

The Role of Social Entrepreneurship in Increasing Student Intrapreneurship: An Analysis of Learning Effectiveness

Ludi Wishnu Wardana^{1,*}, Angga Martha Mahendra², A'isy Fiklil Nafisah¹,
Ranny Fitria Puspitasari¹, Yogie Dana Insani¹, Herla Lukmanasari¹

¹ Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Malang

² Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Surabaya

*Corresponding author. Email: ludi.wishnu.fe@um.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The Ministry of Education and Culture (2020) recommends that lecturers from higher education institutions apply social entrepreneurship learning to provide a complex learning environment and build critical skills among students. For this reason, this study aims to: 1) The ability to identify opportunities; 2) Creativity and innovation; 3) Measurable risk-taking; 4) Leadership spirit; 5) Ability to work together; 6) Orientation to social impact. Intrapreneurship skills have been considered an alternative learning outcome of entrepreneurship education, but entrepreneurship lecturers require a complex learning program to promote intrapreneurship among business students. The study results show that social entrepreneurship learning effectively develops students' intrapreneurship skills, and the Flow of experiences during lectures positively impacts students' intrapreneurship skills.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship Education, Intrapreneurship, Flow, Case Method.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In order to equip students to become professionals and entrepreneurs with an entrepreneurial attitude, college programs now strategically teach entrepreneurship. Students in both developed and developing nations throughout the world are inspired to be innovative by entrepreneurship courses in higher education. For students to succeed in the business and employment worlds, this is a necessary skill. Conversely, there are currently no standardized criteria for entrepreneurial learning. There are still many debates regarding the achievement of learning in entrepreneurship education. Research shows that student learning outcomes should encourage them to form an entrepreneurial mindset. Define the four types of entrepreneurial learning outcomes. They are as follows: 1) give students life-changing experiences that foster an entrepreneurial mentality; 2) develop students who can launch or grow a new company or offer the required ability to do it; 3) Enhance students' knowledge and skills in every area to help them market their intellectual property; 4) Give business school students more perspectives. Select the third option to apply to undergraduate programs in the arts, sciences, engineering, education, and business that do not include entrepreneurship. In this instance, commercializing intellectual property still focuses on two things: developing new goods through start-ups or applying new knowledge to an already-existing firm (Farrukh et al., 2020; Rigtering et al., 2019; Wardana et al., 2020, 2023, 2024).

Every study program at Universitas Negeri Malang's Faculty of Economics and Business includes entrepreneurship courses, but entrepreneurship study programs are particularly available. However, in the study program for entrepreneurship and digital business, entrepreneurial content is taught in many classes with fewer semester credits. Even if the goal of creating learning outcomes is to create new firms, it is indisputable that entrepreneurship education cannot always result in the creation of new entrepreneurs. The majority of their graduates are still seeking employment in an established firm or business, despite the fact that many business schools have established entrepreneurship learning objectives to foster the growth of new entrepreneurs. Furthermore, some developed and developing nations throughout the world think that teaching entrepreneurship in higher education can encourage students to be innovative. Thus, entrepreneurship education should focus on the achievement of learning in the power of individual innovation, which is demonstrated in an entrepreneurial attitude or spirit. (Cerro-Urcelay et al., 2023; Laužikas & Mačiukaitė-žvinienė, 2023; Manjon et al., 2021; Menegaz et al., 2021; Mottiar & Boluk, 2017; Parker, 2009; Ravina-Ripoll et al., 2023; Turro et al., 2016)

Researchers have previously defined Intrapreneurship as an entrepreneurial spirit inherent in a person based on their innovation ability. According to it, entrepreneurship education aims to instil the spirit of entrepreneurship in students. The ethos of intrapreneurial entrepreneurship is absorbed. The ability to drive innovation is regarded as intrapreneurship, and it is a crucial component of an entrepreneur's or business's success. Intrapreneurship is demonstrated by traits like initiative, leadership, teamwork, critical and innovative thinking, and decision-making. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated via empirical research that intrapreneurship in people is a necessary condition for the development of an entrepreneurial mindset. As a result, researchers argue that Intrapreneurship is a more important and appropriate skill for achieving entrepreneurial education in business and economics. Developing Intrapreneurship helps students prepare to work in an existing company, build an existing MSME, or establish a new start-up. Instead of starting a new company, this research selected intrapreneurship as a personal value that graduates might utilize to pursue a career as an entrepreneur or professional. (Ballesteros-Ruiz et al., 2019; Boore & Porter, 2011; Carvalho, 2022; Dai et al., 2025; Kistruck & Beamish, 2010; Tajeddini & Tajdini, 2023)

