


RESEARCH ARTICLE

Relationship between CEO's personality and company's entrepreneurial orientation: the case of SMEs

Antonio J. Verdú-Jover, Marina Estrada-Cruz , Noelia Rodríguez-Hernández and José M. Gómez-Gras

Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche, Economic and Financial Studies, Avda Universidad S/N, Elche, Spain

Author for correspondence: Marina Estrada-Cruz, E-mail: mestrada@umh.es

(Received 20 March 2020; revised 7 October 2020; accepted 20 October 2020; first published online 16 November 2020)

Abstract

Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) is a key factor in the creation and development of companies. This study examines the CEO's personal background (personality, proactivity and resistance to change) and its influence on the EO of the organization to determine which factors enhance or weaken EO. We achieve this goal through quantitative research, developing a structural equations model with partial least squares to analyse a sample of 358 Spanish SMEs from different sectors. The results suggest that specific personality dimensions exert substantial influence on the organization's EO. We also analyse individual proactivity and resistance to change as conduits for the effect of personality dimensions on the company's EO.

Key words: Entrepreneurial orientation; personality; proactivity; resistance to change; SMEs

Introduction

Entrepreneurial orientation (hereinafter EO) (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; Dess, Pinkham, & Yang, 2011) is one of the most salient business management principles in the literature (Gupta & Gupta, 2015). Research views companies that achieve greater innovation, a higher level of risk-taking and proactive competition as entrepreneurship-oriented (Covin & Slevin, 1986; De Mel, McKenzie, & Woodruff, 2009; Dess & Lumpkin, 2005; Miller, 1983).

EO is one of the most important factors for companies' growth and profitability. The literature has thus paid much attention to EO's relationship to business performance and shown that companies with greater EO have better performance and better chances of growth and survival (Gupta & Wales, 2017; Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2017; Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2009). In seeking to understand EO in greater depth, various studies analyse the figure of the CEO, on the assumption that business decisions involve great ambiguity and uncertainty, and are particularly susceptible to influence by the CEO's personality (Nei, Foster, Ness, & Nei, 2018; Rondan-Cataluña, Navarro-García, & Arenas-Gaitan, 2016; Simsek, 2007). Although studies that relate the CEO to EO indicate the importance of aspects such as the leader's personality traits and attitudes (Kozubíková, Čepel, & Zlámalová, 2018), personal values and internal motivation (Baum & Locke, 2004; Mohd, Kamaruddin, Yahya, & Sanidas, 2015) and dynamic capabilities (Ruiz-Ortega, Parra-Requena, García-Villaverde, & Rodrigo-Alarcon, 2017), very few consider the different dimensions of CEO personality as variables that influence the company's EO.

Research on organizational behaviour has traditionally positioned the CEO as the most influential change agent in the business environment (Chung & Lo, 2007), especially in small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) (Thong, 1999; Wincent & Westerberg, 2005). SMEs tend to have very centralized structures in which the CEO makes the main decisions (Finkelstein &

Hambrick, 1996; Thong, 1999). Moreover, SME managers' abilities and personality characteristics are universally regarded as one of the most powerful sets of factors impacting (whether positively or negatively) the firm's competitiveness and ultimate success (Wijewardena, Nanayakkara, & De Zoysa, 2008)

Management can manage EO, but its proper development depends on the leader's personal characteristics (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Becherer & Maurer, 1999). The influence of the leader's characteristics on the company's EO is a key factor in the company's degree of manoeuvrability. This study identifies the missing link between the individual and organizational levels, a link especially important because in SMEs the organization becomes an extension of the entrepreneur (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996; Wincent & Westerberg, 2005). Two analytical questions follow: Can the CEO's personal background influence the company's EO? If so, does this background weaken or enhance the company's EO?

Although the literature has progressed in understanding the importance of executives' personality, specific psychological traits and mechanisms that unite principals' personality with strategic influence and performance remain unexplored (Avolio, Sosik, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Boal & Hooijberg, 2001).

This study aims to determine the links between specific characteristics (personality, proactivity and resistance to change) of the CEO and the EO of SMEs. According to the OECD, 99% of companies in Spain are SMEs, making further study necessary to improve knowledge and management of SMEs (Bañón & Sánchez, 2005; Rondan-Cataluña, Navarro-García, & Arenas-Gaitan, 2016). Given that all economic actors recognize EO's importance in job creation, technological innovation and economic rejuvenation, it is important that study of SMEs be a research priority (Freeman, Styles, & Lawley, 2012).

Our analysis is structured as follows. First, we perform a literature review of the study variables and justify the study hypotheses. Next, we describe the data collection and variable validation processes used, and contrast the research hypotheses. Subsequently, we present the results obtained, followed by the main conclusions, implications for management, limitations and future lines of research.

Theoretical framework and hypotheses

Personality and entrepreneurial orientation

The EO literature has developed from two conceptualizations of the construct itself (Covin & Wales, 2012). The first, initially proposed by Miller (1983) and subsequently adopted by Covin and Slevin (1989), views EO as 'a basic one-dimensional strategic orientation' (Covin & Slevin, 1989: 79) that appears in the presence of three components, two behavioural (innovation capacity and proactivity) and one attitudinal (risk assumption). Innovation capacity is the willingness to support new ideas, to experiment and to use creative processes (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller & Friesen, 1983). Proactivity is opportunity-seeking, forward-looking behaviour that acts 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, 2015; Rauch et al., 2009). Finally, risk assumption involves the implementation of actions requiring significant levels of resources without certainty of success (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Rauch et al., 2009). The second perspective, proposed by Lumpkin and Dess (1996), is multidimensional. It does not require simultaneous appearance of the various components (Covin & Wales, 2012) and introduces two additional factors, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy. Although other studies have investigated and reconceptualized EO (Anderson et al., 2015; Martens, Lacerda, Belfort, & de Freitas, 2016; Wales, 2016), the literature debates whether EO is a one-dimensional or multidimensional construct (Wales, Gupta, & Mousa, 2013). Analysing two conceptualizations of corporate EO – as multidimensional and as a composite – De Clercq, Dimov, and Thongpapanl (2013) conclude that neither is

intrinsically superior and that the two are mutually compatible. This study uses the one-dimensional construct identified by Miller (1983) 'as an imprint of the leader in the organization, the result of certain individual characteristics that represent the distinctive features of the entrepreneurial personality and motivation' (Pittino, Visintin, & Lauto, 2017: 225). EO can refer to both companies and individuals, and it can be an important feature of either new or existing companies (Ferreira, Jalali, Bento, Marques, & Ferreira, 2017). In fact, the CEO often plays a fundamental role in the company's EO because business decisions, which involve great ambiguity and uncertainty, are influenced by the executive's personality (Simsek, 2007). Because CEOs' authority in decision-making and pervasive influence strongly shape the firm's strategy, culture and actions, they are critical to the survival and development of SMEs (Beaver & Jennings, 2001; Davies, Hides, & Powell, 2002; Palmer, Niemand, Stöckmann, Kraus, & Kailer, 2019; Pupilampu, 2005). Unlike larger firms, where success is determined primarily by organizational variables, SMEs owners are the 'source of action' (Rauch & Frese, 2000).

