

Suggested citation: Tuksatit, N., & Rajiani, I. 2020. Entrepreneurial Drivers of Innovation Success – International Business Perspectives. *Global Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management*, 1(1):1-15. <https://doi.org/10.57585/GJEM.020.001>

ENTREPRENEURIAL DRIVERS OF INNOVATION SUCCESS – INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS PERSPECTIVES

Nattarom Tuksatit^a, Ismi Rajiani^{b}*

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this research was to investigate the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation and success, from an international business perspective comparing results from Thailand and Indonesia. The study was necessitated by the importance of continued and successful innovation in the business environment, as a means of improving business performance and sustainability. The study adopted Stevenson's conceptualization of innovation management. A quantitative research design was adopted, with primary data collected from the employees of firms operating in the two countries. The sample size comprised 442 and 497 respondents for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. The data were collected using a questionnaire. The techniques used for analysis were Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and multiple regression analysis. Results indicated that opportunity-based strategic orientation, control of resources, management structure, and renewed philosophy are significant and positive drivers of innovation success in both Thailand and Indonesia. However, commitment to resources and entrepreneurial culture significantly affected Thailand only. Though Stevenson's conceptualization of innovation management factors was found to significantly drive innovation and success, they were more influential in Thailand compared to Indonesia. The study recommended that management should consider four major factors as significant entrepreneurial drivers of innovation and success. These factors include opportunity-based oriented strategic orientation, opportunity-based control of resources, opportunity-based management structure, and opportunity-based renewed philosophy.

KEYWORDS: *Entrepreneurial drivers, innovation success, international business perspective, Stevenson's conceptualization of innovation management, entrepreneurial*

JEL CLASSIFICATION: *O30, O35, L26*

DOI: 10.57585/GJEM.020.001

Received: 5 January 2020

First revision: 12 February 2020

Accepted: 17 May 2020

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of innovation involves transformation through improvement or transformation of processes, products, or concepts aimed at increasing value. Business involves introducing new processes, services, or products aimed at improving business value and consequently increasing profits. The concept of business innovation took the lead in the 1980s as many businesses sought

Nattarom Tuksatit^a, Stamford International University, Bangkok, Thailand; **Ismi Rajiani^b** Lambung Mangkurat University, Banjarmasin, Indonesia.

^{1*} Corresponding author: rajiani@ulm.ac.id

Global Journal of Entrepreneurship and Management – Volume 1, Issue 1

creative ideas to gain a competitive advantage in the market space. There are various forms of innovations based on the dimensions of market and technology (Fellnhofer, 2017). Incremental innovation is the most commonly utilized form of innovation, and it involves the application of the existing technology to increase value. Incremental innovation includes adding new features to products or services and removing features that clog the business process through simplification to add value.

The other form of innovation involves disruptive innovation, which includes the application of new processes and technologies. There are often few disruptive innovations due to the characteristics of new technologies being expensive and inferior to the existing technologies. Architectural innovation involves the learning of particular technologies and applying them in different markets. Low risks characterize architectural innovations due to the reintroduction of proven technologies (Radović-Marković & Salamzadeh, 2012). The other form of innovation involves radical innovation, which entails the creation of revolutionary technologies that swallow the existing technologies in the same industry. For example, although the development of the airplane was not the first mode of transportation, it revolutionized the commercialization of air transport.

While innovation is recognized as being necessary to increase competitive advantage, various innovation milestones make businesses reluctant to adopt formal success strategies. The success of innovations thus depends on different aspects, including having an innovation team dedicated to creating new or improved products and services for continued business competitive advantage. Successful innovation strategies require intelligent staff and highly skilled and creative teams dedicated to sharpening and harnessing innovation strategies (Gliń, 2018; Bolton, 2012). The success of innovation also requires clear goals and objectives tied to the business mission. Having clear goals and objectives helps build trust among the team members and encourages collaboration that enhances innovation efforts. Innovation labs are the other common factors of innovation success. Innovation Labs play a role in fostering innovative solutions by researching and developing various products and services. According to Fowosire et al. (2017), business organizations aiming to have successful innovation programs need to nurture and develop an innovation culture. A positive innovation culture helps increase motivation among employees, promote innovation, and raise employee awareness of innovation.

Entrepreneurship is a business practice that involves the ability and readiness to organize, develop, and run a business enterprise to make a profit. Starting business enterprises can be risky as it comes with various uncertainties. However, entrepreneurs are required to be creative and present new ideas in the business procedures. Innovation is an important aspect of entrepreneurship as it promotes creativity, nature, and the design of thinking in business processes (Singh, 2018). Initially, the concept of entrepreneurship was considered a start-up idea among Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). However, the idea has grown too large for organizations aiming at long-term success and navigating challenges from global competition and digitalization. Corporate entrepreneurship thus involves the development of new products and services as well as new business processes aimed at improving business value and increasing revenue.

Innovation plays a vital role in entrepreneurial success. Kerr (2014) articulates that innovation helps entrepreneurs make the best utility of existing products and services. While introducing new products is imperative in the long-term survival of any business, making the best of the existing products helps reduce the cost of the product while maintaining the competitive advantage of the business and improving revenue. Similarly, innovation helps both small and large business organizations to respond to trends and competition. Using innovation to respond to current

business trends and predicting future trends helps businesses develop solutions to improve business growth.