However, fostering student intrapreneurship is not a simple undertaking. In order to develop intrapreneurship, pupils need to go through a challenging educational process. Cognitive, affective, and psychomotor experiences should be included in the development of Intrapreneurship (Mattingly et al., 2019; J. P. C. Rigtering & Weitzel, 2013). In this regard, (Lages et al., 2017)Ministry of Education and (Layman et al., 2023)) suggest social entrepreneurship and team-based learning to support complex and in-depth education. Team-based and social entrepreneurship learning helps graduates gain critical skills (Kassa & Raju, 2015; Xie et al., 2024). Undoubtedly, such goals correspond to the dynamics and learning experiences required in entrepreneurship education. The Case method empirically engages students in complex and contextual learning experiences during their learning activities (Chahine, 2022). Therefore, it can be concluded that social entrepreneurship learning approaches will encourage significant entrepreneurial learning and foster student intrapreneurship. Based on this view, this study aims to 1) examine students' ability to identify opportunities; 2) investigate students' creativity and innovation toward intrapreneurship skills; 3) investigate the measurable risk-taking capabilities of intrapreneurship skills; 4) investigate the spirit of student leadership towards intrapreneurship skills; 5) investigating students' ability to cooperate with intrapreneurship skills; 6) investigate the orientation on the social impact of students on intrapreneurship skills.

Case studies can help students learn from real situations, not from real situations (Murray, 2019). Solving cases gets students into areas where they have to master the problem, find the source, create alternative solutions, and talk about the best solutions to make it flow. Undoubtedly, stream experiences are necessary to produce significant or immersive learning experiences (Murray, 2019).

Applying a case-based and team-learning approach to entrepreneurship education is the goal of this study. When the Harvard Graduate School of Business started using the case study approach in its courses, it gained popularity. (Ayanda Malindi Krige & Sutherland, 2016; Lara-Bocanegra et al., 2022; Ugwu & Idemudia, 2023). It has become popular due to its high adaptability rate, problem-based learning, and improved analytical abilities (Deprez, 2024; Rodríguez-Peña, 2025). These analytical abilities are fostered via narrative materials combined with inquiries and exercises that promote group debate and intricate problem-solving. (Iacobucci & Micozzi, 2012; Moustaghfir et al., 2020; Nafari et al., 2024). In addition, case studies facilitate the application, analysis, and evaluation of more complex cognitive aspects.

Additionally, this study assessed team-based learning and case techniques according to students' proficiency with intrapreneurship and flow experiences. The Micro-Small-Medium Enterprise (MSMEs) case is the one that is being used. In this instance, students are required to handle business development-related issues in their own companies or other MSMEs. Solving problems entails a positive learning process. This learning strategy is based on the constructivism theory of learning (Grohs et al., 2017).

Additionally, this study's case method notion is an unstructured case approach. Using Porter's five strengths approach—PESTLE (Political, Economic, Socio-Cultural, Technological, Legal, and Environmental) and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) students are given real-world examples of how to develop existing businesses and empirically assess their viability. In order for students to reflect their learning progress at each meeting and be assessed by their peers, case assignments will be completed throughout the semester. In order to foster intrapreneurship in students, this learning design is anticipated to offer a sophisticated, rich, dynamic, real, and contextual learning experience.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

2.1. Research Approach

(Dung & Giang, 2022) suggests using a "pragmatic problem-solving model" in a case approach. The model consists of five steps: 1) Finding the problem; 2) Separating the problem from the leading cause and its symptoms; 3) Creating alternative problem-solving strategies; 4) Evaluate all available alternatives and choose the best one; and 5) Make a plan to implement the chosen strategy. Business development planning taught in the entrepreneurship and digital business study program is related to this stage. Therefore, the stage of the case study in this study is adjusted to the object of the research (Larsson, 2019).

