

Influence of Entrepreneurial Leadership's Organizational Dimension on Organizational Performance in the Solar Energy Sector of Kenya

Wilfred Nyanusi Maranga Harun^{1*}, Damary Sikalieh¹ and Zachary Mosoti¹

¹United States International University-Africa

Corresponding Author's E-mail: wilfredmaranga@gmail.com

Cite: Harun, W. N. M., Sikalieh D., & Mosoti, Z. (2021). Influence of Entrepreneurial Leadership's Organizational Dimension on Organizational Performance in the Solar Energy Sector of Kenya. *The University Journal*, 3(2), 59-74.

Abstract

The main objective of this paper was to determine the influence of entrepreneurial leadership's organizational dimension on organizational performance in the solar energy sector of Kenya. The study used a descriptive correlational research design. The study population included 11 solar energy firms, adding up to a population of 289 managers. Stratified random sampling technique was applied in selecting the study participants. The sample size used for the study, included 165 respondents. Primary data was collected from the respondents through the use of a questionnaire. The correlational analysis showed that the organization dimension had a strong positive and statistically significant relationship with organizational performance. The findings showed that creativity statistically and significantly influences organizational performance. Resource allocation does not have a statistically significant influence on organizational performance. Proactiveness was determined not to have a statistically significant relationship with organizational performance. The study concluded that it is important for the solar energy organizations to consider the organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership in their operations. Regarding the constructs for the organization dimensions of the entrepreneurial leadership, it was concluded that creativity should be considered by the organization while applying the organization dimension of the entrepreneurial leadership in the organizations. This means that as organizations considers using the organization dimension of the entrepreneurial leadership in their operations, they should mostly consider creativity within the organization.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship Leadership, Organization Dimension, Creativity, Resource Allocation, Proactiveness.

Introduction

Entrepreneurial leadership's Organizational dimension defines factors relating to creativity, stability, proper resource allocation, and discipline (Musa & Fontana, 2014). Organizational dimension covers the structure and basic managerial mechanisms of the organization. In the current dynamic business environment globally, the importance of being creative, resourceful, and discipline, can be linked to the survival and sustainability of an organization and its performance and the market share it can amerse. De Jong and Den Hartog (2007) argued that organizational factors or a leader's organizational orientation pay in the shape of idea generation and is also vital in risk-taking, proactive, or reactive response. According to Scheepers *et al.* (2008) entrepreneurial orientation is all about innovativeness, risk-taking, and a proactive approach. Thus, when leaders exhibit innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness, it leads to organizational performance.

The organization is the backbone and building block of any firm, and it influences the way internal dimensions are formed the firm develops. It houses human resources, hierarchies, total quality management, the business model, and daily operations, amongst other areas (Steiglitz, 2014). Organizational dimension relates to organizational performance in many ways. Tashi and Ghernaouti-Helie (2011) discussed the organizational dimension looks at aspects directly linked to organizational performance by determining its survival through operational and technical issues. It looks at people, roles, responsibilities, processes, and information security governance measures. Halim *et al.* (2016) further note that organizations create organizational structures and policies that provide a comprehensive, integrated and coordinated approach that will inform organizational performance as they progress. These structures, policies, and procedures give a roadmap and alignment that will guide ventures post the development and pilot stage, usually the first year of operation.

While discussing some of the factors that can be used to measure organizational performance, Halim *et al.*, (2016) identify the organizational structure, integration, evaluation, faculty and staff development, and resource allocation as some elements that can be used. Kaufman (2014) suggests vital processes and competencies as measures that can inform organizational dimensions. Furthermore, Hejazi *et al.*, (2012) note that the organizational dimension of entrepreneurship leadership entails such factors as emotional strategy, creativity, open mind, modesty and humility, courage, proper placement of people and things, and discipline. According to Musa and Fontana (2014), the organizational dimension of entrepreneurship leadership concerns factors relating to creativity, stability, proper resource allocation, and discipline.

Workplace creativity plays a significant role in organizational success; the organization has thus to focus on ways to enhance workplace creativity. One of the aspects of the organization that has been used to enhance creativity is organizational leadership. Leaders are thought to impact the organization's creativity through their styles (Mainemelis, Kark & Epitropaki, 2015). According to Cai, Lysova, Khapova and Bossink (2018), the way managers lead in contemporary organizations is changing, leading to the birth of more entrepreneurial leadership styles exerting an influence on creativity. An entrepreneurial leader's key distinctive characteristic is that they motivate employees to follow and join the opportunity-driven process through creativity and creatively committing to the discovery and utilization of prospects for new businesses by developing new products, services, and business processes.

Resource allocation involves the management of assets to support strategic goals set by an organization (Rouse, 2019). It covers both tangible and soft assets, such as hardware and human capital. According to Friebel and Raith (2009), resource allocation is one of managers' most important tasks. They argue that resource allocation involves balancing competing needs and priorities, determining an effective course of action to maximize the use of limited resources, and gaining the best return on investment. Due to the scarcity of resources, each want, and need may never be satisfied with the resources disposed to, this calls for choices. With these choices, some of the wants and needs could be satisfied while others not. The action of making a decision or making choices to direct resources to fulfill some of the wants and needs over others is the resource allocation process (Shuqair & Abdel-Aziz, 2015).

