
The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation, Organizational Learning Capability, and Firm Innovation

ความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคุณลักษณะการเป็นผู้ประกอบการ ความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กรและนวัตกรรมของบริษัท

Ploychompoo Kittikunchotiwut

พลอยชมพู กิตติกุลโชติวุฒิ

Maharakham Business School, Maharakham University

Ploychompoo.k@acc.msu.ac.th

Abstract

This research aims to examine the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation on organizational learning capability. The relationship between organizational learning capability on firm innovation was analyzed. The data were collected by using a questionnaire from 348 small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand. The hypothesized relationships among variables are examined by using ordinary least square (OLS) regression analysis. The results indicate that entrepreneurial orientation support has a significant positive impact on organizational learning capability. The findings further demonstrated that there was a relationship between organizational learning capability on firm innovation.

Keywords: entrepreneurial orientation, organizational learning capability, firm innovation

บทคัดย่อ

การวิจัยครั้งนี้มีวัตถุประสงค์เพื่อตรวจสอบความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างคุณลักษณะการเป็นผู้ประกอบการกับความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กร และตรวจสอบความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กรกับนวัตกรรมของบริษัท ในการศึกษาครั้งนี้เก็บรวบรวมข้อมูลโดยใช้แบบสอบถามจากธุรกิจขนาดกลางและขนาดย่อมในประเทศไทยจำนวน 348 คน ความสัมพันธ์ของตัวแปรที่ตั้งสมมติฐานจะถูกตรวจสอบโดยใช้การวิเคราะห์ถดถอยที่ใช้วิธีกำลังสองน้อยสุด (OLS) ผลการวิจัยพบว่าคุณลักษณะการเป็นผู้ประกอบการกับความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กรมีผลกระทบเชิงบวก ผลการวิจัยแสดงให้เห็นว่ามีความสัมพันธ์ระหว่างความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กรและนวัตกรรมของบริษัท

คำสำคัญ: คุณลักษณะการเป็นผู้ประกอบการ, ความสามารถในการเรียนรู้ขององค์กร, นวัตกรรมของบริษัท

Introduction

Extended organizational literature research suggests that companies achieve significant strategic advantages concluded entrepreneurial orientation (EO) (Anderson, Covin, & Slevin, 2009; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). Entrepreneurship orientation (EO) is a considered position that supports business procedures and attitudes (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Although entrepreneurial orientation (EO) devised consistently been associated with higher rates of firm quality (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2001), less research has remained conducted into how entrepreneurial orientation (EO) funds to reasonable achievement. For instance, business orientation could be a main factor of a company's level of administrative training (Wang, 2008).

Moreover, Hughes and Morgan propose that the two main experiments fronting entrepreneurial firms are how to develop their knowledge disreputable and how to maximize the benefits of their business orientation (EO). Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) is a company-level concept well-defined as the tendency of the top management of a company to revenue considered risks, be innovative and determine calculated proactivity (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983).

Therefore, it is a mental make that reproduces the purposes and proclivities of the main players of the organization towards business responsibilities and performances (Krauss, Frese, Friedrich, & Unger, 2005). As associates of the higher level of a company, the entrepreneurial orientation (EO) of top management influences the strategic choices of the company in founding the principles and business performs of the organization associated to learning, conclusion and abusing new chances (Covin & Miles, 1999; Hambrick & Mason, 1984).

In this situation, concern in both entrepreneurial orientation (EO) and organizational training has grown done the past two periods, as equally offer potential conducts to discourse the need for continuous motivation and management of strategic alteration in command to gain reasonable improvement (Covin & Slevin 1989) confirm survival and produce increased performance (Covin & Slevin 1989; Wiklund & Shepherd 2005). Following substantial advancement in both grounds of research, attention has remained drained to the possibility for interconnections between the two theories that would increase the efficiency of separately (Deakins, 1999). Their research funds to this growing field of attention by adopting a multi-level viewpoint on organizational learning capacity towards investigate how the small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand learns and the role that entrepreneurial orientation theaters in how they acquire.