Experimental design is used to apply and analyze case studies. Experimental studies are considered the most effective for demonstrating causal relationships in behavioural research (Darcis et al., 2024). This is due to the fact that when experimental manipulations are tried, student behavior is used to capture phenomena in experimental investigations. This study uses field experiments to take advantage of actual field learning. The Digital Business course is an example of field learning (Hair et al., 2019). Two groups were involved in the study: the experimental and control groups. The experimental group has a digital business and entrepreneurship study program with the same courses, while the control group has a digital business study program. Data in this study were collected at the end of the test (post-test) for both groups (Hair et al., 2019). Post-test testing was conducted on experimental and control groups to determine the behaviour between samples (Hair et al., 2019). The intrapreneurship and flow experience variables consisted of post-test instruments; The first was adapted from (Purwanto & Sudargini, 2021), and the second was adapted from (Miranda et al., 2014; Stott et al., 2019)

2.2. Experimental Procedure

The following is a description of the many steps of the experimental approach used in this study:

- a. Sample matching and selection: this is done to guarantee that the experimental and control groups have the same starting capabilities. Students with similar educational backgrounds make up the sample, and outliers are eliminated to guarantee that the participants have similar traits. The average academic performance from the previous semester is used to evaluate these appropriateness characteristics.
- b. Orientation to learning. discussion of the fundamental ideas and tactics of growing an entrepreneurial firm and how they are used in actual businesses, together with an explanation of the cases that students are required to complete in class;
- c. Preparation in groups. At this point, students organize into study or business groups based on their interest in a specific industry. After that, they have to assist them in solving the issue and coming up with strategies for business expansion.
- d. Resolution of cases. At this point, students examine Porter's five strengths: SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) and PESTLE (Political, Economic, Socio-Cultural, Technological, Legal, and Environmental). They then write a paper that includes a case solution. Students are invited to present their cases in front of the class at each step of the case-solving process so that their peers may provide comments. Additionally, students are encouraged to modify the format of their papers for submission to the student innovation program competition.
- e. Tests for Easter. Intrapreneurship abilities and flow experience tools must be developed by the conclusion of the course for both subjects and controllers. These tools are anonymous in order to guarantee that study participants are truthful in their assessments.

2.3. Data Analysis

Three phases were used to analyze the collected data. First, descriptive statistical analysis was used to evaluate the research subjects' intrapreneurship skills and flow experience. Furthermore, the Mann-Whitney U test evaluates the difference between a student's intrapreneurship skills and flow experience. We employed non-parametric tests as the data we gathered did not fit the normal distribution (Hair et al., 2019); and third, we utilized Square Least Square (PLS) to assess how flow experience affected students' intrapreneurship abilities. (Hair et al., 2019).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Demographics, Statistics, Sample and Descriptive

The study involved two experimental groups and one control group. Digital study programs for entrepreneurship and business were given to experimental groups, and digital study programs for business were given to control groups. All courses include the "business development strategy" course, which is used to apply the MSME case approach. According to the sex and study program, the experiment and control distribution samples were almost identical, as shown in Table 1. In addition, the results of the t-test between the study program and gender showed that there was no difference between the groups of learners. This indicates that there is no bias based on gender or knowledge. In addition, the intrapreneurship experience score and the Flow of the experimental group were higher than those of the control group. Before testing showed a difference, we were unsure whether the MSME case method improved the flow experience or intrapreneurship skills.

