

Psychological Climate in the Organization: A Determinant of Entrepreneurial Behavior

Božidar Leković and Slobodan Marić

Abstract Entrepreneurial behavior is reflected through independent individuals/entrepreneurs who are ready to start new enterprises and therefore take risks in newly created circumstances. Increasing, dynamic markets, and competition create powerful pressure on organizations by enforcing them to continually grow and develop as a basic condition to survive. Innovation is the biggest potential for growth and thus becomes a continual business need in the cited circumstances so participants can have the necessary flexibility, competitiveness and adequate answers in the face of change. Circumstances considered as favorable to generate innovations within the organization are dominantly entrepreneurial because of their features, necessary creativity of active people and readiness to take risk and they are strong enough to generate 'something new', as the most authors in this field define internal entrepreneurship.

While analyzing motivators that cause internal entrepreneurship, on the one side there is the organizational context (psychological climate of organization) or management style and personal interests of internal entrepreneurs/employees on the other. According to past research, an entrepreneurial climate is essential for awakening the individual entrepreneurial potential of employees such as innovativeness, risk taking and being proactive. These characteristics require the following organizational factors to flourish: management support for new ideas and projects, participation in strategic decisions, tolerance of risk-taking, autonomy and resource allocations.

The primary purpose of this research chapter is to present an empirical study framed by the theory that task-oriented and relations-oriented leadership behaviors (or different leadership style) are positively related to the employees' perceptions of organizational climate. The study introduces this theoretical perspective and examines the relevant literature that supports the significance of leadership behavior and the organizational climate. Results of empirical research will be presented in the second part of the chapter.

Many authors identified leadership/management behaviors as an emergent process that acts on both the organizational climate and conditions for

B. Leković, Ph.D. • S. Marić, Ph.D. (✉)

The Faculty of Economics Subotica, Department for Management, University of Novi Sad,
9-11 Segedinski put, Subotica 24000, Republic of Serbia
e-mail: bolesu@ef.uns.ac.rs; marics@ef.uns.ac.rs

entrepreneurship. An organizational climate has been conceptualized as a mediator of the relationship between leadership style and organizational entrepreneurship.

1 Problems

Schumpeter (1934) was the first economist to explain, in an unconventional way and outside usual forms of statistical comparative analyses, the connectivity of entrepreneurship and economic growth, he defined an entrepreneur as the agent of change. Today, long-term global studies spanning over the last two decades have not exhausted all research questions in the field of entrepreneurship. They offer valuable quantitative research results, identifying the entrepreneurial economy as having big potential for economic growth. Such a research orientation identifies the entrepreneurial sector, as a specific form of doing business and thus neglects the size of the company, sort of activities, economic sector, goals and business motives.

Stimulation and development of entrepreneurship among employees represents one of the most important goals of every enterprise, as entrepreneurial behavior is the key source of competitive advantage. Trying to provide the necessary conditions and adequate support to entrepreneurial initiative and activity, every organization, disregarding the size, should develop the appropriate organizational climate. Also, entrepreneurial resources are equally important and have their values in the sense of potential of economic growth, neglecting general system environment, in the sense of development degree of some economy, emphasizing the special place and role in the processes of economic restructuring and transition (Lekovic et al. 2014).

Organizational climate reflects the perception, values, beliefs and attitudes of its employees and in this way, it represents positive or negative power in shaping individual business intentions of internal entrepreneurs. In the absence of mentioned support in the internal environment of the enterprise itself, numerous examples and significant massiveness of spin-off entrepreneurial projects are noticed, which have not met with favorable ambient for implementation within the current enterprises but instead have found conditions for realizing business ideas in the external environment. This confirms the importance of the organizational climate, as the key factor in realizing entrepreneurial intentions within the current organizations. The role of an individual is also important as a holder of entrepreneurial activities, without which the appearance of entrepreneurship and mentioned effects for business performance would not come.

The essential problematic of this chapter is dedicated to the identification of the basic conditions of entrepreneurial behavior in the organizations from which the following **research goals** are set:

- Identify the nature and volume of observed features—leading style, motivation level, organizational climate and inclination to risk in selected organizations;
- Establish the power and direction of connection between observed research variables.

The nature and structure of available data, then the basic problem orientation with set research goals, as well as connection and analysis of observed variables of the research refer to the application of non-parameter statistical techniques and coefficients to the Spearman's rank correlation, as the selected methodology, in order to obtain research results.