Proactiveness is demonstrated by people who tend to influence their environment (Delle & Amadu, 2015). A proactive leader is one who is not controlled by situational forces and the influence of environmental changes. A proactive leader will identify opportunities and act on

them, demonstrate initiative, take action, and endure until they bring meaningful change (Bateman & Grant 1993). Proactiveness is a characteristic of entrepreneurs; an entrepreneurship leader would exhibit proactive behaviors like taking charge personally and flexibly. According to EL-Annan (2013), proactive leaders would tend to act in a manner to make changes to their environment. Wu and Wang (2011) observed that proactiveness describes a personality trait, behavior, or a series of actions that focus on bringing about change. According to Schmitt, Den Hartog and Belschak (2016), being proactive means anticipating future outcomes, striving to control and improve the environment, and initiate action and change without being asked to do so.

Literature Review

Literature was reviewed theoretically and empirically. The theoretical review was done in order to identify the study variables and explain their relationship while the empirical review captures similar studies on organizational dimension and organizational performance.

Theoretical Orientation

Thornberry (2006) developed a model that classified the leaders into two types, i.e., activist and catalyst. Activist refers to the leader's personal level behavior, whereas catalyst refers to the leader's organizational level behavior. The researcher further separated these leaders into four (4) dimensions, such as explorer, miner, accelerator, and integrator. Explorer behavior refers to leaders' behavior in exploring new opportunities. Miner behavior refers to leaders' behaviors in applying creative and innovative approaches in problem-solving. Accelerator refers to leaders' behavior in applying creative and innovative actions. Integrator behavior refers to leaders' behavior in communicating the vision and mission to all staff and encourages them to engage in entrepreneurial thinking to achieve the organization's vision. Chen (2007) conceptualizes entrepreneurial leadership as a combined construct of risk-taking, proactiveness, and innovativeness. Entrepreneurial leadership has also been defined to include four main components, which are proactive, innovative, creative, and risk-taking (Ichraikie, 2013).

Musa and Fontana (2014) defined the entrepreneurial leadership dimensions as strategic, communicative, motivational, and organizational. Strategic dimension deals with the ability to comprehensively determine the organization system while leveraging in resources, people, strategy, and the business model that the organization adopts. The communicative dimension deals with how such a vision of future possibilities is shared throughout the organization. The motivational dimension deals with human action within the organization that affects both motivation and cognition of people. Organizational dimension addresses factors relating to creativity, stability, proper resource allocation (job fit), and discipline. From the preceding, we can establish that there seems to be no universal understanding of what elements constitutes leadership; hence, this study will seek to contribute to entrepreneurial leadership's elements or dimensions. For this study, the researcher adopted Musa and Fontana's (2014) organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership. The study will examine three aspects of organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership namely, creativity, resource allocation, and proactiveness.

The organizational dimension of entrepreneurship leadership concerns factors relating to creativity, stability, proper resource allocation, and discipline (Musa & Fontana, 2014). Creativity deals with the creative skills to organize the needed resources and enact the role of framing the challenge. Creativity is essential to organizations because creative contributions

can help organizations become more efficient and responsive to opportunities and help organizations adapt to change, grow, and compete in the global market (Lee & Tan, 2012). Hence, for the solar energy sector to realize sustained growth, creativity is needed at both individual and collective levels.

Stability refers to emotional stability at the individual level, passion, and commitment to the organizations' entrepreneurial activities at large (Musa & Fontana, 2014). According to Aghion, Akcigit and Howitt (2014), organizations around the world are changing. Ashkanasy (2011) notes that such change, coupled with new competitors emerging from around the world, can stir strong emotions, which can significantly affect performance. Emotions are salient in terms of organizational commitment (Li, Ahlstrom, & Ashkanasy, 2010), innovation, and new ventures and a host of other important organizational and managerial performance (Ahlstrom, 2014). Hence, players within the solar sector need to put in place strategies to pursue their employees' emotional stability as the industry evolves to realize sustained performance in the wake of change.

Proper resource allocations include managing resources and maintaining dynamic capabilities to enhance knowledge management within the organization, which could support efforts to recognize opportunities. At the same time, organizational discipline deals with building a sustained bridge that links entrepreneurship and strategic management (Fontana, & Musa, 2017). Nowadays, both profit and non-profit organizations are typically confronted with resource allocation's critical problems (Phillips & Costa, 2007). Hence, identifying the significant strategic projects under limited resources is a crucial managerial activity that has been empirically identified in several studies (Santhanam & Kyparisis, 1995; Chen, Lin, & Cheng, 2009). The suitably selected projects could bring competitive advantages to a business (Chen, Lin, & Cheng, 2009). Hence, because of limited resources in the solar energy sector, not only financial but also technological and human, selecting a set of optimal projects remains a delicate process that is utterly dependent on an organization's available resources. In this study, the organizational dimension entailed a leader's ability to use available resources appropriately and creatively.

