



Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis

Vol. 11, No. 1, June 2022, pp. 13-29

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indragiri (STIE-I) Rengat

<https://journal.stieindragiri.ac.id/index.php/jmbi/issue/view/22>

REINSTATING FOR ENTREPRENEUR TERMINOLOGY IN MANAGEMENT, AN ALTERNATIVE OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE

Oscarius Yudhi Ari Wijaya

Indonesian Academy of Secretaries and Management (ASMI) Surabaya, Indonesia

artaprima@gmail.com

Submitted: 2022.07.06 Reviewed: 2022.07.07 Accepted: 2022.07.18

<https://doi.org/10.34006/jmbi.v11i1.462>

Abstract

Academic scientific culture has encouraged the birth of many new ideas, both in the form of new theoretical conceptions and modeling of a research, including several new ideas. which gave birth to new terms in a scientific field, including the field of management, including the term "entrepreneur" or its derivatives such as "entrepreneurship" or "entrepreneurial". The purpose of this article is to conduct a critical study regarding the appropriateness of the use or development of these terms. A new approach that integrates analysis of semantic, conceptual-theoretical and cognitive perspectives is used to confirm their findings, where it is known that new findings are confusing, overlapping, and useless. 146/U/2004 is called chaos, ambiguity, and misunderstanding. Other new findings in this article are in the analytical methods used, namely semantics, conceptual-theoretical and cognitive and the results of the discussion in this paper suggest a way that can improve the deepening study of management concepts rather than building terminology that can lead to confusion, overlap and redundancy. , misunderstanding, superficiality and imperfection of the concept.

INTRODUCTION

The latest developments in the academic world, including in the field of contemporary research, have developed in such a way that it has encouraged the birth of many new ideas, both in the form of a new theoretical conception and modeling of a research, including several new ideas that try to construct a new theory by taking some of the old ideas or concepts that have been previously assessed as established, are then elaborated with a new development perspective approach from a particular scientific discipline.

In addition, several other academic phenomena attempt to take old ideas by simply collaborating with technical terms in training or seminars with various contemporary issues that are developing, thus giving birth to a new knowledge discourse which is represented by the emergence of a new term or terminology, in the hope that it can be considered, assessed. or even categorized as a renewal or novelty.

This kind of phenomenon is common in the academic world. Branch (2015) mentions concept development as something that should be considered as a fundamental scientific activity. Kemendikristek RI through Kepmendiknas RI No. 146/U/2004, confirms the efforts of scientists and scholars who have and continue to produce scientific concepts, with their disclosures set out in a set of terms. So it is known that there are terms that are already established and there are terms that still need to be created. New terms to express concepts can be designed according to the environment and the style of the field of activity.

The concepts applied in research development are essentially used as the basis for building a conceptual definition, usually used to provide brief, clear and firm explanations related to the concept. Meanwhile, the understanding of the conceptual definition itself, according to Silalahi (2009), is interpreted as a definition that describes the concept with the use of other concepts. Azwar (2007), defines it as a series of concepts that are considered as definitions which are still in the form of concepts and their meanings are still very abstract even though they can still be understood intuitively.

In line with this view, it is relevant to raise another explanation from the Indonesian Ministry of National Education based on the decision stated in the Indonesian Ministry of National Education Decree No. 146/U/2004, where it is emphasized that the idea of forming a new term must not depart from the purpose of the formation of the term, including the special term in it, namely in order for the exchange of information to obtain good results, special terms, which are an important joint in the scientific system, must have the same meaning for everyone who uses it.

The consistent meaning and use of new terms that are special based on general agreement or interpreted in general will result in regularity and uniformity of a special vocabulary that contains standard concepts, terms, and definitions. The standardization of nomenclature and special terminology will facilitate mutual understanding and facilitate scientific communication, both at the national and international levels, as well as reduce confusion, ambiguity, and misunderstanding. Branch (2015) mentions that immature concepts result in imperfection or suffering for knowledge.

According to the author, this is especially true when the new idea, whether in the concept of a new form of theory construction or just a new discourse in seminars and training or a new variable (factor) from a new research model, tries to take advantage of the use of terminology that was previously unknown. is used or at least has a definition that is not too broad and then expanded or vice versa, takes part of the scope of meaning, just to

accommodate thoughts that are considered to be in harmony or in line with part of the scope of meaning of the term in question.

This phenomenon can be seen from the evidence of the use, development and invention of certain terms, no exception occurs or is experienced specifically in the use of the term " *entrepreneur* " or its derivatives such as " *entrepreneurship* " or " *entrepreneurial* ", which is applied to many disciplines, just to label a different approach. considered new in a branch of science, including the occurrence of several terms or concepts that intersect with management.