2 Evidence

The circumstances treated as favorable for generating innovations within an organization are dominantly entrepreneurial and exclusive because of their characteristics. The key characteristic is creativity and readiness to take risk, as they are able to generate 'something new', as many authors in this field define internal entrepreneurship.

Many attitudes in the literature on entrepreneurship and management that consider the category of internal entrepreneurship and/or corporative entrepreneurship point to the need of a precise definition and comparison of different attitudes in order to offer adequate answers to previously asked questions. However, the category of internal entrepreneurship has different interpretations by some authors; therefore, the level of observation significantly generates some inference, so treating things in this way is quite justified.

Entrepreneurship can be observed as the process of creating some new values though investment of necessary time and effort and taking financial and social risk with a view of acquiring reward in the form of material and moral satisfaction (Hisrich et al. 2004). This interpretation of entrepreneurship contributes to understanding this process and its role in the context of the business system. Contrary to the mentioned entrepreneurship is the act of developing a new project outside the existing organization. Internal entrepreneurship helps managers to renovate and revitalize their business, to innovate but also to improve their general performances (Kuratko et al. 1990; Antoncic and Hisrich 2001).

In order to successfully represent the concept of internal entrepreneurship, it is necessary to differentiate to the categories of entrepreneurship. Recent research on entrepreneurship defines internal entrepreneurship in two fundamentally different ways. On the one side, internal entrepreneurship reflects the quality of the organization itself (organizational level) confirmed by the attitudes that entrepreneurial organizations are small (Aldrich and Austen 1986), focused on fast growth (Drucker 1985), more innovative, more flexible and adaptive (Birch 1987). According to the second definition, entrepreneurship is considered a characteristic of employees' behavior and managers in the enterprise, not as a characteristic of the enterprise itself. Enterprising people look for opportunities in order to acquire added value both for them and the enterprise (Burgelman 1983), where, for the first time, there appears the idea on internal entrepreneurship and/or 'corporate entrepreneurship'; or entrepreneurship in the big corporate environment as it is often named. Internal entrepreneurship—also known as corporate entrepreneurship or

corporate undertaking—is the practice of development of the new project within the existing organization, with a view of using new chance to create new economic value (Parker 2011).

In analyzing the motivators causing the appearance of internal entrepreneurship, on the one side there is organizational context or management style, while on the other side, they come from personal interests of internal entrepreneurs/employees. For example, organizational support for internal entrepreneurship can be reflected in an appropriate environment where the entrepreneur can easily approach necessary organizational resources, but also the presence of necessary conditions for developing and implementing innovative ideas and projects results in overall organizational innovativeness (Alpkan et al. 2010).

The author who tries to explain entrepreneurial behavior based on personal characteristics of individuals exclusively makes the difference between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. As for the concept of internal entrepreneurship, this argument is not enough to analyze the behavior of employees within the existing organizations. It often happens that internal entrepreneurs leave existing enterprises in order start their own business because the reward in the form of symbolic tribute is not enough in relation to the risk they bear by taking some initiatives on themselves. We can only say that all the factors cited above are essential for the development of internal entrepreneurship in existing organizations, but none is enough to explain the cause of the appearance itself.

Clearly none of the offered reasons for understanding entrepreneurship are completely acceptable. Taking into consideration experiences and opportunities in the domestic business environment, we can say that the truth is somewhere in the middle. To show the ‘phenomenon’ of internal entrepreneurship in the right form, the existence of favorable business climate is necessary and employees with some inclinations and characteristics that make them entrepreneurs. This includes the existence of favorable external political, social and economic environment. This can be seen in the data on significant reaction of the volume and structure of entrepreneurial activities according to the stages of entrepreneurial process depending on the economic conjuncture (Lekovic and Maric 2012). In other situations where one of the mentioned fundamental conditions are missing, entrepreneurship will not appear in the form described in the previous part of the text. Horizontal individuality can explain internal entrepreneurship in the form of support by the organizational climate (Abraham 1997). Hornsby et al. (1993) cite a selection of factors that are the prerequisite for the success of internal entrepreneurship, which are:

- Management support or stimulation of innovation through fast accepting new ideas and capital availability for experimental projects;
- Autonomy/work of discretion, which relates to the autonomy in work and design without punishment for experimenting;
- Reinforcement where the reward should recognize real accomplishments and provoke tasks;

- Available time—without time limitations with sufficient flexibility that enables individuals to solve problems of long duration;
- Organizational barriers, work outside formal administrative procedures.

