         | 2,4   | 100,0  |
| Toplam | 83        | 100,0 |        |

97,6% (81 people) of employee participating in the study were male and 2,4% (2 people) were female

#### 3.1.3.3.Age

| Age   | Frequency | N  | %     | C%    |
|-------|-----------|----|-------|-------|
| 30-35 |           | 32 | 38,6  | 38,6  |
| 35-40 |           | 27 | 32,5  | 71,1  |
| 40-45 |           | 16 | 19,3  | 90,4  |
| 45 +  |           | 8  | 9,6   | 100,0 |
| Total |           | 83 | 100,0 |       |

38.6% (32 people) of the employees participated in the study, 30-35 years old, 32.5% - 35-40 years old, 19,3%- 40-45 years old and 9,6% 45+ years old.

#### 3.1.3.4. Education:

| Education     | Frequency | %     | C%    |
|---------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Primary       | 21        | 25,3  | 25,3  |
| High School   | 25        | 30,1  | 55,4  |
| Two-year      | 13        | 15,7  | 71,1  |
| Bachelors     | 13        | 15,7  | 86,7  |
| Post Graduate | 11        | 13,3  | 100,0 |
| Total         | 83        | 100,0 |       |

25,3% (21 people) of primary school graduates, 30,1% (25 people) high school graduates, 15,7% (13 people) two-year degree graduates, 15,7% (13 people ) bachelors graduate and 13,3% (11 persons) are post graduate .

### 3.1.3.5. Term of Employment in Existing Firm

| Term              | Frequency | %     | C%    |
|-------------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Less than 6 month | 2         | 2,4   | 2,4   |
| 6 month-1 year    | 7         | 8,4   | 10,8  |
| 2-4 years         | 9         | 10,8  | 21,7  |
| 5-10 years        | 32        | 38,6  | 60,2  |
| 10 years+         | 33        | 39,8  | 100,0 |
| Total             | 83        | 100,0 |       |

Term of employment in existing firms; 2.4% (2 people) employees less than 6 months, 8.4% (7 people) employees for 6 months-1 year, 10.8% (9 people) employees 2-4 years, 38,6% (32 people) worked for 5-10 years and 39,8% (33 people) worked for more than 10 years.

### 3.1.3.6. Total Term of Employment Covered Old Firms:

#### Total Term of Employment

|                 | Frequency | %     | C%    |
|-----------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Less than 1year | 6         | 7,2   | 7,2   |
| 2-4 yeras       | 5         | 6,0   | 13,3  |
| 5-10 years      | 21        | 25,3  | 38,6  |
| 10-20 years     | 42        | 50,6  | 89,2  |
| 20+             | 9         | 10,8  | 100,0 |
| Total           | 83        | 100,0 |       |

When the total working term of employees participating in the study is considered; (6 people) 7,2% worked less than 1 year, (5 people) 6% worked for 2-4 years, 25,3% (21 people) worked for 5-10 years, (42 people) 50,6% worked for 10-20 years and 10,8% (9 people) work for more than 20 years.

### 3.1.3.7. Status-Positions:

#### Status

|            | Frequency | %     | C%    |
|------------|-----------|-------|-------|
| Manager    | 9         | 10,8  | 10,8  |
| Supervisor | 20        | 24,1  | 34,9  |
| Others     | 54        | 65,1  | 100,0 |
| Total      | 83        | 100,0 |       |

It is seen that 10,8% (9 persons) of the personnel participating in the study are managers, 24,1% (20 people) are supervisors and 65,1% (54 people) are in other positions.

