

## **THE EFFECT OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE ON INTRAPRENEURSHIP ATTITUDES OF EMPLOYEES**

**Reşat ŞEKERDİL** <sup>1</sup>

**Evrım GÜNEŞ** <sup>2</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this study is to examine the effect of leadership styles and organization culture on intrapreneurship. The relationship of intrapreneurship with organization culture and leadership styles among employees was examined. In this research, the effect of leadership and organizational culture variables are focused on intrapreneurship variable. Within the scope of the research, hypotheses are tested using a random sample of 154 employees working in SMEs in Izmir. In order to test construct validity of the study; factor analysis, correlation analysis were used to measure the severity and direction of the relationship between the variables and regression analysis was used to measure causality between variables. Findings showed that leadership and it's sub-dimensions, organizational culture and it's sub-dimensions had a significant and positive effect on intrapreneurship.

**Keywords:** Organizational Culture, Leadership Styles, Entrepreneurship, Intrapreneurship

**JEL Codes:** O31, M10, M13

---

<sup>1</sup>Ph.D. Student, Ege University, Institute of Social Sciences,35100, Campus Bornova, Izmir, Turkey, resat121@hotmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Ph.D. Student, Ege University, Institute of Social Sciences,35100, Campus Bornova, Izmir, Turkey  
evrimgunes1988@gmail.com

Geliş Tarihi/ Received: 13.02.2020

Kabul Tarihi/ Accepted: 04.06.2020

## INTRODUCTION

Organizational culture interacts with the person; this interaction causes an exchange between organizations and employees. Organizations enable employees to gain new skills, new knowledge and new equipment. In this way, organizations create a change. If the managers managing this change have leadership qualities, they will enable their employees to establish integrity with the organization and employees who integrate with the organizational culture will develop their sense of belonging. The individual's need to belong, his desire to integrate his deficiencies and to identify himself with the organization can turn into a strong entrepreneurial motivation. A strong source of intrapreneurship is a unique opportunity for businesses. Because employees with strong sense of belonging will increase the growth and development of the organization with their strong leaders. For example, organizational cultures which has features that is risk taking encouraged, shown tolerance for failures, having positive and supportive management, providing free time in order to contribute by employees, making discourses about the common vision and mission innovative, providing information exchange among employees, is supported innovation activities within the organization structure and culture. Thus, the company can sustain innovations in the scope of business.

This study tries to explain how organizational culture and leadership behaviors contribute to the potential of intrapreneurs. In the literature section, we explain the concepts of organizational culture, leadership and intrapreneurship which are related to research in order to ensure understanding of the research's purpose and provide useful information in the flow of research appropriately. The methodological approach adopted shows the way in which results are handled, their scientific basis, explains primary research methods, and summarizes important findings. In the conclusion part, evaluations and suggestions regarding organizational culture and leadership styles are presented to develop intrapreneurial behavior.

## 1. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to Denison (1996), organizational culture is the deep structure of organizations based on values, beliefs and assumptions shared by members of the organization. James et al. (2007) defined culture as "normative beliefs (system values) and common behavior expectations in an organization (system norms). According to Beugelsdijk et al. (2006), organizational culture is unique to an organization (Smircich, 1983), relatively stable (Christensen and Gordon, 1999) and may affect inter-institutional relations. For these reasons, organizational culture provides enterprises with sustainable competitive advantage (Miron, Erez and Naheh, 2004) (cited in Sarros et al., 2008: 147). Organizational culture is a sub-element of culture (Eren, 2007: 135; Köksal, 2018: 484; Akyürek and Çelik, 2018: 309).

Organizational culture is an important strategic resource that firms can use to gain competitive advantage, encouraging learning, risk-taking and innovation (cited from Dyer et al. by Zahra et al., 2004: 365).

Organizations have the power to influence their collaborators, constituting by that the force that explains human motivation within the organizational framework. This will explain why someone has the ability to act on behalf of a group or organization. Participating in group work becomes a motivating force to be desired for changes in organizations and employees. It could hardly be conceived of innovative companies without deepening their organizational culture. According to Matthew, the organizational culture is a constitution based on the common beliefs shared by certain human groups, which become their dominant patterns of behavior and values. For Kline and Rosenberg (1986), organizational culture forms the basis for the success of innovation projects. Culture is the way we do things in one way or another. Schein defines that “organizational culture is the pattern of basic premises that are in group invented, discovered or developed in the process of learning to solve their problems of external adaptation and internal integration and that worked well enough to the point of being considered valid and appropriate to be taught to new members of the group as the correct way to perceive, think and feel in relation to these problems (López et al., 2019: 72).

Although there are common characteristics that are accepted as entrepreneurs in all cultures, there are studies that determine cultural differences and that each culture prefers certain characteristics. The study of entrepreneurial personality in various cultures shows that the entrepreneurial phenomenon is more strongly linked to the performance of emerging economies than developed economies (Luca et al, 2016: 174). Organizational culture can be abstract and concrete because it covers all material and spiritual elements. It can be provided efficiency, productivity, as well as that can be caused performance degradations, resistance to changes, conflicts (Akyürek and Çelik, 2018: 310).

One of the most widely used models in empirical research on organizational culture is the types of organizational culture that emerged within the framework of the competitive values model developed by Cameron and Quinn. In the competitive values model, the type of organizational culture emerges as a result of the degree of environmental approach and management approach adopted by enterprises (Çetin and Topaloğlu, 2017: 479-480). The classification made by Cameron and Quinn will be discussed. These are clan, adhocracy, market and hierarchy cultures (Örki, 2018: 15-16; Sazkaya, 2018: 119-120; Çetin and Topaloğlu, 2017: 480; Engelen et al., 2014: 734-740).

