

Intrapreneurship in Public Organizations as a Mechanism for Generating Value: A Literature Review

Paulo Roberto Peixoto Lima de Santana¹ and Alexandre Santos Pinheiro²

¹Master's Degree in Public Administration Federal University of Vicosa (UFV)
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7608-8186>

²Dr. in Business Administration, Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG)
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1307-6154>

DOI: 10.46609/IJSSER.2024.v09i12.032 URL: <https://doi.org/10.46609/IJSSER.2024.v09i12.032>

Received: 19 November 2024 / Accepted: 20 December 2024 / Published: 31 December 2024

ABSTRACT

This study examined how the principles of entrepreneurship can promote intrapreneurial behavior in the public sector, analyzing the impact of these practices on the innovation and efficiency of public organizations. The main objective was to investigate how entrepreneurial ideals can be integrated into the public environment to improve the quality of services provided to the population. The results indicate that intrapreneurship can transform the public sector by encouraging a more innovative and proactive mindset among employees. The adoption of entrepreneurial practices within public organizations can lead to the reevaluation and improvement of processes and services, resulting in greater efficiency and effectiveness in public management. The study reveals that creating a culture of innovation, where creativity and initiative are valued, can help overcome bureaucratic rigidities and increase employee engagement. Finally, the application of entrepreneurial methods can also improve public perception of the administration, strengthening community trust and support for government initiatives. In summary, intrapreneurship offers a promising path for continuous improvement and innovation in the public sector.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship. Intrapreneurship. Public Management. Innovation.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of entrepreneurship is central to innovation and competitiveness in a globalized market. In a scenario of constant technological evolution and fierce competition, companies have turned to the continuous improvement of their products and services. This improvement often

involves the adoption of new production methods, the exploration of new markets and organizational restructuring. Entrepreneurship, by transforming knowledge into new products and generating profit, adds value to both the company and the customer.

Thus, it becomes an essential component for the growth and development of societies.

Historically, the role of entrepreneurs has been fundamental to the progress of societies. However, formal entrepreneurship education is relatively recent. Accelerated technological advancement and the resulting demands have forced a reassessment of traditional approaches. The need to formalize knowledge, which was previously acquired empirically, became evident with the increasing complexity of the economy and production methods.

Dornelas (2011) observes that the emphasis on entrepreneurship emerged as a response to rapid technological changes and global competition. These factors have forced entrepreneurs to adopt new paradigms, adapting to new market realities. The sophistication of the economy and production processes has made it essential to formalize knowledge, which was previously informal and based on empirically developed practices.

According to Costa et al. (2007), entrepreneurship is strongly associated with policies to combat unemployment. However, they argue that entrepreneurship is not only a response to the employment crisis, but also a consequence of changing social and political patterns. In a globalized world, entrepreneurship is configured as an adaptive response to new social and economic conditions.

The concept of corporate entrepreneurship has been explored in recent decades, reflecting an expansion of the traditional concept of entrepreneurship into established companies. Dornelas (2011) defines corporate entrepreneurship as the process by which individuals or groups within an existing organization create new initiatives or promote innovation. This concept suggests that innovation can occur at any level of the company, leveraging employee experiences and resources.

The justification for this bibliographic study lies in the growing need to rethink innovation in the public sector from the perspective of entrepreneurship. In a scenario where innovation is essential for the competitiveness and effectiveness of organizations, the public sector, traditionally more rigid and less flexible, faces significant challenges to adopt innovative practices.

The objective of the study is to analyze how the ideals of entrepreneurship can contribute to intrapreneurial behavior, investigating how these methods can positively influence innovation and efficiency within public organizations. In view of the above, how can intrapreneurship

contribute to improving the value of services provided in the public sector?

LITERATURE REVIEW

AN ANALYSIS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The concept of entrepreneurship is often described as complex, as it encompasses several aspects and dimensions. Falcone and Osborne (2005) point out that defining entrepreneurship is not a simple task, given its multifaceted nature and the diversity of factors involved. The difficulty in pinpointing a single definition is due to the intersection of personal characteristics, economic contexts, and social influences, requiring a comprehensive approach to capture the full essence of the phenomenon.

