A Comparative Study of Cultural Dimension as an Influencing Factor to Entrepreneurial Orientation

Kee-SeonYoo, PhD
Professor
School of Management & Economics
Handong Global University

A Comparative Study of Cultural Dimension as an Influencing Factor to Entrepreneurial Orientation

Kee-SeonYoo, Ph.D.
Professor
School of Management & Economics
Handong Global University

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to evaluate how proactiveness and risk-taking of entrepreneurial orientation appearing in SMEs and the level of performance-oriented and human-oriented dimension of national culture are related. Selective comparative research on eight hypotheses were established with data collected from 387 South Korea and Thailand SMEs to verify the level of relationship of two national cultural dimensions of GLOBE project, and level of entrepreneurial orientation of the SMEs' from both countries. The result of hypothesis tests provide important implication on this topic. While performance-oriented culture level has positive influence on SME's risk-taking and proactiveness level, human-oriented culture level has negative influence on proactiveness level, and the negative relations of risk-taking level was rejected. South Korea's intensity of positive relationship of performance-oriented culture to the level of risk-taking and proactiveness is stronger than those of Thailand. On the contrary, Thailand's intensity of negative relationship of Human-oriented culture level to the level of proactiveness is stronger than those of South Korea. Hypothesis regarding relationship and intensity between two countries of Human-oriented culture level to the level of risk-taking cannot be verified.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Orientation; Risk taking; Proactiveness; GLOBE; Human oriented; Performance oriented

1. Introduction

Capability to create and sustain entrepreneurial activity is different for each country (McHrath, Macmillan &Scheinberg, 1992; Chrisman, Chua, and Steir, 2002; Carter and Wilton, 2006).There were various explanations for the reasons of the differences, but many scholars considered that one of the main factors that determined a country's economic level or development was by their national cultural property (Porter, 1990; McGrath, Macmillan, Yang, and Tsai, 1992; House, Javidan, Hanges, and Dorfman, 2002). And usually many scholars believed that the level of entrepreneurship mindset was affected through the policy that represents culture and the cultural value where national culture form a part of the society (Hofsteade, 1980; Ahlstrom and Bruton, 2002; Dickson, 2004). Although many past studies have examined the relationship between national culture and entrepreneurial activities, further studies must be done more closely on how culture affects entrepreneurial behavior (Zahra, Jennings, and Kuratko, 1999; Hayton, George, and Zahra, 2002).

Innovativeness, risk-taking and proactiveness are conceptualized as three major dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, which is considered as the core concept of entrepreneurial activities (Miller and Friesen, 1982; Miller,

1983; Covin and Slevin, 1989). Covin and Slevin presumed that these three levels can be combined to assess the overall level of entrepreneurial orientation of the corporate. However, recent studies have assumed that the level of each dimension of entrepreneurial orientation provides unique contribution to the overall level of entrepreneurial orientation (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Dess, Lumpkin, and McGee, 1999; Kreiser, Marino, and Weaver, 2002). From the individual-level perspective, many studies reported innovativeness as the major factor of entrepreneurial orientation and had many interests in between the relations of national culture (Morris, Avila, and Allen, 1993; Shane, 1993; Mueller and Thomas, 2001), however empirical studies on the other two factors of entrepreneurial orientation, risk-taking and proactiveness, were relative rarely dealt (Lee and Peterson, 2000).

In such conditions, it is very important to explore deeply in entrepreneurial activity and the relationship of individual level of national culture and entrepreneurial orientation. Therefore, this study has especially focused on the relationship of neglected aspects of national cultural value, which are performance-oriented level and human-oriented level, and the major factors of entrepreneurial orientation: risk-taking and proactiveness. Past studies fundamentally have researched the influence of entrepreneurial orientation with Hofstede's cultural orientation(Patrick, Louis, Carl, 2010; Moses, 2014), and some researchers studied by comparing Hofstede's sub-dimensions and have recently developed GLOBE(Global Leadership and Organizational Effectiveness) project's cultural sub-dimensions methodology(Chand and Ghorbani, 2011; Zhao, Rauch, and Rauch, 2012); however, not much attempts were made to study on whether closely related entrepreneurial activity have any influence on national culture level and entrepreneurial orientation. In addition, since most of previous studies in this topic were centered mainly on the United States and other western countries, the pursuit of this study is very significant to accomplish comparative research on South Korea, Thailand other Asian countries.

The main purpose of this study is to evaluate how there is a relationship between proactiveness and risk taking of corporate behavior level of entrepreneurial orientation appearing in SMEs and the level of performance-oriented and human-oriented national culture. This study established hypotheses that predict the relationship between GLOBE project's two cultural dimension, performance-oriented and human-oriented (House et al. 2000) and level of corporate risk-taking and proactiveness. For this, 387 data were collected from South Korea and Thailand SMEs to determine the specific influence it has on sub individual level of entrepreneurial orientation of the SMEs' from both countries. This study is expected to provide new insight towards entrepreneurial orientation and thereafter some strategic policy implications to both countries SMEs. The implication of this study, comparative research of South Korea and Thailand's SME, is to understand both countries' characteristics of SME to support to increase the trade relationship and understand the corporate police between them. Thailand, being the center of South-East Asia, is South Korean government's New Asia Initiative main cooperative partnering country as the current trade volume of both countries exceeds 100 billion dollars and active personal exchange is over 1.3 million annual visits. It is expected to provide useful information for understanding future trades and trade partners especially to new SMEs entrants.

The study is composed as the followings. First, the essence of entrepreneurial orientation was looked over based on the previous studies of entrepreneurial orientation through literature research, then looked over previous studies on entrepreneurial orientation and national culture. Furthermore, circumstances that were created through cultural dimensions were analyzed after summarizing the current status of two countries' entrepreneurial activity. Next, based on this study, research hypothesis for the relationship of entrepreneurial orientation and national culture were developed and analyzed. Finally, the necessary efforts to improve entrepreneurial orientation for both countries were discussed.

