

## REFERENCES

Albers, S. 2010. PLS and success factor studies in marketing. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

American Marketing Association. 2007. *Memo, AMA definition of marketing*. Press statement issued on December 17, 2007. [Online] Available from: <http://www.marketingpower.com/Community/ARC/Pages/Additional/Definition/default.aspx> [Accessed: 24-08-2010].

Anderson, J.C. & Gerbing, D.W. 1988. Structural equation modelling in practice: a review and recommended two-step approach. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(3):411-423.

Anon. 2010. Interview with Tanya Vogt, COO of the South African medical device industry association (SAMED). *Journal of Medical Device Regulation*, 7 (2):3-4.

Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. 2001. Intrapreneurship: construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5):495-527.

Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. 2004. Corporate entrepreneurship contingencies and organizational wealth creation. *Journal of Management Development*, 23(6):518-550.

Armstrong, J.S. & Overton, T.S. 1977. Estimating nonresponse bias in mail surveys. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 14(3):396-402.

Aspen Pharma. 2009. *Annual report 2009*. [Online] Available from: [www.aspenpharma.com](http://www.aspenpharma.com) [Accessed: 2010-08-09].

Audretsch, D.B. & Keilbach, M. 2004. Does entrepreneurship capital matter? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(5):419-423.

Augusto, M. & Coelho, F. 2009. Market orientation and new-to-the-world products: exploring the moderating effects of innovativeness, competitive strength, and environmental forces. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38(1):94-108.

Avert. n.d. *HIV and Aids in South Africa*. [Online] Available from: [www.avert.org/aidssouthafrica.htm](http://www.avert.org/aidssouthafrica.htm) [Accessed: 2011-01-28].

Babbie, E. 2010. *The practice of social research*, 12th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Bagozzi, R.P. & Baumgartner, H. 1994. The evaluation of structural equation models and hypothesis testing. In: Bagozzi, R.P. (ed.) *Principles of marketing research*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Barclay, D., Higgins, C. & Thompson, R. 1995. The partial least squares (PLS) approach to causal modeling, personal computer adoption and use as an illustration. *Technology Studies*, 2(2):285-309.

Barlow Hills, S. & Sarin, S. 2001. *Understanding market-driving capability in high-technology industries: a theoretical framework for examining firm strategic orientation and strategy selection*. Paper presented at the American Marketing Association Conference Proceedings, Winter 2001 (12):217-222.

Barlow Hills, S. & Sarin, S. 2003. From market driven to market driving: an alternate paradigm for marketing in high technology industries. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 11(3):13-24.

Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1):99-120.

Baron, R.A. & Markman, G.D. 2000. Beyond social capital: how social skills can enhance entrepreneurs' success. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14(1):106-118.

Baron, R.A. & Markman, G.D. 2003. Beyond social capital: the role of entrepreneurs' social competence in their financial success. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1):41-60.

Baron, R.M. & Kenny, D.A. 1986. The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6):1173-1182.

Barrett, H. & Weinstein, A. 1998. The effect of market orientation and organizational flexibility on corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(1):57-70.

Barrett, H., Balloun, J.L. & Weinstein, A. 2000. Marketing mix factors as moderators of the corporate entrepreneurship – business performance relationship – a multistage, multivariate analysis. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 8(2):50-62.

Barringer, B.R. & Bluedorn, A.C. 1999. The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(5):421-444.

Baumgartner, H. & Homburg, C. 1996. Applications of structural equation modeling in marketing and consumer research: a review. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 13(2):139-161.

Becherer, R.C. & Maurer, J.G. 1997. The moderating effect of environmental variables on the entrepreneurial and marketing orientation of entrepreneur-led firms. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 22(1):47-58.

Blesa, A. & Ripollés, M. 2003. The role of market orientation in the relationship between entrepreneurial proactiveness and performance. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 12(1):1-19.

Bollen, K.A. 1989. *Structural equations with latent variables*. New York: Wiley.

Bollen, K. & Lennox, R. 1991. Conventional wisdom on measurement: a structural equation perspective. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110(2):305-314.

Brown, T., Davidsson, P. & Wiklund, J. 2001. An operationalization of Stevenson's conceptualization of entrepreneurship as opportunity-based firm behaviour. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(10):953-968.

Bryman, A. & Bell, E. 2007. *Business research methods*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burgelman, R.A. 1984. Designs for corporate entrepreneurship in established firms. *California Management Review*, 26(3):154-166.

Burke, M.C. 1984. Strategic choice and marketing managers: an examination of business-level marketing objectives. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21(4):345-359.

Burke Jarvis, C., MacKenzie, S.B. & Podsakoff, P.M. 2003. A critical review of construct indicators and measurement model misspecification in marketing and consumer research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 30(2):199-218.

Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. 1994. *The management of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cadogan, J.W., Souchon, A.L. & Procter, D.B. 2008. The quality of market-oriented behaviours: formative index construction. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12):1263-1277.

Carifio, J. & Perla, R. 2007. Ten common misunderstandings, misconceptions, persistent myths and urban legends about Likert scales and Likert response formats and their antidotes. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(3):106-116.

Carifio, J. & Perla, R. 2008. Resolving the 50-year debate around using and misusing Likert scales. *Medical Education*, 42(12):1150-1152.

Carrillat, F.A., Jaramillo, F. & Locander, W.B. 2004. Market-driving organizations: a framework. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, 8(6). [Online] Available from: <http://www.amsreview.org/articles/carrillat05-2004.pdf>. [Accessed: 2009-09-19].

Carson, D. 2010. Interface research: a commentary on a commentary – ten years on. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1):8-10.

Carte, T.A. & Russell, C.J. 2003. In pursuit of moderation: nine common errors and their solutions. *MIS Quarterly*, 27(3):479-501.

Cassel, C., Hackl, P. & Westlund, A.H. 1999. Robustness of partial least-squares method for estimating latent variable quality structures. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 26(4):435-446.

Chadwick, K., Barnett, T. & Dwyer, S. 2008. An empirical analysis of the entrepreneurial orientation scale. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 13(4):64-84.

Chandler, G.N. & Hanks, S.H. 1994. Market attractiveness, resource-based capabilities, venture strategies, and venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(4):331-349.

Chang, L. 1994. A psychometric evaluation of 4-point and 6-point Likert-type scales in relation to reliability and validity. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 18(3):205-215.

Chin, W.W. 1995. *Partial least squares is to Lisrel as principal components analysis is to common factor analysis*. [Online] Available from: <http://disc-nt.cba.uh.edu/chin/technologystudies.pdf> [Downloaded: 2011-02-23].

Chin, W.W. 1998. The partial least squares approach to structural equation modelling. In: Marcoulides, G.A. (ed.) *Modern methods for business research*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chin, W.W. 2010. Bootstrap cross-validation indices for PLS path model assessment. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Chin, W.W. & Newsted, P.R. 1999. Structural equation modelling analysis with small samples using partial least squares. In: Hoyle, R.H. (ed.). *Statistical strategies for small sample research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chin, W.W., Marcolin, B.L. & Newsted, P.R. 1996. *A partial least squares latent variable modelling approach for measuring interaction effects: results from a Monte Carlo simulation study and voice mail emotion/adoption study*. Paper presented at the 17<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Information Systems. Cleveland, Ohio.