Table 1. Demographics, Statistics, Sample and Descriptive							
No t.	Criterion	n	%	Average Score		T-test	
				F E	In t	FE	Int
Experimental Group							
1. Gender							
	Man	23	49,25 %	4,29	4,25	0,3	0,6
	Woman	26	50,75 %	4,08	3,98	0,09	0,91
2. Courses							
	Entrepreneurship	24	48,97 %	4,07	3,95	0,3	0,1
	Digital Business	25	51,03 %	4,29	4,26	0,28	0,03
	Entire	49	100,0 0%	4,18	4,11		
Control Group							
1. Gender							
	Man	12	52,17 %	4,29	3,33		
	Woman	11	47,83 %	3,55	3,60		
	Entire	23	100,0 0%	3,93	3,46		

3.2. Experimental Results

To assess the efficacy of the MSME case technique, an experimental design was employed. The Mann-Whitney U Test was used to assess the results since the data did not satisfy the normalcy assumption. Table 2 below demonstrates that the MSME case technique enhanced students' intrapreneurship abilities, with an Asymptotic Sig of 0.005, below the threshold value (<0.05). Students' feelings of flow, however, were unaffected by this, with an Asymptotic Sig of 0.133 (>0.005). Consequently, whereas the first research goal is supported, the second one is not.

Table 2. Mann-Whitney U Test Results

Not.	Summary of the Mann- Whitney U Test	Intrapreneurship	Stream Experience
1.	Sum N	72	72
2.	Mann-Whitney U	325,000	439,500
3.	Wilcoxon W	601,000	715,500
4.	Test Statistics	325,000	439,500
5.	Standard Errors	82,009	82,460
6.	Standard Test Statistics	-2,908	-1,504
7.	Asymptotic Sig (2-sided test)	0,004	0,133

3.3. PLS Results

At this stage, we use PLS-SEM to perform an association analysis of intrapreneurship experiences and flows. This is due to the fact that variable features, which are latent variables, are necessary even though PLS-SEM is not a structural model (Hair et al., 2019). In order to verify the correctness of the construction, this study examined the external model prior to testing the hypothesis. Table 3 displays the construct's validity. After removing the invalid items (FE8 and I1), all items have loading factors greater than 0.7, meeting the convergent validity criterion. Furthermore, the flow experience (CA: 0.928; CR: 0.942) and intrapreneurship (CA: 0.955; CR: 0.964) pass the reliability test based on the Alpha and Cronbach Composite Reliability values. Last but not least, the HTMT value (0.385) satisfied the requirements of discriminant validity (<0.8), suggesting that the experiences of flow and intrapreneurship were different.

Table 3. Validity Construct

Variable	Loading Factor	AVE	CA	CR	HTM
Stream Experience					
FE1	0,804				
FE2	0,829				
FE3	0,891				
FE4	0,838	0,698	0,928	0,942	
FE5	0,867				
FE6	0,851				0,385
FE7	0,763				
Intrapreneurship					
I2	0,856				
I3	0,918	0,815	0,955	0,964	
I4	0,949				
I5	0,929				
I6	0,879				
I7	0,883				

The PLS findings are displayed in table 4 below. With a p-value of 0.000 (<0.05 , α : 5%) and a path coefficient of 0.379, the findings demonstrated that flow experience had a favorable impact on intrapreneurship. This implies that more students can develop their intrapreneurship abilities by participating in the stream. The findings demonstrate the third goal of the study.

Table 4. PLS Results

Road	Coef.	T-Statistics.	P value	Result
Intrapreneurship • Flow Experience	0,379	4,058	0,000	Supported

3.4. Discussion

According to this study, students' intrapreneurship abilities are greatly impacted by the MSME case technique. These findings are consistent with (Aparicio et al., 2020; Dennett, 2022; Yariv & Galit, 2017), who believe that intrapreneurship training should involve intricate learning activities that involve students in a variety of tasks that closely resemble real-world company occupations. This is because case studies allow students to interact with real business cases and contextual experiences, allowing them to experience the world of business or entrepreneurship firsthand during the renovation learning process (Brem & Borchardt, 2014; Putranto & Sakrapurnama, 2016; Raderstorf et al., 2024). It is anticipated that students would be able to suggest an alternative business synthesis or development utilizing the MSME case method, based on real-world issues, theoretical and research-based literature, market projections, and the best business strategy for their team. As stated by (Chen et al., 2022; Tracey & Stott, 2017), students learn to enhance their emotional, behavioral, and cognitive skills through such challenging assignments. Teaching entrepreneurship, specifically intrapreneurship abilities, is typically a good fit for the case