2. Theoretical Background and Advance Research

2.1 Entrepreneurial Orientation

Many scholars who have studied entrepreneurship agree that there is no clear and exact definition for entrepreneurship. However, entrepreneurial orientation from the studies of entrepreneurship has a concept where many scholars agreed with a valid definition, unlike the other various definition of entrepreneurship (Wiklund and Sheperd, 2003, 2005; Covin and Green 2006). This was because entrepreneurial orientation was very effectively utilized in gathering information for corporate decision making and entrepreneurial activity in different geographical circumstances and various organizations (Kemelgor, 2002; Kreiser, Marino and Weaver, 2002). Due to these characteristics of entrepreneurial orientation, it was regarded as an interesting concept used for comparative research amongst SMEs in different countries. Entrepreneurial orientation, as a main driver of

entrepreneurial activity, was regarded as the central topic of entrepreneurship studies and it was accepted as universally utilized measurement of entrepreneurial activity (Covin and Wales, 2011; Runyan, Ge, Dong and Swinney, 2011; Wales, Monsen and McKelvie, 2011).

Entrepreneurial orientation was researched from various aspects, and the trend of most studies was about the direct and indirect effects of entrepreneurial orientation on corporate performance. In the direct, it is effect on different strategy and environment, and in the indirect it is effect on variables controlled through many indirect factors (Becherer and Maurer, 1998; Jantunen, Puumalainen, Saarenketo and Kylaheiko, 2005; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005; Rauch, Wilklund, Lumpkin and Freae, 2009).

Also, other researches were: study that considered psychological state of manager or entrepreneur as preliminary variable of entrepreneurial orientation (Begley and Boyd, 1987; Stewart, Watson, Carland and Carland, 1999) and study on environmental factor(Becherer and Maurer, 1997), study on the influence of organization (Green, Covin and Slevin, 2008), additional study on the origin of entrepreneurial orientation (Yang and Dess, 2007), and study that search for relations of entrepreneurial orientation and corporate resources and competency (Smart and Conant, 1994; Dess, Lumpkin and Covin, 1997). Despite of many studies, arguments on the driver of entrepreneurial orientation and the exact reason for the relations of performance and entrepreneurial orientation still continue (Miller, 2011). In addition, disputes on the definition of entrepreneurial orientation and potential construct that will become an acceptable conceptualization for all is still being continued without a certain conclusion (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011).

Looking at the different views of the scholars' definitions of entrepreneurial orientation is useful to recognize the direction for entrepreneurial orientation research. Entrepreneurial orientation, first proposed by Miller (1983), is a concept originated from Schumpeter's(1934) entrepreneurship. He categorized organization into three categories: simple organization, planned organization, organic organization, and discovered that entrepreneurial orientation is composed of innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking through studying the factors that decides entrepreneurship. Covin and Slevin (1989) named 'Entrepreneurial Posture' and defined entrepreneurial orientation as the process of leading a corporate through entrepreneurship and practical decision making activity. Also, continuous studies for sub-factors of entrepreneurial orientation as multidimensional concept were proposed as two dimensional sub-factors that include innovativeness and risk-taking(Miler and Friesen, 1982), three sub-dimensional factors that include innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking (Miller, 1983; Covin and Slevin 1991; Zahra and Covin, 1993), and fifth dimensional sub-factors that include autonomy and competitive aggressiveness (Lampkin and Dess, 1996; Dess, Lumkin and Covin, 1997). Covin and Slevin (1991) proposed three important characteristics of corporations with entrepreneurial orientation. First is risk-taking of top management related to investment decision and strategic action in the midst of uncertainty. Second is the leadership tendency to gain product innovation and technological advantage in terms of scale and frequency. Finally, it is the assertiveness towards competitors within the industry and tendency of aggressive corporation with frontier characteristics. On the other hand, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) developed entrepreneurial orientation one dimension further by adding autonomy and competitive aggressiveness, and newly defined the concept of entrepreneurial orientation as the tendency that includes activity method, implement and decision making.

Research on these sub-dimensional factors affected the entrepreneurial orientation's conceptualization method (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011; George and Marino, 2011), but transition occurred as multi-dimensional approach method of Lumpkin and Dess(1996)was accepted from the single dimensional conceptualization method research of Miller(1983) and Covin and Slevin(1989). It can be seen that these conceptualization methods change depending on the independently transforming of the entrepreneurial orientation dimensions (Covin, Green and Slevin, 2006). Entrepreneurial orientation's concept of single constituent means corporation needs risk-taking, innovativeness and proactiveness at the same time, and each contribute commonly to the entrepreneurial orientation of corporation (Kreiser, Marino and Weaver, 2002). In other words, all three dimensions need to increase at the same time for entrepreneurial orientation to increase(George and Marino, 2011). This single constituent was criticized because of the possibility of each variables being able to have different effects on the result variables such as performance, but it became the chance to apply multi-dimensional approach method as a measurement. There is independence among three dimensions, but it is thought that constituent form from the sum of each series of independent activity scores (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011).Therefore, multi-constituent approach is being accepted in many entrepreneurial orientation studies because it is possible to flexibly apply in constructing theories (Kreiser, Marino and Weaver, 2002). This study, based on the characteristics of comparative research

asserted by Kreiser, Marino and Weaver (2002), utilized the multi-dimensional constituents on the basis that it will provide more preciseness on comparative research of the targets.

2.2 Entrepreneurial Orientation and National Culture

Culture is generally defined as a collective value system that distinguishes member from one group to another member from a different group (Hofstede, 1980; Muller and Thomas, 2001). Therefore, one nation's culture provides a frame of reference to understand organization, environment and mutual relationship through societal members (Geletkanycz, 1997).

Lee and Peterson (2000) claims that entrepreneurship rely on the unique assembly of cultural factors like attitude, value and behavior to support or disturb entrepreneurial orientation, but they also claimed that based on the national culture, the level of entrepreneurial orientation can be changed. In other words, entrepreneurship begins from striking an opportunity and since this opportunity exists in the environment, the help of external environment has a great influence on the formation of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation. Muller and Thomas (2001) claimed that national culture is responsible for the behavior which is not commonly accepted in other countries. Hayton, George and Zahra (2002) extended these perspectives that national culture, on the level of individual and organizational, had serious influences on the decision of entrepreneurial activity, and claimed desire to believe that recognizing the opportunity a society perceives and that the intensity of entrepreneurial activity that allows to pursue and implement is closely connected. Therefore, cultures that supported entrepreneurship not only brought more people with entrepreneurial potential, but these cultures showed that it had direct influence on entrepreneurial orientation of corporations. If these studies do not consider the cultural influences when comparing the entrepreneurial orientation of two different countries, it will show that the result of this comparison is imperfect and will emphasize the influence of culture on entrepreneurial orientation.

