

# Influence of High Performance Work System, Emotional Intelligence, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Organizational Learning Capability and Creativity on “Management Support” of Corporate Entrepreneurship - An Empirical Study

**M. Banumathi**

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Business Administration,  
Govt. Arts and Science College for Women, Kodaikannal,  
Dindugal District, Tamil Nadu

---

**Abstract:** *Corporate entrepreneurship is an organizational process for transforming individual ideas into collective actions through the management of uncertainties. The main purpose of this study is to identify empirically study of the influencing of high performance work system, emotional intelligence, entrepreneurial orientation, organizational learning capability and creativity on management support of corporate entrepreneurship. Data was collected from 400 executives working in 12 manufacturing companies in Chennai and multiple regression analysis was adopted to select the respondents. This indicates that respondents are ready to consider the factors while management support in manufacturing company. Results showed that the factors like management support significant of corporate entrepreneurship.*

**Keywords:** *Emotional intelligence, Entrepreneurial Orientation and Corporate entrepreneurship.*

## Introduction

Corporate entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship within an established business organization. It is the process of creating value by bringing together a unique package of resources to exploit and pursue opportunities. The process of corporate entrepreneurship is to follow and take advantages of opportunities not considering what resources they possess. It is concerned with idea recognition and converting opportunities into businesses. It is often explained as a process that goes on inside an existing firm and that may lead to new business ventures, the development of new products, services or processes and the renewal of strategies, administrative techniques, and competitive postures (Hisrich and Peters, 1984). Sathé (1985) argues that corporate entrepreneurship is a process of organizational renewal. It has emerged as a much needed ingredient contributing towards the growth of any organization under a changing business

environment.

Management Support is the intention of managers to promote entrepreneurship attempts in an organization that contains introduction and patterning new ideas and providers of them, preparing required resources, professional view points about innovations and supporting innovators. The willingness of senior management to facilitate and promote entrepreneurial activity in the organization, include championing innovative ideas as well as providing necessary resources, expertise or protection.

## Review of Literature

The concept of corporate entrepreneurship has been evolving for the last three decades. Researchers have suggested that the pursuit of corporate entrepreneurship requires established companies to strike a balance between engaging in activities that make use of existing knowledge, while at the same time challenging themselves to

embark upon new adventures, seeking new knowledge and opportunities to rejuvenate themselves (Floyd and Woolridge, 1999). The perspective of entrepreneurship as a continuum is evident in Covin and Slevin's (1989) distinction between conservative (risk averse, non-innovative, and reactive) firms and entrepreneurial (risk taking, innovative, and proactive) firms. Environmental uncertainty, turbulence, and heterogeneity lead to operational challenges for organizations. To cope with the challenges of developing and nurturing both today's and tomorrow's core competencies, firms increasingly rely on effective use of corporate entrepreneurship (Covin and Miles, 1999).

High performance work systems are said to be ensuring superior employee output through the system's set of human resource management practices selecting, developing, and retaining workforce comprising of individuals this possess superior abilities, and motivating these individuals to apply their superior abilities in their work related activities; and whose work-related activities result in these organizations achieving superior organizational performance and sustainable competitive advantage (Becker and Huselid 1998; Delery 1998, Guthrie 2001; Wright and Boswell, 2002). Way (2002) defines high performance work system as a group of interconnected human resource practices that aid in eliciting superior employee outputs. Defines staffing, compensation, flexible job assignments, teamwork, training, and communication as the practices of high performance work system Banumathi and Samudhrarakumar (2015).

Emotional intelligence is a set of competencies, which direct and control one's feelings towards work and performance at work. These set of competencies are the ability of the individual to control and manage his or her moods and impulses on the job (Mayer and Salovey, 1993). Knowing one's emotions and feelings as they occur, and tuning one's self to the changed situation, requires emotional competency, emotional maturity, and emotional sensitivity that are demanded a on the job. In a work situation, performance of the employees depends on working with group of people with different ideas,

suggestions, and opinions. Effective use of emotional intelligence gives better team harmony (Ashforth et al, 1995). Leaders need high emotional intelligence because they represent the organization to the customers, they interact with the highest number of people within and outside the organization, and they set the tone for employee morale (Mayer and Salovey, 1997).