approach. The suggestions are also supported by these findings (Pätzmann, 2021). College graduates should be taught critical thinking skills through the use of a case method. However, the case method did not provide a student-flow experience in entrepreneurship education, according to this study. The findings, which indicate that participant-centered teaching is a kind of case study that aids students in following courses, go counter to this viewpoint. Complete learning engagement is demonstrated by flowing student experiences. These results could have arisen as a result of a failure to take into account the relative characteristics of the learner, the creation of favorable psychological settings, and learning dynamics study (Klein & Assadi, 2025). To identify the correct issue, additional investigation is necessary. After conducting some study, we can develop a better case design to enhance the learning experience for the students. These elements include the psychological state of the learner, the anticipated optimal learning dynamics, and the learning style and traits of each individual student. Finally, these findings suggest that students' intrapreneurship skills are strengthened by the experiences flowing from entrepreneurial education. This result aligns with the opinion (Frank et al., 2016) that Flow can help students internalize new information and integrate it into their knowledge. This can lead to new understanding and skills. Students who engage in their group assignments, discussions, and learning realize that learning is the responsibility of each student, not the teacher (de Lange & Dodds, 2017). Therefore, students with streams will be highly engaged during the learning process. This encourages them to adopt deep learning rather than surface learning. In addition, Students' ability to solve challenging issues will foster their ability to think creatively as a personal value. One of the most important aspects of intrapreneurship abilities is this. In order to come up with ideas and reach choices, students working on MSME case solving must also use critical, creative, and cooperative thinking. (Geradts & Alt, 2022), Intrapreneurship abilities require this (Urbano et al., 2024). Consequently, our results highlight the value of stream experiences in entrepreneurial education, particularly in approaches that need students to complete several tasks throughout the learning process.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This research aims to: 1) examine students' ability to identify opportunities; 2) investigate students' creativity and innovation towards intrapreneurship skills; 3) investigate the measurable risk-taking capabilities of intrapreneurship skills; 4) investigate the spirit of student leadership towards intrapreneurship skills; 5) investigating students' ability to cooperate with intrapreneurship skills; 6) investigate the orientation on the social impact of students on intrapreneurship skills. The study's results showed that students' stream experience during entrepreneurship education affected their intrapreneurship skills, but there was no evidence that the case of MSMEs could improve their flow experience. The results show that the case-based method benefits implementation as part of a business development course. As a result, entrepreneurship teachers should consider using case methods in their teaching programs. In designing cases, entrepreneurship teachers must find the proper case for specifically targeted learning outcomes to align the learning process and outcomes. The entrepreneurship program's expected outcome should align with what is learned during the case-solving process. In addition, university teachers should conduct further research on student learning styles, demographics, psychological conditions, and expected learning programs to enhance the student flow experience. Classroom action research will be beneficial for research strategies in these circumstances. Entrepreneurship teachers can create more appropriate case designs that enhance the student flow experience by using empirical data from their classrooms. Using ongoing and trustworthy action research, entrepreneurship gurus can create more appropriate case designs. According to this study, increasing student intrapreneurship is essential. No teaching design can improve the flow experience in this study. Therefore, we recommend further research to continue improving the design. Due to its experimental nature, this study may not have external validity. Research that replicates or modifies the case of MSMEs and applies them in non-business entrepreneurship education programs can result in external validity or generalization of MSME methods.

REFERENCES

- Aparicio, S., Turro, A., & Noguera, M. (2020). Entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in social, sustainable, and economic development: Opportunities and challenges for future research. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(21), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218958>
- Ayanda Malindi Krige, K., & Sutherland, M. (2016). Helenvale's recycling initiative – catalysing community-driven social entrepreneurship. *Emerald Emerging Markets Case Studies*, 6(4), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EEMCS-10-2016-0278>
- Ballesteros-Ruiz, M., Cardenas-del Castillo, F. F., & Corrales-Estrada, M. (2019). The entrepreneur and the types of entrepreneurship. In *Innovation and Entrepreneurship: A New Mindset for Emerging Markets* (pp. 65–81). Emerald Group Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-78973-701-120191007>
- Boore, J., & Porter, S. (2011). Education for entrepreneurship in nursing. *Nurse Education Today*, 31(2), 184–191. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2010.05.016>