There are relatively small comparative research studies about entrepreneurial orientation between national cultures. Zahra, Jennings and Kuratko (1999) emphasized that past entrepreneurship studies centered on the sample of the United States and claimed the necessities for comparative research between countries with the data retrieved from various cultures and countries. The most of comparative studies on small business employer's risk-taking and innovativeness are centered on the United States and the western countries; for example, the United States and Finland(Hyrsky and Tuunanen, 1999), comparative research on entrepreneurship in the United States and Japan (Suzuki, Kim and Bae, 2002), comparative research in a form of case studies of the Netherlands and the United States (Kemelgor, 2002),and self-awareness comparative research on entrepreneurial orientation of the students in Germany and the United States (Domke-Damonte, Faulstich and Woodson, 2008).

Despite some limitations to confirm cultural value related entrepreneurship, studies are still based on cultural dimension developed by Hofsteade(1980,1991). Unlike Hofsteade, other scholars proposed similar studies, but more precise classification standards and the main standard include classification standard developed by Kluckhohn & Strodtbeck, classification standard developed by McClelland, Triandis, Schwartz, Trompennarm and GLOBE Project, one of the most recently developed classification standard. GLOBE Project's cultural dimension classification standard is also being broadly accepted as a new method, it has high precision by including some supplementary dimensions to Hofstede's basic dimension. Although two dimensions does not completely match, it can be concluded that combining two different classification standard can improve accuracy in the study of the cultural dimension's influence on entrepreneurial orientation

The main classification standards researched from GLOBE Project are based on 8 cultural properties handled in quantitative dimension such as, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, collectivism, gender egalitarianism, assertiveness, future orientation, performance-oriented and human-oriented. These dimensions were selected based on the existing comparative cultural research, related references and cultural measurement used in early large scale sample studies. First, five cultural dimensions utilized Hofstede's(1980) cultural dimension. The three dimensions, uncertainty avoidance, power distance and individualism are presented as the same concept of Hofstede's dimensions. It measured Hofstede's individualism from collectivism dimension, where low score represents individualism and high score represents collectivism. Two dimensions, gender egalitarianism and assertiveness, were developed other than Hofstede's masculine dimension. Future orientation means the degree of organization or society to encourage and reward future orientation activity like future plan, investment and delaying gratification. It used society's temporal dimension form of the "past, present, future-oriented" from

Kluckhonn and Strodtbeck(1961). Meanwhile, performance-oriented means the degree of organization or society to encourage and reward group members for the performance improvement or excellence, this dimension is similar to Hofstede and Bond's (1988) "Confucian dynamics", and McClelland's performance-oriented desire. Also, human-oriented means the degree of organization or society to encourage and reward individual for fairness, altruistic behavior, friendly behavior, mercy, service and hospitality. This dimension is similar to Hofstede and Bond(1988)'s "kind heartedness" dimension and it was developed by taking in Putnam's(1993) "Civic Society" and Kluckhonn and Strodtbeck's (1961) "Human Nature is Good vs. Human Nature is Bad".

This study excluded the commonly used national culture dimensions seen from the existing national culture comparative research. It mainly looked over the relationship of the entrepreneurial orientation's lower level of proactiveness and risk-taking based on GLOBE Project provided performance-oriented, human-oriented of nation culture dimension, and also looked over the relationship between national culture's performance-oriented and human-oriented level based proactiveness and risk-taking, which is thought to be more directly related with entrepreneurial orientation. The empirical research of this study focused on performance orientation and human orientation used in House et al.(2004)'s GLOBE study because Hofstede's research included a different dimension, and the purpose of this research was to analyze the relationship between national culture dimension and SMEs' entrepreneurial orientation dimension, and both of these dimensions were the main national culture that influenced corporate culture and the compatibility of this study and GLOBE Project. Therefore, GLOBE Project utilized Hofstede's culture dimension and it became the base of national culture as well as corporate culture which is the lower level of national culture, and 62 countries out of 875 countries became the target countries, as well as 15,000 people. In addition, actual research was very recently accomplished ensuring the timeliness of the survey.

2.3. Entrepreneurship and National Culture of South Korea and Thailand

Based on Global Entrepreneurship Monitor's (GEM) level of economic development, South Korea is categorized as innovation driven economy and Thailand is categorized as efficiency driven economy. Therefore, judging on the basis entrepreneurship statistics, it is determined that South Korea had higher tendency to catalyze entrepreneurial orientation than Thailand. Looking over the statistics of 2014 GEM's simplicity to start a new business, (Table 1,2) shows that excluding the high start-up cost, South Korea is overall easier to start a business compared to Thailand. Having a high start-up cost means that there are higher business ratio of start-up item that requires higher costs than Thailand. It can be seen that simplicity of start-up is relatively not affected from comparing the relative cost of real estate and facility cost.

Table 1: Starting a Business

2014	South Korea	Thailand	New Zealand
Rank (of 189 countries)	17	75	1
DTF(Distance to Frontier)	94.36	87.98	99.96
Procedures (number)	3	4	1
Time (days)	4	27.5	0.5
Cost (% of income per capita)	14.5 %	6.6 %	0.3 %
Minimum capital (% of Income per capita)	0.0 %	0.0 %	0.0 %

Sources: Adapted from: Doing Business, World Bank (2014)

On the other hand, over viewing GEM Total Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) in 2013, it showed South Korea 6.9% and Thailand 17.7%, where the level of South Korea is low compare to other countries with the same economic scale, whereas Thailand had a higher level. Especially, South Korea decreased by half compared to 12.3% in 2001 and Thailand showed overall drop from its boom of 26.87% in 2007. Opportunity-driven entrepreneurial activity increased from 36% to 51.1% in 2011 to 2013 and remained around the same of 51% in 2008. In the case of necessity-driven entrepreneurial activity, although it was 40% in 2008 and decreased from 41% to 36.5% in 2011 to 2013, it showed high level compared to other countries with similar income level. In the case of Thailand, the 30% level of necessity-driven entrepreneurial activity in 2011 showed decreasing trend and in 2013 each necessity-driven and opportunity-driven activity reaching 18.7% and 67.8% showed that opportunity-driven entrepreneurial activity has far superior level.