In addition, it is likewise significant to pay consideration to the organizational effects on innovation. While several of these factors have been studied, academics are giving increasing attention to the opportunity that organizational learning's collective ability theaters a main role in defining creativity (Senge, 1990; Senge, Roberts, Ross, Smith, & Kleiner, 1994; Tushman & Nadler, 1986). In fact, Organizational learning was well-defined as a shared capacity founded on experiential and intellectual processes linking knowledge acquisition, knowledge sharing, and then use of knowledge (DiBella, Nevis, & Gould, 1996; Organizational training, creativity and success are linked to each other positively.

Nevertheless, there is still insufficient work that concurrently explores the interrelationships between the three definitions. Earlier readings regularly effort on the company's innovativeness, i.e., the grade to which the administrative nation encourages and provisions innovation (Keskin, 2006; Lee & Tsai, 2005) or evaluate just one form of innovation, namely product innovation (Salavou & Lioukas, 2003). Earlier examination, however, offers only a fractional description of the technology trend.

Likewise, for evaluating this term, most organizational training studies take a cultural perspective. Very few studies examine the mechanism of organizational learning (Darroch & McNaughton, 2002) Since cultural values are harder to change than specific actions, it may be more effective for professionals to concentrate on the process. This research efforts to report the shortcomings of the previous literature and analyzes together in an only model the relationships between entrepreneurial orientation, organizational learning ability, and innovation performance.

Therefore, this research will explore whether and to what extent, the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation on organizational learning capability. Meanwhile, the relationship between organizational learning capability on firm innovation. The article begins with a summary of these topics in the literature and an overview of the ideas for the model. The present study aims to fulfil two objectives: 1) To analyze the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation on organizational learning capability. 2) To analyze the relationship between organizational learning capability on firm innovation.

Literature Review

The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Innovation

Entrepreneurial orientation mostly contains of three key dimensions: creativity, proactivity, and risk-taking (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983). Entrepreneurial orientation container be intellectualized as a range that varies from a conventional stance to an ambitious stance (Covin & Slevin, 1989). For example the cumulative rate of take-up of a company's innovativeness, proactivity, and risk increases, so prepares the complete near of business orientation. Innovativeness implies a firm's durable guarantee to promoting new product contributions (Zahra, 1993). Since all three promote organizational regeneration and stability (Covin & Slevin 1991; Miller 1983), a significant factor in firms ' existence is entrepreneurial orientation.

While, Miller, (1983) proposes that the unit of entrepreneurship of a company is the grade to which it renews, performances proactively, and takes risks. The conceptualization of Entrepreneurial orientation has stayed the subject of lively conversation (Covin, Green, & Slevin 2006; Lumpkin & Dess 1996; Lyon, Lumpkin, & Dess, 2000) and additional dimensions of the construction take appeared (Wang, 2008). (Lumpkin & Dess ,1996) aimed at example, propose that proactivity and aggressiveness are distinct dimensions, although they are carefully linked. Because a wide-ranging theoretical examination is beyond the scope of this reading, we assume the three extensively accepted

dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation proposed by (Miller, 1983) innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactivity and thus intellectualize entrepreneurial orientation.

Moreover, Proactivity is an opportunity-seeking viewpoint involving strategic moves ahead of competing firms to predict future demand (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). Proactivity refers to a forward-looking attitude and the possibility of introducing new goods and innovations to change the environment (Covin & Slevin, 1989). Proactive firms can therefore performance in expectation of future challenges and opportunities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Likewise, Risk-taking refers to the unit of willingness of businesses to kind significant asset investments through a fair casual of disaster and unpredictable results (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Miller & Friesen, 1978). Although these three dimensions could provide different offerings to the strategic approach of a company (Kreiser, Marino, & Weaver, 2002; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996), all three extents are often observed as mutually reflecting the overall level of entrepreneurial orientation of a business (Covin & Slevin; Covin & Wales, 2010).

