

## Exploring the Impact of Strategic Intelligence on Entrepreneurial Orientation: A practical Study on the Jordanian Diversified Financial Services Companies

**Ahmad Nasser Abuzaid**

*Business Administration Department, Business Faculty*

*Tafila Technical University, Tafila, Jordan*

**[Abstract]** Due to the turbulent business environment which characterized by constant changes and the hyper competition that came as a result of technological advancement and using the innovative ways in conducting business, the organizations need to adopt the entrepreneurial orientation that enables them to achieve the superiority over competitors and preserve its survival. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to identify the impact of strategic intelligence on the entrepreneurial orientation of the (36) Jordanian diversified financial services companies listed in Amman stock exchange. The sample of the study includes all the study population. The sampling unit and analysis (respondents) composed of the Chairman of Board of Directors, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and Executive Vice President of all the target companies. In order to achieve the study objectives, the researcher designed a questionnaire to collect the required data from study sample. To test the hypotheses the multiple regression analysis used. Empirical results indicated that the strategic intelligence has a positive impact on entrepreneurial orientation. Based on the results of the study, the organizations need to embrace and promote the strategic intelligence within it to ensure the successful implementation of its entrepreneurial orientation, and thus achieve superior business performance, increase their competitiveness, and differentiate itself from its competitors. In addition, researchers should conduct additional studies in strategic intelligence and entrepreneurial orientation in the different industries and contexts, especially in the manufacturing companies and taking other dimensions of strategic intelligence rather than foresight, visioning, and motivating.

**[Keywords]** Strategic Intelligence, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Risk Taking, Innovativeness, Proactiveness, Competitive Aggressiveness.

### Introduction

The current business environment is characterized by turbulent, complexity, and hyper competition because of technological advancement and continuous changes in customer needs and using the innovative ways in conducting business. Under this type of business environment organizations required to be superior in their performance, striving to achieve competitiveness, and differentiation from its competitors. In order to meet these requirements, the successful organizations apply and practice an entrepreneurial orientation (Vij & Bedi, 2012).

The literature of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation strategic management has identified entrepreneurial orientation as the most important concept for superior business performance (Rauch et al., 2009; Saeed et al., 2014). In addition, organizations that striving to achieve competitiveness understand and promote entrepreneurial orientation (Rahimić & Vuk, 2012). The organizations with higher entrepreneurial orientation have a greater chance to determine and act upon market opportunities (Eggers, Hansen, & Davis, 2012). One of the useful techniques that making the organizations able to achieve the excellence and entrepreneurship is the applying of strategic intelligence.

Strategic intelligence can facilitate the entrepreneurial orientation through providing useful information for organizations about their business environment, competitors, customers, and markets that are needed to anticipate changes and design appropriate strategies. thus the organizations will have a clear understanding of the consequences of strategic planning, and properly budget resources for new initiatives, ongoing commitment to champion the latest updates in product and technology, to advance existing products in a new market, or to introduce new products to existing customers, have a position to shape the industry, by combining innovation and careful planning of the organization's future, and invokes the

organization's ability to reflect on the past, understand current competitive actions, and predict future trends in the industry.

Through reviewing the literature there is a lack in studies and researches that measured the direct impact of strategic intelligence on entrepreneurial orientation. Most of the previous studies used the entrepreneurial orientation as independent variable and measured its impact on the performance for example (Brouthers et al, 2015; Engelen, 2015; Zhao, 2011; Rauch et al., 2009; Richard et al., 2009; Keh, 2007). regardless the results revealed by previous studies which confirmed that the entrepreneurial orientation considered as the most important way for superior business performance, but there are a lack in studies that shown how to enhance the entrepreneurial orientation, or identified the techniques that contributes to implements the entrepreneurial orientation in the successful way. In order to enrich the literature this research aims to test the impact of strategic intelligence on entrepreneurial orientation in the Jordanian diversified financial services companies listed in Amman stock exchange to answer the research main question: what is the impact of strategic intelligence on entrepreneurial orientation?