- Brem, A., & Borchardt, J. (2014). Technology entrepreneurship, innovation and intrapreneurship - managing entrepreneurial activities in technology-intensive environments. In *Handbook of Research on Techno-Entrepreneurship, Second Edition: How Technology and Entrepreneurship are Shaping the Development of Industries and Companies* (pp. 17–38). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781781951828.00007>
- Carvalho, J. M. S. (2022). Modelling (Social) Intra/Entrepreneurship Process. *Emerging Science Journal*, 6(1), 14–36. <https://doi.org/10.28991/ESJ-2022-06-01-02>
- Cerro-Urcelay, I., Pinillos, M. J., & Blanco, M. R. (2023). Comparison of Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship: A Current View. *Revista Venezolana de Gerencia*, 28(10), 1194–1215. <https://doi.org/10.52080/rvgluz.28.e10.20>
- Chahine, T. (2022). Social Entrepreneurship: Building Impact Step by Step: Second Edition. In *Social Entrepreneurship: Building Impact Step by Step: Second Edition*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003094715>
- Chen, H., Lee, B. H., & Alymkulova, A. (2022). Gender gaps in opportunity-driven entrepreneurship: the impact of human and social capital. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 14(3), 285–299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJGE-06-2021-0097>
- Dai, L., Li, Z., Zeng, K., & Hu, Y. (2025). Where humor prevails, entrepreneurship never ends: the role of leader's positive humor on employee intrapreneurship. *Chinese Management Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CMS-09-2024-0655>
- Darcis, A. C., Hahn, R., & Alt, E. (2024). Putting entrepreneurship in corporate change agency: A typology of social intrapreneurs. *Business Ethics, the Environment and Responsibility*, 33(2), 170–183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12600>
- de Lange, D., & Dodds, R. (2017). Increasing sustainable tourism through social entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(7), 1977–2002. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-02-2016-0096>
- Dennett, P. (2022). Entrepreneurship & Intrapreneurship. In *The Handbook of Creativity & Innovation in Business: a Comprehensive Toolkit of Theory and Practice for Developing Creative Thinking Skills* (pp. 363–378). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-2180-3_17
- Deprez, J. (2024). Intrapreneurship as a driver of renewal in social organizations. In *Social Innovations in Education, Environment, and Healthcare* (pp. 170–190). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-2569-8.ch009>
- Dung, L. T., & Giang, H. T. T. (2022). The effect of international intrapreneurship on firm export performance with driving force of organizational factors. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 37(11), 2185–2204. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-01-2021-0018>
- Farrukh, M., Khan, M. S., Raza, A., & Shahzad, I. A. (2020). Influence of high-performance work systems on intrapreneurial behavior. *Journal of Science and Technology Policy Management*, 12(4), 609–626. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTPM-05-2020-0086>
- Frank, H., Korunka, C., Lueger, M., & Weismeier-Sammer, D. (2016). Intrapreneurship education in the dual education system. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Venturing*, 8(4), 334–354. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEV.2016.082218>
- Geradts, T. H. J., & Alt, E. (2022). Social entrepreneurial action in established organizations: Developing the concept of social intrapreneurship. *Journal of Business Research*, 151, 197–206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2022.06.047>
- Grohs, S., Schneiders, K., & Heinze, R. G. (2017). Outsiders and Intrapreneurs: The Institutional Embeddedness of Social Entrepreneurship in Germany. *Voluntas*, 28(6), 2569–2591. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-016-9777-1>
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2019). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM): An emerging tool in business research. *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- Iacobucci, D., & Micozzi, A. (2012). Entrepreneurship education in Italian universities: Trend, situation and opportunities. *Education and Training*, 54(8), 673–696. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911211274828>
- Kassa, A. G., & Raju, R. S. (2015). Investigating the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and employee engagement. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 7(2), 148–167. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-12-2014-0046>
- Kistruck, G. M., & Beamish, P. W. (2010). The interplay of form, structure, and embeddedness in social intrapreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 34(4), 735–761. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2010.00371.x>
- Klein, G., & Assadi, D. (2025). From Collectivism to Entrepreneurship: Personality Traits Driving Entrepreneurial Transformation in Kibbutzim. *Administrative Sciences*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15020065>