Empirical Literature Review

The organizational dimension of entrepreneurship leadership concerns creativity, stability, proper resource allocation, and discipline (Musa & Fontana, 2014). Researchers have delved into these factors and how they influence organizational performance. Jeffrey (2008) examined the influence of personnel stability on organizational performance among army personnel in battalions. The research was underlined by the production function theory with the factor input of interest being increased personnel stability and production output of unit effectiveness. Jeffrey's (2008) findings did not show a prevalent or strong relationship between leadership stability and battalion training proficiency. Jeffrey's (2008) results did not show any significant correlation between stability and performance; it thus calls for further research in the area to ascertain this.

Bature, Sallehuddin and Saad (2018) researched Proactiveness, Innovativeness, and Firm Performance while assessing the mediating role of organizational capability in the relationship. Cluster sampling was adopted, self-administered questionnaires were administered, collecting data from 305 respondents from manufacturing small and medium enterprises in north-central geographical zones in Nigeria. Partial least square structural equation modeling was adopted to test the relationship. They established that organizational capability mediates the relationship

between proactiveness and innovativeness and organizational performance. The study was conducted in Nigeria while this study was conducted in Kenya while testing the mediating effect of organizational commitment on the relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and organizational performance.

The concept of organizational performance has attracted many researchers who have associated it with various aspects such as organizational effectiveness, organizational capabilities, employee performance, leadership, risk management and organizational commitment (Bratnicka, 2015; Knies *et al.*, 2016; Kopia, 2017; Sani & Maharani, 2012; Silitonga & Widodo, 2017; Teck-Hong & Yong-Kean, 2012). Many researchers have tried identifying ways to measure the same and came up with different constructs that indicate organizational performance (Bashaer *et al.*, 2016; Maria & Elena-Julliana, 2016; Rehman *et al.*, 2019).

In a study on organizational performance and enterprise risk management (ERM), Kopia *et al.* (2017), sought to identify how enterprise risk management influenced organizational performance. In their findings, management of risk and opportunities is a genuine part of organizational activities. To add to this, based on the act that enterprise risk management directly influences strategic decision-making in any organization, it influences outputs in an organization, thus impacting performance. The researcher undertook a secondary study by identifying scientific papers that ties enterprise risk management to organizational performance and analyzed the findings and approaches in order to develop a better approach for their study. In their conclusion, they assert that ERM is a construct or strong indicator of organizational performance. This study however, looked at entrepreneurial leadership and organizational performance. The researcher brings in the aspect of risk management as a skill that an entrepreneurial leader should possess in order to influence performance in the organization thus bringing out the similarity between Kopia *et al.* (2017) study and this study. Moreover, the researcher undertook a field research instead of a secondary research used by Kopia, *et al.* (2017).

Bashaer *et al.* (2016) conducted a study to identify determinants of organizational performance. Their paper's main aim was to review various determinants that influence organizational performance and develop a framework that would be beneficial to leaders in an organization. A systematic review of articles on the same field was used for this study in order to collect empirical evidence. However, the researcher in this study took a different approach and collected data from the field to get a different perspective from what has been documented in articles and scientific papers. In their study, the researchers concluded that employee performance and leadership competencies played a role in ensuring organizational performance. While their study took a different approach with regards to research design and methodology, a similarity can be seen on the determinants of organizational performance where the researcher in this study looked at leader effectiveness and employee satisfaction which can be closely linked to leadership competencies and employee performance.

Methodology

Research Design

This study used a descriptive correlational research design. The study population included 11 solar energy firms registered with the Global Off-Grid Lighting Association (GOGLA), adding up to a population of 289 managers. Primary data was collected from the respondents through the use of a questionnaire. Data was subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Sampling

Stratified random sampling technique was applied in selecting the study participants. The sample size used for the study, included 165 respondents as shown in Table 1. The sample size for this study was determined using Fisher's (1998) formula given as:

$$n = \frac{z^2 x p x q}{d^2}$$

Where; n = Sample size for large population (assuming the population is less than 10,000); Z = the normal distribution Z value score, (1.96); p = the proportion of units of the sample size under study, where for this study it is set at 50% (0.5); q = constant (usually set at 1-p) = 0.5; d = Precision level desired or the significance level which is 0.05 for this study.

The target population for this study included 289 managers drawn from different organizations. However, for small populations, the finite population correction factor should be used to adjust the sample size further (Bartlett, Kotrlik & Higgins, 2001).

$$n_0 = \frac{n}{1 + \left(\frac{n-1}{N}\right)}$$

Where; N = Target population (289); Finite Population correction factor=N=384;

$$n_0 = \frac{384}{1 + \left(\frac{384-1}{289}\right)} = 165$$

Table 1: Sample Size

| Organization | Population | % of Respondents | Sample size |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|
| Greenlight Planet Kenya Limited | 34 | 12% | 19 |
| D-Light | 29 | 10% | 17 |
| M-KOPA Kenya Ltd | 32 | 11% | 18 |
| Azuri Technologies Ltd | 31 | 11% | 18 |
| B-Box | 25 | 9% | 14 |
| Solar Panda | 25 | 9% | 14 |
| Bio-Lite | 27 | 9% | 15 |
| Sun-Culture | 23 | 8% | 13 |
| NIWA | 15 | 5% | 9 |
| Sun Transfer | 22 | 8% | 13 |
| Mobisol | 26 | 9% | 15 |
| Total | 289 | 100% | 165 |

