Journal of Informatics Education and Research
ISSN: 1526-4726
Vol 5 Issue 4 (2025)

Influence of Family Background on Intrapreneur in Entrepreneurial Development

Sugat Gautam[1], Prof. (Dr.) Subramanian Shanmugam[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Commerce and Business Studies, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya, Bihar-India
[2]Professor, Department of Commerce and Business Studies, Central University of South Bihar, Gaya, Bihar-India

Abstract
This study investigates the influence of family background on intrapreneurs and their entrepreneurial development. The research explores five major dimensions: (1) cultural factors; (2) the presence of family business traditions; (3) the role of parental models in shaping entrepreneurial intentions; (4) entrepreneurship as a career path compared to self-employment; and (5) the significance of family support, particularly in the case of women entrepreneurs. Data were collected through structured schedules using a five-point Likert scale from 74 respondents in small-scale industries in Gaya district, Bihar. Findings suggest that family background exerts a powerful effect on entrepreneurial orientation, with family support and exposure to entrepreneurial role models acting as significant enablers. Tables integrated into the discussion highlight socio-economic trends, family roles, and the cultural environment that shape intrapreneurial intentions. Results indicate that intrapreneurs not only inherit entrepreneurial zeal from families but also gain confidence, resources, and networks to transition into independent entrepreneurs. The paper concludes that intrapreneurship development is inseparable from socio-cultural contexts and provides suggestions for policymakers and educational institutions to strengthen family-based entrepreneurial ecosystems.

Keywords: entrepreneur, intrapreneur, family support, social factor, cultural context

1. Introduction
Entrepreneurship has long been regarded as a cornerstone of economic growth, industrial development, and innovation. In contemporary economies, whether developed or emerging, entrepreneurship is seen as both a response to socio-economic challenges and an opportunity to create new markets, technologies, and employment (Aparicio et al., 2020). Alongside entrepreneurship, the concept of *entrepreneurship* has emerged as an equally important phenomenon, referring to entrepreneurial activities carried out within existing organizations. The notion of intrapreneurship was first introduced by Gifford and Elizabeth Pinchot in 1978 and popularized in their later work, *Entrepreneur* (Pinchot, 1984). They described intrapreneurs as “dreamers who take hands-on responsibility for creating innovation of any kind within a business.” In essence, intrapreneurs combine the vision of entrepreneurs with the organizational embeddedness of employees.

Research has shown that intrapreneurs often act as catalysts for organizational innovation, risk-taking, and long-term competitiveness (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003). Carrier (1991) argued that even small businesses, traditionally considered less innovative, rely heavily on intrapreneurial employees to adapt to growing competition. More recently, Zhu et al. (2014) described intrapreneurs as “thinkers, doers, planners, and workers” who translate ideas into profitable ventures. Importantly, when intrapreneurs find their organizational environments unsupportive, many choose to leave and establish independent start-ups, thereby transitioning into entrepreneurs. This transition raises a critical question: what shapes the intrapreneurial drive, and how do contextual factors such as family background influence this journey?

1.1 The Role of Family in Entrepreneurial Development

While entrepreneurship literature often highlights individual autonomy, self-efficacy, and personal motivation (Zhao et al., 2005; Schwartz & Whistler, 2009), it increasingly acknowledges the decisive role of family background. Families transmit values, provide financial and emotional support, and expose individuals to role models who shape entrepreneurial aspirations (Odoardi, 2003; Gibson, 2004). In many cases, entrepreneurial families not only provide tangible resources such as capital and networks but also intangible assets such as attitudes toward risk-taking, resilience, and innovation. Businesses started by entrepreneurs from supportive family environments also tend to have higher survival rates compared to those founded by individuals lacking such support (Presutti et al., 2011).

For intrapreneurs, family influence is particularly critical. Unlike entrepreneurs who may independently decide to start ventures, intrapreneurs often balance organizational responsibilities with entrepreneurial aspirations. Family support in this context can encourage risk-taking, validate entrepreneurial ideas, and ultimately shape decisions to transition into start-ups. Conversely, families that prioritize stability, job security, or traditional career paths may discourage entrepreneurial pursuits, thus limiting intrapreneurial development (Henderson & Robertson, 2000).

