



# Impact of Institutional Pressure, Entrepreneurial Orientation, and Organizational Performance on the Livestock Industry in Indonesia: Role of Collaboration as a Mediator

Febroni Wanda Purba<sup>1(✉)</sup> and Yasmine Nasution<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, PPIM School of Management, University of Indonesia,  
Depok, Indonesia

febroni.wanda@ui.ac.id

<sup>2</sup> University of Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia

yasmine73@ui.ac.id

**Abstract.** This study aims to determine the impact of institutional pressure on the performance of industrial organizations in Indonesia. This research yields empirical findings that institutional pressure impacts livestock performance. This research was carried out using a quantitative method using structural model analysis (SEM) based on survey data obtained from 120 companies in the industry in Indonesia. Empirical results show that institutional pressure significantly influences collaboration and entrepreneurial orientation. Entrepreneurial orientation positively and significantly influences collaboration. In addition, collaboration positively and significantly influences the performance of industrial organizations in Indonesia. The methods and results of this study are in line with the general objective of the research to prove the institutional pressure factors that influence the performance of server industry organizations. Researchers who observe this research can be continued with similar research in other industrial contexts.

**Keywords:** institutional pressure · entrepreneurial orientation · collaboration · organizational performance

## 1 Introduction

Institutional pressure is understood as the unfavorable influence of the organization that is obtained from institutions and limits organizational choices regarding their structure and behavior (Moser, Winkler, Narayanamurthy & Pereira, 2020). Institutional pressure has long been considered by scholars to be the main determinant of organizational action (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

DiMaggio & Powell (1983) divided institutional pressure into three forms of pressure, namely coercive pressure, mimetic pressure, and normative pressure. Coercive pressure is pressure both formally and informally that comes from other organizations

where there is dependence on it. Coercive pressure is in the form of formal or informal pressure provided by other institutions where the organization depends on these institutions, such as organizations that have dominant resources and regulatory institutions (Teo, Wei, & Bensabat, 2003). They usually formulate rules and make requests that companies must comply with because there will be rewards or sanctions. Mimetic pressure is a situation where an organization imitates the practices of other organizations that usually operate in the same industry and prove successful (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Meanwhile, normative pressure is the existence of a standard or behavior for community members determined by professional organizations and other social structures (Berrone, Fosfuri, Gelabert, & Gomez-Mejia, 2013).

Previous literature has explained the impact of institutional pressure on collaboration. The existence of institutional pressure (especially regulations) makes some companies build collaborations because these companies realize that they are unable to achieve organizational goals (Ramanathan, Bentley, & Pang, 2014; Vachon & Klassen, 2008).

Coercive pressure (customers) and mimetic pressure (competitors) play an important role in motivating organizations to use and utilize social media technologies in the context of agribusiness companies in China (Lin, Luo, Benitez, Luo, & Popovič, 2021). Song & Zhao (2021) found that institutional pressure will promote exploratory and exploitative innovation in cluster firms. The results of this study prove that normative pressure plays a more prominent role in promoting cluster company innovation.

Based on research by Franco & Haase (2013) it proves that innovation from an entrepreneurial orientation tends to encourage entrepreneurship for collaboration. Wittman, Hunt & Arnett (2009) emphasized that alliance performance is determined by the extent to which the alliance creates new resources for the organization. When organizations obtain new resources from the actions of these alliances, it has the potential to increase innovation and competitive advantage (Li, Jiang, Pei & Jiang, 2016).

Many studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between collaboration and organizational performance from various perspectives. Flatten, Greve & Brettel (2011) assesses that there is a significant influence between collaboration and the performance of SME companies in Germany. In line with that, Lee's research (2007) confirms that strategic alliances increase success in creating new businesses in the context of Biotechnology SME companies (Biomedicine, Bioagriculture, Biofood, Biochemistry, Bioenvironment and Bioservices) located in Taiwan. The findings of Khalid and Larimo (2012) reveal a positive and significant relationship between entrepreneurial alliances and firm performance. In addition, Sarkar, Echambadi & Harrison (2001) found that entrepreneurial alliances lead to superior firm market performance, especially for small-scale firms.