Table 2: Entrepreneurial Activity and Perceptions in the GEM economies in 2013

	Nascent Entrepreneur-ship rate	New Business Ownership rate	Early stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA)	Established Business Ownership rate	Discontinuation of Business	Necessity-Driven rate (% of TEA)	Improvement-Driven Opportunity (% of TEA)
South Korea	2.7	4.2	6.9	9.0	2.5	36.5	51.1
Thailand	7.9	10.4	17.7	28.0	3.5	18.7	67.8

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2013 Global Report (2013)

South Korea rapidly progressed from labor and capital based on factor driven growth to efficiency driven growth through productivity growth. However, South Korea's active ratio of opportunity-driven entrepreneur in 2013 was found less compared to United States 59%, Japan 61%, German 51% and France 59%. It expresses the need of diverse government policies for creating new jobs and new value through improving start-up environment and venture environment of the government to respond to slow economic growth and retain sustainable growth. World Economic Forum(WEF), GEM classified South Korea as innovation-driven country, however South Korea needs to pay attention on entrepreneurship that creates employment and increase value through new ideas for future sustainable growth. Acs(2006), a policy to strengthen entrepreneurial activity, emphasized educational function, technological commercialization, R&D of high school educational system and easy financing in the preliminary step of entrepreneurial activity before technology. An important point to not here is that the policy to strengthen entrepreneurial activity is not only from one part of a policy, but progressed in combinational number of sectors. South Korea needs to see start-up not only as simple venture policy and corporate policy to promote entrepreneurial activity, but consider it as combinational policy fields including finance and education. On the other hand, according to OECD report in 2011, Thailand's SME and entrepreneurial activity generally maintains the international level. As it mentioned, necessity-driven entrepreneurial activity reached 30% which conventionally showed a high ratio, but recent rapid growth in information communication technology trend showed increase in opportunity-driven entrepreneurial activity ratio. Thailand experienced financial crisis in 1997 and received $17.2 billion bailout loan from the International Monetary Fund(IMF), escaped negative growth since 1999 and maintained 5% growth for a considerable amount of period since 2002. Thailand maintained economic growth of 7.8% in 2010, 6.5% in 2012 despite the global economic depression and it is expecting a 2.6% growth from the negative influence of recent political instability and internal and external factors. The recent popularization of information communication industry showed higher ratio of opportunity-driven entrepreneurial activity relatively to necessity-driven entrepreneurial activity, under these circumstances the possibility of withering entrepreneurial activity due to increasing economic difficulties is high and therefore continuous vitalization is necessary for government to create policy considering the newly established venture as well as of entrepreneurship education in universities.

According to OECD report in 2011, Thailand entrepreneurs listed the following obstacles that were perceived by themselves.

Table 3: Obstacles Perceived by Entrepreneurs

World Economic Forum	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor	World Bank	Government Surveys
Political instability	Lack of financial funds	Tax complexity	Lack of railway transport systems
Corruption	Inadequate profitability	Lack of loan finance and venture capital	Lack of storage facilities
Heavy bureaucracy		High redundancy costs	Port congestion
		Cumbersome regulation	Low-quality roads

Source: OECD Reviews of SME &Entrepreneurship Issues & Policies: The Example of Thailand (2011)

As shown in [Table 3], political instability, corruption, heavy bureaucracy, excessive regulation, tax complexity, lack of capital financing system and lack of social overhead capital can be solved on the level of the government through political approach. In particular, research on entrepreneurial orientation is a factor that cannot be ignored to search and change Thailand economy in a sense of long and short term. Especially, the importance of

corporation being armed with entrepreneurship on the time of difficulties in the nation economy was brought up and entrepreneurship which adequately respond and understand the environmental change, is thought to be the key variable that will have positive influence on Thailand (Michale Ha et. al , 2014).

This study comparing entrepreneurial orientation as key influential variable of national culture will become the foundation to establish future research hypothesis. Here, we examined the differences of South Korea and Thailand's national cultural orientation based on Hofstede and GLOBE's national culture value index. Table underneath shows the comparison of South Korea and Thailand's nation culture orientation index

Table 4: South Korea and Thailand's score on Hofstede and GLOBE scale

			South Korea	Thailand
Scores for the Hofstede IBM study (Hofstede, 2001)	Power Distance		60	64
	Uncertainty Avoidance		85	64
	Individual (vs Collectivism)		18	20
	Masculinity (vs. Femininity)		39	34
	Long/Short-term Orientation		75	56
Scores for the GLOBE Study(House et. al., 2004)	Assertiveness	Practices	4.36	3.58
		Values	3.69	3.43
	Institutional Collectivism	Practices	5.2	3.88
		Values	3.84	5.08
	In-Group Collectivism	Practices	5.71	5.72
		Values	5.5	5.73
	Future Orientation	Practices	3.9	3.27
		Values	5.83	6.26
	Gender Egalitarianism	Practices	2.45	3.27
		Values	4.23	4.12
	Humane Orientation	Practices	3.73	4.87
		Values	5.61	5.05
	Performance-oriented	Practices	4.53	3.84
		Values	5.41	5.76
	Power Distances	Practices	5.69	5.62
		Values	2.39	2.74
	Uncertainty Avoidance	Practices	3.52	3.79
		Values	4.74	5.71

Source: Anne-WilHarzing's website(www.harzing.com/download/hgindices.xls)

Overall cultural orientation of South Korea and Thailand can be easily recognized from the table. As mentioned earlier, this study mainly focused on the relationship of entrepreneurial orientation based on GLOBE's performance-oriented and human-oriented because the study on Hofstede's national culture dimension was accomplished many times from previous studies. The thing to particularly notice from the GLOBE Project score related to this is that there is a big difference between the two scores because each cultural dimension is classified as 'Practice' and 'Value' viewed from the perspective of "As Is" or "Should Be". Interpretation by considering the difference between two scores in comparative research on national culture plays an important role to judge the practice of national culture. From this viewpoint, it can be found that there is a big difference in South Korea and Thailand's cultural orientation. Particularly, in the case of the institutional totalitarianism, the difference can be clearly seen. Practically South Korean corporate had stronger tendency of totalitarianism compared to Thailand expressed in practice South Korea 5.2 and Thailand 3.8 and in value South Korea 3.84 and Thailand 5.08, but it showed antinomic phenomenon that feeling desirable is contrary, so it expressed that South Korea is strongly influenced by group totalitarianism. The same case can be found in performance-oriented and human-oriented, the main interest in this study, performance-oriented of value dimension shows little difference of 5.41, 5.76, but practice dimension of 4.53, 3.84 relatively shows a big difference. Performance-oriented in the corporate sitemeans stronger in case of South Korea rather than thinking entrepreneur as an intangible value. In addition, this phenomenal appeared same in human-oriented and in case of human-oriented, Thailand showed stronger in

corporate site practice.