- Lages, M., Marques, C. S., Ferreira, J. J. M., & Ferreira, F. A. F. (2017). Intrapreneurship and firm entrepreneurial orientation: insights from the health care service industry. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(3), 837–854. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-016-0428-1>
- Lara-Bocanegra, A., Bohórquez, M. R., & García-Fernández, J. (2022). Innovation from sport's entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship: opportunities from a systematic review. *International Journal of Sports Marketing and Sponsorship*, 23(5), 863–880. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSMS-12-2020-0212>
- Larsson, A. (2019). The seven dimensions of Skunk Works: a new approach and what makes it unique. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 21(1), 37–54. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JRME-09-2017-0038>
- Laužikas, M., & Mačiukaitė-žvinienė, S. (2023). The Role of Cultural and Social Dimensions on New Entrepreneurship Opportunities After the Pandemic: Comparative Analysis Between Deep-Tech Entrepreneurs in Malta and Lithuania. In *Cross-Driven Institutional Resilience: Case Studies of Good Governance in Europe during the Covid-19 Pandemic* (pp. 71–115). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-31883-2_5
- Layman, C. V., Sasmoko, Hamsal, M., & Lim, S. (2023). Social Performance: A Vital Turning Point for Better Hospital Care in Indonesia. *Journal of Industrial Integration and Management*, 8(1), 83–112. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S242486222250018X>
- Manjon, M. J., Merino, A., & Cairns, I. (2021). Tackling energy poverty through social intrapreneurship in large-scale energy companies. *Social Enterprise Journal*, 17(4), 604–624. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SEJ-11-2020-0103>
- Mattingly, T. J., Abdelwadoud, M., Mullins, C. D., & Eddington, N. D. (2019). Pharmapreneur – defining a framework for entrepreneurship in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 83(10). <https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7548>
- Menegaz, J. D. C., Trindade, L. de L., & Dos Santos, J. L. G. (2021). Entrepreneurship in Nursing: contribution to the Health and Well-being Sustainable Development Goal. *Revista Enfermagem*, 29. <https://doi.org/10.12957/reuerj.2021.61970>
- Miranda, H. L., Duarte, D. L., Souza, M. V. S., & Filho, J. R. F. (2014). The influence of intellectual capital on organizational productivity: Literature review. *IIE Annual Conference and Expo 2014*, 1916–1925. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84910049330&partnerID=40&md5=11119ad3a9f9b502bbf6c8e97dd16428>
- Mottiar, Z., & Boluk, K. (2017). Understanding How Social Entrepreneurs Fit into the Tourism Discourse. In *Tourism on the Verge: Vol. Part F1057* (pp. 117–132). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-46518-0_7
- Moustaghfir, K., Ramid, S., & Touhs, K. (2020). Linking human resource management, entrepreneurial orientation, and firm performance: An integrative theoretical framework. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, 28(3), 394–414. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2020.109843>
- Murray, A. (2019). The role of practical assessment in the delivery of successful enterprise education. *Education and Training*, 61(4), 413–431. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-10-2018-0216>
- Nafari, J., Honig, B., & Siqueira, A. C. O. (2024). Promoting academic social intrapreneurship: Developing an international virtual incubator and fostering social impact. *Technovation*, 133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2024.103024>
- Parker, S. C. (2009). Intrapreneurship versus entrepreneurship: An analysis of PSIED II data. *Academy of Management 2009 Annual Meeting: Green Management Matters, AOM 2009*. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2009.44243404>
- Pätzmann, L. M. (2021). Enabling factors of digital intrapreneurship: A socio-technical perspective. *27th Annual Americas Conference on Information Systems, AMCIS 2021*. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85118661319&partnerID=40&md5=f227beb30452e9455066cfbc2edd4dbe>
- Purwanto, A., & Sudargini, Y. (2021). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) Analysis for Social and Management Research : A Literature Review. *Journal of Industrial Engineering & Management Research*, 2(4), 114–123.
- Putranto, I. J., & Sakrapurnama, E. (2016). Measuring entrepreneurship profiles in higher education, case study in universitas Indonesia. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, 2016(DecemberSpecialIssue), 95–100. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85007004067&partnerID=40&md5=2c883e7ee5201fecc442b2dc4f979353>
- Raderstorf, T., Podlesni, M., Meehan, C. W., Novello, J., & Wilson, P. (2024). Intrapreneurship, Business Models, and How Companies Make Money. In *Evidence-Based Leadership, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship in Nursing and Healthcare: A Practical Guide to Success, Second Edition* (pp. 421–439). Springer Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1891/9780826160720.0026>
- Ravina-Ripoll, R., Galvan-Vela, E., Sorzano-Rodríguez, D. M., & Ruíz-Corrales, M. (2023). Mapping intrapreneurship through the dimensions of happiness at work and internal communication. *Corporate Communications*, 28(2), 230–248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-03-2022-0037>
- Rigtering, J. P. C. (Coen., Weitzel, G. U. (Utz., & Muehlfeld, K. (Katrin). (2019). Increasing quantity without

