



## EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCE AND INDIVIDUAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP ORIENTATION

Wei-Che Hsu

Department of Business Administration, National Yunlin University of Science and  
Technology, Yunlin 64002, Taiwan

Yung-Shuan Chen\*

School of Economics and Management, Dongguan University of Technology,  
Dongguan 523808, China

\*Corresponding author: [yung-shaun@qq.com](mailto:yung-shaun@qq.com)

Jui-Tu Liu

Department of Business Administration, National Yunlin University of Science and  
Technology, Yunlin 64002, Taiwan

### Abstract

The main objective of this study is to determine the link between branch performance, environment and resource capability, and how a manager's entrepreneurial orientation having the moderating effect within the model. The results show that environmental munificence has a positive effect on the number of customers of firms while the environmental hostility has a negative effect on firms' earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT), managers' competence and marketing resources have positive effect on their EBIT and the number of visitors, and that innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness of individual entrepreneurial orientation having the moderating effect within the model. The conclusions contain: 1. the individual entrepreneurial orientation of managers can greatly influence the relationship between operation environment and operating performance; 2. the individual entrepreneurial orientation of managers can exert effective influence on the relationship between enterprises' resource capability and operating performance.

Keywords: Environment, Resource Capability, IEO, Performance

### Introduction

Operation environment and resource capability are two critical factors for the survival of an enterprise.

However, current research reveals that the relationship between corporate performance, operation environment and resource capability depends on various contingency factors (Caccio-

latti & Lee, 2016; Devezer, Sprott, Spangenberg, & Czellar, 2014). For example, an unstable environment can have a negative influence on corporate performance. However, some enterprises are still willing to take risks in allocating more resources and adopting new technologies. Because of their appropriate positioning strategies at the tough time, these corporations were able to achieve better performance (Li, Zhao, Tan, & Liu, 2008; Wales, Monsen, & McKelvie, 2011). In recent years, how to start a new business has become the topic of research as start-ups are important driving factors for economic growth (Canina, Palacios, & Devece, 2012). Entrepreneurial orientation is regarded as a sign of enterprise development and performance improvement (Fellnhöfer, Puumalainen, & Sjögrén, 2017; Wales et al., 2011). But individual entrepreneurial orientation attracts much more attention in research and in practice (Ferreira, Marques, Bento, Ferreira, & Jalali, 2015).

Entrepreneurial orientation is an enterprise's strategic posture for its sustainable operation (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011). Previous studies focused on organizational characteristics that can adequately reflect entrepreneurship, including corporate culture, system, scale, industrial type, and coverage (Eshima & Anderson, 2017; Kuratko, Hornsby, & Covin, 2014). They overlooked the managers' right to decide on corporate policy, structure, and culture, as well as how to take advantage of the opportunities. In any industry or organization, managers play a crucial role in formulating the business policy for the future and enterprise performance reflects their decision-making style. This explains why prior studies explored the relationship

between managers' individual traits and organizational performance (Blackburn, Hart, & Wainwright, 2013).

Under the supervision of the ownership structure, the managers will make a decision to benefit the interests of the enterprises (Han, Guo, & Yuan, 2017). Senior managers are expected to have the strategic intention to help the enterprises where they serve with their entrepreneurial activity so that these enterprises can stand out in a hostile and complex environment (Ireland, Covin, & Kuratko, 2009). By doing so, managers can improve the internal environment of entrepreneurial activity of the organization where they belong (Kuratko et al., 2014). On the contrary, once a manager causes a negative event, it will have a serious impact on the enterprise (Xie & Wang, 2017). Previous studies explored the entrepreneurial orientation at both individual and firm levels, only taking entrepreneurs as independent owners (De Clercq, Dimov, & Thongpapanl, 2010; Huang & Wang, 2011). However, business operations will not thrive without efforts from an individual manager (Ferreira et al., 2015). For this reason, this study focuses on the entrepreneurial orientation of individual managers.