3. Research Hypothesis

The study analyzes and investigates the influence of national culture factor of South Korea and Thailand, performance-oriented and human-oriented on entrepreneurial orientation and the composed factors, risk-taking, proactiveness and performance. Performance-orientation shows the degree of encouragement and reward on performance achievement and excellence of a society (House et. al 2002). Corporates often have burdens with performance outcome. In a performance-oriented culture, entrepreneurs believe that they can be successful and have good results. This means a corporate concentrates on goal with demand and focuses on financial performance, which can expect the increase in the tendency for taking risks. Therefore, society's performance-oriented culture has positive relations with the risk-taking tendency of corporation.

On the other hand, majority of studies have shown that proactiveness played the central role to pursue favorable business opportunity of corporations (Knight, 1997; Lumpkin and Dess, 2001; Stevenson and Jarillo, 1990). Knight emphasized that the pursuit of environmental opportunity and utilize all possible ways to research corporate goal is an important factor. Michell et al. (2004) hypothesized explained culture play a fundamental role in how corporation discover, evaluate and develop opportunity through proactiveness. Therefore, performance-oriented dominant culture can be perceived to have a critical role that positively influences to SMEs, is willing to actively handle future market demand and anticipate opportunity through proactive behavior.

Human-orientation shows the degree of encouragement and reward a society give to individuals who fairly, altruistically and generously deal with others. In a high human-oriented society, risk-taking tendency is relatively low because entrepreneurs spend many hours on analyzing strategic situations and have strong tendency of refraining from doing unnecessary high risk activity (McGrath, Macmillan, and Scheinberg, 1992). Therefore, this study set a hypothesis that human-oriented will have negative relations on risk-taking.

Corporations with human-oriented culture greatly emphasize service and consideration of others and remain to the traditional values, have negative relations to the proactiveness that reflect the characteristics of the organization which uses whatever means to reach organization's goals and possess strategy to actively discover future opportunity, lead the market, immediately respond to external environment (Lumpkin and Dess, 2001).

In addition, seen in Table 4, based on GLOBE practices scores of South Korea and Thailand, it was set to show that Thailand with high human-oriented score will have stronger positive relations on proactiveness and risk-taking level than South Korea, and on the opposite, it was set to show that South Korea with performance-oriented will have stronger positive relations on risk-taking and proactiveness than Thailand.
Based on this discussion, this study set the hypothesis on the relationship of entrepreneurial orientation, risk-taking and proactiveness dimension and national culture's performance-oriented and human-oriented as the following:

H1: Level of performance-oriented culture has positive(+) relations to risk-taking level of SME
H2: Level of human-oriented culture has negative(-) relations to risk-taking level of SME
H3: Level of performance-oriented culture has positive(+) relations to proactive activity of SME
H4: Level of human-oriented culture has negative(-) relations to proactive activity of SME
H5: The positive(+) relations of the level of performance-oriented culture and risk-taking level, South Korea will be stronger compared to Thailand.
H6: The positive(+) relations of the level of performance-oriented culture and proactiveness level, South Korea will be stronger compared to Thailand.
H7: The negative(-) relations of the level of human-oriented culture and risk-taking level, Thailand will be stronger compared to South Korea.
H8: The negative(-) relations of the level of human-oriented culture and proactiveness level, Thailand will be stronger compared to South Korea.

4. Empirical Research

4.1 Characteristics of the Sample and Methodology of Data Collection

The data of this study used surveys which were developed and prepared based on the previous studies and it was distributed and collected from South Korea and Thailand SMEs. For this study, we carried out the survey to SMEs in Seoul, Pusan and Daegu of South Korea and Bangkok, Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai of Thailand. 387 copies,

excluding the incomplete answers, were used in the final analysis. 205 surveys were done from South Korean SMEs and 182 surveys (95 copies first round, 87 copies second round) were done from Thai SMEs. Measurement tools were developed based on previous study results (House et al., 2004; Covin and Slevin, 1989). Scales developed and used in previous studies were exactly used or partially modified and complemented to meet the purpose of this study. In addition, the characteristics of both countries' SMEs and population statistical measurement questions were added.

The construct of the collected samples and average and standard deviation from the sample are shown in [Table 5-1], [Table 5-2].Looking at the business category, it showed the distribution of 70 manufacturing business (34.1%), 99 service business (48.3%), 36 information communication technology business (17.6%)in the case of South Korea and 46 manufacturing business (25.3%), 115 service business (63.2%), 21 information communication technology business (11.5%) in the case of Thailand. Based number of employees, South Korea had most 92 businesses (44.95) with less than 5 employees and Thailand had most 84 businesses (49.5%) with less than 5 employees. Based on the year of business establishment both had the most businesses that were established for less than 5 years; South Korea had 88 businesses (42.9%) and Thailand had 92 businesses (50.5%).

Table 5-1: Characteristics of Samples

	South Korea sample (N=205)	Thailand sample (N=182)
Industry sector		
Manufacturing	70(34.1%)	46(25.3%)
Service	99(44.8%)	115(63.2%)
ICT	36(17.6%)	21(11.5%)
Employees		
5 or fewer	92(44.9%)	84(46.2%)
6–50	67(32.7%)	57(31.3%)
More than 51	46(22.4%)	41(22.5%)
Age(Yrs)		
5 or fewer	88(42.9%)	92(50.5%)
6–10	73(35.6%)	62(34.1%)
More than 11	44(21.5%)	28(15.4%)

4.2 Operant Definition of the Variable and Composition of Measuring Tools

To measure the variables in this study, survey method was implemented. Measurement tools for the concepts used in the survey were developed based on previous studies. Basically, the principle was to follow the measurement item of the previous studies, but to fit the circumstances of the business and characteristics of the questioned target, some words and contexts were modified. Prepared surveys were modified and change to fit the characteristics of the business through prior review before it was distributed.

Survey questions used 7 point Likert Scale including human-oriented (HO): 5 question, performance-oriented (PO): 4 questions and As Is questions of Culture and Leadership Scales (CLS) of House et al.(2004) from national culture dimension. On the other hand, corporate activity used Covin and Slevin(1989) and risk-taking(RT): 4 questions and proactiveness(PR): 5 questions of 7 point Likert Scale.

Factor analysis and reliability analysis on each country was used in this study to verify the measurement items on concept validity and measurement validity. This study used principle component analysis for the factor extraction of factor analysis and applied varimax rotation to maintain independence of each variable. Communality, which shows the amount of how each variables are explained from extracted factors of factor analysis result, less than 0.4 were excluded from the factor analysis. So, the validity of composition and variable's structure was to be verified. Also, we measured Cronbach's alpha, an indicator which shows the internal consistency, for reliability analysis of each variables. This study was conducted including only factor loading value of 0.6 or more.

