

Organizational Internal Factor and Corporate Entrepreneurship in Hospitality Firms in Rivers State

Ogundu, Vanessa Onyeka¹ and Amah Edwinah (Ph.D)²

¹Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria | Email: vanessaokay06@gmail.com

²Department of Management, Faculty of Management Sciences
University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria | Email: edwinah4christ@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study examined the relationship between organizational internal factors and corporate entrepreneurship of hospitality firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. Cross sectional research design was adopted in studying eight (8) of these firms. Our respondents were managerial employees constituting the population of the study. From the field survey, we retrieved and analyzed two hundred and twenty two (222) copies of questionnaire from the participants; Spearman's rank correlation coefficient statistical tool was used to determine the relationship existing between the variables while the p-value obtained were used to test hypotheses developed for the study. Findings revealed the existence of significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational internal factors namely; top management support, work discretion and reward system and the measures of corporate entrepreneurship given as innovativeness and business growth. It was then concluded that practices directed at organizational internal factors is necessary for facilitating entrepreneurial activities within the organizations as this will ultimately enhance output levels. This gave rise to our recommendations for the hospitality firms and other business organizations operating in this era of intense competition; that they should put up strategies to support their employees to remain innovative by training them to a level of self empowerment (work discretion) so as to elicit good performance levels for the corporation.*

Keywords: *Organizational internal factors, top management support, work discretion, reward system and corporate entrepreneurship*

Introduction

In this age of competitive business environment, frequent changes in technology and organizational climate, and increased demands for quality of goods and services have necessitated the need for improvement in corporate entrepreneurship practice. The extent to which organizations seek new ways of operations and improved in their level of service rendering will result in effective corporate entrepreneurship for organizational growth and profitability (Dyduch, 2008; Zoohori, Ghan & Zakeri, 2014).

Phan, Wright, Ucbasaran and Tan (2009) posit that firms that pursue corporate entrepreneurship gain financial benefits. Although, the reasons for engaging in corporate entrepreneurship may differ but the main motive lies in the ability to make high return on investment (Zahra & Gervis, 2000). Besides financial reasons, corporate entrepreneurial firms also seek non-financial benefits in form of gaining customer satisfaction, solidify strategies and to improve in operations (Ahmad, Nasurdin & Zaind, 2012; Frese, Rousseau & Wiklund, 2014).

LaNafie, Nimran, Masadieq and Suyadi (2014) opines that when firms practice corporate entrepreneurship, it definitely result in growth and sustainability of the firms in a long-run. According to Dess and Lumpkin (2005) corporate entrepreneurship could be practiced through pro-activeness, innovativeness, and risk taking. Dess and Lumpkin (2005) found pro-activeness as an aspect of corporate entrepreneurship which serves as a critical mechanism that help firms to seek new opportunities to invest. They claimed that innovativeness provides the organization with the ability to generate new business ideas and research in new products and service development, enable firms to gain competitive advantage and realized business growth. While risk taking enable organizations to invest in the opportunity found and manage it effectively with the aim of maximizing sales growth, return on assets, return on investment and increased market share without fair of failure (Dess & Lumpkin, 2005). Hence, the importance of corporate entrepreneurship to achieve innovation and business growth cannot be overemphasized.

However, scholars over the years have examined factors that influence corporate entrepreneurship especially in the foreign environment than within Nigerian context (Chen & Cangahuala, 2010; Covin & Miles 1999; Maktabi & Babakhanian, 2015; Zahra, 1993; Zahra, Nielsen & Bonger, 1999; Zehir, Muceldili & Zehir, 2012). Most of these scholars found that firms that practiced corporate entrepreneurship through pro-activeness, innovativeness, and risk taking improves innovation and ensure business growth and survival (Chen & Cangahuala, 2010; Covin & Miles, 1999; Zehir, Muceldili & Zehir, 2012).

