

intrapreneurial self-capital: a new construct for the 21st century

Annamaria Di Fabio

This article presents a new career construct, intrapreneurial self-capital, and provides empirical evidence to verify it. Intrapreneurial self-capital is defined as a core of individual intrapreneurial resources used to cope with career and life construction challenges and includes dimensions of core self-evaluation, hardiness, creative self-efficacy, resilience, goal mastery, decisiveness, and vigilance. The Intrapreneurial Self-Capital Scale was developed to measure this new construct. It was administered to 171 Italian high school students, and confirmatory factor analysis supported the existence of the construct and its dimensions. Intrapreneurial self-capital is a construct that will be useful for further research as well as for use in career interventions.

Keywords: intrapreneurial self-capital, career, career counseling, prevention, human resources

• • • •

The postmodern era is characterized by rapid economic changes, globalization, and unstable labor markets, resulting in greatly reduced predictability of employment and overall career patterns. As a result, job transitions are more and more frequent and complex (Savickas, 2011). For this reason, the responsibility for one's career progression increasingly rests on the person and not the organization (Duarte, 2004). Individuals have to make career decisions more frequently than in the past, while considering their interests, values, and goals. Therefore, workers in the 21st century must engage in continuous learning, develop flexibility, create their own opportunities, exhibit adaptability, maintain their employability, and proactively construct their careers (Savickas, 2011). Given these career realities, and considering best practices guidelines for psychologists set forth by the American Psychological Association (Hage et al., 2007), the professionals in the fields of guidance, career counseling, career planning, life construction (Guichard, 2013), and human resources development need to assist clients to develop a perspective that focuses on prevention and not just remediation. Furthermore, it is important to help clients develop protective factors that decrease the probability of undesirable outcomes related to their careers. Preventive, proactive approaches have been supported in the literature as being more effective and less expensive than interventions undertaken after problems have appeared (Blustein, 2011; Kenny, Horne, Orpinas, & Reese, 2009). Intrapreneurial self-capital is a construct that is situated in this preventive framework.

• • • •

Annamaria Di Fabio, Department of Education and Psychology, University of Florence, Florence, Italy. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Annamaria Di Fabio, Department of Education and Psychology, University of Florence, Psychology Section, via di San Salvi, 12, Complesso di San Salvi, Padiglione 26, 50135, Florence, Italy (e-mail: adifabio@psico.unifi.it).

The term *capital* in the career literature has multiple meanings (Guichard, 2013). For example, there is career capital (DeFilippi & Arthur, 1996), identity capital (Côté, 1996), and psychological capital (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). Career capital (DeFilippi & Arthur, 1996) refers to three different ways of knowing: (a) knowing-how about career capabilities in terms of a person's explicit knowledge, implicit experiences, soft skills, and technical expertise; (b) knowing-whom about career capabilities in terms of a person's network of intrafirm, interfirm, professional, and social relations; and (c) knowing-why about career capabilities in terms of a person's energy, sense of purpose, motivation, and identification with the world of work.

Identity capital (Côté, 1996) refers to resources individuals use to cope with the obstacles of late-modern society and is divided into two types of resources: psychological resources and sociological resources. Côté (1997) empirically tested the identity capital model using a sample of university students transitioning from late adolescence to adulthood. In the study, the dependent variables were two factors, adult identity resolution and community identity resolution. Both are accumulated during late adolescence and were measured by a self-report instrument, the Identity Stage Resolution Index. The independent variables were psychological resources (i.e., self-esteem, purpose in life, self-actualization, internal locus of control, ego strength, ideological commitment) and sociological resources (i.e., special competencies, benefit from special competencies, purposive use of skills).

Psychological capital (Luthans et al., 2007) refers to an individual's positive psychological state of development and is characterized by the psychological resources of self-efficacy, hope, optimism, and resilience.

Considering the many challenges people face in the modern world of work, and the need to proactively and flexibly meet these challenges, developing the characteristics of intrapreneurship is valuable. They are defined by the skills required to proactively and flexibly meet challenges in an existing organizational context. Intrapreneurial self-capital provides the personal resources to deal with constant changes and transitions by creating innovative solutions that confront the constraints that the environment poses and turn these constraints into resources.

Using theories of prevention (Blustein, 2011; Kenny et al., 2009), career construction (Savickas, 2005, 2011), and life construction (Guichard, 2013) as the main framework, I thus propose the concept of intrapreneurial self-capital.