Contributions from the academicians & finally shortlisted three dimensions to represent entrepreneurial orientation, which are used in our study. The individual dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation are classified as innovation, risk-taking, and proactiveness. Innovativeness refers to willingness to support creativity and experimentation in introducing new products/services besides novelty, technological leadership, and R&D in developing new processes. Secondly, risk taking means tendency to take bold actions such as venturing into unknown new markets, committing a large portion of resources to venture with uncertain outcomes, and/or borrowing heavily. Lastly, proactiveness is defined as an opportunity-seeking, forward-looking perspective involving introducing new products or services ahead of the competition and acting in anticipation of future demand to create change and shape the environment. A successful entrepreneur in establishing his business does not only depend on his role but also on his orientation toward the organization itself; thus, entrepreneurial orientation is an important part since it can assist an individual to adapt to his working environment. Final conclusion that can be drawn from the literature is, that the strategic decisions of the leaders that integrate these three dimensions, are the key impetus to generate growth Banumathi and Samudhrarakumar (2015).

Creativity scholars have created a vast body of literature regarding a large number of contextual and individual factors, which can enable or inhibit the generation of creative ideas (Runco and Pritkzer, 2011; Mumford, 2012; Runco, 2012). According to in-depth discussions made by scholars, creativity is considered as the ability to think up and design new inventions, produce works of art, solve problems in new ways, or develop an idea based on an original, novel, or

unconventional approach. The academicians stress the need to have creativity inhibited in the minds of employees to face stiff challenges from the external forces and to manufacture products at lesser cost. To conclude, creativity, as a strategic asset, acts as a base for competitive advantage, is and a source for firm growth (Weinzimmer, Michel, and Franczak 2011).

Organizational learning is a concept for which many definitions have been given. One of the first definitions given to organizational learning is that of Argyris and Schn, 1978. The concept of organizational learning capability (Dibella et al., 1996; Goh and Richards, 1997; Hult and Ferrell, 1997; Yeung, et al., 1999; Jérez- Gómez, et al., 2005) seems to stress the importance of the facilitating factors for organizational learning or the organizational propensity to learn. Ang and Joseph (1996) contrast organizational learning and learning organization in terms of process versus structure. Organizational learning may be defined as a change in cognition or a change in behaviour (Easterby-Smith et al., 2000) learning needs to be explored as a social and psychological process (Stiofán Deburca, 2000).

Christophe Boone et. al., (2018), had done a research on "Top management team nationality diversity, corporate entrepreneurship and innovation in multinational firms". Top management teams (TMTs) affects corporate entrepreneurship as evidenced by diversity in global knowledge sourcing and through this innovation performance in MNCs. In a panel of 165 manufacturing MNCs based in 20 countries, we confirm that the positive effects of TMT nationality diversity on corporate entrepreneurship and innovation are only unleashed in TMTs with low social stratification and in MNCs located in home countries that are low in national power distance. Results of a regression of average TMT tenure on TMT social stratification and its interaction with nationality diversity indeed showed a significantly shorter tenure in nationality diverse TMTs with high social stratification, in support of our argument. Banumathi and Samudhra Rajakumar (2019), have done a study, "A Study on corporate

entrepreneurship development by organizational learning capability and outcome of job satisfaction". Survey method was undertaken to collect data from 250 middle level managers working in Chemical Engineering Manufacturing Industries in Chennai. Corporate Entrepreneurship was measured by using Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessment Instrument and the Organizational Learning Capability (OLC) measurement instrument consists of 14 items grouped into 5 dimensions: experimentation, risk taking, interaction with the external environment, dialogue and participative decision making. Results of this study indicate that Organizational Learning Capability has positive relationship with Corporate Entrepreneurship.

Astrini, et al., (2020), had done a research on "Innovativeness, Proactiveness, and Risk-taking: Corporate Entrepreneurship of Indonesian SMEs". The aim of this study was twofold. First, to discover the pattern CE (innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking) intensity on four SMEs and second, to identify the likely causes of that pattern from a strategic management perspective. This research employed a case study design with four Indonesian SMEs as the subjects. The data were gathered through guided interviews and observations. Dyadic data were collected to avoid bias. The answers were then put into a scale from one to seven by the informants and combined using a simple mean. A pattern was inferred from the scale. The results suggest that all four SMEs have a similar low-medium range of CE intensity. From the strategic management standpoint, this was likely due to the fact the SMEs have not conducted proper environmental scanning in terms of looking for new technology or embraced the involvement of low-level employees in their planning process.