Analysis result is summarized in [Table 6]. Internal consistency testing was performed first by excluding communality less than 0.4 and by calculating the factor value from factor loading value of 0.6 or more from factor analysis result. Also, further analysis was accomplished by using items from factor loading value of 0.6 or more. Both countries continued by excluding items (HO5, PO1, RT2, PR3, PR5) with communality that was less than 4.

In addition, South Korea continued with communality item (HO3) less than 0.4 was excluded and Thailand continued with communality item (PR5) less than 0.4 was excluded.

Table 6-2: Reliability and Validity Analysis

	Measured Question	Variable 1 South Korea/Thailand	Variable 2 South Korea/Thailand	Variable 3 South Korea/Thailand	Variable4 South Korea/Thailand
Human Orientation	HO1	.775 / .782			
	HO2	.803 / .836			
	HO3	.634			
	HO4	.789 / .796			
Performance-oriented	PO2		.764 / .745		
	PO3		.813 / .804		
	PO4		.637 / .618		
Risk-Taking	RT1			.682 / .657	
	RT3			.754 / .731	
	RT4			.714. / .700	
Proactiveness	PR1				.828 / .742
	PR2				.857 / .728
	PR4				.744 / .632
	PR5				.608
Eigen Value		1.668 / 2.366	2.437 / 1.986	2.003 / 1.998	2.919 / 2.142
Explanatory Variance(accumulated)		59.120 / 53.129	40.283 / 37.914	52.807 / 48.902	70.362 / 67.214
Cronbach'sα		.725 /.711	.811 / .796	.780 / .761	.791 / .732
KMO		.719 / .684			

4.3 Correlation Analysis and Comparison between Countries

As it is shown on correlation analysis table, South Korea is showing significant correlations on risk-taking with respect to performance and proactiveness and performance-oriented with respect to proactiveness, and human-oriented with respect to performance-oriented, and proactiveness also show significant correlations except risk-taking. On the other hand, Thailand also shows the same correlations as South Korea. But overall strength of correlations is lower than those of Korea except risk-taking with respect to human-oriented. Moreover, looking at the result of comparing the average amongst countries through ANOVA showed that there was a meaningful average difference amongst the countries in all the fields. South Korea had higher degree of performance-oriented, risk-taking and proactiveness while Thailand had higher degree of human-oriented. Therefore, South Korea had less tendency of being human oriented compared to Thailand. When comparing the result of this study in [Table 7] and previously research in [Table 4], this study expresses similar results with GLOBE study on entrepreneurial orientation.

Table 7-1: Results of Correlation Analysis (Korea Sample)

	Mean	SD	PO	HO	RT	PR
PO	4.65	.89	1.000			
HO	3.76	1.09	-.036*	1.000		
RT	2.85	1.02	.405***.	-.041*	1.000	
PR	3.77	.97	.314**	-.560**	.510*	1.000

* p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

Table 7-2: Results of correlation analysis (Thailand Sample)

	Mean	SD	PO	HO	RT	PR
PO	3.79	1.41	1.000			

HO	4.92	1.34	-.057*	1.000		
RT	2.91	1.29	.370***	-.152*	1.000	
PR	3.44	1.03	.231*	-.380**	.421***	1.000

*. p<.05, ** p<.01, *** p<.001

4.4 Hypothesis Testing

Followed by correlation analysis, in order to test the hypothesis applied in this study, simple regression analysis and multiple regression analysis were performed; analysis results are on the following [Table 8] and [Table 9].
Hypothesis 1 through 4 is to verify whether performance-oriented culture level and human-oriented culture level have any influence on SME's two low factors of entrepreneurial orientation, risk-taking and proactiveness level. The result of regression analysis for hypothesis verification; while performance-oriented culture level has positive influence on SME's risk-taking and proactiveness level, human-oriented culture level has negative influence on proactiveness level, but the negative relations of risk-taking level was not meaningful and therefore rejected. As a result, in the society of human-oriented culture, immediate support is available from others when surrounding situation aggravates while managing a corporation. Moreover, it is easier to ensure the stability of business operation, and the social atmosphere with such culture allows this to be brought up. Therefore, instead of businesses being reluctant to investment due to the fear of failure, there is a tolerating atmosphere that is allowed. It is the occurrence of this cross-over effect that influences the outcome.

Hypothesis 5 through 8 is to verify South Korea and Thailand's intensity of the relationship of performance-oriented culture level and human-oriented culture level, and risk-taking and proactiveness, all were accepted except for hypothesis 7. These results conclude by reflecting that the relations of risk-taking level and level of human-oriented culture are not stable.

Table8-1: Regression analysis table- Influence of National Culture Level on Entrepreneurial Orientation [Risk-Taking]

Variable	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	.177			
Human-Oriented	-.048	.035	.620	1.536
Performance-Oriented	.273	.218	4.082	.000
Adjusted R2	0.443			
F	9.957			
P	0.000			

Table8-2: Regression analysis table - Influence of National Culture Level on Entrepreneurial Orientation [Proactiveness]

Variable	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	.341			
Human-Oriented	-.029	.129	2.156	.008
Performance-Oriented	.199.	.178	3.444	.001
Adjusted R2	.351			
F	8.902			
P	0.000			

Table9-1: Regression analysis table - Influence of South Korea/Thailand's National Culture Level on Entrepreneurial Orientation [Risk-Taking]

Variable	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	.121* / .188*			
Human-Oriented	.-.019 / -.032.	.104 / .135	1.046 / .996	.141 / .124
Performance-Oriented	.278 / .167	.236 / .154	1.998 / 2.001	.041 / .039

Adjusted R2	.338 / .321
F	7.226 / 6.554
P	0.000 / 0.000

Table9-2: Regression analysis table - Regression analysis table - Influence of South Korea/Thailand's National Culture Level on Entrepreneurial Orientation [Proactiveness]

Variable	B	Beta	T	Sig.
Constant	.301 / .366			
Human-Oriented	-.042/ -,011	.102 / .411	1.942 / 2.313	.008 / .006
Performance-Oriented	.238. / .587	.259 / .167.	3.012 / 3,702	.001 / .000
Adjusted R2	.380 / .285			
F	10.108 / 6.123			
P	0.000 / 0.000			

5. Conclusion

Many studies from the past have been thought to have important relationship between national culture and entrepreneurial activity, but there still has not been relatively sufficient amount of empirical analysis being accomplished. This study examined the relationship between two major dimensions of embedded cultural values of SMEs on national culture and key variables of corporate strategic decision making in entrepreneur orientation. The research implemented targeting SMEs in South Korea and Thailand in order to compare and evaluate the differences between the two countries and what relations does national culture level of performance-oriented and human-oriented with risk-taking and proactiveness of entrepreneurial-oriented activity decision level appear in SMEs.