Findings

Demographic Characteristics

The study sample comprised 68.8% males and 31.2% females. According to the findings, Kenya's Solar Energy has a higher number of managers in the 30-39 range taking up 50%. Very few managers were in the 40-49 (18.2%) age bracket, while 31.8% were in the 20-29 age bracket. The study's findings indicated that 70.1% of the respondents possessed a bachelor's degree, while 29.9% had master's Degrees. From the study's findings, 51.3% of the Senior managers indicated to have worked in the organization for 3 to 4 years. Additionally, 26% indicated that they had worked in their organizations for 0 to 2 years, while 22.7% indicated

they had worked in their organizations for five and above years. Data collected on the management level indicates that 54.5% of the respondents are heads of a unit or a team in their organizations, while 22.7% are heads of sub-departments. Further, 13.6% indicated they are heads of departments while 9.1% indicated they are heads of sections in the subject organizations in the Solar Energy sector.

The study's findings indicated that organizations in the Solar Energy sector in Kenya regularly developed new opportunity-driven processes and fostered cooperative teamwork environments. Further, employees frequently recognized opportunities and combined previous disparate elements in new ways to achieve organizational goals and objectives. It was also evident that leaders in the solar energy sector were committed to discovering and utilizing prospects for new business and controlled inherent conflicts between creativity and the organization. Leaders were also depicted to solve problems creatively and did not depend on influence derived from power or conformity pressure to handle their duties. Again, leaders in the solar energy sector mentioned they regularly generated and shared ideas and knowledge with their colleagues. There was also evidence that the organizations' product portfolio in the solar energy sector had evolved over the past three years. From the findings reported above, it is evident that creativity plays a key role in impacting organizational performance as a measure of the organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership.

The organizations in Kenya's solar energy sector had provided suitable equipment for employees' execution of duties. Further, the organizations have enough manpower that ensures better production. Findings further indicated that the availability of resources has reduced employee job stress and have contributed to employee personal growth and development. It was also evident that leaders in the Solar Energy sector in Kenya balanced competing needs and priorities and regularly monitored and audited allocated resources. Leaders also determined an effective course of action to maximize the use of limited resources and gain Return on Investment (ROI). Organizations in the solar energy sector have highly invested in information technology.

Findings of the study indicated that leaders in the solar energy sector spent time identifying long-term goals for the organizations and that the organizations quickly responded to changes and emerging opportunities. Further, leaders felt they were in charge of making things happen and felt responsible for the organization. Notably, leaders in the solar energy sector were driven by a sense of purpose and the organization's values. It was also evident that there were abundant opportunities in the Solar Energy sector, and the organizations possessed forward-looking strategy-making in line with the future demands. Again, leaders in this sector regularly set practical change-oriented goals. From the findings reported above, it is evident that proactiveness plays a key role in impacting organizational performance to measure entrepreneurial leadership's organizational dimension.

Correlational Analysis

The correlational analysis showed that the organization dimension had a strong positive and statistically significant relationship with organizational performance ($r(152)=.709$, $p<.000$). The organizational dimension of entrepreneurship leadership concerns creativity, stability, proper resource allocation, and discipline (Musa & Fontana, 2014). The study findings are consistent with the findings of Lemarleni *et al.*, (2017) determined positive and significant correlations between resource allocation and organizational performance. This is because planning is part of organizational performance and if organizations does proper planning, then

they have a better chance of performing very well. Jeffrey (2008), in a study that examined the influence of personnel stability on organizational performance obtained mixed findings. The results showed a prevalent or strong relationship between leadership stability and battalion training proficiency, but they did not show any significant correlation between stability and performance. This is because organizations may be stable because it is able to meet employee and customer demands but not performing because they may have spent a lot in their investments which don't bring returns. Zahra (1986) found that degree of innovation, risk-taking, and futurity significantly predict the financial performance in terms of the net income-to-sales ratio.

Table 2: Correlation between Organizational Dimension and Organizational Performance

| | | Perceived Financial Performance | Employee Satisfaction | Leader Effectiveness | Organizational Performance |
|---------------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Creativity | Pearson | .664** | .575** | .657** | .713** |
| | Correlation | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 154 | 154 | 154 | 154 |
| Resource allocation | Pearson | .607** | .563** | .556** | .625** |
| | Correlation | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 154 | 154 | 154 | 154 |
| Proactiveness | Pearson | .621** | .514** | .595** | .644** |
| | Correlation | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 154 | 154 | 154 | 154 |
| Organization Dimension | Pearson | .677** | .591** | .647** | .709** |
| | Correlation | | | | |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 154 | 154 | 154 | 154 |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Model Summary

Table 3 presents the model summary for the regression analysis between organizational dimension constructs and organizational performance. The model summary findings indicate that the combined organizational dimension construct variables explained 51.4% of the variability in the organizational performance in Kenya's solar energy sector (Adjusted - $R^2 = .514$). The other part of organizational performance is accounted for by other factors outside this study model.