To answer this question first we need to understand some key concepts.

**Strategic Intelligence.** Strategic intelligence defined as a process or a tool for gathering the information that help decisions makers to obtain the knowledge that support the decision taking through the environmental scanning for the organization and then analyzing the information, and the ability to forecast and future planning and the adaptation with environment changes. Pirttimaki (2007) defined strategic intelligence as realistic understanding of situations and using it to develop appropriate strategies and adapting the workplace to different situations. According to (Fleisher & Bensoussan, 2007) strategic intelligence is the gathering, analysis, and dissemination of data relevant to strategic decision making.

Through strategic intelligence organizations can obtain useful information about their business environment that are needed to anticipate changes and design appropriate strategies that will create value and build the future growth of profitability the new markets within or in other industries (Marchand & Hykes, 2007).

The importance of strategic intelligence summarized in its role in qualifying the organizations to be able to conduct the innovation and formulating innovative change strategies, taking the decisions in effective way, achieving superior competitive position comparing with others. Maccoby (2011) identified the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimension of strategic intelligence, and this dimensions adopted in the current study.

**Foresight.** Foresight is the capability to understand the forces shaping the future and to intuit and foresee new opportunities and threats that might redefine the business, it is an approach that evaluates the past and the present to make forecasts of what the future will or should be depending on the continuation of dynamic developments from the past to the future (Maccoby, 2011).

**Visioning.** visioning reflect the leader's ability to see the organization's future clearly and completely, and it include the desire to change the current situation, the tendency to adopt goals completely different from the existing goals, the ability to determine opportunities in the environment, the formation of a long term growth path for their organizations, and the capability to communicate it to all people in the organization. It is a process that happens over time. It requires engaging people in understanding what the ideal is, and compelling them to collaboratively move in that direction (Maccoby, 2011).

**Motivating.** Motivation is about getting people to embrace a common purpose and to implement that vision. Vision is not just something to talk about, it's something to move toward in one's work, (Maccoby, 2011). Motivating includes the leader's ability to carry out the various goals and plans of the new vision and put strategic goals and plans into place, the ability to encourage employees on active participation in implementing plans, the ability to inspiration and motivation of employees to achieve high performance.

**Entrepreneurial Orientation.** Entrepreneurship is the process entrepreneurs follow to discover new opportunities, whereas organizations' entrepreneurial orientation is the process that puts the organization's entrepreneurship into action. Entrepreneurial orientation is the organization's strategic tool in finding new entries in the market by employing entrepreneurial practices, approaches, and decision-making styles (Covin and Slevin, 1989). Entrepreneurial orientation can be defined as a strategic orientation adopted by

top management and include the innovation in introduced products and services and challenge the competitors and moving quickly to face the competitor's movements toward the new opportunities and achieving the superiority over the competitors (Wang, 2008).

According to Miller (1983) the organizations that have the entrepreneurial orientation described as an innovative, risky, and proactive. Thus, describe the strategic situation taken by the owners and managers of entrepreneurial orientation organizations, which they are described in high level of venturing and forecasting, and the orientation toward developing and introducing new and innovating products and services to the markets. Miller (1983) defined an entrepreneurial organization as one that offers innovative products and services, assumes risky ventures with clear consequences, and is the first to develop and employ a new strategic approach. An entrepreneurial oriented organization is innovative by developing and adopting new strategies, proactive by understanding the right factors that contribute to success, and is knowledgeable that taking risks will contribute to increasing the business performance (Wang, 2008). Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) is the structural foundation for entrepreneurial decisions and activities (Covin & Miller, 2014). Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, and Frese (2009) viewed EO of the organization as a top manager's ability to implement entrepreneurship into the company's strategy to achieve its purpose, support its vision, and create competitive advantage(s).

Khandwalla (1977), Covin and Slevin (1989), Miller and Friesen (1982), and Miller (1983) identified three dimensions of EO: innovation, proactivity, and risk taking. Miller proposed that an entrepreneurial firm is one that sells innovative products, assumes somewhat risky projects and proactively assessing the environment to increase challenges among rivals. Lumpkin and Dess (1996a) recognized to sell innovative products successful firms foster autonomy and compete aggressively. We added autonomy and competitive aggressiveness as two more dimensions of EO.