INTRAPRENEURIAL SELF-CAPITAL: A NEW CAREER CONSTRUCT

Intrapreneurial self-capital builds on concepts developed in the organizational psychology literature. The term *intrapreneur* was first used by Macrae (1976) in *The Economist* and was later defined by Pinchot (1985) as "shorthand for intra-corporate entrepreneur" (p. 12). The term *intrapreneurship* was created to differentiate among types of entrepreneurship in existing organizations (Bird, 1989; Hisrich & Peters, 1995; Oden, 1997). Intrapreneurs differ from entrepreneurs in that entrepreneurs have an innovative idea and are committed to realize it in an entrepreneurial manner using their own skills and passion to create their own business (Honig, 2001).

In contrast, intrapreneurs develop their innovative ideas within the organization to which they belong and are committed to implementing them within the confines of their organization, even when confronted with organizational change and possible organizational conflicts (Pinchot & Pellman, 1999).

Initial research on intrapreneurship in the 1980s and 1990s focused on three areas. The first area, upon which intrapreneurial self-capital is based, described intrapreneurs' characteristics; the second focused on the formation of new corporate ventures; and the third identified characteristics of intrapreneurial organizations (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003). Research focusing on intrapreneurs has identified a number of distinctive characteristics. An intrapreneur is fundamentally a risk taker, an adapter, and an innovator (Cox & Jennings, 1995). Intrapreneurs also possess tenacity/persistence, vision (i.e., anticipator of objectives), aversion to repetition, creativity, innovativeness, and resilience (Davis, 1999).

Other studies have also identified the characteristics of intrapreneurs. Honig (2001) found that the most used learning style of intrapreneurs was linked to the desire to continually develop one's own skills. Lubkins and Kans (2007) found that intrapreneurs prefer to plan more in uncertain environments; study environments in-depth to ensure mastery; and use information in a rational, formal, strategy-making process. Lubkins and Kans suggested that intrapreneurs use strategic management processes to introduce innovative ideas that can be incorporated into the strategic direction of their organizations. Intrapreneurs have also been described as possessing self-determination, freedom, and autonomy when making decisions, and it has been found that they can be satisfied through self-imposed projects (Menzela, Aaltio, & Ulijna, 2007). Recent studies have associated intrapreneurship with high self-esteem and self-efficacy (Ronen, 2010), internal locus of control (Muller, Garrecht, Pikal, & Reedwisch, 2002; Ronen, 2010), and low neuroticism (Ronen, 2010).

On the basis of the literature, the new construct of intrapreneurial self-capital is proposed. Intrapreneurial self-capital is defined as the positive self-evaluation of the self-concept characterized by one's own ability to be committed, to identify significant objectives, to feel in control over life events, to creatively solve problems, to change constraints into resources, to develop one's own skills, to apply decision-making skills to every aspect of life, and to make decisions carefully and rationally. More specifically, intrapreneurial self-capital represents a core of attributes possessed by individuals as intrapreneurs of their lives. These attributes allow an individual to deal with the constant changes that occur throughout his or her career through the creation of innovative solutions to confront environmental challenges and turn constraints into resources.

Intrapreneurial self-capital is a higher order construct composed of seven specific constructs (i.e., core self-evaluation, hardiness, creative self-efficacy, resilience, goal mastery, decisiveness, vigilance). Defining a higher order construct permits the specific constructs to be measured at the same time, resulting in a more economical procedure that is a valid and reliable measure of the core construct.

For each of the seven constructs, I systematically show relationships present in the literature, and, as suggested by Whiston (2008), examine each of the specific constructs with four variables. One variable is grade point average (GPA), a concrete measure of students' performance (Alpkan, Bulut, Gunday, Ulusoy, & Kilic, 2010;

Foba & De Villiers, 2007). The other variables are subjective measures: employability, career decision-making self-efficacy, and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Whiston, 2008).

The first specific construct in the higher order construct intrapreneurial self-capital is core self-evaluation (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2003). It refers to positive self-concept in terms of self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and the absence of pessimism. Core self-evaluation includes individual characteristics relative to a positive self-concept in relation to intrapreneurship (i.e., self-esteem, self-efficacy, internal locus of control, low neuroticism; Muller et al., 2002; Ronen, 2010). In the literature, core self-evaluation is positively associated with performance (Bono & Judge, 2003), employability (Judge & Hurst, 2008), career decision-making self-efficacy (Koumoundourou, Kounenou, & Siavara, 2012), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2012b).

The hardiness construct describes the resistance exhibited by individuals and includes the tendency to fully engage in all aspects of life, to identify goals, and to set priorities (commitment). Hardiness is characterized by the perceived control that individuals have over their lives and can influence the events in a positive sense for themselves. It is the ability to take responsibility (control) and the tendency to believe that change and stressful events can be opportunities for personal development rather than a threat to one's security. Hardiness is also defined by the tendency to actively seek out new experiences and stimulants, and the ability to respond adaptively to unexpected situations (challenge; Maddi, 1990).