An essential determinant of entrepreneurial behavior, disregarding to the circumstances of entrepreneurial inclination to risk, is understanding the psychological characteristic of an individual in relation to the level of tolerance to risk, i.e. how much subjective perception influences the process of business decision-making. According to Petrakis (2005), the key factors exerting influence on risk taking are:

- Environment (economic, political, social, cultural);
- Economic branch (competition, buyers, suppliers, limitations);
- Characteristics of business (entrepreneurial) project;
- Characteristics of problematic situations;
- Level of risk and potential loss.

Of all previously cited factors of tolerance to risk, cognitive possibilities (knowledge, skills and capabilities), motives and personal characteristics have the biggest influence. Internal motivation particularly stimulates the inclination to risk, as a voluntary experimentation with new ideas (Dewett 2007). In the context of the group, the organizational inclination to risk, determined by the level of consciousness and the process of risk management, directly influences the behavior of employees in the process of decision-making. Developing risk awareness with all the team members, as a constituent element of business environment, as well as the concept of risk management as an obligatory of subsystem management, determines competition of the business system. Decision-making in the conditions of risk is the function of perceived probability of alternatives, perceived consequences and psychological inclination of individuals to take risks. However, risk perception is subject to changes because of appropriate market circumstances, as well as closer conditions of the economic branch which are often irrational.

The positive result of a well-perceived risk as a reward for bigger inclination to risk must be adequately distributed between the organization and the individual that took the initiative to risky business operations. The individual deserves adequate praise because of additional efforts done in taking risk and realizing business idea. At the same time the organization realizes the right to participate in the positive result based on available resources put for the development of ideas and an adequate environment to take over the potential negative result of business projects.

An important dimension of the organizational climate to be taken into consideration the inclination to risk is the trust between managers and employees as an indicator of tolerance to faults as prerequisites and the indicator of the organization's readiness to take risk. Individuals unwillingly take risks in the conditions of limited tolerance to faults, formal relationships, and the absence of trust. These factors create a discouraging organizational climate relating to the risk taking. This set of factors of the working environment exerts influence on behavior and motivation of every individual. As an internal working environment is dominantly

determined by the relationship management-employees, it greatly influences employee behavior. Organizational climate, as the most important indicator of organizational culture, points to the nature of the internal relationships present in the organization. The basic characteristics of organizational climate according to Marshall Poole (1985) are:

- Characteristics of the organization and its parts;
- The organization and its parts;
- Routine activities of the organization;
- Behavior and attitudes of the staff.

The climate of the organization is a reflection of perceptive attitudes. It is still spoken about precise elements of which it is constituted. Therefore, we find the most common factors of the psychological? Climate:

- Structure—perception of the formal organizational structure and administrative regulations;
- Support and warmth—employee readiness to help and the feeling of interpersonal relationships in the organization;
- Risk—organizational readiness and tolerance for risk-taking;
- Identity—feeling of belonging and loyalty to the organization
- Standards—perceived importance of set goals (Konrad and Kline 1986).

The climate is determined by all the aspects of psychosocial relationships developing within the organization (Patterson et al. 2005). The climate influences psychological processes in the organization such as communication, problem solving, decision-making, conflict management, learning and motivation. From all this, we can notice that the climate directly or indirectly influences the efficiency of the organization and its capability to create innovations which is the key source of competitiveness. The organizational climate represents a general psychological atmosphere in the organization felt by each individual, which is an important factor to understand organizational behavior. A positive organizational climate is directly connected to the success of the organization. The stimulation of initiatives by the company management leads to new ideas, innovations and better performance. Another form in which organizational climate can be stimulated is through psychological security, when it supports open interaction and trust inside the working environment and thus leads to easier problem solving, faster learning, bigger inclusion of employees and finally risk reduction. In these working circumstances, employees can experiment with new methods for attaining goals and show creativity when faced with problems. On the other hand, rigid and nonflexible managers control the methods of work and do not give their employees enough confidence, which does not stimulate successful results. With this style of leadership, employees get sanctioned for showing individuality and these results in the absence from work, psychological insecurity, and the absence of creativity in work.