Churchill, G.A. & Peter, J.P. 1984. Research design effects on the reliability of rating scales: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 21(4):360-375.

Churchill, N.C. & Muzyka, D.F. 1994. Defining and conceptualising entrepreneurship: a process approach. In: Hills, G.E. (ed.) *Marketing and entrepreneurship, research ideas and opportunities*, Westport, CT: Quorum.

Clason, D.L. & Dormody, T.J. 1994. Analyzing data measured by individual Likert-type items. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 35(4):31-35.

Cockburn, I.M., Henderson, R.M. & Stern, S. 2000. Untangling the origins of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10/11):1123-1145.

Collinson, E. 2002. The marketing/entrepreneurship interface. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 18(3/4):337-340.

Collinson, E. & Shaw, E. 2001. Entrepreneurial marketing – a historical perspective on development and practice. *Management Decision*, 39(9):761-766.

Coltman, T., Devinney, T.M., Midgley, D.F. & Venaik, S. 2008. Formative versus reflective measurement models: two applications of formative measurement. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12):1250-1262.

Cooper, A.C., Markman, G.D. & Niss, G. 2000. The evolution of the field of entrepreneurship. In: Meyer, G.D. & Heppard, K.A. (eds.) *Entrepreneurship as strategy: competing on the entrepreneurial edge*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cooper, D.R. & Schindler, P.S. 2008. *Business research methods*, 10th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Cornelius, B., Landström, H. & Persson, O. 2006. Entrepreneurial studies: the dynamic research front of a developing social science. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(3):375-398.

Council of Medical Schemes. 2009. *Annual Report 2008-2009*. [Online] Available from: [http://www.medicalschemes.com/Publications/CMS Annual Report 2008-2009.pdf](http://www.medicalschemes.com/Publications/CMS%20Annual%20Report%202008-2009.pdf) [Downloaded: 2010-06-30].

Council of Medical Schemes. 2010. *Annual Report 2009-2010*. [Online] Available from: [http://www.medicalschemes.com/Publications/CMS Annual Report 2009-2010.pdf](http://www.medicalschemes.com/Publications/CMS%20Annual%20Report%202009-2010.pdf) [Downloaded: 2011-04-13].

Covin, J.G. & Covin, T.J. 1990. Competitive aggressiveness, environmental context, and small firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 14(4):35-50.

Covin, J.G. & Miles, M.P. 1999. Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3):47-63.

Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. 1986. The development and testing of an organizational-level entrepreneurship scale. In: Ronstadt R., Hornaday, J.A., Peterson, R. & Vesper, K.H. (eds.) *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.

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

Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. 1991. A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(1):7-25.

Cunningham, J.B. & Lischeron, J. 1991. Defining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 29(1):45-61.

Davidsson, P. & Honig, B. 2003. The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3):301-331.

Davis, D., Morris, M. & Allen, J. 1991. Perceived environmental turbulence and its effect on selected entrepreneurship, marketing, and organizational characteristics in industrial firms. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 19(1):43-51.

Dawes, J. 1999. The relationship between subjective and objective company performance measures in market orientation research: further empirical evidence. *Marketing Bulletin*, 10 (Research note 3). [Online] Available from: [http://marketing-bulletin.massey.ac.nz/V10/MB\\_V10\\_N3\\_Dawes.pdf](http://marketing-bulletin.massey.ac.nz/V10/MB_V10_N3_Dawes.pdf) [Downloaded: 2011-01-08].

Day, G.S. 1998. What does it mean to be market-driven? *Business Strategy Review*, 9(1):1-14.

Day, G.S. 1999. *The market driven organization: understanding, attracting and keeping valuable customers*. New York: The Free Press.

De Carolis, D.M., Litzky, B.E. & Eddleston, K.A. 2009. Why networks enhance the progress of new venture creation: the influence of social capital and cognition. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2):527-545.



Deeds, D.L. & Hill, C.W.L. 1996. Strategic alliances and the rate of new product development: an empirical study of entrepreneurial biotechnology firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 11(1):41-55.

Deshpandé, R. & Farley, J.U. 1998. Measuring market orientation: generalization and synthesis. *Journal of Market Focused Management*, 2(3): 213-232.

Deshpandé, R., Farley, J.U. & Webster, F.E. 1993. Corporate culture, customer orientation, and innovativeness in Japanese firms: a quadrad analysis. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(1):23-37.

Dess, G.G. & Robinson, R.B. 1984. Measuring organizational performance in the absence of objective measures: the case of the privately-held firm and conglomerate business unit. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(3):265-273.

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*, 24(3):85-102.

Dess, G.G. Ireland, R.D., Zahra, S.A., Floyd, S.W., Janney, J.J. & Lane, P.J. 2003. Emerging issues in corporate entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3):351-378.

Diamantopoulos, A. 1994. Modelling with LISREL: a guide for the uninitiated. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 10(1-3):105-136.

Diamantopoulos, A. 2006. The error term in formative measurement models: interpretation and modelling implications. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, 1(1):7-17.

Diamantopoulos, A. & Hart, S. 1993. Linking market orientation and company performance: preliminary evidence on Kohli and Jaworski's framework. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 1(2):93-121.

Diamantopoulos, A. & Schlegelmilch, B.B. 2000. *Taking the fear out of data analysis: a step-by-step approach*. London: Business Press.

Diamantopoulos, A. & Siguaw, J.A. 2006. Formative versus reflective indicators in organizational measure development: a comparison and empirical illustration. *British Journal of Management*, 17(4):263-282.

Diamantopoulos, A. & Winkelhofer, H.M. 2001. Index construction with formative indicators: an alternative to scale development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 38(2):269-277.

Diamantopoulos, A., Riefler, P. & Roth, K.P. 2008. Advancing formative measurement models. *Journal of Business Research*, 61(12):1203-1218.

Dickson, P.H. & Weaver, K.M. 1997. Environmental determinants and individual-level moderators of alliance use. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(2):404-425.

Dijkstra, T. 1983. Some comments on maximum likelihood and partial least squares methods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 22(1/2):67-90.

Dooley, L.M. & Lindner, J.R. 2003. The handling of nonresponse error. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 14(1):99-110.

Edwards, J.R. 2001. Multidimensional constructs in organizational behaviour research: an integrative analytical framework. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(2):144-192.

Edwards, J.R. & Bagozzi, R.P. 2000. On the nature and direction of relationships between constructs and measures. *Psychological Methods*, 5(2):155-174.

Episcom Healthcare Intelligence. 2010. *The medical device market: South Africa*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.marketresearch.com/product/display.asp?productid=2879098> [Accessed: 2011-01-29].

Esposito Vinzi, V., Trinchera, L. & Amato, S. 2010. PLS path modeling: from foundations to recent developments and open issues for model assessment and improvement. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Falk, R.F. & Miller, N.B. 1992. *A primer for soft modeling*. Akron: University of Akron Press.

Filion, L.J. 1998. From entrepreneurship to entreprenology: the emergence of a new discipline. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 6(1):1-23.