The construct of hardiness and its three dimensions (i.e., commitment, control, challenge) reflect qualities identified by Davis (1999): tenacity/persistence, vision, and dislike of repetition. The commitment dimension of hardiness is linked to tenacity and perseverance in achieving one's own objectives by working hard. The control dimension relates to planning in advance and possessing vision to anticipate possible problems. The challenge dimension is specifically linked to a desire for environmental changes and the avoidance of repetition. In the literature, hardiness is positively associated with performance (Maddi et al., 2006), employability (Coetzee & Gunz, 2012), career decision-making self-efficacy (Maddi, Harvey, Khoshaba, Fazel, & Resurreccion, 2009), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Brown et al., 2012).

Creative self-efficacy refers to an individual's perception of his or her ability to face and solve problems in a creative way (Tierney & Farmer, 2002). The construct of creative self-efficacy is an aspect of creativity/innovativeness that Davis (1999) associated with intrapreneurship. The literature suggests positive relationships between creative self-efficacy and performance (Mathisen, 2011), employability (Bridgstock, 2009), career decision-making self-efficacy (Ford & Gioia, 2000), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, in press; Tierney & Farmer, 2002).

The resilience construct refers to the ability to cope with and continue to withstand adversity in an adaptive way (Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000) and to implement adaptive strategies to deal with discomfort and adversity (Tugade & Fredrickson, 2004). Resilience also refers to the set of resources that allow individuals to use their strengths within their limits, to understand that critical experiences can become a

training opportunity for personal growth, to withstand stressful events, and to continue to grow by increasing their own resources, resulting in a positive reorganization of life (Malaguti, 2005). The construct of resilience was identified by Davis (1999) as a distinctive characteristic of intrapreneurship. It is important to be resilient so as to deal with setbacks, rejection, and difficulties. In the literature, resilience shows positive associations with performance (Bhamra, Dani, & Burnard, 2011), employability (Kinman & Grant, 2011), career decision-making self-efficacy (Shin, Taylor, & Seo, 2012), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Stern et al., 2010).

Goal mastery refers to the pursuit of developing one's own skills (Midgley et al., 2000). Individuals who possess goal mastery perceive learning as inherently interesting and focus attention on their tasks. It should be noted that unlike goal mastery, performance goal is directly linked to achievement in the short term and with reference to a specific objective. For this reason, performance goal can decrease motivation to strive for a high level of competence (Midgley et al., 2000). Goal mastery refers to the tendency to achieve the perceived best level in relation to each task, with the general objective of continuously developing one's own competence (Midgley et al., 2000). Goal mastery characterizes intrapreneurs and refers to a learning strategy that is linked to the desire to continually develop one's own skills (Honig, 2001). An analysis of the literature indicates positive relationships between goal mastery and performance (Darnon, Butera, & Harackiewicz, 2007), employability (van Emmerik, Schreurs, De Cuyper, Jawahar, & Peeters, 2012), career decision-making self-efficacy (Harackiewicz, Barron, Tauer, & Elliot, 2002), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Germeijs & Verschueren, 2006).

Decisiveness concerns the perceived ability to make decisions interchangeably in all decision-making contexts (Frost & Shows, 1993). The construct of decisiveness in relation to intrapreneurship reflects characteristics relative to self-determination in decision making and the freedom and autonomy to make decisions (Menzela et al., 2007). In the literature, decisiveness is positively associated with performance (Creed, Prideaux, & Patton, 2005), employability (Abu Talib & Tan, 2009), career decision-making self-efficacy (Di Fabio, Palazzeschi, Asulin-Peretz, & Gati, 2013), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Amir & Gati, 2006).

Vigilance refers to a decision-making approach that is characterized by the careful and rational searching of relevant information and the careful evaluation of each option before making a choice (Mann, Burnett, Radford, & Ford, 1997). In the decisional styles model developed by Mann et al. (1997), vigilance represents an adaptive decisional style in contrast to three other maladaptive styles: avoidance, procrastination, and hypervigilance. Vigilance is a characteristic of intrapreneurs (Lubkins & Kans, 2007) and reflects the abilities to plan more in uncertain environments, to study the environments in-depth to ensure mastery of the environment, and to use information in a rational, formal, and strategic process. In the literature, positive relationships have emerged among vigilance and performance (Senko, Hama, & Belmonte, 2013), employability (Burns, Dittmann, Nguyen, & Mitchelson, 2000), career decision-making self-efficacy (Ueichi, Kuriyama, Saito, & Kusumi, 2012), and lack of career decision-making difficulties (Osipow & Gati, 1998).

METHOD

Participants

Study participants were 171 students attending the last 2 years of high school in the Tuscany, Italy, school system. There were 72 men (42.11%) and 99 women (57.89%), with an average age of 18.12 years ($SD = 0.83$). Specialized staff administered the instruments in the classroom at a time agreed upon with the school and with adherence to the requirements of privacy and informed consent.