### 3.1.4. Reliability Analysis:

#### 3.1.4.1. Distribution of Corporate Objectives reliability analysis and frequency :

| Corporate Objectives | Strongly Disagree |     | Disagree    |     | Undecided   |      | Agree       |      | Strongly Agree |       |
|----------------------|-------------------|-----|-------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------|------|----------------|-------|
|                      | <i>Freq</i>       | %   | <i>Freq</i> | %   | <i>Freq</i> | %    | <i>Freq</i> | %    | <i>Freq</i>    | %     |
| Item-1               | 3                 | 3,6 | 1           | 1,2 | 11          | 13,3 | 38          | 45,8 | 30             | 36,14 |
| Item-2               | 3                 | 3,6 | 0           | 0,0 | 8           | 9,6  | 39          | 47,0 | 33             | 39,76 |
| Item-3               | 3                 | 3,6 | 0           | 0,0 | 3           | 3,6  | 34          | 41,0 | 43             | 51,81 |
| Item-4               | 2                 | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0 | 6           | 7,2  | 38          | 45,8 | 37             | 44,58 |
| Item-5               | 1                 | 1,2 | 4           | 4,8 | 19          | 22,9 | 30          | 36,1 | 29             | 34,94 |
| Item-6               | 0                 | 0,0 | 6           | 7,2 | 9           | 10,8 | 41          | 49,4 | 27             | 32,53 |
| Item-7               | 0                 | 0,0 | 3           | 3,6 | 9           | 10,8 | 40          | 48,2 | 31             | 37,35 |
| Item-8               | 2                 | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0 | 7           | 8,4  | 36          | 43,4 | 38             | 45,78 |
| Item-9               | 2                 | 2,4 | 1           | 1,2 | 13          | 15,7 | 42          | 50,6 | 25             | 30,12 |
| Item-10              | 0                 | 0,0 | 4           | 4,8 | 13          | 15,7 | 43          | 51,8 | 23             | 27,71 |
| Item-11              | 0                 | 0,0 | 2           | 2,4 | 23          | 27,7 | 31          | 37,3 | 27             | 32,53 |
| Item-12              | 2                 | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0 | 6           | 7,2  | 41          | 49,4 | 34             | 40,96 |
| Item-13              | 3                 | 3,6 | 2           | 2,4 | 15          | 18,1 | 33          | 39,8 | 30             | 36,14 |
| Item-14              | 2                 | 2,4 | 1           | 1,2 | 11          | 13,3 | 37          | 44,6 | 32             | 38,55 |
| Item-15              | 1                 | 1,2 | 0           | 0,0 | 3           | 3,6  | 38          | 45,8 | 41             | 49,4  |
| Item-16              | 0                 | 0,0 | 2           | 2,4 | 14          | 16,9 | 43          | 51,8 | 24             | 28,92 |
| Item-17              | 1                 | 1,2 | 1           | 1,2 | 9           | 10,8 | 44          | 53,0 | 28             | 33,73 |
| Item-18              | 1                 | 1,2 | 2           | 2,4 | 10          | 12,0 | 44          | 53,0 | 26             | 31,33 |
| Item-19              | 2                 | 2,4 | 3           | 3,6 | 16          | 19,3 | 42          | 50,6 | 20             | 24,1  |
| Item-20              | 1                 | 1,2 | 1           | 1,2 | 3           | 3,6  | 47          | 56,6 | 31             | 37,35 |
| Item-21              | 0                 | 0,0 | 3           | 3,6 | 13          | 15,7 | 35          | 42,2 | 32             | 38,55 |

#### Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha |  | N of Items |
|------------------|--|------------|
| ,942             |  | 21         |

Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is a coefficient that shows the similarity and closeness of the questions to each other in the cases where the individual scores are collected by the answers given to the questions on a scale containing the questions. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient is between 0 and 1 and Alpha coefficient is desired to be  $1 > \text{Alpha coefficient} > 0,7$ .

The Cronbach 'Alpha coefficient of 21 items in the institutional objectives section of the questionnaire was found as 0,942. This value is in the range that we desired for the homogeneity and aggregability of the questions and Cronbach's alpha coefficient is very reliable for the scale.