Since the 1980s, the predominant reference system for personality traits is the Big Five (or Five-Factor) model (Costa & McCrae, 1992; John, Naumann, & Soto, 2008), one of the most accepted integral models of personality (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006). This system condenses personality into five critical factors (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005): extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience. The detection of the five factors across numerous cultures and languages has provided strong support for this model and demonstrated its high level of universal applicability (Bell & Njoli, 2016). Various studies have used these dimensions to analyse CEO personality. On the one hand, Judge and Bono (2000) liken traits from the five-factor model to transformational leadership behaviour. Crant and Bateman (2000) analyse the relationship of measures of proactive personality and of the five-factor model to perceptions of charismatic leadership. Ployhart, Lim, and Chan (2001) test the distinction between typical and maximum criteria using ratings of transformational leadership performance to examine whether the criterion-related validities of the five-factor model differ for the two types of criteria. On the other hand, Giberson, Resick, and Dickson (2005) investigate trait homogeneity in organizations. They examine intra-organizational similarity among members' personality traits and personal values to test the relationship between the top leaders' personal characteristics, organizational profiles of personality and values using Big Five model. Finally, Do and Minbashian (2020) study the relationship between personality and leadership by conceptualizing personality in terms of factors at the broadest levels of the personality hierarchy. Since CEOs are the principal decision makers and are ultimately responsible for the firm's strategic decision making, their personality traits have a significant impact on strategic decisions (Lefebvre & Lefebvre, 1992; Palmer *et al.*, 2019). Because CEOs – and thus their personalities – can be central to strategic changes in SMEs (Herrmann & Nadkarni, 2014), we consider the SME context as suitable for examining the relationships theorized.

Based on the foregoing, we now analyse each dimension and its relationship to EO.

The sociability of extraverted CEOs enables them to mobilize others and develop extensive interactions or social networks, both internally and externally. These social interactions are crucial to collection of information that supports interpretation of new information (Kraatz, 1998) and its rapid transmission (Davis & Greve, 1997).

Research suggests that specific traits are universal predictors of leaders' ability to influence and motivate followers to embrace their strategic vision of the firm (Gupta, Wieland, & Turban, 2019). For example, meta-analysis has shown that extraversion is strongly associated with the leader's ability to motivate and inspire individuals (Bono & Judge, 2004). Strategic leadership research has argued that the CEO's personality influences strategic entrepreneurial activities by shaping how CEOs define and communicate strategic vision and goals, and mobilize and coordinate the activities of top management team members, key agents championing strategies across various levels in the organization (Herrmann & Nadkarni, 2014; Nadkarni & Herrmann, 2010).

Agreeableness, in turn, fosters a culture of creativity and risk-taking grounded in cooperative relationships that are open and based on trust (Judge & Bono, 2000). Highly conscientious individuals are oriented to achievement, work hard and show independence (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001).

CEOs who are sympathetic, courteous, forgiving, trusting and cooperative (i.e., agreeable) perform better because persons possessing such traits are more rule-compliant and cooperative (Yeh et al., 2016). Furthermore, Nadkarni and Herrmann (2010) argue that achievement-oriented CEOs take control and responsibility for strategic activities. Conscientiousness is therefore positively related to the business's long-term survival (Ciavarella, Buchholtz, Riordan, Gatewood, & Stokes, 2004).

Neuroticism reflects an individual's degree of emotional stability (Yong, 2007). High emotional stability can improve individuals' ability to maintain relationships (Hurtz & Donovan, 2000), potentially facilitating the entrepreneur's long-term success by establishing networks with customers, employees and suppliers (Zhao & Seibert, 2006). Successful CEOs manage their emotions and respond to others. They stimulate and motivate employees through good social skills and empathy. Such CEOs regulate their own emotions and those of employees through strong self-regulation and self-awareness skills (Goleman, 2000; Maamari & Majdalani, 2017).

People who are open to new experiences are intellectually curious and receptive to a wide range of stimuli. They are reflective and creative (McCrae & Costa, 1987). They do not fear new challenges but are versatile and imaginative (Yong, 2007). Leaders who are open to new experiences actively seek excitement and risk (Judge, Heller, Mount, 2002). Individuals with a high level of openness to experience are more intellectually challenged, creative, imaginative and attentive to their internal sensations (Javed, Khan, Arjoon, Mashkoor, & Haque, 2020; Silvia, Nusbaum, Berg, Martin, & O'Connor, 2009). Open-minded individuals' healthy curiosity and high degree of innovative thinking generates a variety of ideas and perspectives (Baer & Oldham, 2006; Javed et al., 2020). EO provides a competitive advantage by efficiently regulating processes and strategies, and by discovering the talent or productive behaviours in the organization. EO is thus very important for recognizing opportunities and/or their benefits in the environment. It creates a dynamic, flexible, innovative, competitive organizational structure that is especially successful at shaping the work environment to achieve advantage and long-term gains (Covin & Miles, 1999; Kör, 2016; Zahra, 1986).

CEOs' need for change and risk assumption can promote behaviours that change existing products and/or processes (Nadkarni & Narayanan, 2007). We thus expect higher levels of openness to lead to a higher probability of business survival and a lower failure rate (Ciavarella et al., 2004).

Following these arguments, we propose the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1 A CEO personality in which either a high level of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness or openness to experience; or a low level of neuroticism predominates is positively related to the company's entrepreneurial orientation.

Personality and personal proactivity

Personal proactivity refers to individuals' predisposition to act and influence their environment (Thomas, Whitman, & Viswesvaran, 2010). Proactive people tend to 'look for opportunities, show initiative, act and persevere until significant changes are achieved' (Bateman & Crant, 1993: 105). Individuals with proactive personality tend to be future-oriented and to focus on improving themselves (Parker, Lüdtke, Trautwein, & Roberts, 2012).

Previous research has shown consistent positive relationships between proactive personality and two Big Five factors: conscientiousness and extraversion (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 1995; Crant & Bateman, 2000). In one study, proactive personality also correlated positively with openness and negatively with neuroticism (Crant & Bateman, 2000). After controlling for

both extraversion and conscientiousness, Crant (1995) demonstrated that proactive personality accounted for incremental variance in the job performance of real estate agents and concluded that specific measures of personality, such as proactive personality, ‘can have incremental validity over the Big Five factors’ (p. 536).

More recently, Thomas, Whitman, and Viswesvaran (2010) concluded that individual proactivity is conceptually somewhat related to the Big Five personality traits, since the proactive assumption of five-factor theory suggests that ‘individuals are neither passive victims of their life circumstances nor empty organisms programmed by histories of reinforcements’ (McCrae, Costa, Pervin, & John, 1999: 142). Overall, however, comparative research differentiates the Big Five personality traits from emergent proactive constructs (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006; Young, Glerum, Wang, & Joseph, 2018).

In a study to validate a scale for personal proactivity, Bateman and Crant (1993) find that the construct of personal proactivity is positively related to extraversion, conscientiousness, need for achievement and need for mastery; and is not related to openness, neuroticism, pleasantness, locus of control and mental capacity (Bateman & Crant, 1993; Crant, 1995). As indicated above, Bateman and Crant (1993) find disposition to proactivity to be conceptually related to extraversion because both involve the search for new experiences and activities. The tendencies to sociability, activity and energy that characterize extraverts may be related to proactive tendencies to create new environments through social pathways (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006).

Personal proactivity is also related to conscientiousness (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Both proactivity and conscientiousness imply persistence in achieving goals, self-discipline and effort towards realistic achievement. Proactive individuals anticipate and plan the optimization of procedures (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006).

The sociable, active and assertive tendencies that characterize extraverts may be related to proactive tendencies to shape environments through social avenues (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006). For example, extraverts’ sociability may relate to proactive propensities to communicate and to voice change initiatives. Facets of activity and assertiveness may also relate to personal tendencies to rally support for change and assertively support change in the face of opposition (LePine & Van Dyne, 1998; Thomas, Whitman, & Viswesvaran, 2010; Wu & Turban, 2007).

Proactive behaviour is related to openness to experience, since both involve exploration of the unknown. The need to change and assume risk can promote behaviours that disrupt the existing product and generate advantages from companies’ stable resources (Nadkarni & Narayanan, 2007). Because individuals with a high degree of openness tend to gravitate towards intellectual and imaginative pursuits (Digman, 1990), the intellectual component of openness may foster proactive individuals’ efforts to evaluate complex environments and plan transformative changes (Crant & Bateman, 2000; Rode, Arthaud-Day, Mooney, Near, & Baldwin, 2008).