Measures

To measure the intrapreneurial self-capital construct, I developed the Intrapreneurial Self-Capital Scale (ISCS). My study reports the results relative to a series of analyses to establish the reliability and validity of the ISCS as a measure of the new construct presented.

The ISCS uses a 5-point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) and is composed of 28 items adapted from other scales that measure the specific dimensions of the intrapreneurial self-capital construct. The items and scales are as follows:

- Four items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio & Busoni, 2009) of the Core Self-Evaluation Scale (Judge et al., 2003) were used to measure the core self-evaluation dimension (e.g., “Sometimes when I fail I feel valueless”; self-esteem, inverse item).
- Nine items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2014c) of the Hardiness Scale (Bartone, 1995; Bartone, Ursano, Wright, & Ingraham, 1989) were used. Three of the items focus on commitment (e.g., “By studying with strong commitment, you can always reach your goals”); three focus on control (e.g., “Planning in advance can help avoid most future problems”); and three focus on challenges (e.g., “Changes in routine are attractive to me”).
- Three items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2014a) of the Creative Self-Efficacy Scale (Tierney & Farmer, 2002) were used to measure the creative self-efficacy dimension (e.g., “I’m able to solve problems creatively”).
- Three items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2012a) of the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale (Campbell-Sills & Stein, 2007) were used to measure the resilience dimension (e.g., “I’m able to achieve objectives despite obstacles”).
- Three items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2014b) of the Goal Mastery Orientation Scale of the Patterns for Adaptive Learning Survey (Midgley et al., 2000) were used to measure the goal mastery dimension (e.g., “One of my goals in training is to learn as much as I can”).

- Three items adapted from the Italian version (Di Fabio, Busoni, & Palazzeschi, 2011) of the Indecisiveness Scale (Frost & Shows, 1993) were used to measure the decisiveness dimension in terms of lack of indecisiveness (e.g., “It’s simple for me to decide”).
- Three items related to vigilance decisional style adapted from the Italian version (Nota & Soresi, 2000) of the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire (Mann et al., 1997) were used to measure the vigilance dimension (e.g., “When I must make decision, I like to stop and consider all possible options”).

Employability. To measure employability as perceived by students, I used the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2013b) of the Self-Perceived Employability for Students (SPES; Rothwell, Herbert, & Rothwell, 2007) questionnaire. The questionnaire is composed of 16 items and uses a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neither agree nor disagree*, 4 = *agree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). Examples of items include “The skills and abilities that I possess are what employers are looking for” and “I feel I could get any job so long as my skills and experience are reasonably relevant.” A Cronbach’s alpha of .75 has been reported for the instrument (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2013b).

Career decision-making self-efficacy. To measure career decision-making self-efficacy, I used the Italian version (Nota, Pace, & Ferrari, 2008) of the Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale–Short Form (CDESES-SF; Betz & Taylor, 2000). The tool is composed of 20 items and uses a 5-point Likert scale format ranging from 1 (*I have no confidence*) to 5 (*I have complete confidence*). The questionnaire permits the administrator to measure a total score for career decision-making self-efficacy. Cronbach’s alpha for the total score was .74.

Career decision-making difficulties. To measure career decision-making difficulties, I used the Italian version (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2013a) of the Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire (CDDQ; Gati, Krausz, & Osipow, 1996; Gati & Saka, 2001). The questionnaire is composed of 34 items (two of these items check response validity) and uses a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*does not describe me*) to 9 (*describes me well*).

This questionnaire is composed of three scales and 10 subscales. The scale Lack of Readiness includes the subscales Lack of Motivation (e.g., “I know that I have to choose a career, but I don’t have the motivation to make the decision now), Indecisiveness (e.g., “It is usually difficult for me to make decisions”), and Dysfunctional Beliefs (e.g., “I expect that entering the career I choose will also solve my personal problems”). The scale Lack of Information includes the subscales Lack of Information About the Decision-Making Process (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because I do not know what steps I have to take”), Lack of Information About the Self (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because I still do not know which occupations interest me”), Lack of Information About Occupations (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because I do not have enough information about the characteristics of the occupations and / or training programs that interest me”), and Lack of Information About Ways of Obtaining Information (e.g., I find it

difficult to make a career decision because I do not know how to obtain additional information about myself”). The scale Inconsistent Information included the subscales Unreliable Information (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because I constantly change my career preferences”), Internal Conflicts (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because I’m equally attracted by a number of careers and it is difficult for me to choose among them), and External Conflicts (e.g., “I find it difficult to make a career decision because people who are important to me, such as parents or friends, do not agree with the career options I am considering and / or the career characteristics I desire”). Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the CDDQ dimensions were .87 for Lack of Readiness, .89 for Lack of Information, and .91 for Inconsistent Information. The total score was .93 (Di Fabio & Palazzeschi, 2013a).