The basic critical question is is it right? Of course, it becomes a problem when new terminology emerges which creates confusion or contradiction or even futility *or* waste or even more fatal because it is irrelevant, including if it is related to management or at least not in line with the scope of meaning. intact from the definition of *entrepreneur* itself, but already used.

THEORETICAL BASIS

a. *Entrepreneurs and Entrepreneurs*

The term *entrepreneur* was first introduced around 1800 by an economist from France Jean-Baptiste Say who stated that, ' *The entrepreneur shifts economic resources out of an area of lower and into an area of higher productivity and greater yield* ' (Drucker, 1993). Richard Cantillon was the first to use the term *entrepreneur* in the 18th century, according to which *entrepreneur* is defined as someone who buys a product to resell at a higher price for profit.

Louis Jacques Filion (2010) in the book *De l'intuition au projet d'entreprise* describes the characteristics of an *entrepreneur* as an imaginative person, marked by the ability to set goals and achieve them, and have a high awareness of finding opportunities and making decisions (Suarlin and Ali, 2018). Schumpeter (1965) in Kurniati (2018) defines entrepreneurs as individuals who take advantage of market opportunities through technical and/or organizational innovation. Clifford (2013) asserts that entrepreneurship is often associated with new, small, for-profit start-ups, entrepreneurial behavior can be seen in small, medium and large companies, new and established companies and non-profit and not for profit organizations, including voluntary sector groups, organizations charity and government.

Andre J. Dubrin (2008) defines *entrepreneur* as someone who establishes and runs an innovative business (Paramita and Ardiansyah, 2016). Sarosa (2005) asserts the notion of

entrepreneur is someone who has a vision, passion and takes an action that can be proven or actually in the business world to create and develop their own source of income or income without having to depend on other people (Pratolo et al, 2019; Alfiyanti and Ardianti, 2013).

Entrepreneur in English is translated as entrepreneur, entrepreneur or entrepreneur. The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines *entrepreneur* as someone who organizes and assumes the risk of a business or venture. Whereas In the Big Indonesian Dictionary, *entrepreneur* is defined as a person who is smart or talented in recognizing new products, developing new ways of producing, arranging operations for procuring new products, managing capital for operations, and marketing them.

Therefore, in general an *entrepreneur* or entrepreneur can be interpreted as a person who builds his own business by finding his own business path, has the ability to get out of business difficulties, and persists with his business plan so as to give birth to new creativity and innovation, where when people others prefer to volunteer to apply for full-time jobs elsewhere.

On the other hand, a term emerged from the newer concept of *entrepreneur* which is intended to apply to employees of the company and is referred to as *intrapreneur* , which is considered to represent the *entrepreneurial characteristics* inherent in employees in a company. Braunerhjelm, Ding and Thulin (2017) refer to *intrapreneurs* as individuals who are involved in innovative activities within the company.

Orchard (2017) tries to delineate the boundaries of what he considers to be fundamental differences between “ *entrepreneurs* ” and “ *intrapreneurs* ”, by explaining that the literature tends to generalize the term entrepreneur as a business founder, but many have become what is considered an entrepreneur through working his or her way through the level of business that is now run. or owned. Therefore, there is an opportunity for *intrapreneurs* to be categorized as entrepreneurs. Daniel, et al (2015) explain that this term was first introduced around 1978 by Gifford Pinchot III in terms of *intrapreneur* and *intrapreneurship* , which Anton (2014) refers to as the value of entrepreneurship in certain systems or entities, such as companies, organizations, sectors, clusters, national or even global economy.

Several literacy sources state that the birth of the *intrapreneur concept* can not be separated from several senior executives of large companies in America leaving their jobs to start their own small businesses because the top leaders in these companies do not want to accept innovative ideas. These executive-turned-entrepreneurs achieved phenomenal success in their new ventures. Shastri (2013) mentions that people generally want to believe that '*intrapreneurship*' , such as entrepreneurship may signify a '*mind set*' or a '*skill set*' .

b. Concept Development and Terminology

The development of a concept cannot be separated from the process of forming terms as a representation of the concept being built, requiring a set of criteria that can be used as a benchmark for how well a new concept is formed. Adams and K. Hoy (2016) mention the concept is a term that has been given an abstract and general meaning. Buller and Gamble (2002) mention that in general Gerring (1999) has stated that a concept consists of three elements. First, there are properties or attributes that distinguish one concept from another. Second, there are events, circumstances or phenomena to be covered. Finally, there are terms or labels that summarize the various elements or dimensions.