We have thus far shown that organization leaders shape the organizational climate to a great extent. Organizational climate, as a derivative of leadership

style, directly influences the motivation of employees and performance of the organizations. If the organizational climate is positive, it is more probable that employees will identify their own goals with the goals of the organization due to a higher level of motivation. The positive organizational climate is characterized by good colleague relationships and a reward system that increases innovative accomplishments, as the consequence of information availability and exchange. These elements point to colleague leadership style where authority and power are equally distributed between workers, which are quite the opposite of the authoritative style that promotes hierarchical relationships. Leadership is as an important factor of organizational climate as it influences individual perceptions of the working environment as well as the success and results of the organization itself. Numerous studies confirm that the philosophy, policy and activities of leaders have a significant influence on the satisfaction and productivity of employees and impacts the organizational climate on the whole (Klem and Schlechter 2008).

3 Theme in Practice

3.1 The Sample and Data Collecting

The data on was collected though selected questionnaires from 270 employees in management positions (operative and medium level of management) in 18 companies. The observed research variables were leadership style, motivation, organizational climate and inclination to risk. The companies were selected at random with different sector distribution, which are, according to the administrative classification (Law on Accounting and Audit—Sluzbeni glasnik RS, br. 46/06 and 111/09) classified as large companies. Respondents gave adequate answers enabling them to express subjective preference and evaluation of observed patterns. Through a specific methodology, the available data enabled the realization of set research goals.

3.2 Methodology

As for the methodology, it is important to note that the nature of observed pattern and research intentions, points to the need of reporting individual, subjective perceptions as well as inclinations at the aggregate level, i.e. the level of the enterprise. Therefore, some individual attitudes in the form of medium values were aggregated at the enterprise' value so that the research would make sense. As we talk about patterns whose character is important in the form of prevailing nature of the observed events at the level of the enterprise, not in individual case.

The evaluation of observed patterns at the individual level cannot contribute to answering the basic research questions and set research goals. In accordance with it, disregarding the number of respondents (270) and the size of patterns, the number of enterprises is relevant (18) in the form of observation which are processed in the pattern and it seeks the application of non-parameter statistical techniques. Analysis of observed research variables and the analysis of available data are performed by means of the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient.

The set research object, as well as the basic research intention point to the following research supposition in the form of the basic research hypothesis, which is:

H0: Leadership style (management structure) determines necessary conditions of entrepreneurial behavior of existing organizations in the form of positive organizational climate by which stimulating circumstances are created for ideas development and innovation because of inclination to risk as basic dimensions of entrepreneurial projects are:

3.3 Variables and Measures

Measuring organizational climate in the enterprise causes some methodological problems appearing in the following forms:

- Problems connected to limited psychological climate from job satisfaction;
- Problems of aggregation of individual evaluations of psychological climate in the united measure of organizational climate;
- One of possible problems that can appear relates to the existence of more than one climate within the organization, i.e. the climate varies according to one's position in the hierarchical structure of the organization.

Organizational climate was measured by means of questionnaire called the "Evaluation methods of psychological climate in the organization" by A.F. Fidper. Within the defined methodology in the form of a questionnaire, organizational climate is evaluated by respondents in the form of subjective observation according to selected dimensions (friendly—spite, agreement—disagreement, satisfaction—dissatisfaction, productivity—unproductivity, warmth—coldness, cooperation—disharmony, support—unwelcome, interested—indifference, dedication to job—uncommitted to job, successfulness—unsuccessfulness). It was measured on a scale from 1 to 8, where smaller grades mark positive observations.

Inclination to risk was measured in the form of the test named "Evaluation methods of risk inclination" by Schubert. In the form of the test, the respondent answered 25 questions on a scale of from 1 (I agree completely) to 5 (I do not completely agree) according to defined values in relation to the situation that is

evaluated. Obtained results, first at the level of individual respondents, later aggregated at the level of the enterprise, were classified in three categories: small, medium and high inclination to risk. *Motivation* was measured by using the “Methods of diagnosing people on the motivation to attaining success”, by T. Elers. Obtained results, individual and collective were classified to four categories of motivation dependent on the obtained research results. *Leadership style* (individual and dominant) in the organization was identified by means of the “Methods for identification of leadership style” by V.P. Zaharov and A.L. Zuravljev. Based on obtained answers of respondents, the research results, individual and in the form of dominant style in the organization, were classified to three categories: colleague (democratic, indulgent (combined) and direct (autocratic).