Clan (Collaborative) Culture: the friendly work environment is similar to family-type enterprises and stands out as a type of organizational culture where compliance, business rotation, teamwork and participation in management are important. Employees can easily express their thoughts, rewarding is team-based, shared values and goals, commitment to the organization, employee participation are among the characteristics of this culture. Expresses an inward culture where unity and

solidarity are important. Clan culture promotes the personal atmosphere between peers (horizontal relationships) and personal, mentor-based leadership (vertical relationships) between superiors and subordinates. Employees in individualist cultures tend to work with very broad job descriptions, but workers in collectivist cultures tend to prefer narrow job descriptions that protect them (Çetin and Topaloğlu, 2017: 480; Sazkaya, 2018: 119)

**Adhocracy Culture:** it expresses an innovative cultural environment, communicates quickly with the environment, fulfills the requirements of the information age, research and development is important for its, it innovates in products and services, evaluates opportunities, it has visionary of entrepreneurial, innovative, risk-taking organizational cultures. It has an organic structure. In this type of organization, innovation and creativity is encouraged, employees can take initiative, in order to adapt to a dynamic and rapidly changing environment, it is seen in organizations with flexible structures. In an adhocracy organizational culture, relations between peers (horizontal relationships) are characterized by flexibility as innovation, and pursuing opportunities requires changes in relationships. Adhocracy culture may jeopardize harmony, another important value of collective cultures (Örki, 2018: 15-16; Engelen et al., 2014: 734; Sazkaya, 2018: 119).

**Market (Competition) Culture:** the main objective(s) are to focus on the external environment, to focus on competition, to focus on transaction cost approach, profitability, competitiveness, population penetration and productivity. It is important to gain competitive advantage and interact with the external environments such as customers, suppliers, competitors, trade unions. Employees are very competitive and focused on achieving the goal, the success of the organization is measured by its success in the market. Market culture means a strong production orientation that emphasizes goals and tasks. It contrasts strongly with collectivist cultures. It is more compatible with low power distance cultures (Çetin and Topaloğlu, 2017: 480; Sazkaya, 2018: 119).

**Hierarchy (Control) Culture:** there is almost no diversity in product or service, a sluggish environment prevails, and all environmental variables are almost under control, based on formal and structured rules and policies. In this culture of extreme formality and a structured work environment, order and rules are important. A hierarchical culture is defined by the stability and predictability of horizontal relationships, the order of rules and coordinator-style leadership in vertical relationships between superiors and subordinates (Sazkaya, 2018: 119-120; Çetin and Topaloğlu, 2017: 480).

In the process of change, leadership and organizational culture are linked (Afsaneh, 1993; Kotter, 1998; Schein, 1984). As Kotter (1998) points out, culture that can adapt to change can really be developed and nurtured only through leadership". According to Ostroff et al., (2003), leadership is a new process that acts on both organizational climate and culture (cited in Sarros et al., 2008: 145).

The concept of leadership is a very old concept and has been the subject of science since the 1920s, many definitions have been made about the concept of leadership, and new leadership styles have

emerged during the history process (Bakan and Büyükbeşe, 2010: 73). Leaders, who have a great influence on human behavior, are still not more understandable today. The reason for this is that leadership in every environment and condition has different characteristics of leadership (Cemaloğlu, 2007: 76).

In general, the following elements are mentioned in leadership definitions (Alga, 2017: 98; Cemaloğlu, 2007: 76; Bakan ve Büyükbeşe, 2010: 74; Güney, 2016: 381-382; Tetik, 2014: 268; Demir et al., 2010: 131; Gazi and Alam, 2014: 253; Fiaz et al., 2017).

- To be able to gather the employees around certain purposes and to ensure their efficient work,
- To mobilize, influence and motivate the employees,
- To increase the competencies of the employees, to ensure the change, to solve the problems,
- To create an effective, sufficient and dynamic organization by combining the values, norms and ideals of the organization between employees,
- Positive impact on employees without using coercive power.

**Instrumental Leadership:** The characteristics of the guiding leadership that the performances are clearly defined, and the necessary procedures are prepared by the managers and the works are clearly presented. In this respect, the leader's dominance over planning, organizing, directing and controlling functions comes to the forefront. It is made possible by involving the employee in the decision processes in order to ensure equal, fair, consistent and participatory transactions. Although the leadership does not focus on the distribution of resources, it clearly emphasizes the gains to be achieved by employees (such as salary increase, promotion and job security) and emphasizes that the employees receive these rewards (Turhan, 2015:106).

**Democratic-Participatory Leadership:** The leader shares his authority with his subordinates, The leadership behavior includes that acts by getting the opinions of employees in determining goals and targets, in the distribution of work, in making plans and policies (Bayyurt and Kılıç, 2017: 2, Eren, 2017: 461) . The participant leader can be provided that the participate is in three different ways; the first participation that is mental and emotional participation, the second is participation that motivation through increasing the creativity of employees, the third is participation that enables employees to take responsibility (Alga, 2017: 101). It results in high employee productivity, satisfaction, collaboration and commitment. Reduces the need for controls and formal rules and procedures. Low employee absenteeism and turnover results. It develops competent people who are willing to do their best, think for themselves, communicate clearly and take responsibility (Gazi and Alam, 2014: 258). In this style of leadership, a high degree of staff morale is always enhanced (Okoji Olufemi, 2015: 134).

**Supportive Leadership:** House (1981) stated that supportive leaders had emotional behaviors such as sympathy, love, caring, and listening to their followers. It also emerges as an informative leader who worries and cares about the needs and preferences of his followers (Alannah and Mark, 2006: 39).

It is claimed that supportive leader behavior shapes the self-efficacy feelings that help the subordinates to reach the goal by directing them to learn their roles effectively and effectively (Banai and Reisel, 2007: 466). The leader directly cares about the satisfaction of his followers' needs. It takes care of its followers and takes a friendly approach, attaching importance to their care, well-being, and meeting their needs, and creates a work environment where friendly and employees are psychologically supported (Turhan, 2015:23).