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) identified Autonomy, Innovativeness, Risk taking, Proactivity, and competitive aggressiveness as a dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation. Based on Lumpkin and Dess work the current study adopted Innovativeness, Risk taking, Proactivity, and competitive aggressiveness to reflect the entrepreneurial orientation.

**Risk Taking.** Lumpkin and Dess (1996a) described risk taking as a readiness to allocate proper resources to initiate and complete projects that involve uncertainty regarding the outcomes. Risk aversion boosts the organization's attitude to search for new opportunities likely to increase performance (Miller & Friesen, 1982). Dickson and Giglierano (1986) suggested that risk links with any type of investment activities. Mishra, Barclay, and Lalumière (2014) concurred that the bigger the risk organization can take, the greater the returns maybe. Mishra et al. considered leaders of organizations who take greater risks than their competition are more entrepreneurial. In contrast, Elston and Audretsch (2011) suggested that the level of risk taking might be the same between entrepreneurial and non-entrepreneurial organizations.

**Innovativeness.** Innovation considers as a crucial strategic thrust that plays a significant role in the organization's survival and prosperity at all organization sizes and in every industry (Utterback, 1994) and it is the core of entrepreneurship. Innovation is something that is new or improved done by the organization to create significantly added value either directly for the enterprise or directly for its customer (Carnegie & Butlin, 1993). Many scholars argue that Innovation is more than the generation of creative ideas; it is the practical implementation of those ideas into some new device or process (Schilling, 2008).

There is a numerous classification for innovation, among of them radical innovation versus incremental innovation. According to (Garcia & Calantone, 2002; Koberg, Detienne, & Heppard, 2003) incremental innovation defined as product improvements and line extensions that are designed to meet the needs to existing customers or markets. It includes the products that provide new features, benefits, or improvements to the existing technology in the existing market. Incremental innovation might not be particularly new or exceptional; it might have been previously known to the organization or industry, and involve only a minor change from (or adjustment to) existing practices. Radical innovation is defined as product innovations that are new to the organization and/or the industry, and offer substantial new benefits to customers. It embodies a new technology that results in a new market infrastructure (Chandy & Tellis, 2000).

**Proactivity.** Refers to the organization efforts in acquisition of new opportunities, and monitoring the trends to identify the future requirements of current customers, and recognition of changes that may lead to new projects opportunities. Proactivity does not include only the recognition of changes but also the ability to work on it and achieve the superiority over the competitors. The term proactivity defined by (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996) as acting in anticipation of future problems, needs or changes. Related to processes, seeking to anticipate and act upon future needs, searching for new opportunities that may or may not be related to the current line of operations, introduction of new products/trademarks ahead of the competition (Venkatraman, 1989).

**Competitive Aggressiveness.** Lumpkin and Dess (1996a) developed Miller's 1983 definition of an entrepreneurial firm of "beating competitors to the punch," and claimed competitive aggressiveness as an important dimension of EO. Competitive aggressiveness refers to the type of power that the organizations need to compete among rivals. Covin and Slevin (1989) reported that competitive aggressiveness is highly correlated with entrepreneurship. Competitive aggressiveness alludes to how organizations react to competitive movements in the current market (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). Competitive aggressiveness defined the organization's ability to shape and challenge its rivals to accomplish market entry or improve its strategic position, and to outperform competitors in the marketplace (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996a). According to Chen (1996), competitive aggressiveness may include the use of confrontational approaches such as fast follower strategy or reactive approach when competitive challenges exist.

### Study Hypothesis

The study mainly aimed to examine the impact of strategic intelligence on entrepreneurial orientation. Therefore, the main hypothesis is:

H0: There is no impact with statistical significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) of strategic intelligence on entrepreneurial orientation. This hypothesis generates the following sub-hypotheses:

H01: There is no impact with statistical significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) of strategic intelligence on risk taking.