However, a careful review of streams of literature on this concept has revealed that amongst the factors that affect corporate entrepreneurship, greater attention has not been given to organizational factors especially within the internal environment of the organization. This implies that empirical studies in this area is still lacking in research. Hence, only few scholars have found that top management and their philosophies influence corporate entrepreneurship (Chaka, 2005). While others specifically stated that factors such as; reward systems and the ability to control, culture, the firm's structure and managerial supports are main determinants (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Hisrich & Peters, 1986; Kanter, 1985; Kuratko, Hornsby, Naffziger & Montagno, 1993; Sathe, 1985).

LaNafie *et al.*, (2014) shared the same view that these factors are responsible for corporate entrepreneurship and in their study they include; top management support, supportive organizational structure, resource availability, reward system and work discretion (LaNafie *et al.*, 2014). While the more recent study by Zohoori *et al.* (2016) used management support, organizational values, economic environment , work independency, empowerment, financial control, environmental influence; monitoring and organizational communication (Zohoori *et al.*, 2016). Their study found significant relationship between these variables and corporate entrepreneurship.

Although, their study was conducted in the foreign environment and as environment differs, their finding may not provide an effective generalization to cover the domestic environment like Nigeria, especially with regards to hospitality firms in Port Harcourt. This has created the need to examine how these factors may affect corporate entrepreneurship within Nigerian context focusing on hospitality businesses in Port Harcourt with a view to encourage hospitality business operators to develop the propensity for innovativeness in order to increase profitability, business growth and survival.

Literature Review

Theoretical Framework

Technology-Organization-Environment Framework (TOE)

The framework was based on three components: the external environment, the technology and the organization. However, present study is mainly concerned with the organizational component. The organizational context explains the nature of an organization such as the size of the firm, the extent of centralization, formalization, the complexity of its managerial structure, and the amount of free resources (time) available within the firm (Arpaci, Yardinci, Ozkan & Turetken, 2012). It is assumed that the extent to which employees will participate in corporate entrepreneurial activities will largely depend upon the degree of centralization and amount of free time they have in their respective organizations.

Job Characteristics Theory

The theory is based on five job dimensions; these include skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. These job dimensions are assumed to trigger three different psychological states which in turn will lead to different outcomes (Hackman & Oldham, 1976). However, in this study, we are only concerned with only one dimension of the model, and that is autonomy. Autonomy refers to the extent to which a job allows employee independency, discretion or freedom in terms of schedule of work or determination of procedures in execution of the work (Robbins *et al.*, 2013). It is assumed in present study that if employees are given substantial autonomy on their work, it will lead them to take entrepreneurial risks on behalf of their organization.

Concept of Organizational Internal Factors

This group includes all those factors (top management support, reward system and work discretion) etc. contained in the organization, as a commercial entity, within it, internally. The organization can influence this group of factors (Jones, 2004). The changes in any of these factors will inevitably lead to changes in the organizational structure and corporate entrepreneurship. Internal factors are those, as the title itself says, which have an internal impact on the organization, inside the organization, and the organization can influence them mostly.

Top Management Supports and Corporate Entrepreneurship

The value of top management support has been recognized by many researchers over the years. Raghunathan (1992) sees top management support as a critical factor for entrepreneurial motivation and development. The future development of an organization as well as the capacity of firms to explore the business environment rests on the extent to which top management support employees in the organization. Young and Jordan (2008) posit that top management involves the ability of senior management or other knowledgeable managers spent more time and efforts to set plans and follow up the outcomes and motivate employees to take initiatives in developing ideas and accomplish tasks. This implies that within the context of entrepreneurship management or top managers must provide necessary mechanisms that can spur employees on to engage in innovative ideas and task accomplishment.

Elenkov, Judge and Wright (2003) have a strong point made on this concept that top management support services as a vital issue to address and maintain it in fullest sense in a competitive business environment and in decision making concerning the organizational performance.

It might be effective to say that many employees in the organization does not possess the required knowledge of business creation, and for this reason top management owe it to provide the employees which good working environment, improves employees task delivery and encourage innovative ability that will drive the organization toward achieving its goals. Manna (2012) plainly explain that top management owe it to fully set and implement the organizational principles and structure of the organization in such a way that it delivers the values of employees in order to create a synergy and compatibility between the employees and the organization. This implies that the duty of top management is as vital as creating a successful organization.

