Table 4.4: Stepwise Regression Results for Overall CEAI each CEAI Factor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall CEAI</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>423.85</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>223.47</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>154.32</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Management Support for CE</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>207.13</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>2,441</td>
<td>113.54</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>3,440</td>
<td>79.46</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>rating of effectiveness of bonus</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>61.07</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2: Work Discretion</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>211.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>unofficial improvements implemented by you</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>112.62</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3: Rewards/Reinforcement</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>315.56</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of pay raise</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>164.05</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>112.49</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4: Time Availability</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>16.97</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of “other” method of pay raise</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5: Organizational Boundaries</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>106.36</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>times recognized for job improvement</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>56.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: Entrepreneurial Performance Index Statistical Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement Score</th>
<th>Organizational Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statement Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Table 4.6: Chronbach’s Test of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chronbach’s a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Support</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discretion</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards / Reinforcement</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Availability</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Boundaries</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7: Stepwise Regression Results for Overall CEAI each CEAI Factor (POST TEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall CEAI</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>309.952</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>2,341</td>
<td>210.570</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>3,540</td>
<td>151.320</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Management Support for CE</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>1,442</td>
<td>188.139</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>2,347</td>
<td>99.846</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>3,150</td>
<td>62.359</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>rating of effectiveness of bonus</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>4,119</td>
<td>59.073</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 2: Work Discretion</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>208.574</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>unofficial improvements implemented by you</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>2,139</td>
<td>111.422</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 3: Rewards/Reinforcement</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>311.554</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of pay raise</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>161.049</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>times recognized for new idea</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>3,639</td>
<td>101.007</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 4: Time Availability</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>16.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>use of “other” method of pay raise</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>11.013</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 5: Organizational Boundaries</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Adjusted R square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>total satisfaction</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>1,219</td>
<td>105.799</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>times recognized for job improvement</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>51.661</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>use of bonuses</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>3,437</td>
<td>31.476</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8: Chronbach’s Test of Significance (POST TEST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable:</th>
<th>Chronbach’s a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Support</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Discretion</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards / Reinforcement</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Availability</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Boundaries</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5. Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to gain insights from the proposals and findings discussed in chapters 1-4. As previously discussed the practice and research involving CE is relatively new. Within the realm of hospitality research the practice of research involving entrepreneurship is highly scarce. According to Stevenson (1983), entrepreneurial activity within the global business environment is growing at a rate of two-fold each economic year. Innovative products and services are being introduced into the marketplace at a rapid pace. Within the U.S. eighty percent of all businesses are classified as being owned and operated by small business organizations / individuals (Stevenson, 1983). Within the food service industry small businesses are the driving force in growth and menu diversity in the U.S. With the extent of this movement in the industry and hyper competition throughout the entire industry, it is incomprehensible that more research is not conducted within the realm of entrepreneurship and innovative management practices.

This study involving CE and organizational behavior has provided and supported several important hypotheses involving managers’ and TMTs’ perceptions about CE activity and the recognition of reinforcement practices that decision making and innovation provides.
Through stepwise regression analysis the following hypotheses presented in chapter 1 proved to be valid:

H1a: The perception of a corporate entrepreneurial culture will result in increased job satisfaction.

Through the statistical analysis, the perception of a corporate entrepreneurial culture resulted in a model R-square of .337. Within the informal job satisfaction analysis and the view of organizational quality, positive results were received and evaluated. Some written comments from unit managers included the overall sense of organizational support for management innovations that improve operational performance and customer and employee satisfaction. The key question to present through the analysis of data is the strength of CE practices are occurring within an individual organization. Through the regression analysis, this question could not be substantiated by the results. This poses a future research problem involving CE that is yet to be explored.

H2a: The perception of each corporate entrepreneurial factor measured by the CEAI will result in increased job satisfaction.

Within the stepwise regression results the overall composite score on the CEAI, total satisfaction, use of bonuses, and times recognized for new ideas resulted in a model R square of .509. Through this statistical analysis it is the general consensus from the sample size that there is some form of recognized reward system in place for management performance through the CEAI assessment (i.e. bonuses, recognition, and or promotions for management innovations and product service enhancement). This is a
significant relationship to be validated within the initial hypothesis of CE involvement within the casual dining industry. First, the practice of rewards for management performance is a long standing organizational practice. However, within the statistical analysis and outcomes, unit managers have recognized rewards for innovative performance. Second, the validation of the CEAI allows for industry to translate the research data and adjust their future management practices to allow for more unit management autonomy and allow for performance enhancing innovative practices in order to increase management job satisfaction. Third, it is recognized through the analysis that TMTs are recognizing and encouraging innovative management practices at the unit level. This is evident through the realization of innovative practices at the unit level.

H1b: The perception of a corporate entrepreneurial culture will result in increased reinforcement practices.