H02: There is no impact with statistical significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) of strategic intelligence on innovativeness.

H03: There is no impact with statistical significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) of strategic intelligence on proactivity.

H04: There is no impact with statistical significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) of strategic intelligence on competitive aggressiveness.

### Methodology

The study adopted the descriptive and field analytical methodology. In the descriptive methodology, the literature related to the strategic intelligence and entrepreneurial orientation was reviewed in order to build the theoretical framework of the study and developing the questionnaire. In the field, analytical methodology, a field survey was conducted in order to collect the required data through the questionnaire distributed, and the statistical techniques such as (Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance Inflation Factory (VIF) Test, Tolerance Test, Skewness Test, and Multiple Regression) were used to describe and analyze the collected data and to test the study hypotheses.

### Study Population and Sample

The study population consisted of all Jordanian companies working in diversified financial services sector and listed in Amman stock exchange, which amount (36) company. The study sample included all the study population. The sampling unit and analysis was all the Chairman of Board of Directors, Chief Executive Officer (CEO), and Executive Vice President of the target companies. Table 1 presents the characteristics of study sample in terms of their gender, years of experience in the company, educational level, and finally their age.

Table 1

*The Characteristics of Study Sample (Respondents)*

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	73	68.00
	Female	35	32.00
Years of experience	Less than ( 5) years	-	-
	From (5) to less than (10) years	18	17.00
	From (10) to less than (15) years	27	25.00
	From (15) to less than (20) years	35	32.00
	(20) years and above	28	26.00
Educational Level	Bachelor	41	38.00
	Master	39	36.00
	PhD	28	26.00
Age	Less than (30) years	-	-
	From (30) to less than (35) years	11	10.00
	From (35) to less than (40) years	37	34.00
	(41) years and above	60	56.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>108</b>	<b>100%</b>

***Study Instrument***

The study instrument included a questionnaire developed by reference to the theoretical literature related to the strategic intelligence and entrepreneurial orientation. The questionnaire composed of three parts: The first part covers the demographic variables of the respondents, such as the gender, experience, educational level, and the age. The second part of the questionnaire includes the paragraphs related to the strategic intelligence, which developed by the researcher. The third part of the questionnaire includes the paragraphs related to the entrepreneurial orientation which include risk taking that measured by (5) items, and innovativeness that measured by (6) items, and proactivity that measured by (6) items, and competitive aggressiveness that measured by (6) items. The paragraphs of third part adopted from (Hughes & Morgan, 2007) with some modifications from researcher. The answers to the second and third part of questionnaire relied on a Likert Scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1); disagree (2); moderately agree (3); I agree (4); and strongly agree (5).

***Instrument Validity***

The researcher offered the study instrument on a number of specialist academicians in the field of business administration, and research methodology, and according to their opinions; the language and words of questionnaire are clear. In addition, the questionnaire is adequate and fit to the present research.

***Instrument's Reliability***

The researcher determined the reliability of instrument by Cronbach alpha coefficients in order to ensure the internal consistency among questionnaire items. The alpha values was (0.87) for the strategic intelligence and (0.83) for entrepreneurial orientation items and (0.81) for the instrument as a whole. These values are excellent because it is higher than the acceptable value (60%) and it is acceptable for the purposes of this research.

## Results and Discussion

### Data Presentation

The means and standard deviations for the respondent's answers on the questionnaire items related to the strategic intelligence and entrepreneurial orientation introduced in the table 2 and table 3. Where table 2 presents the means and standard deviations for the respondent's answers on the questionnaire items related to the strategic intelligence, while table (3) presents the means and standard deviations for the respondent's answers on the questionnaire items related to the entrepreneurial orientation.