Major, Turner, and Fletcher (2006) find that altruism (a facet of the dimension agreeableness, which reflects concern for the welfare of others and a tendency to generosity) correlates positively with personal proactivity.

Individuals who score high on the dimension of neuroticism may experience high levels of anxiety, depression and vulnerability that inhibit their ability to concentrate and to influence their environment (e.g., Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006). Individuals with high levels of anxiety are not expected to seek out or participate in new learning opportunities (Major, Turner, & Fletcher, 2006). Emotionally stable people (low scores in neuroticism), in contrast, experience states of relaxation and self-confidence that facilitate a proactive approach (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

Drawing on these arguments, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2 A CEO personality with a predominantly high level of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness or openness to experience; or a predominantly low level of neuroticism is positively related to a high level of individual proactivity.

Personality and resistance to change

The Big Five (Five-Factor) model of personality provides a good framework for analysing individual differences and attitudes to change. Several studies find that attitude to change can be predicted by traits such as self-esteem (Wanberg & Banas, 2000), risk tolerance (Judge, Higgins, Thoresen, & Barrick, 1999a), need for achievement (Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994) and locus of control (Lau & Woodman, 1995).

A number of empirical studies have focused on other dispositional variables. In a study of managers, Judge et al. (1999b) found that seven personality factors predicted reactions to change. They divided these factors into two main categories. Positive self-concept includes locus of control, self-efficacy, self-esteem and positive affectivity, while risk tolerance includes openness to experience, tolerance of ambiguity and risk assumption. A number of researchers have reported self-efficacy – and more specifically, change-related self-efficacy – as a significant variable (Herold, Fedor, & Caldwell, 2007; Holt, Armenakis, Feild, & Harris, 2007; Jimmieson, Terry, & Callan, 2004; Rosenbaum, More, & Steane, 2018; Rudisill & Edwards, 2002; Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Lau and Woodman (1995) found a significant relationship between locus of control and the formation of change schemata but little impact of dogmatism. These authors argue that attitudes to change depend on individual patterns of change, defined as mental maps that represent knowledge structures about attributes and relationships between different change events. In their study, personality affects these schemas significantly.

Vakola, Tsaousis, and Nikolaou (2004) suggest that openness to experience is related to positive attitude towards change because it describes people who cope effectively. Such people are tolerant and open to new ideas and suggestions. Following Smollan, Matheny, and Sayers (2010), we argue that the concept of openness to experience virtually defines adaptation to change. McCrae (1994) and Watson and Clark (1997) specifically identify positive affectivity with propensity to change. From a conceptual standpoint, the other four factors may also be relevant to organizational change.

Vakola, Tsaousis, and Nikolaou (2004) expect the dimension of conscientiousness – which describes people with self-discipline, ambition and competence (Costa & McCrae, 1992) – to correlate positively with positive attitudes towards change. For Brennan and Skarlicki (2004), conscientiousness contributes to the way survivors of downsizing continue to perform and Moon, Kamdar, Mayer, and Takeuchi (2008) report that conscientiousness is related to taking charge, a construct that includes initiating change.

We expect a negative relationship between the dimension of agreeableness and resistance to change, since individuals who score high in agreeableness are more reluctant to resist and more willing to follow new procedures and policies that arise from changes in the organization (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Agreeableness also fosters a culture of creativity and risk-taking based on cooperation, open relationships and employee trust (Judge & Bono, 2000).

As to the relationship between extraversion and attitude towards change, extraverted people tend to take initiative and develop the capacity to adapt quickly to changes in the environment. These actions require creation of new ideas that can deviate from past strategies (Johnson, Lee, Saini, & Grohmann, 2003).

Finally, we investigate neuroticism. Bass and Stogdill (1990) suggest that most of the successful CEOs are emotionally stable (low on neuroticism). Emotional stability may enhance effective leadership, social interaction and complex decision-making (Boudreau, Boswell, & Judge, 2001; Judge et al., 2002). Emotional stability is associated with optimism, self-confidence, self-assurance, decisiveness and success (Gow, Kaplan, Larcker, & Zakolyukina, 2016). Emotionally stable people tend to remain calm and balanced in stressful situations (McCrae & Costa, 1997). They are less threatened by uncertainties and not afraid to challenge the status quo and take risks (Judge & Bono, 2000; Nadkarni & Herrmann, 2010; Peterson, Smith, Martorana, & Owens, 2003; Shimizu & Hitt, 2004). Others argue against this positive view of emotional stability, however, holding that emotionally stable individuals ignore important cues because they are

too focused (Easterbrook, 1959). Also, negatively related to beliefs about the importance of working hard (Gottfredson, Jones, & Holland, 1993), neuroticism is probably undesirable in a CEO. Consistent with this argument, some studies find that neuroticism is negatively related to job performance and career success (Sackett, Lievens, Van Iddekinge, & Kuncel, 2017; Salgado, 1997; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991).

People with a high degree of neuroticism cope poorly with stress (McCrae & Costa, 1987). Since introducing change is usually associated with increased levels of stress and insecurity (Elrod & Tippett, 2002), it can generate resistance to change and inhibit successful implementation of change processes. We thus expect individuals' emotional stability (i.e., lower neuroticism) to be negatively related to negative attitudes (resistance) to change.

Although personality can influence and even play a key role in adaptation to change, other variables may exert stronger influence on some people and some types of change (Smollan, Matheny, & Sayers, 2010). For example, a person who is high in neuroticism and therefore possibly predisposed to resist change is nevertheless likely to react somewhat positively to an organizational change that lowers stress or delivers valued outcomes. Conversely, even those who show significant levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience will probably resist change that is clearly unfavourable and unjust (Bareil, Savoie, & Meunier, 2007; Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Day, Crown, & Ivany, 2017).

Based on these arguments, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3 A CEO personality in which a high level of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness or openness to experience predominates; or in which a low level of neuroticism predominates is negatively related to a high level of resistance to change.

Personal proactivity and entrepreneurial orientation

Proactive personality in the CEO can be an important predictor of an organization's EO. Empirical evidence shows that proactive personality is positively related to a series of organizational outcomes, including job performance (Crant, 1995), tolerance to stress at work (Parker & Sprigg, 1999), participation in organizational initiatives (Parker, 1998) and entrepreneurial behaviour (Becherer & Maurer, 1999).

To measure proactive personality, the scale evaluates personal disposition towards proactive behaviour, a concept intuitively related to entrepreneurial spirit (Crant, 1996). Since identification of opportunities is an important aspect of individual initiative (Tang, Kacmar, & Busenitz, 2012), proactive personality is a crucial antecedent of businesses that are alert to opportunities. Using longitudinal data from two high schools in Helsinki, Finland, Obschonka, Hakkarainen, Lonka, and Salmela-Aro (2017) confirm that creativity and proactivity improve the connection between personality and business alertness. EO as a strategic stance towards entrepreneurship implies willingness of the organization's members to innovate, seek and take risks, and be more proactive and aggressive than competitors in the search for new market opportunities (Li, Fay, Frese, Harms, & Gao, 2014). We thus expect the CEO's personal proactivity to predict the organization's EO.

Following these arguments, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4 The CEO's personal proactivity is positively related to the organization's entrepreneurial orientation.

Resistance to change and entrepreneurial orientation

The CEO's attitude towards change can influence the organization's strategy significantly (Musteen, Barker, & Baeten, 2006). According to Langkamp-Bolton and Lane (2011), attitude influences the emergence of EO, specifically in innovation, risk-taking and proactivity. This finding could suggest that the company's strategy is conditioned by the CEO's attitude towards change.

Hambrick and Mason (1984) find that a general director with a high level of dogmatism and a preference for sustaining the organization's status quo and tested practices discourages EO in the organization (Halikias & Panayotopoulou, 2003). SMEs' stance on entrepreneurship and the values associated with it can, however, promote the organization's transformation and renewal, and support the construction of new competencies (Grinstein, 2008). This finding suggests that developing EO in the company induces a will to change in its members and improves the organization's flexibility (Dayan, Zacca, Husain, Di Benedetto, & Ryan, 2016).