Entrepreneurial orientation plays a role in improving firm performance (Zahra and Covin, 1995; Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009). The same thing was also explained by Li, Huang, & Tsai (2009) that entrepreneurial orientation has a positive effect on the knowledge creation process, which in turn positively affects company performance. Kami-Sing Wong (2014) notes that entrepreneurial orientation contributes to the success of new products by taking advantage of new business opportunities. Li, Liu, &

Zhao (2006) suggest that entrepreneurial orientation motivates organizations to aggressively aim at launching product innovations, exploring opportunities and supporting new product development activities.

## 2 Literature Review

### A. *Institutional Pressure*

Institutions or agencies are defined as social structures that exert pressures, expectations, and constraints on firm choices, including not only regulatory structures, government agencies, laws, courts, and professions, but also interest groups and public opinion (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Krell, Matook & Rohde, 2016; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 1987). Firm behavior is constrained by various external pressures because firms are in the same and interconnected environment in which they must respond to external demands and expectations in order to survive (Oliver, 1991). Based on an institutional-based strategy perspective (Meyer and Peng, 2015; Peng, Wang, and Jiang, 2008), the environment creates and governs the business in which firms operate and provides a context for competition between firms. To achieve a competitive advantage, companies cannot rely solely on the market environment. Companies must also have a non-market strategy to compete. Effective management in achieving superior performance does not only depend on the market environment but also the non-market environment (Baron, 2013).

In developing countries, companies must be careful because government regulations often limit the level of investment by foreign companies. Under the institutional transition, multinational companies face uncertainty about the strategic actions that will bring legitimacy in a changing context (Hwang & Gaur, 2009). Under moderate levels of institutional transition, multinational companies tend to take strategic positions to take advantage of growth opportunities. Legitimacy is a central part of neo-institutionalism, which indicates that organizations seek legitimacy to fulfill expected performance involving regulatory and administrative systems (Meyer, Estrin, Bhaumik, & Peng, 2009). Legitimacy is not only a resource that benefits the organization but is a state in which the organization is aligned and accepted by the three different institutional pillars (Scott, 2001). Therefore, the existence of a flexible legal framework and business formalization incentive programs are very important for the possibility of business partnerships (Pratono & Sutanti, 2016). However, as the intensity of institutional reforms increases, companies tend not to adopt a wait-and-see strategy by reducing existing resources and capabilities (Singh, Pattnaik, Gaur, & Ketencioglu, 2018).

There are three types of institutional pressures that affect organizational behavior in various ways, namely coercive pressure, mimetic pressure and normative pressure (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Firm behavior is constrained by various external pressures, because they share the same environment and are interconnected, and firms must respond to external demands and expectations in order to survive (Oliver, 1991).

Coercive pressure results as formal or informal pressure exerted by other organizations on which they depend, such as resource dominant organizations and governmental organizations (Teo, Wei, & Benbasat, 2003). They formulate rules and make

requests with which companies need to comply, because these organizations can reward or sanction companies for actions.

Mimetic pressure comes from uncertainty (Liang, Saraf, Hu, & Xue, 2007). When companies are stuttering about technology or feeling uncertain about the environment, they may imitate the choices and behaviors of other companies that have succeeded in solving similar problems (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Normative pressure arises from standards of appropriate behavior for network members determined by professional organizations and other social structures (Berrone, Fosfuri, Gelabert, & Gomez-Mejia, 2013). In contrast to coercive pressure, companies comply with these norms due to soft constraints rather than mandatory force; for example, they identify with these institutions and believe that compliance is beneficial to them (Krell, Matook, & Rohde, 2016; Zhu, 2016).