Firkin, P. 2001. *Entrepreneurial capital: a resource-based conceptualisation of the entrepreneurial process*. (Labour Market Dynamics Research Programme: Working Paper no. 7). Albany, Auckland: Massey University.

Foedermayr, E., Diamantopoulos, A. & Sichtmann, C. 2009. Export segmentation effectiveness: index construction and link to export performance. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 17(1):55-73.

Fornell, C. 1983. Issues and application of covariance structure analysis: a comment. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9(4):443-448.

Fornell, C. & Bookstein, F.L. 1982. Two structural equation models: Lisrel and PLS applied to consumer exit-voice theory. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(4):440-452.

Fornell, C. & Cha, J. 1994. Partial least squares. In: Bagozzi, R.P. (ed.) *Advances methods of marketing research*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. 1981. Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1):39-50.

Gaddefors, J. & Anderson, A.R. 2008. Market creation: the epitome of entrepreneurial marketing practices. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1):19-39.

Gardner, D.M. 1994. Marketing/entrepreneurship interface: A conceptualization. In: Hills, G.E (ed.) *Marketing and Entrepreneurship, research ideas and opportunities*, Westport, CT: Quorum.

Gartner, W.B. 1990. What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(1):15-28.

George, B.A. 2011. Entrepreneurial orientation: a theoretical and empirical examination of the consequences of differing construct representations. *Journal of Management Studies (forthcoming)* accepted article. [Online] Available from: doi.10.1111/j.1467-6486.2010.01004.x [Downloaded: 2011-04-03].

Ghuri, P.N., Tarnovskaya, V. & Elg, U. 2008. Market driving multinationals and their global sourcing network. *International Marketing Review*, 25(5):504-519.

Gilmore, A. 2010. Reflections on methodologies for research at the marketing/entrepreneurship interface. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 12(1):11-20.

González-Benito, O., González-Benito, J. & Muñoz-Gallego, P.A. 2009. Role of entrepreneurship and market orientation in firm's success. *European Journal of Marketing*, 43(3/4):500-522.

Goodale, J.C., Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S. & Covin, J.G. 2010. Operations management and corporate entrepreneurship: the moderating effect of operations control on the antecedents of corporate entrepreneurial activity in relation to

innovation performance. *Journal of Operations Management*. [Online] Available from: doi:10.1016/j.jom2010.07.005 [Downloaded: 2010-08-10].

Götz, O., Liehr-Gobbers, K. & Krafft, M. 2010. Evaluation of structural equation models using the partial least squares (PLS) approach. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Grinstein, A. 2008a. The relationship between market orientation and alternative strategic orientations. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(1/2):115-134.

Grinstein, A. 2008b. The effect of market orientation and its components on innovation consequences: a meta-analysis. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(2):166-173.

Grönroos, C. 1994. From marketing mix to relationship marketing: towards a paradigm shift in marketing. *Management Decision*, 32(2):4-20.

Gulati, R. 1998. Alliances and networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(4):293-317.

Gulati, R. 1999. Network location and learning: the influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(5):397-420.

Guth, W.D. & Ginsberg, A. 1990. Guest editors' introduction: corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(special issue):5-15.

Guthrie, J.P., Spell, C.S. & Ochoki Nyamori, R. 2002. Correlates and consequences of high involvement work practices: the role of competitive strategy. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(1):183-197.

Haenlein, M. & Kaplan, A.M. 2004. A beginner's guide to partial least squares analysis. *Understanding Statistics*, 3(4):283-297.

Hair, J.F., Ringle, C.M. & Sarstedt, M. 2011. PLS-SEM: indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2):139-151.

Hamel, G. & Prahalad, C.K. 1994. *Competing for the future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Harmsen, H. & Jensen, B. 2004. Identifying the determinants of value creation in the market: a competence-based approach. *Journal of Business Research*, 57(5):533-547.

Harris, L.C. & Cai, K.Y. 2002. Exploring market-driving: a case study of De Beers in China. *Journal of Market-Focused Management*, 5(3):171-196.

Hatch, N.W. & Dyer, J.H. 2004. Human capital and learning as a source of sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 25(12):1155-1178.

Helm, S., Eggert, A. & Garnefeld, I. 2010. Modeling the impact of corporate reputation on customer satisfaction and loyalty using partial least squares. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Henseler, J. & Chin, W.W. 2010. A comparison of approaches for the analysis of interaction effects between latent variables using partial least squares path modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 17(1):82-109.

Henseler, J. & Fassott, G. 2010. Testing moderating effects in PLS path models: an illustration of available procedures. In: Esposito Vinzi, V., Chin, W.W., Henseler, J. & Wang, H. (eds.) *Handbook of partial least squares: concepts, methods and applications*. Heidelberg: Springer.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C.M. & Sinkovics, R.R. 2009. The use of partial least squares path modelling in international marketing. *Advances in International Marketing*, 20(4):277-319.

Hills, G.E. 1994. Marketing and entrepreneurship: the domain. In: Hills, G.E. (ed.) *Marketing and entrepreneurship, research ideas and opportunities*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Hills, G.E. & LaForge, R.W. 1992. Research at the marketing interface to advance entrepreneurship theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 16(3):33-59.

Hills, G.E., Hultman, C.M. & Miles, M.P. 2008. The evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1):99-112.

Hisrich, R.D. 1992. The need for marketing in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 7(3):53-57.

Hisrich, R.D. 1994. Product/service development in new/growing firms. In: Hills, G.E. (ed.) *Marketing and entrepreneurship, research ideas and opportunities*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Hisrich, R.D. & Peters, M.P. 1986. Establishing a new business venture unit within a firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(3):307-322.

Hisrich, R.D., Peters, M.P. & Shepherd, D.A. 2008. *Entrepreneurship*, 7th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hitt, M.A. & Ireland, R.D. 2002. The essence of strategic leadership: managing human and social capital. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 9(1):3-14.

Hitt, M.A., Bierman, L., Shimizu, K. & Kochhar, R. 2001. Direct and moderating effects of human capital on strategy and performance in professional service firms: a resource-based perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1):13-28.

Hitt, M.A., Dacin, M.T., Levitas, E., Arregle, J.-L. & Borza, A. 2000. Partner selection in emerging and developed market contexts: resource-based and organizational learning perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43(3):449-467.

Holt, D.T., Rutherford, M.W. & Clohessy, G.R. 2007. Corporate entrepreneurship: an empirical look at individual characteristics, context, and process. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 13(4):40-54.

Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F. & Montagno, R.V. 1999. Perception of internal factors for corporate entrepreneurship: a comparison of Canadian and US managers. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(2):9-24.

Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F. & Zahra, S.A. 2002. Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17(3):253-273.

Hornsby, J.S., Kuratko, D.F., Shepherd, D.A. & Bott, J.P. 2009. Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions: Examining perception and position. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(3):236-247.

Hornsby, J.S., Naffziger, D.W., Kuratko, D.F. & Montagno, R.V. 1993. An interactive model of corporate entrepreneurship process. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(2):29-37.

Hu, L.-T. & Bentler, P.M. 1995. Evaluating model fit. In: Hoyle, R.H. (ed.) *Structural equation modelling, concepts, issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hulland, J. 1999. Use of partial least squares (PLS) in strategic management research: a review of four recent studies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20(2):195-204.