Simon (2002) describes entrepreneurship as a dynamic process that involves identifying, developing, and realizing a vision. This process is intrinsically linked to innovation, as it requires the creation of new opportunities and the management of risks and uncertainties. Thus, entrepreneurship is not limited to the generation of ideas; It also involves the ability to turn these ideas into concrete realities, facing challenges and adapting to changes along the way.

Filion (1999) argues that the study of entrepreneurship is enriched by diverse academic disciplines, including economics, psychology, history, and sociology. Each of these areas contributes with a unique perspective, offering a more complete and diversified view of the phenomenon. While economics can focus on opportunities and resources, psychology can explore the individual motivations and characteristics of entrepreneurs, reflecting the importance of an integrated approach to understanding entrepreneurship.

The role of scholars such as Cantillon (1755), Say (1832), Schumpeter (1934) and Shapero (1980) in shaping the concept of entrepreneurship is fundamental. Cantillon introduced the idea that the entrepreneur takes risks in pursuit of profit, while Say and Schumpeter broadened this view by emphasizing innovation and the role of the entrepreneur as agents of economic change. These contributions have helped shape the modern understanding of entrepreneurship as a key driver of development and economic transformation.

According to Hisrich et al. (2009), the entrepreneur is the one who combines resources efficiently to create value, promoting changes and innovations. This economic definition underlines the importance of not only pooling resources but also utilizing them in a way that generates new products, services, or processes that can bring significant benefits to the market. The entrepreneur plays a crucial role in creating economic and social value through the introduction of innovations.

McClelland's (1987) contribution to the behavioral approach in the study of entrepreneurship is significant. McClelland identified common behavioral traits among entrepreneurs, such as the need for success and the desire for control, that influence their decisions and actions. These traits help explain why certain individuals are more likely to seek out and explore entrepreneurial opportunities, highlighting the importance of personal characteristics in entrepreneurial success.

McClelland revealed that entrepreneurs tend to set challenging goals and actively seek responsibility for solving problems. These behaviors are indicative of a willingness to face challenges and seek creative solutions, characteristics that are essential for success in entrepreneurial environments. Studying these traits offers valuable insights into the motivational and behavioral factors that drive entrepreneurial behavior.

Filion (1999) notes that, after McClelland's contributions, the behavioral approach dominated the field of entrepreneurship for approximately two decades. During this period, the focus was to identify and understand the characteristics and behaviors of entrepreneurs, establishing a methodological consensus on how to study these individuals. This behavioral domain helped refine the understanding of the factors that contribute to entrepreneurial success.

Teodoro and Oliveira (2006) suggest that the entrepreneur seeks to create conditions that provide a tangible return on his actions and behaviors. This return can be financial, but it also includes personal and professional benefits, such as developing skills and achieving personal goals. The motivation to obtain a positive return drives entrepreneurial behavior and influences how entrepreneurs approach and manage their initiatives.

Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) identify six schools of thought on entrepreneurship, each offering a distinct perspective on the phenomenon. These schools include the Bibliographic, Psychological, Administration, Leadership, Corporate and Intrapreneurial School. Each school addresses different aspects of entrepreneurship, from innovation to management and leadership, offering a more complete and diverse view of the role of the entrepreneur.

Timmons (1994) identifies three essential factors for the success of entrepreneurship: opportunity, team and resources. The opportunity is crucial to the viability of the venture, while the team must have the right profile and skills to support the initiative.

The resources are necessary to start and sustain the business. These interdependent factors are critical to the success of any venture and must be managed effectively.

The School of Intrapreneurs and the discussions on corporate entrepreneurship, as presented by Cunningham and Lischeron (1991), show that entrepreneurship can occur within established organizations. The intrapreneur is the one who adopts an entrepreneurial mindset within the

corporate structure, seeking to innovate and improve existing processes. This type of entrepreneurship can bring new challenges and opportunities to existing companies.