Sharma and Rai (2003) also noted top management support appears to be the most vital element in ensuring innovation in the organization as their core role involve nourishing employees in training, motivating and leading their desires toward the firm's goals. This implies that top management ensures that knowledge is made available to employees that spur them, utilize it to the advancement of the organization. Furthermore, top management supports their employees through empowerment, creativity and innovation.

According to Vande Ven (1993), top management also display keen consideration towards employees needs and provide motivating incentives which is critical to employees motivation to advance his/her potentials to solve problems that might help the organization to succeed. As Jung, Chow and Wu (2003) noted, a good number of researchers have put efforts in examining the concept of top management support and how it helps employees to improve in their performance and tasks accomplishment (see; Ryan & Tipu, 2013; Smith & Tushman, 2003). However, the concept of top management support is still gaining consideration in this present competitive business environment. Thus, top management is important in employees' motivation to engage in entrepreneurial activities as well.

H0₁: Top management support has no significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship of hospitality firms in Rivers State.

Work Discretion

One of the internal factors that motivate staff in the organization to engage in corporate entrepreneurship practice is work discretion (Zoboori, Gani & Zakeri, 2016). Hornsby *et al.* (2002) referred to it as work independency. Staff is motivated by granting them work discretion as they experience the capacity to make same decision affecting them in operations without the presence of top management. It has been found that when staff are given the opportunity to carry out operations, it improves their level of job involvement and innovativeness (Chen & Cangahuala, 2010). However, LaNafie, Nimran and Suyadi (2014) found that work discretion is one way of allowing staff to control jobs and make decisions concerning such jobs.

Work discretion which is freedom to work, autonomy or work independency (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002; Zohoori *et al.*, 2016) empowers staff to develop innovative abilities and improves organizational operations of corporate entrepreneurship. In this way, work discretion is similar to decentralization that gives greater work autonomy to staff. Not only that work discretion

provides great autonomy but it allow staff to face the challenges associated with tasks accomplishment, then improves staff quality of decision making. It has also been noted that work discretion improves staff efficiency and maximizes the use of group or team and individuals level of capabilities and skills necessary for effective corporate entrepreneurship practice (Chen & Cangahuala, 2010).

The extent to work discretion improves staff morale in corporate entrepreneurship practice has been attributed to risk taking propensity (Chen & Cangahuala, 2010), and the middle managers are those capable of taking such risk for the purpose of corporate entrepreneurship. However, LaNafie *et al.* (2014) noted that high level much work discretion could lead to inappropriate job handling as the effectiveness of work discretion could be militated by poor level of work coordination and failure of top level managers to support decentralization (LaNafie *et al.*, 2014). This implies that management owes it to monitor or support work discretion as the staff is operated the opportunity to carry out task at an autonomy level.

H0₂: Work discretion has no significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship of hospitality firms in Rivers State.

Reward System

Aside from top management support s means for motivating employees towards innovative, proactive and risk-taking behaviour, rewards system is another viable means of motivating employees to the development of entrepreneurial behaviour. Reward system is the provision of monetary and non-monetary benefits by management as means of motivating productive behaviors in the organization (Griffin, 2005)

An organizational reward system is a formal and informal mechanism by which employee's performance is defined, evaluated and rewarded. Any reward system that is planned toward improving employees job performance stand the chance to motivate and direct the desire behavior towards improving productivity (Griffin, 2005)

The organizational reward system influences decision makers by suggesting what choices have better personal payoffs. Robbins, Judge and Vohra (2011) found that when organization reward risk aversion, managers are more likely to make conservative decision that improves organizations as well as individual performance. In a real sense, organization needs their employees to work effectively at a high level and to make it worth their effort to do so. Griffin (2005) found that when reward are planned with high level of task delivery, employees will see it fit to improve their performance in order to achieve the awards associated. In such situation, the interest of employees may be aligned with the objectives of the organization. Although, it has been observed that the economic condition can affect many organizations in rewarding employees especially when economic condition is very poor.

The organizational reward systems could be looked at from two aspects which includes the intrinsic and extrinsic reward systems. Wehrich, Cannile and Koontz (2011) posit that the intrinsic reward comprises of some inner benefits such as, self-actualization, satisfaction, feeling of accomplishment etc while the extrinsic reward will include pay, recognitions, allowances etc.