- compromising quality: How managerial framing affects intrapreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.11.002>
- Rigtering, J. P. C., & Weitzel, U. (2013). Work context and employee behaviour as antecedents for intrapreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 9(3), 337–360. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-013-0258-3>
- Rodríguez-Peña, A. (2025). Corporate entrepreneurship and the sustainable development goals: exploring the connection. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00481-0>
- Stott, N., Fava, M., & Slawinski, N. (2019). Community social innovation: taking a long view on community enterprise. In *Handbook of Inclusive Innovation: The Role of Organizations, Markets and Communities in Social Innovation* (pp. 145–166). Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786436016.00018>
- Tajeddini, O., & Tajdini, J. (2023). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Its Effect on Business Performance: Evidence from Digikala. In *Innovation, Technology and Knowledge Management: Vol. Part F1550* (pp. 119–126). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40324-8_7
- Tracey, P., & Stott, N. (2017). Social innovation: a window on alternative ways of organizing and innovating. *Innovation: Organization and Management*, 19(1), 51–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14479338.2016.1268924>
- Turro, A., Alvarez, C., & Urbano, D. (2016). Intrapreneurship in the Spanish context: a regional analysis. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 28(5–6), 380–402. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2016.1162850>
- Ugwu, L. E., & Idemudia, E. S. (2023). Retirement Planning and Financial Anxiety among Nigerian Civil Servants: Insights from Social Comparison Theory. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(5). <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs13050425>
- Urbano, D., Orozco, J., & Turro, A. (2024). The effect of institutions on intrapreneurship: An analysis of developed vs developing countries. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 62(3), 1107–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2022.2161556>
- Wardana, L. W., Ahmad, Indrawati, A., Maula, F. I., Mahendra, A. M., Fatihin, M. K., Rahma, A., Nafisa, A. F., Putri, A. A., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2023). Do digital literacy and business sustainability matter for creative economy? The role of entrepreneurial attitude. *Heliyon*, 9(1), e12763. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e12763>
- Wardana, L. W., Martha, J. A., Wati, A. P., Narmaditya, S., Setyawati, A., Maula, F. I., & Martha, A. (2024). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy really matter for entrepreneurial intention? Lesson from covid-19. *Cogent Education*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2024.2317231>
- Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Mahendra, A. M., Wibowo, N. A., Harwida, G., & Rohman, A. N. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurship education and students' entrepreneurial mindset: the mediating role of attitude and self-efficacy. *Heliyon*, 6(9), e04922. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04922>
- Xie, F., Guan, X., Peng, X., Wang, C., Zeng, Y., Wang, Z., & Bai, R. (2024). Exploration of the Deep Impact of Digital Platforms on Innovation and Entrepreneurship Activities of Entrepreneurs under the Information Management Framework. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16103919>
- Yariv, I., & Galit, K. (2017). Can Incivility Inhibit Intrapreneurship? *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 26(1), 27–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0971355716677386>