Table 3: Coefficient of Determination

| Model Summary | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .724 ^a | .523 | .514 | .25207 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Proactiveness, Resource allocation, Creativity

Regression ANOVA

The regression ANOVA in Table 4, was used to assess whether there existed a linear relationship between combined organizational dimension constructs and organizational performance. Table 4 indicates that there existed a statistical and significant linear relationship between the combined organizational dimension constructs and organizational performance in Kenya's solar energy sector ($F(3,150) = 54.925, p < .05$).

Table 4: Regression ANOVA for Linear Relationship between Organization Dimensions Constructs and Organizational Performance

| Model | Sum of Squares | ANOVA ^a | | | |
|--------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------|--------|-------------------|
| | | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 Regression | 10.470 | 3 | 3.490 | 54.925 | .000 ^b |
| Residual | 9.531 | 150 | .064 | | |
| Total | 20.001 | 153 | | | |

- a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance
- b. Predictors: (Constant), Proactiveness, Resource allocation, Creativity

Regression Coefficient

The regression coefficients presented in Table 5 shows the individual influence of each of the organizational dimension construct variables on organizational performance in Kenya's solar energy sector. The findings from Table 5 shows that creativity can statistically and significantly influence organizational performance ($\beta = 0.371, t(150) = 4.680, p < .05$) and that with a 1 unit increase in creativity, the organizational performance was improved by 0.371 units. Resource allocation positively influenced organizational performance though not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.043, t(150) = .560, p > .05$). Proactiveness positively influenced organizational performance though not statistically significant ($\beta = 0.123, t(150) = 1.771, p > .05$). As shown with the standardized coefficient, creativity ($\beta = 0.518$) had a greater influence on organization performance, followed by proactiveness ($\beta = 0.180$) and lastly, resource allocation ($\beta = 0.061$).

Table 5: Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients of Organizational Dimension and Organizational Performance

| Model | | Coefficients ^a | | | | |
|-------|---------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
| | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | t | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.560 | .180 | | 8.686 | .000 |
| | Creativity | .371 | .079 | .518 | 4.680 | .000 |
| | Resource allocation | .043 | .073 | .061 | .584 | .560 |
| | Proactiveness | .123 | .070 | .180 | 1.771 | .079 |

- a. Dependent Variable: Organizational Performance

Discussion

This finding can be explained by the argument of Naiman (2014) that creativity in the workplace can perceive the world in new ways, find hidden patterns, and turn ideas and imaginations into a productive reality that will drive organizational performance. In line with results here, Scarmozzino and Corvello (2017), in a study of employee creativity's role in delivering organizational performance improvements, found out that employee creativity improves organizational performance. Similarly, Mwesigwa and Namiyigo (2014) also

conducted a study on job resources, employee creativity, and commercial banks' firm performance through a cross-sectional study. They found out that there is a significant positive relationship between employee creativity and firm performance.

Results here also correspond to Alnidawi and Jaffal (2018) study that sought to find out the impact of organizational creativity and organizational performance. Their study indicated that organizational creativity drives production and increases its flow in an organization. While explaining how creativity correlates with organizational performance, Alnidawi and Jaffal (2018) pointed out that creativity enables an organization to achieve market competition and achieve profits, which overall adds to better organizational performance. Further, the results here correspond to Weinzimmer *et al.*, (2011) study who conducted a study looking at creativity and firm performance. They identify that creativity is the most critical attribute of future business success in today's dynamic business environment. Weinzimmer *et al.*, (2011) on their part, while justifying the effect of creativity on organization performance, explained that creativity impacts several aspects that contribute to organizational performance, such as organizational behaviors. Bratnicka (2015) adds to this by looking at the effect of creativity on organizational effectiveness. This is due to the fact that organizational creativity creates a conducive environment for the employees to be creative by offering the required resources and training that impacts effectiveness of the organization and hence better performance of the organizations.

Additionally, other studies have supported findings here, which point to a positive association between creativity and organizational performance. A study by Scarmozzino and Corvello (2017) looked at employee creativity as a driver of organizational performance improvements. The study revealed that if organizations focus on nurturing employee creativity, then it will positively impact organizational performance. Moreover, Siddiqi and Qureshi (2016) support the fact that employee creativity impacts organizational performance in their study on employee creativity's impact on a firm's performance. This is because when employees are empowered in an organization, there is efficient utilization of resources, which maximizes organizational performance. Another study by Gong, Zhou, and Chang (2013) established that employee creativity's core knowledge was negatively related to firm performance when riskiness orientation was high. This may be due to the fact that employees may be using creative ideas that are not working for their organizations. The relationship between performance and creativity was also positive when realized absorptive capacity was high. This may be because of the utilization ability by the employee who is innovative. Finally, the relationship between performance and creativity was more positive in small firms than in large firms. This may be due to the fact that in small organizations there are limited bureaucracy before adoption of any creative innovation compared to larger organizations.