4 Outcomes

The selected research approach and the evaluation methods of observed features of leadership style, motivation level, organizational climate and risk inclination, enabled the realization of set research goals and expected results. Subjective perception, values, beliefs and employees’ attitudes as respondents were successfully united and reported at the aggregate level per observed research variables.

The cited values are illustrated in Tables 1, 2 and 3 as described statistical indicators of categorical research variables of leadership style, motivation and risk inclination at the level of observed enterprises, in the form of prevailing category for every observed enterprise as an individual observation in the sample. These descriptive statistical indicators of selected research variables in the form of frequencies do not have analytical importance. It is enabled by the impression on basic characteristics of observed patterns within this research, which are represented in the form of prevailing categories.

Table 1 Motivation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent	
Valid	1. Low motivation	0	0	0	0	
	2. Medium motivation	7	38.9	38.9	38.9	
	3. Mod. high motivation	11	61.1	61.1	100.0	
	4. High motivation	0	0	0		
	Total	18	100.0	100.0		

Source: Author’s calculation

Table 2 Leadership style

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent	
Valid	1. Direct lead. style	0	0	0	0	
	2. Indulgent lead. style	0	0	0	0	
	3. Colleag. lead. style	18	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Source: Author's calculation

Table 3 Risk inclination

		Frequency	Percent	Valid percent	Cumulative percent	
Valid	1. Small risk inclination	8	44.4	50.0	50.0	
	2. Med. risk inclination	8	44.4	50.0	100.0	
	3. Big risk inclination	0	0	0		
	Total	16	88.9	100.0		
Missing	System	2	11.1			
Total		18	100.0			

Source: Author's calculation

So, in Table 1, we can see that a high motivation of employees dominates in 61.1 % of cases, while the category of medium motivation constitutes 38.9 % of observations in the sample. The category of low motivation and high motivation appear in no case as a dominant category.

As for the analysis of presence of some leadership styles, whose descriptive indicators of this category variable are represented in Table 2, the picture is very simple. In all analyzed cases of samples (100 %), colleague leadership appears as exclusively dominant in style. These surveys have no intentions to fog obtained research results; on the contrary, by abstracting the details they enable observation that provides a clear picture of the observed patterns.

In Table 3, dominant categories of risk inclination within analyzed sample are represented, where we can see that in the equal number of cases (50 %) categories of low and medium risk inclination dominate. Generally, considering enterprises in the sample through the dimension of risk inclination, we cannot say that entrepreneurial orientation is shown. Another medium value points to it; it is organizational climate, which is, to medium estimate, insignificantly evaluated as positive. For deeper analyses and thorough conclusions, the second part of the chapter is reserved.

In this way, a presentation of the observed patterns indicates the correlation connection that will be tested by complex procedures. A detailed structure of research variables represented by the central and dispersive parameters, then the parameters of asymmetry and flattening (Attachment 1) enables a complete perception of the nature of the research variables. From the aspect of priority of this chapter, it is enough to emphasize medium values of all the observed variables in order to get a basic impression of the pattern researched.

Thus, categories of leadership within the observed sample have the following values. Direct leadership style is represented in 15.26 % of cases; indulgent style is present with 10.78 %, while colleague leadership style reaches 73.66 %. As for motivation, the dominant level is moderately high with 40.92 %, medium motivation is present in 34.53 % of cases, while a high motivation level appears in 23.79 % of cases on average. A low motivation level reaches an insignificant level, on average it is present in 1.48 % of cases. Organizational climate is generally evaluated as positive on average, with the medium value of 3.17 % on a scale from 1 to 8, where smaller values are positive. As for the evaluation of risk inclination, an insignificant value of observed pattern dominates, at 53.81 %, while the medium significant risk inclination appears at 42.09 %, and significant risk inclination is irrelevant as it is present in 4.09 % on average.

Central attention is oriented to the results of the correlation analysis of selected research variables and obtained values according to the Spearman's rank correlation coefficient, illustrated in Table 4. Results obtained by the application of selected method for testing the connectivity of selected research variables point to the following factual state. The connection between direct leadership style and low motivation level is expressed in the form of strong and positive correlation $r = 0.548^*$, at the level of statistical significance. This relationship confirms the opposite type of connection of medium strength/intensity, $r = -0.337$, direct leadership style and medium high motivation. Reliability of obtained research results is confirmed by the correlation connection between the colleague leadership style and low motivation level, $r = -0.484^*$, which has negative, medium strength at the level of statistical significance. The same leadership style according to medium high motivation is explained by the medium powerful positive correlation, $r = 0.249$.