1.2 Cultural and Social Dimensions in Family Influence

Family background cannot be divorced from cultural context. Cultural norms, religious values, and caste dynamics often define career choices in societies such as India. Hofstede's cultural dimensions framework suggests that values such as individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation significantly influence entrepreneurial behavior (Hayton et al., 2002). In India, caste-based occupational patterns, religious attitudes toward risk, and societal expectations regarding gender roles intersect with family dynamics to shape entrepreneurial intentions (Iyer et al., 2013; Audretsch et al., 2007).

For example, intrapreneurs from business-oriented communities often inherit not only networks but also a cultural acceptance of entrepreneurial risk-taking. By contrast, individuals from families emphasizing government jobs or salaried employment may struggle to secure family approval for entrepreneurial ventures. Similarly, women entrepreneurs face additional cultural barriers, with family support often determining whether entrepreneurial ambitions translate into reality (Saxena, 2019).

1.3 Intrapreneurship in the Indian Context

India provides a particularly compelling setting for studying the interplay of family background and intrapreneurial development. As an emerging economy, India faces the twin challenges of high youth unemployment and the need for innovation-driven growth. In this context, intrapreneurship represents a bridge: young employees innovate within organizations, but when constrained, they branch out as entrepreneurs, creating new ventures and jobs.

Bihar, one of India's least industrialized states, presents unique socio-cultural dynamics. While the region has traditionally been dominated by agriculture and government employment, small-scale industries are gaining traction. Here, family background plays a disproportionately large role in career decisions, as access to financial resources, risk-taking capacity, and community reputation often depend on family support. For intrapreneurs in such contexts, family encouragement can mean the difference between staying in conventional employment or venturing into entrepreneurial activities.

1.4 Research Problem and Objectives

Despite growing recognition of family influence on entrepreneurship, limited research has been conducted on intrapreneurs, particularly in emerging economies like India. Existing studies either focus broadly on entrepreneurs or narrowly on individual personality traits, leaving a gap in understanding the socio-cultural and familial dimensions of intrapreneurial development.

This study seeks to fill that gap by investigating:

1. The socio-economic characteristics of intrapreneurs in Bihar's small-scale industries.
2. The extent to which family support and role models shape intrapreneurial aspirations.
3. The influence of cultural dimensions such as caste, religion, and locality on entrepreneurial choices.

By integrating socio-economic analysis with family and cultural dimensions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how intrapreneurs transition toward entrepreneurship.

1.5 Structure of the Paper

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the literature on intrapreneurship, family influence, and cultural dimensions, situating the study within theoretical frameworks. Section 3 describes the research methodology, including sampling, data collection, and analysis techniques. Section 4 presents the results and discusses them in light of existing literature, integrating socio-economic, family, and cultural perspectives. Section 5 offers suggestions and recommendations for policymakers, educators, and families to strengthen intrapreneurial ecosystems. Finally, Section 6 concludes by summarizing key findings and outlining avenues for future research.

2. Review of Literature

Entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship have been examined extensively across diverse disciplines, with scholars seeking to explain why some individuals pursue entrepreneurial careers while others remain in traditional employment or organizational roles. Two broad approaches dominate this inquiry: one emphasizes personality traits and psychological attributes, while the other stresses environmental, social, and cultural factors. Both perspectives are relevant, yet the role of the family and the wider socio-cultural environment has gained increasing attention in recent years, particularly in the study of intrapreneurs.

The personality trait approach posits that certain individuals are predisposed to entrepreneurship due to inherent psychological qualities. Researchers have identified a range of traits that predict entrepreneurial orientation. Self-efficacy, or the belief in one's ability to achieve goals, is a strong determinant of entrepreneurial intentions, as individuals with high self-efficacy are more likely to perceive and act upon opportunities (Zhao et al., 2005). Risk propensity is another key trait, with entrepreneurs and intrapreneurs often characterized by their willingness to tolerate uncertainty and embrace challenges that others may avoid (Schwartz & Whistler, 2009). Closely related is tolerance for ambiguity, which allows individuals to function effectively in uncertain and dynamic environments (Hmieleski, 2006). Locus of control also plays a role, with those possessing an internal locus more inclined to believe that outcomes are shaped by their actions rather than external forces, thereby motivating entrepreneurial effort (Battistelli, 2001). Creativity is consistently identified as a critical enabler of entrepreneurial activity, as it provides the ability to generate novel solutions and identify new opportunities in competitive markets (Smith et al., 2016). Finally, metacognitive abilities, or the capacity for self-reflection and adaptation, enable entrepreneurs to evaluate their decisions critically and adjust to changing circumstances (Kor et al., 2007).