There are various ways that business organizations can ensure the success of entrepreneurship and innovation. Highly innovative business organizations embrace the aspect of risk-taking. Risk-taking is an entrepreneurial aspect that allows businesses to distinguish themselves from the competition. Risk-taking in business encourages innovation that leads to improved business growth (Brown et al., 2001). Innovation in business enterprises involves exploring new paths in the development of products and services. Innovative leadership is the other aspect that promotes entrepreneurship and innovation success. Successful business organizations are characterized by innovative management styles that differ from other businesses. Ensuring entrepreneurial success will require the leadership to use entrepreneurial intelligence in problem-solving that will underline the uniqueness of the business enterprise.

Creativity is the other important aspect of the success of entrepreneurship and innovation. Creativity is a vital aspect of innovation, and it helps in developing new strategies and new ways to stay ahead of the competition. Managing entrepreneurship requires developing a better approach that helps develop unique business processes that add value and increase profitability (Chow, 2006). Creativity in business increases the business potential in innovation energy that expands business possibilities and consequently ensures success. Based on this background, this research has two major objectives: 1) to identify the entrepreneurs' entrepreneurial drives of innovation success, and 2) to compare the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation success between Thailand and Indonesia. The driver of success under consideration for this study include commitment to opportunity, strategic orientation, commitment to resources, control of resources, management structure, renewed philosophy, growth orientation, entrepreneurial culture, and innovation success.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurial management with organizations plays a vital role in ensuring innovation success. The concept of entrepreneurial management involves the utilization of both creative and innovative abilities in addition to skills that effectively manage business enterprises. According to Fellnhofner (2017), entrepreneurial management involves the pursuit of business opportunities without regard to the current resources under control and irrespective of the organizational contexts. Stevenson's theory of entrepreneurial management is thus an opportunity-based entrepreneur behavior that helps businesses to remain valuable while contributing to society through value creation. There are various dimensions under Stevenson's concept of entrepreneurial management that promote entrepreneurial success and act as drivers of innovation success in business.

Strategic orientation is one of the conceptual dimensions of entrepreneurial management that highlights the factors driving the formulation of strategy. Business leaders use entrepreneurial orientation to develop strategies aimed at the development of new processes through the exploitation of new opportunities (Razmus & Laguna, 2018). The entrepreneur's strategies under Stevenson's entrepreneurial management concept are opportunity-driven, and, in this case, every opportunity is relevant. The entrepreneurial trustee's strategy involves utilizing available resources in the most efficient way to create value. Strategies oriented towards the efficient utilization of the available resources help drive innovation in business and consequently lead to business success (Brown, 2001). Similarly, since the strategic decisions are not limited to the existing resources, there is a need to marshal the necessary resources to attain the identified opportunities, and in the process drive innovation.

The other dimension in the concept of entrepreneurial management involves a commitment to opportunities. Stevenson's idea of commitment to opportunity involves the willingness and ability to pursue business opportunities identified under the entrepreneurial orientation strategy. Inferring from Fellnhofer (2016), the concept of commitment to opportunity in entrepreneurship involves the entrepreneur's willingness to act quickly in a short time in pursuit of opportunities. Under this dimension, the trustee's decision process may be slow compared to the promoter, who is willing to pursue given opportunities (Brown, 2001). The dimension of commitment to opportunity also drives innovation through the entrepreneur's need to grab the opportunities quickly.

Similarly, the dimension on the commitment to opportunity, and the entrepreneurial management dimension on the commitment to resources involve a multi-staged commitment with a minimum requirement of resources at each decision point. Both the promoter and the trustee in business require resources to pursue resources (Farrukh et al., 2017). However, the difference occurs where the promoter needs to maximize value through minimizing the resource requirements, while the trustee commitment to resources involves a large single-stage involvement. The process of minimizing resources comes with various risks adding to organizational pressure, including capital allocation and planning (Hung & Chu, 2006). The dimension of commitment to resources in entrepreneurial management thus drives innovation through minimization of the risks involved in the process.

Decisiveness is one of the characteristics of entrepreneurs. Successful entrepreneurs make effective decisions responsible for guiding business trajectories, including resource allocation. Stevenson's entrepreneurial management dimension of control of resources involves the way business resources are owned and controlled (Shaw, 2005). The entrepreneurs try to reduce the number of resources used and owned while improving value. Often, promoters are concerned with access to resources such as intellectual capital, competencies, skills, and financial capital. As the business grows, there are chances of increased resource accumulation, making it difficult to ensure resource control entrepreneurs thus engage in innovative ways to provide more flexibility and opportunity for business development (Bolton & Lane, 2012). The entrepreneurs' engagement in strategies to ensure flexibility in the control of resources serves as a driver of innovation success.