Through regression analysis, the researcher established that resource allocation does not have a statistically significant influence on organizational performance ($\beta = 0.043$, $t(150) = .560$, $p > .05$). However, correlation results established that resource allocation has a positive and statistically significant relationship with organizational performance ($r(152) = .625$, $p < .000$). This result confirms the finding of Lemarleni *et al.*, (2017) that there are positive and significant correlations between resource allocation and organizational performance. It is also critical to understand that the allocation of too few resources can slow organizational operations, while too much funding may waste organizational resources and reduce financial performance (Lemarleni *et al.*, 2017). Further, Mirela and Šemsudin (2017) pointed out the importance of human resources to organization performance. They alluded that organizational

success relies on human resources, which is the most significant resource in any organization. They noted that human resources are the developers and makers of new technical, technological, and organizational solutions, makers of new values, managers of the working process, and creators of the organization system. However, the organization needs to find a proper management system for human resources and motivate them for the entire organization to perform better.

The result here also upholds the finding of Omollo, Ngacho, and Onyango (2017), who studied the effects of resource allocation on firm performance. The findings indicated that resource allocation has a positive effect on firm performance. This is may be due to the fact that whenever resources are properly allocated then the organization can attain the set goals and achieve better performance. On the other hand, Koskei, Kimutai and Kemboi (2017) conducted a study on the influence of hospitals' resource provision and performance. Their results showed that there is a significant positive relationship between resource allocation and organization performance.

Proactiveness was determined not to have a statistically significant relationship with organizational performance ($\beta = 0.123, t(150) = 1.771, p > .05$). However, correlation analysis established that proactiveness had a positive and statistically significant relationship with organizational performance ($r(152) = .644, p < .000$). These findings are consistent with the findings of Abaho's (2013) study who demonstrated that proactiveness has a significant and positive effect on SMEs' export performance. The result is also similar to the study result of Boohene, Marfo-Yiadom, and Yeboah (2012) that provided evidence of a strong and positive connection between proactiveness and organizational performance. This study result agrees with the observation of Wambugu *et al.*, (2015), who studied the relationship between the proactiveness and performance of SMEs and established that proactiveness influences performance in an organization. This is because proactiveness leads to better sales, employee growth, profitability, product, and customer performance. Proactiveness further ensures a strategic posture in employees that enables them to pursue opportunities in the market as they present themselves.

Findings here are also supported by as the findings of Bature *et al.*, (2018), who studied proactiveness, innovativeness, and firm performance and found out that proactiveness is a critical strategic posture for an organization to thrive in a fast-changing business environment. Oni (2012) researched the importance of entrepreneurial proactiveness on business performance and found out that enterprise performance results from a broader base of entrepreneurial proactiveness. This is due to the fact that that organizations that seek to accomplish high levels of efficiency should concentrate on entrepreneurial proactiveness. According to Zehir, Can and Karaboga (2015), proactive organizations will perform better than their competitors since they respond to market change promptly, and they develop to be leaders of their industry with opportunities they take advantage of before their competitors. Baba, Tourigny, Wang and Liu, (2009) also carried out a study on proactive personality and work performance and found out that proactiveness personality positively affects job performance. Further, Thomas *et al.*, (2010) conducted a study on employee proactivity in organizations specializing on emergent proactive constructs' meta-analysis. The results of the study revealed a significant correlation between proactiveness and performance in the organization. This may be because proactiveness is part of organization performance and employees become proactive so as to perform better in the organization.

Conclusion

The study findings revealed that the organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership had a significant effect on organizational performance in the solar energy sector of Kenya. The study concluded that it was important for the solar energy organizations to consider the organizational dimension of entrepreneurial leadership in their operations. Regarding the constructs for the organization dimensions of the entrepreneurial leadership, the study revealed that creativity had a positive and statistically significant influence on organizational performance. Resource allocation positively influenced organizational performance though not statistically significant. Proactiveness positively influenced organizational performance though not statistically significant. This implies that creativity should be considered by the organization while applying the organization dimension of the entrepreneurial leadership in the organizations. This means that as organizations consider using the organization dimension of the entrepreneurial leadership in their operations, they should mostly consider creativity within the organization.