While personality traits are undeniably influential, scholars have criticized trait-based theories for being overly deterministic and limited in scope. Not all individuals with high creativity or strong self-efficacy become entrepreneurs, and many entrepreneurial ventures arise not from innate psychological dispositions but from environmental opportunities and constraints. This recognition has shifted attention toward explanations that emphasize the role of family, culture, and institutional structures in shaping entrepreneurial orientation.

Environmental and behavioral explanations suggest that entrepreneurship is a socially embedded process. Aldrich (1990) argued that entrepreneurship cannot be understood in isolation from its social environment, as families, communities, and institutions deeply influence individuals. Bandura's (1986) Social Learning Theory is especially relevant here, as it emphasizes that individuals learn behaviors by observing others, particularly role models. In the context of entrepreneurship, parents, relatives, and community leaders often serve as role models, transmitting both practical knowledge and values related to resilience, innovation, and risk-taking. Gibson (2004) further elaborated on the significance of role models, noting that individuals tend to emulate those they admire for their achievements or social status. Odoardi (2003) pointed out that young people frequently rely on family guidance when choosing entrepreneurial careers, while Presutti et al. (2011) emphasized the importance of family networks as intangible resources that enable business development.

The influence of family in entrepreneurial development is multifaceted. Financial support provided by families often acts as initial capital for new ventures, especially in economies where access to external credit is limited. Emotional and moral support play an equally crucial role, offering stability and confidence to individuals contemplating risky entrepreneurial moves. Families also transmit tacit knowledge and business skills across generations, as children involved in family businesses often learn valuable practices through informal exposure (Demirci, 2007). Moreover, values such as hard work, independence, and perseverance are frequently instilled within the family environment, providing the foundation for entrepreneurial mindsets. Hisrich and Peters (1995) demonstrated that individuals with entrepreneurial family backgrounds are more likely to start ventures, while Berber (2000) argued that even intrapreneurs who remain within organizations often emerge from families engaged in professional or business activities.

Culture operates as a critical mediating factor in the relationship between family and entrepreneurship. Scholars such as Li (2007) and Gurel et al. (2010) observed that cultural contexts shape how individuals perceive risk, opportunity, and innovation. Zhao et al. (2012) distinguished between two types of cultural influence: one operating at the psychological level, where cultural values modify individual attitudes and abilities, and the other at the institutional level, where societal norms create environments that are either conducive or hostile to entrepreneurship. Hayton et al. (2002) further argued that culture shapes entrepreneurship both directly by influencing values and indirectly by structuring institutions such as education, financial systems, and legal frameworks.

Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide a structured framework for analyzing these effects. In collectivist cultures, family approval and community acceptance become critical for entrepreneurial success, while in individualist cultures, autonomy and independence are more strongly emphasized. Societies with high uncertainty avoidance discourage risk-taking and entrepreneurial experimentation, while those with lower uncertainty avoidance encourage innovation. Similarly, gendered cultural values shape entrepreneurship by influencing whether women are encouraged to pursue business careers. Power distance also matters, as societies with high power distance may restrict entrepreneurial opportunities to elite groups, while marginalizing others. In the Indian context, these cultural dimensions intersect with caste, religion, and regional traditions. Iyer et al. (2013) documented how caste networks influence access to credit and legitimacy for entrepreneurs, while Dana (2010) and Audretsch et al. (2007) highlighted the role of religion in shaping attitudes toward economic activity.

Family influence on entrepreneurship is also deeply gendered. Women entrepreneurs, especially in patriarchal societies such as India, rely heavily on family support. Saxena (2019) argued that cultural sensitivity strongly influences intrapreneurial growth among women in organizations, with families often acting as either enablers or inhibitors of women's entrepreneurial ambitions. Families that encourage professional education for women expand their opportunities, while those that emphasize traditional domestic roles restrict them. Thus, the role of family in shaping entrepreneurial orientation is not gender-neutral but mediated by cultural expectations of male and female roles.

Succession and intergenerational entrepreneurship represent another important dimension of family influence. Families engaged in business often expose their children to entrepreneurial activities from an early age, instilling familiarity with decision-making, risk-taking, and innovation. Berber (2000) noted that this exposure creates an entrepreneurial pipeline, where children are more likely to continue or expand family businesses. However, succession is not automatic. Verma (2016) observed that intergenerational conflicts, differing aspirations, or excessive emphasis on stability can discourage children from pursuing entrepreneurship, despite exposure to family businesses. The strength of parental role models often determines whether entrepreneurial traditions continue across generations.