It has been shown that an enterprise's entrepreneurial orientation can effectively moderate the relationship between the environment and corporate performance, resource and corporate performance (Chirico, Sirmon, Sciascia, & Mazzola, 2011). As middle managers often play a key role in the entrepreneurial success of a company (Hornsby, Kuratko, & Zahra, 2002) our understanding of entrepreneurship can be strengthened if we are aware of the

intrinsic factors that influence managers' entrepreneurial activity. Managers' innovation and entrepreneurship can affect the relationship between corporate strategic positioning and the market, as well as how to allocate resources and improve the corporate performance. In general, managers of enterprises with better operating performance are more willing to try new technologies or methods, always on the lookout for new market opportunities, and take risks (Covin & Slevin, 1989, 1991).

The aim of this study is to explore how the individual entrepreneurial orientation of managers moderates the relationship of the operation environment-corporate performance, and the relationship of the resource capability-corporate performance. This study focuses on the individual entrepreneurial orientation of managers from retail chains. This study considers the environmental factors, their resource capability, innovation, risk-taking attitude, and proactiveness characteristics.

#### Literature Review and Hypotheses

Previous empirical studies do not show the exact relationship between the environment and corporate performance (Chong & Chong, 1997). Some held that the environment has a negative influence on organizational performance (Wales et al., 2011), while others claimed that a stable, simple, and benign environment is good for firms. Still, some believed that the environment can significantly enhance the organizational performance if firms adopt a prudent responding strategy (G Thomas Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). However, other studies also pointed out that the environment did not have any significant influence on corporate performance (Osborn & Hunt, 1974).

Based on the above-mentioned inference, this study proposed hypotheses 1.

H1: Environment has an effect on the corporate performance.

H1a: Environmental munificence has a positive effect on the corporate performance.

H1b: Environmental hostility has a negative effect on the corporate performance.

As resource-based views put it, efficient resource allocation and proper application of capability can give a company a competitive advantage and improve its performance (Davicik & Sharma, 2016). Improving corporate performance has always been the goal of managers. It can be measured through the exploitation of resources by using the least resource to gain the most output and the largest profit. It is clear that corporate performance, apart from being affected by the operational environment, depends on the core competencies cultivated by corporate resources. Based on the above-mentioned inference, this study proposed hypotheses 2:

H2: Resource capability has an effect on corporate performance.

H2a: Management capability has a positive effect on corporate performance.

H2b: Marketing resource has a positive effect on corporate performance.

Many scholars explored the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and organizational performance. They found that entrepreneurial orientation had a positive influence on corporate performance for the most part (Covin & Slevin, 1991). For example, firms with high innovativeness often contribute more to the economic

performance by creating or introducing new products and technology. In contrast to their rivals, proactive firms tend to step into the profitable market earlier and can predict new market demands, new products or technology (Wiklund, 1999). In addition, as time progresses, firms with great entrepreneurial orientation will frequently conduct entrepreneurial activities that greatly influence corporate performance (Zahra & Covin, 1995). Firms with entrepreneurial orientation are willing to adopt innovation and tolerate changes. Because entrepreneurial orientation has a positive influence on corporate performance, it is an important strategic resource for firms to sustain their competitive advantage (G Tom Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

Many empirical studies have proved the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on organizational performance, holding that both external environmental and internal organizational elements would affect the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and organizational performance (Covin & Slevin, 1991; G Tom Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). But these studies did not explore how firms can affect the environment which also influences their performance or take advantage of the existing resources and capabilities. This shows that it is difficult to fully understand the importance of improving firms' entrepreneurial orientation. For example, if the environment consists of threatening factors that may affect the organizational development, firms with entrepreneurial orientation know how to adopt viable strategies to reduce uncertain and unfavorable effects. The entrepreneurial orientation presented in the pursuit of opportunity can be a driving force for firms' expansion, technological advancement,

and better performance (Li et al., 2008; Wales et al., 2011). Individual entrepreneurial orientation embodies capability of managers to solve problems and respond to the environmental changes. Therefore, the individual entrepreneurial orientation of the manager is the key to creating an environment for innovation and entrepreneurship, thus, encouraging firms to engage in entrepreneurial activity (Blackburn et al., 2013; Ferreira et al., 2015). Based on the aforementioned inference, this study put forward hypotheses 3 and 4:

H3: Individual entrepreneurial orientation can enhance the positive effect of the favorable environment on corporate performance. (IEO as nutriment)