Scholastic success. GPA at the end of the scholastic year was used to evaluate scholastic success.

Data Analysis

I verified the factorial structure of the ISCS through second-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with the use of the statistical package AMOS, Version 6 (Arbuckle, 2005), using the maximum likelihood method. The model fit was analyzed based on the ratio between chi-square and degree of freedom (χ^2/df), the comparative fit index, the nonnormed fit index, the root mean square error of approximation, and the standardized root mean square residual. I verified the reliability of the ISCS’s internal consistency through the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. The criterion validity was verified through Pearson’s *r* correlation of the ISCS with performance in terms of GPA at the end of the scholastic year (predictive validity) and with SPES, CDESE-SF, and CDDQ (concurrent validity).

RESULTS

To verify the factorial structure of the ISCS, I conducted a second-order confirmatory factor analysis with summed scores for each construct that composed the higher construct of intrapreneurial self-capital as observed variables. The goodness-of-fit indices are reported in Table 1.

With regard to the considered indices, the factorial structure of the ISCS was confirmed. To verify the internal consistency of the scale, I calculated the Cronbach’s

TABLE 1
Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Goodness of Fit

Variable	χ^2/df	SRMR	RMSEA	NNFI	CFI
Intrapreneurial self-capital	1.43	.04	.05	.90	.90
Confidence interval			[.04, .06]		

Note. SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; NNFI = nonnormed fit index; CFI = comparative fit index.

alpha coefficient, which was .86. The correlations of the ISCS with performance in terms of GPA at the end of the scholastic year (predictive validity), the SPES, the CDESES-SF, and the CDDQ (concurrent validity) are reported in Table 2.

DISCUSSION

My article introduces a new construct, intrapreneurial self-capital, and the Intrapreneurial Self-Capital Scale developed to measure it. The scale’s dimensionality, reliability, and the criterion validity were verified. With regard to dimensionality, the second-order confirmatory factor analysis indicated that the nine identified constructs (i.e., core self-evaluation, commitment dimension of hardiness, control dimension of hardiness, challenge dimension of hardiness, creative self-efficacy, resilience, goal mastery, decisiveness, vigilance) converge in the higher order construct of intrapreneurial self-capital and show satisfactory statistic fit indices. With regard to the scale’s reliability, Cronbach’s alpha coefficient results were acceptable. With regard to the criterion validity, the positive relationship between scores on the ISCS and performance as measured by GPA at the end of the scholastic year showed good predictive validity. Following the advice of Whiston (2008) regarding the importance of using multiple perspectives, I chose the external criterion variable scholastic success as a concrete measure of students’ performance. According to the preventive framework (Blustein, 2011; Kenny et al., 2009), the positive relationship between intrapreneurial self-capital and scholastic success indicates the importance of intrapreneurial individual characteristics in promoting performance at school. The positive relationships between scores on the ISCS and measures of employability and career decision-making self-efficacy, compared with the negative relationship with career decision-making difficulties, showed a good criterion validity, underlining the importance of intrapreneurial self-capital in perceived employability and career decision making.

Results from my study suggest that it is possible to empirically verify the intrapreneurial self-capital construct by using the ISCS. Nevertheless, my study is limited to only a sample of Tuscany high school students, who may not be representative of the larger Italian student population. Therefore, future research should consider groups of participants more representative of other populations, such as high school

TABLE 2

Correlations of Intrapreneurial Self-Capital With Grade Point Average at the End of the Scholastic Year, With the SPES, With the CDESES-SF, and With the CDDQ

Variable	Grade Point Average	SPES	CDESES-SF	CDDQ
Intrapreneurial self-capital	.32*	.36*	.46*	-.26*

Note. N = 171. SPES = Self-Perceived Employability for Students; CDESES-SF = Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale–Short Form; CDDQ = Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire. *p < .01.

students in other Italian regions and countries. Moreover, studies that use samples of university students, entrepreneurs, adults in transition, employed workers, unemployed individuals, aging workers, or workers close to retirement would broaden the development of the intrapreneurial theory.

Despite these limitations, the results obtained using the intrapreneurial self-capital construct as measured by the ISCS appear to be particularly promising and are potentially useful for those working in guidance, career counseling, career planning, life construction, human resources, and organizational development. Clients who receive help identifying a set of preventive individual resources in terms of an intrapreneurial core are better able to handle and succeed in a constantly changing labor market. Moreover, an intrapreneurial core is very useful to design one's own future, to create one's own opportunities, to reinforce adaptability skills, to maintain employability and proactivity, and to construct one's self, identity, and life (Guichard, 2013; Savickas, 2011). Therefore, the intrapreneurial self-capital construct underlines the value of personal intrapreneurship as an early preventive resource that has to be strengthened to flexibly, adaptively, and proactively build one's own personal and professional development path. It also helps people to cope with the new reality of the world of work and to preserve their individual potentialities and talents (Blustein, 2011; Guichard, 2013; Kenny et al., 2009).