Hult, G.T.M. & Ketchen, D.J. 2001. Does market orientation matter? A test of the relationship between positional advantage and performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(9):899-906.

Hultman, C.M. 1999. Nordic perspectives on marketing and research in the marketing/entrepreneurship interface. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 1(1):54-71.



Hunt, S.D. 1991. *Modern marketing theory: critical issues in the philosophy of marketing science*. Cincinnati: South-Western.

Ireland, R.D., Covin, J.G. & Kuratko, D.F. 2009. Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1):19-46.

Ireland, R.D., Hitt, M.A. & Vaidyanath, D. 2002. Alliance management as a source of competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 28(3):413-446.

Ireland, R.D., Kuratko, D.F. & Morris, M.H. 2006. A health audit for corporate entrepreneurship: innovation at all levels: part 1. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 27(1):10-17.

Ireland, R.D., Hitt, M.A., Camp, S.M. & Sexton, D.L. 2001. Integrating entrepreneurship and strategic management actions to create firm wealth. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(1):49-63.

Jaccard, J. & Jacoby, J. 2010. *Theory construction and model-building skills*. New York: Guilford Press.

Jahn, S. 2007. *Strukturgleichungsmodellierung mit LISREL, AMOS und SmartPLS. Eine Einführung*. Technische Universität Chemnitz. [Online] Available from: [www.tu-chemnitz.de/Jahn2007-strukturgleichungsmodellierungmitLisrel.pdf](http://www.tu-chemnitz.de/Jahn2007-strukturgleichungsmodellierungmitLisrel.pdf). [Downloaded: 2010-10-03].

Jamieson, S. 2004. Likert scales: how to (ab)use them. *Medical Education*, 38(12):1212-1218.

Jaworski, B.J. & Kohli, A.K. 1993. Market orientation: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing*, 57(3):53-70.

Jaworski, B., Kohli, A.K. & Sahay, A. 2000. Market-driven versus driving markets. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(1):45-54.

Jennings, D.F. & Young, D.M. 1990. An empirical comparison between objective and subjective measures of the product innovation domain of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(1):53-66.

Jöreskog, K.G. 2005. *Structural equation modeling with ordinal variables using LISREL*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.ssicentra.com/lisrel/corner.htm>. [Accessed: 2011-03-07].

Jöreskog, K.G. & Wold, H. 1982. The ML and PLS techniques for modeling with latent variables. In: Jöreskog, K.G. & Wold, H. (eds.) *Systems under indirect observation*, Part 1. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Kale, P., Singh, H. & Perlmutter, H. 2000. Learning and protection of proprietary assets in strategic alliances: building relational capital. *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(3):217-237.

Kaplan, D. 2009. *Structural equation modeling: foundations and extensions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Keh, H.T., Nguyen, T.T.M. & Ng, H.P. 2007. The effects of entrepreneurial orientation and marketing information on the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4):592-611.

Khandwalla, P.N. 1976/77. Some top management styles, their context and performance. *Organization and Administrative Sciences*, 7(4):21-51.

Khandwalla, P.N. 1977. *The design of organizations*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Khandwalla, P.N. 1987. Generators of pioneering-innovative management: some Indian evidence. *Organization Studies*, 8(1):39-59.

Kim, W.C. & Mauborgne R. 2005. Value innovation: a leap into the blue ocean. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 26(4):22-28.

Kirby, D.A. 2003. *Entrepreneurship*. Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill.

Kirca, A.H., Jayachandran, S. & Bearden, W.O. 2005. Market orientation: a meta-analytic review and assessment of its antecedents and impact on performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 69(2):24-41.

Kjellberg, H. & Helgesson, C.F. 2007. On the nature of markets and their practices. *Marketing Theory*, 7(2):137-162.

Kline, R.B. 2011. *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*. 3rd ed. New York: Guilford Press.

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

Kohli, A.K. & Jaworski, B.J. 1990. Market orientation: the construct, research propositions, and managerial implications. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(2):1-18.

Kohli, A.K., Jaworski, B.J. & Kumar, A. 1993. MARKOR: a measure of market orientation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30(4):467-477.

Kotler, P. 1972. A generic concept of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 36(2):46-54.

Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. 2010. *Principles of marketing*. 13th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Kotzé, T. 2006. *Referencing in academic documents: official guidelines of the Department of Business Management*. Pretoria: Department of Marketing and Communication Management, University of Pretoria.

Kreiser, P.M., Marino, L.D. & 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.

Kumar, N., Scheer, L. & Kotler, P. 2000. From market driven to market driving. *European Management Journal*, 18(2):129-142.

Kumar, K., Subramanian, R. & Yauger, C. 1998. Examining the market orientation-performance relationship: a context-specific study. *Journal of Management*, 24(2):201-233.

Kuratko, D.F. & Hodgetts, R.M. 1998. *Entrepreneurship: a contemporary approach*, 4th ed. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.

Kuratko, D.F & Morris, M.H. 2003. Corporate entrepreneurship: the dynamic strategy for 21<sup>st</sup> century organizations. *Advances in the Study of Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Economic Growth*, 14 (n.a):21-46.

Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S. & Goldsby, M.G. 2004. Sustaining corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 5(2):77-89.

Kuratko, D.F., Ireland, R.D. & Hornsby, J.S. 2001. Improving firm performance through entrepreneurial actions: Acorida's corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(4):60-71.

Kuratko, D.F., Montagno, R.V. & Hornsby, J.S. 1990. Developing an intrapreneurial assessment instrument for an effective corporate entrepreneurial environment. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(special issue summer):49-58.

Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S., Naffziger, D.W. & Montagno, R.V. 1993. Implement entrepreneurial thinking in established organizations. *SAM Advanced Management Journal*, 58(1):28-39.

Law, K.S. & Wong, C.-S. 1999. Multidimensional constructs in structural equation analysis: an illustration using the job perception and job satisfaction constructs. *Journal of Management*, 25(2):143-160.

Law, K.S., Wong, C.-S. & Mobley, W.H. 1998. Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4):741-755.

Lehner, F. & Haas, N. 2010. Knowledge management success factors – proposal of an empirical research. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 8(1):79-90.

Leskiewicz Sandvik, I. & Sandvik, K. 2003. The impact of market orientation on product innovativeness and business performance. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 20(4):355-376.

Levy, P.S. & Lemeshow, S. 2008. *Sampling of populations: methods and applications*, 4th ed. New Jersey: Wiley.

Li, Y., Zhao, Y., Tan, J. & Liu, Y. 2008. Moderating effects of entrepreneurial orientation on market orientation-performance linkage: evidence from Chinese small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1):113-133.

Likert, R. 1932. A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 40(4):1-55.

Lissitz, R.W. & Green, S.B. 1975. Effect of the number of scale points on reliability: a Monte Carlo approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(1):10-13.

Lohmöller, J.-B. 1989. *Latent variable path modeling with partial least squares*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.

Lukas, B.A. & Ferrell, O.C. 2000. The effect of market orientation on product innovation. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28(2):239-247.

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

Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. 2001. Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: the moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5):429-451.