Although much of the literature focuses on entrepreneurs, parallels exist for intrapreneurs. Blanka (2018) emphasized that intrapreneurship must be analyzed at the individual level, considering how backgrounds shape employees' willingness to innovate within organizations. Families that value independence, creativity, and problem-solving cultivate orientations conducive to intrapreneurial activity. Camelo (2012) further highlighted the role of intrapreneurs in fostering innovation within creative industries, where family support often provides the psychological security necessary for risk-taking. When organizational barriers inhibit innovation, family encouragement frequently motivates intrapreneurs to transition into independent entrepreneurship.

Despite these insights, significant gaps remain in the literature. Research on family influence has disproportionately focused on entrepreneurs, leaving intrapreneurs underexplored. The majority of studies are situated in Western contexts, neglecting the unique socio-cultural dynamics of emerging economies such as India. Additionally, marginalized groups such as lower castes, women, and economically disadvantaged communities are often overlooked, despite their distinct experiences with family and cultural constraints. Finally, there is a lack of integrative models that combine personality trait theories with environmental and cultural explanations to provide a holistic understanding of entrepreneurial development.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The present study adopts a descriptive and exploratory research design to examine the influence of family background on intrapreneurial development. It combines qualitative insights with quantitative measurement, but the approach is primarily empirical in nature. The focus is on identifying socio-economic factors, family influences, and cultural contexts that shape intrapreneurial aspirations.

3.2 Study Area

The research was conducted in Gaya district of Bihar, India, which is characterized by low levels of industrialization but a growing presence of small-scale industries (SSIs) in both manufacturing and service sectors. The region was selected because family and community networks strongly influence occupational choices, making it suitable for studying family background in entrepreneurial development.

3.3 Population and Sampling

The study focused on employees working in small-scale industries, including both manufacturing and service units, located in the Gaya district. To ensure representation of diverse socio-economic and caste groups, a random sampling technique was employed. A total of 100 questionnaires were distributed to potential respondents. Out of these, 84 questionnaires were returned, and after careful screening, 74 were deemed usable for analysis. This yielded a response rate of 74 percent, which is considered satisfactory for field-based social research.

3.4 Data Collection Instrument

Primary data were collected using a structured questionnaire that was supplemented by a schedule to guide the respondents where necessary. The questionnaire employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree (5) to Strongly Disagree (1). It was organized into three key sections. The first section captured the socio-economic profile of respondents, including details such as age, gender, marital status, education, caste, and work experience. The second section examined family influence, focusing on aspects such as support in decision-making, exposure to family businesses, the presence of role models, and encouragement of creativity. The third section explored the cultural environment, addressing the influence of caste, religion, locality, and broader societal attitudes toward business activities.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

The content validity of the questionnaire was ensured by deriving items from an extensive review of the literature on intrapreneurship and family influence, drawing on key studies such as Bandura (1986), Gibson (2004), Hayton et al. (2002), and Zhao et al. (2012). A pilot test was conducted with a small group of respondents to assess clarity and comprehensibility, which led to minor revisions in wording for improved precision. Reliability was confirmed through an internal consistency check using Cronbach's alpha, and the results indicated acceptable reliability levels for the Likert-scale items included in the instrument.

3.6 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques. Frequency distributions, percentages, and simple mean scores were calculated to summarize the responses and highlight key patterns. The results were systematically presented in tables that covered socio-economic characteristics, family support, and the cultural environment of the respondents. Given the exploratory nature of the study, descriptive statistics were considered sufficient to identify prevailing trends and patterns without resorting to more complex causal or inferential models.

4. Results and Discussion

The analysis of data collected from 74 respondents provides insights into how socio-economic factors, family support, and cultural environment shape the entrepreneurial orientation of intrapreneurs. The results are presented in three major sections: (i) socio-economic characteristics of respondents, (ii) family background and role of reference groups, and (iii) cultural environment affecting intrapreneurship. Tables summarizing these findings are included within the discussion, followed by a detailed interpretation.