Table 2

*The Means and Standard Deviations for the Respondent's Answers on the Questionnaire Items Related to the Strategic Intelligence*

<b>Foresight</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
1. The company work on diagnose and identify the opportunities continuously.	4.19	0.974
2. The company takes the strategic decisions at appropriate time.	3.98	0.939
3. The company accepts the alternative ideas.	3.96	0.852
4. The company is seeking to diagnose uncertainty states and dealing with it in rational way.	4.08	0.905
5. The company generates alternative paths for the future based on the information from external environment.	4.02	0.833
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.046</b>	
<b>Visioning</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
6. We have a comprehensive vision that enables us to identify the direction of a company.	4.27	0.861
7. We use our vision to unify all staff efforts toward achieving company purpose.	4.11	0.849
8. We have the capability to convert the vision into reality under the umbrella of company goals and mission.	3.94	0.799
9. We use our vision to take the right decisions.	4.06	0.905
10. We use our vision to figure out the unseen and deal with it.	3.89	0.960
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.054</b>	
<b>Motivating</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard deviation</b>
11. I have the ability to direct the employees to implement the vision.	3.90	0.970
12. We create a positive competition among our staff to receive more achievements.	4.22	0.916
13. We use several kinds of incentives to motivate staff.	4.16	0.962
14. We encourage the staff to participate in decisions making process.	4.011	0.836
15. We encourage the effective communication among staff.	3.82	0.894
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.022</b>	

As shown in table 2 the results indicate that the respondents in the Jordanian diversified financial services companies have a high visioning with average of means (4.054). And the paragraph (the company work on diagnose and identify the opportunities continuously) has the highest mean (4.19) while the paragraph (the company accepts the alternative ideas) has the lowest mean (3.96) within foresight. In addition, the results shown that the paragraph (We have a comprehensive vision that enables us to identify the direction of a company) has the highest mean (4.27) while the paragraph (We use our vision to figure out the unseen and deal with it) has the lowest mean (3.89) within visioning. And finally, the results from table 2 shown that the paragraph (We create a positive competition among our staff to receive more achievements) has the highest mean (4.22) while the paragraph (We encourage the effective communication

among staff) has the lowest mean (3.82) within motivating.

Table 3

*The Means and Standard Deviations for the Respondent's Answers on the Questionnaire Items Related to the Entrepreneurial Orientation*

<b>Risk Taking</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard Deviations</b>
16. The company invests in the projects that have high risk.	4.39	0.993
17. The company invests in high-tech technology to introduce its products and services.	3.97	0.981
18. The company takes bold decisions despite the uncertainty state.	4.30	0.924
19. The philosophy of top management confirms on developing and improving the services and products regardless of financial state.	3.95	0.892
20. The company invest in the opportunities available in its business environment without fear from its risks.	4.36	0.885
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.194</b>	-
<b>Innovativeness</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard Deviations</b>
21. We actively introduce improvements and innovations in our Business.	4.25	0.911
22. Our business is creative in its methods of operation.	4.19	0.899
23. We introduce improved, but existing services for our local market.	3.87	0.877
24. Our business seeks out new ways to do things.	3.98	0.920
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.073</b>	-
<b>Proactivity</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard Deviations</b>
25. We always try to take the initiative in every situation against competitors.	4.33	0.917
26. In general, my company strives to be the 'first in', thus reaping all the benefits of being a pioneer in its field.	3.91	0.881
27. We excel at identifying opportunities.	3.99	0.852
28. We initiate actions to which other organizations respond	3.97	0.860
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.050</b>	-
<b>Competitive Aggressiveness</b>	<b>Means</b>	<b>Standard Deviations</b>
29. The company face its competitors in nontraditional competitive methods	4.30	1.06
30. The company respond directly with the same level if it is exposed to heavy pressure from competitors.	4.02	0.955
31. The company is working on inclusion new features in their services and products to superior the competitors	4.27	0.961
32. The company is trying to achieve the superiority over the other competitive companies by owning the means of contemporary technology in the provision of products and services	3.93	0.897
33. The company accelerate in response to any maneuver carried out by other competing companies	3.96	0.938
<b>Average</b>	<b>4.096</b>	-

As shown in table 3, the results indicate that the Jordanian diversified financial services companies

have a high entrepreneurial orientation especially in risk taking orientation with average of means (4.194) and aggressive competition with average of means (4.096). Also the results from table 3 shown that the paragraph (The company invests in the projects that have high risk) has the highest mean (4.39) within risk taking and the paragraph (We actively introduce improvements and innovations in our Business) has the highest mean (4.25) within innovativeness and the paragraph (We always try to take the initiative in every situation against competitors) has the highest mean (4.33) within proactivity and the paragraph (The company face its competitors in nontraditional competitive methods) has the highest mean (4.30) within aggressive competition.