H4: Individual entrepreneurial orientation can mitigate the negative effect of the unfavorable environment on corporate performance. (IEO as medicines)

Empirical studies attached too much importance on the link between resource allocation and performance but paid less attention on how managers effectively used resources (Helfat, 2000). Managers can make good use of firms' resource base to cope with opportunities and environmental changes (Cockburn, Henderson, & Stern, 2000). The entrepreneurial orientation of firms prompts them to take actions based on the early signals of the internal and external environment. This helps them stay ahead of the competition (G Tom Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). According to resource-based view, entrepreneurial orientation represents how firms organize resources to discover and use the opportunity in order to improve the relationship between resources and performance (Barney,

1995).

EO captures the entrepreneurship of an organization and can enhance other corporate resources. A firm well-endowed with these resources will perform even better if it has an EO, i.e., the methods, practices, and managers with a decision-making style that promotes a willingness to capitalize on its knowledge-based resources by engaging in entrepreneurial activities (Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003). Based on the aforementioned inference, this study put forward hypothesis 5:

H5: Individual entrepreneurial orientation can enhance the positive effect of the favorable resource capability on corporate performance. (IEO as nutriment)

#### Materials and Methods

Based on the sample survey methods of Hansen et al. (1953), this study took 183 divisions in 63 branches of Carrefour Taiwan as subjects. And then this study distributed 183 questionnaires with the help from auditing managers of the Taiwan Organization Project (TOP) in northern and southern Taipei, as well as central and south of Taiwan to collect annual data of each division on operation and performance in 2014.

In terms of environment variables, this study uses the per capita consumption in the location of branches to measure the Environmental Munificence, which indicates the availability and munificence of resources in that region, and measure the Environmental Hostility with the local rent for the branches. The rent is comparatively high in the region with tough competition, intense operating pressure, and high risk (Dess & Beard, 1984). In terms of resource capability variables,

this study uses the stock of commodities in branches to assess Management Competence of managers. Overstock means lack of management competence. In addition, this study evaluates the Marketing Resource a branch manager has based on the marketing expenses of the branch which covered by the marketing budget that varies for each branch (Morgan, Vorhies, & Mason, 2009).

Three widely adopted dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation were applied in this study as a measurement tool. They include innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness (Covin & Slevin, 1989). Innovativeness refers to a manager's willingness to adopt new ways of doing things and introduce new concepts into a company. Risk-taking refers to a manager's tendency to take actions, such as investing and entering unknown markets and put resources into undefined new business and activity. Proactiveness refers to a manager's tendency to seek opportunities, forecast future demands and introduce new products or services ahead of competitors (Covin & Slevin, 1989, 1991; G Thomas Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). All items in the questionnaire that are rating scale variables were measured by a seven-point Likert scale where one point indicates strongly disagree and seven points mean strongly agree. The questionnaire items on the three dimensions of individual entrepreneurial orientation are shown in Table 1.

Because operating performance mainly includes subjective, objective, financial and non-financial performances (Rudd, Greenley, Beatson, & Lings, 2008), this study used earnings before interest and tax (EBIT) of each branch to measure its objective and

Table 1. The Questionnaire Items Of Three Dimensions Of IEO

Measurement dimensions	Serial number	Content of items
Innovativeness (IN)	IN1	I like to try new ways of doing things and look for special solutions
	IN2	I often introduce new ideas and practice to my company
	IN3	While learning something new, I tend to use my own special method rather than follow others
Risk-taking (RIS)	RIS1	I prefer high-risk cases
	RIS2	Under uncertainty, I tend to make immediate decision rather than to wait until things become clear
	RIS3	Considering environmental characteristics, I think audacity and large-scale activity are helpful for enterprise goal
Proactiveness (PR)	PR1	I keep an eye on customer demands
	PR2	I often seek for new market opportunity
	PR3	I observe environmental trend any time and immediately take action if necessary

financial performance and adopted the number of visitors to measure the subjective and non-financial performance that reflect the business condition of each branch.