### *B. Entrepreneurial Orientation*

Most research on entrepreneurial orientation covers three dimensions, namely innovation, proactivity, and risk taking (Kreiser, Marino, Kuratko, & Weaver, 2012; Wales, 2015). Within the framework of an entrepreneurial orientation, innovation refers to the tendency for creative process activities, experimentation, and the introduction of new products and services, thereby deviating from existing practices (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009). Proactive refers to opportunity seeking, forward-looking behavior that incorporates action on future needs and trends ahead of competitors, thereby actively entering new product/market spaces, creating first mover advantages, and seeking market leadership positions (Anderson, Kreiser, Kuratko, Hornsby, & Eshima, 2014; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003). Risk taking refers to the tendency to engage in high-risk activities with high chances of returns, as well as in bold actions in uncertain environments (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009).

### *C. Collaboration*

The term collaboration was originally called a network (network), which later in business terminology began to appear in the mid-1980s. This concept focuses on understanding the relationships between organizations (Halinen & Törnroos, 1998). Still according to Halinen & Törnroos (1998), a business network is a structure of relationships between companies that emerge and develop through a continuous interactive process. Gray (1985) defines collaboration as a process of joint decision-making by key stakeholders about the future and problem areas. Bititci, Martinez, & Parung (2004) define collaboration as different organizations in which companies work together in equality, commitment and trust in exchanging information, sharing activities and resources and complementing each other's capacities to the benefit of achieving common goals by sharing risk, responsibility and reward. Meanwhile, Baringger & Harrison (2000) interfirm alliances enable value creation through a combination of resources, knowledge sharing, speed to market and access to foreign markets.

#### D. *Organizational Performance*

Organizational performance is defined as a set of financial and non-financial indicators that are able to assess the extent to which organizational goals and objectives are achieved (Kaplan & Norton, 1992). Operationally, organizational performance is defined according to Singh, Darwish, & Potočnik (2015) in terms of financial ratios, for example return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE), market share, stock price, growth, human resources (job satisfaction, commitment, etc.), organizational results (productivity, service quality, new product development, etc.). Financial performance indicators can be measured with the help of company reports or data published from the stock exchange. Organizational performance can also be measured based on subjective information collected from managers or other key informants by asking them to rate the overall performance of the company such as: market share, profitability, innovation efforts, employee performance and other attributes. Kunze, Boehm and Bruch (2013) also assessed company performance using top managers' perceptions of the financial situation, company growth, employee productivity, and employee fluctuation and retention compared to their direct industry competitors.

According to Neely, Adams, & Kennerley (2002), organizational performance is defined as the process of measuring the efficiency and effectiveness of past actions. According to this definition, performance is divided into two components. First, efficiency describes how the organization uses resources in production and services, namely the relationship between the combination of real and ideal inputs to produce certain outputs. Second, effectiveness which describes the degree of achievement of organizational goals. Effective performance measurement must be inclusive, universal, measurable and consistent (Beamon, 1996). In diagnosing performance measurement is comparing actual results with planning (Wouters, 2009).

### 3 Hypothesis

Previous literature has explained the impact of institutional pressure on collaboration. The existence of institutional pressure (especially regulations) makes some companies build collaborations because these companies realize that they are unable to achieve organizational goals (Ramanathan, Bentley, & Pang, 2014; Vachon & Klassen, 2008). Collaboration appears to address the increasing uncertainty of the business environment (Gulati & Gargiulo, 1999). Collaboration will increasingly be able to implement or comply with well-designed policies that suit the specific ecological, political and economic situation of the affected area as well as the capacities of stakeholders (Cocklin, Mautner, & Dibden, 2007). In order to move towards sustainable agriculture it will be easier for collaboration especially in various situations, for example stable and profitable prices (Carlberg, Holcomb, & Ward, 2003; Mburu & Wale, 2006), high demand (Warner, 2007; Vuylsteke, Simoncini, & van Huylbroeck, 2008), and little competition (Carlberg, Holcomb, & Ward, 2003).