Intrapreneurial self-capital provides guidance and career counselors with a construct to conceptualize a core of resources for individuals to use when facing the challenges of the 21st century. It is important to emphasize that intrapreneurial self-capital is valuable because it serves as a means to prevent potential career decision-making problems instead of focusing on remediation. If the new construct calls for early actions for enhancing intrapreneurship at school, the results of my study also suggest that counselors can help clients prevent future career problems by helping them to develop intrapreneurial self-capital. Intrapreneurial self-capital can also be effectively used to construct career services and career counseling goals in organizational and community contexts. When people develop intrapreneurial self-capital, they will be better equipped to cope with the complex career issues of the 21st century.

REFERENCES

- Abu Talib, M., & Tan, K. A. (2009). Predictors of career indecision among Malaysian undergraduate students. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 8*, 215–224.
- 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*, 732–755.
- Amir, T., & Gati, I. (2006). Facets of career decision-making difficulties. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 34*, 483–503.
- Antonicic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Privatization, corporate entrepreneurship and performance: Testing a normative model. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, 8*, 197–218.
- Arbuckle, J. L. (2005). *Amos 6.0 user's guide*. Chicago, IL: SPSS.
- Bartone, P. T. (1995, July). *A short hardiness scale*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Society, New York, NY.

- Bartone, P. T., Ursano, R. J., Wright, K. M., & Ingraham, L. H. (1989). The impact of a military air disaster on the health of assistance workers: A prospective study. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 177*, 317–328.
- Betz, N. E., & Taylor, K. M. (2000). *Manual for the Career Decision Making Self-Efficacy Scale (CDMSES) and CDMSES–Short Form*. Unpublished manuscript, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Bhamra, R., Dani, S., & Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research, 49*, 5375–5393.
- Bird, B. (1989). *Entrepreneurial behavior*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Blustein, D. L. (2011). A relational theory of working. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 79*, 1–17.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Core self-evaluations: A review of the trait and its role in job satisfaction and job performance. *European Journal of Personality, 17*, S5–S18.
- Bridgstock, R. (2009). The graduate attributes we've overlooked: Enhancing graduate employability through career management skills. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*, 31–44.
- Brown, S. D., Hacker, J., Abrams, M., Carr, A., Rector, C., Lamp, K., . . . Siena, A. (2012). Validation of a four-factor model of career indecision. *Journal of Career Assessment, 20*, 3–21.
- Burns, L. R., Dittmann, K., Nguyen, N. L., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2000). Academic procrastination, perfectionism, and control: Associations with vigilant and avoidant coping. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*, 35–46.
- Campbell-Sills, L., & Stein, M. B. (2007). Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 20*, 1019–1028.
- Coetzee, M., & Gunz, H. (2012). Careers and retention of staff in the 21st century world of work: Introduction to the special edition. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 10*, 1–4.
- Côté, J. E. (1996). Sociological perspectives on identity formation: The culture–identity link and identity capital. *Journal of Adolescence, 19*, 419–430.
- Côté, J. (1997). An empirical test of the identity capital model. *Journal of Adolescence, 20*, 577–597.
- Cox, C., & Jennings, R. (1995). The foundations of success: The development and characteristics of British entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 16*, 4–9.
- Creed, P., Prideaux, L. A., & Patton, W. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of career decisional states in adolescence. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 67*, 397–412.
- Darnon, C., Butera, F., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2007). Achievement goals in social interactions: Learning with mastery vs. performance goals. *Motivation and Emotion, 31*, 61–70.
- Davis, K. S. (1999). Decision criteria in the evaluation of potential intrapreneurs. *Journal of Engineering & Technology Management, 16*, 295–327.
- DeFilippi, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1996). Boundaryless contexts and careers: A competency-based perspective. In M. B. Arthur & D. M. Rousseau (Eds.), *The boundaryless career: A new employment principle for a new organizational era* (pp. 116–131). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Di Fabio, A., & Busoni, L. (2009). Proprietà psicometriche della versione italiana della Core Self-Evaluation Scale (CSES) con studenti di scuola secondaria [Psychometric properties of the Italian version of the Core Self-Evaluation Scale (CSES) with high school students]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni, 2*, 73–83.
- Di Fabio, A., Busoni, L., & Palazzeschi, L. (2011). Indecisiveness Scale (IS): Proprietà psicometriche della versione italiana [Indecisiveness Scale (IS): Psychometric properties of the Italian version]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni, 4*, 13–24.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2012a). Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale: Proprietà psicometriche della versione italiana [Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale: Psychometric properties of the Italian version]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni, 5*, 101–110.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2012b). Incremental variance of the core self-evaluation construct compared to fluid intelligence and personality traits in aspects of decision-making. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*, 196–201.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (Eds.). (2013a). *Adattamento italiano del CDDQ–Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire [Italian Adaptation of the CDDQ–Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire]*. Florence, Italy: Giunti O.S.

- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2013b). Self-perceived employability for students: Un primo contributo alla validazione nel contesto italiano [Self-perceived employability for students: A first contribution to validation in the Italian context]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 6, 97–105.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2014a). Creative Self-Efficacy Scale: Proprietà psicometriche della versione italiana [Creative Self-Efficacy Scale: Psychometric properties of the Italian version]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 7, 73–79.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2014b). Proprietà psicometriche di una scala per rilevare il goal mastery orientation nel contesto italiano [Psychometric properties of a scale to measure goal mastery orientation in the Italian context]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 7, 89–94.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (2014c). Una scala per rilevare l'hardiness nel contesto Italiano: Proprietà psicometriche [A scale to measure hardiness in the Italian context: Psychometric properties]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*, 7, 81–88.
- Di Fabio, A., & Palazzeschi, L. (in press). Creative self-efficacy e career decision-making difficulties in studenti italiani di scuola superiore. [Creative self-efficacy and career decision-making difficulties in Italian high school students]. *Counseling. Giornale Italiano di Ricerca e Applicazioni*.
- Di Fabio, A., Palazzeschi, L., Asulin-Peretz, L., & Gati, I. (2013). Career indecision versus indecisiveness: Associations with personality traits and emotional intelligence. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 21, 42–56.
- Duarte, M. E. (2004). O indivíduo e a organização: Perspectivas de desenvolvimento. [The individual and the organization: Perspectives of development]. *Psychologica (Extra-Série)*, 549–557.
- Foba, T. W., & De Villiers, D. (2007). The integration of intrapreneurship into a performance management model. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5, 1–8.
- Ford, C. M., & Gioia, D. A. (2000). Factors influencing creativity in the domain of managerial decision making. *Journal of Management*, 26, 705–732.
- Frost, R. O., & Shows, D. L. (1993). The nature and measurement of compulsive indecisiveness. *Behavior Research Therapy*, 31, 683–692.
- Gati, I., Krausz, M., & Osipow, S. H. (1996). A taxonomy of difficulties in career decision making. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 43, 510–526.
- Gati, I., & Saka, N. (2001). High school students' career-related decision-making difficulties. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 7, 331–340.
- Germeijs, V., & Verschuere, K. (2006). High school students' career decision-making process: Development and validation of the Study Choice Task Inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 14, 449–471.
- Guichard, J. (2013, June). *Forms of reflexivity and transformations of systems of subjective identity forms during life designing dialogues*. Lecture presented at the Society for Integrative Oncology International Conference, Padua, Italy.
- Hage, S. M., Romano, J. L., Conyne, R. K., Kenny, M., Matthews, C., Schwartz, J. P., & Waldo, M. (2007). Best practice guidelines on prevention practice, research, training, and social advocacy for psychologists. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 35, 493–566.
- Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Tauer, J. M., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). Predicting success in college: A longitudinal study of achievement goals and ability measures as predictors of interest and performance from freshman year through graduation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 562–575.
- Hisrich, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (1995). *Entrepreneurship: Starting, developing and managing a new enterprise*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Honig, B. (2001). Learning strategies and resources for entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26, 21–35.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2003). The Core Self-Evaluations Scale: Development of a measure. *Personnel Psychology*, 56, 303–331.
- Judge, T. A., & Hurst, C. (2008). How the rich (and happy) get richer (and happier): Relationship of core self-evaluations to trajectories in attaining work success. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93, 849–863.
- Kenny, M. E., Horne, A. M., Orpinas, P., & Reese, L. E. (2009). Social justice and the challenge of preventive interventions: An introduction. In M. E. Kenny, A. M. Horne, P. Orpinas, & L. E. Reese (Eds.), *Realizing social justice: The challenge of preventive interventions* (pp. 3–14). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Kinman, G., & Grant, L. (2011). Exploring stress resilience in trainee social workers: The role of emotional and social competencies. *British Journal of Social Work, 41*, 261–275.
- Koumoundourou, G. A., Kounenou, K., & Siavara, E. (2012). Core self-evaluations, career decision self-efficacy, and vocational identity among Greek adolescents. *Journal of Career Development, 39*, 269–286.
- Lubkins, L., & Kans, K. (2007). *Entrepreneurial strategic process*. London, England: Elsevier.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71*, 543–562.