The logical connection between leadership style and organizational climate is confirmed; where there is direct leadership style, their negative weak correlation is present, $r = -0.070$, and for colleague leadership style, positive weak correlation is present, $r = 0.055$, with a positive organizational climate. In the final instance, the analysis of the connection between leadership style and risk inclination confirm the previous results because there is increasing tendency between the category of colleagues leadership style and risk inclination from insignificant through medium and to significant, reflected by the following values of coefficient r , $r = -0.073$, $r = 0.067$ and $r = 0.097$.

Based on the previous analysis of result correlation between leadership style, motivation level, organizational climate and risk inclination, we can say that the

Table 4 Correlations

Spearman's rho	Motivation	Motivation medium	Motivation moderate high	Motivation high	Organizational climate 1 (+)–8 (-)	Risk insignificant inclination	Risk medium significant inclination	Risk sig. inclination to risk
<i>Direct leadership style</i>								
Correlation coefficient	0.548*	-0.155	-0.337	0.447	0.070	0.028	-0.012	0.049
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.019	0.540	0.172	0.063	0.788	0.917	0.965	0.858
N	18	18	18	18	17	16	16	16
<i>Indulgent leadership style</i>								
Correlation coefficient	0.222	-0.207	-0.070	0.254	0.153	0.131	-0.129	-0.169
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.376	0.411	0.782	0.310	0.557	0.630	0.634	0.530
N	18	18	18	18	17	16	16	16
<i>Colleague leadership style</i>								
Correlation coefficient	-0.484*	0.218	0.249	-0.439	-0.055	-0.073	0.067	0.097
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.042	0.385	0.318	0.068	0.832	0.789	0.806	0.720
N	18	18	18	18	17	16	16	16

Source: Author's calculation

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

basic hypothesis of this chapter is confirmed. We can also say that leadership style (management structure) determines the necessary conditions of entrepreneurial behavior of existing organizations in the form of a positive organizational climate. This creates stimulating circumstances for the development of ideas and innovation due to a stronger inclination to risk. In addition, through analysis of obtained results as well as previously applied methodological procedures, research goals were realized for observed patterns, which were selected within the research concept, identifies and quantitatively expresses, measured and it enabled the determination of mutual connection of strength and course of connection.

5 Concluding Remarks

Starting from the basic benefits of entrepreneurial behavior, we emphasize that creating new business projects and innovation within existing organizations, advances competition and performance. In accordance with the importance of entrepreneurship, especially internal entrepreneurship and the provision of a favorable business climate for its institutionalization, this chapter researches the relationship between leadership style and basic dimensions of entrepreneurial behavior, risk inclination by means of the level of motivation of employees, and organizational climate as the basic determinant of entrepreneurial initiative.

Obtained research results, after the application of selected statistical procedures, point to the positive correlations between leadership style, moderate high motivation, positive organization climate and medium and significant inclination to risk. The results of correlation analysis argue that leadership is the key determinant of the internal environment, due to the organizational climate being the key factor in developing new ideas through readiness to take risk and innovation as the principal entries of entrepreneurial behavior of an individual. Within existing organizations, the support coming in the form of organizational ambient is very important for decision-making on implementation of new business projects.

In addition, the selected methodology enabled the adequate evaluation of observed patterns through aggregation of subjective estimates of respondents, which resulted in the previously cited conclusions. The aggregate level of individual estimations of observed patterns enabled the limitation of the level of motivation present in the organization and the identification of the ruling organizational climate, and was thus a significant prerequisite to realize the set research goals. By the same approach, the dominant leadership style was identified, as well as the level of inclination to risk within the enterprise. In this way we had all the necessary elements to realize our basic research intentions.