Following these arguments, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5 The CEO's resistance to change is negatively related to entrepreneurial orientation in the organization.

Methodology

To perform the empirical study, we took as the target population companies located in the geographic territory of Spain in four sectors: food, wine, footwear and information and communication technologies. We chose these sectors due to the differences in the speed of change in their industries, an issue of great interest in the strategic management literature (Eisenhardt & Martin, 2000).

The questionnaire was addressed to firms defined as SMEs in European Union Recommendation 2003/361/CE (European Union, 2003). The companies selected were sent the online questionnaire, a statement explaining the study's purpose and a cover letter (via email) addressed to the company's manager.

We used a sample of SMEs because SMEs form the backbone of EU countries' growth: SMEs represent 99% of enterprises and 67% of all employment in the EU (OECD, 2012). Improving SMEs' managerial knowledge and competencies is thus crucial to leveraging development of the whole economy (Hussain, Millman, Matlay, Birmingham, & Barr, 2006). Companies in general, and SMEs in particular, are influenced by the character of their CEO, the individual with the strongest effect on decision-making in the company (Rondan-Cataluña, Navarro-García, & Arenas-Gaitan, 2016). This role is even more intense in SMEs (Chung & Luo, 2013).

The sample finally selected included 4,396 SMEs from the SABI (System of Analysis of Iberian Balance database) database (Bureau Van Dijk, 2013). The selection method was random sampling, and the number of companies obtained in each sector directly reflected the sector's proportion of the total population.

The first mailing was sent in February, followed by second and third mailings in March and April, respectively. We received 376 questionnaires, of which 358 were valid, yielding an approximate response rate of 8.5%. This response rate is satisfactory, since it exceeds the minimum threshold for applying structural equations methodology and testing the psychometric properties of the measurement scales (Williams, Gavin, & Hartman, 2004).

We performed the data analysis with structural equations modelling using partial least squares (PLS-SEM) (Fornell & Cha, 1994). Several characteristics of PLS-SEM have increased researchers' use of this technique in areas such as management, market research and strategy (Sattler, Völckner, Riediger, & Ringle, 2010).

Measures used

Personality

To analyse CEO personality, we used 23 items adapted from the scale used by Hewee and Shamuganathan (2010). These items enable us to measure the five personality factors.

Calculation of the Cronbach's α confirmed that all dimensions of the scale have high levels of reliability (extraversion: $\alpha = .807$, agreeableness: $\alpha = .878$, conscientiousness: $\alpha = .811$, neuroticism: $\alpha = .776$, openness to experience: $\alpha = .855$).

Entrepreneurial orientation

To measure the variable EO, we adapted nine items from the original scale developed by Covin and Slevin (1989). In developing this measure, Covin and Slevin theorized that the three dimensions of EO act together to explain a basic, one-dimensional strategic orientation. The variable focuses on risk-taking orientation, proactivity and innovation by the company's management. We verified that this scale presents a high level of reliability ($\alpha = .871$).

Personal proactivity

We measured personal proactivity through six items from the original proactive personality scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993). We adapted these six elements following a previous study by Claes, Beheydt, and Lemmens (2005), who concluded that the abbreviated six-item scale measured proactive personality similarly to the scale developed by Bateman and Crant (1993).

We verified internal consistency of the scale's items by analysing the Cronbach's α , which enabled us to confirm that this scale had a high level of reliability ($\alpha = .819$).

Resistance to change

To analyse this construct, we used an adaptation of the 11-item scale developed by Oreg (2006). We also confirmed this scale's high level of reliability through the Cronbach's α ($\alpha = .930$).

All variables were measured using a 7-point Likert scale, on which 1 = 'total disagreement' and 7 = 'total agreement'.

Analysis and results

Table 1 displays the results of the descriptive data analysis and the correlation matrix. We observe a good associative relationship among the variables in the model.

Evaluation of the measurement model showed α and CR values above the required threshold of .7 for all constructs (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). All constructs also followed Fornell and Larcker's (1981) recommendation that the average variance extracted be greater than .50.

To test discriminant validity, we analysed the Fornell and Larcker criterion (1981) and confirmed that all study constructs met this requirement (see Table 2).

Since the items that assess CEO personality consist of five subscales, it is important to know which factors provide the best data in the study. Construct analysis aims to determine whether the constructs are homogeneous – that is, whether they can measure the construct (Gregory, 2007). As Table 3 shows, the five personality dimensions explain 100% of the variance. These results are consistent with the findings of John and Srivastava (1999). Similarly, Benet-Martinez and John (1998) find that the taxonomy of the five main factors is similar across different types of samples.

To assess common method bias, we used the test developed by Kock and Lynn (2012). These authors propose a full collinearity test as a comprehensive procedure to assess vertical and lateral collinearity simultaneously (Kock & Gaskins, 2014). Obtaining a Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) greater than 3.3 indicates pathological collinearity, as well as the possibility that the model may be contaminated by common method bias. If all VIFs obtained in a full collinearity test are less than or equal to 3.3, the model can be considered as free of common method bias (Kock, 2015). Table 4 shows that the model is free of common method bias.

The second stage of the analysis, interpretation of a PLS-SEM model, evaluates the structural model. Table 5 summarizes the results of the PLS-SEM analyses. The variance of the latent dependent variables explained by the constructs that predict them (R^2) is higher than .1 for all latent variables. In analysing the size of R^2 (Falk & Miller, 1992) as a criterion of predictive relevance, we applied the sample reuse method (Q^2 through blindfolding) proposed by Stone (1974) and Geisser (1975). The Q^2 values are greater than zero for all latent dependent variables,

Table 1. Correlation among variables analysed

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Extraversion	5.15	1.06	1							
2. Agreeableness	6.31	.78	.216***	1						
3. Conscientiousness	6.11	.69	.360***	.497***	1					
4. Neuroticism	5.89	.76	.472***	.417***	.629***	1				
5. Openness to experience	5.71	.87	.582***	.464***	.461***	.615***	1			
6. EO	4.30	1.11	.434***	.203***	.266***	.330***	.480***	1		
7. Proactivity	5.44	.88	.632***	.248***	.462***	.515***	.557***	.351***	1	
8. Resistance to change	2.55	1.12	-.297***	-.292***	-.227***	-.318***	-.446***	-.268***	-.261***	1

n = 358; **p* < .05; ***p* < .01; ****p* < .001.

Table 2. Discriminant validity

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Extraversion	.622	.091	.154	.255	.375	.271	.368	.207
2. Agreeableness		.733	.207	.172	.238	.042	.017	.097
3. Conscientiousness			.626	.410	.144	.063	.118	.058
4. Neuroticism				.692	.339	.104	.230	.106
5. Openness to experience					.735	.234	.187	.216
6. EO						.609	.145	.114
7. Proactivity							.696	.075
8. Resistance to change								.616

Table 3. Initial values for total variance explained

Personality dimensions	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
1. Extraversion	2.4	40.68	40.68
2. Agreeableness	.8	13.56	54.24
3. Conscientiousness	.8	13.56	67.80
4. Neuroticism	.8	13.56	81.36
5. Openness to experience	1.1	18.64	100

indicating that the model has predictive validity. The results of this procedure show that all structural relationships proposed are significant (see *t*-value in Table 5).

The results obtained in this study indicate that extraversion, neuroticism and openness to experience significantly affect the company's EO ($\beta = .37$, $\beta = .13$, $\beta = .15$ and $p < .001$, $p < .01$, respectively), but that other dimensions, such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, do not ($\beta = .05$ and $\beta = .07$, respectively).