MacCallum, R.C. 1995. Model specification: procedures, strategies and related issue. In: Hoyle, R.H. (ed.) *Structural equation modelling: concepts, issues, and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

MacCallum, R.C. & Browne, M.W. 1993. The use of causal indicators in covariance structure models: some practical issues. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114(3):533-541.

MacKenzie, S.B. 2003. The dangers of poor construct conceptualization. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(3):323-326.

MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, P.M. & Burke Jarvis, C. 2005. The problem of measurement model misspecification in behavioural and organizational research and some recommended solutions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(4):710-730.

Marcoulides, G.A. & Saunders, C. 2006. PLS: A silver bullet? *MIS Quarterly*, 30(2):iii-ix.

Marcoulides, G.A., Chin, W.W. & Saunders, C. 2009. A critical look at partial least squares modeling. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(1):171-175.

Matell, M.S. & Jacoby, J. 1972. Is there an optimal number of alternatives for Likert-scale items? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 56(6):506-509.

Matsuno, K., Mentzer, J.T. & Özsomer, A. 2002. The effects of entrepreneurial proclivity and market orientation on business performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 66(3):18-32.

Matsuno, K., Mentzer, J.T. & Rentz, J.O. 2005. A conceptual and empirical comparison of three market orientation scales. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(1):1-8.

McNaughton, R.B., Osborne, P. & Imrie, B.C. 2002. Market-oriented value creation in service firms. *European Journal of Marketing*, 36(9/10):990-1002.

Medicaldevice-network.com. 2009. *Is South Africa equipped for success?* [Online] Available from: <http://www.medicaldevice-network.com/features/feature56399/> [Accessed: 2011-01-29].

Miles, G., Heppard, K.A., Miles, R.E. & Snow, C.C. 2000. Entrepreneurial strategies: The critical role of top management. In: Meyers, G.D & Heppard, K.A. (eds.) *Entrepreneurship as strategy: competing on the entrepreneurial edge*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miles, M.P. & Arnold, D.R. 1991. The relationship between marketing orientation and entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(4):49-65.

Miles, M.P. & Darroch, J. 2006. Large firms, entrepreneurial marketing processes, and the cycle of competitive advantage. *European Journal of Marketing*, 40(5/6):485-501.

Miles, M.P. & Darroch, J. 2008. A commentary on current research at the marketing and entrepreneurship interface. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1):46-49.

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

Miller, D. 1987. Strategy making and structure: analysis and implications for performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30(1):7-32.

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

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

Miller, D. & Friesen, P.H. 1983. Strategy-making and environment: the third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4(3):221-235.

Moorman, C. & Rust, R.T. 1999. The role of marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 63(special issue):180-197.

Morgan, G.A., Leech, N.L., Gloeckner, G.W. & Barrett, K.C. 2007. *SPSS for introductory statistics: use and application*. 3rd ed. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Morgan, R.E. & Strong, C.A. 2003. Business performance and dimensions of strategic orientation. *Journal of Business Research*, 56(3):163-176.

Morris, M.H. 1998. *Entrepreneurial intensity: sustainable advantages for individuals, organizations, and societies*. Westport, CT: Quorum.

Morris, M.H. & Paul, G.W. 1987. The relationship between entrepreneurship and marketing in established firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2(3):247-259.

Morris, M.H. & Sexton, D.L. 1996. The concept of entrepreneurial intensity: implications for company performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 36(1):5-13.

Morris, M.H., Kuratko, D.F. & Covin, J.G. 2008. *Corporate entrepreneurship and innovation*, 2nd ed. Mason: Thomson South-Western.

Morris, M.H., Schindehutte, M. & LaForge, R.W. 2002. Entrepreneurial marketing: a construct for integrating emerging entrepreneurship and marketing perspectives. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 10(4):1-19.

Morris, M.H., van Vuuren, J., Cornwall, J.R. & Scheepers, R. 2009. Properties of balance: a pendulum effect in corporate entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons*, 52(5):429-440.



Narver, J.C. & Slater, S.F. 1990. The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing*, 54(4):20-35.

Narver, J.C., Slater, S.F. & MacLachlan, D. 2004. Responsive and proactive market orientation and new-product success. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 21(5):334-347.

Nitzl, C. 2010. *Eine anwenderorientierte Einführung in die Partial Least Squares (PLS)-Methode*. (Arbeitspapier Nr. 21) Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.

Norman, G. 2010. Likert scales, levels of measurement and the “laws” of statistics. *Advances in Health Science Education*, 15(5):625-632.

Nunnally, J.C. & Bernstein, I.H. 1994. *Psychometric theory*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Parker, P.L., McDaniel, H.S. & Crumpton-Young, L.L. 2002. *Do research participants give interval or ordinal answers in response to Likert scales?* IIE Annual Conference Proceedings, 1-4. [Online] Available from: <http://0-search.proquest.com.innopac.up.ac.za/docview/192468666?accountid=14717>. [Accessed: 2011-03-01].

Pearl, J. 2007. *Causality: models, reasoning and inference*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Podsakoff, N.P. & Yeon Lee, J. 2003. The mismeasure of man(agement) and its implications for leadership research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6):615-656.

Porter, M.E. 1998. *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*. New York: The Free Press.

Preston, C.C. & Colman, A.M. 2000. Optimal number of response categories in rating scales: reliability, validity, discriminating power, and respondent preferences. *Acta Psychologica*, 104(1):1-15.

Rauch, A., Frese, M. & Utsch, A. 2005. Effects of human capital and long-term human resources development and utilization on employment growth of small-scale businesses: a causal analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(6):681-698.

Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T & 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 (27p). [Online] Available from: Academic OneFile. <http://0-find.galegroup.com> [Accessed: 2009-07-27].

ReportLinker. 2011. *South Africa pharmaceuticals and healthcare report Q1 2011*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.reportlinker.com/p0174634/South-Africa-Pharmaceuticals-and-Healthcare-Report-Q1.html> [Accessed: 2011-01-29].

Rigdon, E.E. 1995. A necessary and sufficient identification rule for structural models estimated in practice. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 30(3):359-383.

Rigdon, E.E. 1998. Structural equation modeling. In: Marcoulides, G.A. (ed.) *Modern methods for business research*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Riggio, R.E. 1986. Assessment of basic social skills. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(3):649-660.

Ringle, C. 2004. *Gütemaße für den partial least squares-Ansatz zur Bestimmung von Kausalmodellen*. (Arbeitspapier Nr. 16). Universität Hamburg. [Online] Available from: [www.econbiz.de/guetemasse\\_pls-ansatz\\_kausalm Modelle.pdf](http://www.econbiz.de/guetemasse_pls-ansatz_kausalm Modelle.pdf) [Downloaded: 2011-02-05].

Ringle, C., Wende, S. & Will, A. 2005. *SmartPLS 2.0 (beta)*. Universität Hamburg. [Online] Available from: [www.smartpls.de](http://www.smartpls.de) [Downloaded: 2011-03-16].

Roberts, N. & Bennett Thatcher, J. 2009. Conceptualizing and testing formative constructs: tutorial and annotated example. *The Data Base for Advances in Information Systems*, 40(3):9-39.