### **Research Objective**

To empirically find out the influence of high performance work system, emotional intelligence, entrepreneurial orientation, organizational learning capability and creativity on management support of corporate entrepreneurship.

## **Research Method**

### **Sample and Data Collection**

The target respondents of the study are middle level managers working in manufacturing industries in Chennai, capital of Tamil Nadu state. Industrial Development Corporation was approached to obtain the list of manufacturing companies adopting ISO 14001 /TS 16949 and employ a minimum of 500 staffs. These two conditions were used as implementation of ISO 14001/TS 16949 requires the need for more middle level executives and in companies of 500 employees, number of middle level executives would be more. From the list of top 50 companies (based on turnover) 12 companies were randomly selected. By using proportionate random sampling Gellatly et al., (2007), I was shortlisted from a population of Kidder and Judd (1986), middle level managers working in those 12 companies.

A structured questionnaire was developed to elicit opinion from the sample respondent's. A pilot study was conducted to check the reliability.

### **Measurement**

#### **Corporate Entrepreneurship**

Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessment Instrument (CEAI) developed by Hornsby et al., (2002) was used in this study. It consists of 48 items in five dimensions. They are management support measured by 19 items, reward/reinforcement (6 items), work discretion (10 items), time availability (6 items), and organizational boundaries (7 items). The questionnaire five point Likert type scale with Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

#### **High Performance Work System**

High performance work system (HPWS) is one of the independent variables. Numerous studies have shown that various authors developed scales to measure High performance work system. Snell and Dean (1992), Delery and Doty (1996) and Becker and Huselid (1998) have proposed various dimensions to measure high performance work system. After careful study the researcher has chosen six dimensions from these three instruments. For example, employee empowerment, reward practices, job security and performance appraisal were taken from Snell and Dean (1992), internal career opportunities was taken from Delery and Doty

(1996) and information sharing was taken from Becker and Huselid (1998). Employee empowerment has been measured by 4 items, reward practices (8 items), job security (3 items), performance appraisal (4 items), internal career opportunities (4 items) and information sharing (5 items).

#### **Emotional Intelligence**

Emotional intelligence (EI) is another independent variable. The researcher used Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale in this study. Emotional Intelligence scale has four dimensions namely, self-emotion measured by 4 items, other emotion (4 items), use of emotion (4 items) and regulation of emotion (4 items).

#### **Entrepreneurial Orientation**

Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) is the independent variable. The entrepreneurial orientation scale of Covin and Slevin (1986) has been adopted in his study. The scale consists of three dimensions. They are innovativeness, (3 items), proactiveness (3 items) and risk-taking (3 items).

#### **Creativity**

Creativity is the independent variable. Zhou and George's (2001) scale is found to be the most widely used instrument by academicians and practitioners. This scale has 10 items. The questionnaire five point Likert type scale with Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

#### **Organizational Learning Capability**

Organizational learning capability (OLC) is the last independent variable. With a view to choose a suitable scale to measure organizational learning capability, studies that used this variable were examined. The researcher found that Chiva et al., (2007) have used the instrument designed by Algre and Chiva (2007) in their works. The reliability scores were good and consistent in all the studies, and hence its robustness was established. Obviously, this scale was used in this study. This instrument has five dimensions learning, experimentation, external environment, dialogue, and participative decision-making. The dimensions are measured by learning (2 items), experimentation (2 items), external environment (3 items), dialogue (3 items), and participative decision-making (4 items).