#### Results

In Table 2, the Cronbach  $\alpha$  values of innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness are all between 0.408 and 0.595, the basic standard to con-

struct reliability and validity. This means there is an internal consistency between the measurement items of the same variable and there is a composite reliability between measured variables and potential factors. In addition, as the factor loadings of each variable are all greater than 0.5, there is convergent validity in measured items (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Table 2. Factor Analysis of IEO

Variables	Measurement items	Item/total correlations	Cronbach's $\alpha$	Factor loading
Innovativeness(IN)	IN1	0.267	0.408	0.715
	IN2	0.246		0.681
	IN3	0.222		0.636
Risk-taking(RIS)	RIS1	0.488	0.595	0.829
	RIS2	0.508		0.810
	RIS3	0.262		0.562
Proactiveness(PR)	PR1	0.354	0.517	0.810
	PR2	0.233		0.764
	PR3	0.422		0.561

As this study used a self-report questionnaire to collect the perceived information from a single respondent, common method bias may occur. In addition, the main principal component analysis (the maximum variance orthogonal rotation) on the measurement items of innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness showed that the first axis of factors can only explain the 33.59% of the variance and that the factors whose eigenvalue is greater than 1 (three can be extracted) can explain the 58.50% of the variance. Thus, it concluded that the common method bias might have a little influence on the findings of this study (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003; Podsakoff & Organ, 1986).

Table 3 shows the mean, the standard deviation, and Pearson's correlation matrix of various variables in the study, including the environmental munificence, environmental hostility, management competence, marketing resources, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, EBIT, and the number of visitors. The value of innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness in individual entrepreneurial orientation is the average of various measuring items. The value of environmental munificence, environmental hostility, management competence, marketing resources, innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, EBIT, and the number of visitors comes from the case company's internal data in 2014.

In this study, the normalized standard scores (Z-scores) of the raw scores of various variables, such as EBIT, the number of visitors, environmental munificence, environmental hostility, management competence, marketing resources, innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness, were

first calculated. Then the EBIT and the number of visitors were taken as dependent variables. Finally, the independent variables include the multiplication of environmental munificence, environmental hostility, management competence, marketing resources, innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness, the multiplication of environmental munificence and innovativeness, the multiplication of environmental hostility and innovativeness, the multiplication of management competence and innovativeness, the multiplication of marketing resources and innovativeness, the multiplication of environmental munificence and risk-taking, the multiplication of environmental hostility and risk-taking, the multiplication of management competence and risk-taking, the multiplication of marketing resources and risk-taking, the multiplication of environmental munificence and proactiveness, the multiplication of environmental hostility and proactiveness, the multiplication of management competence and proactiveness, and the multiplication of marketing resources and proactiveness. The research hypotheses are thus verified by comparing the effect of different variables on corporate performance.

In terms of the hierarchical regression analysis of EBIT, Model 1 demonstrated that the test results showed that environmental hostility had a significant and negative influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  - value = -0.508,  $p < 0.001$ ). Management competence had a significant and positive influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  - value = 0.862,  $p < 0.001$ ). Marketing resource had a significant and positive influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  - value = 1.735,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 2: the test results showed that risk-taking had a significant and positive influence on

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics And Pearson's Correlation Matrix

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>Environment</b>										
1.Environmental munificence	291165.11	47547.22								
2.Environmental hostility	-11556736.41	12426244.99	-0.08							
<b>Resource capability</b>										
3.Management competence	27143.66	16956.30	-0.01	-0.64***						
4.Marketing re-sources	-4102434.01	3153259.95	0.05	0.65***	-0.91***					
<b>Individual entrepreneurial orientation</b>										
5.Innovativeness	5.23	0.47	0.09	-0.12	0.32***	-0.42***				
6.Risk-taking	4.97	0.76	0.15 <sup>+</sup>	0.07	-0.11	-0.09	0.31***			
7.Proactiveness	5.72	0.53	0.04	-0.15 <sup>+</sup>	0.30***	-0.44***	0.58***	0.44***		
<b>Corporate performance</b>										
8.EBIT	6828224.40	16910870.20	-0.08	-0.06	0.40***	-0.62***	0.45***	0.39***	0.44***	
9.The number of visitors	56146.53	23835.90	0.07	-0.56***	0.69***	-0.82***	0.54***	0.28***	0.52***	0.69***

Notes: + indicates there is significant correlation when the significant level is at 0.1 (double tail);\* indicates there is significant correlation when the significant level is at 0.05 (double tail); \*\*indicates there is significant correlation when the significant level is at 0.01 (double tail); \*\*\*indicates there is significant correlation when the significant level is at 0.001 (double tail).