Ardichvili et al. (1998) integrated the interests of entrepreneurship, leadership and organizational behavior. Venture capital capitalists regard an entrepreneur's leadership ability as critical and make it necessary for entrepreneurs to work together, understand and motivate others towards goals. Schein (1983) showed the key role played by the founder in establishing an institution's culture. In this context, entrepreneurial organization is effective in the process of revealing culture (cited in Jensen and Luthans, 2006: 649-650). Entrepreneurship culture is a culture in which new ideas and creativity are expected, risk taking is encouraged, failure is tolerated, learning is encouraged, product, process and administrative innovations are put forward and continuous change is seen as a carrier of opportunities (Ireland et al., 2003). Many of the structures used in the field of entrepreneurship are also found in the mainstream of leadership theory. Entrepreneurship is a leadership that occurs in a certain environment (cited in Vecchio, 2003: 62).

In the literature of entrepreneurship, two models are used to explain the formation and results of entrepreneurship. First, Shapiro's (1984) model of entrepreneurial event: entrepreneurial intentions develop if individuals experience positive or negative events that lead to a change in behavior. The perception of feasibility and perception of desirability is the belief that entrepreneurs have the ability to successfully perform their roles and tasks, and they are the pioneers of entrepreneurial self-efficacy development (Krueger et al., 2000). Secondly, Ajzen's (1991) planned behavior theory states it is shaped by attitude: attitudes towards behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavior control. The perceived desirability and perceived feasibility in Shapiro's model corresponds to Ajzen's attitudes and perceived behavior control, respectively. Therefore, many researchers have used perceptions of feasibility and desirability to explain entrepreneurial intentions. (Laspita et al., 2012: 416).

In this context, in order to develop entrepreneurship in the company, perceived desirability and perceived feasibility against the behavior of employees should be evaluated. Another point of view (Vecchio, 2003: 305) is the supply and demand side. While the supply-side approach examines the tendency and usability of individuals for entrepreneurial roles, the demand-side approach focuses on the number and quality of entrepreneurial roles that need to be filled. The supply side approach focuses on the demand side content while examining the psychology of the individual. Entrepreneurship has an economic dimension as well as a behavioral dimension, but a good general definition focusing on the managerial aspects of entrepreneurship is the pursuit of opportunity without considering the available

resources. This definition serves well to identify intrapreneurship that seeks opportunities within an existing organization, as well as the pursuit of opportunities by creating new initiatives. Entrepreneurship includes identifying opportunities, analyzing risks and gains, strategic tracking of resources, and implementing an action plan. Barriers to such activities can be economic, organizational or behavior (Phillips, 2006: 473).

The term intrapreneur was first used by Macrae (1976) in *The Economist*, and was later described by Pinchot (1985) “shorthand for intra-corporate entrepreneur” intrapreneurship was created to distinguish between the types of entrepreneurship in existing organizations. Intrapreneurs are different from entrepreneurs because they have an innovative idea like entrepreneurs and they are determined to do this in an entrepreneurial way by using their entrepreneurial skills and passions in their own companies (Di Fabio, 2014: 99).

In the literature, intrapreneurship is generally classified in seven dimensions. These are new business venturing, innovativeness, self-renewal, proactiveness, competitive aggressiveness, risk-taking and autonomy (İbrahimoğlu and Uğurlu, 2013: 105-106). We can summarize these dimensions as below (Bektemür, 2018: 162; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229; İbrahimoğlu and Uğurlu, 2013: 106,; Dehghanzadeh, et al, 2016 ; Attali and Yemini, 2017: 144; Solymossy, 1998: 52-57; Vecchio, 2003: 307-309, Eyal and Kark, 2010: 213):

Innovation, is pointed at the development of existing products and services, the creation of new products, services, processes, management systems that add value, or combined forms. The successful implementation of creative ideas can be expressed as the realization of new and untested ideas. Innovation is defined as the ability to implement newly designed services and /or products (Eyal and Kark, 2010:211; Patricia da Silva Souza and Takahashi, 2017: 340)

Risk Taking, is one of the basic elements of intrapreneurship and it is an inseparable dimension of its. Risk Taking is defined as attempting in the unknown situations, seeking high returns by taking the risk of losing. The tendency to take risks is a decision-making orientation to accept a greater probability of loss for a larger potential reward (Dehghanzadeh, et al, 2016:596; İbrahimoğlu and Uğurlu, 2013: 106)

Proactive Behavior, can be defined as leading the way, not lagging behind the changes that occur, taking advantage of new opportunities, taking risks, seeing the markets and shortcomings in the markets, finding out which new products and services can be improved, and creating strategic profitability and competitive advantage. Proactivity is the tendency to shape the environment rather than just passively react (Eyal and Kark, 2010:211; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229)

Autonomy (autonomy), can be expressed as independence within the company, as a team or as an individual, not being influenced by others until starting and ending a business idea. To present their ideas, visions, reporting to managers, having the information and continue learning can be defined as

autonomy. Autonomy can be defined as the desire to be independent and self-directed (Vecchio, 2003: 308; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229).

The New Business Initiative, is able to work autonomously or semi-autonomously to initiate an initiative within or outside the organization, and to initiate an initiative regardless of the size of the organization and the level of competence granted (İbrahimoglu and Ugurlu, 2013: 106); Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229.

Self-Renewal, means that organizations change their shape by adding new ones to existing ideas and strategies, redefining and arranging the business concept, realizing fundamental innovations by defining new strategies and developing new ideas. Self-efficacy is the belief that the entrepreneur has the capacity to perform their roles and tasks (İbrahimoglu and Ugurlu, 2013: 106; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229).

Competitive Entrepreneurship, means trying radical, unusual and new methods rather than traditional methods. It identifies the weaknesses of the opponent and strengthen own position in the market and stand out from own competitors (İbrahimoglu and Ugurlu, 2013: 106; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229).

Competitive Assertiveness is defined as making something different, changing existing conditions and applying extraordinary strategies such as struggle and challenge. Competitive assertiveness is defined as making something different, changing existing conditions and applying extraordinary strategies such as struggle and challenge. ( Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229)

An entrepreneur is often defined as a leader who must identify people and attract people to move around that vision. In this context, entrepreneurship and leadership are intertwined behaviors (Jensen and Luthans, 2006: 652). Thus, the ability to influence others to emphasize behaviors of seeking opportunities and seeking advantages can be defined as entrepreneurial leadership (Antonakis and Autio, 2014:192).