Hashimoto (2009) proposes three classifications of corporate entrepreneurship: formal or induced, informal or autonomous, and aligned with organizational strategy. Formal corporate entrepreneurship involves initiatives facilitated by the organization, while informal entrepreneurship occurs spontaneously, without the explicit support of the company.

Alignment with organizational strategy reflects a more formal integration of entrepreneurial practices into the company's goals and objectives.

Baron and Shane (2007) highlight the importance of human resources for the success of any enterprise. The selection of partners and employees should be based on their skills and knowledge, reflecting the need for a well-prepared team capable of contributing to the success of the business. Choosing proper team members is essential to ensure that the venture can thrive and achieve its goals.

Garcia et al. (2008) and Pin et al. (2010) emphasize that intrapreneurial competencies, such as creativity, innovation, and leadership, have a significant impact on the performance of organizations. The development of these skills within companies can promote sustainable growth and strengthen competitiveness. Intrapreneurship, therefore, not only facilitates innovation but also contributes to the efficiency and success of organizations.

INTRAPRENEURSHIP IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR

Intrapreneurship in the public sector is a concept that has gained relevance in recent years, as organizations look for alternatives to improve their services and increase efficiency. Tavares (2010) points out that public institutions, which have the responsibility of providing services to society, function as dynamic and complex systems. These systems are interdependent and interrelated, involving information flows, organizational structures, people, and technologies. Although the Federal Constitution of 1988 establishes efficiency as a constitutional principle, many of these organizations still operate in a bureaucratic and mechanistic manner. This scenario demonstrates a pressing need for transformation to overcome existing obstacles and limitations.

In this context, Marques (2014) analyzes the impact of entrepreneurship and innovation on the survival of public organizations. The author suggests that these processes are crucial to add value to the services provided to society. Marques highlights the importance of innovative practices that can address bureaucratic rigidity and promote a more efficient public administration. He points out that flexibility and a systemic vision are fundamental for entrepreneurial practices to be effective in the public sector.

Coelho (2010) also has this perspective when he observes that intrapreneurship is emerging as a positive trend in public organizations. According to the author, the fact that intrapreneurship is becoming a common practice, even among employees who do not occupy formal leadership positions, reflects a significant change in the public sector, evidencing a potential for transformation.

On the other hand, Festa and Garcia Filho (2013), in their study, critically point out the organizational culture in the public sector, identifying an important obstacle to intrapreneurship. They note that, despite the theoretical understanding of the importance of entrepreneurial characteristics, the reality of public organizations often reflects a traditional culture that discourages innovation. The contrast between the potential for innovation and the conservative reality of employees suggests a gap that needs to be addressed to stimulate intrapreneurship.

Rodrigues' (2014) analysis reveals significant sociodemographic aspects related to intrapreneurship in the public sector. The study identifies that women and individuals with a high salary and high level of education are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Rodrigues also notes that employees in positions of trust have greater freedom to implement innovative practices. These factors point to a correlation between individual characteristics and the ability to promote change within public organizations.

According to Nienkoetter and Cruz (2012), public administration must continuously develop and bring about changes to achieve sustainability and self-sufficiency. They highlight that the ability to create and innovate is a crucial asset for organizations. The need for an internal cultural change that allows employees to use their creativity for the benefit of the organization is emphasized as an essential step for progress in the public sector.

Similarly, Coelho (2010) highlights that the intrapreneur is a fundamental agent of innovation. It seeks and drives innovation within organizations, playing a crucial role in advancing practices, both in the public and private sectors. The ability to promote changes and innovations within institutions is essential for the evolution of services provided to society.

In turn, Fontes (2014) addresses the situation of public administration, particularly in the context of crisis and abandonment of public institutions. She argues that, even in a scenario of predominance of bureaucracy and self-indulgence, entrepreneurship can thrive. Fontes suggests that, with a better use of resources and an environment conducive to innovation, it is possible to create an entrepreneurial environment that improves public management.