Table 4. The regression analysis of 「EBIT」

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value
Environmental munificence (A)	0.042	-0.013	-0.051	-0.085*	-0.085*
Environmental hostility (B)	-0.508***	-0.483***	-0.447***	-0.431***	-0.431***
Management competence (C)	0.862***	0.807***	0.490***	0.340***	0.340***
Marketing resource (D)	1.735***	1.672***	1.177***	0.981***	0.981***
Innovativeness (E)		0.043	0.106*	0.144**	0.144**
Risk-taking (F)		0.112*	0.147**	0.159**	0.159**
Proactiveness (G)		-0.035	-0.018	-0.011	-0.011
A×E			0.003	0.010	0.010
B×E			0.010	-0.043	-0.043
C×E			0.293**	0.330**	0.330**
D×E			0.494***	0.495***	0.495***
A×F				-0.023	-0.023
B×F				0.160***	0.160***
C×F				0.007	0.007
D×F				0.021	0.021
A×G					-0.039
B×G					-0.052
C×G					0.039
D×G					-0.078
R-Square	0.698	0.724	0.761	0.784	0.784
F-value	137.978	102.868	70.129	61.480	61.480
P-value	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
degree of freedom	(3,179)	(4,157)	(7,154)	(9,152)	(9,152)

\* indicates  $P < 0.05$  , \* \* indicates  $P < 0.01$  , \* \* \* indicates  $P < 0.001$  ,  $\beta$ -value is standardized regression coefficient.

Table 5. The regression analysis of the Number Of Visitors

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value	$\beta$ -value
Environmental munificence (A)	0.111***	0.066	0.066	0.053	0.058
Environmental hostility (B)	0.014	0.096	0.096	0.047	0.044
Management competence (C)	0.396***	0.138	0.138	0.047	0.164
Marketing resource (D)	1.183***	0.724***	0.724***	0.651***	0.694***
Innovativeness (E)		0.177***	0.177***	0.190***	0.184***
Risk-taking (F)		0.171***	0.171***	0.163***	0.156***
Proactiveness (G)		0.017	0.017	0.047	0.036
A×E			0.018	0.033	0.031
B×E			0.017	-0.043	-0.007
C×E			0.028	0.041	0.003
D×E			0.008	-0.045	0.012
A×F				-0.004	-0.005
B×F				0.023	0.047
C×F				0.320***	0.274**
D×F				0.393***	0.4***
A×G					-0.041
B×G					-0.047
C×G					0.043
D×G					-0.109*
R-Square	0.7	0.724	0.732	0.756	0.763
F-value	139.119	102.868	143.782	96.858	3.012
P-value	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***	0.000***
degree of freedom	(3,179)	(4,157)	(3,158)	(5,156)	(6,155)

\* indicates  $P < 0.05$  , \* \* indicates  $P < 0.01$  , \* \* \* indicates  $P < 0.001$  ,  $\beta$ -value is standardized regression coefficient.

EBIT ( $\beta$  – value = 0.112,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Model 3: the test results showed that the interaction between the management competence and innovative-

ness had a significant and positive influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  – value = 0.293,  $p < 0.01$ ). In addition, the interaction between marketing resources and innovativeness had a significant and

positive influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  – value = 0.494,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 4: the test results showed the interaction between environmental hostility and risk-taking had a significant and positive influence on EBIT ( $\beta$  – value = 0.160,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 5: the test results showed no significant effect.

In terms of the hierarchical regression analysis of the number of visitors, Model 1 demonstrated that the test results showed environmental munificence had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.111,  $p < 0.001$ ). Management competence had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.396,  $p < 0.001$ ). Marketing resource had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 1.183,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 2: the test results showed innovativeness had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.177,  $p < 0.001$ ). Risk-taking also had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.171,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 3: the test results showed there is no significant effect. Model 4: the test results showed the interaction between management competence and risk-taking had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.320,  $p < 0.001$ ). The interaction between marketing resource and risk-taking had a significant and positive influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = 0.393,  $p < 0.001$ ). Model 5: the verification results showed the interaction between marketing resource and proactiveness had a significant and negative influence on the number of visitors ( $\beta$  – value = -0.109,  $p < 0.05$ ).