### *Hypotheses Testing*

Before applying the regression analysis to testing the study hypothesis the researcher conducted the following tests to ensure the fitness of data for the regression analysis assumptions: Variance Inflation Factory (VIF) Test, and Tolerance Test to ensure there is no high correlation between the independent variables (Multicollinearity), and Skewness Test to ensure the normal distribution of the data. The results of these tests presented in table 4.

Table 4

*The Results of VIF, Tolerance, and Skewnes Tests*

<b>Independent Variables</b>	<b>VIF</b>	<b>Tolerance</b>	<b>Skewness</b>
Foresight	2.57	0.451	0.604
Visioning	2.39	0.463	0.622
Motivating	2.61	0.428	0.584

As shown in table 4, the results indicate that the values of (VIF) for all variables less than (10) and the values of (Tolerance) higher than (0.05) which mean there is no high correlation (Multicollinearity) between the independent variables. Also the results from table 4 shown that the values of Skewness less than (1) which means the normal distribution of the data. Based on these results the multiple linear regression analysis conducted to test the study hypothesis. Table 5 presents the model summary, and table 6 presents ANOVA analysis and tables 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 presents beta and t values for the research hypotheses.

Table 5

*The Model Summary*

<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of The Estimate</b>
1	0.901	0.810	0.742	0.381

\*Predictors: (Constant), Foresight, Visioning, Motivating.

As shown in table 5, the results indicate that the value of R square is (0.81) and this value means that the model explains (81 %) from the variance in the dependent variable (entrepreneurial orientation) by strategic intelligence.

Table 6

*ANOVA Analysis*

<b>Model</b>	<b>Sum of Squares</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>Mean Square</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>Sig.</b>
1 Regression	452.619	4	61.417	1193.622	0.000
Residual	45.093	104	0.073		
Total	497.712	108			

\*Predictors: (Constant), Foresight, Visioning, Motivating. \*\*Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Orientation



As shown in table 6, the results indicate that the value of (F) is (1193.622) with significant (0.000) which is lower than the specified value (0.05) so the model is fit and acceptable.

Table 7

*Beta and T Values for the Main Study Hypothesis*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t.	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 ( Constant)	0.083	0.068			
Foresight	0.703	0.047	0.772	39.274	0.000
Visioning	0.725	0.039	0.791	43.917	0.000
Motivating	0.711	0.041	0.784	41.250	0.000

\*Significant at the level of statistical significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

\*\*Dependent Variable: Entrepreneurial Orientation

As shown in table 7, the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that the strategic intelligence affects the organizational entrepreneurial orientation. The values of beta and t-tests shown that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimension of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on entrepreneurial orientation at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and the highest impact for visioning, then motivating while the lowest impact for foresight.

Table 8

*Beta and T Values for the First Sub Hypothesis*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t.	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 ( Constant)	0.075	0.061			
Foresight	0.694	0.039	0.738	32.729	0.000
Visioning	0.709	0.022	0.753	34.616	0.000
Motivating	0.701	0.029	0.745	33.119	0.000

\*Significant at the level of statistical significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ )

\*\* Dependent Variable: Risk Taking

As shown in table 8, the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that the strategic intelligence affects the risk taking. The values of beta and t-tests shown that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimension of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on risk taking at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and the highest impact for visioning, then motivating while the lowest impact for foresight.