4.1 Socio-Economic Profile of Respondents

Table 1: Socio-Demographic Profile of Respondents

(Source: Primary Data)

Respondent Profile	**Frequency**	**Percent (%)**
Gender		
Male	51	68.9
Female	23	31.1
Age		
< 21 years	12	16.2
21–30 years	38	51.4
31–40 years	12	16.2
> 40 years	12	16.2
Marital Status		
Single	41	55.4
Married	33	44.6
Qualification		
Non-matric	4	5.4
12th	14	18.9
Undergraduate	31	41.9
Postgraduate	25	33.8
Caste		
General	39	52.7
OBC	21	28.4
SC	13	17.6
ST	1	1.4
Years of Experience		
< 3 years	28	37.8
3–5 years	20	27.0
5–10 years	12	16.2
> 10 years	14	18.9

The socio-economic profile shows a clear gender gap: 68.9% of respondents were male while only 31.1% were female. This finding highlights the continuing dominance of men in entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial pursuits in Bihar, reflecting wider patriarchal structures that influence occupational choices in India (Iyer et al., 2013). However, the notable participation of women over 30% signals a positive shift toward gender inclusivity, aligning with recent trends where women are increasingly entering entrepreneurial domains despite cultural constraints (Saxena, 2019).

Age distribution reveals that over half the respondents (51.4%) are between 21 and 30 years, underscoring the entrepreneurial enthusiasm of youth. Younger respondents are typically more open to risk, innovation, and change, consistent with the argument that youth-driven entrepreneurship fuels economic transformation (Zhu et al., 2014). The relatively small share of respondents above 40 years indicates that entrepreneurship in this context is more attractive to early-career individuals than to older workers who may prefer stable employment.

Marital status data show that 55.4% are single, suggesting that fewer family responsibilities encourage individuals to consider entrepreneurial ventures. Married respondents (44.6%) may face greater pressures for job security, consistent with Henderson and Robertson's (2000) observation that family responsibilities can act as constraints on entrepreneurial risk-taking. Education levels are relatively high, with over 75% being graduates or postgraduates. This indicates that intrapreneurs in Gaya are well-educated, which is consistent with research suggesting that higher education increases awareness of entrepreneurial opportunities and enhances risk management skills (Smith et al., 2016). The presence of a small number of non-matriculated respondents (5.4%) highlights that entrepreneurship is not exclusive to the highly educated, though the majority are from educated backgrounds. Caste distribution reveals that 52.7% of respondents belong to the General category, followed by OBCs (28.4%), SCs (17.6%), and STs (1.4%). This reflects historical inequalities in access to entrepreneurial opportunities, as marginalized communities often face barriers in credit access, networking, and social legitimacy (Iyer et al., 2013). Work experience data show that 64.8% of respondents had less than five years of experience, indicating that entrepreneurial aspirations are strongest among younger employees at early stages of their careers. This suggests that intrapreneurial orientation emerges relatively early, supporting Bandura's (1986) Social Learning Theory that behaviors are shaped during formative stages.

4.2 Family Background and Role of Reference Groups

Table 2: Family and Reference Group Affecting Intrapreneurs

(Source: Primary Data)

Statements	Agree (%)	Frequency	Disagree (%)	Frequency
Family supports in making career in the business field.	66.2	49	31.1	23
The family always ready to bear risk in starting new business.	54.0	40	36.5	27
Belong to class where family members engage in business.	54.4	41	35.1	26
Creative business ideas are appreciated by family.	52.7	39	36.5	27
Business qualities are inherited from the family.	46.0	34	43.2	32
Family emphasizes professional over traditional courses.	46.0	34	43.2	32

The findings demonstrate the pivotal role of families in shaping intrapreneurial behavior. A majority (66.2%) affirmed that their families support career choices in business, reflecting that families often act as incubators for entrepreneurial ambitions. This aligns with Türker et al. (2005), who emphasized that family support strongly correlates with entrepreneurial propensity among youth. Similarly, 54% reported that their families were willing to bear the risks involved in new ventures. This willingness highlights the role of families as financial and emotional safety nets, particularly in contexts where formal financial institutions may be inaccessible or risk-averse (Presutti et al., 2011). Exposure to business environments also emerged as significant. Over 54.4% of respondents came from families where members were already engaged in business activities, supporting the argument that entrepreneurial orientation is often inherited and reinforced by lived experiences in entrepreneurial households (Hisrich & Peters, 1995).