The formation of terms can not be separated from the formation of new words. Hampsher-Monk et al (1998) assert that the importance of language in understanding reality has dramatically changed the focus of the humanities and social sciences, which have historically developed concepts, language and political discourse. Adams and K. Hoy (2016) associate concepts with words, by calling concepts are abstract words that are given special definitions, which makes it possible to agree on the meaning of these terms. Furthermore, Schmid (2008) emphasizes that the study of new words and the early stages of lexicalization and institutionalization is very focused on structural and semantic changes, as well as the gradual spread of words in speech communities.

However, it is not uncommon for conceptual and terminological confusion to occur given the formation of concepts and terms related to so many interacting fields, inseparable from a linguistic perspective. Schmid (2005) in an attempt to structure the complexity of the distinguishable processes in the development of *words* towards their establishment and to increase the transparency of terminology, introduces a distinction between three perspectives regarding its development, namely: Analysis of the structural perspective (the development of the properties of the word itself), socio-pragmatic perspective analysis (spread of familiarity of a word in a community), and cognitive perspective analysis (formation and reinforcement of word-related concepts in the minds of community members).

Gerring (1999) explores the role of exposure frequency and semantic transparency of concepts in the memory of language users, including the pragmatic exploitation and conceptual utility of empirical or theoretical relevance, by proposing a set of criteria for the formation and use of all good social science concepts: (1) *Familiarity*, (2) *resonance*, (3) *parsimony*, (4) *coherence*, (5) *differentiation*, (6) *depth*, (7) *theoretical utility*, and (8) *field utility*, which is further described by Buller and Gamble (2002).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study in this research is based on qualitative and literature. Qualitative research to answer problems that require in-depth understanding in the context of the time and situation concerned, is carried out naturally and naturally in accordance with objective conditions in the field without manipulation and the type of data collected (Arifin, 2011). *Library research*, confirms that the most common literature-based approach to concept development is literature review (Branch, 2015; Hasan, 2008).

The compilation of the complexity of the distinguishable processes in the development of *words* towards establishment and to increase terminology transparency has three perspectives, namely: structural perspective analysis, socio-pragmatic perspective analysis and perspective analysis (Schmid, 2008). Relevant to this approach, in the perspective of analysis of the application of the term *entrepreneur* or its derivatives such as *entrepreneurial* and *entrepreneurship* in management, it will be approached with three new perspectives in an integrated manner, namely semantic perspective analysis, conceptual-theoretical perspective analysis and cognitive perspective analysis.

DISCUSSION

The formation of concept terms in the field of management can be seen as a process of forming meaning because in essence the concept sends a meaningful message. This is because the formation of new concepts, variables or factors in the form of phrases is a form of language intended to contain a certain message or meaning that represents the concept and context of a management phenomenon to be explained.

a. Semantic Analysis Approach

The semantic analysis approach as a branch of linguistics emphasizes that semantic analysis provides a perspective on how definitions or meanings are inferred from words and concepts, so that this approach was used by the author from the start to understand the relevance of the use and application of the term *entrepreneur* in the field of management, including analyzing the application of the term *intrapreneur*. inside it. Branch (2015) asserts that the field of semantics explores concepts not in lexical terms, but in terms of a range of characteristic synonyms, antonyms, and related terms, forming a more or less integrated part of the vocabulary at any given time.

The use of the term *entrepreneur* as *entrepreneurial* which is linked to management concepts such as *leadership*, *management*, *employee*, *marketing*, *corporate* and others

suggests that it is hoped that the characteristics of an *entrepreneur* or entrepreneur can be attached to the activities of everyone in management, as a *leader* or manager in terms of *entrepreneurial leadership*. *star intrapreneur* and *entrepreneurial management* as well as employees in terms of *entrepreneurial employee*, *entrepreneurial marketing* , and *corporate entrepreneurship* .

This is of course contrary to the *parsimony criterion* (simplicity) from Gerring (1999), which in determining the feasibility of forming a concept like this becomes difficult to implement. This is because every mention of the concept of *entrepreneur* as *entrepreneurial* which is linked to management concepts such as *leadership* , *management* , *employee* , *marketing* , *corporate* and others, it must be linked to the basic concept of *entrepreneur* as an explanation. The *parsimony* criterion insists the formal definition of a concept as opposed to its properties and attributes should be as simple and concise as possible, to avoid endless qualifiers, footnotes and sub-clauses.

Moreover, if it is based on the scope of the meaning of *entrepreneur* or entrepreneur which is most prominent and commonly known by the wider community including academics, regarding independence as a business actor in taking risks, developing new creativity and innovation, including his greatest motivation to create abundant wealth, then it becomes difficult to accept. if the term entrepreneur or *entrepreneur* is attached to a person who chooses not to be independent in working as an employee in a company or other.