Implications for these empirical results are as follows. First, in contrast to performance-oriented culture having positive effect on both proactiveness and risk-taking level of corporate, human-oriented culture on proactiveness have negative relation, but human-oriented culture on risk taking did not appear to have any significant effect. This result of the relationship between human oriented culture and risk taking seems to come from cross effects of human-oriented culture, which means to analyze the strategic situation and negative aspects on behavior with unnecessary high degree of risk and positive influence of leniency on tolerating failure. For this, precise effect will need to be investigated through additional analysis of the two effects in further research. Secondly, in the relationship between the proactive level of performance-oriented culture appears to have a positive relationship, whereas in human-oriented relationship, negative relationship appeared. Thirdly, in the comparative research between Korea and Thailand, both national culture variable and sub level variables of entrepreneur orientation are analyzed with differences. Meanwhile, intensity of influence between variables of both countries had meaningful results excluding the comparison of the relation between level of human-oriented culture and level of risk-taking. Thus, in relationship between proactiveness level and level of human-oriented culture, Thailand showed stronger negative relations than South Korea and positive relationship of the level of performance-oriented culture of SMEs and the level of proactiveness and risk taking, South Korea showed stronger than Thailand.

These results hold an important implication of corporate management amongst countries in which SME needs to consider the potential cultural influences when predicting their competitor's strategies. Therefore, it means that the influence will be stronger when strategic decision making is done by considering human-oriented culture in Thailand. Also, this study provide insight towards why a specific culture have greater effect on entrepreneurship compare to other culture, meaning that when corporations explain or predict competitor's level of risk-taking and proactiveness, it is necessary to consider the cultural value in the society which the competitor belong.

This study has couple contribution points despite the constraints of testing partial cultural level that focus on two aspects of national culture's various dimensions, performance orientation and human orientation. Study result attempted a concentrated study on the aspect of human orientation and performance orientation influence on strategic decision making of business as embedded corporate culture which diverged from Hofstede's 5 dimensions of relation between culture and entrepreneurial orientation from previous studies. In addition, if existing studies were mainly focused on the comparison of each country with similar cultural classification, western and eastern and mainly between western countries, it is significant to provide a new horizon in this field

of study through comparing Asia's two countries classified with different culture(House et al., 2004).

References

Ahlstrom, D. &Bruton, G.D. (2002).An institutional perspective on the role of culture in shaping strategic actions by technology-focused entrepreneurial firms in China. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26(4), 53–69.

Anne-WilHarzing(2012). Score on Hofstede and GLOBE scale. Retrieved from http://www.harzing.com/

Becherer, R. C. and Maurer, J. G. (1998). The Moderating Effect of Environmental Variables on the Entrepreneurial and Marketing Orientation of Entrepreneur-led Firms. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 22(1), 47–58.

Begley, T. M. & Boyd, P. D. (1987). Psychological Characteristics Associated With Performance in Entrepreneurial Firms and Smaller Businesses. Journal of Business Venturing, 2(1), 79–93.

Carter, S. & Wilton, W. (2006). "Entreprise culture": Necessary in promoting enterprise; Lessons from enterprise development in Zimbabwe. Journal of Enterprising Culture, 14(3), 177–198.

Chrisman, J.J., Chua, J.H.,&Steier, L.P. (2002).The influence of national culture and family involvement on entrepreneurial perceptions and performance at the state level. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26(4), 113-130.

Covin, J. G., &Slevin, D. (1988).The influence of organization structure on the utility of an entrepreneurial top management style.Journal of Management Studies 25 (3), 217–234.

Covin, J. G., &Slevin, D.(1989).Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments.Strategic Management Journal 10 (1), 75–87.

Covin, J. G.,&Slevin, D.(1991).A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 16 (1), 7–25.

Covin, J. G., K. M. Green, & D. P. Slevin (2006).Strategic Process Effects on the Entrepreneurial Orientation-Sales Growth Rate Relationship. Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 30(1), 57–81.

Covin, J. G.,& Wales W.J., 2011.The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 36(4), 677–702.

Covin, J. G. & Lumpkin, G. T.(2011). Entrepreneurial Orientation Theory and Research: Reflections on a needed construct. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35(5), 855–872.

Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T. & Covin, J. G.(1997). Entrepreneurial strategy making and firm performance: tests of contingency and configurational models. Strategic Management Journal, 18(9), 677–695.

Dess, G.G., Lumpkin, G.T., & McGee, J.E. (1999). Linking corporate entrepreneurship to strategy, structure, and process: Suggested research directions. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 23(3), 85–102.

Dickson, P. (2004). Entrepreneurial orientation: The role of institutional environment and firm attributesin shaping innovation and proactiveness. Paper presented at the Strategic Management Society Conference, an Juan, Puerto Rico.

Domke-Damonte, D., Faulstich, J. A. & Woodson, W.(2008). Entrepreneurial Orientation in a Situational Context: Comparisons between Germany and the United States. Journal of Business Strategies, 25(1), 15–30.

Geletkanycz, M.A. (1997). The salience of "Culture's Consequences": The effects of cultural values on top executive commitment to the status quo. Strategic Management Journal, 18(8), 615–634.

George, B. A. & Marino, L., (2011). The Epistemology of Entrepreneurial Orientation: Conceptual Formation, Modeling, and Operationalization. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35(5), 989–1024.

Ghorbani, M., and Chand, M. (2011). National Culture, Networks and Ethnic Entrepreneurship: A Comparison of Indian and Chinese Immigrants in the USA. International Business Review, 20(6), 593-606.

Green, K. M., Covin, J. G. &Slevin, D. P.(2008). Exploring the relationship between strategic reactiveness and entrepreneurial orientation: the role of structure-style fit., Journal of Business Venturing, 23(3), 356–383.

Hayton, J.C., George, G., & Zahra, S.A. (2002). National culture and entrepreneurship: A review of behavioral research. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26(4), 33–53.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G.(1991), Cultures and Organizations: Software of Mind, London: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstede, G. (2001). Cultures Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverley Hills. CA: Sage.