According to Tavares (2010), despite efforts to promote entrepreneurial practices, resistance to change and centralization remain significant challenges. Lack of awareness and attachment to bureaucracy often inhibit entrepreneurial traits, hindering employee development and the

effectiveness of innovative practices.

In contrast, Lacerda et al. (2017) highlight that the focus of intrapreneurship in the public sector should be focused on solutions that improve the services provided to society. The goal is not profit, but rather to improve the quality of care and create an environment favorable to the development of entrepreneurial skills. The implementation of innovative management practices and the integration between theory and practice are suggested as effective strategies to achieve these objectives.

According to Klein et al. (2014), there is a manifestation of public entrepreneurship in activities such as changing institutional rules and creating new public resources. They emphasize that innovation in the public interest occurs when resources are used in new ways, based on innovative ideas. This reinforces the importance of an entrepreneurial approach to addressing challenges and driving improvements in the public sector.

For Festa and Garcia Filho (2013), even with human and financial resources available, the traditional organizational culture often prevents innovation. The presence of a conservative and low-risk culture is identified as a significant obstacle to the development of entrepreneurial practices, suggesting that a cultural shift is needed to harness the innovative potential of public organizations.

According to Rodrigues (2014), women tend to be more intrapreneurial, and individuals in positions of trust are more likely to undertake. These observations highlight the importance of personal and professional characteristics in promoting intrapreneurship and suggest that factors such as salary range and level of education also play a relevant role.

METHODOLOGICAL PROCEDURES

The study was delimited by a literature review and aimed to investigate the harm caused by psychopaths in the public service work environment. It was based on the methodological precepts of Gil (2012), using systematic mapping to gather and analyze relevant studies on the subject. The starting point was the clear formulation of the research problem, focusing on the identification and description of entrepreneurship, but focused on the internal side of public institutions.

The methodology included a search for studies, articles, databases such as Google Scholar and Scielo, digital libraries and relevant scientific publications. Specific search terms were used, related to the following keywords: Entrepreneurship, Intrapreneurship, Public Management, Innovation, Characteristics, Management Training.

Literature Mapping Table 1

Author	Year	Results	Publication Location
BARON, R. A.; SHANE, S. A.	2007	It explores the process of entrepreneurship, addressing its characteristics and dynamics.	São Paulo: Thomson Learning
CANTILLON, R.	1755	It introduces the concept of entrepreneurship, emphasizing the role of the entrepreneur in the economy.	Paris
COELHO, M. L. G. M. Mota	2010	It analyzes intrapreneurship and innovation in federal public management, highlighting challenges and opportunities.	<i>Revista do Serviço Público</i> , v. 61, n. 3, p. 233-249
CUNNINGHAM, J. B.; LISCHERON, J.	1991	It defines entrepreneurship and its fundamental characteristics, exploring different theoretical approaches.	<i>Journal of Small Business Management</i> , v. 29, n. 1, p. 45-61
FALCONE, T.; OSBORNE, S.	2005	It discusses the diversity of the concept of entrepreneurship in different cultural and economic contexts.	Annals of the IberoAcademy, Faculty of Economics - New University of Lisbon
FESTA, M. P.; GARCIA FILHO, M. A.	2013	It studies the profile of intrapreneurs in the Brazilian public banking sector, identifying characteristics and behaviors.	<i>Cadernos UiFOA</i> , 21 ed.
FILION, L. J.	1999	It examines the differences between entrepreneur management systems and small business operators.	<i>RAE – Journal of Business Administration</i> , v. 39, n. 4, p. 6-20
FONTE, V.	2014	It addresses the role of entrepreneurship in public management, discussing its implications and practices.	Federal Board of Directors
GARCIA, U. L.; GIMENEZ, F. A. P.; TOLEDO, A.	2008	Develops a scale to measure intrapreneurial actions and behaviors in companies.	Annals of the V EGEPE
HASHIMOTO, M.	2009	It investigates how intrapreneurial organizations create a link between internal climate and superior performance.	Thesis (Doctorate), School of Business Administration of São Paulo, FGV