**Hypothesis 1:** Institutional Pressure has a positive effect on Collaboration

A company can translate institutional pressure into motivation towards radical innovation in the context of manufacturing companies in China (Tang, Hu, Petti & Thürer, 2019). Coercive pressure (customers) and mimetic pressure (competitors) play an important role in motivating organizations to use and utilize social media technologies in the context of agribusiness companies in China (Lin, Luo, Benitez, Luo, & Popovič, 2021). Coercive pressure (customers) and mimetic pressure (competitors) play an important role in motivating organizations to use and utilize social media technologies in the context of agribusiness companies in China (Lin, Luo, Benitez, Luo, & Popovič, 2021).

**Hypothesis 2:** Institutional Pressure has a positive effect on Entrepreneurial Orientation

Based on research by Franco & Haase (2013) it proves that innovation from an entrepreneurial orientation tends to encourage entrepreneurship for collaboration. Dickson and Weaver (1997) said that when a company faces an uncertain environment, the company carries out an entrepreneurial orientation strategy which will then influence its decision to collaborate. Several studies have shown how the role of entrepreneurship in alliances affects firm market performance (Sarkar, Echambadi & Harrison, 2001) and how alliance-driven technology entrepreneurship influences organizational performance (Antoncica & Prodan, 2008). Wittman, Hunt & Arnett (2009) emphasized that alliance performance is determined by the extent to which the alliance creates new resources for the organization. When organizations obtain new resources from the actions of these alliances, it has the potential to increase innovation and competitive advantage (Li, Jiang, Pei & Jiang, 2016).

**Hypothesis 3:** Entrepreneurial Orientation has a positive effect Collaboration

Flatten, Greve & Brettel (2011) assesses that there is a significant influence between collaboration and the performance of SME companies in Germany. In line with that, Lee's research (2007) confirms that strategic alliances increase success in creating new businesses in the context of Biotechnology SME companies (Biomedicine, Bioagriculture, Biofood, Biochemistry, Bioenvironment and Bioservices) located in Taiwan. The findings of Khalid and Larimo (2012) reveal a positive and significant relationship between entrepreneurial alliances and firm performance. In addition, Sarkar, Echambadi & Harrison (2001) found that entrepreneurial alliances lead to superior firm market performance, especially for small-scale firms.

Agricultural policies that include collaborative activities between public and private actors, farmers, suppliers, consumers and research, will drive the progress of agricultural processes (Baker, Caracciolo, Doroszenko, & Suominen, 2016). Therefore, a much more effective outcome that can be created is for third parties to seek solutions for effective policies and increase agricultural productivity. Research by Kim and Lee (2010) shows that there is no direct relationship between system collaboration and strategic collaboration on the performance of 18 information technology companies. But the two collaborations affect the response of the supply chain which ultimately affects the market performance of the market.

**Hypothesis 4:** Collaboration has a positive effect Organizational Performance

Entrepreneurial orientation plays a role in improving firm performance (Zahra and Covin, 1995; Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009). The same thing was also

explained by Li, Huang, & Tsai (2009) that entrepreneurial orientation has a positive effect on the knowledge creation process, which in turn positively affects company performance. Kam-Sing Wong (2014) notes that entrepreneurial orientation contributes to the success of new products by taking advantage of new business opportunities. Li, Liu, & Zhao (2006) suggest that entrepreneurial orientation motivates organizations to aggressively aim at launching product innovations, exploring opportunities and supporting new product development activities.

Gomes, Seman, Berndt, & Bogoni's research (2021) proves a direct relationship and makes a positive and significant contribution to organizational performance. Hughes and Morgan (2007) then emphasized that proactive and innovative attitudes have a positive effect on organizational performance. Proactively encourages companies to anticipate before market changes that enable companies to manage their market and shape the direction of competition from time to time innovation then directs companies to produce new competitive offers to meet market needs by means of proactive scanning. Both (proactive and innovative) can be powerful processes in achieving organizational performance. Still according to Hughes & Morgan (2007) an entrepreneurial orientation strategy is beneficial for newly developing companies.