The term entrepreneurship refers to how entrepreneurial the individual's mentality or culture of an organization is; the higher the entrepreneurship, the more entrepreneurial mentality and culture. Organizational culture and entrepreneurship are a feed-and-feed cycle that nurtures and feeds each other and improves each other. In this context, an increase in the entrepreneurship of an organizational culture leads to the feedback effect of an increase in the entrepreneurship of the manager's mentality. The interdependence between the entrepreneurship of the manager's mentality and the entrepreneurship of the culture of the organization has shown that the entrepreneurial culture and entrepreneurial mentality are inseparably intertwined (Shepherd et al., 2009: 60).

The aim of this research is to demonstrate the impact of leadership styles and organization culture on intrapreneurship tendencies. The main hypothesis of the research within this scope is that "



leadership styles and organization culture performance have significant and positive effect on intrapreneurship tendencies".

Ha: Leadership styles will have positive effect on the intrapreneurship

Hb: Organization culture performance will have positive effect on the intrapreneurship

Within the scope of the basic hypothesis of the research; the following hypothesis were tested considering leadership styles and organization culture performances; leadership styles sub-dimension (instrumental, democratic-participatory, supportive), organization culture sub-dimension (clan culture and culture of adhocracy, hierarchy culture and market culture) and intrapreneurship sub-dimension (innovation and risk taking, proactivity, competitive assertiveness and autonomy and self-renewal).

## 2. DATA

The research was carried out in May – June 2019 in Izmir where there are SMEs. The reasons for conducting the research in İzmir; it is the third largest city of Turkey, has got a large number of firms, provides saving time and money. The population in the research area includes firms' employees who were chosen randomly and were considered to contribute to the work as voluntary. The survey methods were used. The survey methods were used. It is possible to measure the attitudes of the individual perceptions after discussing with the firms' managers and obtaining the necessary permits. A quantitative approach has been adopted in the research. The questionnaire which includes participants' demographics was reported, then the intrapreneurship, organization culture, leadership styles tendencies were measured on a 5point Likert scale. The rating is appropriate for a likert scale of 5 (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). 19 items on Intrapreneurship Scale, 15 items on Organization Culture Scale, 22 items on Leadership Styles scale were used in the questionnaire. The leadership styles scale - leadership styles sub-dimension scale items were reached scale items in doctoral thesis that is entitled "A Research On Investigation Of The Relationship Among Perceived Leadership Styles, Organizational Justice And Organizational Commitment" by Turhan (2015). House and Dessler (1974) model was developed by House and Robert (1993), the final development is made up of items by Karayel (1999). Huang et al. (2011) and Sökmen and Boylu (2009) were used in Perceived Leadership Behavior Scale. There are a total of 22 items in the perceived leadership behavior which were made up of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 22 items of Instrumental leadership Style, 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20 and 21 items of participatory leadership style, 8, 9, 10, 18, 19, 20 and 21 items of participatory leadership style, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 items of leadership style (cited in Turhan, 2015). The organization culture scale - organization culture sub-dimension scale items were reached scale items in doctoral thesis that is entitled "The Examination of Relationships Among Organizational Culture, Organizational Silence and The Intention of Leaving from Work" by Acaray (2014). A review of the literature shows that the quantitative assessment of organizational culture has been dominated by studies adopting the competing values

framework developed by Quinn and Cameron. The use of this model embraces the notion that the 4 cultural types (hierarchical culture, market culture, clan culture and adhocracy culture). There are 13,14,15 items of hierarchical culture, 9,10, 11,12 items of market culture, 1,2,3,4 items of clan culture, 5,6,7,8 items of adhocracy culture in the organization culture scale (cited in Acaray, 2014). The intrapreneurship scale - intrapreneurship sub-dimension scale items were reached scale items in article that is entitled "The Relationship between Organizational Culture and Intrapreneurship in SMES: A Sectoral Research" by İbrahimoğlu and Uğurlu (2013). Intrapreneurship scale was adapted from the study of Antoncic and Hisrich (2003). There are 5 items of innovation, 4 items of self-renewal, 5 items of risk taking, 3 items of proactivity, 3 items of competitive assertiveness and 6 items of autonomy in the intrapreneurship scale (Cited in İbrahimoğlu and Uğurlu, 2013).

### 3. ANALYSIS RESULTS

Intrapreneurship scale - intrapreneurship sub-dimension scale, organization culture scale - organization culture sub-dimension scale and leadership styles scale - leadership styles sub-dimension scale analysis were examined with Cronbach Alfa in the research, the results are shown in Table 1. In addition, factor analysis was used to measure construct validity of the scales. The results are shown in Table 2.

**Table 1: Reliability Analysis Related to Scales**

Scale	Cronbach Alpha( $\alpha$ )	N
<b>Intrapreneurship</b>	<b>0,909</b>	<b>12</b>
Innovation and Risk Taking	0,873	5
Proactivity	0,748	2
Competitive Assertiveness and Autonomy	0,830	2
Self-renewal	0,839	3
<b>Organization Culture</b>	<b>0,872</b>	<b>11</b>
Clan Culture and Culture of Adhocracy	0,862	7
Hierarchy Culture and Market Culture	0,679	4
<b>Leadership Styles</b>	<b>0,926</b>	<b>15</b>
Instrumental	0,813	6
Democratic-Participatory	0,799	3
Supportive	0,952	6