In addition, Innovativeness can be viewed as "the propensity of an organization to pursue and promote new concepts, innovation, creativity, and innovative processes that can lead to new goods, services, or technical processes" (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Creative companies are the ones that continuously show creative behavior over time. Inexpensive aggressiveness raises to the tendency of a business to challenge its competitors aggressively and vigorously to gain entry or role change, that is, to overtake business rivals in the industry (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Moreover, Entrepreneurial orientation is seen as a dynamic capacity enabling administrations to continually rewrite the organization done the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on organizational learning heights. Dynamic capabilities are firm-specific capabilities that enable administrations to reconfigure present incomes and practices Zahra, Sapienza & Davidsson, 2002).

The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Organizational Learning Capability

Most companies are struggling to thrive and remain competitive in this rapid change in economic instability and uncertainty. Organizational learning potential was considered one of the key ways to preserve long-term organizational performance in order to develop and execute (Senge, 1990). Past organizational training conceptualizations used a wide range of analytical lenses to determine the existence and/or implications of the knowledge procedure. For instance, the literature on exploratory learning and unequal learning attentions principally on whether prevailing (mistreatment) or innovative (exploration) knowledge is improved as a straight result. The reproductive and adaptive knowledge literature (Senge, 1995; Slater & Narver, 1995) takings interested in consideration whether organizational learning outcomes in incremental transformation (adaptive learning) or radical modification (generative learning) towards the current knowledge immoral of the business. The fiction happening absorption capacity (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Zahra & George, 2002) focuses primarily scheduled whether the

organization remains capable of gaining and assimilating new information (potential absorption ability) efficiently or converting and leveraging this knowledge internally (realized absorption capacity).

Moreover, acquisition of information, which is the method used by the organization to acquire new information and knowledge. Covetous learning occurs after a corporation obtains pre-existing information that occurs separate its boundaries, though experimental learning happens inside when new knowledge that is separate from that specific organization is generated (Yang, Narayanan, & Zahra, 2009; Zahra, Nielsen et al., 1999). Generous learning benefits mainly after knowledge-based resource acquisition and creative learning primarily from knowledge-based resource incorporation besides/or exploitation. Although advanced training is a competitively useful result that companies can use to additional improve their essential skills (Yang et al., 2009), knowledge-based acquisition also precedes the company's ability to incorporate besides/or leverage these assets (Nahapiet & Ghoshal, 1998; Zahra, Nielsen et al., 1999) acquisitive and experimental learning model incorporates most of the aspects contained in previous learning conceptualizations.

Moreover, many trainings demonstration a positive correlation between administrative training and firm results. Baker and Sinkula (1994), for example, found that training orientation has a through outcome on the quality of the organization. Similar results have been found in other studies, which likewise usage a cultural learning degree (Keskin, 2006; Ussahawanitchakit, 2008, Bontis et al., 2002) also provide suggestion of a positive relationship between organizational training and efficiency, but they focus on learning stocks at three levels: person, team, and organization. Also, demonstrate that the five steps they identify inside the organizational learning procedure (acquisition of data, dissemination of information, collective understanding, declarative memory and procedural memory) have a positive consequence on firm performance. (Darroch & McNaughton, 2003) offer signal that better performance is generated throughout the cycle of organizational training. Eventually, (Zheng et al., 2010) initiate that information management show business a mediating role in the affiliation between the community, structure, policy, and usefulness of the organization.

Research Methodology

Sample Selection and Data Collection Procedure

This study examines the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and organizational learning capability. Organizational learning capability has a relationship on firm innovation. Hence, this education selected small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand as the sample. The population was obtained from a list database of small and medium- sized enterprises ((SMEs) in Thailand, 2020: Online). A mail investigation process through questionnaire was used for data collection. The key participants in this study were executives or managers. With regard to the questionnaire mailing, 14 surveys were undeliverable because some firms were no longer in business or had moved to unknown locations. Deducting the undeliverable from the original 984 mailed, the valid mailing was 970 surveys, from which 350 responses were received. Of the surveys completed and

returned, only 348 were usable. The effective response rate was approximately 35.87 %. Rendering to Aaker, Kumar and Day (2001), the response rate for a mail survey, without an appropriate follow-up procedure, and greater than 20%, is considered acceptable.