## Discussions and Conclusions

As shown in the results, managers with entrepreneurial orientation are more able to discover and seize business opportunities, to turn the tables, and to lead an enterprise into the right direction. According to the resource dependency theory, organizations could change their surroundings. As the time goes by, enterprises will be committed to pursuing their own advantages and try to affect an inter-organizational dependent relationship where managers have three management roles: symbolic, responsive, and discretionary (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). It is clear that the results of this study provide empirical support for the resource dependency theory. When faced with the requirements and environmental limitations, managers with entrepreneurial orientation will have a positive attitude towards the situation, adopt necessary measures to make an adjustment, and weigh various external and interdependent factors that could make or break an enterprise.

The RBV views an enterprise as a set of resources and explains the sustainable advantages and inter-enterprise difference of enterprises by focusing on the characteristics of resources and a strategic asset market. In his book entitled “The Nature of Managerial Work,” Mintzberg (1973) divided a manager’s major activities into three types: interpersonal relationship, information transfer, and decision making. By resource distributor, Mintzberg proposes that managers need to know how to allocate all resources, including their own time, the ongoing plan, and appropriate action. This reflects in the results of this study which found that enterprises with managers who possess entrepreneurial

orientation can effectively allocate resources, utilize enterprise capability, and take appropriate actions to improve their performance. Therefore, this study proved that managers are an important human resource of an enterprise and play a key role in enterprise resource allocation and capability utilization. Managers with entrepreneurial orientation are an indispensable part of enterprise strategic assets and can create a competitive advantage for enterprises.

Carrefour understands that its staff is the most important asset and that education and training are its significant strategy to improve the quality of staff and services. Thus, the company established the Carrefour University to help employees learn, develop, unleash their potentials, cultivate excellent professional managers, and improve the competitive edge of its human resources. In addition to the training courses planned for junior, middle, and senior directors, Carrefour University also helps branches create a training plan and continue to introduce domestic and overseas training courses for internal staff. Furthermore, the university selects experienced trainers in the fields of education and training to develop various courses. These trainers not only give regular lectures at each branch but also responsible for the training of internal instructors throughout Taiwan.

Carrefour University values the freedom and responsibilities of its staff, shares the philosophy of the company, cultivates honesty, and encourages staff to unite, pursue progress, and respect each other. The purpose of Carrefour's training is to develop employees into outstanding managers, to strengthen their professional knowl-

edge, skills, attitude, and productivity, and to provide the best service for customers. At Carrefour, the Education and Training Section of the Human Resource Department takes charge of the coordination of its nationwide training courses and the planning of its annual training. In addition, the Section also provides professional training consultation and training course planning to ensure training achievement. Carrefour also has a training passport system which employees can take as a reference of training courses after they start to work in the company. Under the arrangement of their directors, employees are required to attend regular courses. Lecturers on duty will annotate trainers' notes after classes. Apart from the courses under the training passport, the branches also offer on-the-job training courses based on operating requirements. The staff members are also allowed to discuss their personal training needs with their directors based on the overall training information of the company.

#### References

- Anderson, J. C., & Gerbing, D. W. (1988). Structural equation modeling in practice: A review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological bulletin*, 103(3), 411.
- Barney, J. B. (1995). Looking inside for competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 9(4), 49-61.
- Blackburn, R. A., Hart, M., & Wainwright, T. (2013). Small business performance: business, strategy and owner-manager characteristics. *Journal of small*