Risk taking is one of the three key elements of entrepreneurial orientation, and one that increases firm profitability (Miller, 1983). Risk-taking behavior provides the benefits of innovation in technology, production and markets (Pratono, 2018; Rezaei & Ortt, 2018) which can bring greater profits to companies (McKinley, Latham & Braun, 2014). Risk-taking behavior has a positive effect on the performance of companies with high managerial abilities in the manufacturing industry (Simamora, 2021).

**Hypothesis 5:** Entrepreneurial Orientation has a positive effect Organizational Performance

## 4 Methodology

This study was conducted in survey service company. The survey was conducted by an online questionnaire Likert- scale-type indicators with response 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Prior to the distribution of the questionnaire and collecting data, the instruments was tested and reviewed in advance by pre-test and discussions with experts.

Research model examination was conducted using variance-based SEM (Partial Least Squares/PLS). The model were tested by: (i) Evaluation of the outer model or models of measurement, to examine indicators of latent variables, and (ii) Evaluation of inner models or structural models, to test the effect of one latent variable to other latent variable (Hair, Sarstedt, Hopkins, & Kuppelwieser, 2014).

After the text edit has been completed, the paper is ready for the template. Duplicate the template file by using the Save As command, and use the naming convention prescribed by your conference for the name of your paper. In this newly created file, highlight all of the contents and import your prepared text file. You are now ready to style your paper; use the scroll down window on the left of the MS Word Formatting toolbar.

## 5 Result and Discussion

The survey has been carried out for eight weeks and the researchers managed to collect 120 empirical data from survey service company. Before hypotheses testing, validity and reliability evaluation were performed to the research model. This study used indicator reliability (minimum score of 0.4), discriminant validity, average variance extracted (AVE, minimum score of 0.5), Cronbach's Alpha (CA, minimum score > 0.6) and composite reliability (CR, minimum score of 0.7) for validity and reliability evaluation. The result of validity and reliability evaluation is described in Table 1.

Hypotheses testing were taken after ensuring all the indicators and dimensions are valid and reliable. According to Hair et al (2014), hypotheses testing using SEM-PLS is done by measuring the structural model that describes the relationship between latent variables.

In the PLS SEM analysis, the significance and direction of direct influence can be seen from the p value, t statistic and path coefficients connecting endogenous to exogenous. If the p value is < 0.05 and the T statistic is > 1.65 (one tail t value), it can be concluded that the exogenous variable has a significant effect on the endogenous variable with the direction of influence according to the sign attached to the path coefficient. Furthermore, if the p value is obtained > 0.05 and the T statistic is < 1.65 (one tail t value), then it is

**Table 1.** Assessment of Internal Consistency and Convergent Validity

Construct	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE
Collaboration	0.919	0.94	0.760
Entrepreneurial Orientation	0.984	0.986	0.793
Organizational Performance	0.954	0.964	0.817
Institutional Pressure	0.981	0.982	0.775

**Table 2.** Results of hypotheses testing

Hypothesis	Path Coefficient	T-Values	P-Values
H1 Institutional Pressure → Collaboration	0.540	8.343	0.000
H2 Institutional Pressure → Entrepreneurial Orientation	0.722	20.261	0.000
H3 Entrepreneurial Orientation → Collaboration	0.177	3.031	0.003
H4 Collaboration → Organizational Performance	0.597	12.514	0.000
H5 Entrepreneurial Orientation → Organizational Performance	0.323	5.370	0.000



concluded that the exogenous variable has no significant effect on the endogen. Based on the evaluation of the structural model, Table 2 can be concluded that the five hypotheses are accepted.