House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., &Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. Journal of World Business, 37, 3–10.

House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., &Dorfman, P., & Gupta, V. (2004).Culture, leadership and organi-zations: The GLOBE study of 62 societies. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hyrsky, K. and Tuunanen, M.(1999). Innovativeness and Risk-taking Propensity: A Cross-Cultural Study of Finnish and U.S. Entrepreneurs and Small Business Owners. The Finnish Journal of Business Economics, 3(3), 283–256.

Jantunen, A., Puumalainen, K., Saarenketo, S. &Kyläheiko, K.(2005).Entrepreneurial orientation, dynamic capabilities and international performance. Journal of International Entrepreneurship, 3(3), 223–243.

Jose E. A., Niels B. & Global Entrepreneurship Research Association (GERA) (2013).Global Entrepreneurship Monitor: 2013 Global Report on Fifteen Years of Assessing Entrepreneurship Across the Globe: Babson College, Babson Park, MA, USA.

Kemelgor, B. H., (2002). A comparative analysis of corporate entrepreneurial orientation between selected firms in the Netherlands and the USA. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 14(1), 67–87.

Kluckhohn, F. R., &Strodtbeck, F. L. (1961).Variations in values orientations. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, & Co.

Knight, G. (1997).Cross-cultural reliability and validity of a scale to measure firm entrepreneurial orientation. Journal of Business Venturing, 12(3), 213–225.

Kreiser, P.M., Marino, L., & Weaver, K.M. (2002).Assessing the psychometric properties of the entrepreneurial orientation scale: A multi-country analysis. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26(4), 71–94.

Lee, S.M. & Peterson, S.J. (2000). Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness. Journalof World Business, 35(4), 401–416.

Lumpkin, G.,&Dess, G.(1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. Academy of Management Review,21 (1), 135–172.

Lumpkin, G., &Dess, G.(2001).Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: the moderating role of environment and industry lifecycle. Journal of Business Venturing, 16 (5), 429–441.

McClelland, D.C. (1960). The achieving society. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.

McGrath, R.G., Macmillan, I.C., &Scheinberg, S. (1992). Elitists, risk-takers, and rugged individualists? An exploratory analysis of cultural differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Journal of BusinessVenturing, 7(2), 115–135.

McGrath, R.G., Macmillan, I.C., Yang, E.A., & Tsai, W. (1992). Does culture endure, or is it malleable? Issues for entrepreneurial economic development.Journal of Business Venturing, 7(6), 441–458.

Mitchell, R.K., Busenitz, L., Lant, T., McDougall, P.P., Morse, E.A., & Smith, J.B. (2004).The distinctive and inclusive domain of entrepreneurial cognition research. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 28(6), 505–518.

Miller, D.(1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. Management Science, 29 (7), 770–791.

Miller, D.,& Friesen, P.(1978).Archetypes of strategy formulation. Management Science, 24 (9), 921–933.

Miller, D., Friesen, P. (1982). Innovation in conservative and entrepreneurial firms: two models of strategic momentum. Strategic Management Journal 3, 1–25.

Moorman, R., Blakely, G.(1995). Individualism-collectivism as an individual difference predictor of organizational citizenship behavior. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 16 (1), 127–142.

Morris, M.H., Avila, R.A., & Allen, J. (1993). Individualism and the modern corporation: Implications for innovation and entrepreneurship. Journal of Management, 19(3), 595–612.

Moses A. Y. (2014). Analysis of Entrepreneurship: How does Culture Influence Risk-Taking in SMEs in the Sekondi-Takoradi Metropolis, Ghana? American International Journal of Contemporary Research, 4(2), 131-139.

Mueller, S.L. & Thomas, A.S. (2001). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. Journal of Business Venturing, 16(1), 51–75.

OECD Reviews of SME & Entrepreneurship Issues & Policies: The Example of Thailand (2011)

Patrick, K., Louis, D. M., Carl, L. T. (2010).The Development and Validation of an Objective Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale. Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research, 30(20), 24-37.

Peterson, R. (1988). Understanding and encouraging entrepreneurship internationally.Journal of SmallBusiness Management, 26(2), 1–7.

Porter, M.E. (1990). The competitive advantage of nations. New York: The Free Press.

Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T. and Frese, M.(2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 33(3), 761–787.

Runyan, R. C., Ge, B., Dong, B. and Swinney, J. L.(2011). Entrepreneurial Orientation in Cross-Cultural Research: Assessing Measurement Invariance in the Construct. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,36(4), 819-836

Schumpeter, J. (1934), The theory of economic development, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Shane, S. (1993). Cultural influences on national rates of innovation. Journal of Business Venturing, 8 (3), 59–73.

Smart, D. T. & Conant, J. S. (1994).Entrepreneurial orientation, distinctive marketing competencies and organization performance.Journal of Applied Business Research, 10(3), 28–38.

Stevenson, H.H. &JarilloJ.C., (1990).A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. Strategic Management Journal. 11, 17-27.

Stewart, W. H. JR., Watson, W. E., Carland, J. C. &Carland, J. W. (1999). A Proclivity for Entrepreneurship: A Comparison of Entrepreneurs, Small Business Owners and Corporate Managers. Journal of Business Venturing, 14(2), 189–214.

Suzuki, K., Kim, S. & Bae, Z.(2002). Entrepreneurship in Japan and Silicon Valley: a comparative study. Technovation, 22(10), 595–606.

Wales, W., Monsen, E.,&McKelvie, A. (2011).The Organizational Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Orientation. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 35(5), 895– 923.

Wiklund, J. and Shepherd, D.(2003).Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. Strategic Management Journal, 24(13), 1307–1314.

Wiklund, J. and Shepherd, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: a configurational approach. Journal of Business Venturing, 20(1), 71– 91.

Yang, H. &Dess G. G. (2007). Where do Entrepreneurial Orientations Come From? An Investigation on their Social Origin. In: G. T. Lumpkin and J. A. Katz, eds. 2007.Entrepreneurial Strategic Processes (Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, 10, 223–247.

Zhao, X, Rauch, A. and Rauch, M. (2012), Cross-country Differences in Entrepreneurial Activity: The Role of National Cultural Practice and Economic Wealth. Frontier Business Research, 6(4), 447-474.

Zahra, S. A. and Covin, J. G.(1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Business Venturing, 10(1), 43–58.

Zahra, S., Jennings, D., Kuratko, D.(1999). The antecedents and consequences of firm-level entrepreneurship: the state of the field. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 24 (2), 47–67.