Second, EO is affected positively by individual proactivity and negatively by resistance to change in each of the models analysed. These results support hypotheses 1a, 1d, 1e; 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d and 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d. They do not support hypotheses 1b and 1c, and 2e and 3e. The results also support hypothesis 4, since we have verified that individual proactivity affects the company's EO positively and significantly. Resistance to change, in contrast, affects the business's EO negatively and significantly, supporting hypothesis 5. Table 5 presents the model relationships analysed.

Conclusions and discussion

Recognized as a determining factor in a company's growth and profitability (Brown, Davidsson, & Wiklund, 2001), EO is a key ingredient for an organization's success.

The current study explores the relationship between the EO an organization develops and the CEO's personal traits and characteristics. Several previous studies (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008) note the importance of the CEO's role in the organization's decisions. This role becomes crucial in SMEs (Chung & Luo, 2013; Rondan-Cataluña, Navarro-García, & Arenas-Gaitan, 2016; Thong, 1999; Wincent & Westerberg, 2005). Because SMEs tend to have very centralized

Table 4. Full collinearity VIFs

	EO	Personal proactivity	Resistance to change
EO		1.489	1.468
Extraversion	2.781	1.611	2.979
Personal proactivity	2.532		2.57
Resistance to change	1.219	1.231	
EO		1.143	1.286
Agreeableness	1.161	1.145	1.138
Personal proactivity	1.147		1.369
Resistance to change	1.15	1.21	
EO		1.2	1.269
Conscientiousness	1.676	1.16	1.65
Personal proactivity	1.719		1.866
Resistance to change	1.124	1.162	
EO		1.253	1.294
Neuroticism	1.97	1.291	1.921
Personal proactivity	1.902		2.033
Resistance to change	1.164	1.207	
EO		1.508	1.512
Openness to experience	2.637	1.828	2.604
Personal proactivity	2.166		2.202
Resistance to change	1.366	1.359	

structures, the general director makes the fundamental decisions (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996; Thong, 1999).

Our results extend previous research by highlighting the role of the CEO's personality in the organization's development of EO. They also show the influence of two other personality traits, individual proactivity and resistance to change, linking the CEO's personality to the organization's EO.

More specifically, we find that some dimensions predominant in the CEO's personality exert a significant influence on the organization's EO. CEO personality with a high level of extraversion or openness to experience; or a predominantly low level of neuroticism exerts a positive influence on the development of organizational EO.

We also find that CEOs who scored high in extraversion, agreeableness or conscientiousness; or low in neuroticism showed both high levels of personal proactivity and less resistance to change.

Furthermore, we analysed individual proactivity and resistance to change as mediators of the effect of the CEO's personality dimensions on the company's EO.

Our results show that the CEO's personal proactivity has a positive influence on the organization's EO. Proactivity is characterized as or preceded by specific dimensions of the CEO's personality – extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and neuroticism. All of these dimensions exert a positive influence on the organization's development of EO. The dimension openness to experience does not significantly influence personal proactivity, however, perhaps indicating that the CEO's creativity is not related to openness to new experiences and active risk seeking.

Table 5. Hypothesis validation

	Model I		Model II		Model III		Model IV		Model V	
	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -value bootstrap	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -value bootstrap	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -value bootstrap	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -value bootstrap	Standardized β	<i>t</i> -value bootstrap
Extraversion → EO	.37***	5.92								
Extraversion → Personal proactivity	.65***	18.35								
Extraversion → Resistance to change	-.37***	6.40								
Proactivity → EO	.12†	1.71								
Resistance to change → EO	-.13**	2.12								
Agreeableness → EO			.05	1.09						
Agreeableness → Personal proactivity			.30***	5.77						
Agreeableness → Resistance to change			-.31***	5.95						
Proactivity → EO			.33***	6.72						
Resistance to change → OE			-.19***	3.06						
Conscientiousness → EO					.07	1.42				
Conscientiousness → Personal proactivity					.53***	10.31				
Conscientiousness → Resistance to change					-.25***	4.64				
Proactivity → EO					.29***	5.04				
Resistance to change → EO					-.21***	3.23				
Neuroticism → EO							.13**	2.18		
Neuroticism → Personal proactivity							.56***	11.46		

Neuroticism → Resistance to change				-.31***	6.09		
Proactivity → EO				.27***	4.71		
Resistance to change → EO				-.18***	2.96		
Openness to experience → EO						.15**	2.48
Openness to experience → Personal proactivity						-.09	1.45
Openness to experience → Resistance to change						.36***	5.68
Proactivity → EO						.6***	15.25
Resistance to change → EO						-.44***	8.31
R2 (EO)	.25	.19	.19	.20	.26		
Q2 (EO)	.11	.08	.08	.09	.12		
R2 (Personal proactivity)	.42	.08	.27	.31	.36		
Q2 (Personal proactivity)	.2	.03	.12	.14	.17		
R2 (Resistance to change)	.13	.09	.06	.09	.2		
Q2 (Resistance to change)	.07	.04	.03	.05	.11		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Furthermore, we verify that the leader's resistance to change exerts a negative influence on EO. Resistance to change is also characterized or preceded by the dimensions of CEO personality. In this case, CEO personality with a predominantly high level of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness or openness to experience; or a low level of neuroticism is negatively related to resistance to change, which in turn negatively influences the organization's development of EO.

We can derive various theoretical and practical implications from this empirical study. From the theoretical point of view, our study broadens the perspective of 'Upper Echelons' theory (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1996; Hambrick, 2007) by showing what happens in the specific case of general managers of Spanish SMEs. We highlight the role of CEO personality in the company's EO, as well as the role of individual proactivity and resistance to change as channelling elements between the leader's personality and the organization's EO. These findings explain how individual CEO traits translate into the characteristics of the organization.

From the practical point of view, the results have significant implications for recruitment and development of the organization's CEO. If an organization wants to develop EO, it must take the CEO's personal characteristics into account. Organizations should look for individuals with personalities in which extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness or openness to experience predominate. Companies that wish to achieve EO should seek a CEO who responds positively to change, that is, a CEO who does not resist and who is proactive. These leadership characteristics exert a strong influence on the organization's development of EO.

This study is subject to various limitations. The first involves the limited generalization of current results to large companies, since our research focuses on SMEs. It would be interesting for future studies to test in large companies the relationships our research establishes in SMEs. Second, our sample was composed of companies operating in only four Spanish business sectors. Future research should disaggregate the factors omitted from our analysis of EO, risks and organizational proactivity. This study measured EO as a first-order reflective construct, following the theorization by Covin and Slevin (1989). In this measure, the three dimensions of EO work together to explain a basic one-dimensional strategic orientation. Some literature, however, recommends using EO as a disaggregated construct and treating its dimensions separately (Hughes & Morgan, 2007). Other research even supports the argument that EO should be measured on a second-order formative scale (Covin & Wales, 2012; Jarvis, MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2003). We plan to assess these ways of measuring EO by developing new research models in the future.

Another future line of research could test the possible relationship between the personality of CEOs who develop their professional careers in social companies. Due to the individual's importance to the success of social enterprises, several researchers have identified a portrait of social leaders (Thorgren & Omoredé, 2018).

Future research could also focus on the relationship between CEO personality and causal and effectual logic (Sarasvathy, 2001) in decision-making in the early stages of business growth. Such analysis could provide important additional insights by investigating how workplace values relate to actual leadership behaviour and effectuation.

Acknowledgements. The authors acknowledge Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness for partial financing of this research through projects ECO2013-45885-R and ECO2016-80677-R.

References

- Anderson, B. S., Kreiser, P. M., Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Eshima, Y. (2015). Reconceptualizing entrepreneurial orientation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 36(10), 1579–1596.
- Avolio, B. J., Sosik, J. J., Jung, D. I., & Berson, Y. (2003) CEO models, methods, and applications. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 277–307). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Baer, M., & Oldham, G. R. (2006). The curvilinear relation between experienced creative time pressure and creativity: Moderating effects of openness to experience and support for creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 963–970.