In H-1 this study supports the research of Ramanathan, Bentley, & Pang, 2014; Vachon & Klassen (2008) that the existence of institutional pressure makes some companies build collaborations because these companies realize that they are unable to achieve organizational goals. In h-2 this research supports the research of Tang, Hu, Petti & Thürer (2019) which concludes the same thing that a company can translate institutional pressure into motivation towards radical innovation in the context of manufacturing companies in China.

In H-3 it also supports the research of Dickson & Weaver (1997) which shows that when a company faces an uncertain environment, the company carries out an entrepreneurial orientation strategy which will then influence its decision to collaborate. On H-4 the research also supports research conducted by Greve & Brettel (2011) where they explained the significant influence between collaboration and the performance of SME companies in Germany. In H-5 this study supports the research of Li, Huang, & Tsai (2009) that entrepreneurial orientation has a positive effect on the knowledge creation process, which in turn positively affects company performance.

## 6 Conclusion

This research empirically proves that internal and external organizational factors have a positive effect on increasing the performance of alarm companies in Indonesia. This study also found that institutional pressure affects organizational performance through moderation of collaboration and entrepreneurial orientation. Among the three institutional pressures, the highest pressure felt by the organization is mimetic and normative pressure. The results of this study support a number of previous studies which have found a significant influence link between institutional pressure and organizational performance (Lin, Luo & Robert, 2019; Ramanathan, Bentley, & Pang, 2014; Vachon & Klassen, 2008; Luo, & Luo, 2020; Tang, Hu, Petti & Thürer, 2019).

In addition, the effect of the discussion is the one that most influences organizational performance than entrepreneurial orientation. This also supports a number of previous studies (Sarkar, Echambadi & Harrison, 2001; Flatten, Greve & Brettel, 2011; Allaoui, Guo, & Sarkis, 2019; Pérez-Mesa, Piedra-Muñoz, Galdeano-Gómez, & Giagnocavo, 2021; Nha Trang, Nguyen, Pham, Anh Cao, Trinh Thi, & Shahreki, 2022). This study mainly includes five points. First, institutional pressure influences partnerships with company representatives towards entrepreneurial orientation and collaboration to obtain optimal organizational performance. In particular, coercive pressure and normative pressure have a greater impact on collaboration and entrepreneurial orientation. These findings state that three types of institutional pressure are important factors that affect organizational performance in partner companies. Second, institutional pressure encourages entrepreneurial orientation in the third dimension. Third, activation setup has a significant positive effect on collaboration. Fourth, collaboration has a significant positive impact on organizational performance. Fifth, the installation has a positive effect on system performance. Entrepreneurial orientation as well as the risk dimensions used

in this study (innovative, proactive, and taking) have been proven to be able to increase average profit and increase sales volume growth in the last three years.

## 7 Limitation of Study

This research has limitations in the context of Indonesia which adheres to the Pancasila economic system where the government often makes policies to control the market economy. This research was conducted on various business fields in the livestock sector such as poultry pens, cattle pens, meat processing, animal medicine, and feed raw materials so that the institutional pressures felt were not the same in each business sector. This study uses 5 Likert scales where the tendency of respondents to answer is doubtful so that it reduces some of the information captured by the respondents. This is also known as the central tendency effect. In the questionnaire, there are limitations related to the absence of question items that are presented in reverse (reverse question). This is a potential risk for respondents who only follow certain patterns in answering the questionnaire.