**Table 2: Factor Analysis and Findings**

Factors	Items	Factor Load Range	Explained Variance	KMO	$\chi^2$	df	p
<b>Leadership Styles</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>0,875 - 0,526</b>	<b>69,814</b>	<b>0,925</b>	<b>1613,634</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>0,000</b>
Supportive	6	0,948-0,830	80,873	0,920	966,588	15	0,000
Instrumental	6	0,801-0,619	52,949	0,837	286,399	15	0,000
Democratic-Participatory	3	0,861-0,822	71,356	0,706	142,103	3	0,000
<b>Organization Culture</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0,822-0,575</b>	<b>55,323</b>	<b>0,873</b>	<b>651,148</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>0,000</b>
Clan and Adhocracy Culture	7	0,807-0,571	55,116	0,848	454,083	21	0,000
Hierarchy and Market Culture	4	0,764- 0,623	51,654	0,715	95,869	6	0,000
<b>Intrapreneurship</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0,870- 0,540</b>	<b>75,896</b>	<b>0,879</b>	<b>1041,463</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0,000</b>
Innovation and Risk Taking	5	0,892- 0,698	67,250	0,848	414,268	10	0,000
Self-Renewal	3	0,881- 0,864	76,052	0,727	185,446	3	0,000
Competitive Assertiveness and Autonomy	2	0,925- 0,925	85,531	0,500	106,526	1	0,000
Proactivity	2	0,894- 0,894	79,879	0,500	66,926	1	0,000

<b>Organizational Culture Scale</b>	<b>Clan and Adhocracy Culture</b>	<b>Hierarchy and Market Culture</b>		
Leadership in our business generally refers to entrepreneurship, innovation and risk taking.	0,822			
It is very important to obtain new resources and search for new opportunities and opportunities in our company.	0,789			
It is the commitment of employees to the workplace that holds our business together and carries it to success.	0,698			
Emphasis is placed on the development of employees in our business.	0,642			
Since our business is entrepreneurial and dynamic, employees are willing to take risks.	0,627			
Our business is like a large family where employees share many things.	0,597			
Leadership in our business generally refers to guidance, facilitating and educating.	0,575			
Leadership in our business often refers to coordinating, organizing, or working efficiently.		0,772		
What keeps our business together is formal rules and policies.		0,695		
In our company, where employees are competitive and success-oriented, jobs are oriented towards results.		0,612		
It is very important that the works in our company are balanced and trouble-free.		0,595		
<b>Leadership Scale</b>	<b>Supportive</b>	<b>Instrumental</b>	<b>Democratic-Participatory</b>	
He takes the ideas of his subordinates before taking action.	0,900			
He takes the ideas of his subordinates before making decisions.	0,885			
Takes into consideration the suggestions of subordinates.	0,878			
Receives ideas of subordinates while sharing tasks.	0,843			
When faced with problems, he consults his subordinates.	0,759			
Makes his subordinates' job attractive to them.	0,668			
Puts things to do.		0,815		
Provides an understanding of the weight of his subordinates.		0,738		
Determines and applies success standards.		0,721		
Ensures that subordinates comply with standard rules.		0,631		
Explains what he expects from his subordinates.		0,605		
Decide what should be done and how.		0,514		
Puts suggestions from subordinates into practice.			0,823	
He treats his subordinates as friends.			0,709	
Treats his subordinates as equal and equal to himself.			0,641	
<b>Intrapreneurship Scale</b>	<b>Innovation and Risk Taking</b>	<b>Self-Renewal</b>	<b>Proactivity</b>	<b>Competitive Assertiveness and Autonomy</b>
The importance given to developing new services / products and making technological innovations in our company is gradually increasing.	0,847			
In our business, the resources allocated for the development of new services, technologies and techniques are increasing.	0,824			
There is an increase in the number of new services / projects / products developed in the last five years.	0,823			
Significant changes have been made in existing products / services and processes in the last five years.	0,665			
Senior management is taking bold and comprehensive steps to achieve the goals set.	0,540			
Business units and departments are reorganized to increase innovation efforts and activities.		0,802		
The areas to be operated are redefined from time to time.		0,756		
Flexible organizational structures are created to increase innovation and creativity.		0,749		
In this facility, other employees are given the freedom to participate in decisions regarding changes in existing product / service and price structures.			0,870	
In this company, promotion / marketing strategies for a new product or service are given the freedom to make decisions to other employees.			0,828	
This business is always the first to use new technology, techniques and methods while competing with its competitors.				0,873
This business has the power to move ahead of its competitors while fighting.				0,705

In order to determine the organizational culture dimensions, varimax rotation factor analysis was applied to the 15 variables in the questionnaire with the basic components method. In order to determine the organizational culture dimensions, varimax rotation factor analysis was applied to the 15 variables in the questionnaire with the basic components method. As a result of the analysis, the questions of OK7, OK10, OK11, OK12 were excluded from the analysis as they reduced the validity of

decomposition. As a result of factor analysis, 2 factors and 11 variables explained 55% of the total variance. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was measured by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test. The fact that KMO is 0.873 and that the Barlett Sphericity test (651,148;  $p < 0.000$ ) is significant shows that the data are suitable for factor analysis. The organizational culture scale developed by Cameron and Quinn includes four dimensions: adhocracy, market, hierarchy and clan. In the factor analysis conducted in the study, when the variables were evaluated in terms of factor loads, it was observed that the variables of adhocracy and market culture type were collected under one factor and the variables of clan culture type were collected under one factor. Table 2 shows the factors and variance values of the organizational culture variable. In order to determine the leadership dimensions, equamax rotation factor analysis was applied to the 17 variables in the questionnaire with the basic components method. As a result of the analysis, L7, L12, L11, L3, L14, L15, L17 questions were excluded from the analysis as they reduced the validity of decomposition. As a result of factor analysis, 3 factors and 15 variables explained 69% of the total variance. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was measured by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test. The fact that KMO is 0.925 and that the Barlett Sphericity test (1613,634;  $p < 0,000$ ) is significant shows that the data are suitable for factor analysis. The leadership style scale developed by Turhan includes 3 dimensions as supportive, directive, participatory and democratic. In the factor analysis carried out in the study, when the variables were evaluated in terms of factor loadings, it was observed that the variables of the supportive leadership type were collected under one factor, the variables of the guiding leadership type were collected under one factor and the variables of participatory - democratic leadership type were collected under one factor. Table 2 shows the factors and variance values of the leadership style variable. In order to determine the dimensions of intrapreneurship, varimax rotation factor analysis was applied to 19 variables in the questionnaire with the basic components method. In order to determine the dimensions of intrapreneurship, varimax rotation factor analysis was applied to 19 variables in the questionnaire with the basic components method. As a result of the analysis, IC6, IC7, IC8, IC11, IC12, IC13, IC16 questions were excluded from the analysis as they reduced the validity of decomposition. As a result of factor analysis, 4 factors and 12 variables explained 75% of the total variance. The suitability of the data for factor analysis was measured by Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) coefficient and Barlett Sphericity test. The fact that KMO was 0.75896 and that the Barlett Sphericity test (1041, 463;  $p < 0,000$ ) was significant indicated that the data were suitable for factor analysis. The intrapreneurship scale developed by Antoncic and Hisrich includes 4 dimensions as innovation and risk-taking, self-renewal, competitive assertiveness and autonomy, and being proactive. In the factor analysis carried out in the study, when the variables were evaluated in terms of factor loadings, the variables of supportive innovation and risk taking type were collected under one factor, the variables of self-renewal type were collected under one factor, the variables of competitive assertiveness and autonomy type were collected