Furthermore, a non-response bias test was performed by comparing early and late responses. Characteristics of the firms comprise industry types, amount of capital funding, time in business, number of employees, and key informants who self-reported all constructs (Armstrong & Overton, 1977). As for non-response bias, t-test statistical tests were performed and; the results exhibited no significant differences. Therefore, a non-response bias is of no concern in this data.

Methods

In this study, factor analysis is used to study the construct validity of several constructs in the conceptual model that has been developed as scales. Factor analysis was used to assess the basis of a large number of items and to determine whether they could be reduced to a smaller set of factors. All factor loadings are higher than the rule-of-thumb 0.40 cut-off and are statistically significant (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994). Moreover, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was used to evaluate the measurement of reliability. In the scale, Cronbach's alpha coefficients are higher than 0.70 (Nunnally & Berstein, 1994). Therefore, scales of all measures are shown to result in consistency. So, these measures are considered appropriate for further analysis because they show that validity and reliability that have been recognized in this study. The result shows factor loadings and the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for multiple item scales used in this study in presents all variables that have factor loading scores as between 0.731 – 0.902. Additionally, Cronbach's alpha for all variables are shown between 0.817 – 0.887. Therefore, all constructs of the validity and reliability of measurement can be applied for further analysis.

The ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analysis is used to test and examine the hypothesized relationships between dependent and independent variables of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand. Then, the aforementioned variables play significant roles in explaining the research relationships. Because all dependent variable, independent variables, and the control variables in this study were neither nominal data nor categorical data, OLS is deemed an appropriate method for examining the hypothesized relationships (Aulakh, Kotabe & Teegen, 2000).

Research Results

Table 1 presents the results of OLS regression analysis of the relationships between entrepreneurial orientation and organizational learning capability support is significant ($\beta = 0.818$, $p < 0.01$), thus, Hypothesis 1 is supported.

Table 1: Results of Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
	Organizational Learning Capability (OL)
Constant	0.640*** (0.156)
Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO)	0.818*** (0.034)
Firm Age (FA)	-0.002 (0.023)
Firm Size (FS)	0.038 (0.019)
Adjusted R ²	0.636

***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10, ^a Bata coefficients with standard errors in parenthesis

Table 2 presents the results of OLS regression analysis of the relationships between organizational learning capability and firm innovation support is significant ($\beta = 0.883$, $p < 0.01$)

Table 2: Results of Regression Analysis

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables
	Firm Innovation (FI)
Constant	0.487*** (0.145)
Organizational Learning Capability (OL)	0.883*** (0.032)
Firm Age (FA)	-0.014 (0.022)
Firm Size (FS)	0.002 (0.018)
Adjusted R ²	0.692

***p < 0.01, **p < 0.05, *p < 0.10, ^a Bata coefficients with standard errors in parenthesis

Discussion

In addition, the findings show that entrepreneurial orientation involved creativity, proactivity, risk taking which can impact organizational learning capability. This enables new knowledge to be gained, transformed, and used to promote organizational innovation. In fact, there are two implications

of these findings. First, entrepreneurial orientation contributes organizational learning capability. Secondly, the findings show that organizational learning capability to firm innovation.

Significantly, the results found in this study confirm the principal point of entrepreneurial orientation's contribution towards organizational learning capability (Bhatt, 2001). As exposed by (Choi et al., 2010) organizational learning capability kinds firm innovation extra dynamic and applicable to the formation of firm values. Similarly, studies by (Chen and Huang, 2009; Shujahat et al., 2017) support the character of organizational learning capability the link between firm innovations. Likewise, the findings found in this study correlates through the results of Lai et al., (2014) which create that organizational learning capability influences firm innovation. Similarly, the results likewise funding the aforementioned revisions signifying that organizational learning capability is a fundamental success factor for the development of new products and a main initiator of innovation. (Hamdoun et al., 2018; Mardani et al., 2018).

Also, results are reliable with earlier studies which claim that when knowledge is achieved successfully, it increases a firm's inventive capability and attractiveness (Donate & Guadamillas, 2011; Donate & Pablo, 2015). While a previous study by Wang & Wang (2012) emphasize the character of knowledge sharing in firm innovation, their learning has revealed that knowledge sharing is further applicable to firm performance innovation.