In business management, the entrepreneurs often decide on the management hierarchy regarding resource ownership and resource employment. Often, the entrepreneurs do not own all the resources required in business development. Stevenson's concept of management structure in entrepreneurial management involves the management structure aimed at coordinating the non-controlled resources and creating an environment that promotes opportunity creation (Shafique & Kalyar, 2018; Yang, 2008; Vera & Crossan, 2014; Zahra, 1996). The management structure helps the entrepreneurs develop multiple management networks that help them seek opportunities for business improvement. For instance, entrepreneurs need to decide between using and renting resources instead of owning or employing the resources (Fellnhofer, 2016). The management skill in entrepreneurial management is essential, and decisions on efficient management lead to the development of innovation in business.

Entrepreneurial management differs from traditional administrative management based on concepts of compensation and reward. Based on Stevenson's view of entrepreneurial management, the dimension of reward philosophy involves compensations based on contributions to business opportunities and exploitations (Gürbüz & Aykol, 2009; Williams et al., 2010). Entrepreneurial businesses are focused on value creation; thus, the concept of rewards is based on value-driven philosophy. The entrepreneurs are thus likely to base their rewards on performance as opposed to administrative organizations that focus less on the maximization and distribution of value. By

following the reward philosophy that focuses on the creation of value, the employees end up promoting the use of innovation to achieve performance (Nardelli, 2017; Urban & Wood, 2017). Under this value-driven reward philosophy, the employees can experiment on potential opportunities to achieve value and drive innovation.

Every business desire systematic growth and development, and this requires additional efforts. However, growth in administrative business management differs from entrepreneurial management, as the entrepreneurs require rapid growth as opposed to slow, steady growth under administrative management (Brown, 2001). Stevenson's dimension of growth orientation under entrepreneurial management involves a flexible structure of management that puts at risk the exploitation of opportunities to ensure attainment of the desired rapid growth (Neneh & van Zyl, 2017). Growth orientation under entrepreneurial management pushes entrepreneurs to determine what the business requires to attain rapid growth. For instance, the need for new employee skills or new procedures necessary for the business growth. The need for the development of new strategies that promote business growth and drive business innovation leading to rapid enterprise growth.

Entrepreneurial culture refers to the attitudes, skills, values, and power of individuals in organizations aimed at creating value. Entrepreneurial characteristics involve aspects such as risk tolerance, adaptability, persistence, and decisiveness, among other aspects. Entrepreneurial managed businesses exhibit entrepreneurial characteristics and encourage the employees to generate creative opportunities that ensure value creation (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2008). Stevenson's entrepreneurial management dimension of entrepreneurial culture involves an environment that includes a wide range of ideas aimed at ensuring creative outputs (Spanjol et al., 2012). Entrepreneurial culture in management consists of various elements of growth and success. Innovation is one of the key elements that drive entrepreneurial culture. Innovation helps in the development of creative opportunities that drive business growth and development. In contrast, management under administrative leadership is limited to ideas related to the relevant resources, leading to limited growth. Entrepreneurs thus tend to create an environment that allows the development of innovative ideas that helps to utilize the non-controlled resources and consequently promotes business growth.

Various studies have been conducted on the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation success based on Stevenson's dimensions of entrepreneurial management. Brown (2001) outlines the link between entrepreneurial management and organizational innovation success through its effects on the entrepreneurial dimensions. Some entrepreneurial management dimensions such as strategic orientation and commitment to opportunity drive innovation and consequently improve the firm's performance. Stevenson and Carlos Jarrillo-Mossi (1986) argue that entrepreneurship involves the pursuit of opportunities without regard to controlled resources. Since every business requires resources to grow, Kuhn (2010) hypothesizes that firms utilizing entrepreneurial management approaches are forced to implement innovative strategies to cover non-controlled resources and drive innovation.

Kuhn (2010) further aimed to highlight how the concept of entrepreneurship contributes to sustainable business growth and innovation. The research conducted an empirical study on 301 employees to understand the nature of sustainable entrepreneurship and innovation. The results indicated that the entrepreneurial dimension is a significant indicator of perceived innovation success within a sustainable business. Similarly, Hossein et al. (2013) articulate that the concept of Firm-Level Entrepreneurship (FLE) leads to improved corporate performance and innovation success. The measurement for entrepreneurial success at the firm level is possible through a commitment to opportunity aimed at revolutionary innovations over a short period.

Edwards et al. (2014) state that entrepreneurial orientation involves the development of strategies aimed at exploiting opportunities that other businesses are yet to harness. Diverse dimensions promote business growth and success. Innovativeness is one of the entrepreneurial dimensions in business organizations that help in increased performance. Innovativeness involves the predisposition of pursuing creativity and experimentation to promote the development of new products and services and consequently improve firm performance. Also, in the study by El-Annan (2013), the research outlines the various leadership styles and entrepreneurial dimensions that drive innovation. The study articulates that leadership in itself does improve business success; however, linking leadership styles with entrepreneurship management helps to utilize and harmonize different dimensions, including management structure, control of resources, and commitment to resources, which help drive entrepreneurial innovation skills.

Majid Levie et al. (2008) researched the entrepreneurial management effects on firm performance. The study explored the relationship between entrepreneurship management and a firm's growth based on Stevenson's dimensions of entrepreneurial management techniques. The dimensional constructs under the approach included strategic orientation, resource orientation, and reward philosophy, among other dimensions proposed by Stevenson. The findings indicated that entrepreneurial management dimensions contribute significantly to the firm's improved performance. Through the use of entrepreneurial dimensions such as reward philosophy to attain an improved performance level, the approach necessitates creativity that promotes innovation.