H0₃: There is no relationship between reward system has no significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship of hospitality firms in Rivers State.

Concept of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Corporate entrepreneurship is one of the most important variables or factors that drive many individuals or firms to succeed in business growth, and survival. It is an activity or activities that involve either informally or formally generation of new business and ideas that enables the creation of wealth to the organization and the society (Dess, Lumpkin & McGee, 1999; Zahra, 1991).

The idea of corporate creation has gained recognition over the years and researchers have developed keen interest in examining the extent to which corporate entrepreneurship could be enhanced to ensure profitable business operation (Hult and Ferrell, 1997; Ireland *et al.*, 2009; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Zhang, 2008).

Corporate entrepreneurship is defined by scholars based on their views on the subject matter. For instance, Hitt, Ireland and Hoskisson (2005) defined corporate entrepreneurship as a process whereby individual or a group in an existing organization creates a new venture or develop an innovation. This definition focused attention on individuals or that create knowledge of new business in an organization. This implies that the entrepreneurs may employees or managers found within existing firms.

Zahra (1991) posit that corporate entrepreneurship involve activities that formally or informally performed with the aim to create business ideas that is new in addition to the existing business operations. Although the main focus is on creation and production of new products and services in new market or existing market. All of their efforts must channel towards survival. With this in mind, many scholars now entertain the belief that organizations will need to be entrepreneurial and operate in such a way as entrepreneurs operates to survive the competitive business environment firms find itself today (Harley & Hult, 1998; Hitt *et al.*, 2005; Zhang, 2008). The formal aspect of corporate entrepreneurship may focus on strategic arrangement by the organization to train key employees in developing entrepreneurial innovative mind set toward new opportunities found and profitable investment (Ireland *et al.*, 2009). While the informal aspect may concern individual's ability to create new business ideas within the organizational setting.

There are other scholars' definitions (see Cunningham & Lischeron, 1991; Ireland, Kurako & Covin, 2003; Morris, 2001; Pinchot, 1985). Despite no generally acceptable definition, the meaning of entrepreneurship capture two important elements such as creation and generation of new business ideas which will definitely involve innovation in process products, and services.

Whatever meaning attached to corporate entrepreneurship the main idea is that it is essential in today's business operation for survival. Scholars over the years have determined different aspect of corporate entrepreneurship to include: management, support, organizational boundaries, reward, reinforcement, time availability and work direction; Dyduch (2008) also support these elements in his work in measuring corporate entrepreneurship on organizational performance. Hornsby, Kuratko and Montagno (1999) was with the view that corporate entrepreneurship involves those elements that managers or organizational leaders possessed which can ensure effective corporate entrepreneurship (management, support, work discretion, availability of resources, organizational structure and recruitment (Hornsby *et al.*, 1999).

The benefits of corporate entrepreneurship include: strategic renewal, satisfying customer value and growth increase (Ireland *et al.*, 2009; Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2010). Each of these

elements must be provided and managed by organizational leaders or managers effectively. In a specific situation, where corporate entrepreneurship is measured, certain criteria variables are used of which their absence denotes no corporate entrepreneurship practice. But in a deep understanding they constitute the existence of corporate entrepreneurship.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopted a cross sectional survey research design in studying eight (8) hospitality firms which forms our accessible population, however our study units include the managerial employees (managers at all levels) of the firms having that our unit of analysis is at the organizational level and such employees we elicit our information making up a total number of two hundred and twenty two (222). The human resource department provided us the needed information. A census was conducted for the study; there was no need for sampling as we included all as our study objects. The instrument with which we elicited data from the respondents is the questionnaire (222 copies of questionnaire) and was analyzed using Spearman’s rank correlation statistical tool.