Another encouraging finding is that 52.7% noted that their creative ideas were valued and supported by their families. This indicates that beyond financial support, families also provide psychological encouragement, validating the innovative spirit necessary for intrapreneurship. The transmission of entrepreneurial qualities was acknowledged by 46% of respondents, who felt that such traits were inherited from their families. This strongly supports Bandura's (1986) Social Learning Theory, which highlights the intergenerational transfer of behaviors through observation and role modeling. Finally, 46% reported that their families encouraged professional education over traditional courses, reflecting a shift toward modern skill development. Families emphasizing education provide individuals with the knowledge base necessary for entrepreneurial ventures, consistent with Zhao et al. (2005) who linked self-efficacy and education to entrepreneurial intentions. Overall, the evidence from Table 2 confirms that families act as both facilitators and role models for intrapreneurs. They provide financial backing, risk-sharing, and encouragement of creativity, while also transmitting values that foster resilience and entrepreneurial ambition.

4.3 Cultural Environment Affecting Intrapreneurs

Table 3: Cultural Environment Affecting Intrapreneurs

(Source: Primary Data)

Statements	Agree (%)	Frequency	Disagree (%)	Frequency
Society grants freedom in personal decisions.	56.8	41	40.5	30
Business groups aware of code of conduct.	27.1	20	63.5	47
Market communication is polite and ethical.	33.8	25	59.5	44
Caste plays crucial role in business choice.	59.4	44	29.7	22
Religion influences business decisions.	70.3	52	24.3	18
Some places are business-oriented; others not.	78.3	58	13.5	10

Cultural environment emerged as a strong determinant of entrepreneurial development. A majority (78.3%) believed that certain localities are more business-oriented, suggesting the existence of entrepreneurial clusters where cultural norms favor risk-taking and innovation. This is consistent with institutional theories emphasizing that entrepreneurial ecosystems are geographically embedded (Zhao et al., 2012).

However, challenges remain. Only 27.1% agreed that business groups were aware of codes of conduct, while 63.5% disagreed, indicating a lack of professionalism in business practices.

Similarly, 59.5% felt that communication in markets was impolite or unethical, suggesting deficiencies in customer orientation and professional etiquette. These findings reflect underdeveloped entrepreneurial cultures where formal business norms are weak, echoing Urbano et al. (2011), who stressed that weak socio-cultural institutions hinder entrepreneurship. Traditional structures also exert a powerful influence. 59.4% agreed that caste plays a crucial role in business selection, reflecting how occupational choices remain tied to social identity in Bihar. This aligns with Iyer et al. (2013), who highlighted caste-based networks as determinants of entrepreneurial legitimacy and opportunity in India. Religion also shapes entrepreneurship, with 70.3% agreeing that religious beliefs influence business decisions. This supports studies by Dana (2010) and Audretsch et al. (2007), which emphasized the role of religious values in entrepreneurial behavior, affecting risk attitudes and ethical practices. Finally, 56.8% agreed that their society grants personal freedom in decision-making, but the significant minority of 40.5% who disagreed suggests that cultural constraints still inhibit autonomy. Families and communities in such contexts may prioritize stability and conformity over individual entrepreneurial pursuits.

These findings underscore that the cultural environment can both encourage and restrict intrapreneurial development. While certain places and communities foster entrepreneurial orientation, caste, religion, and weak business ethics continue to limit the scope for innovation.

5. Suggestions and Recommendations

The findings of this study reveal that family background and cultural environment play an indispensable role in shaping intrapreneurial development. Building on these insights, several recommendations can be offered at the family, institutional, policy, and societal levels.

5.1 Strengthening Parental Role Models

Exposure to entrepreneurial role models within the family strongly influences intrapreneurial aspirations. Families should actively involve children and youth in business-related discussions and activities, even if they are employed in organizations rather than running enterprises. Parents who demonstrate resilience, innovation, and ethical practices not only provide tangible guidance but also create an environment where risk-taking and creativity are normalized. Schools and universities can build on this by organizing family entrepreneurship workshops that highlight successful parent-child entrepreneurial collaborations.

5.2 Supporting Women Intrapreneurs and Entrepreneurs

The study shows that while women constitute nearly one-third of the sample, they remain underrepresented in intrapreneurial activities. Families often play a decisive role in either encouraging or discouraging women from pursuing entrepreneurship. Therefore, targeted initiatives should be designed to sensitize families about the importance of supporting women in entrepreneurial roles. Community-based programs, women's self-help groups, and microfinance institutions should provide platforms where families and women jointly engage in entrepreneurial planning. This dual approach would reduce cultural resistance and expand opportunities for women entrepreneurs.