## Data Interpretation

### Multiple Regression Analysis for Management Support Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig.
1	.792(a)	.650	.620	3.266	11.417	0.001**

### Coefficients(a)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	17.152	2.417		7.097	.000
Reward Practices	.196	.058	.162	3.366	<b>.001**</b>
Employee Empowerment	.370	.156	.139	2.369	<b>.018*</b>
Job Security	-.286	.135	-.134	-2.124	<b>.034*</b>
Performance Appraisal	.280	.213	.078	1.315	.189
Internal Career opportunities	-.409	.203	-.139	-2.018	<b>.044*</b>
Information Sharing	.045	.145	.022	.309	.758
Self-Emotion	.755	.183	.219	4.133	<b>0.001**</b>
Other's Emotion	.825	.201	.226	4.100	<b>0.001**</b>
Use of Emotions	-.302	.152	-.121	-1.989	<b>.047*</b>
Regulation of Emotion	.017	.120	.009	.139	.890
Innovation	-.592	.195	-.169	-3.041	<b>.003**</b>
Proactiveness	.380	.197	.108	1.927	<b>.055*</b>
Risk Taking	.557	.144	.223	3.857	<b>0.001**</b>
Overall Creativity	-.022	.073	-.015	-.303	.762
Learning	.194	.068	.160	2.365	<b>.016*</b>
Experimentation	.146	.167	.055	.875	.382
External Environment	.013	.161	.005	.079	.937
Dialogue	-.021	.136	-.009	-.155	.877
Participative Decision-Making	.382	.150	.128	2.541	<b>.011*</b>

Note: Denotes significant at 1% level

Denotes significant at 5% level.

Dependent variable: Management support

As with the multiple regressions, we look to the p-value of the F-test to see if the overall model is significant. With a p-value of zero to three decimal places, the model is statistically significant ( $F=11.417$ ;  $p<0.001$ ). The R-squared is 0.650, meaning that 65 percentage of the variability of **Management Support** is accounted for by the variables in the model.

In this case, the adjusted R-squared indicates that about 62 percentage of the variability of **Management Support** is accounted for by the model, even after taking into account 19 predictor variables in the model. The coefficients for each of the variables indicate the amount of change one could expect in **Management Support** given a one-unit change in the value of that variable, given that all other variables in the model are held constant. To compare the strengths of coefficients of predictor variables refer to the column of Beta coefficients, also known as standardized regression coefficients. The beta coefficients are used to compare the relative strength of the various predictors within the model. Because the beta coefficients are all measured in standard deviations, instead of the units of the variables, they can be compared to one another.

In other words, the beta coefficients are the coefficients that if the outcome and predictor variables were all transformed to standard scores, also called z-scores, before running the regression. In this regression, **Other's Emotion** has the largest Beta coefficients, (0.226) and **Use of Emotion** has the smallest Beta, (-.121). One standard deviation increase in leads to a (0.226) standard deviation increase in **Emotional Intelligence**, in turn, leads to a (-.121) standard deviation decrease in **Emotional Intelligence** with the other variables in the model held constant.

In interpreting this output, it should be remembered that the difference between the regular coefficients and the standardized coefficients is the units of measurement. For regression, to describe the raw coefficient for

**Reward Practices**, we can say that a one unit increase reward practices would yield a 19.6 unit increase in the predicted **Management Support**.

However, for the standardized coefficient (Beta) a one standard deviation increase in **Reward Practices** would yield a 16.2 standard deviation increase in the predicted **Management Support**.

Results of the multiple regression analysis shown in Table 4.13 explain that, factors like reward practices ( $t= 3.366$ ), employee empowerment ( $t= 2.369$ ), job security ( $t=-2.124$ ), internal career opportunities ( $t= -2.018$ ), self-emotion ( $t=4.133$ ), other's emotion ( $t=4.100$ ), use of emotion ( $t= -1.989$ ), innovation ( $t= -3.041$ ), proactiveness ( $t= 1.927$ ), learning ( $t= 2.365$ ) and participative decision-making ( $t= 2.541$ ) have significant regression coefficient as judged from their t-values. This indicates that respondents are ready to consider the factors while management support in manufacturing company.

Results of regression analysis using management support as dependent variable, reveals that 11 dimensions have positive influence. From the six dimensions of high performance work system, four have significant beta values. In centralized organization structure and mediocre management support, employees' propensity to be entrepreneurs would be less. Our study shows that the existing procedure of providing rewards to employees and providing adequate authority to decide on critical issues are important high performance work system factors that influence the need for management support. Growth in the form of internal promotions (non financial incentive) and a sense of sacredness in the present job also entail affiliation from the top management. That is why these dimensions have emerged as significant predictors. The procedures adopted by the organizations to appraise the performance of employees are predetermined and evolved after a careful consideration and discussion by the management, and nothing can be modified on ad hoc basis. Hence, it is logical that 'performance appraisal' did not affect management support. Our findings are in line with the results reported by Morris et al., (2008).