The supported results presented in the CEAI study reinforce the notion of innovative activities implemented by TMTs and unit managers and reinforced through the variables of bonuses, promotions, and organizational incentives. Hence, this hypothesis may be supported by the CEAI results.
H2b: The perception of each corporate entrepreneurial factor measured by the CEAI will result in increased reinforcement practices.

As previously mentioned within the hypothesis statement of H1b, the statistical analysis of the CEAI have resulted in positive R-square models in variables related to use of bonuses and times recognized for new ideas (R-square .509), support factor and total satisfaction (R-square .352), work discretion, total satisfaction, and unofficial improvements implemented (R-square .337), use of pay and recognition for new ideas (R-square .432), “other” method of pay raise for innovative management (R-square .044), and bonuses for job improvement (R-square .208).

The statistical analysis of stepwise regression was used to analyze and develop results that support the variables involving organizational reinforcement practices and innovative management performance. The conclusion of the results supports the aforementioned hypothesis and provides a measurable link between CE development and assessment within the hospitality industry. By providing a tangible measurement in linking the variables of compensation, job reinforcement, and management performance / innovation; elements of CE provided by the literature review was able to be discovered and supported by the research conducted within this study. The second result of this study has allowed for a sizable contribution to entrepreneurship within the hospitality / tourism industry. Implications of future research involving this study will be summarized within the conclusions section of this chapter.
Discussion of the Instituted Propositions

Within the propositions posed in chapter 1, several conclusions can be drawn from the results that were yielded within this study in order to further develop the propositions posed in the realm of CE research. The following propositions (below) that were previously mentioned are described with the following conclusions:

1. Using management reinforcement practices, to what extent are TMTs and unit managers within casual dining based organizations able to identify entrepreneurial characteristics embedded and practiced within the organization?

Within the results presented in this chapter and chapter 4, in assessing managers’ perceptions and the practice of CE this question was best supported through the positive response of the organization’s reinforcement of management performance and innovations that related to higher unit performance. By tying in bonuses to reinforcement practices, the practice of CE realization and performance was measured.

2. Using management reinforcement practices, to what extent are TMTs and unit managers aware of the corporate structure, which foster such type of entrepreneurial activity?

Although managers positively related to the relationship of rewards for innovative performance, the question of whether corporate structure fosters entrepreneurial activity is rather ambiguous. The only statistical results within this study that would support this
proposition are through the pilot study correlating organization’s entrepreneurial activity intensity with overall management satisfaction within the organization.

3. To what extent are entrepreneurial strategies considered competitive methods within each TMTs and unit managers’ organization?

4. Using management reinforcement practices, to what extent do TMTs and unit managers understand the execution and value of entrepreneurial practices within the organization?

Within proposition 3, which has been posed the interpretation of using CE as a strategic competitive method, it is a viable option. However, within the context of this study no significant references can be drawn from TMTs’ and unit managers’ realization of CE as a sustainable competitive advantage. Only the literature review involving entrepreneurial strategy can support this proposition at this time. In a recent study which was published by Zahra et. al. (2002) the subject of entrepreneurship and a strategic competitive advantage was investigated within the manufacturing industry. Within the researcher’s conclusions, no statistical significance could be drawn from the two constructs. The researchers argue that the intangibility of a strategic competitive advantage clouded the overall vision of entrepreneurship and strategic initiatives within manufacturing (a basic operational business function).
5. Using management reinforcement practices, to what extent do TMTs allocate resources towards the development and advancement of entrepreneurial practices / strategies?

Within the statistical analysis of the CEAI using the variables of overall CEAI and rewards / reinforcement, a positive relationship was found in these areas. This supports the proposition of resource allocation however; allocation of time availability and use of organizational boundaries was not statistically significant to support the use of resource allocation towards entrepreneurial activities.

6. Using management reinforcement practices, have TMTs communicated these entrepreneurial strategies to the unit level?

When assessing this proposition it is important to point to the initial study in Chapter 3 involving the perception of organizational entrepreneurial intensity. The purpose of the pilot study was to assess whether managers view their respected organization to be “highly entrepreneurial” in nature. By conducting a basic correlation analysis it was found that the small sample size (N=55) believed that there was a fair amount of congruency between the entrepreneurial practices of their organization and their current management objectives. This would support proposition 6.

In propositions 7, and 8 no conclusive results can be drawn from these aforementioned propositions. It is my opinion that future studies will need to be drawn using income /
profit independent variables as a measure to determine entrepreneurial success within an organization.