Rossiter, J.R. 2002. The C-OAR-SE procedure for scale development in marketing. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 19(4):305-335.

Rothaermel, F.T. & Deeds, D.L. 2006. Alliance type, alliance experience and alliance management capability in high-technology ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(4):429-460.

Santos, J.R.A. 1999. Cronbach's alpha: a tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2):1-4. [Online] Available from: <http://www.joe.org/joe/1999april/tt3.php>. [Accessed:2010-05.05].

Sawyer, O.O. & McGee, J.E. 1999. *The impact of personal network characteristics on perceived environmental uncertainty: an examination of owners/managers of new high technology firms*. [Online] Available from: [http://www.babson.edu/entrep/fer/papers99/V/V\\_A/V\\_A%20Text.htm](http://www.babson.edu/entrep/fer/papers99/V/V_A/V_A%20Text.htm) [Accessed: 2009-10-27].

Schindehutte, M., Morris, M.H. & Kocak, A. 2008. Understanding market-driving behaviour: the role of entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1):4-26.

Schindehutte, M., Morris, M.H. & Kuratko, D.F. 2000. Triggering events, corporate entrepreneurship and the marketing function. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 8(2):18-30.

Schindehutte, M., Morris, M.H. & Pitt, L.F. 2009. *Rethinking marketing: the entrepreneurial imperative*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Schneeweiss, H. 1991. Models with latent variables: LISREL versus PLS. *Statistica Neerlandica*, 2(45):145-157.

Schumacker, R.E. & Lomax, R.G. 2010. *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling*, 3rd ed. New York: Routledge.

Sharma, P. & Chrisman, J.J. 1999. Toward a reconciliation of the definitional issues in the field of corporate entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3):11-27.

Shaw, E. 1999. Networks and their relevance to the entrepreneurial/marketing interface: a review of the evidence. *Journal of Research in Marketing & Entrepreneurship*, 1(1):24-40.

Shergill, G.S. & Nargundkar, R. 2005. Market orientation, marketing innovation as performance drivers: Extending the paradigm. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 19(1):27-47.

Sheth, J.N., Gardner, D.M. & Garrett, D.E. 1988. *Marketing theory: evolution and evaluation*. New York. John Wiley & Sons.

Shmueli, G., 2010. To explain or to predict? *Statistical Science*, 25(3):289-310.

Slater, S.F. & Narver, J.C. 1994. Does competitive environment moderate the market orientation-performance relationship? *Journal of Marketing*, 58(1):46-55.

Slater, S.F. & Narver, J.C. 1995. Market orientation and the learning organization. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(3):63-74.

Slater, S.F. & Narver, J.C. 1998. Customer-led and market-oriented: let's not confuse the two. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19(10):1001-1006.

Slater, S.F. & Narver, J.C. 2000. The positive effect of a market orientation on business profitability: a balanced replication. *Journal of Business Research*, 48(1):69-73.

Smart, D.T. & Conant, J.S. 1994. Entrepreneurial orientation, distinctive marketing competencies and organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10(3): 28p. [Online] Available from: EBSCOHost: Business Source Premier: <http://0-search.ebscohost.com.innopac.up.ac.za> [Downloaded: 2010-08-05].

Song, M. & Parry, M.E. 2009. The desired level of market orientation and business unit performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 37(2):144-160.

Sörbom, D. & Jöreskog, K.G. 1982. The use of structural equation models in evaluation research. In: Fornell, C. (ed.) *A second generation of multivariate analysis*, Vol. 2. New York: Praeger.

SouthAfrica.info. 2009. *NHI: decent health care for all*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.southafrica.info/news/nhi-010709.htm> [Accessed: 2011-01-28].

Spector, P.E. 1992. *Summated rating scale construction: an introduction*. Newbury Park: Sage University Papers.

SPSS Inc. 2004. *SPSS V. 9.0*. Chicago, Illinois.

Stevenson, H.H. & Jarillo, J.C. 1990. A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(special issue):17-27.

Stevenson, H.H. & Jarillo-Mossi, J.C. 1986. Preserving entrepreneurship as companies grow. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 7(1):10-23.

Stokes, D. 2000. Putting entrepreneurship into marketing: the process of entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 2(1):1-16.

Stopford, J.M. & Baden-Fuller, C.W.F. 1994. Creating corporate entrepreneurship. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15(7):521-536.

Subramanian, R. & Gopalakrishna, P. 2001. The market orientation-performance relationship in the context of a developing economy: an empirical analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 53(1):1-13.

Temme, D. & Hildebrandt, L. 2006. *Formative measurement models in covariance structure analysis: Specification and identification*. SFB 649 (Discussion Paper 2006-083). Institute of Marketing, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. [Online] Available from: <http://sfb649.wiwi.hu-berlin.de> [Downloaded: 2011-01-23].

Tenenhaus, M., Esposito Vinzi, V., Chatelin, Y-M. & Lauro, C. 2005. PLS path modelling. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 48(1):159-205.

Teng, B.S. & Cummings, J.L. 2002. Trade-offs in managing resources and capabilities. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(2):81-91.

Thomas, D.R., Lu, I.R.R. & Cedzynski, M. 2007. *A critique on partial least squares, and a preliminary assessment of an alternative estimation method*. Sprott Letters, Working Papers. [Online] Available from: [www.sprott.carleton.ca/research\\_dev/documents/letters/SL07-002.pdf](http://www.sprott.carleton.ca/research_dev/documents/letters/SL07-002.pdf) [Downloaded: 2011-01-24].

Tuominen, M., Rajala, A. & Möller, K. 2004. Market-driving versus market-driven: Divergent roles of market orientation in business relationships. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(3):207-217.

Unger, J.M., Rauch, A., Frese, M. & Rosenbusch, N. 2011. Human capital and entrepreneurial success: a meta-analytical review. *Journal of Business Venturing* 26(3):341-358.

UTI Pharma. 2011. *2010: a winning year for UTI Pharma*. [Online] Available from: <http://www.utipharma.co.za/Pages/Welcome.aspx> [Accessed: 2011-01-29].

Venkatraman, N. 1989. Strategic orientation of business enterprises: the construct, dimensionality and measurement. *Management Science*, 35(8):942-962.

Vesper, K.H. 1984. Three faces of corporate entrepreneurship: a pilot study. In: Hornaday, J.A., Tarpley, F.A., Timmons, J.A & Vesper, K.H. (eds.) *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research*. Proceedings of the 1984 Entrepreneurship Research Conference, 294-320.

Wall, T.D., Michie, J., Patterson, M., Wood, S.J., Shehan, M., Clegg, C.W. & West, M. 2004. On the validity of subjective measures of company performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 57(1):95-118.

Weng, L.-J. 2004. Impact of the number of response categories and anchor labels on coefficient alpha and test-retest reliability. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(6):956-972.

Wetzels, M., Odekerken-Schröder, G. & van Oppen, C. 2009. Using PLS path modeling for assessing hierarchical construct models: guidelines and empirical illustration. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(1):177-195.

Wold, H. 1982. Soft modeling: the basic design and some extensions. In: Jöreskog, K.G. & Wold, H. (eds.) *Systems under indirect observation*, Part 2. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Wright, P.M., Dunford, B.B. & Snell, S.A. 2001. Human resources and the resource based view of the firm. *Journal of Management*, 27(6):701-721.