Similarly, entrepreneurial culture is the other entrepreneurial management dimension that promotes business performance and promotes innovation success. Osowska (2016) outlines the relationship between culture and entrepreneurship. He informs that entrepreneurship exemplifies skills such as adaptability, creativity, and decisiveness, among others. The entrepreneurial culture in organizations helps in the promotion of a broad search for opportunities which in turn leads to the development of innovations that promote organizational success.

The conceptual framework section presents the development of the proposed model that was evaluated to be used in the analysis. The model was developed with reference to Stevenson's conceptual dimensions of entrepreneurial management, and previous studies conducted on the same topic of the study. The model consists of eight independent variables and one dependent variable. The independent variable includes a commitment to opportunity (CO), strategic orientation (SO), commitment to resources (CMR), control of resources (CR), management structure (MS), renewed philosophy (RP), growth orientation (GO), entrepreneurial culture (EC); and the dependent variable is innovation success (IS). From the model, the hypotheses were developed as listed below.

3. METHODOLOGY

This research investigated the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation and success from an international business perspective by comparing Thailand and Indonesia. The study adopted quantitative techniques where data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The results were analysed using statistical software to evaluate the research objectives developed in the research.

3.1 Target population

The study populations were the employees in both countries that operate internationally. A total of eight international companies were selected, four in each of Thailand and Indonesia were selected. The respondents from these companies were selected randomly. A structured questionnaire was developed and used to collect the data from sample respondents. The questionnaire was

distributed online using the invitation link sent to the sample population. The responses successfully retrieved were 442 and 497 for Thailand and Indonesia respectively.

3.2 Data collection and analysis

The questionnaire was developed using the Likert 5-point scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Data analysis was conducted to evaluate responses to the study objectives. The first analysis was descriptive statistics to evaluate the demographic characteristics of the respondents, including age, gender, and income among other characters. The model evaluation was conducted to evaluate its fitness using techniques such as normality tests, multicollinearity tests and heteroscedasticity tests. The major analysis was conducted using multiple regression analysis to find out which factors significantly influence innovation.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section evaluated the demographic characteristics of the respondents for the study. The demographic characteristics evaluated include gender, age, education level, and period worked in the concerned organization. The results show that for both Thailand and Indonesia, males were the majority representing 72% and 71% for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. Considering the age of the respondents, the majority age group for both countries was 30 – 40 years representing 71% for Thailand and 68% for Indonesia. This age group was followed by the 40 – 50 years age group which was represented by 10% and 11% for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. Another variable evaluated was the education level of the respondents. For both countries, the majority of the respondents were those with college education represented by 48% and 59% for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. The second majority for Thailand was those with high school education represented by 27% while in Indonesia it was those with bachelor’s education represented by 38%. The last demographic characteristic evaluated was the period worked in the concerned organization by the respondents; the majority in Thailand was between 5 – 10 years (61%) while the majority in Indonesia was 10 – 15 years (60.8%).

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

		Thailand		Indonesia	
		N	%	N	%
Gender	Male	319	72.2	353	71.0
	Female	123	27.8	144	29.0
	20-30 Years	67	15.2	89	17.9
	30-40 Years	314	71.0	339	68.2
	40-50 Years	46	10.4	52	10.5
	50 and above	15	3.4	17	3.4
Education Level	Below and High School	15	3.4	2	0.4
	High School	119	26.9	10	2.0
	College	212	48.0	295	59.4
	Bachelor and above	96	21.7	190	38.2

	1-5 Years	66	14.9	16	3.2
Period Worked in the Organization	5-10 Years	269	60.9	106	21.3
	10-15 Years	93	21.0	302	60.8
	Above 15 Years	14	3.3	73	14.7

Before conducting the actual analysis to evaluate the study hypotheses, it was important to evaluate the suitability of the proposed model in conducting the analysis. The model evaluation was conducted through Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), reliability analysis, and validity analysis. These sections and their findings are presented below in table 2.

The analysis data was evaluated for multicollinearity using the variance inflated factor (VIF) which tests the amount of multicollinearity in a set of multiple regression analysis. The results are presented in the table below. The required threshold is that $VIF > 10$ and $tolerance > 1.0$. Since these criteria were fulfilled, it was satisfied that multicollinearity was not a problem in the analysis.

Table 2. VIF Test Results

Collinearity Statistics	
Tolerance	VIF
.317	3.158
.283	3.533
.351	2.845
.309	3.238
.397	2.518
.353	2.835
.194	5.160
.253	3.945

a. Dependent Variable: IS

Another diagnostic test that was conducted was the autocorrelation test, to test the degree of correlation between the values of variables across different data sets. Durbin Watson tests was used, which indicated that Durbin Watson = 1.970. Since the value was between 1.5 and 2.5 and therefore the data is not autocorrelated. CFA was used to evaluate the model by checking the relationship between the observed variables and their underlying latent variables. CFA relies on several statistical tests to determine the adequacy of model fit to the data. The chi-square test indicates the amount of difference between expected and observed covariance matrices. A chi-square value close to zero indicates little difference between the expected and observed covariance matrices (Kline, 1998). The statistical tests concocted in this study are listed in Table 3 below, and their CFA results indicate the fit of the model.