- Bañón, A. R., & Sánchez, A. A. (2005). Factores asociados con el éxito competitivo de las pyme industriales en España. *Universia Business Review*, 8, 38–51.
- Bareil, C., Savoie, A., & Meunier, S. (2007). Patterns of discomfort with organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(1), 13–24.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1–2), 9–30.
- Bass, B. M., & Stogdill, R. M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 4(2), 103–118.
- Baum, J. R., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 587.
- Beaver, G., & Jennings, P. (2001). Human resource development in small firms: The role of managerial competence. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 2(2), 93–101.
- Becherer, R. C., & Maurer, J. G. (1999). The proactive personality disposition and entrepreneurial behavior among small company presidents. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(1), 28–36.
- Bell, C., & Njoli, N. (2016). The role of big five factors on predicting job crafting propensities amongst administrative employees in a South African tertiary institution. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14(1), 1–11.
- Benet-Martinez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(3), 729–750.
- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2001). Strategic CEO research: Moving on. *CEO Quarterly*, 11(4), 515–549.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(5), 901.
- Boudreau, J. W., Boswell, W. R., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Effects of personality on executive career success in the United States and Europe. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(1), 53–81.
- Brennan, A., & Skarlicki, D. P. (2004). Personality and perceived justice as predictors of survivors' reactions following downsizing. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(6), 1306–1328.
- 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.
- Bureau Van Dijk. (2013). SABI. Sistema de Análisis de Balances Ibéricos. Available on <https://sabi.bvdinfo.com/>.
- Chawla, A., & Kelloway, K. E. (2004). Predicting openness and commitment to change. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 25(6), 485–498.
- Chung, C., & Luo, X. (2013). CEO Succession and firm performance in an emerging economy: Successor origin, relational embeddedness, and legitimacy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 34(3), 338–357.
- Chung, R.-G., & Lo, C.-L. (2007). The relationship between CEO behaviour and organizational performance in non-profit organizations, using Social Welfare Charity Foundations as an example. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 12(1), 83–87.
- Ciavarella, M. A., Buchholtz, A. K., Riodan, C. M., Gatewood, R. D., & Stokes, G. S. (2004). The Big Five and venture capital survival. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(4), 465–483.
- Claes, R., Beheydt, C., & Lemmens, B. (2005). Unidimensionality of abbreviated proactive personality scales across cultures. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(4), 476–489.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Covin, J. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 855–872.
- Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 47–63.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1986) The development and testing of an organizational-level entrepreneurship scale. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 1(3), 628–639.
- 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., & Wales, W. J. (2012) The measurement of entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(4), 677–702.
- Crant, J. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34(3), 42–49.
- Crant, J. M. (1995). The Proactive Personality Scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 532–537.
- Crant, J. M., & Bateman, T. S. (2000). Charismatic leadership viewed from above: The impact of proactive personality. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(1), 63–75.
- Davies, J., Hides, M., & Powell, J. (2002). Defining the development needs of entrepreneurs in SMEs. *Education + Training*, 44(8/9), 406–412.

- Davis, G. F., & Greve, H. R. (1997). Corporate elite networks and governance changes in the 1980's. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), 1–37.
- Day, A., Crown, S. N., & Ivany, M. (2017). Organisational change and employee burnout: The moderating effects of support and job control. *Safety Science*, 100, 4–12.
- Dayan, M., Zacca, R., Husain, Z., Di Benedetto, A., & Ryan, J. C. (2016). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation, willingness to change, and development culture on new product exploration in small enterprises. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 31(5), 668–683.
- De Clercq, D., Dimov, D., & Thongpapanl, N. (2013). Organizational social capital, formalization, and internal knowledge sharing in entrepreneurial orientation formation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(3), 505–537.
- De Mel, S., McKenzie, D., & Woodruff, C. (2009). Innovative firms or innovative owners? Determinants of innovation in micro, small, and medium enterprises, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3962, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labour (IZA). Retrieved from <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/35347>
- Dess, G. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 147–156.
- Dess, G. G., Pinkham, B. C., & Yang, H. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation: Assessing the construct's validity and addressing some of its implications for research in the areas of family business and organizational learning. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), 1077–1090.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 41(1), 417–440.
- Do, M. H., & Minbashian, A. (2020). Higher-order personality factors and leadership outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 163, 110058.
- Easterbrook, J. A. (1959). The effect of emotion on cue utilization and the organization of behavior. *Psychological Review*, 66(3), 183.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & Martin, J. A. (2000). Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21(10–11), 1105–1121.
- Elrod, D., & Tippett, D. (2002). The 'Death Valley' of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 15(3), 273–291.
- European Union. (2003). Recommendation 2003/361/EC: SME Definition.
- Falk, R. F., & Miller, N. B. (1992). *A primer for soft modeling*. Akron, OH: University of Akron Press.
- Ferreira, F. A., Jalali, M. S., Bento, P., Marques, C. S., & Ferreira, J. J. (2017). Enhancing individual entrepreneurial orientation measurement using a metacognitive decision making-based framework. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(2), 327–346.
- Fincham, R., & Rhodes, P. S. (2005) *Principles of organizational behavior* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Finkelstein, S., & Hambrick, D. C. (1996). *Strategic CEO: Top executives and their effects*. Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing.
- Fornell, C., & Cha, J. (1994) Partial least squares. In R. P. Bagozzi (Ed.), *Advanced methods of marketing research* (pp. 52–78). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50.
- Freeman, J., Styles, C., & Lawley, M. (2012). Does firm location make a difference to the export performance of SMEs? *International Marketing Review*, 29(1), 88–113.
- Geisser, S. (1975). The predictive sample reuse method with applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 70(350), 320–328.
- Giberson, T. R., Resick, C. J., & Dickson, M. W. (2005). Embedding leader characteristics: An examination of homogeneity of personality and values in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), 1002.
- Gottfredson, G. D., Jones, E. M., & Holland, J. L. (1993). Personality and vocational interests: The relation of Holland's six interest dimensions to five robust dimensions of personality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 40(4), 518.
- Goleman, D. (2000). Leadership that gets results. *Harvard Business Review*, 78(2), 78–90.
- Gow, I. D., Kaplan, S. N., Larcker, D. F., & Zakolyukina, A. A. (2016). CEO personality. Working paper No. 22435. Available at <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2805635>.
- Gregory, R. J. (2007) *Psychological testing: History, principles, and applications* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson International Edition.
- Grinstein, A. (2008). The relationships between market orientation and alternative strategic orientations: A meta-analysis. *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(1/2), 115–134.
- Gupta, V., & Gupta, A. (2015). The concept of entrepreneurial orientation. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 55–137.
- Gupta, V. K., & Wales, W. J. (2017). Assessing organisational performance within entrepreneurial orientation research: Where have we been and where can we go from here? *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 26(1), 51–76.
- Gupta, V. K., Wieland, A. M., & Turban, D. B. (2019). Gender characterizations in entrepreneurship: A multi-level investigation of sex-role stereotypes about high-growth, commercial, and social entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 57(1), 131–153.