under one factor, and the variables of proactive type were collected under one factor. It was observed. Table 2 shows the factors and variance values of the leadership style variable.

**Table 3: Variables between Correlation Analysis and Findings**

	Intrapreneurship	Innovation and Risk Taking	Self-renewal	Proactivity	Competitive Assertiveness and Autonomy	Organization Culture	Clan Culture and Culture of Adhocracy	Hierarchy Culture and Market Culture	Leadership Styles	Supportive	Instrumental	Democratic-Participatory
<b>Mean</b>	3,80	3,87	3,79	3,62	3,81	3,94	3,83	4,14	4,02	3,82	4,27	3,73
<b>Std. Deviation</b>	0,77	0,90	0,91	0,97	0,89	0,67	0,82	0,60	0,66	1,06	0,52	0,99
Intrapreneurship	1,00	,932**	,712**	,687**	,762**	,686**	,668**	,527**	,656**	,603**	,544**	,590**
Innovation and Risk Taking		1,00	,603**	,451**	,584**	,609**	,597**	,458**	,586**	,554**	,467**	,530**
Self-renewal			1,00	,610**	,564**	,679**	,640**	,571**	,563**	,520**	,476**	,522**
Proactivity				1,00	,428**	,554**	,536**	,433**	,518**	,500**	,497**	,425**
Competitive Assertiveness and Autonomy					1,00	,509**	,489**	,408**	,489**	,389**	,380**	,479**
Organization Culture						1,00	,966**	,786**	,631**	,595**	,507**	,571**
Clan and Adhocracy Culture							1,00	,599**	,581**	,564**	,433**	,558**
Hierarchy and Market Culture								1,00	,564**	,492**	,533**	,431**
Leadership Styles									1,00	,754**	,810**	,869**
Supportive										1,00	,493**	,665**
Instrumental											1,00	,497**
Democratic-Participatory												1,00

\*p<0.01level is significance

**Table 4: Regression Analysis and Findings for The Effect of Leadership Styles and Organizational Culture on Intrapreneurship Attitudes of Employees**

Independent Variable	Intrapreneurship								DurbinWatson
	R2	F	β	SD	T	p	Tolerance	VIF	
Leadership Styles	0,547	93,411	0,516	0,080	6,449	0,000	0,602	1,662	1,375
Organization Culture			0,433	0,082	5,279	0,000	0,602	1,662	
Supportive	0,479	45,964	0,218	0,059	3,680	0,000	0,523	1,914	1,528
Instrumental			0,400	0,104	3,827	0,000	0,706	1,416	
Democratic-Participatory			0,199	0,063	3,148	0,002	0,520	1,924	
Clan Culture and Culture of Adhocracy	0,464	67,210	0,517	0,070	7,432	0,000	0,642	1,558	1,434
Hierarchy Culture and Market Culture			0,253	0,094	2,680	0,008	0,642	1,558	

\*p<0.01level is significance

The coefficients of correlation are shown between the variables of intrapreneurship and the variables of organization culture and leadership styles used in the research. According to the values (figures) in the chart of 5 , there is a high and positive relationship between leadership styles, organization culture and intrapreneurship dimensions; innovation and risk taking (r =,932; p<0.01), proactivity (r =,687; p<0.01), competitive assertiveness and autonomy, (r =,762; p<0.01) , self-renewal

( $r = ,712$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), organization culture ( $r = ,686$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), clan culture and culture of adhocracy ( $r = ,668$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), hierarchy culture and market culture ( $r = ,527$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), leadership styles ( $r = ,656$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), instrumental ( $r = ,544$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), democratic-participatory ( $r = ,590$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), supportive ( $r = ,603$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). The coefficients of correlation are shown between the variables of organization culture and the variables of intrapreneurship and leadership styles used in the research. According to the values (figures) in the chart of 5, there is a high and positive relationship between leadership styles, intrapreneurship and organization culture dimensions; intrapreneurship ( $r = ,686$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), innovation and risk taking ( $r = ,609$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), proactivity ( $r = ,554$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), competitive assertiveness and autonomy, ( $r = ,509$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), self-renewal ( $r = ,679$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), clan culture and culture of adhocracy ( $r = ,966$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), hierarchy culture and market culture ( $r = ,786$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), leadership styles ( $r = ,631$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), instrumental ( $r = ,507$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), democratic-participatory ( $r = ,571$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), supportive ( $r = ,595$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). The coefficients of correlation are shown between the variables of leadership styles and the variables of intrapreneurship and organization culture used in the research. According to the values (figures) in the chart of 5, there is a high and positive relationship between, organization culture, intrapreneurship and leadership styles dimensions; intrapreneurship ( $r = ,656$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), innovation and risk taking ( $r = ,586$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), proactivity ( $r = ,518$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), competitive assertiveness and autonomy, ( $r = ,489$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), self-renewal ( $r = ,563$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), organization culture ( $r = ,631$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), clan culture and culture of adhocracy ( $r = ,581$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), hierarchy culture and market culture ( $r = ,564$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), instrumental ( $r = ,810$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), democratic-participatory ( $r = ,869$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ), supportive ( $r = ,754$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ).