Table 3. Model Evaluation Fitness Index

Model	X ² (df)	X ² /(df)	CFI	TLI	IFI
Thailand	1467.378(552)	2.658	.916	.903	.915
Indonesia	1614.5(552)	2.925	.914	.902	.914

X² = chi-square, TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index, CFI = comparative fit index, RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation, df = degrees of freedom, IFI = Incremental fit index

The results presented in Table 2 shows that IFI, TLI, and CFI have met their threshold of >.90 as indicated by Byrne (1994), and Fan et al. (1999). Additionally, Schumacker and Lomax (2004) suggest that there is an adequate fit if RMSEA is <= .080, which has been met in the two models of this study. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggest that X²(df) should be <=3.0 which was satisfied in both of our models. Therefore, from these metrics, the CFA indicated that the proposed model showed and good and adequate fit.

4.1 Drivers of Innovation success in Thailand

In the regression analysis, the results indicated that R-squared was 0.762 while the adjusted R-squared was 0.757. This implied that 75.7% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables included in the model. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also carried out which indicated that $F(8, 433) = 172.918$, $p = 0.000$. These results indicated that the whole model was significant because p -value < 0.05. The regression results presented in the table below indicated that innovation success was influenced by most factors. These factors that significantly and positively influenced innovation success in Thailand included entrepreneurial culture (EC) ($\beta = 0.085$, p -value = 0.036); strategic orientation (SO) ($\beta = 0.301$, p -value = 0.000); renewed philosophy (RP) ($\beta = 0.067$, p -value = 0.049); management structure (MS) ($\beta = 0.083$, p -value = 0.016); control of resources (CR) ($\beta = -0.064$, p -value = 0.000); commitment to resources (CMR) ($\beta = 0.061$, p -value = 0.012). However, growth orientation (GO) was found to have a insignificant but a negative effect on innovation success (IS) ($\beta = 0.398$, p -value = 0.077); while commitment to opportunity (CO) was found to have an insignificant relationship with innovation success (IS) ($\beta = 0.040$, p -value > 0.426). These results are summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Regression Results for Thailand

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.108	.105		1.030	.304
CMR	.061	.040	.063	1.510	.012
SO	.301	.041	.326	7.400	.000
CR	.398	.040	.396	10.003	.000
MS	.083	.043	.081	1.919	.016
RP	.067	.034	.073	1.973	.049

GO	-.064	.036	-.070	-1.775	.077
CO	.040	.051	.042	.796	.426
EC	.085	.045	.089	1.916	.036

Note: Dependent Variable: IS; commitment to opportunity (CO), strategic orientation (SO), commitment to resources (CMR), control of resources (CR), management structure (MS), renewed philosophy (RP), growth orientation (GO), entrepreneurial culture (EC); and the dependent variable is innovation success (IS)

4.2 Drivers of Innovation success in Indonesia

In the regression analysis, the results indicated that R-squared was 0.729 while the adjusted R-squared was 0.725. This implied that 72.5% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables included in the model. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also carried out which indicated that $F(8, 488) = 164.069$, $p = 0.000$. These results indicated that the whole model was significant because $p\text{-value} < 0.05$. The regression results presented in the table below indicated that innovation success was influenced by most factors. These factors that significantly and positively influenced innovation success in Indonesia included strategic orientation (SO) ($\beta = 0.352$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$); renewed philosophy (RP) ($\beta = 0.176$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$); management structure (MS) ($\beta = 0.085$, $p\text{-value} = 0.021$); and control of resources (CR) ($\beta = 0.042$, $p\text{-value} = 0.000$). However, the other factors were found to have insignificant influence on innovation success. These results are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Regression Results for Indonesia

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.137	.104		1.326	.186
CMR	.023	.040	.025	.590	.555
SO	.352	.041	.376	8.560	.000
CR	.320	.042	.311	7.614	.000
MS	.085	.049	.079	1.751	.021
RP	.176	.045	.170	3.909	.000
GO	-.019	.037	-.019	-.507	.612
CO	-.004	.050	-.004	-.086	.932
EC	.036	.044	.037	.830	.407

a. Dependent Variable: IS; commitment to opportunity (CO), strategic orientation (SO), commitment to resources (CMR), control of resources (CR), management structure (MS), renewed philosophy (RP), growth orientation (GO), entrepreneurial culture (EC); and the dependent variable is innovation success (IS)

4.3 Comparison of Thailand and Indonesia

After evaluating the specific drivers of innovation success in Thailand and Indonesia independently, the other objective was to compare the driver of innovation between the two countries. The comparison is presented in the table 6 below.