Operational Measures of Variables

The dimensions of organizational internal factors include top management support, reward system and work discretion (Chaka, 2008; Lee & Lim, 2009). Top management support will be measured using 7 item statements by Chaka (2008) on a Likert’s 5-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Where strongly will score 5-point, agree will score 4-point, neutral will score 3 point, disagree will score 2-point, strongly disagree will score 1-point. Sample items for top management support will include; My organization is quick to use improved work methods. My organization is quick to use improved work methods that are developed by workers. Sample items for reward system will include; My manager helps me get my work done by removing obstacles. The rewards I receive are dependent upon my work on the job. Sample items for work discretion will include; I feel that I am my own boss and do not have to double check all of my decisions. This organization provides the chance to be creative and try my own methods of doing the job.

On the other hand, corporate entrepreneurship was measured with innovation and business growth (Bezzina, 2010).

Results and Data Analyses

Correlations

		Top Mgt Support	Work Discretion	Reward System	Corporate Entrepreneurship
Spearman’s rho	Top Mgt Support	1.000	.790**	.883**	.881**
			.000	.000	.000
	N	222	222	222	222

	Correlation Coefficient	.790**	1.000	.769**	.862**
Work Discretion	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000
	N	222	222	222	222
	Correlation Coefficient	.883**	.769**	1.000	.911**
Reward System	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000
	N	222	222	222	222
	Correlation Coefficient	.814**	.607**	.747**	1.000
Corporate Entrepreneurship	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.002	.
	N	222	222	222	222

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

Source: SPSS Output–Version 20 (field survey)

Discussion of Findings

- i. The result of the tested H_{01} revealed the existence of a significant relationship between top management support and corporate entrepreneurship; ($\rho = .814^{**}$, $p = .001$); in a study by Manna (2012) plainly explained top management support as a factor in ensuring apt implementation of organizational principles and policies in such a way that value is delivered; synergy and compatibility is created between the employees and the organization. This goes on and births innovativeness in the organization and the corresponding increase in output levels.
- ii. The result of the tested H_{02} indicated that work discretion has significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship among employees of hospitality firms as reported in the study; ($\rho = .607^{**}$, $p = .000$). One of the internal factors that motivate staff in the organizations to engage in corporate entrepreneurship practice is work discretion asserted Zoboori *et al.* (2016). Hornsby *et al.* (2002) corroborated the view by referring it to work independency; such that staff is motivated when granted work discretion as they experience the capacity to make same decision affecting them in operations without the presence of top management; this way, they remain innovative thus promoting favorable results in the organization.
- iii. The result of the tested H_{03} indicated that reward system also has significant relationship with corporate entrepreneurship among employees of hospitality firms as reported in the study; ($\rho = .747^{**}$, $p = .002$). aside top management support as means of motivating employees towards innovative, proactive and risk-taking behaviour, rewards system is another viable means of motivating employees to the development of entrepreneurial behaviour stated Griffin (2005).
- iv. An organizational reward system is a formal and informal mechanism by which employee's performance is defined, evaluated and rewarded. Any reward system that is

planned toward improving employees job performance stand the chance to motivate and direct the desired behavior towards improving productivity (Griffin, 2005).

Conclusion

Empirical findings from data analyzed predicate the following conclusions relative to the scope of our study;

Top management support directly relates with corporate entrepreneurship; top management support implies supporting employees through empowerment, creativity and innovation; this implies that top management ensures that knowledge is made available to employees that spur them to utilize it to the advancement of the organization.

Accordingly, work discretion is significantly related with corporate entrepreneurship as it concerns goal attainment even as evidenced in literature and from practical evidences; work discretion connotes independency; staff is motivated by granting them work discretion as they experience the capacity to make same decision affecting them in operations without the presence of top management.

Similarly, reward system had significantly reported a strong influence on corporate entrepreneurship; any reward system that is planned toward improving employees job performance stand the chance to motivate and direct the desired behavior towards improving output levels in the organization.

Recommendations of the Study

The following recommendations come about as a result of prior findings and conclusions reached relative to the variables studied, thus;

- i. Business organizations operating today should strive to lend support to operations of the organization as it concerns the employees; because through them, innovativeness is ensured by training, motivating and leading their desires toward corporate goals.
- ii. Business organizations should ensure a culture that promotes work discretion among workers because through this, staff is given the opportunity to carry out operations, thus improving their level of job involvement and innovativeness.
- iii. Reward systems should be closely examined so that through such systems; job performance of employees is improved, through the system also employees are motivated and directed to elicit the desired behavior towards improving productivity within the system.