HISRICH, R. D.; PETERS, M. P.; SHEPHERD, D. A.	2009	It offers a comprehensive overview of the concept of entrepreneurship and its practices.	Porto Alegre: Bookman
KLEIN, B. L.; FULCO, J. F.; SANTOS, G.; BITTARELLO, K.	2017	It analyzes the integration between incubated companies and universities to generate continuous competitive advantages in dynamic environments.	NAVUS Journal of Management and Technology, v. 7, n. 2, p. 78-96
LACERDA, R. T. de O.; KLEIN, B. L.; FULCO, J. F.; SANTOS, G.; BITTARELLO, K.	2017	Similar to the study by KLEIN et al. (2017), focusing on innovative integration and continuous generation of competitive advantages.	NAVUS Journal of Management and Technology, v. 7, n. 2, p. 78-96
MARQUES, S. B. V.	2014	Case study on intrapreneurship in the public sector at a federal university, highlighting perspectives and challenges faced by managers.	Dissertation (Master's Degree), Federal Technological University of Paraná, Curitiba
MCCLELLAND, D.	1987	It identifies the characteristics of successful entrepreneurs and the factors that contribute to their success.	The Journal of Creative Behavior, v. 21, n. 3, p. 219-233
NIENKOETTER, E. A. S.; CRUZ, H. A. da.	2012	Analysis of intrapreneurship in cultural tourism in the public sector, with a focus on São Bonifácio/SC.	IX SEGeT Symposium of Excellence in Management and Technology
PIN, W. L.; LIE, J.; NAIQIU, L.; ZHENGZHONG, X.	2010	Review of research on human resource management in intrapreneurship, with future projections.	Advanced Management Science (ICAMS), IEEE International Conference
RODRIGUES, D. M.	2014	Multi-case study on intrapreneurship in the public service, analyzing different cases and practices.	Monograph (Administration), University of Brasília - UNB
SAY, J.-B.	1832	It presents an economic theory that addresses the role of the entrepreneur and his influence on the economy.	Paris
SCHUMPETER, J. A.	1983 [1934]	It examines the theory of economic development and the role of innovation and entrepreneurship in the process of economic growth.	São Paulo: Abril Cultural

SHAPERO, A.	1980	It analyzes the social dimensions of entrepreneurship and its impacts on research on the subject.	Entrepreneurship Research Congress, Waco, TX
SIMON, H. A.	2002	Study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations, highlighting behaviors and techniques.	New York: Macmillan
TEODORO, P.; OLIVEIRA, V. C. S.	2006	It discusses entrepreneurship by necessity and the managerial training of the small Brazilian entrepreneur, highlighting challenges and proposals for improvement.	In: ÉSTHER, Â. B.; PAÇO-CUNHA, E.; SANÁBIO, M. T. (orgs). Small businesses: reflections and perspectives for action
TIMMONS, J. A.	1994	It explores the creation of new ventures and the critical factors for the success of new businesses.	Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill
TAVARES, E. V. C.	2010	It examines the use of intrapreneurship in public institutions and the impacts of this approach on efficiency and innovation.	Legal Content, Brasília

Source: Own Authorship 2024

The selection of studies was based on pre-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, ensuring the relevance and quality of the sources used. The analysis of the collected data was conducted in a critical and interpretative manner, focusing on the identification of similarities with the theme proposed in the study, in which different theoretical and methodological perspectives presented by the selected studies were explored.

The results were presented in an organized and objective manner, highlighting the main findings on the theme proposed in the study. A subtitle was developed for results that summarizes the main links of what the authors highlight in the face of the theme, within a time limit that covers the years between 1755 and 2017. With this, the evolution was delimited in the face of the long period of time.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

Entrepreneurship is already a constant throughout the corporate world and in commercial and service environments. In this sense, Falcone and Osborne (2005) highlight that this is a phenomenon that involves not only the creation of new companies, but also innovation and

adaptation in various contexts. The broad and complex definition of entrepreneurship reflects the need for a comprehensive approach to understanding the multitude of factors that influence entrepreneurial practice.