Table 6. Comparison of Thailand and Indonesia

Variables	Thailand	Indonesia
	Beta coefficient	Beta coefficient
(Constant)	.108	.137
CMR	.061**	.023
SO	.301***	.352***
CR	.398***	.320***
MS	.083**	.085**
RP	.067**	.176***
GO	-.064	-.019
CO	.040	-.004
EC	.085**	.036

Note: Dependent Variable: IS; commitment to opportunity (CO), strategic orientation (SO), commitment to resources (CMR), control of resources (CR), management structure (MS), renewed philosophy (RP), growth orientation (GO), entrepreneurial culture (EC); and the dependent variable is innovation success (IS)

From the findings of this research analysis, notable aspects were observed about the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation success in Thailand and Indonesia. The first aspect is that Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurship management is more evident in Thailand as compared to Indonesia. The major reason for this observation is that among the 8 factors of Stevenson's concept, six factors were found to have a positive and significant effect on innovation success; while in Indonesia, only four factors were found to have significant and positive effects. For Thailand, these factors include strategic orientation, commitment to resources, control of resources, management structure, renewed philosophy (RP), and entrepreneurial culture. These findings are supported by the findings of various other researchers. For instance, (Larson, 2000; Zhao, 2005), indicated that having an entrepreneurial culture encourages a sustainable and innovative culture, which generates growth ideas. The aspect of entrepreneurial control of resources and commitment of resources is supported by the fact that having an entrepreneurially managed firm enhances resources management. In such an environment, the working groups could have flexible coordination of key resources which could be utilized to seek and create opportunities (Schaltegger & Wagner, 2008).

Comparing Thailand and Indonesia, there are four factors of Stevenson's entrepreneurship management concept that proved significant in both countries' entrepreneurial environments. These factors include strategic orientation, control of resources, management structure, and renewed

philosophy. Among them, entrepreneurial control of resources was observed to have the highest effect on innovation success in both countries. According to the research statistics, one unit increase in entrepreneurial control of resources would boost innovation success by 0.398 and 0.320 units for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. The second important variable is strategic orientation, where one unit increase in strategic orientation would boost innovation success by 0.301 and 0.352 units for Thailand and Indonesia respectively. These findings are supported by Zhao (2005) aligning a business strategically within the entrepreneurial environment provides an optimal condition for establishing and maintaining sustainable driven innovations. This research confirms that Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurial management is a good and positive predictor of innovation success. However, these aspects are quite different in the two countries considered, as the entrepreneurial driver of innovation success.

5. CONCLUSION

This research investigated the entrepreneurial drivers of innovation success from the international business perspective. The research compared results for two countries, Thailand and Indonesia. Considering the increase in the competitive business environment in the global market, and the growing need for business innovation, this study of evaluating entrepreneurial drivers of innovation success was considered paramount. The study adopted the concept of Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurial management. Primary data was applied, which was collected from employees working in various organizations in the two countries. The analysis was conducted using multiple linear regression analysis.

The results of the study indicated that there are four factors of Stevenson's entrepreneurship management concept that proved significant in the two countries' entrepreneurial environments. These factors include strategic orientation, control of resources, management structure, and renewed philosophy. Among them, entrepreneurial control of resources and strategic orientation were observed to have the highest effect on innovation success in both countries. Other drivers' factors that were found to have a significant effect on Thailand's innovation success were commitment to resources and entrepreneurial culture. Though Stevenson's conceptualization of innovation management factors was found to have significant drivers to innovation success, they were more influential in Thailand as compared to Indonesia. This implies that there was a significant difference between the two countries as far Stevenson's concept of entrepreneurial drivers of innovation is concerned. There are two limitations associated with this study. First, the study specifically relied on Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurial management factors. Therefore, future researchers could consider adopting other models or adding other variables. Secondly, the study was conducted in two countries, Thailand and Indonesia, hence the application of the results should be done with this recognition.

From the managerial perspective, this research suggests that for both Thailand and Indonesia, management should consider four major factors as significant entrepreneurial drivers towards innovation. These factors include opportunity-based oriented strategic orientation, opportunity-based control of resources, opportunity-based management structure, and opportunity-based renewed philosophy. However, for Thailand, two additional factors should be considered important, which are opportunity-based commitment to resources and opportunity-based entrepreneurial culture. Another implication is that this research has effectively attempted to bridge the gap between entrepreneurship and innovation, worth expounding. Therefore, though Stevenson's

conceptualization of innovation management factors from the entrepreneurial perspective was applied, this theoretical concept could be expounded to consider the management perspectives.