**Item-Total Statistics**

|       | Scale Mean if<br>Item Deleted | Scale Variance if<br>Item Deleted | Corrected<br>Item-Total<br>Correlation | Cronbach's<br>Alpha if Item<br>Deleted |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| KA_1  | 83,0482                       | 125,437                           | ,739                                   | ,937                                   |
| KA_2  | 82,9518                       | 126,290                           | ,733                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_3  | 82,7711                       | 126,886                           | ,723                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_4  | 82,8434                       | 128,182                           | ,706                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_5  | 83,1566                       | 128,012                           | ,601                                   | ,940                                   |
| KA_6  | 83,0723                       | 129,653                           | ,585                                   | ,940                                   |
| KA_7  | 82,9518                       | 129,973                           | ,634                                   | ,939                                   |
| KA_8  | 82,8434                       | 127,304                           | ,741                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_9  | 83,0964                       | 126,722                           | ,743                                   | ,937                                   |
| KA_10 | 83,1205                       | 132,424                           | ,474                                   | ,942                                   |
| KA_11 | 83,1446                       | 130,759                           | ,534                                   | ,941                                   |
| KA_12 | 82,8795                       | 127,985                           | ,727                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_13 | 83,1205                       | 126,376                           | ,648                                   | ,939                                   |
| KA_14 | 82,9880                       | 127,890                           | ,660                                   | ,939                                   |
| KA_15 | 82,7229                       | 131,081                           | ,652                                   | ,939                                   |
| KA_16 | 83,0723                       | 130,751                           | ,612                                   | ,940                                   |
| KA_17 | 82,9759                       | 129,073                           | ,698                                   | ,938                                   |
| KA_18 | 83,0361                       | 131,938                           | ,501                                   | ,941                                   |
| KA_19 | 83,2410                       | 129,795                           | ,548                                   | ,941                                   |
| KA_20 | 82,8675                       | 131,799                           | ,584                                   | ,940                                   |
| KA_21 | 82,9880                       | 129,232                           | ,636                                   | ,939                                   |

When each question is subtracted separately from the scale, the table above shows the variation in mean, variance, correlation and Cronbach's Alpha.

After the measured questions subtracte from analysis, If an increase in the calculated reliability coefficient is observed, it is decided that the substance reduces the reliability of the measurement. When the reverse question withdraw from analysis and a considerable decrease in the coefficient of reliability (below the general alpha coefficient) is observed , the corresponding substance should be considered to be quite important for the measured dimension. When each of the 21 items in the scale is subtracted separately, the alpha coefficient decreases. It is consequently possible that these questions are suitable substances for the measurement tool

The total item correlation is based on the correlation calculation between a question and the whole of the collection of the other questions. This method states that Whether every problem handled has an additable attribute in the whole or not. If the question-total correlation coefficient is low, it means that the contribution of this question to the composite scale is low. If the item-to-total correlation coefficient of a problem is too low, it can be interpreted as an unnecessary question and remove from the scale.

Correlation coefficients between the question and the whole should not be negative. This disrupts the collectability of your scale feature. The question is expected to be that all correlations are not negative, even greater than 0.25. We may propose removing questions that do not comply with this rule. But this is not the absolute rule. In order to remove the question; If the question is deleted, the change in the alpha coefficient and the question is deleted, then the change in the average should be observed. Institutional objectives are positive for each of the questions in our scale, and the correlation value is greater than 0.25. The resulting scale was prepared to measure the institutional objectives.

