

STRATEGIC ENTREPRENEURSHIP FROM MIDDLE MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVE

Şükran Gökçe¹, M. Atilla Arıcıoğlu²

¹ Res. Asst., Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey, E-mail address: sgokce@erbakan.edu.tr

² Prof. Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey, E-mail address: maricioglu@erbakan.edu.tr

Received 17 07 2023; Accepted 25 07 2023

Abstract

Considering its dual focus on creating competitive advantage and utilizing new opportunities, the interest in Strategic Entrepreneurship (SE) research has increased rapidly over the last two decades, and the relationship of this concept with other fields is also under scrutiny. The literature on middle management has also taken its share from this increasing interest. It is argued in the relevant literature that middle manager roles serve as the foundation of the company's strategic entrepreneurship. The present study aims at showcasing the relationships between the two basic academic disciplines. In order to test this aim, a total of 330 questionnaires were applied to mid-level managers of medium-sized enterprises in Bursa, Sakarya, Istanbul, Kocaeli and Konya provinces operating in Turkey and leading in the automotive supply industry. It is thought that the four basic strategic roles of middle managers significantly relate to the four dimensions that reveal the SE of the enterprises. The successful integration of these two fields can pave the way for the development of a new and important perspective for both researchers and practitioners. Moreover, the implications of the study will shed light on future research and applications on the integration of these two subjects, which are scarce in the existing literature.

Keywords: *integration, middle management, middle manager, strategic entrepreneurship (SE), strategic roles.*

JEL Codes: *L10, L26, M12.*

Introduction

The new living environment of the business world and companies emphasises the indispensability of the existence of change. This is the context in which technology has brought competition to a new dimension through digital transformation (Bettis and Hitt, 1995; Ireland and Hitt, 1999). However, it should not be forgotten that change brings new opportunities, and companies endeavour to capitalise on these opportunities (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

In this context, entrepreneurship is one of the most well-known efforts of companies and managers to achieve success in competition. Because the basis of entrepreneurship lies in seizing opportunities and achieving success in the new understanding of competitiveness. Especially motivation, which includes a long-term

perspective and willingness for sustainable success, plays an important role in this process. As a matter of fact, all levels of management, especially senior managers, play an important role in integrating the strategic and entrepreneurial dimensions of SE. In this study, firstly entrepreneurship is discussed in relation to the SE process, then the conceptual framework of strategic entrepreneurship is discussed and finally the relationship between strategic entrepreneurship and middle managers is discussed. The relationship between the discussion and strategic entrepreneurship is analysed through field research and the relationship between them is tried to be described.

A Short Conceptual Framework for Entrepreneurship

The ability of organisations to adapt to an evolving and rapidly changing world depends on how uncertainties are managed and the level of proactive behaviour (McGrath and MacMillan, 2000: 1). Because entrepreneurship involves identifying and exploiting opportunities in an uncertain environment regardless of the availability of resources (Stevenson et al., 1983). Especially in parallel with the economic developments, new features have been added to the definition of entrepreneur over time. For example, Say mentions that in the 1800s, the entrepreneur was a contractor who mediated between capital and labour. Schumpeter, on the other hand, emphasises the necessity for the entrepreneur to be innovative and dynamic. Another emphasis is on the important contributions that entrepreneurship makes to the economic welfare of regions and nations, such as providing new employment opportunities by paving the way for the establishment of new enterprises through innovations and technological changes. Today, entrepreneurship, which is generally recognised as an incentive to create value as a result of the individual actions of firms (Peng, 2001), is seen as a way of coping with the new competitive environment and its tremendous pace of change (Brock and Evans, 1989; Hitt and Reed, 2000).

On Strategic Entrepreneurship

The relationship between strategy and entrepreneurship is a remarkable issue for both those working in the organisational field and those working on the impact of management on entrepreneurship (Acs and Audtretsch, 2003; Bruton et al. 2013). Because, the relationship between these two concepts describes a two-way relationship in creating added value. While discussions on the concept of entrepreneurship, which is in mutual interaction, aim to create value, those who research on strategy discuss how to create value (Pitelis, 2009). As a matter of fact, according to Dess et al. (1999: 85), not only those working in this field but also strategic

management researchers are making efforts to understand entrepreneurship. Schendel and Hofer (1979: 6) argue that the choice made by the entrepreneur is important in understanding strategy and strategic management. Because it is accepted that strategy paves the way with strategic thinking on the entrepreneur in both planning and implementation process (Zabriskie and Huellmantel, 1991). On the other hand, it is necessary to evaluate the relationship between these two concepts through the concept of opportunity. Because opportunities are guiding in the description of both concepts and in the understanding of competition (Hitt et al, 2001; Ireland et al, 2001).