As is known in the use of general terms, both in English and in Indonesian, *entrepreneur* is most simply understood to represent a personal figure who chooses a profession as a business actor, entrepreneur, entrepreneur or entrepreneur, which is clearly different in choice and contrary to those who choose a profession. as an employee. The emergence of the term *intrapreneur* , especially for company employees, is actually another clear evidence that confirms that the term *entrepreneur* actually seems to be forced to attribute to the behavioral characteristics of employees in a company management, so that it is replaced by the emergence of the term *intrapreneur* .

The introduction of *intrapreneurs* who really want to introduce and emphasize a new term that is somewhat different from *entrepreneur* , in order to be more suitable to be juxtaposed and worn together with the term employee, although definitively it turns out to still use the scope of developing entrepreneurial traits or characteristics that are applied internally to the company for employees, even for anyone who is in contact with the term will not be able to release the affinity of its characteristics with *entrepreneurs* or entrepreneurs.

This understanding cannot be separated from the formation of the term, *intrapreneur* is built from the words *intra* and *entrepreneur*, which was first coined by Gifford Pinchot III around 1978. *Intrapreneur* is defined as an employee who is tasked with developing innovative ideas or projects within a company. Within the constraints of this definition, *intrapreneurs* are described as not facing too great a risk or reaping extraordinary rewards from an entrepreneur, however, *intrapreneurs* have access to the resources and capabilities of established companies.

The development of the concept of *intrapreneurs* like this becomes problematic when faced with Gerring's (1999) *Field Utility criteria* which refers to disturbances that can occur in the formation of concepts related to the semantic field, where when defining a concept it is partly about building relationships with another term. The concept that is built must be one that brings at least a certain amount of interference to other concepts.

This is because, in the idea of forming the term *intrapreneur*, it appears that the scope of definition is disrupted, even though it no longer uses the term *entrepreneur*, but within the term *intrapreneur* still deliberately uses the scope of meaning and characteristics of entrepreneurship, where the position of *entrepreneur* itself is contradictory or contradictory to the position of entrepreneur. employee.

The concept of *intrapreneur* that is attached to employees is actually related to the concept of *entrepreneur*, by ignoring the most substantive and most important characteristics of the *entrepreneur* himself, namely deciding to work independently and taking risks as an entrepreneur, and it is contrary to the attitude and decision to become an employee (*which paid*) from *entrepreneurs* or in corporations or companies owned by *entrepreneurs*.

The motivational factors of the two are very different, where entrepreneurs have their own business to pursue wealth that is expected to be abundant by being willing to take any risks, while employees choose to be more comfortable working with a safer guarantee of receiving a more secure salary and career, so the company's HR management tries hard to build motivation through several approaches such as career development, compensation increase, *self-esteem recognition and self-actualization* expression to foster loyalty, *sense of belonging*, responsibility and performance.

This fact confirms that however, to build a spirit of creativity and innovation in employees, it is impossible to approach or rely on the conception of entrepreneurship or *entrepreneurship*, because in fact the degree or level of motivation and courage to take risks between entrepreneurs and employees is clearly very different. Therefore, the company's HRM empowerment approach would be more appropriate to use a management approach that

is oriented towards building and strengthening loyalty, *sense of belonging* , responsibility and performance, not through an *entrepreneurial concept approach such as entrepreneurship training* that is internalized to company employees to become *intrapreneurs* .

Based on this understanding, the author views that however, whether the use of language is practical or conceptual, there is no doubt that it will reduce the scope of the meaning of *entrepreneur* , which is only attributed to independent business actors or entrepreneurs or entrepreneurs, which in this context then refers to *entrepreneurs* or entrepreneurs . Some of these characteristics were identified, such as the motivation to pursue abundant wealth, risk takers, and later found to have innovation, creativity, self-confidence and so on, so it is not easy to embed *entrepreneur* in employee terms.

Relevant to this, Gerring's (1999) concept feasibility criterion is mainly related to one of the criteria, *Differentiation* (Differentiation), where the idea of developing or forming a concept must be able to help clarify what is not included in the scope of the concept term, which sets the boundaries within which the concept can be defined. a concept should not be extended to avoid the problem of drafting the concept.