According to the values (figures) in the chart of 6, The Durbin-Watson statistic value indicates whether there is between autocorrelation and values, it is 1,375 figures. It can be said that there is no autocorrelation. When intrapreneurship was kept constant, the effect of "leadership styles" variable on the dependent variable was significant ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $\beta = 0,516$ ), "organization culture" has a significant effect on intrapreneurship ( $p < 0.05$ ,  $\beta = 0,433$ ). The effect of the supportive variable on the dependent variable was also significant ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.218$ ), the effect of the lead variable on the dependent variable was also significant ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0,400$ ), The effect of the democratic-participatory variable on the dependent variable was also significant ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.199$ ), the effect of the clan culture and culture of adhocracy variable on the dependent variable was also significant ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.517$ ), the effect of hierarchy culture and market culture variable on the dependent variable is also significant ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $\beta = 0.253$ ). In the light of all these findings, it was seen that leadership and leadership sub-dimensions, organizational culture and organizational culture sub-dimensions had a significant and positive effect on intrapreneurship ( $H_a, H_b$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ).

## CONCLUSION

In order to gain an advantage in today's globalized competitive environment, innovation is inevitable. Businesses make a difference thanks to innovation and take one step ahead of their competitors. Innovation requires proactive and autonomous employees who can take risks. For this, the innovative environment must be supported by the leader with organizational culture. The leader should get to know the employees, make them feel valued and give them the opportunity to improve themselves and use their guiding and supporting skills. If organizational culture supports entrepreneurship activities, employees acquire intrapreneurship characteristics. Therefore, they should create clan culture and adhocracy culture which is one of the dimensions of organizational culture through norms, values, best practices and stories, in which employees can gain entrepreneurial characteristics while executives play leading roles. Intrapreneurship that describes such as transforming the organization, mobilizing, revitalizing, creating a new enterprise within the existing structure, renewing the activities, innovating in the organization, evaluating new potential opportunities, adapting the resources, putting new ideas into practice very quickly. It means that intrapreneurship has become a concept that sets out what needs to be done for the continuity of organizations (Bektemür, 2018: 162; Soysal and Kolca, 2018: 229; Kayalar and Arslan, 2016: 522).

Blake and Hanson (2005) argue that innovations do not create a void and are the products of people resident in certain sociocultural contexts. This reveals the need for a broader understanding of innovation that does not limit innovation to purely economic and technological understanding. (Jiménez and Zheng 2018: 100). The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between leadership, intrapreneurship and organizational culture. As a result of the research, positive relationships were found between leadership, intrapreneurship and organizational culture. As these dimensions create a collaborative, innovative, sharing and supportive climate, they may increase entrepreneurship behaviors. The fact that the research was conducted only in İzmir and the fact that very large-scale firms do not support the research makes it difficult to analyze especially the intrapreneurship behaviors. In this context, collecting data from large-scale firms over larger samples in future studies will help to make relations more clear.

**REFERENCES**

Acaray, A. (2014). Örgüt Kültürü, Örgütsel Sessizlik ve İşten Ayrılma Niyeti Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesi (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy's thesis). Kocaeli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kocaeli.

Akyürek, M.İ. and Çelik, S. (2018). Örgüt Kültürü: Bilim ve Sanat Merkezleri Örneği. E-Şarkiyat İlimi Araştırmalar Dergisi, 10(1):307-324.

Alga, E. (2017). Örgütlerde Algılanan Liderlik Tarzlarının Çalışanların Tükenmişliğine Etkisi. Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 28(1):97-124.

Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R.N. and Gasparishvili, A. (1998). Leadership Styles and Management Practices of Russian Entrepreneurs: Implications for Transferability of Western HRD Interventions. Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9(2):145-155.

Attali, M.O. and Yemini, M. (2016). Initiating consensus: stakeholders define entrepreneurship in education. Educational Review, 69(2):140-157.

Bakan, İ. and Büyükbeşe, T. (2010). Liderlik Türleri ve Güç Kaynakları'na ilişkin Mevcut-Gelecek Durum Karşılaştırması: Eğitim Kurumu Yöneticilerinin Algılamalarına Dayalı Bir Alan Araştırması. KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi. 12(19):73-84.

Banai, M. and Reisel, W. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: A six-country investigation. Journal of World Business. 42. 463-476.

Bayyurt, N. and Kılıç, C.H. (2017). Liderlik Tarzının Örgüt Bağlılığına Etkisi: Bir Hastane Araştırması. İşletme ve İktisat Çalışmaları Dergisi, 5(2):1-13.

Bektemür, G. (2018). İç Girişimciliğin Hasta Güvenliği Kültürü Üzerine Etkisi: Bir Özel Hastane Uygulaması. Sağlık Akademisyenleri Dergisi, 5(3): 161-177.

Cemaloğlu, N. (2007). Okul Yöneticilerinin Liderlik Stillерinin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 5(1):73-112.

Çalışkan, N. (2015). Ulusal Kültürün Örgüt Kültürü ve Paternalist Liderlik Algısı Üzerindeki Etkisi (Unpublished master's thesis). Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Nevşehir.

Çetin, A. and Topaloğlu, C. (2018). Otel İşletmelerinde Cameron-Quinn Örgüt Kültürü Tiplerinin Yenilikçiliğe Etkisi. Journal of Tourism and Gastronomy Studies, 6(2): 476-492.

Dehghanzadeh M.R., Kholasehzadeh G., Birjandi M., Antikchi E., Sobhan M.R. and Neamatzadeh, H. (2016). Entrepreneurship Psychological Characteristics of Nurses. Acta Med Iran, 54(9):595-599.