Zahra, S.A. 1991. Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: an exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4):259-285.

Zahra, S.A. 1993a. A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour: a critique and extension. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17(4):5-21.

Zahra, S.A. 1993b. Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: a taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(4):319-340.

Zahra, S.A. 2008. Being entrepreneurial and market driven: implications for company performance. *Journal of Strategy and Management*, 1(2):125-142.

Zahra, S.A. & Covin, J.G. 1993. Business strategy, technology policy and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(6):451-478.

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

Zahra, S.A., Jennings, D.F. & Kuratko, D.F. 1999. The antecedents and consequences of firm-level entrepreneurship: the state of the field. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(2):45-65.

Zhou, K.Z., Brown, J.R. & Dev, C.S. 2009. Market orientation, competitive advantage, and performance: a demand-based perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(11):1063-1070.



**ANNEXURE A**

**Research questionnaire**

**Level of corporate entrepreneurship in the South African healthcare industry**

Good morning / afternoon \_\_\_\_\_(insert name), my name is \_\_\_\_\_. I am a doctoral student at the University of Pretoria. I am conducting a survey amongst members of management in order to gain a general understanding of the level of entrepreneurship within the healthcare industry in South Africa. I would appreciate some of your valued time and input. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. All your answers are treated confidential and will only be evaluated on an aggregated basis.

S1) May I ask you a few questions to see if you qualify to take part?

Yes.....  (1)  go to S2)

No .....  (2)  Terminate interview

Cannot speak at the moment /  
please call later .....  (3)  Make appointment

S2) What is the main business focus of your firm?

Pharmaceuticals: Originals or Generics .....  (1)  go to S3)

Medical Devices .....  (2)  go to S3)

Pharmaceutical Distributor/Wholesaler .....  (3)  go to S3)

Medical Scheme.....  (4)  go to S3)

Other .....  (5)  Terminate interview



S3) Which of the following describes the level of management you fall under?

Top Management, e.g. General Manager,  
Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer,

Chief Financial Officer, Head Business Unit .....  (1) go to S4)

Middle Management, e.g. Senior Brand

Manager, Business Director .....  (2) go to S4)

Junior Management, e.g. Brand Manager,

Team Leader .....  (3) go to S4)

None of these .....  (4) Terminate interview

S4) Would you please tell me under which category your company falls under in terms of the number of employees nationally?

1-100 .....  (1) Terminate interview

101-200 .....  (2) go to S5)

201-300 .....  (3) go to S5)

301-400 .....  (4) go to S5)

401-500 .....  (5) go to S5)

501-1000 .....  (6) go to S5)

More than 1000 .....  (7) go to S5)

S5) Would you please tell me in which category your company's turnover falls under in terms of the last financial year?

Up to 50 million .....  (1) Terminate interview

50 – 100 million .....  (2) go to 1a)

101 – 150 million .....  (3) go to 1a)

151 – 200 million .....  (4) go to 1a)

201 – 250 million .....  (5) go to 1a)

More than 250 million .....  (6) go to 1a)

Please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements. On a scale of 1 to 5, where **1=decreased significantly**, **2= decreased**, **3=remained the same**, **4= increased**, **5= increased significantly**.

Please note that for the following 3 questions, we are asking about your perceptions. Comparing your firm's performance for 2008 and 2009 please rate

<b>Decreased significantly</b>	----- ----- ----- -----	<b>Increased significantly</b>
(1)	(2) (3) (4) (5)	

- |                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1a)...the overall level of financial performance,<br>e.g. company profit, net financial results ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1b)...the overall level of market share in % .....                                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 1c)...the overall development of cost base,<br>e.g. production cost, operating expenses.....          | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Please answer the questions according to your own personal judgement. The remainder of the questionnaire uses a scale of 1 to 5. Where **1 = Strongly disagree**, **2= Disagree**, **3= Neither agree nor disagree**, **4= Agree** and **5 = Strongly agree**. For each statement please tell me in what way you agree with the statement

<b>Strongly disagree</b>	----- ----- ----- -----	<b>Strongly agree</b>
(1)	(2) (3) (4) (5)	

The next 4 questions will cover the **organisational structure** of your firm. Please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements.

At our firm ...

- |                                                                                            |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. ...we have a flat organisational structure.....                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. ...we have many standard procedures that<br>everyone must follow .....                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. ...we have open channels of communication .....                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. ...employees are free to take decisions within<br>their scope of responsibilities ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Moving on to <b>management support</b> of your firm.					
5. Upper Management is aware and very receptive to employees' ideas and suggestions.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Those employees who come up with innovative ideas on their own often receive management encouragement for their activities.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. An employee with a good idea is often given free time to develop that idea .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Management provides a conducive environment for staff to communicate and understand each other .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Using the same 5 point scale, we'll now discuss your firm's approach to <b>risk-taking</b>					
9. We have a strong inclination / tendency to low risk projects, with normal and certain rates of return .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. We would never pursue any projects that could potentially result in any kind of loss .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thinking about your firm's <b>proactiveness</b>					
11. We try to anticipate developments in the market in order to adjust to changes quickly .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. In dealing with our competitors we typically respond to actions which competitors initiate .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Compared to our competitors we are very seldom the first business to introduce new products or services .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
	----- ----- ----- -----				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
<p>The next section covers your firm's <b>responsiveness to the market</b></p>					
14. Usually we implement changes suggested by business partners .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. We regularly analyse our relationships with business partners and respond quickly to major issues .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. If we identify gaps in our product/service delivery we respond by taking appropriate actions .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The next 4 questions relate to your firm's approach to <b>information generation</b></p>					
17. We regularly meet with clients to learn how to serve them better .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. We are slow to detect changes in our clients' product or service preferences.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Our firm does a lot of market research .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. We spend a lot of time discussing clients' future needs with business partners.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Moving onto your firm's communication and <b>spreading of information</b></p>					
21. Management regularly communicates industry developments to staff .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. We have regular meetings to discuss market trends and developments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. When one department finds out something important about competitors, it is slow to alert other departments.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Our firm regularly circulates reports or newsletters internally that provide information on our clients, competitors or the industry.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Strongly disagree

Strongly agree

|-----|-----|-----|-----|  
(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Talking about how your firm different **departments work together**  
Please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements.

- 25.Information that is received from e.g. sales consultants is distributed within all relevant departments .....
- 26.We share a lot of business information with different departments .....
- 27.All departments work together in offering value to the client.....
- 28.Different departments share resources, for example business systems with each other .....

Thinking about your firm’s **innovation intensity**

- 29.We have a strong emphasis on research and development of new products/services .....
- 30.In the past 5 years our firm has marketed plenty new products/services.....
- 31.Changes in product or service offerings have been mostly of minor nature.....

The following 3 questions relate to your firm’s **entrepreneurial capital**  
On the same rating scale used before, please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements.

*Note: questions 32-34 deleted*

Thinking about your firm’s **financial resources**

35. If we want to pursue an opportunity in the market we will make the financial means available .....
36. There is a tight control on financial resources that are spent on product or service development.....
37. There is always enough funding for marketing our products and services to the public.....