- 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.
- Halikias, J., & Panayotopoulou, L. (2003). Chief executive personality and export involvement. *Management Decision*, 41(4), 340–349.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). Upper Echelons theory: An update. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 334–343.
- Hambrick, D. C., & Mason, P. A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*, 9(2), 193–206.
- Herrmann, P., & Nadkarni, S. (2014). Managing strategic change: The duality of CEO personality. *Strategic Management Journal*, 35(9), 1318–1342.
- Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Caldwell, S. D. (2007). Beyond change management: A multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 942.
- Hewee, J. K., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(2), 259–282.
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255.
- Hughes, M., & Morgan, R. E. (2007). Deconstructing the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance at the embryonic stage of firm growth. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 36(5), 651–661.
- Hurtz, G. M., & Donovan, J. J. (2000). Personality and job performance: The Big Five revisited. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(6), 869.
- Hussain, J., Millman, C., Matlay, H., Birmingham, U. C. E., & Barr, P. (2006). Access to entrepreneurial finance: An international perspective. In *The International Conference on Financing of SMEs in Developed Countries* (Vol. 4, p. 5th).
- Jarvis, C. B., 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.
- Javed, B., Khan, A. K., Arjoon, S., Mashkoo, M., & Haque, A. U. (2020). Openness to experience, ethical leadership, and innovative work behavior. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 54(1), 211–223.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Terry, D. J., & Callan, V. J. (2004). A longitudinal study of employee adaptation to organizational change: The role of change-related information and change-related self-efficacy. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 9(1), 11.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (3rd ed., pp. 114–158). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Johnson, J. L., Lee, R. P., Saini, A., & Grohmann, B. (2003). Market-focused strategic flexibility: Conceptual advances and an integrative model. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 31(1), 74–89.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational CEO. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(5), 751–765.
- Judge, T. A., Heller, D., Mount, K. M. (2002). Five-factor model of personality and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(3), 530–541.
- Judge, T. A., Higgins, C. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Barrick, M. R. (1999a). The Big 5 personality traits, general, mental ability and career success across the life span. *Personnel Psychology*, 52(3), 621–654.
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999b). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1), 107.
- Kock, N. (2015). Common method bias in PLS-SEM: A full collinearity assessment approach. *International Journal of e-Collaboration (IJEC)*, 11(4), 1–10.
- Kock, N., & Gaskins, L. (2014). The mediating role of voice and accountability in the relationship between Internet diffusion and government corruption in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa. *Information Technology for Development*, 20(1), 23–43.
- Kock, N., & Lynn, G. (2012). Lateral collinearity and misleading results in variance-based SEM: An illustration and recommendations. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 13(7), 546–580.
- Kör, B. (2016). The mediating effects of self-leadership on perceived entrepreneurial orientation and innovative work behavior in the banking sector. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1–15.
- Kozubíková, L., Čepel, M., & Zlámalová, M. (2018). Attitude toward innovativeness based on personality traits in the SME sector: Czech Republic case study. *Management & Marketing*, 13(2), 913–928.
- Kraatz, M. (1998). Learning by association? Interorganizational networks and adaptation to environmental change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 41(6), 621–643.
- Langkamp-Bolton, D., & Lane, M. D. (2011). Individual entrepreneurial orientation: Development of a measurement instrument. *Education + Training*, 54(2/3), 219–233.
- Lau, C. M., & Woodman, R. W. (1995). Understanding organizational change: A schematic perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(2), 537–554.

- Lefebvre, E., & Lefebvre, L. A. (1992). Firm innovativeness and manager characteristics in small manufacturing firms. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, 9(3), 243–277.
- LePine, J. A., & Van Dyne, L. (1998). Predicting voice behavior in work groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 853.
- Li, W. D., Fay, D., Frese, M., Harms, P. D., & Gao, X. Y. (2014). Reciprocal relationship between proactive personality and work characteristics: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(5), 948.
- 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.
- Maamari, B. E., & Majdalani, J. F. (2017). Emotional intelligence, leadership style and organizational climate. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25(2), 327–345.
- Major, D. A., Turner, J. E., & Fletcher, T. D. (2006). Linking proactive personality and the big five to motivation to learn and development activity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 9(4), 927–935.
- Martens, C. D. P., Lacerda, F. M., Belfort, A. C., & de Freitas, H. M. R. (2016). Research on entrepreneurial orientation: Current status and future agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 22(4), 556–583.
- McCrae, R. R. (1994). Openness to experience: Expanding the boundaries of Factor V. *European Journal of Personality*, 8(4), 251–272.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, Jr, P. T., (1987) Validation of the five factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, Jr, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509.
- McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., Jr., Pervin, L. A., & John, O. P. (1999). *A Five-Factor theory of personality (in handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nd ed., pp. 139–153). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770–791.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1983). Strategy-making and environment: The third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4(3), 221–235.
- Miller, V. D., Johnson, J. R., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 22(1), 59–80.
- Mohd, R., Kamaruddin, B. H., Yahya, K. K., & Sanidas, E. (2015). Can values of honesty, hard work, loyalty and discipline predict entrepreneurial orientation of Muslim owner managers?. *Journal of Emerging Economies & Islamic Research*, 3(1), 65–77.
- Moon, H., Kamdar, D., Mayer, D. M., & Takeuchi, R. (2008). Me or we? The role of personality and justice as other-centered antecedents to innovative citizenship behaviors within organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(1), 84.
- Musteen, M., Barker, V. L., & Baeten, V. L. (2006). CEO attributes associated with attitude toward change: The direct and moderating effects of CEO tenure. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(5), 604–612.
- Nadkarni, S., & Herrmann, P. (2010). CEO personality, strategic flexibility, and firm performance: The case of the Indian business process outsourcing industry. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(5), 1050–1073.
- Nadkarni, S., & Narayanan, V. K. (2007). Strategic schemas, strategic flexibility, and firm performance: The moderating role of industry clockspeed. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(3), 243–270.
- Nei, K. S., Foster, J. L., Ness, A. M., & Nei, D. S. (2018). Rule breakers and attention seekers: Personality predictors of integrity and accountability in leaders. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 26(1), 17–26.
- Obschonka, M., Hakkarainen, K., Lonka, K., & Salmela-Aro, K. (2017). Entrepreneurship as a twenty-first century skill: Entrepreneurial alertness and intention in the transition to adulthood. *Small Business Economics*, 48(3), 487–501.
- Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 73–101.
- OECD (2012). *Financing SMEs and entrepreneurs 2012: An OECD scoreboard*. Paris: OECD.
- Palmer, C., Niemand, T., Stöckmann, C., Kraus, S., & Kailer, N. (2019). The interplay of entrepreneurial orientation and psychological traits in explaining firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 94, 183–194.
- Parker, P. D., Lüdtke, O., Trautwein, U., & Roberts, B. W. (2012). Personality and relationship quality during the transition from high school to early adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, 80(4), 1061–1089.
- Parker, S. K. (1998). Enhancing role breadth self-efficacy: The roles of job enrichment and other organizational interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(6), 835–852.
- Parker, S. K., & Sprigg, C. A. (1999). Minimizing strain and maximizing learning: The role of job demands, job control, and proactive personality. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 925–939.
- Peterson, R. S., Smith, D. B., Martorana, P. V., & Owens, P. D. (2003). The impact of chief executive officer personality on top management team dynamics: One mechanism by which leadership affects organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 795.
- Pittino, D., Visintin, F., & Lauto, G. (2017). A configurational analysis of the antecedents of entrepreneurial orientation. *European Management Journal*, 35(2), 224–237.
- Ployhart, R. E., Lim, B. C., & Chan, K. Y. (2001). Exploring relations between typical and maximum performance ratings and the five factor model of personality. *Personnel Psychology*, 54(4), 809–843.
- Puplampu, B. (2005). “Skills, structure and leadership: Critical variables in SME internationalization”, in Kuada, J. (Ed.), *Internationalization and enterprise development in Ghana* (pp. 129–194). London: Adonis and Abbey.