Therefore, the formation of the term *entrepreneur employee* or *intrapreneur* , which is interpreted as an *entrepreneur employee* , becomes biased in meaning, distorts the meaning of *entrepreneur* , so that it becomes a flawed term. Although it is claimed that this kind of idea is inspired by the range of characteristics of an *entrepreneur* , for example taking risks, being innovative, creative, confident, and other characteristics inherent in the *entrepreneurial spirit* , an employee cannot be called an *entrepreneur* before being able to independently build his own business and regardless of depending on the salary of others, because after all the term *entrepreneur* is specifically intended as an entrepreneur, so all the characteristics inherent in *entrepreneurs* must be returned to the identity of entrepreneurs or entrepreneurs, not employees.

b. Conceptual-Theoretical Analysis Approach

The conceptual-theoretical analysis approach is identical to the pragmatic socio-analytic approach proposed by Schmid (2008). The difference is that concept analysis for spoken language is more appropriate to use a socio pragmatic approach, while this analysis is related to concept analysis of literacy (non-spoken language), so that the conceptual-theoretical analysis approach of literacy is another form of socio-pragmatic approach to spoken language.

Characteristics such as innovative, creative, confident and other characteristics inherent in the concept of *entrepreneur* have become a separate part of the study in

management. Scott & Bruce (1994) call innovative behavior a multi-stage process with different individual activities and behaviors at each stage. Janssen (2000) calls innovative behavior a complex three-stage behavior, namely *idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization* .

Intrapreneur characteristics such as courage and flexibility to think outside the box, which allows to work on ideas that can change strategic direction and add value. Isn't it a fact that every characteristic of creativity and innovation is born from a pattern of thinking that is bold, flexible and out of the box and that means it has been internalized in management, without having to include *intrapreneur terminology* which seems to be very strongly related to the concept of *entrepreneur* .

Characteristics such as innovative, creative, competitive, collaborative, and so on have even received special attention and with very deep development, although the term *entrepreneur is not included* in the management field, including marketing management and human resource management, which are used in employee development efforts and measurement. performance.

Gerring 's (1999) *Theoretical Utility Criteria* require that concepts should assist in theory formation and development, with concepts and theories being inherently related. But in fact, all the characteristics inherent in *entrepreneurs* have been discussed separately in the field of management, so the formation of new concepts such as *entrepreneurial management, entrepreneurial leadership, entrepreneurial employees, star intrapreneurs, entrepreneurial marketing, corporate entrepreneurship*, and others is *useless* . .

Employee innovation is already known in the management concept called *innovative work behavior* (Janssen, 2000), which defines innovative behavior as the creation, introduction and application of new ideas intentionally in a job, group, or organization to gain an advantage in performance. a job, group or organization.

Employee performance appraisal is also not free from creative characteristics. Hasibuan (2012) mentions that the aspects assessed from employee or employee performance factors include: loyalty, work performance, honesty, discipline, creativity, cooperation, leadership, personality, initiative, skills, and responsibility. Robbins in Pratiwi (2012) states that there are seven characteristics of organizational culture, namely innovation and risk taking, attention to detail, results orientation, orientation to human resources, team orientation, aggressiveness and stability.

The facts of the study and development of employee characteristics in the field of management in general, which are related to some of the characteristics of entrepreneurs or

entrepreneurs , confirm that there is no need for the formation of other special terms such as *entrepreneur* which is absorbed into the field of human resource management to confirm the development of employee characteristics such as innovation, creativity, risk taking and so on, which in the end will lead to confusion in management behavior.

The formation of such a new concept causes futility or inaccuracy in the application of the use of the term, giving a negative contribution because it has the potential to give birth to a wider but very shallow scientific spectrum. If the term is placed correctly, the depth and maturity of scientific mastery will be more developed, have relevant concepts and contexts and will not cause confusion in application and practice.

The phenomenon of concept development accompanied by the formation of such terms also indicates a discrepancy with the *Depth criteria* according to Gerring (1999), where the greater the depth of a concept, the better. The presence of this new concept has led to shallowness of the concept, not to deepen the existing management concepts in organizational psychology, individual organizational behavior, and employee performance.

If judging from the *Familiarity criteria* (familiarity) from Gerring (1999), new concepts must be avoided so that there is no *overlap* with established uses, so there is no need for the presence of new concepts. Given the existence of old concepts in management that include innovative characteristics, creativity, taking risks and others already exist first.

c. Cognitive Analysis Approach

In the context of the distortion of meaning due to a process of forming subjective perceptions of experience in learning, the use of the terms *entrepreneur* , *entrepreneurship* and *entrepreneurship* can be caused by cognitive bias as a fact of errors in thinking, judging, remembering, or in general involving cognitive processes, which in general can be referred to as the occurrence of a pattern of deviations in consideration, where inferences can occur unreasonably. Dahl and Voll (2004) assert that cognitive structures provide meaning and organization of experience and enable individuals to draw conclusions beyond the information actually given.

term *intrapreneur* , which conceptually begins with the identification of an understanding of the characteristics of *entrepreneurs* , is indicated to be built on subjective perceptions, given the background of its original originator, an *entrepreneur practitioner* , Gifford Pinchot III, an American entrepreneur and President of Pinchot & Company, who put forward the concept of *intrapreneurship* (1978) " *Intra-Corporate Entrepreneurship* " while attending the *Tarrytown School for Entrepreneurs in New York*, followed by his first book,

Intrapreneuring: Why You Don't Have to Leave the Corporation to Become an Entrepreneur (1985) presenting an expansion of the concept of *intrapreneurship* .