Table 9

*Beta and T Values for the Second Sub Hypothesis*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t.	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	0.069	0.051			
Foresight	0.655	0.031	0.692	30.041	0.000
Visioning	0.673	0.028	0.711	31.411	0.000
Motivating	0.664	0.021	0.698	30.990	0.000

\*Significant at the level of statistical significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) \*\* Dependent Variable: Innovativeness

As shown in table (9) the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that the strategic intelligence affects the innovativeness. The values of beta and t-tests shown that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimensions of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on innovativeness at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and the highest impact for visioning, then motivating while the lowest impact for foresight.

Table 10

*Beta and T Values for the Third Sub Hypothesis*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t.	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	0.077	0.063			
Foresight	0.733	0.038	0.781	33.529	0.000
Visioning	0.761	0.035	0.792	35.019	0.000
Motivating	0.751	0.027	0.783	34.117	0.000

\*Significant at the level of statistical significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) \*\* Dependent Variable: Proactivity

As shown in table (10) the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that the strategic intelligence affects the proactivity. The values of beta and t-tests shown that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimensions of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on proactivity at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and the highest impact for visioning, then motivating while the lowest impact for foresight.

Table 11

*Beta And T Values For The Fourth Sub Hypothesis*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t.	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	0.085	0.074			
Foresight	0.717	0.038	0.741	32.903	0.000
Visioning	0.748	0.032	0.779	34.830	0.000
Motivating	0.769	0.035	0.790	35.702	0.000

\*Significant at the level of statistical significance ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) \*\* Dependent Variable: Competitive Aggressiveness

As shown in table (11) the results of multiple regression analysis indicate that the strategic intelligence affects the competitive aggressiveness. The values of beta and t-tests shown that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimension of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on competitive aggressiveness at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) and the highest impact for motivating, then visioning while the lowest impact for foresight.

### Conclusion and Recommendations

The current study examined the impact of strategic intelligence in terms of (foresight, visioning, and motivating) on entrepreneurial orientation. Empirical results found that the foresight, visioning, and motivating as a dimensions of strategic intelligence has a positive impact on the entrepreneurial orientation and the highest impact for visioning, then motivating while the lowest impact for foresight. Based on the results the organizations need to embrace and promote the strategic intelligence within it through enhance the capabilities of their top management in articulating a clear vision and getting people to embrace a common purpose and to implement that vision. In addition, improve the foresight of their top management to understand the forces shaping the future. By doing this, the organizations will ensures the successful implementation of its entrepreneurial orientation, and thus achieve superior business performance, increase their competitiveness, and differentiate itself from its competitors.

### Future Researches

The current study and its results limited to the Jordanian diversified financial services companies, therefore there are a need for conducting more researches and studies on the subject of strategic intelligence and entrepreneurial orientation in the different sectors and industries and contexts, especially in the manufacturing companies. In addition, the current study measured the strategic intelligence in terms of foresight, visioning, and motivating so there is a need to take another dimension of strategic intelligence.

### References

- Brouters, K. D., Nakos, G. & Dimitratos, P. (2015). SME entrepreneurial orientation, international performance, and the moderating role of strategic alliances. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39, 1161–1187. doi:10.1111/etap.12101
- Carnegie, R., & Butlin, M. (1993). Managing the innovative enterprise: Australian companies competing against the World's best. Business Council of Australia, Melbourne.
- Chandy, R. K., & Tellis, G. J. (2000). The incumbent's Curse? Incumbency, size, and radical product innovation. *Journal of Marketing*, 64(3), 1-17.
- Covin, J. G., & Miller, D. (2014). International entrepreneurial orientation: Conceptual considerations, research themes, measurement issues, and future research directions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 38(1), 11-44. doi:10.1111/etap.12027
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87. doi:10.1002 /smj.4250100107
- Dickson, P. R., & Giglierano, J. J. (1986). Missing the boat and sinking the boat: A conceptual model of entrepreneurial risk. *Journal of Marketing*, 50(3), 58-70. doi:10.2307/1251585
- Eggers, F., Hansen, D. J., & Davis, A. E. (2012). Examining the relationship between customer and entrepreneurial orientation on nascent firms' marketing strategy. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 8(2), 203-222. doi:10.1007/s11365-011-0173-4
- Elston, J. A., & Audretsch, D. B. (2011). Financing the entrepreneurial decision: An empirical approach using experimental data on risk attitudes. *Small Business Economics*, 36(2), 209-222. doi:10.1007/s11187-009-9210-x
- Engelen, A., Strenger, V. G., & Brettel, M. (2015). Entrepreneurial Orientation, Firm Performance, and the Moderating Role of Transformational Leadership Behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 41(4), 1069-1097. 10.1177/0149206312455244
- Fleisher, C., & Bensoussan, B. (2007). *Business and Competitive Analysis: Effective application*.