### 3.1.4.2. Distribution of Internal Entrapreneurship reliability analysis and frequency :

| INTERNAL<br>ENTREPREN<br>EURSHIP | Strongly<br>Disagree |     | Disagree    |      | Undecided   |      | Agree       |      | Strongly Agree |      |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|-----|-------------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|----------------|------|
|                                  | <i>Freq</i>          | %   | <i>Freq</i> | %    | <i>Freq</i> | %    | <i>Freq</i> | %    | <i>Freq</i>    | %    |
| Item-1                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 1           | 1,2  | 19          | 22,9 | 48          | 57,8 | 13             | 15,7 |
| Item-2                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0  | 12          | 14,5 | 37          | 44,6 | 32             | 38,6 |
| Item-3                           | 0                    | 0,0 | 1           | 1,2  | 17          | 20,5 | 40          | 48,2 | 25             | 30,1 |
| Item-4                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0  | 15          | 18,1 | 43          | 51,8 | 23             | 27,7 |
| Item-5                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 3           | 3,6  | 25          | 30,1 | 35          | 42,2 | 18             | 21,7 |
| Item-6                           | 4                    | 4,8 | 1           | 1,2  | 21          | 25,3 | 37          | 44,6 | 20             | 24,1 |
| Item-7                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 2           | 2,4  | 15          | 18,1 | 48          | 57,8 | 16             | 19,3 |
| Item-8                           | 3                    | 3,6 | 10          | 12,0 | 16          | 19,3 | 39          | 47,0 | 15             | 18,1 |
| Item-9                           | 2                    | 2,4 | 9           | 10,8 | 22          | 26,5 | 33          | 39,8 | 17             | 20,5 |
| Item-10                          | 1                    | 1,2 | 0           | 0,0  | 17          | 20,5 | 45          | 54,2 | 20             | 24,1 |
| Item-11                          | 2                    | 2,4 | 0           | 0,0  | 9           | 10,8 | 46          | 55,4 | 26             | 31,3 |
| Item-12                          | 3                    | 3,6 | 0           | 0,0  | 20          | 24,1 | 42          | 50,6 | 18             | 21,7 |
| Item-13                          | 2                    | 2,4 | 6           | 7,2  | 20          | 24,1 | 36          | 43,4 | 19             | 22,9 |
| Item-14                          | 3                    | 3,6 | 1           | 1,2  | 10          | 12,0 | 46          | 55,4 | 23             | 27,7 |
| Item-15                          | 7                    | 8,4 | 3           | 3,6  | 17          | 20,5 | 43          | 51,8 | 13             | 15,7 |
| Item-16                          | 6                    | 7,2 | 4           | 4,8  | 28          | 33,7 | 35          | 42,2 | 10             | 12,0 |
| Item-17                          | 1                    | 1,2 | 1           | 1,2  | 23          | 27,7 | 36          | 43,4 | 22             | 26,5 |
| Item-18                          | 4                    | 4,8 | 3           | 3,6  | 19          | 22,9 | 36          | 43,4 | 21             | 25,3 |

#### Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's<br>Alpha | N of Items |
|---------------------|------------|
| ,893                | 18         |

Age-internal entrepreneurship: First of all, the homogeneity of variances should be tested for the 4-year-old group. Homogeneity test of Levene variances was used for this analysis.

#### Test of Homogeneity of Variances

| yas              |     |     |      |
|------------------|-----|-----|------|
| Levene Statistic | df1 | df2 | Sig. |
| 5,555            | 18  | 51  | ,000 |

P (sig.): 0,000 < 0.05, the variances are not homogeneous. Although the assumption of normality was provided, the Kruskal-Wallis test was used to test for non-parametric tests whether there was any difference in the total entrepreneurship scores according to the age of the staff, since the assumption of homogeneity of variances was not provided.

#### Ranks

|                   | yas          | N  | Mean Rank |
|-------------------|--------------|----|-----------|
| Toplam_I.G._puany | 30-35 yas    | 32 | 40,89     |
|                   | 35-40 yas    | 27 | 42,20     |
|                   | 40-45 yas    | 16 | 43,56     |
|                   | 45 yas üzeri | 8  | 42,63     |
|                   | Total        | 83 |           |



| Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup> |                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
|                                | Toplam I.G. puaný |
| Chi-Square                     | ,143              |
| df                             | 3                 |
| Asymp. Sig.                    | ,986              |

a. Kruskal Wallis Test

b. Grouping Variable: yas

$H_0$ : There is no difference between medians of total entrepreneurship scores by age.

$H_1$ : There is a difference between medians of total entrepreneurship scores by age.

P (sig.): 0,986 > 0,05, So  $H_0$  hypothesis can not be rejected, there is no difference between the medians of the total scores of internal entrepreneurship by age. We can say that the age has no effect on internal entrepreneurship.