Contrary to the influence of high performance work system, only two dimensions (learning and participative decision-making) have affected

management support. In tune with the arguments of Daniel and Bailey (1999) and Scott-Land and Chen (2004), our results confirm that firms need to implement the policy of participative decision-making for increased involvement in corporate entrepreneurship programs and this enhances the commitment of employees to contribute more in proposing new ideas. Similarly, it is acknowledged by the academicians that organizational learning is linked to performance (Algre and Chiva, 2008) and establishing an organization culture of openness to learn is the key to innovation. Because, whether the staff are willing to learn and change or resist to change depends on the genuine support rendered by the management. That is why, learning dimension has shown a stronger influence ( $B=0.16$ ) than decision-making ( $B=0.128$ ). These findings support the contributions of Amabile et al., (1996).

In the case of emotional intelligence, except 'regulation of emotions' all other three dimensions exerted significant influence, which confirms that this variable is essential for management support.

As far as the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientations is concerned, our results resemble the studies of Covin and Slevin (1989), Lumpkin and Dess (1996) and Morris and Jones (1999). Our findings lead to the

understanding that to strengthen an organization's tendency to be innovative and encourage novelty, support from the management in the form of empowerment is required. Besides, risk-taking propensity of employees too need management support especially during failures and the management should go one step forward by encouraging the staff to continue their thinking process. The above arguments explain the reasons behind the significant influence of innovation and risk-taking dimensions.

### **Managerial Implications**

To enhance management support, firms should monitor the performance of employees, before finalizing the reward policies. Firms can resort to the practice of rewarding their employees for

successful completion of each stage (idea generation, in progress and completion) with varying percentages (50+20+30).

Executives should be empowered to make suitable decisions for promoting entrepreneurial mindset within the organization. Top management should not interfere on the day to day progress, and the executives should be given wide latitude to decide on what is to be done. Executives who possess emotional intelligence need to be provided with the responsibility of leading creative teams, as they can comfortably balance the extreme behaviors of employees. Management should not discriminate among employees while providing opportunities to learn, and an unbiased evaluation is required in this regard. Besides, making a provision in the organization hierarchy that enables the executives to vent their opinions without any hesitation is essential.

### **Conclusion**

In summary, our study provides empirical evidence that high performance work system, organizational learning capability, emotional intelligence, entrepreneurial orientation and creativity enhance corporate entrepreneurship. The results emerge from this study show that corporate entrepreneurship capability can be nurtured if employees perceive that top management is supporting the innovative process, by providing autonomy in a flexible organization structure.

As radical innovation becomes key to organizational performance, firms must pamper creative people and treat idea generation as the key performance indicator. Ensuring quick internal career growth opportunities along with adequate rewards/recognition would pave way for better corporate entrepreneurship initiatives. Emotionally intelligent middle managers with proactiveness and aggressiveness would successfully implement corporate entrepreneurship programs and they need to guide supervisors to acquire new knowledge. Establishing a conducive environment to learn and to conduct experiments will certainly encourage employees to support the corporate

entrepreneurship policy. Employees will experience a sense of satisfaction in their job, owing to the firms' readiness to initiate and consistently implement corporate entrepreneurship activities. Needless to say that creation of sustainable entrepreneurship affects firm performance.

To conclude, corporate entrepreneurship is considered globally as a critical driver of sustainable growth and it is imperative that Indian companies should understand the forces that drive corporate entrepreneurship to have competitive advantage.