The fact that the *intrapreneur concept* that was born from the adjustment of the *entrepreneurial concept* within the company's internal employees emphasizes that a person can create and describe a subjective social reality that he or she is involved in or faces, based on perceptions, views and can even determine his own behavior, which proves cognitive bias. lead to distorted perceptions, improper judgments or illogical interpretations.

Entrepreneurs associated with employees cause the formation of a *cognitive mindset* that gives birth to inappropriate management behavior in employee HR development, by using an entrepreneurial concept approach to foster creativity and innovation, for example through entrepreneurship training. This is contrary to the strengthening of employee loyalty, which does not want employee *turnover to occur*. For example, employees are given training through *mentoring* and *coaching methods* to streamline and generate *entrepreneurial skills* as the method developed by Wijaya and Radianto (2016) in an idea " *Mentoring and Coaching as a Strategy for Development of Entrepreneurship Education: Phenomenological Studies* " .

When it comes to making strategic decisions for the company, employees are very dependent and bound by their environment, especially to their superiors, while an *entrepreneur* must have an independent spirit, mentality and behavior when making decisions, including freedom in calculating and taking risks as well as potential and projected profits to be achieved.

The term *entrepreneurial employee* or called by other terms *intrapreneur* or other *entrepreneurial* derivatives , is not fully related coherently based on Gerring's (1999) perspective, because after all the characteristics of *entrepreneurs* do not have a completely linear definition range with creative, innovative, risk-taking and other theories in the concept. previously established management theories, such as organizational behavior theory, organizational psychology, and employee performance, for some of the reasons previously described.

The expected "cognitive click" effect in the *Resonance criteria* (resonance) by Gerring (1999) when a new concept is formed or built that includes the *entrepreneurial subphrase* in management, because the innovative, creative, risk-taking characteristics that are in the corporate circle are very different from the world *entrepreneur* . Examples of success from the depth of innovative, creative, risk-taking concepts in management such as in organizational behavior, organizational psychology and employee performance are very

successfully applied by one of the giant global information technology companies, namely Google.

Google does not try to build the concept of *entrepreneur employee* or in other words, *intrapreneur* within the company, but is able to grow and build the creative and innovative power of its employees practically with very high dynamics without having to create ambiguity in the management concept. All that Google management has done globally is simply to approach it like established management theory, by creating an ecosystem in the office environment, where employees work in harmony by providing as much support as possible for employees to ensure and enable psychological, behavioral and performance developments. employees who are filled with creative power, innovation and never give up.

CLOSING

Regardless of the reach of the three approaches in the analysis above, considering that *entrepreneurship* has become part of the global terminology in the management field, the choice to continue using it or not in the field of management is returned to academics regarding the terminology of *intrapreneur* and *entrepreneur* in several derived phrases. As Rhodes (2000) points out, theorists assert that all parties are always open to conflict, confirming that these are terms and concepts that can never be expected to reach agreement due to factors of imprecision, ignorance, or hostility (Pennanen, 2021).

a. Conclusion

- 1) The use of the term *entrepreneur* in the formation of new terms in management such as *entrepreneur employee* , *intrapreneur* or *star intrapreneur* becomes a meaning bias, distorts the meaning of *entrepreneur* or entrepreneur from an approach with a semantic, conceptual and cognitive perspective, so that it becomes an imperfect term and creates confusion.
- 2) use of the terms *entrepreneur* and *intrapreneur* in the field of management does not only have an impact on meaning bias, term defects, distorted meaning, less relevant, and not aligned, but also related to the inappropriate approach to achieving managerial goals, because it will use the approach of an entrepreneur in fostering creativity. and innovation, for example through entrepreneurship training.
- 3) *entrepreneurial* approach is clearly irrelevant to employees who work in the company, considering that the motivation and risk tolerance factors differ greatly between entrepreneurs and employees. What is needed is modification and creativity in implementing the company's HR policies, through various approaches such as career

development, work environment development. supportive (ecosystem), compensation increase, *self-esteem recognition and self-actualization* expression to foster loyalty, sense of belonging (*sense of belonging*), responsibility and performance.