	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
	----- ----- ----- -----				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
The next section covers your personal <b>social skills</b>					
38. I feel comfortable working with people from diverse backgrounds .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39. I have strong connections to various different business networks.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
40. I spend a significant amount of my time discussing business with external network partners.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Thinking about your firm's <b>human resources</b>					
On the same rating scale used before, please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements.					
41. For middle and higher management positions our firm would only consider candidates with university degrees .....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. Our middle and higher management consists of people from various knowledge backgrounds ..	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. For middle and higher management positions our firm would only consider candidates with management experience.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>Strongly disagree</b>				<b>Strongly agree</b>	
----- ----- ----- -----					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	

Please tell me in what way you agree with the following 6 statements

- |                                                                                                                                                                                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 44. Firms that have a flexible organisation structure, a management that supports new ideas and takes a moderate amount of risk will be able to shape and change the market.....         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 45. Having a flexible organisation structure, a management that supports new ideas and takes a moderate amount of risk will facilitate activities to create new clients preferences..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 46. Firms that act proactively and respond to the market will be able to shape and change the market .....                                                                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 47. Being proactive and responsive to the market will allow a firm to sense the market for future developments.....                                                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 48. Firms that collect information, distribute it within the organisation, align departments and show innovative behaviour will be able to shape and change the market .....             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 49. Information generation, dissemination and alignment of departments as well as innovation are important in order to form alliances with business partners.....                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The next section covers your firm's ability to **influence clients preferences**  
Please rate the extent of your activities towards an understanding of clients' needs.

- |                                                                                                                                    |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 50. We continuously monitor clients complaints about products or services that our firm offers .....                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 51. We change clients preferences by offering products or services that have not been available before.....                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 52. We constantly deliver exceptional products or services that outperform the products or services delivered by competitors ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 53. We regularly inform our clients about our developments regarding new products or services, market trends etc .....             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |





**Strongly disagree** **Strongly agree**  
 |-----|-----|-----|-----|  
 (1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Now we'll discuss your firm's ability to **form alliances** with other firms  
 When answering the following questions please think of all forms of alliances that your firm has had in the past 4 years. Alliances refer to cooperative agreements where firms jointly work on product/service development, develop marketing strategies/activities etc.  
 On the same rating scale used before, please tell me in what way you agree with the following statements.

- 54. In the past 4 years we have had very few alliances with other firms.....
- 55. The total number of alliances has increased in the past 4 years.....
- 56. We have benefited a lot from our current and previous alliances to run our business successfully.....
- 57. It is difficult to find the right alliance partners as we take a long time to develop mutual trust.....
- 58. We have a process that allows us to evaluate alliance options and the benefits for our firm.....

Please tell me in what way you agree with the following 2 statements.

- 59. A firm that actively shapes clients preferences, senses changes in the market and has reliable alliance partners will achieve superior performance.....
- 60. A firm that actively shapes clients preferences, senses changes in the market and has reliable alliance partners will achieve a competitive advantage .....



Never used Very frequently used

|-----|-----|-----|-----|

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

Moving onto your firm's ability to **sense the market**

The rating scale is still 1-5, but now **1 = never used**, **2 = seldom used**, **3 = neither never used nor very frequently used**, **4 = frequently used** and **5 = very frequently used**.

Please rate the extent to which the following scanning devices are used by your firm to gather information about your business environment:

- |                                                                             |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 61. Regular evaluation of opinions from clients .....                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 62. Explicit tracking of strategies and tactics of competitors .....        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 63. Forecasting future sales.....                                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 64. Research on future challenges, for example government regulations ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 65. Collecting information from business partners or associations .....     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Very similar Very different

|-----|-----|-----|-----|

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5)

The next 5 questions relate to your firm's **relative competitive strength**

The rating scale is still 1-5, but now **1 = very similar**, **2 = similar**, **3 = neither similar nor different**, **4 = different** **5 = very different**.

Relative to your major competitor please rate

- |                                                                                     |                          |                          |                          |                          |                          |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 66. ... how well your products/services meet client's needs .....                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 67. ... the quality of handling client requests and queries .....                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 68. ... your firm's image.....                                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 69. ... your firm's ability to gain market share.....                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 70. ... your firm's ability to transfer knowledge efficiently within the firm ..... | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



**Demographic information**

I. Gender  male (1)  female (2)

II. Name of company \_\_\_\_\_

III. *Became S3*)

IV. In which department do you currently work?

Finance.....  (1)

Human Resources (HR) .....  (2)

Information Technology (IT).....  (3)

Legal.....  (4)

Marketing, Sales.....  (5)

Medical, Research & Development.....  (6)

Production.....  (7)

Other: please specify\_\_\_\_\_  (99)

V. Can you please tell me your age range

21-30                      31-40                      41-50                      51-60+

                                                                

(1)                      (2)                      (3)                      (4)

VI. How many years of experience you have in the healthcare environment?

Less than              1-3                      4-6                      7-9                      more than  
1 year                      years                      years                      years                      9 years

                                                                                      

(1)                      (2)                      (3)                      (4)                      (5)

VII. How many years have you been working in your present job?

Less than              1-3                      4-6                      7-9                      more than  
1 year                      years                      years                      years                      9 years

                                                                                      

(1)                      (2)                      (3)                      (4)                      (5)

**Thank you very much for your participation.**

## ANNEXURE B

Original outer loadings for reflective indicators

	BE		SO				CA			CE			MD			PERF	COMP
	PRO	RESP	GEN	DIS	COO	INN	FIN	HUM	SOC	RISK	MGT	STRU	ALL	SENS	CUST		
Q11	0.9733																
Q12	-0.3959																
Q13	0.0081																
Q14		0.6048															
Q15		0.8705															
Q16		0.8308															
Q17			0.7683														
Q18			0.1428														
Q19			0.6911														
Q20			0.8128														
Q21				0.8626													
Q22				0.8904													
Q23				0.1895													
Q24				0.7352													
Q25					0.8093												
Q26					0.8926												
Q27					0.8296												
Q28					0.6927												
Q29						0.9635											
Q30						0.7249											
Q31						-0.1256											
Q35							0.8646										
Q36							-0.3941										
Q37							0.7198										
Q41								0.6056									
Q42								0.7416									
Q43								0.7157									
Q38									0.6611								
Q39									0.7941								
Q40									0.728								
Q9										0.7575							
Q10										0.9282							
Q5											0.8955						
Q6											0.8725						
Q7											0.8134						
Q8											0.8723						
Q1												0.1536					
Q2												-0.3989					
Q3												0.9292					
Q4												0.8766					
Q54													0.0575				
Q55													0.5686				
Q56													0.7447				
Q57													0.1633				
Q58													0.9128				
Q61														0.7545			
Q62														0.7916			
Q63														0.6198			
Q64														0.7396			
Q65														0.7919			
Q50															0.6985		
Q51															0.6659		
Q52															0.7483		
Q53															0.8504		
Q1A																0.7992	
Q1B																0.904	
Q1C																0.4629	
Q66																0.7479	
Q67																0.8052	
Q68																0.8512	
Q69																0.8222	
Q70																0.7529	