Practical Implications

Nearly practical implications container be resulting from this study. The relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and organizational learning capability provides a guide on how small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs) in emerging countries can improve firm innovation. The changed performs propose specific performs that the manager container attention on. The scholarship has exposed that firms that put on explicit and tacit knowledge canister recover their innovation effectiveness. Future research canister emphasis on specific entrepreneurial orientation and how they influence firm innovation. In place of instance, this study has found that potential absorption ability and realized absorption capacity further practices can enable innovation. Future research container, therefore, emphasis on precise performs of organizational learning capability and how the instruments work in preparation.

Limitations and Future research

First, the results of the study are derived since self-reported data. This can contribute to possible variations in specific methods. Second, the methodology charity in this analysis is cross-sectional and does not reflect the long-term efficiency of the mechanisms explored in this research. Third, this research focused on only three approaches to entrepreneurship; innovation, proactivity, risk-taking. Many aspects of entrepreneurial orientation have not remained explored and canister be equally useful in describing firm innovation in small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs). Other

researchers should look at the impact of certain entrepreneurial orientation on firm innovation and company results across various industries as a recommendation for future study. Despite these limitations, this research presented concrete empirical evidence to demonstrate the correlations between entrepreneurial orientation, interpersonal thinking skills, firm creativity, and firm performance in the small and medium- sized enterprises (SMEs).

References

- Aaker, David A., Kumar, V. and Day, George S. (2001). *Marketing Research*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Anderson, B., Covin, J., & Slevin, D. (2009). Understanding the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and strategic learning capability: An empirical investigation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 3(3), 218–240.
- Armstrong, J.S. and Overton, T.S. (1977). Estimating Non-response Bias in Mail Surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14(3), 396.
- Aulakh, Kotabe & Teegeen, (2000). Export Strategies and Performance of Firms from Emerging Economies: Evidence from Brazil, Chile, and Mexico, *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (3), 342–361.
- Bhatt, G. D. (2001). Knowledge management in organizations: Examining the interaction between technologies, techniques, and people. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5(1), 68–75.
- Bontis, N., Crossan, M.M., Hulland, J. (2002). Managing an organizational learning system by aligning stocks and flows, *Journal of Management Studies*, 39 (4), 437-469.
- Chen, C.-J., & Huang, J.-W. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance -The mediating role of knowledge management capacity. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(1), 104-114.
- Choi, Law, Chien, Link, and Wong, (2010). In vivo development of dendritic orientation in wild-type and mislocalized retinal ganglion cells. *Neural Development*, 5(1), 29.
- Cohen, W.& Levinthal, D. (1990). Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(1), 128–152.
- Covin, J. & Wales, W. (2010). The measurement of entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 677-702.
- Covin, J. G. & D. P. Slevin (1991). A Conceptual Model of Entrepreneurship as Firm Behavior. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 16(1), 7-26.
- Covin, J. G., K. M. Green, & D. P. Slevin (2006). Strategic process effects on the entrepreneurial orientation-sales growth rate relationship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 30(1), 57-81.
- Covin, J.G. & Miles, M.P. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 47- 63.
- Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.
- Darroch J, McNaughton R. (2002). Examining the link between knowledge management practices and types of innovation. *Journal Intellectual Capital*, 3(3), 210-222.