## References

- Anderson, B. S., Kreiser, P. M., Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Eshima, Y. (2014). Reconceptualizing entrepreneurial orientation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(10), 1579-1596. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2298>
- Antoncica, B., & Prodan, I. (2008). Alliances, corporate technological entrepreneurship and firm performance: Testing a model on manufacturing firms. *Technovation*, 28(5), 257-265.
- Baker, T., Caracciolo, C., Doroszenko, A. & Suominen, O. (2016). GACS core: Creation of a global agricultural concept scheme. In Garoufallou, E., Subirats Coll, I., Stellato, A. & Greenberg, J., eds., *Metadata and Semantics Research* (pp. 311–316). Cham: Springer.
- Baron, D. P. (2013). *Business and its environment*. Boston: Pearson.
- Barringer, B. R., & Harrison, J. S. (2000). Walking a tightrope: Creating value through Interorganizational relationships. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 367-403.
- Beamon, B.M. (1996). Performance measures in supply chain management. In: *Conference on Agile and Intelligent Manufacturing Systems*, Troy, New York.
- Berrone, P., Fosfuri, A., Gelabert, L., & Gomez-Mejia, L. (2013). Necessity as the mother of 'green' inventions: Institutional pressures and environmental innovations. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(8), 891-909.
- Bititci, U. S., Martinez, V., Albores, P., & Parung, J. (2004). Creating and managing value in collaborative networks. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management*, 34(3/4), 251- 268.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147.
- Flatten, T. C., Greve, G. I., & Brettel, M. (2011). Absorptive capacity and firm performance in smes: The mediating influence of Strategic Alliances. *European Management Review*, 8(3), 137-152.
- Gomes, G., Seman, L. O., Berndt, A. C., & Bogoni, N. (2021). The role of entrepreneurial orientation, organizational learning capability and Service Innovation in organizational performance. *Revista De Gestão*, 29(1), 39-54.

- Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10), 911-936.
- F. Hair Jr, J., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & G. Kuppelwieser, V. (2014). Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb-10-2013-0128>
- Halinen, A., & Törnroos, J. (1998). The role of embeddedness in the evolution of Business Networks. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 14(3), 187-205.
- Hwang, P., & Gaur, A. S. (2009). Organizational efficiency, firm capabilities, and Economic Organization of Mnes. *Multinational Business Review*, 17(3), 143-162. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1108/1525383x200900021>
- Kam-Sing Wong, S. (2014). Impacts of environmental turbulence on entrepreneurial orientation and new product success. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 17(2), 229-249.
- Kaplan, R. S. and D. P Norton. (1992). The balanced scorecard—measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 71–79.
- Khalid, S., & Larimo, J. (2012). Firm specific advantage in developed markets dynamic capability perspective. *Management International Review*, 52(2), 233-250.
- Kim, D., & Lee, R. P. (2010). Systems collaboration and strategic collaboration: Their impacts on supply chain responsiveness and market performance\*. *Decision Sciences*, 41(4), 955-981.
- Kreiser, P. M., Marino, L. D., Kuratko, D. F., & Weaver, K. M. (2012). Disaggregating entrepreneurial orientation: The non-linear impact of innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking on SME Performance. *Small Business Economics*, 40(2), 273-291.
- Krell, K., Matook, S., & Rohde, F. (2016). The impact of legitimacy-based motives on IS adoption success: An institutional theory perspective. *Information & Amp; Management*, 53(6), 683–697.
- Kunze, F., Boehm, S., & Bruch, H. (2013). Organizational performance consequences of age diversity: Inspecting the role of diversity-friendly HR policies and top managers' negative age stereotypes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 50(3), 413-442.
- Li, Y., Liu, Y., & Zhao, Y. (2006). The role of market and entrepreneurship orientation and internal control in the new product development activities of Chinese firms. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 35(3), 336-347.
- Li, Y., Huang, J., & Tsai, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: The Role of Knowledge Creation Process. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 38(4), 440-449.
- Liang, Saraf, Hu, & Xue. (2007). Assimilation of Enterprise Systems: The Effect of Institutional Pressures and the Mediating Role of Top Management. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 5
- Lin, J., Luo, Z., & Luo, X. (2020). Understanding the roles of institutional pressures and organizational innovativeness in contextualized transformation toward e-business: Evidence from agricultural firms. *International Journal of Information Management*, 51, 102025.
- 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.
- McKinley, W., Latham, S., & Braun, M. (2014). Organizational decline and innovation: Turnarounds and downward spirals. *Academy of Management Review*, 39(1), 88-110.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Meyer, K. E., Estrin, S., Bhaumik, S. K., & Peng, M. W. (2009). Institutions, resources, and entry strategies in emerging economies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(1), 61-80.
- Meyer, K., & Peng, M. (2015). Theoretical foundations of emerging economy business research. *Journal Of International Business Studies*, 47(1), 3-22. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2015.34>
- Moser, R., Winkler, J., Narayanamurthy, G., & Pereira, V. (2020). Organizational knowledgeable responses to institutional pressures – a review, synthesis and extension. *Journal Of Knowledge Management*, 24(9), 2243-2271.