**Table:1 Total Corporate Objectives**

|            | N  | Average | Std. Dev. | Std. Err | Minimum | Maksimum |
|------------|----|---------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Manager    | 9  | 92,5556 | 10,78322  | 3,59441  | 72,00   | 105,00   |
| Supervisor | 20 | 91,9500 | 8,24286   | 1,84316  | 74,00   | 105,00   |
| Others     | 54 | 84,4630 | 12,50466  | 1,70167  | 50,00   | 105,00   |
| Total      | 83 | 87,1446 | 11,90525  | 1,30677  | 50,00   | 105,00   |

#### ANOVA

| Toplam K.A. puaný |                |    |             |       |      |
|-------------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|------|
|                   | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
| Between Groups    | 1113,667       | 2  | 556,833     | 4,239 | ,018 |
| Within Groups     | 10508,598      | 80 | 131,357     |       |      |
| Total             | 11622,265      | 82 |             |       |      |

$H_0$ : There is no difference between medians of total entrepreneurship scores by positions

$H_1$ : There is a difference between medians of total entrepreneurship scores by positions.

P (sig.): 0.018 < 0.05, So  $H_0$  hypothesis is rejected, there is a difference between the averages of total points of institutional objectives according to positions, status. Here we can say that the position has an impact on corporate objectives. The average points of corporate objectives belongs to managers and the supervisors are close to each other but higher than other positions.

## RESULT

In the first part of this study, business goals and institutional objectives are mentioned and in the second part the concept of intra-organizational entrepreneurship explained and the importance, process of internal entrepreneurship are examined.

The third part is the embracement of institutional objectives with the relationship of intra organizational entrepreneurship. For this purpose, a questionnaire study was done on the level of corporate goals embracement by employee and its effect on internal entrepreneurship.

The questionnaire made in two corporate firms to show whether the level of employees' acceptance of corporate objectives (institutional goals-objectives) affected the intra-organizational entrepreneurship and whether this situation varies according to the sector. When we evaluate the questionnaire survey in terms of age, education and position-status, it is seen that age has no effect on institutional objectives and internal entrepreneurship.

When we look at the level of education, the higher the level of education, the higher the level of realization of institutional objectives, but the level of education has no effect on internal entrepreneurship. According to position-status survey, position has an impact on corporate objectives, but position has no impact on internal entrepreneurship.

As a result of research for the relationship between internal entrepreneurship and corporate objectives in 2 firms; It is seen that Firm A has %48,7 as the relation ratio corporate entrepreneurship to corporate entrepreneurship and Firm B has 67,4% in this relation. So, there is a positive relation between internal entrepreneurship and corporate objectives in 2 both firms. The relation in firm B is higher than firm A.

## REFERENCES

- Akgemci, Tahir (2013), “Stratejik yönetim” (3.Baskı). Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.
- Drucker, Peter (2012), “Yönetim” (1. Baskı), İstanbul: Optimist yayınları
- Eren, Erol (2011), “Yönetim ve Organizasyon” (10. Baskı), İstanbul: Beta Yayıncılık
- Eren, Erol (2010), “Stratejik Yönetim ve İşletme Politikası”, (8. Baskı), İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.
- Gatewood, Robert D., Taylor, Robert R. ve Ferrell, O.C, (1995)” Management: comprehension, analysis, and application” (1. Baskı), Van Hoffmann Press, Inc.
- Göçmen, Selin (2007) “İşletmelerde Girişimcilik Özelliğini Destekleyen faktörler: “iç girişimcilik”. Yönetim Organizasyon Programı, Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Manisa
- Koçel, Tamer (2011), “İşletme Yöneticiliği” (13.Baskı), İstanbul: Beta.
- Smither, Robert D., Houston, John M. Ve McIntire, Sandra D. (1996), “Organizational Development: Strategies for Changing Environments” (2. Baskı), New York: Harper Collins.