**Assessment of CE Model**

After reviewing the data, and drawing conclusions from the data, the original model of CE and strategy posed by Guth and Ginsberg (1990) has been refined. The new model presented below is a reflection of management perception and an organization’s commitment towards entrepreneurial strategies. The previously mentioned constructs of environment, strategic leadership, organizational domain, and organizational performance are still equally important to the success of the model. The new construct of job satisfaction and rewards for management innovation / performance has been created not only due to the results of this study but it is also created to emphasize the importance of creating a link between the organizational domain, management strategies, the unit level, and performance. These findings are essential for the development, enhancement, and execution of entrepreneurial strategies within the hyper competitive casual dining segment. Figure 5.1 illustrates the previous model in addition to the new construct of job satisfaction and rewards for management / innovation performance.
Future development of this model would suggest developed and tested constructs involving organizational performance and alignment of organizational domain, strategy choice, executed entrepreneurial strategies (unit level), organizational performance, and feedback mechanism. As previously stated, future studies would need to investigate and validate the relationship between established organizational entrepreneurial strategies and financial performance. As in any function of business, the return on investment or positive cash flows will prompt whether a strategic decision will be embraced or rejected by all levels of management.
Implication of this Study to Practitioners

As mentioned previously, research involving CE and entrepreneurial behavior is in its infancy. Any contribution to this field especially in the hospitality industry adds to the relatively low amount of work involving entrepreneurship. The benefits to practitioners in research and management in hospitality are numerous. Here are a few key additions of this study to note:

1. It has been proven in this study that reinforcement practices and rewards are recognized and are viewed by management as a factor involving innovation practices.

2. There is a credible link between management reinforcement practices and innovative performance of managers.

3. There is a substance of elements in entrepreneurial practices within the casual dining industry.

4. This study adds to the body of literature in research involving entrepreneurship and hospitality / tourism research.

Limitations of the Study

This study was designed and used to test and evaluate several factors including CE and the hospitality industry (casual dining restaurant segment). First, an induction and extensive review of the body of literature was shown between individual entrepreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial strategy, and research relating to entrepreneurship and the hospitality industry. Second, propositions and hypothesis was proposed in order to support congruency between CE strategies and adoption / management practice of CE. Variables of management bonuses / rewards
were selected as a measurement of CE use and adoption. Third, several statistical analysis were used to measure CE intensity, CE practices, management understanding of CE, and overall CE effectiveness. Fourth, conclusions were drawn from the results and an overall tie in between theories posed, hypothesis posed, and results generated with conclusions were developed in order to support CE practice within the casual dining restaurant segment. Although it may considered that this study is an overall success in statistically measuring CE practice and reinforcement within organizations, several questions still do exist.

1. Although this study is conclusive in its findings supporting CE practice and realized strategies, it does not support the length and strength of CE strategies used.

2. This study does not address CE strategy and financial performance related to CE.

3. Future clarity is needed to address the strategic future of CE practices.

4. A future study is needed to address the link between CE intensity and organizational longevity.

5. Other segments within the hospitality / tourism industry need to be researched evaluating CE practices within each segment.

6. Future research is needed to address TMTs’ influence and value of CE within their respected segment.

7. This study did not address strategic resource allocation towards the advancement of CE. (However it can be argued that management promotions / bonuses / rewards could be construed as resource allocation in enhancing innovation.)
8. Although the variables of management rewards were used as variables for this study, other variables could be studied in order to determine CE effectiveness.

9. The Entrepreneurial Intensity study needs to be expanded in a future study in order to extend the consensus of entrepreneurial intensity within a hospitality organization.

10. The low results of model R-square as it relates to total satisfaction of organizational boundaries (.193) and total satisfaction of time availability for new ideas (.035), needs to be further explored to explain a low relationship with CE.

It is also important to mention that this study focuses in on one segment of the hospitality/tourism industry. Other studies need to address entrepreneurial practices involving additional segments to support entrepreneurial practices within this industry.

**Summary and Future Research Directions**

As Morris and Kuratko (2002) posit about a future direction of CE practice and research, several comments by the researchers were made:

- When recognizing and rewarding managers for innovative achievement, several directions need to be addressed and taken. Not only are financial rewards important but also intrinsic awards and overall CE awareness needs to take shape and maintain consistency among TMTs and unit-level managers. Future research would suggest a longitudinal analysis to examine an organization’s commitment of CE and reinforcement of these practices over an extended period of time.
• The authors also point out that there is an inherent merit of fear between establishing the normal practices within an organization and establishing a dynamic, innovative culture. Future studies would examine not only psychological profile or base of TMTs’ organizational practices but also an examination or review of societal / governmental incentives for innovative practices (i.e. awards of recognition, financial incentives).

• Another focus for future and ongoing research should encompass the measurement of continuous improvement of CE practices. Consistency not only needs to be evaluated but also the organizational threats (downsizing, budget cuts) that influence or hasten the progress of CE.

Overall, the goal of identifying CE intensity and a measurement for a practice of CE within the hospitality industry has been achieved. As mentioned above future research needs to address the pilot study of overall CE intensity and the economic value of CE. As future studies progress between entrepreneurship and financial performance within the hospitality industry the study of entrepreneurship will continue to be enhanced within hospitality research.
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