- Macrae, N. (1976, December 25). The coming entrepreneurial revolution. *The Economist*, p. 42
- Maddi, S. R. (1990). Issues and interventions in stress mastery. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Personality and disease* (pp. 121–154). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Maddi, S. R., Harvey, R. H., Khoshaba, D. M., Fazel, M., & Resurreccion, N. (2009). The personality construct of hardiness, IV: Expressed in positive cognitions and emotions concerning oneself and developmentally relevant activities. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 49*, 292–305.
- Maddi, S. R., Harvey, R. H., Khoshaba, D. M., Lu, J. L., Persico, M., & Brow, M. (2006). The personality construct of hardiness, III: Relationships with repression, innovativeness, authoritarianism, and performance. *Journal of Personality, 74*, 575–598.
- Malaguti, E. (2005). *Educarsi alla resilienza: Come affrontare crisi e difficoltà e migliorarsi* [Educate yourself on resilience: How to deal with crises and difficulties and improve]. Trento, Italy: Erickson.
- Mann, L., Burnett, P., Radford, M., & Ford, S. (1997). The Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire: An instrument for measuring patterns for coping with decisional conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 10*, 1–19.
- Mathisen, G. E. (2011). Organizational antecedents of creative self-efficacy. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 20*, 185–195.
- Menzela, H. C., Aaltio, I., & Ulijna, J. M. (2007). On the way to creativity: Engineers as intrapreneurs in organizations. *Technovation, 27*, 732–743.
- Midgley, C., Maehr, M. L., Hruda, L. Z., Anderman, E., Anderman, L., Freeman, K. E., . . . Urdu, T. (2000). *Manual for the patterns of adaptive learning scales*. Retrieved from University of Michigan website: http://www.umich.edu/~pals/PALS%202000_V13Word97.pdf
- Muller, G. F., Garrecht, M., Pikal, E., & Reedwisch, N. (2002). Intrapreneurs: Trait-related similarities and differences compared with other employees and entrepreneurs. *Zeitschrift für Personalpsychologie, 1*, 19–26.
- Nota, L., Pace, F., & Ferrari, L. (2008). Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale–Short Form: Uno studio per l'adattamento italiano [Career Decision Self-Efficacy Scale–Short Form: A study for Italian adaptation]. *GIPO Giornale Italiano di Psicologia dell'Orientamento, 9*, 23–35.
- Nota, L., & Soresi, S. (2000). Adattamento italiano del Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire di Leon Mann [Italian adaptation of the Melbourne Decision Making Questionnaire of Leon Mann]. *Giornale Italiano di Psicologia dell'Orientamento, 1*, 38–52.
- Oden, H. (1997). *Managing corporate, culture, innovation, and intrapreneurship*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Osipow, S. H., & Gati, I. (1998). Construct and concurrent validity of the Career Decision-Making Difficulties Questionnaire. *Journal of Career Assessment, 6*, 345–364.
- Pinchot, G., III. (1985). *Intrapreneuring*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Pinchot, G., & Pellman, R. (1999). *Intrapreneuring in action: A handbook for business innovation*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Ronen, S. (2010). Determinants of intrapreneurship among high-tech engineers. In A. Malach-Pine & M. F. Özbilgin (Eds.), *Handbook of research on high-technology entrepreneurs* (pp. 233–251). Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgard.
- Rothwell, A., Herbert, I., & Rothwell, F. (2007). Self-perceived employability: Construction and initial validation of a scale for university students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 73*, 1–12.
- Savickas, M. L. (2005). The theory and practice of career construction. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (pp. 42–70). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Savickas, M. L. (Ed.). (2011). *Career counseling*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Senko, C., Hama, H., & Belmonte, K. (2013). Achievement goals, study strategies, and achievement: A test of the "learning agenda" framework. *Learning and Individual Differences, 24*, 1–10.
- Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*, 727–748.
- Stern, M., Krivoy, E., Foster, R., Bitsko, M., Toren, A., & Ben-Arush, M. (2010). Psychosocial functioning and career decision-making in Israeli adolescent and young adult cancer survivors. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer, 55*, 708–713.
- Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1137–1148.
- Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotion to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 86*, 320–333.
- Ueichi, H., Kuriyama, N., Saito, T., & Kusumi, T. (2012). Effect of the deliberate decision-making style on career decision-making processes and coping with regret after high school. *Psychologia, 55*, 28–44.
- van Emmerik, I. H., Schreurs, B., De Cuyper, N., Jawahar, I. M., & Peeters, M. C. (2012). The route to employability: Examining resources and the mediating role of motivation. *Career Development International, 17*, 104–119.
- Whiston, S. C. (2008). *Principles and applications of assessment in counseling* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.