References

- Ahmad, A. R., WanYusoff, F. W., Md Noor, H., & Ramin, A. K. (2012). Preliminary study of rural entrepreneurship development program in Malaysia. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Akponi, E. M. (2009). Entrepreneurship education (EE) for all students in higher education institutions (thesis) in Nigeria: a means to sustainable development. *Journal of sustainable development in Africa*, 11(1), 3-7.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2001). Intrapreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 495-527.

- Arpaci, I., Yardimci, C. Y., Ozkan, S., & Turetken, O. (2012). Organizational adoption of information technologies: A literature review. *International Journal of E-business and E-government Studies*, 4(2), 37-50.
- Barney, J. B. (2001). *Gaining and sustaining competitive advantage* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Barufaldi, D., (2008). A review of past recessions. <http://www.investopedia.com/articles/economics/08/past-recessions.asp>. The Crisis through the Lens of History. *Finance and Development*, 45(4), 18-20.
- Bernard, L. C., Walsh, R. P., & Mills, M. (2005). The motivation analysis test: A contemporary empirical evaluation. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Bezzina, F. (2010). Characteristics of the maltese entrepreneur. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3(7), 292–312.
- Bianchi, A., & Pini, P. (2009). Riflessioni circa la natura della crisi. Le vie per uscirne e le opportunità da (non) cogliere. *Economia e Società Regionale*, 1(2), 32-55.
- Boggs, J. (2004). The culture concept as theory, in context. *Current Anthropology*, 45(12), 2-5.
- Bowley, A. L. (1926). *Elements of Statistics*. New York: Scribner.
- Brandolini, A., & Bugamelli, M. (2009). Report on trends in the Italian productive system, Bank of Italy. *Occasional Papers*, 45, 2-6.
- Baum, J. R., & Wally, S. (2003). Strategic decision speed and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(11), 1107-1129.
- Carayannis, E. G., & Provan, M. (2008). Measuring firm innovativeness: Towards a composite innovation index built on firm innovative posture, propensity and performance attributes. *International Journal of Innovation and Regional Development*, 1(1), 90–107.
- Chaka, J. G. (2008). Information and communication technology (ICT) as a vital tool in the education sector reform in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Sociology in Education*, 2(2), 181-190.
- Chen, M. H., & Cangahuala, G., (2010). Corporate entrepreneurship environment and organizational performance in technology manufacturing sector. PICMET 2010 Proceedings, Phuket, Thailand.
- Cho, H. J., & Pucik, V. (2005). Relationship between innovativeness, quality, growth, profitability and market value. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(6), 555-575.
- Clark, K. M. (1987). Managing technology in international competition: The case of product development in response to foreign entry. In M. Spence and H. Hazard (eds.). *International Competitiveness*, 27-74.
- Coe, R., (2002). It's the effect size, stupid. What effect size is and why it is important? Presentation to the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, England 2002. Retrieved November 2011 from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00002182.htm>
- Covin & Miles (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage.
- Covin, J., & Slevin, D. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory Practice* 16(7), 7–25.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.