For Simon (2002), it is a dynamic process that requires the identification and transformation of opportunities into concrete realities. This process is intrinsically linked to innovation, since entrepreneurship is not limited to creating new ideas, but also involves the ability to manage and adapt them to changes.

Filion (1999) argues that the study of entrepreneurship is enriched by several disciplines, reflecting the complexity of the phenomenon. Integrating economic, psychological, historical, and sociological perspectives can offer a more complete picture of how entrepreneurship can be applied to promote innovation and efficiency.

Schumpeter (1934) and Shapero (1980) demonstrate that the concept of entrepreneurship has evolved over time. Cantillon (1755) introduced the idea of risk, and Say (1832) emphasized the role of innovation. Schumpeter highlighted the entrepreneur as an agent of economic change. These contributions have helped shape the modern understanding of entrepreneurship, which can be applied to improve public administration by embedding innovative and dynamic practices in the public sector.

Hisrich et al. (2009), who see the entrepreneur as someone who combines resources efficiently to create value, underlines the importance of effective resource management. In the public sector, this implies the need to use available resources in order to promote innovations that bring tangible benefits to society. Applying this vision can help create a more efficient and results-oriented environment.

McClelland (1987) offers a behavioral perspective by identifying common traits among entrepreneurs, such as the need for success and the desire for control. These characteristics are essential to face challenges and seek creative solutions, which is particularly relevant for the public sector. Employees with these characteristics can drive change and innovation within institutions, helping to overcome resistance to change and foster a more entrepreneurial culture.

The behavioral approach, dominated by McClelland and observed by Filion (1999), highlights the importance of understanding the traits and behaviors of entrepreneurs. In the public sector, this may mean identifying and cultivating individuals who possess these entrepreneurial traits, providing them with the support they need to implement changes and innovations that benefit the public administration.

Teodoro and Oliveira (2006) suggest that entrepreneurs seek a tangible return on their actions, not

only financially, but also in terms of personal and professional development. In the public sector, this can translate into benefits such as improving employee skills and achieving goals that promote more efficient and effective administration. The motivation to obtain a positive return can drive intrapreneurial behavior and contribute to significant improvements.

Cunningham and Lischeron (1991) identify several schools of thought on entrepreneurship, each offering a distinct perspective. This diversity of approaches can be applied to the public sector to explore different innovation and management strategies.

Understanding these approaches can help develop practices that encourage intrapreneurship and improve the efficiency of public institutions.

Timmons (1994) highlights three essential factors for the success of entrepreneurship: opportunity, team and resources. In the context of the public sector, identifying opportunities for innovation, building competent teams, and effectively managing resources are crucial to promoting entrepreneurial practices. The integration of these factors can help transform public administration and achieve better results for society.

Hashimoto (2009) classifies corporate entrepreneurship into three types: formal, informal, and aligned with organizational strategy. This classification can be applied to the public sector to understand how entrepreneurial initiatives can be facilitated or spontaneously arise within institutions. Integrating entrepreneurial practices with organizational strategy can help improve public management and service efficiency.

Baron and Shane (2007) emphasize the importance of human resources for the success of enterprises. In the public sector, this means that the selection and training of employees with entrepreneurial skills is essential to promote change and innovation. A well-prepared team can contribute significantly to the transformation and improvement of the services offered to society.

Garcia et al. (2008) and Pin et al. (2010) emphasize that competencies such as creativity, innovation, and leadership have a positive impact on the performance of organizations. In the public sector, the development of these skills can promote sustainable growth and strengthen the competitiveness of institutions. Intrapreneurship can facilitate innovation and contribute to the efficiency and success of public organizations.

Tavares (2010) points out that public institutions face challenges due to their bureaucratic and mechanical structure. Despite efforts to promote entrepreneurial practices, resistance to change and centralization remain significant obstacles. Overcoming these challenges is essential for the successful implementation of intrapreneurial practices and for improving the efficiency of public services.