- Upper Saddle River: FT Press.
- Garcia, R., & Calantone, R. (2002). A Critical look at technological innovation typology and innovativeness terminology. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 19(2), 110-132.
- 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. doi:10.1016/j.indmarman.2006.04.003
- Keh, H. T., Mai Nguyen, T. T., & Ping Ng, H. (2007). The effects of entrepreneurial orientation and marketing information on the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 592-611. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.05.003>.
- Khandwalla, P. N. (1977). Some top management styles, their context and performance. *Organization & Administrative Sciences*, 7(4), 21-51.
- Koberg, C. S., Detienne, D. R., & Heppard, K. A. (2003). An Empirical Test of Environmental, Organizational, and Process Factors Affecting Incremental and Radical Innovation. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 14(1), 21-45.
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996a). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172. doi:10.5465/AMR.1996.9602161568
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996b). Enriching the entrepreneurial orientation construct--a reply to entrepreneurial orientation or pioneer advantage. *The Academy of Management Review*, 21(3), 605-607. Retrieved from <http://aom.org/amr/>
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 429-451. doi:10.1016/S0883-9026(00)00048-3
- Maccoby, M. (2011). Strategic Intelligence: conceptual system of leadership for change. *Performance Improvement*, 31-40.
- Marchand, D., & Hykes, A. (2007). Leveraging What Your Company Really Knows: A Process View of Strategic Intelligence. IN Xu, M. ed. *Managing Strategic Intelligence – Techniques and Technologies*. University of Portsmouth, UK: Idea Group Inc.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770-791. doi:10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P. H. (1982). Innovation in conservative and entrepreneurial firms: Two models of strategic momentum. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(1), 1-25. doi:10.1002/smj.4250030102
- Mishra, S., Barclay, P., & Lalumière, M. L. (2014). Competitive disadvantage facilitates risk taking. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 35(2), 126-132. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.11.006
- Pirttimäki, V. (2007). Business Intelligence as a Managerial Tool in Large Finnish Companies. Doctoral Dissertation, Tampere.
- Rahimić, Z., & Vuk, S. (2012). *Evaluating the effects of employees' education in B&H companies*. Conference Proceedings: International Conference of the Faculty of Economics Sarajevo (ICES), 1044-1057.
- 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 & Practice*, 33(3), 761-787. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00308.x
- Richard, O. C., Wu, P., & Chadwick, K. (2009) The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance: the role of CEO position tenure and industry tenure. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20(5), 1078-1095. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190902850281>
- Saeed, S., Yousafzai, S. Y., & Engelen, A. (2014). On cultural and macroeconomic contingencies of the entrepreneurial orientation–performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), 255-290. doi:10.1111/etap.12097
- Schilling, M.A. (2008). *Strategic management of technological innovation*. Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Utterback, J. (1994). *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). Strategic orientation of business enterprises: The construct, dimensionality, and

- measurement. *Management Science*, 35(8), 942-962.
- Vij, S., & Bedi, H. S. (2012). Relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: A review of literature. *IUP Journal of Business Strategy*, 9(3), 17-31. Retrieved from <http://www.iupindia.in/608/ijbs.asp>
- Wang, C. L. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(4), 635-656. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6520.2008.00246.x
- Zhao, Y., Li, Y., Lee, S. H., & Chen, L. B. (2011). Entrepreneurial Orientation, Organizational Learning, and Performance: Evidence From China. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35, 293-317.