- Cunningham, J. B., & Lischeron, J. (1991). Defining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 29(1), 45-61.
- Deshpande, R., Farley, J. U., & Webster, F. E. (1993). Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: A quadrad analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 3-5.
- Dess, G. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 147-156.
- Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., & McGee, J. E. (1999). Linking corporate entrepreneurship to strategy, structure, and process: Suggested research directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 85-102.
- Dierickx, I., & Cool, K. (1989). Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage. *Management Science*, 35(12), 1504-1512.
- Dwight, R. L. K. (2006). Freedom, entrepreneurship and economic progress. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 2-5.
- Dyduch, W. (2008). Corporate entrepreneurship measurement for improving organizational performance. *Journal of economic and management*, 4, 3-6.
- Elenkov, D. S., Judge, W., & Wright, P. (2003). Strategic leadership and executive innovation influence: an international multi-cluster comparative study. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 665-682.
- Faini, R., & Sapir, A. (2005). Un modello obsoleto? Crescita e specializzazione dell'economia Italiana, Mimeo, Università di Roma Tor Vergata.
- Frese, M., Rousseau, D. M., & Wikland, J. (2014). The emergence of evidence-based entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 200-216.
- Glassman, M. (2001). Dewey and Vygotsky: Society, experience, and inquiry in educational practice. *Journal of Educational Researcher*, 30(4), 3-14.
- Greiner, L. E. (1998). Evolution and revolution as organizations grow. *Harvard Business Review*, 2-5.
- Griffin, R. W. (2005). *Management* (8th ed.). New York. Houghton Mifflin company.
- Hackman, R. J., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work. Test of a theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Han, J. K., Kim, N., & Srivastava, R. K. (1998). Market orientation and organizational performance: Is innovation a missing link? *Journal of Marketing*, 62, 30-45.
- Hurley, R., & Hult, G. T. M. (1998). Innovation, market orientation, and organizational learning: An integration and empirical examination. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 42-54.
- Hisrich, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (1986). Establishing a new venture unit within a firm. *Journal of business venturing*, 1, 307-302.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2005). Strategic management. United state of America. southern-western, Thompson corporation.
- Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). Middle managers perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: Assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of business venturing*, 17(3), 253-273.

- Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & Montagno, R. V. (1999). Perception of internal factors for corporate entrepreneurship: A comparison of Canadian and U.S. managers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(2), 9–24.
- Hult, G. T. M., & Ferrell, O. C. (1997). Global organizational learning capacity in purchasing: Construct and measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 40(2), 97-111.
- Hult, G. T. M., Hurley, R. F., & Knight, G. A. (2004). Innovativeness: Its antecedents and impact on business performance. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(5), 429-438.
- Ireland, R. D., Kuratko, D. F., & Covin, J. G. (2003). Antecedents, elements, and consequences of corporate entrepreneurship strategy. Best Paper Proceedings: Academy of Management, Annual Meeting, Seattle Washington
- Ireland, R. D., Covin, J. G., & Kuratko, D. F. (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 33(1), 19-46.
- Jhingan, M. L. (2006). *The economic of development and planning* (38th ed.). Virnda Publication (P) Ltd., Delhi.
- Jung, D. I., Chow, C., & Wu, A. (2003). The role of transformational leadership in enhancing organizational innovation: Hypotheses and some preliminary findings. *Leadership Questionnaire*, 14, 525-544.
- Kanter, R. M. (1985). Supporting innovation and venture development in established companies. *Journal of Business Venturing* 1, 47–60.
- Kim, C. J., & Nelson, C. R. (1999). *State-space models with regime switching*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kotler, P., & Keller, K. L. (2011). *Marketing management* (12th ed.). New Jersey. Prentice Hall.
- Kuratko D. F., Montagno, R. V., & Hornsby J. S. (1990). Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11-14.
- LaNafie, N. A., Nimran, U., Musadieq, M. A., & Suyadi, I. (2014). Organizational internal factors, corporate entrepreneurship, and organizational performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 6(36), 12-15.
- Lee, A. (2007). How can a mentor support experiential learning? *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 12(3), 333-340.
- Lee, S. M., & Lim, S. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of service business. *Service Business*, 3, 1–13.
- Lippert, S. K., & Forman, H. (2005). Utilization of information technology: examining cognitive and experiential factors of post-adoption behavior. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 52(3), 363-381.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1 55.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-72.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G., (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429-51.
- Maktabi, H., & Babakhanian, M. (2015). Identification of factors affecting organizational entrepreneurship in selected Sama technical schools. world conference on technology,