References

- Abaho, E. (2013). Entrepreneurship lecturer's entrepreneurial orientation; evidence from Uganda. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3 (5), 42, 57.
- Aghion, P., Akcigit, U., & Howitt, P. (2014). What do we learn from Schumpeterian growth theory? In *Handbook of economic growth* (Vol. 2, pp. 515-563). Elsevier.
- Ahlstrom, D. (2014). Entrepreneurial firms' network competence, technological capability, and new product development performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 31(3), 687-704.
- Alnidawi, A. A. B., & Jaffal, S. A. Q. (2018). The Impact of Organizational Creativity On Organizational Performance: The Moderating Role Of Knowledge Sharing: Empirical Study In Pharmaceutical Jordanian Companies. *Economics and Management*, 14(2), 144-156.
- Ashkanasy, N. M. (2011). International happiness: A multilevel perspective. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 25(1), 23-29.
- Baba, V. V., Tourigny, L., Wang, X., & Liu, W. (2009). Proactive personality and work performance in China: The moderating effects of emotional exhaustion and perceived safety climate. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 26(1), 23-37. doi:10.1002/cjas.90
- Bartlett, J., Kotlik, J., Higgins, C., & Williams, H. J. P. R. (2001). Exploring factors associated with research productivity of business faculty at National Association of Business Teacher Education. *Published Report*.
- Bashaer, A., Singh, S. K., & Farouk, S. (2016). Determinants of organizational performance: a proposed framework. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*.
- Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1999). Proactive behavior: Meaning, impact, recommendations. *Business Horizons*, 42(3), 63-70. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(99\)80023-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(99)80023-8).
- Bature, S. W., Sallehuddin, R. M., Rosli, N. A., & Saad, S. (2018). Proactiveness, innovativeness and firm performance: the mediating role of organizational capability. *Academy of Strategic*
- Boohene, R., Marfo-Yiadom, E., & Yeboah, M. A. (2012). An empirical analysis of the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance of auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis. *Developing Country Studies*, 2(9), 77-86.
- Bratnicka, K. (2015). Creativity and effectiveness in organizations. A new approach to an old question. *Management*, 19(1), 33-45. <https://doi.org/10.1515/manment-2015-0003>.

- Cai, W., Lysova, E. I., Khapova, S. N., & Bossink, B. A. (2018). Does Entrepreneurial Leadership Foster Creativity Among Employees and Teams? The Mediating Role of Creative Efficacy Beliefs. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 34*(2), 203-217. doi:10.1007/s10869-018-9536-y
- Chen, M. H. (2007). Entrepreneurial leadership and new ventures: Creativity in entrepreneurial teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management, 16*(3), 239-249.
- Chen, Y. S., Lin, M. J. J., & Chang, C. H. (2009). The positive effects of relationship learning and absorptive capacity on innovation performance and competitive advantage in industrial markets. *Industrial marketing management, 38*(2), 152-158.
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of innovation management, 10*(1), 41-64.
- Delle, E., & Amadu, I. M. (2015). Proactive personality and entrepreneurial intention: Employment status and student level as moderators. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research, 3*(4), 1-13.
- EL-Annan, S. H. (2013). Innovation, proactive and vision are three integrated dimensions between leadership and entrepreneurship. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences, 1*(12), 148-163.
- Fontana, A., & Musa, S. (2017). The impact of entrepreneurial leadership on innovation management and its measurement validation. *International Journal of Innovation Science, 9*(1), 2-19.
- Friebel, G., & Raith, M. (2009). (1) (PDF) *Resource allocation and organizational form*. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228749970_Resource_allocation_and_organizational_form
- Gong, Y., Zhou, J., & Chang, S. (2013). Core knowledge employee creativity and firm performance: The moderating role of riskiness orientation, firm size, and realized absorptive capacity. *Personnel Psychology, 66*(2), 443-482.
- Halim, A. H. A., Hanafi, E., & Zain, F. M. (2016). An Analysis of Organizational Dimension as Predictor to the Intention to Use of e-Training System Among Senior School Administrators. *Envisioning the Future of Online Learning, 159–169*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0954-9_14
- Hejazi, S. A. M., Malei, M. M., & Naeiji, M. J. (2012, February). Designing a scale for measuring entrepreneurial leadership in SMEs. In *International Conference on Economics, Marketing and Management, IPEDR 28*(2), 71-77.
- Ichrakie, F. (2013). Intangible Resources as Key Determinants of Job Network Providers' Success: A Resource-based Study. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research, 2*(11), 43.
- Jeffrey, P. D. (2008). *The Effect of Personnel Stability on Organizational Performance: Do Battalions with Stable Command Groups Achieve Higher Training Proficiency at the National Training Center?* Rand graduate school Santa Monica CA.
- Knies, E., Jacobsen, C. & Tummers, L. G. (2016). Leadership and Organizational Performance: State of the Art and Research Agenda. In: Storey, J., Denis, J.L., Hartley, J. & Hart, P. (Eds.). *Routledge Companion to Leadership* (pp. 404-418). London: Routledge.
- Kopia, J. (2017). *Organization performance and enterprise risk management. 6*(1), 13.
- Kopia, J., Just, V., Geldmacher, W., & Buřian, A. (2017). Organization performance and enterprise risk management. *Ecoforum Journal, 6*(1).
- Koskei, T. A. H., Kimutai, G. & Bogonko, J. (2018). Continuance Commitment and Employee Performance at University of Eastern Africa, Baraton Kenya. *Journal of Business and Management, 20*(2), 61-67.