REFERENCES

- Arthur-Aidoo, B.M., Aigbavboa, C.O. & Thwala, W.D. 2016. Attitudes of owners which impedes firm's growth: A case of small and medium-sized construction firms in Ghana. *Procedia Engineering*, 164(2016):230-234.
- Athayde, R. 2012. The impact of enterprise education on attitudes to enterprise in young people: An evaluation study. *Education and Training*, 54(8/9): 709-725.
- Badenhorst-Weiss, J.A. & Ambe, I.M. 2011. Improving service delivery through outsourcing. *Journal of Contemporary Management*, 8: 453-472.
- Baumol, W.J. 1990. Entrepreneurship: productive, unproductive, and destructive. *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5):893-921.
- Blakely, E.J. & Leigh, N.C. 2013. Planning local economic development: Theory and practice. 5th ed. California: Sage Publications.
- Bobby-Evans, A. 2015. Apartheid Legislation in South Africa. Available at: <http://africanhistory.about.com/library/bl/blsalaws.htm>. [Date accessed: 3.09.2015].
- Bolton, D.L. 2012. Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation: Further Investigation of a Measurement Instrument. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*: 18 (1): 91-98.
- Bolton, D.L., & Lane, M.D., 2012. Individual entrepreneurial orientation: Development of a Measurement Instrument. *Education+ Training* 54 (2/3): 219-233.
- Brown, T. E. 2001. An operationalization of Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurship as opportunity-based firm behavior. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(10): 953-968.
- Brown, T.E., Davidsson, P., & Wiklund, J. 2001. An operationalization of Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurship as opportunity-based firm behavior. *Strategic Management Journal*: 22 (10): 953-968.
- Byrne, B. M. 1994. *Structural equation modeling with EQS and EQS/Windows*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California.
- Chow, I.H.-s. 2006. The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance in China. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*: 71 (3): 11-21.
- Edwards, J. K., Ketchen, D., Short, J., & Try, D. 2014. *Mastering strategic management-1st Canadian Edition*. BCcampus, Victoria British Columbia.
- El-Annan, S. H. 2013. Innovation, proactive, and vision are three integrated dimensions between leadership and entrepreneurship. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*: 1(12): 148-163.
- Fan, X., Thompson, B. & Wang, L. 1999. Effects of sample size, estimation method, and model specification on structural equation modeling fit indexes. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6: 56-83.
- Farrukh, M. C., Chong, W.Y., Mansori, S., & Ramzani, S.R. 2017. Intrapreneurial behaviour: the role of organizational commitment. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 13(3): 243-256.
- Fellnhöfer, K. 2017. Drivers of innovation success in sustainable businesses. *Journal of Cleaner Production*: 16(7): 1534-1545.
- Fellnhöfer, K., 2016. The Organizational Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Orientation across Hierarchical Levels. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*: 17 (4): 217-227.
- Fowosire, R. A., Idris, O.Y., & Elijah, O. 2017. Technopreneurship: a view of technology, innovations and entrepreneurship. *Global Journal of Research In Engineering (F)*, 17(7): 40-46.
- Gliń, W. 2018. Problems of Polish enterprises in the field of innovation. *Production Engineering Archives*, 21(21), 44-47.
- Grootaert, C., 1998. The missing link. *Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life*, 23(8):1-24.
- Gürbüz, G. & Aykol, S. 2009. Entrepreneurial management, entrepreneurial orientation and Turkish small firm growth. *Management Research News*, 32(4): 321-336.
- Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. 2010. *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.), Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Herrington, M. & Kew, J. 2013. GEM 2013 South African Report: Twenty years of democracy. University of Cape Town Centre for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Cape Town: South Africa.
- Herrington, M., Kew, J. & Kew, P. 2010. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. University of Cape Town. Cape Town: South Africa.
- Herrington, M., Kew, J. & Kew, P. 2015. 2014 GEM South Africa report: South Africa: The crossroads – a goldmine or a time bomb? University of Cape Town Centre for Innovation and Entrepreneurship. Cape Town: South Africa.