- innovation and entrepreneurship. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 195, 940–947.
- Manna, A. Q. (2012). Evaluation of the role of top management in achieving synergy between organizational structure and information technology in communications and banking sectors. Doctoral theses, Amman Arab University, Jordan.
- McKeown, K., (2012). Better being strategy and implementation plan: promoting improved mental health for families report for respond! Housing Association.
- Miniaci, Raffaele, & Guglielmo, W. (1999). The Italian recession of 1993: Aggregate implications of microeconomic evidence. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81(2), 237-249.
- Morris, M. H. (2001). *Entrepreneurial intensity: Sustainable advantages for individuals, organizations and societies*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Mwangi, E. N., & Wekesa, S. (2017). Influence of economic factors on organizational performance of airlines: A case study Kenya airways ltd. *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 22(5), 8-14.
- Naffziger, D. W., Hornsby J. S., & Kuratko, D. F. (1994). A proposed research model of entrepreneurial motivation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18, 29-42.
- Phan, P. H., Wright, M., Ucbasaran, D., & Tan, W. (2009). Corporate entrepreneurship: Current research and future directions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24, 197–205.
- Pinchot, G. (1985). *Intrapreneuring: Why you don't have to leave the company to become an entrepreneur*. New York Harper and Row.
- Rachlin H, J. (2009). Social discounting and delay discounting. *Journal of behavioral decision making*, 21(1), 29-43.
- Raghunathan, R. (1992). All negative moods are not equal: Motivational influences of anxiety and sadness on decision making. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 79(1), 56–77.
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Vohra, N. (2011). *Organizational behavior* (14th ed.). Pearson, education, inc., Publishing as Prentice Hall.
- Robert, J. G. (2012). Is U.S. economic growth over? Faltering innovation confronts the six headwinds. NBER working paper series
- Robert, K. Y. (2011). The case study. *Sage publications*
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous technological change: The problem of development. A conference of the institute for the study of free enterprise systems. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 2-6.
- Ryan, J. C., & Tipu, S. A. (2013). Leadership effects on innovation propensity: A two-factor full range leadership model. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 2116–2129.
- Sathe, V. (1985). Managing an entrepreneurial dilemma: Nurturing entrepreneurship and control in large corporations. *Frontiers of Research*, 636-657.
- Sharma, S., & Rai, A. (2003). An assessment of the relationship between ISD leadership characteristics and IS innovation adoption in organizations. *Information & Management*, 40(5), 391–401.

- Smith, W. K., & Tushman, M. L. (2005). Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams. *Organization Science*, 16, 522–536.
- Spearman, C. (1910). Correlation calculated from faulty data. *British Journal of Psychology*, 3, 271-195.
- Vande Ven, A. H. (1993). The development of an infrastructure for entrepreneurship, 2-8.
- Wehrich, H., Cannice, M., & Koontz, H. (2011). *Management: A global and entrepreneurial perspective* (13th ed.). New Delhi.Tata, McGraw-Hill, Education private limited.
- Western, B., & Healy, K. (1999). Explaining the OECD wage slowly down. Recession or labor decline. *European Sociological Review*, 15, 223-249.
- Wiklund J. (1999). The sustainability of the entrepreneurial orientation performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 24, 37-48.
- Yadin, D. (2002). *The international dictionary of marketing: Over 2000 professional terms and techniques*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Young, Y., & Jordan, E. (2008). Top management support: Mantra or necessity? *International Journal of Project Management*, 3-8.
- Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10(1), 43-58.
- Zahra, S. A., Nielsen, A. P., & Bogner, W. C. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge, and competence development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 169–189.
- Zahra, S., & Garvis. D. (2000). International corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: The moderating effect of international environmental hostility. *Journal Of Business Venturing*, 15(5,6), 469.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.
- Zahra, S. A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(4), 319-340.
- Zampetakis, L. A., & Moustakis, V. S. (2010). An exploratory research on the factors stimulating corporate entrepreneurship in the Greek public sector. *International Journal of Manpower*, 31(8), 871-887.
- Zehir, C., Müceldili, B., Zehir, S., & Ertosun, Ö. G. (2012). The mediating role of firm innovativeness on management leadership and performance relationship: The first international conference on leadership, technology and innovation management. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 41, 29–36.
- Zohoori, M., Mohammad, H. A., Gholamreza Younesi, G. Y., & Sardroudi, H. J. (2014). Leading innovation through knowledge sharing and HRM practices. *International Journal of Science and Engineering Applications*, 6(8), 4-8.
- Zoohori, M., Ghan, Ghani, A., & Zakeri, H. (2016). Relationship between organizational factors and corporate entrepreneurship. A study of Iranian small and medium enterprises. *International Journal of Science and Engineering Application*, 5(10), 454-459.