- Lee, L., & Tan, E. (2012). The Influences Of Antecedents On Employee Creativity And Employee Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 4(2), 984-996.
- Lemarleni, J. E., Ochieng, I., Gakobo, T. & Mwaura, P. (2017). Effects of resource allocation on strategy implementation at Kenya Police Service in Nairobi County. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 2(4), 1-26.
- Li, Y., Ahlstrom, D., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2010). A multilevel model of affect and organizational commitment. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 27(2), 193-213.
- Mainemelis, C., Kark, R., & Epitropaki, O. (2015). Creative leadership: A multi-context conceptualization. *Academy of Management Annals*, 9(1), 393-482.
- Maria, C. & Elena-Iuliana, I. (2016). Organizational Performance-A Concept That Self-Seeks To Find Itself. *Annals of Constantin Brancusi' University of Targu-Jiu. Economy Series*, (4), 179-183.
- Mirela, K. & Šemsudin, D. (2017). Successful Leadership and Motivation Lead to Employee Satisfaction. *Management International Conference*, (May), 24-27.
- Musa, S. & Fontana, A. (2014, December). Measuring enterpreneurial leadership in innovation management-an exploratory analysis. In *ISPIM Innovation Symposium* (p.1). The International Society for Professional Innovation Management (ISPIM).
- Mwesigwa, R., & Namiyigo, S. (2014). Job resources, employees' creativity and firm performance of commercial banks in Uganda. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3(9), 1-12.
- Naiman, L. (2014, February 17). What is Creativity? (And why is it a crucial factor for business success?). *Creativity at Work*. <https://www.creativityatwork.com/2014/02/17/what-is-creativity/>
- Omollo, N. F., Ngacho, C., & Onyango, Y. J. (2017). Determining the effects of resource allocation on the performance of south Nyanza sugar company limited, Kenya. *International journal of social science and information technology*, 3(9), 2514-2520.
- Oni, E. O. (2012). Relevance of Entrepreneurial Proactiveness on Business Performance: Nigerian Companies Experience. *Kuwait Chapter of Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 1(6), 92-108.
- Phillips, L. D., & Costa, C. A. B. (2007). Transparent prioritisation, budgeting and resource allocation with multi-criteria decision analysis and decision conferencing. *Annals of Operations Research*, 154(1), 51-68.
- Rehman, S. U., Mohamed, R., & Ayoup, H. (2019). The mediating role of organizational capabilities between organizational performance and its determinants. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1), 1-23.
- Rouse, M. (2019). "Definition: resource allocation." *TechTarget*. Accessed April 22, 2020. <http://searchcio.techtarget.com/definition/resource-allocation>.
- Sani, A., & Maharani, V. (2012). The impacts of transformational leadership and organizational commitment on job performance with the among lecturers of faculty in the Islamic Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang University: The mediating effects of organizational citizenship behavior. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 4(4), 102-106.
- Santhanam, R., & Kyparisis, J. (1995). A multiple criteria decision model for information system project selection. *Computers & Operations Research*, 22(8), 807-818.
- Scarmozzino, E., & Corvello, V. (2017). Employee Creativity to Deliver Organizational Performance Improvements: A Multiple Case Study Research Design. In *Integrating Art and Creativity into Business Practice* (pp. 21-39). IGI Global.

- Scheepers, M. J., Hough, J., & Bloom, J. Z. (2008). Nurturing the corporate entrepreneurship capability. *Southern African Business Review*, 12(3), 50-75.
- Schmitt, A., Den Hartog, D. N., & Belschak, F. D. (2016). Transformational leadership and proactive work behaviour: A moderated mediation model including work engagement and job strain. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 89(3), 588-610.
- Shuqair, H. I., & Abdel-Aziz, D. M. (2015). Efficient and strategic resource allocation for sustainable development in Jordan. *Journal of Architectural Engineering Technology*, 4(1), 138.
- Siddiqi, H., & Qureshi, M. (2016). The impact of employees' creativity on the performance of the firm. *Research issues in social sciences*, 1,(2016) 1-12.
- Silitonga, P. E. S., & Widodo, D. S. (2017). Analysis of the effect of organizational commitment on organizational performance in mediation of job satisfaction (Study on Bekasi City Government). *International Journal of Economic Research*, 14(8), 75-90.
- Tashi, I., & Ghernaouti-Helie, S. (2011). *Information Security Evaluation: A Holistic Approach from a Business Perspective*. CRC Press.
- Teck-Hong, T., & Yong-Kean, L. (2012). Organizational Commitment as a Moderator of the Effect of Training on Service Performance: An Empirical Study of Small- to Medium-Sized Enterprises in Malaysia. *International Journal of Management*, 29(1), 65.
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/096317910X502359>
- Thornberry, N. (2006). *Lead like an entrepreneur*. McGraw Hill Professional.
- Wambugu, A. W., Gichira, R. & Wanjau, K. N. (2015). The Relationship Between Proactiveness And Performance of Small and Medium Agro Processing Enterprises In Kenya. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 3(12), 58-72.
- Weinzimmer, L. G., Michel, E. J., & Franczak, J. L. (2011). Creativity and Firm-Level Performance: The Mediating Effects of Action Orientation. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 23(1), 62–82. JSTOR.
- Wu, C., & Wang, Y. (2011). Understanding proactive leadership. In *Advances in global leadership* (pp. 299-314). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Zahra, S. A. (1986, August). A Canonical Analysis of Corporate Entrepreneurship Antecedents and Impact on Performance. In *Academy of management proceedings* (Vol. 1986, No. 1, pp. 71-75). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.
- Zehir, C., Can, E., & Karaboga, T. (2015). Linking Entrepreneurial Orientation to Firm Performance: The Role of Differentiation Strategy and Innovation Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 210(2015), 358-367.