- Darroch, J. (2003). Developing a measure of knowledge management behaviors and practices. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(5), 41-54.
- Deakins, D. (1999). *Entrepreneurship and Small Firms*, 2nd ed. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Dibella, A. J., Nevis, E. C., & Gould, J. M. (1996). Understanding organizational learning capability. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33(3), 361–379.
- Donate, M. J., & Guadamillas, F. (2011). Organizational factors to support knowledge management and innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 15(6), 890-914.
- Donate, M., & Pablo, J. S. (2015). The role of knowledge-oriented leadership in knowledge management practices and innovation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(2), 360-370.
- Hambrick, D.C. & Mason, P.A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193-206.
- Hamdoun, M., Chiappetta Jabbour, C. J., & Ben Othman, H. (2018). Knowledge transfer and organizational innovation: Impacts of quality and environmental management. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 193, 759-770.
- Keskin, H., (2006). Market orientation, learning orientation, and innovation capabilities in SMEs: an extended model. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 9 (4), 396–417.
- Krauss, S.I., Frese, M., Friedrich, C., & Unger, J.M. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation: A psychological model of success among southern African small business owners. *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, 14 (3), 315-344.
- Kreiser, P.M., Marino, L., & Weaver, K.M. (2002). Assessing the psychometric properties of the entrepreneurial orientation scale: A multi-country analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 71-94.
- Lai, Y.-L., Hsu, M.-S., Lin, F.-J., Chen, Y.-M., & Lin, Y.-H. (2014). The effects of industry cluster knowledge management on innovation performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 734-739.
- Lee TS, Tsai HJ. (2005). The effects of business operation mode on market orientation, learning orientation and innovativeness. *Industrial Management and Data System*, 105(3), 325-348.
- Lumpkin, G. T., and G. G. Dess. (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), 429-452.
- Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Lyon, D. W., G. T. Lumpkin, and G. G. Dess. (2000). Enhancing Entrepreneurial Orientation Research: Operationalizing and Measuring a Key Strategic Decision Making Process. *Journal of Management*, 26(5), 1055-1085.
- Mardani, A., Nikoosokhan, S., Moradi, M., & Doustar, M. (2018). The relationship between knowledge management and innovation performance. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 29 (1), 12–26.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770-791.
- Miller, D., and P. Friesen (1978). Archetypes of Strategy Formulation. *Management Science*, 24(9), 921-933.
- Nahapiet, J. & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(2), 242–266.

- Nunnally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.H. (1994). The Assessment of Reliability. *Psychometric Theory*, (3), 248-292.
- Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 761-787.
- Salavou H, Lioukas S. (2003). Radical product innovations in SMEs: the dominance of entrepreneurial orientation. *Creativity Innovation Management*, 12(2), 94-108.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. *Human Resource Management*, 29(3), 343-348.
- Senge, P.M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R.B. & Smith, B.J. (1994). The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook. Doubleday, New York, 5.
- Shujahat, M., Sousa, M. J., Hussain, S., Nawaz, F., Wang, M., & Umer, M. (2017). Translating the impact of knowledge management processes into knowledge-based innovation: The neglected and mediating role of knowledge-worker productivity. *Journal of Business Research*, 94, 442-450.
- Sinkula, J. (1994). Market information processing and organizational learning. *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1), 35-45.
- Slater, S. & Narver, J. (1995). Market orientation and the learning orientation. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3), 63-74.
- Small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). (2020). Retrieved January 16, 2020, from www.sme.go.th/th/.
- Tushman ML, Nadler DA. (1986). Organizing for innovation. *California Management Review*, 28(3), 74-92.
- Ussahawanitchakit, P., (2008). Impacts of organizational learning on innovation orientation and firm efficiency: an empirical assessment of accounting firms in Thailand. *International Journal of Business Research*, 8 (4), 1-12.
- Wang, C. L. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 32(4), 635-657.
- Wang, Z., & Wang, N. (2012). Knowledge sharing, innovation and firm performance. *Expert Systems With Applications*, 39(10), 8899-8908. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.02.017>
- Wiklund, J. & Shepherd, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 20(1), 71-91.
- Yang, Y., Narayanan, V., & Zahra, S. (2009). Developing the selection and valuation capabilities through learning: The case of corporate venture capital. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3), 261-273.
- Zahra, S.A. & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: A review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185-203.
- Zahra, S.A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(4), 319-340.
- Zahra, S.A., Nielsen, A.P., & Bogner, W.C. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge, and competence development. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 169-189.
- Zheng Wei, Yang Baiyin, McLean Gary N. (2010). Linking organizational culture, structure, strategy, and organizational effectiveness: mediating role of knowledge management. *Journal Business Research*, 63(7), 763-771.