- 4) *entrepreneur or entrepreneurial* paradigm in employees through the concept of *intrapreneur* , has a great chance for companies to lose many of their best human resources, because they are triggered to think or even decide to leave the company to build their own entrepreneurs.

b. Suggestion

- 1) The formation of new terms such as *entrepreneur employee, entrepreneurial leadership* , star *intrapreneur* and the like in the future should be avoided as much as possible to prevent overlapping with the scope of similar concepts as already in the management concept, such as those related to the concepts of innovation, creativity, performance, risk and etc
- 2) If you want to develop research and concepts related to employee innovation, risk, and creativity, then the development of new concepts should not have the risk of meaning bias, *overlapping* , and *useless* , so that the impact can actually deepen the conceptual repertoire. and knowledge in the field of management.
- 3) For the next authors it is recommended to prove in more depth the scope of management concepts in *entrepreneurs* to avoid confusion.

References

- Adams, Curt M. and K. Hoy, Wayne, 2016, *Quantitative Research in Education – A Primer* , Published by Corwin, A SAGE Company, 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, California 91320, (800) 233-9936, Fax: (800) 417-2466, <https://tomorrowsprofessor.sites.stanford.edu/post/1562>
- Alfiyanti, Steffi and Ardianti, RR Retno, 2013, *Entrepreneurial Motivation and Perceptions of Barriers to Growth of Micro and Small Enterprises in the Informal Sector in East Java Region* , AGORA Vol. 1, No. 3, (2013) <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/36042-ID-entrepreneurial-motivation-dan-persepsi-terhadap-cepatan-percepatan-usaha-mikr.pdf>
- Anton, Roman, 2014, *Sustainable Intrapreneurship - The GSI Concept and Strategy - Unfolding Competitive Advantage via Fair Entrepreneurship* , MPRA Paper No. 69713, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/21619549.pdf>
- Arifin, Zainal, 2011. *Educational Research* . Bandung: Teen Rosda
- Azwar, Saifuddin, 2007, *Research Methods*, Student Library: Yogyakarta

- Branch, John, 2015, *Concept Development: A Primer* Philosophy of Management 14(2):111-133, University of Michigan, DOI: 10.1007/s40926-015-0011-9, Researchgate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/304242875_Concept_Development_A_Primer
- Braunerhjelm, Pontus & Ding, Ding & Thulin, Per, 2017, *The knowledge Spillover Theory of Intrapreneurship*, Small Bus Econ DOI 10.1007/s11187-017-9928-9, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319941701_The_knowledge_spillover_theory_of_intrapreneurship.
- Buller, Jim dan Gamble, Andrew, 2002, *Conceptualising Europeanisation*, Public Policy and Administration, University of Sheffield, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/33042327_Conceptualising_Europeanisation_Unpublished
- Cantillon, Richard, 1755, *Essai sur la nature du commerce en général*. London: MacMillan, <https://www.institutcoppet.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Essai-sur-la-nature-du-commerce-en-gener-Richard-Cantillon.pdf>
- Clifford, Catherine, 3 September 2013, *Why everyone will have to become an entrepreneur*, entrepreneur.com. Diakses 2 September 2021, <https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/228176>
- Dahl, Veronica dan Voll, Kimberly, 2004, *Concept Formation Rules: An Executable Cognitive Model of Knowledge Construction*, In Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Natural Language Understanding and Cognitive Science, pages 29-36, DOI: 10.5220/0002685700290036, Copyrightc SciTePress, <https://www.scitepress.org/Papers/2004/26857/26857.pdf>
- Daniel, dkk, 2015, *Entrepreneur, Entrepreneurship and Intrapreneurship. A Literature Review*, MPRA Paper No. 78871, https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/78871/1/MPRA_paper_78871.pdf
- Drucker, P. F., 1993, *Innovation and entrepreneurship: practice and principles*, New York: HarperBusiness, http://www.untag-smd.ac.id/files/Perpustakaan_Digital_1/ENTREPRENEURSHIP%20Innovation%20and%20entrepreneurship.PDF
- DuBrin, Andrew, 2008, *The Complete Ideal's Guide: Leadership* (Edisi Kedua). Alih Bahasa: Tri Wibowo. Jakarta: Prenada.
- Filion, Louis Jacques, 2010, *De l'intuition au projet d'entreprise*, Montréal, Éditions Transcontinental
- Gerring, John, 1999, *What makes a concept good? A criterial framework for understanding concept formation in the social sciences*, https://www.academia.edu/2753874/What_makes_a_concept_good_A_criterial_framework_for_understanding_concept_formation_in_the_social_sciences
- Hampsher-Monk, I.; Tilmans, K.; & Van Vree, F. (Eds.), 1998, *History of Concepts: Comparative Perspectives*, Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press, https://www.ssoar.info/ssoar/bitstream/handle/document/33051/ssoar-1998-hampsher-monk_et_al-History_of_concepts_comparative_perspectives.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y&lnkname=ssoar-1998-hampsher-monk_et_al-History_of_concepts_comparative_perspectives.pdf
- Hasan, IqbaI, 2008, *Analisis Data Penelitian Dengan Statistik*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta

- Hasibuan, Malay SP, 2012, *Human Resource Management* , Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Janssen, O., 2000, *Job Demands, Perceptions of Effort–Reward Fairness and Innovative Work Behavior* , Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology. Vol. 73: 287–302
- Ministry of National Education No. 146/U/2004, 2005, Completion of General Guidelines for the Establishment of Terms, Ministry of Education and Culture RI
- Kurniati, Edy Dwi, 2018, *Industrial Entrepreneurship*, Edition I, 3rd Printing, Deepublish Publisher,
http://repository.undaris.ac.id/44/2/Kewirausahaan%20Industri_v.3.0_A5.pdf
- Osman EROĞLU, 2011 , *Entrepreneurship, National Culture and Turkey*, International Journal of Business and Social Science, Vol. 2 No. 16; September 2011,
https://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_16_September_2011/16.pdf
- Pratiwi, 2012, *The influence of organizational culture and empowerment on organizational commitment in improving performance* , Udinus Paper,
<https://journal.widyanggala.ac.id/index.php/jurnalaset/article/view/88/62>
- Sarosa, Pietra, 2005, *Practical Tips for Opening a Business* , Jakarta:PT Elex Media Komputindo
- Schmid, Hans- Jçrg . 2008 . *New Words in The Mind: Concept-Formation and Entrenchment of Neologisms.* Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich ,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270487792_New_Words_in_the_Mind_Concept-formation_and_Entrenchment_of_Neologisms
- Schmid, Hans- Jçrg . 2005, *English morphology and word formation*, an introduction, Berlin: Schmidt
- Scott, & Bruce, RA, 1994, *Determinants of Innovative behavior: A Path Model of Individual Innovation in the Workplace* , Academy of Management Journal
- Silalahi, 2009, *Social Research Methods* , Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama The Economist, 27 April 2009, *entrepreneurship*,
<https://www.economist.com/news/2009/04/27/entrepreneurship>
- Orchard, 2017, *The Influence of Entrepreneurial Leadership On Intrapreneurial Opportunity: A Study of Uk Technologyinnovative SMES* , Business School of Bangkok University,
<http://dspace.bu.ac.th/bitstream/123456789/3505/1/Sharn%20Thesis%20v2%20-%20Watermark.pdf>
- Paramita, Sinta and Ardiansyah, Rezi, 2016, *Entrepreneurship and New Media in the Young Generation* ,
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303822547_ENTREPRENEURSHIP_DAN_NEW_MEDIA_PADA_GENERASI_MUDA
- Pennanen, Jonas, 2021, *Essentially Contested Concepts Gallie's Thesis and Its Aftermath*, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of Jyväskylä,
https://jyx.jyu.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/77373/978-951-39-8802-9_vaitos03092021.pdf
- Pinchot, G., 2010, *The Pinchot Perspective. In Search of a Future Worth Living*,
<http://www.pinchot.com/2010/01/back-to-intrapreneuring.html>
- Pratolo, et al, 2019, *Entrepreneurship Empowerment Model Based on the Muhammadiyah Branch and Branch Economic Independence Movement with the On-Line Method* ,

National Seminar on Abdimas II 2019 Synergy and Strategies of Academics, Business and Government (Abg) in Realizing Progressive Community Empowerment in the Industrial Era 4.0,
<https://prosiding.umy.ac.id/semnasppm/index.php/psppm/article/download/420/498/1852>

Rhodes, MR, 2000, *Coercion: A Nonevaluative Approach*, Rodopi, (Amsterdam).

Shastri, 2013, *Intrapreneurship*, *Symbiosis Institute of Business Management (SIBM), Pune*,
<http://samvad.sibmpune.edu.in/index.php/samvad/article/viewFile/98275/71412>

Suarlin and Ali, M. Ichsan, 2018, *Building the Spirit of Entrepreneurship*, GLOBAL RESEARCH AND CONSULTING INSTITUTE (Global-RCI).,
<http://eprints.unm.ac.id/17882/2/Membangun%20Jiwa%20Kewirausahaan.pdf>

Wijaya and Radianto, 2016, *Mentoring and Coaching as Entrepreneurial Education Development Strategies: Phenomenological Studies*, *Journal of Management Applications* | Volume 14 | Number 4 | December 2016