- Hosseini, M., Dadfar, H., & Brege, S. 2013. Firm-level entrepreneurship and the internationalization of small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 16: 338–368.
- Hu L. T., & Bentler P. M. 1999. Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6: 1–55.
- Hung, S.-C., & Chu, Y.-Y. 2006. Stimulating new industries from emerging technologies: Challenges for the public sector. *Technovation*, 26 (1): 104-110.
- Ijeoma, E.O.C. & Matarirano, O. 2011. Government subsidised financial assistance to small scale businesses: A comparative analysis of Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Journal of Public Administration*, 46(Special issue 1):854-867.
- IT News Africa. 2015. Top 10 richest countries in Africa rated. Available at: <http://www.itnewsafrika.com/2015/02/top-10-richest-countries-in-africa-rated/>. [Date accessed: 23.02.2017].
- Kerr, W. R.-K. 2014. Entrepreneurship as experimentation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(3): 25-48.
- Kline, R. B. 1998. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*, the Guilford Press, New York, NY
- Kozan, M.K., Oksoy, D. & Ozsoy, O. 2012. Owner sacrifice and small business growth. *Journal of World Business*, 47(2012):409–419.
- Kuhn, B. S. 2010. Entrepreneurial management as a strategic choice in firm behavior: linking it with performance. *In 18th High Technology Small Firms Conference (HTSF)*: 1-36.
- Larson, A.L. 2000. Sustainable innovation through an entrepreneurship lens. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 9(5): 304-317.
- Levie, J.D., Majid, I.A., Cooper, S. & Ismail, K. 2008. Entrepreneurial management and technology-based firm performance. *Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 2(1): 79-98.
- Malhotra N. K., & Dash S. 2011. *Marketing research an applied orientation*, Pearson Publishing, London
- Meyer, D., Meyer, N. & Neethling, J.R. 2016. Perceptions of business owners on service delivery and the creation of an enabling environment by local government. *Administratio Publica*, 24(3):52-73.
- Meyer, D.F. & Meyer, N. 2017. Management of small and medium enterprise (SME) development: An analysis of stumbling blocks in a developing region. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 16(1): 127-141.
- Meyer, D.F. 2014. Local government's role in the creation of an enabling developmental environment. *Administratio Publica*, 22(1): 24-46.
- Meyer, N. & Meyer D.F. 2016. The relationship between the creation of an enabling environment and economic development: A comparative analysis of management at local government sphere. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 14(2): 150-160.
- Nardelli, G. 2017. Innovation dialectics: An extended process perspective on innovation in services. *The Service Industries Journal*, 37: 31–56.
- Neneh, B. N., & van Zyl, J. 2017. Entrepreneurial orientation and its impact on firm growth amongst SMEs in South Africa. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 15(3): 166-178.
- Osowska, R. 2016. The development of entrepreneurial culture in a transition economy: An empirical model discussion. *In Contemporary Entrepreneurship (pp. 259-273)*, Springer, Cham.
- Peters, R. & Naicker, V. 2013. Small medium micro enterprise business goals and government support: A South African case study. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 44(4):13-24.
- Pretorius, D. & Schurink, W. 2007. Enhancing service delivery in local government: The case of a district municipality. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(3): 19-29.
- PriceWaterhouseCoopers (PWC). 2010. Local government and King III: Public Sector Working Group Paper 2. Available at: <http://www.salga.org.za/app/webroot/assets/files/>. [Date accessed: 31.03.2016].
- Radović-Marković, M. & Salamzadeh, A. 2012. *The nature of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial activities*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, Saarbrücken: 87-97.
- Rasmus, W. & Laguna, M. 2018. Dimensions of entrepreneurial success: A multilevel study on stakeholders of micro-enterprises. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9: 791. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00791
- Schaltegger, S., & Wagner, M. 2008. Types of Sustainable Entrepreneurship and Conditions for Sustainability Innovation: From the Administration of a Technical Challenge to the Management of an Entrepreneurial Opportunity, in: Rolf Wüstenhagen, J.H., Sanjay Sharma and Mark Starik (Eds), Sustainable Innovation and Entrepreneurship, New Perspectives in Research on Corporate Sustainability Series. Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, UK: pp. 27-48.
- Schumacker, R.E. & Lomax, R.G. 2004. A Beginner's guide to structural equation modeling, Second Edition, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Shafique, I., & Kalyar, M.N. 2018. Linking transformational leadership, absorptive capacity, and corporate entrepreneurship. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(2): 9. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci8020009>

- Shaw, E. O. 2005. Corporate entrepreneurship and innovation part 2: A role-and process-based approach. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 8(4): 393-408.
- Singh, S. K. 2018. Entrepreneurship and innovation management in emerging economies. *Management Decision*, 56(1): 2-5.
- Sivvam, M. 2012. Female entrepreneurship: An Indian perspective. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP Lambert.
- South Africa History Online (SAHO). 1994. South African first democratic elections. Available at: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/dated-event/south-africas-first-democratic-elections>.
- South African History Online (SAHO). 2011. Pass laws in South Africa 1800-1994. Available at: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/south-africa-1806-1899/pass-laws-south-africa-1800-1994>.
- Spanjol, J., Mühlmeier, S., & Tomczak, T. 2012. Strategic Orientation and Product Innovation: Exploring a Decompositional Approach. *Journal of Product Innovation Management* 29 (6): 967-985.
- Stevenson, H.H., & Carlos Jarrillo-Mossi, J., 1986. Preserving Entrepreneurship as Companies Grow. *Journal of Business Strategy* 7(1): 10-23.
- The Presidency. 2014. National Development Plan 2030: Our future-make it work. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Thindwa, J. 2003. Enabling environment for civil society in CDD projects. Washington, DC: World Bank, Social Development Family, CDD Learning Module.
- Trousdale, W. 2005. Promoting Local Economic Development through strategic Planning. The Local Economic Development Series, 1–5. Nairobi, UN-Habitat.
- United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). 2008. Creating an enabling environment for private sector development in sub-Saharan Africa. Vienna. Austria.
- Urban, B. & Wood, E. 2017. The innovating firm as corporate entrepreneurship. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 20(4): 534-556. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-10-2016-0100>
- Van Vuuren, J.J. & Groenewald, D. 2007. A critical analysis of the influence of start-up factors in small businesses and entrepreneurial ventures in SA. *Acta Commercii*, 7(1): 269-280.
- Vera, D., & Crossan, M. 2004. Strategic leadership and organizational learning. *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 222–40.
- Williams, H.M., Parker, S.K., & Turner, K. 2010. Proactively performing teams: The role of work design, transformational leadership, and team composition. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83: 301–24.
- Yang, C. 2008. The relationships among leadership styles, entrepreneurial orientation, and business performance. *Managing Global Transitions*, 6: 257–75.
- Zahra, S. 1996. Governance, ownership, and corporate entrepreneurship: the moderating impact of industry technological opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39: 1713–35.
- Zhao, F. 2005. Entrepreneurship and innovation in e-business: An integrative perspective. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 6(1): 53–60. <https://doi.org/10.5367/0000000053026428>