Demir, C., M., Yılmaz, K. and Çevirgen, A. (2010) Liderlik Yaklaşımları ve Liderlik Tarzlarına İlişkin Bir Araştırma. Alanya İşletme Fakültesi Dergisi, 2(1):129-152.



Di Fabio, A. (2014). Intrapreneurial Self-Capital: A New Construct for the 21st Century. *Journal of Employment Counseling*, 51(3):98-111.

Engelen, A., Flatten, T.C., Thalmann, J. and Brettel, M. (2014). The Effect of Organizational Culture on Entrepreneurial Orientation: A Comparison between Germany and Thailand. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(4):732-752.

Eren, E. (2017). *Örgütsel Davranış ve Yönetim Psikolojisi* (16. Baskı). Beta İstanbul: Beta Yayınları.

Eyal, O. and Kark, R. (2004) How do Transformational Leaders Transform Organizations? A Study of the Relationship between Leadership and Entrepreneurship, Leadership and Policy in Schools, 3(3):211-235.

Fiaz, M., Su, Q., Ikram, A. and Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership Styles And Employees' Motivation: Perspective From An Emerging Economy. *The Journal of Developing Areas* 51(4):143-156.

Gazi, A.I. and Alam, A. (2014). Leadership; Efficacy, Innovations and their Impacts on Productivity. *ASA University Review*, 8(1):253-262.

Güney, S. (2018). *Davranış Bilimleri* (11. Baskı). İstanbul: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

İbrahimoglu, N., Uğurlu, Ö.Y. (2013). Kobi'lerde İç Girişimcilik ve Örgüt Kültürü İlişkisi: Sektörel Bir Araştırma. *H.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 31(1):103-126.

Jensen, S.M. and Luthans, F. (2006). Entrepreneurs as authentic leaders: impact on employees' attitudes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, (27)8: 646-666.

Jiménez, A. and Zheng, Y. (2018). Tech Hubs, Innovation and Development. *Information Technology For Development*, 24(1):95-118.

Kayalar, M. and Aslan, E.T. (2016). İç Girişimcilik Ve İnovasyon İlişkisi: Yapısal Eşitlik Modeli ile Bir İnceleme. *Bartın Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi* 5(1):73-112.

Köksal, K. (2018). Örgüt Kültürünün Örgütsel Adalet Algısına Etkisinde Etik İkelere İlişkin Algıların Aracılık Rolü. *Uluslararası Yönetim İktisat ve İşletme Dergisi*, 14(2):479-504.

Laspita, S., Breugst, N., Heblich, S. and Patzelt, H. (2012). Intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(4) 414-435.

López, D., Arango, D.S. and Jaramillo, D.A. (2019). Innovation in Corporate Organizational Culture: Diversity, Motivation and Organizational Pressure as Possible Realities. *La revista Empresa y Humanismo*, 22(2):63-85.

Luca, M.R. and Simo, A.M. (2016). Entrepreneurial Traits and Work Satisfaction. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov*, 9(58):173-180.

Okoji Olufemi, O. (2015). Relationship between School Principals' Leadership Styles and Teachers' Job Performance in Ondo State, Nigeria. *IFE Psychologia: An International Journal*, 23(2):133-138.

Örki, M.T. (2018). Şirket Satınalma ve Birleşmelerinde Örgütsel Kültürün Çalışan Sonuçlarına Etkisinde Birey-Örgüt Uyumunun Aracı Rolü (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy's thesis). Maltepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Patricia da Silva Souza, C. and Takahashi, A. (2017). Challenges and Motivations for the Development of an Intrapreneurship Initiative in a Public University. *Revista de Administração da UFSM*.

Phillips, F.S. and Garman, A.N. (2006). Barriers To Entrepreneurship In Healthcare Organizations. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 28(4):472-84.

Rafferty, A. and Griffin, M. (2006). Refining individualized consideration: Distinguishing developmental leadership and supportive leadership. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. 79. 37

Sarros, J.C., Cooper, B.K. and Santora, J.C. (2008). Building a Climate for Innovation Through Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 15(2): 145-158.

Sazkaya, M.K. (2018). Bireylerin Örgüt Kültürü Algıları ve Kontrol Odağı İlişkisinin Demografik Değişkenler Bağlamında İncelenmesi. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 16(1):116-135.

Shepherd, D.A., Patzelt, H. and Haynie, J.M. (2009). Entrepreneurial Spirals: Deviation Amplifying Loops of an Entrepreneurial Mindset and Organizational Culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(1): 59-82.

Solymossy, E. (1998). Entrepreneurial dimensions: The relationship of individual, venture, and environmental factors to success. (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy's thesis). Case Western Reserve University Department of Marketing and Policy Weatherhead School of Management.

Soysal, A. and Kolca, D. (2018). Sağlık Kurumlarında Çalışan Hemşirelerin Demografik Özelliklerinin İç Girişimcilik Eğilimleri Üzerine Farklılıklarının İncelenmesi: Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Sağlık Uygulama ve Araştırma Hastanesi Örneği. *KSÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 15(1): 227-252.

Tetik, S. (2014). Yerel Yönetimler Açısından Dönüştürücü Liderlik: Belediye Çalışanlarına Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Yönetim ve Ekonomi*, 21(1).

Turhan, M. (2015). Algılanan Liderlik Tarzları, Örgütsel Adalet ve Örgütsel Bağlılık Arasındaki İlişkilerin İncelenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştırma. (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy's thesis). Mersin Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mersin.

Vecchio, R.P. (2003). Entrepreneurship and leadership: common trends and common threads. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2):303-327.

Zahra, S.A., Hayton, J.C. and Salvato, C. (2004). Entrepreneurship in Family vs. Non-Family Firms: A Resource-Based Analysis of the Effect of Organizational Culture. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 28(4):363-381.

Antonakis, J. and Autio, E. (2014). Entrepreneurship and leadership. Baum, J. R., Frese, M., & Baron, R. A. (Eds.). *The psychology of entrepreneurship*. Psychology Press. 189-208.