- Neely, A.D., Adams, C., Kennerley, M. (2002). The Performance Prism: The Scorecard for Measuring and Managing Stakeholder Relationships. *London: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.*
- Nha Trang, N. T., Nguyen, T., Pham, H. V., Anh Cao, T. T., Trinh Thi, T. H., & Shahreki, J. (2022). Impacts of collaborative partnership on the performance of Cold Supply Chains of agriculture and foods: Literature review. *Sustainability, 14*(11), 6462.
- Oliver, C. (1991). STRATEGIC RESPONSES TO INSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES. *Academy Of Management Review, 16*(1), 145-179.
- Peng, M., Wang, D., & Jiang, Y. (2008). An institution- based view of international business strategy: a focus on emerging economies. *Journal Of International Business Studies, 39*(5), 920-936.
- Pérez-Mesa, J. C., Piedra-Muñoz, L., Galdeano-Gómez, E., & Giagnocavo, C. (2021). Management strategies and collaborative relationships for sustainability in the agrifood supply chain. *Sustainability, 13*(2), 749.
- Pratono, A. H., & Sutanti, A. (2016). The ecosystem of social enterprise: Social culture, legal framework, and policy review in Indonesia. *Pacific Science Review B: Humanities and Social Sciences, 2*(3), 106–112
- Ramanathan, U., Bentley, Y., & Pang, G. (2014). The role of collaboration in the UK Green Supply Chains: An exploratory study of the perspectives of suppliers, logistics and retailers. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 70*, 231-241.
- 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), 761–787.
- Sarkar, M., Echambadi, R., & Harrison, J. S. (2001). Alliance entrepreneurship and firm market performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 22*(6/7), 701–711.
- Scott, W. R. (1987). The adolescence of institutional theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 32*(4), 493.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Singh, S., Darwish, T. K., & Potočník, K. (2015). Measuring organizational performance: A case for subjective measures. *British Journal of Management, 27*(1), 214-224.
- Singh, D., Pattnaik, C., Gaur, A. S., & Ketencioglu, E. (2018). Corporate expansion during pro-market reforms in emerging markets: The contingent value of group affiliation and diversification. *Journal of Business Research, 82*, 220–229.
- Tang, Y., Hu, X., Petti, C., & Thürer, M. (2019). Institutional incentives and pressures in Chinese manufacturing firms' innovation. *Management Decision, 58*(5), 812-827.
- Teo, Wei, & Benbasat. (2003). Predicting Intention to Adopt Interorganizational Linkages: An Institutional Perspective. *MIS Quarterly, 27*(1), 19.
- Vachon, S., & Klassen, R. D. (2008). Environmental Management and Manufacturing Performance: The role of collaboration in the supply chain. *International Journal of Production Economics, 111*(2), 299-315.
- Wales, W. J. (2015). Entrepreneurial orientation: A review and synthesis of promising research directions. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship, 34*(1), 3-15.
- Wiklund, J. & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(13), 1307–1314.
- 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. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026\(94\)00004-e](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-9026(94)00004-e)

**Open Access** This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