Marques (2014) and Coelho (2010) highlight that entrepreneurship and innovation are crucial for the survival and improvement of public organizations. These practices can address bureaucratic rigidities and promote more efficient public administration. The adoption of entrepreneurial practices can help transform public administration and provide better services to society.

Festa and Garcia Filho (2013) observe that the traditional organizational culture in the public sector can discourage innovation. To overcome this barrier, it is necessary to promote a cultural change that allows the development of entrepreneurial practices.

Creating a more innovative and proactive environment can help overcome cultural limitations and drive significant improvements.

Rodrigues (2014) reveals that factors such as salary range and level of education influence the propensity to intrapreneurship. Employees with these characteristics may be better positioned to drive change and innovation in the public sector. Identifying and supporting these individuals can contribute to the successful implementation of entrepreneurial practices.

Nienkoetter and Cruz (2012) highlight that public administration must evolve to achieve sustainability and self-sufficiency. The ability to create and innovate is essential for the progress of public organizations. Promoting an internal cultural change that allows the use of employees' creativity can be an important step to improve public management and the effectiveness of services.

Fontes (2014) argues that, even in crisis scenarios and abandonment of public institutions, entrepreneurship can thrive. With a better use of resources and a favorable environment for innovation, it is possible to create an entrepreneurial environment that improves public management. This perspective suggests that, despite the difficulties, entrepreneurship can be a valuable tool for public sector transformation.

Lacerda et al. (2017) emphasize that the focus of intrapreneurship in the public sector should be aimed at improving the services provided to society. The implementation of innovative management practices and the integration between theory and practice are effective strategies to achieve these goals. Intrapreneurship can contribute significantly to the evolution and efficiency of public institutions.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In view of the objectives and the proposed problem, it was seen that intrapreneurship has the potential to significantly transform the public sector by applying entrepreneurial principles within existing organizational structures. By promoting an innovative and proactive mindset

among employees, intrapreneurship can lead to a reevaluation of processes and services, encouraging the search for more efficient and effective solutions.

This can result in substantial improvements in the quality of services provided, as employees become more engaged and motivated to find new ways to meet the needs of the population, while also facing and overcoming traditional bureaucratic limitations.

By adding the incentive to intrapreneurship, a culture of innovation can be promoted within public organizations, where creativity and initiative are valued and rewarded. This cultural shift is essential to overcome the rigidity and resistance to change that often characterizes the public sector. When employees are empowered to act as intrapreneurs, they have the freedom and support they need to experiment with new approaches and implement improvements that can lead to more efficient and results-oriented public management.

The positive impact of intrapreneurship, on the other hand, goes beyond operational efficiency; It can also improve public perception of the services offered. By demonstrating a commitment to innovation and continuous improvement, public organizations can earn the trust and respect of the community, resulting in greater acceptance and support for their initiatives.

REFERENCES

1. Baron, R. A., & Shane, S. A. (2007). **Empreendedorismo: uma visão do processo**. São Paulo: Thomson Learning.
2. Cantillon, R. (1755). **Ensaio sobre a natureza do comércio em geral**. Curitiba: Segesta Editora.
3. Coelho, M. L. G. M. M. (2010). Intraempreendedorismo e a inovação na gestão pública federal. **Revista do Serviço Público**, 61(3), 233–249.
4. Costa, A. M., et al. (2007). O empreendedorismo corporativo: uma nova estratégia para a inovação em organizações contemporâneas. **Revista de Negócios**, 12(1).
5. Cunningham, J. B., & Lischeron, J. (1991). Defining entrepreneurship. **Journal of Small Business Management**, 29(1), 45–61.
6. Dornelas, J. C. A. (2011). **Empreendedorismo corporativo: como ser empreendedor, inovar e se diferenciar na sua empresa** (3ª ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier Campus.
7. Falcone, T., & Osborne, S. (2005). Entrepreneurship: a diverse concept in a diverse