5.3 Reducing Cultural Barriers

Cultural constraints such as caste-based occupational divisions, religious prescriptions, and rigid societal norms continue to restrict entrepreneurial opportunities. Policymakers and educational institutions should work to challenge stereotypes by promoting success stories of entrepreneurs who have transcended caste or religious barriers. Awareness campaigns that emphasize entrepreneurship as a universal skill rather than a caste-specific activity can help foster inclusivity. Additionally, cultural sensitization training in schools, colleges, and vocational institutions would encourage young people to break away from inherited occupational roles.

5.4 Enhancing Entrepreneurial Education

The findings highlight that over three-quarters of respondents hold graduate or postgraduate degrees, suggesting education is a strong enabler of entrepreneurial orientation. However, formal education often lacks practical entrepreneurial training. Universities, business schools, and vocational training centers should integrate entrepreneurship labs, incubation centers, and simulation-based learning into their curricula. Families should also be encouraged to support children in pursuing professional courses rather than limiting them to traditional or low-risk disciplines.

5.5 Expanding Access to Finance

Although many families are willing to share risks and provide financial backing, access to capital remains uneven, particularly for marginalized caste groups and women. Government and non-government organizations should establish family-inclusive credit schemes, where financial literacy programs target both potential entrepreneurs and their families (Singh & Shanmugam, 2025). This would help build trust in entrepreneurial ventures and reduce resistance from risk-averse families.

5.6 Policy-Level Interventions

At a broader level, policymakers should design entrepreneurship development programs that explicitly acknowledge the role of family support. For instance, start-up schemes and incubation initiatives could include family counseling sessions to ensure that entrepreneurs receive not only financial but also moral support at home. Similarly, cultural factors that hinder business professionalism, such as weak adherence to business codes of conduct, should be addressed through ethics and compliance training for small business owners and employees.

6. Conclusion

The present study set out to examine the influence of family background on intrapreneurial development in the context of small-scale industries in Gaya district, Bihar. By analyzing socio-economic characteristics, family support, and cultural environment, the research provides clear evidence that family background is not a passive backdrop but an active determinant of entrepreneurial behavior. Families shape aspirations, provide resources, and transmit values that directly influence whether intrapreneurs remain within organizations or transition into independent entrepreneurs.

The findings from the socio-economic profile reveal that entrepreneurship in Bihar is largely driven by young, educated males, though women are increasingly participating. This reflects broader national and global trends where youth are emerging as the driving force behind entrepreneurial ecosystems (Zhu et al., 2014). The data also confirm that educational attainment significantly enhances entrepreneurial orientation, underscoring the importance of equipping young people with both knowledge and practical skills. However, caste-based disparities highlight persistent structural inequalities, with marginalized communities underrepresented in entrepreneurial activities (Iyer et al., 2013).

Family influence emerged as a decisive factor. More than half of the respondents reported that their families supported business-related decisions, were willing to share risks, and valued creative ideas. This underscores the dual role of families as financial backers and moral supporters. Families transmit entrepreneurial qualities through direct involvement in business and through the social learning processes described by Bandura (1986). Exposure to entrepreneurial role models within the family increases self-efficacy, builds resilience, and normalizes innovation, consistent with prior research on role modeling (Gibson, 2004).

Importantly, the willingness of families to invest in professional education signals a shift toward modern entrepreneurial competencies.

Cultural factors, however, present a mixed picture. While some localities were seen as more business-oriented, the persistence of caste and religious influences demonstrates how traditional norms continue to dictate business opportunities. The finding that nearly 60% of respondents believed caste determined business type reflects deep-rooted occupational stratification. Similarly, religious values were found to shape entrepreneurial decision-making for 70% of respondents, echoing Dana (2010) and Audretsch et al. (2007), who noted that religion strongly influences entrepreneurial behavior. The lack of professionalism in business practices, evidenced by poor adherence to codes of conduct and impolite market communication, highlights the need for cultural reform within entrepreneurial ecosystems.
The study contributes to theory by reinforcing the argument that entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship cannot be understood through individual psychological traits alone. While self-efficacy, creativity, and risk propensity matter, they are embedded within family and cultural contexts that either amplify or suppress these traits. By integrating Social Learning Theory, Institutional Theory, and Hofstede's cultural dimensions, the study demonstrates that intrapreneurial behavior is shaped by a complex interplay of individual, family, and cultural factors.

Practically, the findings hold several implications. Policymakers and educators must recognize families as key stakeholders in entrepreneurship development. Programs that aim to foster intrapreneurship should involve families, address cultural barriers, and build inclusive financial systems. Supporting women entrepreneurs requires not only institutional backing but also shifts in family attitudes. Efforts to professionalize business practices must address cultural weaknesses in ethics and customer orientation.