Appendix: Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range		Minimum		Maximum		Mean		Std. deviation		Variance		Skewness		Kurtosis		
		Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. error
Direct. lead. style	18	33.00	33.00	0.00	33.00	15.2683	12.14350	147.465	0.178	0.536	1.398	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Indulgent. lead. style	18	39.50	39.50	0.00	39.50	10.7867	12.02514	144.604	1.213	0.536	1.038	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Colleague. lead. style	18	63.00	63.00	37.00	100.00	73.6661	18.31733	335.525	-0.178	0.536	1.038	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Motivation low	18	20.00	20.00	0.00	20.00	1.4817	4.88077	23.822	3.664	0.536	13.877	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Motivation medium	18	67.00	67.00	0.00	67.00	34.5367	17.66626	312.097	-0.213	0.536	1.038	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Motivation moderate high	18	47.00	47.00	20.00	67.00	40.9261	14.52225	210.896	0.368	0.536	1.038	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Motivation high	18	33.00	33.00	7.00	40.00	23.7961	9.52167	90.662	-0.097	0.536	1.038	1.038	0.677	1.038	0.536	0.536	0.677	1.038
Organizational climate 1(+)-8(-)	17	2.86	2.86	2.05	4.91	3.1700	0.71013	0.504	0.630	0.550	1.063	1.063	0.975	1.063	0.550	0.550	0.975	1.063
Risk insignificant inclination	16	93.00	93.00	7.00	100.00	53.8125	30.95043	957.929	0.203	0.564	1.119	1.091	0.564	1.091	0.564	0.564	0.564	1.091
Risk medium sign. inclin.	16	93.00	93.00	0.00	93.00	42.0938	31.34763	982.674	0.055	0.564	1.279	1.091	0.564	1.091	0.564	0.564	0.564	1.091
Risk sign. inclination	16	23.00	23.00	0.00	23.00	4.0938	7.10450	50.474	1.720	0.564	2.286	1.091	0.564	1.091	0.564	0.564	0.564	1.091
Valid N (listwise)	15																	

Source: Author's calculation

References

- Abraham, R. (1997). The relationship of vertical and horizontal individualism and collectivism to intrapreneurship and organizational commitment. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 18*(4), 179–186.
- Aldrich, H., & Austen, E. R. (1986). Even dwarfs started small: Liabilities of age and size and their strategic limitations. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 8*, 165–198.
- Alpkan, L., Bulut, C., Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., & Kilic, K. (2010). Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management Decision, 48*(5), 732–755.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing, 16*(5), 495–527.
- Birch, D. (1987). *Job creation in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Burgelman, R. A. (1983). Corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management: Insights from a process study. *Management Science, 29*(12), 1349–1366.
- Dewett, T. (2007). Linking intrinsic motivation, risk taking, and employee creativity in an R&D environment. *R&D Management, 37*(3), 197–208.
- Drucker, P. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hisrich, R., Peters, M., & Shepherd, D. (2004). *Entrepreneurship*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hornsby, J. S., Naffziger, D. W., Kuratko, D. F., & Montagno, R. V. (1993). An interactive model of the corporate entrepreneurship process. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 17*(2), 29–38.
- Klem, C., & Schlechter, A. F. (2008). The relationship between leader emotional intelligence and psychological climate: An exploratory study. *South African Journal of Business Management, 39*(2), 9–23.
- Konrad, E., & Kline, M. (1986). *Psihološka klima v DO Alpina*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Kuratko, D. F., Montagno, R. V., & Hornsby, J. S. (1990). Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal, 11*, 49–58.
- Lekovic, B., & Maric, S. (2012). Uticaj globalne ekonomske recesije na obim i strukturu preduzetničkih aktivnosti. *Anali Ekonomskog fakulteta u Subotici, 28*, 181–197.
- Lekovic, B., Maric, S., & Lekovic, B. (2014). Characteristics of entrepreneurial activities in transitional countries and their influence on development. *Inzinerine Ekonomika—Engineering Economics, 25*(1), 62–71.
- Parker, S. C. (2011). Intrapreneurship or entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing, 26*(1), 19–34.
- Patterson, M. G., West, M. A., Shackleton, V. J., Dawson, J. F., Lawthom, R., Maitlis, S., et al. (2005). Validating the organizational climate measure: Links to managerial practices, productivity and innovation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26*(4), 379–408.
- Petrakis, P. (2005). Risk perception, risk propensity and entrepreneurial behaviour: The Greek. *The Journal of American Academy of Business, 7*(1), 233–243.
- Poole, M. S. (1985). Communication and organizational climates: Review, critique, and a new perspective. *Organizational Communication: Traditional Themes and New Directions, 13*, 79–108.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle* (Vol. 55). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction publishers.