- Raisch, S., & Birkinshaw, J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of Management*, 34(3), 375–409.
- Rauch, A., & Frese, M. (2000). Psychological approaches to entrepreneurial success: A general model and an overview of findings. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 15, 101–142.
- 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.
- Rode, J. C., Arthaud-Day, M. L., Mooney, C. H., Near, J. P., & Baldwin, T. T. (2008). Ability and personality predictors of salary, perceived job success, and perceived career success in the initial career stage. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 16(3), 292–299.
- Rondan-Cataluña, F. J., Navarro-García, A., & Arenas-Gaitan, J. (2016). Influye la personalidad de los directivos de pymes en los resultados exportadores? *Revista de Administração de Empresas*, 56(1), 43–54.
- Rosenbaum, D., More, E., & Steane, P. (2018). Planned organisational change management: Forward to the past? An exploratory literature review. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 31(2), 286–303.
- Rudisill, J. R., & Edwards, J. M. (2002). Coping with job transitions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 54(1), 55.
- Ruiz-Ortega, M. J., Parra-Requena, G., García-Villaverde, P. M., & Rodrigo-Alarcon, J. (2017). How does the closure of inter-organizational relationships affect entrepreneurial orientation? *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 20(3), 178–191.
- Sackett, P. R., Lievens, F., Van Iddekinge, C. H., & Kuncel, N. R. (2017). Individual differences and their measurement: A review of 100 years of research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 254.
- Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 30–43.
- Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243–263.
- Sattler, H., Völckner, F., Riediger, C., & Ringle, C. M. (2010). The impact of brand extension success drivers on brand extension price premiums. *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, 27(4), 319–328.
- Shimizu, K., & Hitt, M. A. (2004). Strategic flexibility: Organizational preparedness to reverse ineffective strategic decisions. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 18(4), 44–59.
- Silvia, P. J., Nusbaum, E. C., Berg, C., Martin, C., & O'Connor, A. (2009). Openness to experience, plasticity, and creativity: Exploring lower-order, high-order, and interactive effects. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 43(6), 1087–1090.
- Simsek, Z. (2007). CEO Tenure and organizational performance: An intervening model. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(6), 653–662.
- Smollan, R. K., Matheny, J. A., & Sayers, J. G. (2010). 'Personality, affect and organisational change: a qualitative study', in Zerbe, W. F., Ashkanasy, N. M. and Hartel, C. E. J. (Eds.), *Emotions and organisational dynamism: Research on emotions in organisations*, (pp. 85–112). Bingley, UK: Emerald Insight.
- Stone, M. (1974). Cross-validators choice and the assessment of statistical predictions (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 36(2), 111–133.
- Tang, J., Kacmar, K. M. M., & Busenitz, L. (2012). Entrepreneurial alertness in the pursuit of new opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 27(1), 77–94.
- Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 44, 703–742.
- Thomas, J. P., Whitman, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (2010). Employee proactivity in organizations: A comparative meta-analysis of emergent proactive constructs. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(2), 275–300.
- Thong, J. Y. (1999). An integrated model of information systems adoption in small businesses. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 15(4), 187–214.
- Thorgren, S., & Omored, A. (2018). Passionate leaders in social entrepreneurship: Exploring an African context. *Business & Society*, 57(3), 481–524.
- Vakola, M., Tsaousis, I., & Nikolaou, I. (2004). The role of emotional intelligence and personality variables on attitudes toward organizational change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 19(2), 88–110.
- Wales, W. J. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation: A review and synthesis of promising research directions. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(1), 3–15.
- Wales, W. J., Gupta, V. K., & Mousa, F. T. (2013) Empirical research on entrepreneurial orientation: An assessment and suggestions for future research. *International Small Business Journal*, 31(4), 357–383.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(1), 132–142.
- Watson, D. A., & Clark, L. A. (1997). Measurement and mismeasurement of mood: Recurrent and emergent themes. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68(2), 267–296.
- Wijewardena, H., Nanayakkara, G., & De Zoysa, A. (2008). The owner/manager's mentality and the financial performance of SMEs. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 15(1), 150–161.

- Williams, L. J., Gavin, M. B., & Hartman, N. S. (2004) Structural equation modeling methods in strategy research: Applications and issues. In D. J. Ketchen, Jr and D. D. Bergh (Eds.), *Research methodology in strategy and management* (Vol. 1, pp. 303–346). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Wincent, J., & Westerberg, M. (2005). Personal traits of CEOs, inter-firm networking and entrepreneurship in their firms: Investigating strategic SME network participants. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 10(3), 271–284.
- Wu, S. Y., & Turban, D. B. (2007). Examining the antecedents and consequences of mentoring relationships. In *Academy of management proceedings*, 2007 (1), 1–6. Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Yeh, S. C. J., Yuan, K. S., Chen, S. H. S., Lo, Y. Y., Chou, H. C., Huang, S., & Wan, T. T. (2016). The moderating effect of leadership on the relationship between personality and performance. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 24(7), 869–883.
- Yong, L. (2007). *Emotional Intelligence In the Workplace: Leonard Personality Inventory (LPI) Profiling* (Leonard Personality Incorporated, Malaysia).
- Young, H. R., Glerum, D. R., Wang, W., & Joseph, D. L. (2018). Who are the most engaged at work? A meta-analysis of personality and employee engagement. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(10), 1330–1346.
- Zahra, S. A. (1986). A canonical analysis of corporate entrepreneurship antecedents and impact on performance. In *Academy of management proceedings*, 1986 (1), 71–75. Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The big five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 259–271.

Dr. Antonio José Verdú-Jover is Full Professor of Management at Miguel Hernandez University. He received his PhD in Management from the University of Granada. His current research interests include strategic and organizational flexibility, strategic fit, organizational learning, strategic entrepreneurship, innovation, business environment and entrepreneurial processes. He has published in various international journals such as *Journal of Small Business Management*, *British Journal of Management*, *Industrial Marketing Management*, *Personnel Review*, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *Technovation*, *Organization Science*, *International Journal of Production Economics*, *International Business Review* and *Journal of Communication*. He also has contributed as a researcher in two European projects and has been the main researcher in three projects founded by the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science.

Dr. Marina Estrada-Cruz is PhD assistant of Entrepreneurship in Miguel Hernandez University. She received her PhD in Marketing and Strategic Business Management within the line of research focused on social entrepreneurship, innovation and effectuation. Similarly, actively collaborates since the year 2014 in the development of the GEM report in the Valencian Community and in GUESSS (Global University Student's Survey) project. She has published in various journals such as *European Research on Management and Business Economics*, *BRQ Business Research Quarterly* and *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*. In the professional field, she worked at the Business Innovation Centre in Elche, as head of Economic, Financial and Advisory Area for Entrepreneurs and companies where she has more than 10 years of experience.

Dr. Noelia Rodríguez-Hernández holds a degree in Business Administration and Management; she has completed Master's in Human Resources Management, Labor and Organizations and she holds a PhD in Marketing and Strategic Business Management. During the development of her doctoral thesis, she specialized in topics related to strategic entrepreneurship in companies. In her professional career, she highlights her 4-year experience as a researcher in the Department of Economic and Financial Studies of the Miguel Hernández de Elche University (UMH), in the area of Business Organization. On the other hand, she has worked as a practicing economist doing work in areas such as accounting, taxation, market research and training. Noelia currently works as an innovation agent for the UMH Foundation, as well as a Part Time Lecturer in the Department of Economic and Financial Studies UMH.

Dr. José María Gómez-Gras is Professor in Business Organization Area in Miguel Hernandez University (UMH). He holds a PhD in Economics and Business Studies, 'Censor Jurado de Cuentas' and Economist-Auditor, with an experience of 38 courses. Currently he is Excellence Model Assessor of the EFQM (European Foundation for Quality Management). He is the author of more than 100 scientific papers and researcher in more than 50 national and international projects on the problems of the business world and the creation and management of new ventures. Since its creation, he has been the head of the research group on 'Promotion and New Business Creation' of the UMH and the 'Global Entrepreneurship Monitor' Observatory in the Valencian Community, promoted internationally by Babson College and London Business School.

Cite this article: Verdú-Jover AJ, Estrada-Cruz M, Rodríguez-Hernández N, Gómez-Gras JM (2023). Relationship between CEO's personality and company's entrepreneurial orientation: the case of SMEs. *Journal of Management & Organization* 29, 48–68. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2020.33>