- world.*Anais do IberoAcademy*. Faculdade de Economia - Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal, 8-11 dez.
8. Festa, M. P., & Garcia Filho, M. A. (2013). Perfil intraempreendedor: um estudo sobre o perfil profissional encontrado em organização pública do setor bancário brasileiro.*Cadernos UiFOA*, 21.
 9. Fillion, L. J. (1999). Diferenças entre sistemas gerenciais de empreendedores e operadores de pequenos negócios. *RAE – Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 39(4), 6–20.
 10. Fonte, V. (2014). *Empreendedorismo na gestão pública*. Conselho Federal de Administração.
 11. Garcia, U. L., Gimenez, F. A. P., & Toledo, A. (2008). Ações e comportamento intra- empreendedores: uma escala de mensuração. *Anais do V EGEPE*, São Paulo.
 12. Hashimoto, M. (2009). Organizações intra-empendedoras: construindo a ponte entre clima interno e desempenho superior (Tese de doutorado). Escola de Administração de Empresas de São Paulo, FGV, São Paulo.
 13. Hisrich, R. D., Peters, M. P., & Shepherd, D. A. (2009). *Empreendedorismo* (3ª ed.). Porto Alegre: Bookman.
 14. Klein, B. L., et al. (2017). Integração inovadora entre empresas incubadas e universidades para geração contínua de vantagens competitivas em ambientes dinâmicos. *NAVUS Revista de Gestão e Tecnologia*, 7(2), 78–96.
 15. Lacerda, R. T. O., et al. (2017). Integração inovadora entre empresas incubadas e universidades para geração contínua de vantagens competitivas em ambientes dinâmicos. *NAVUS Revista de Gestão e Tecnologia*, 7(2), 78–96.
 16. Marques, S. B. V. (2014). Intraempreendedorismo no setor público: a perspectiva dos gestores de instituições públicas de ensino superior – estudo de caso na Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná (UTFPR). (Dissertação de mestrado). Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná, Curitiba.
 17. McClelland, D. (1987). Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 21(3), 219–233.

18. Nienkoetter, E. A. S., & Cruz, H. A. (2012). Intraempreendedorismo: uma análise no setor público sobre o turismo cultural paisagístico religioso, em São Bonifácio/SC. *IX SEGeT-Simpósio de Excelência em Gestão e Tecnologia*. Resende, RJ.
19. Pin, W. L., et al. (2010). A review and prospect of research on human resource management of intrapreneurship. *Advanced Management Science (ICAMS)*, IEEE International Conference, Chengdu, China, 456–460.
20. Rodrigues, D. M. (2014). Intraempreendedorismo no serviço público: um estudo multicaso (Monografia de graduação). Universidade de Brasília, Brasília.
21. Say, J.-B. (1832). *Traité d'économie politique*. Paris: Deterville. Apud Rocha, A. P. *As observações de Jean-Baptiste Say sobre a escravidão*. *Liberalismo e Escravidão Estud Av.*, 14, 2000.
22. Schumpeter, J. A. (1983). *Teoria do Desenvolvimento Econômico*. São Paulo: Abril Cultural. (Original publicado em 1934).
23. Shapero, A. (1980). Some social dimensions of entrepreneurship. Artigo apresentado no Congresso sobre Entrepreneurship Research. Documento resumo, 28 p., ED 36.351, Waco, TX, 24-25 mar.
24. Simon, H. A. (2002). *Administrative Behavior: study of decision-making processes in administrative organization*. New York: Macmillan.
25. Teodoro, P., & Oliveira, V. C. S. (2006). O empreendedorismo por necessidade e a precariedade da formação gerencial do pequeno empreendedor brasileiro. In: Ésther, Â. B., Paço-Cunha, E., & Sanábio, M. T. (Orgs.). *Pequenas empresas: reflexões e perspectivas de ação* (pp. 348). Minas Gerais: Editora UFJF.
26. Timmons, J. A. (1994). *New venture creation* (4^a ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
27. Tavares, E. V. C. (2010). O intraempreendedorismo e a sua utilização em instituições públicas. *Conteúdo Jurídico*, Brasília.