## References

- Amabile T.M., R. Conti, H. Coon, J. Lazenby and M. Herron (1996), "Assessing the work Environment for creativity", *Academy of Management Journal* 39: 1154- 1184.
- Alegre, J., and Chiva, R. (2007). "Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: *An empirical test.*" *Technovation*, 28(6): 315- 326.
- Alegre and Richardo Chiva (2008), "Entrepreneurial Orientation, innovation and Firm Performance: The importance of Organizational Learning Capability." *Ministry of Science and Innovation (ECO2008-00729) programs for the financial support for this research.* 1-22.
- Astrini, N. J, T Rakhmawati, S Sumaedi, I G M Y Bakti, M Yarmen and S Damayanti (2020), "Innovativeness, Proactiveness, and Risk-taking: Corporate Entrepreneurship of Indonesian SMEs", *Material Science and Engineering, Volume 722, Issue 1*, P 012037.
- Becker and. Huselid (1998), "High Performance Work System and Firm Performance: Synthesis of Research and Managerial Implications," in *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*, 16, G.R. Ferris ed., Stamford, CA: JAI Press.
- Banumathi and Samudhrarakumar (2015), "Role of Middle -Level Managers and Corporate Entrepreneurship," *International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Management Studies, Volume 1, Issue 9*, p 21- 26.
- Banumathi and Samudhrarakumar (2015), "Influence of High Performance Work System, Emotional Intelligence and Entrepreneurial Orientation on Corporate Entrepreneurship," *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research, Vol. 6, Issue, 9*, p.6105-6110.
- Banumathi and Samudhrarakumar (2019), "A Study on Corporate Entrepreneurship development by organizational learning capability and outcome of job satisfaction", *Journal of the Gujarat Research Society, Volume 21, Issue 12*, P 121-129.
- Chiva, R., Alegre, J., and Lapedra, R. (2007). Measuring organizational learning capability among the workforce. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4): 224-242.
- Covin, J. G. and D. P. Slevin (1986), "'The development and testing of an organizational-level entrepreneurship scale'. In R. Ronstadt, J. A. Hornaday, R. Peterson and K. H. Vesper (eds), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research 1986. Center for Entrepreneurial Studies, Babson College, Wellesley, MA*, pp. 628- 639.
- Covin, J.G. and Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic Management of Small Firms in Hostile and Benign Environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1): 75-87.
- Covin, and M. P. Miles (1999), "Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive Advantage," *Journal of Entrepreneurship: Theory and practice*, pp.47-63,
- Delery, J. E., and Doty, D. H. 1996. "Modes of Theorizing in Strategic Human Resource Management: Tests of Universalistic, Contingency, and Configurationally Performance Predictions" *Special Research Forum on Human*

- Resource Management and Organizational Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), pp. 802-825.
- Floyd, S. W., and Wooldridge, B. (1999). Knowledge creation and social networks in corporate entrepreneurship: The renewal of organizational capability. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Spring: 123- 143.
- Gellatly J, Bower P, Hennessy S, Richards D, Gilbody S, et al. (2007) what makes self-help interventions effective in the management of depressive symptoms? Meta- analysis and meta-regression. *Psychol Med* 37 (9) 1217–28.
- Hornsby Kuratko and Zahra (2002), "Middle Managers perception of the internal environment of Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessing Instrument (CEAI)." *Journal of Business Venturing*, p 253-273.
- Hisrich and Peters (1984), "Internal venturing in large corporations." In J.A. Hornaday et al. Eds. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Kidder, L. H., and Judd, C. M. (1986). *Research methods in social relations* (5th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking It to Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 135-172.
- Morris MH, Kuratko DF, Covin JG (2008); *corporate entrepreneurship and innovation*. (2nded). Mason, OH: Thomson.
- Morris. MH and Jones (1999),. "HR practices that promote entrepreneurship", *HR Magazine*, pp: 86-91.
- Sathe (1985), "Managing an entrepreneurial dilemma: Nurturing entrepreneurship and control in large corporation." *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (Wellesley, Mass: Babson College): 636-656.
- Snell, S. A. and Dean, J. W. 1992. "Integrated Manufacturing and Human Resource Management: A Human Capital Perspective." *Academy of Management Journal*, 35: pp. 467-504.
- Scott-Ladd, B. and Chan, C.C.A. (2004). Emotional intelligence and participation in Decision-making: strategies for promoting organizational learning and change, *Strategic Change*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 95-105.
- Zahra S.A., (1993) "Environment, corporate entrepreneurship and financial performance": Ataxonomic approach, *Journal of Business Venturing* 8, 319–340.