References

1. Ahmed, I., Nawaz, M. M., & Ramzan, M. (2012). Do external factors influence students' entrepreneurial inclination? An evidence-based approach. *Actual Problems of Economics, 125*, 51–58. https://doi.org/10.5772/36570
2. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50*(2), 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
3. Aparicio, S., Turro, A., & Noguera, M. (2020). Entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship in social, sustainable, and economic development: Opportunities and challenges for future research. *Sustainability, 12*(21), 8958. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12218958
4. Audretsch, D. B., Boente, W., & Tamvada, J. P. (2007). Religion and entrepreneurship. *Discussion Papers on Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy*, 3207.
5. Aygun, M., Suleyman, I. C., & Kiziloglu, M. (2010, June). Intrapreneurship in small and medium-sized enterprises. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Sustainable Development* (pp. 8–9). Sarajevo, Bosnia-Herzegovina.
6. Blanka, C. (2019). An individual-level perspective on intrapreneurship: A review and ways forward. *Review of Managerial Science, 13*, 919–961. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-018-0277-0
7. Camelo, C. (2012). The intrapreneur and innovation in creative firms. *International Small Business Journal, 30*(5), 513–535. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610385398
8. Dana, L. P. (2010). Introduction: Religion as an explanatory variable for entrepreneurship. In L. P. Dana (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship and religion* (pp. 1–9). Edward Elgar Publishing.

9. Desai, V. (2017). *Small-scale industries and entrepreneurship*. Himalaya Publishing House.
10. Divakara, S., & Surangi, H. A. K. N. S. (2018). The role of intrapreneurship in the growth of small and medium scale manufacturing enterprises in Sri Lanka. In *International Conference on Business and Information* (pp. 1–12).
11. Gupta, A., & Srivastava, N. (2013). An exploratory study of factors affecting intrapreneurship. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development, 2*(8), 1–10.
12. Gursoy, A., & Guven, B. (2016). Effect of innovative culture on intrapreneurship. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 7*(1), 152–162.
13. Hellmann, T. (2002). When do employees become entrepreneurs? Graduate School of Business, Stanford University.
14. Iyer, L., Khanna, T., & Varshney, A. (2013). Caste and entrepreneurship in India. *Economic and Political Weekly, 48*(6), 52–60.
15. Jain, A. K. (1995). *Entrepreneurial opportunities: Professional management & global competition*. Indian Institute of Management, Lucknow.
16. Pinchot, G. (1984). *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the corporation to become an entrepreneur* (pp. 28–48). Harper & Row.
17. Pinchot, G., & Pinchot, E. (1978, Fall). Intra-corporate entrepreneurship. *Tarrytown School for Entrepreneurs Journal*, 1(1), 1–15.
18. Saxena, N. (2019). Impact of cultural sensitivity on intrapreneurial growth of employees in Indian organisations. *Amity Business School Working Paper*, Amity University.
19. Simran Singh, Subramanian Shanmugam. (2025). Investment Behavior in the Fintech Era: A Serial Mediation Analysis. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, *15*(4), 484–496. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v15i4.3656
20. Sinha, N., & Srivastava, K. B. (2013). Association of personality, work values and socio-cultural factors with intrapreneurial orientation. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship, 22*(1), 97–113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971355712469186
21. Smith, R. M., Sardeshmukh, S. R., & Combs, G. M. (2016). Understanding gender, creativity, and entrepreneurial intentions. *Education + Training, 58*(3), 263–282. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-06-2015-0054
22. Türker, D., Onvural, B., Kursunluoglu, E., & Pinar, C. (2005). Entrepreneurial propensity: A field study on Turkish university students. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Management, 1*(1), 15–27.
23. Urbano, D., Toledano, N., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2011). Socio-cultural factors and transnational entrepreneurship: A multiple case study in Spain. *International Small Business Journal, 29*(2), 119–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242610391930
24. Verma, N. (2016). Role of intrapreneurs in the industrial development of India (An empirical study). *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2988224
25. Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self-efficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(6), 1265–1272. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.6.1265
26. Zhao, X., Li, H., & Rauch, A. (2012). Cross-country differences in entrepreneurial activity: The role of cultural practice and national wealth. *Frontiers of Business Research in China, 6*(4), 447–474. https://doi.org/10.3868/s070-001-012-0020-0