- business and enterprise development*, 20(1), 8-27.
- Cacciolatti, L., & Lee, S. H. (2016). Revisiting the relationship between marketing capabilities and firm performance: The moderating role of market orientation, marketing strategy and organisational power. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5597-5610.
- Canina, L., Palacios, D., & Devece, C. (2012). Management theories linking individual and organizational level analysis in entrepreneurship research. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(3), 271-284.
- Chirico, F., Sirmon, D. G., Sciascia, S., & Mazzola, P. (2011). Resource orchestration in family firms: Investigating how entrepreneurial orientation, generational involvement, and participative strategy affect performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 5(4), 307-326.
- Chong, V. K., & Chong, K. M. (1997). Strategic choices, environmental uncertainty and SBU performance: a note on the intervening role of management accounting systems. *Accounting and Business Research*, 27(4), 268-276.
- Cockburn, I. M., Henderson, R. M., & Stern, S. (2000). Untangling the origins of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 1123-1145.
- Covin, J. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 855-872.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 7-26.
- Davcik, N. S., & Sharma, P. (2016). Marketing resources, performance, and competitive advantage: A review and future research directions. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(12), 5547-5552.
- De Clercq, D., Dimov, D., & Thongpapanl, N. T. (2010). The moderating impact of internal social exchange processes on the entrepreneurial orientation–performance relationship. *Journal of business venturing*, 25(1), 87-103.
- Dess, G. G., & Beard, D. W. (1984). Dimensions of organizational task environments. *Administrative science*

- quarterly*, 52-73.
- Devezer, B., Sprott, D. E., Spangenberg, E. R., & Czellar, S. (2014). Consumer well-being: Effects of subgoal failures and goal importance. *Journal of Marketing*, 78(2), 118-134.
- Eshima, Y., & Anderson, B. S. (2017). Firm growth, adaptive capability, and entrepreneurial orientation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(3), 770-779.
- Fellnhöfer, K., Puumalainen, K., & Sjögrén, H. (2017). Entrepreneurial orientation in work groups—effects of individuals and group characteristics. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(2), 427-463.
- Ferreira, F. A., Marques, C. S., Bento, P., Ferreira, J. J., & Jalali, M. S. (2015). Operationalizing and measuring individual entrepreneurial orientation using cognitive mapping and MCDA techniques. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(12), 2691-2702.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Han, D.-P., Guo, C.-C., & Yuan, B. (2017). The relationship between equity structure and corporate philanthropy behavior based on mathematical model. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 20(5), 1265-1276.
- Hansen, M. H., Hurwitz, W. N., & Madow, W. G. (1953). *Sample survey methods and theory. V. 1. Methods and applications. V. 2. Theory*: Wiley.
- Helfat, C. E. (2000). Guest editor's introduction to the special issue: The evolution of firm capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10-11), 955-959.
- 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.
- Huang, S. K., & Wang, Y.-L. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and innovation in small and medium enterprises. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 563-570.
- Ireland, R. D., Covin, J. G., & Kuratko, D. F. (2009). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), 19-46.
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Covin, J. G. (2014). Diagnosing a

- firm's internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons*, 57(1), 37-47.
- Li, Y., Zhao, Y., Tan, J., & Liu, Y. (2008). Moderating effects of entrepreneurial orientation on market orientation-performance linkage: Evidence from Chinese small firms. *Journal of small business management*, 46(1), 113-133.
- 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.
- 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), 429-451.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). Strategy-making in three modes. *California management review*, 16(2), 44-53.
- Morgan, N. A., Vorhies, D. W., & Mason, C. H. (2009). Market orientation, marketing capabilities, and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(8), 909-920.
- Osborn, R. N., & Hunt, J. G. (1974). Environment and organizational effectiveness. *Administrative science quarterly*, 231-246.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*: Stanford University Press.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J.-Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879.
- Podsakoff, P. M., & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. *Journal of management*, 12(4), 531-544.
- Rudd, J. M., Greenley, G. E., Beatson, A. T., & Lings, I. N. (2008). Strategic planning and performance: Extending the debate. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(2), 99-108.
- Wales, W., Monsen, E., & McKelvie, A. (2011). The organizational pervasiveness of entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 895-923.
- Wiklund, J. (1999). The sustainability of the entrepreneurial orientation—performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(1), 37-48.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-based resources,

entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(13), 1307-1314.

Xie, W.-W., & Wang, T. (2017). Impact of corporate social performance on finance performance. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Mathematics*, 20(6-7), 1571-1576.

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.