In particular, the fact that competition has become increasingly difficult and complex has forced businesses to change and improve the way they create value for their stakeholders and achieve their goals (Hitt et al., 2001: 69). This need for change and development forces businesses to make a decision between doing the necessary activities to utilise today's competitive advantages while using their limited resources and skills and discovering innovations today that will provide competitive advantage to the firm in the future (Ireland and Webb, 2007: 50). For the solution of these challenges, entrepreneurship contributes by creating opportunities and strategic management contributes by turning these opportunities into competitive advantage.

Therefore, strategic entrepreneurship is the integration process of entrepreneurship and strategic management (Hitt et al., 2001: 480). As a matter of fact, Hitt, Ireland, Camp and Sexton (2001: 481) define it as the area where strategic understanding/thinking intersects with entrepreneurial understanding and claim that this is also necessary to create prosperity. Because researchers and practitioners working in the field of entrepreneurship and strategy show how to achieve competitiveness and sustainable success through this relationship (Alvarez and Busenitz, 2001). In this context, strategic entrepreneurship explains how competitiveness is integrated with strategy and how entrepreneurship is created through opportunities.

In this regard, Cooper (1979) plays a pioneering role with his researches. In particular, his analyses of the relationship between strategy, performance and entrepreneurship are pioneering. Venture creation and how it arises from the relationship between innovation and opportunity creation make important contributions to the understanding of a new paradigm for strategic management employees (Sandberg, 1992). However, the concept of strategic entrepreneurship is first encountered in Mintzberg's studies since the two thousand years. In 1973, Mintzberg talked about the entrepreneurial role of the manager who determines the strategy and the entrepreneurial organisational structure, and in 1975, under the name of entrepreneurship school, one of the ten schools of strategic management, he defined the concept of entrepreneurship from a strategic perspective as an element that can both facilitate and complicate the strategy process. These definitions have given a perspective to the concept of strategic entrepreneurship in its current meaning (Mintzberg, 1973). However, here, the concept of entrepreneurship is more of a complement to strategy or has different qualities from strategy. Looking at the academic literature, the special issue on "strategic entrepreneurship" in 2001 by Strategic Management Journal is important in terms of emphasising the concept. This special issue aims to encourage, develop and disseminate research that integrates entrepreneurship and strategic management perspectives. Many of the published articles focus on new and different entrepreneurial approaches and strategies. The studies link entrepreneurship and strategic management with new and different approaches such as creative destruction (discontinuities), resource-based view, organisational learning, network theory, transaction costs and institutional theory. These studies, which make important theoretical and empirical contributions to the field, provide a solid foundation for future research on strategic entrepreneurship. In addition, Hitt et al. published "Strategic

Entrepreneurship: Creating a New Mindset" published by Hitt et al. in 2002 has been an important reference for strategic entrepreneurship. These studies, on the one hand, bring the concept of strategic entrepreneurship to the agenda and, on the other hand, provide important steps in the formation of the literature (Foss & Lyngsie, 2011). In addition, the literature on the field is developing with contributions from many fields such as economics, psychology, sociology, organisational behaviour and organisation theory, but it has a scattered and fragmented literature.

The main dimensions of strategic entrepreneurship can be listed as follows (Ireland et al., 2003; Tantau et al., 2011):

a. Entrepreneurial culture includes the skills of risk-taking, dealing with uncertainty, opportunity chasing, flexibility, adaptability, living and managing in a chaotic environment. The culture in which these skills live naturally makes the entrepreneurial drive strong. Because being an entrepreneur teaches how to utilise opportunities in a timely, accurate and effective manner. It also shows how to deal with uncertainty and weaknesses.

b. The second dimension of strategic entrepreneurship is entrepreneurial leadership. Entrepreneurial leadership is about aligning resources and showing how the organisation should behave towards the goal. Especially considering the integrity of the strategy as a long-term process, developing the skills and discovering new talents of the companies is the ingenuity of the entrepreneurial leadership process. This also applies to the management of human resources and the harmonisation of employees with the environment.

c. Strategic entrepreneurship is the strategic management of resources. In the strategic management process, one of the defined objectives is how the resources of the companies will be used and become competitive in the long term. This includes not only the harmonisation of resources with the environment but also how all the resources used should be used for the sustainability of the company.

d. Finally, encouraging and managing creativity for innovation is another dimension of the strategic entrepreneurship approach. Especially with globalisation, the dimension of competitiveness has changed and the need for innovation has increased. As Tantau et al. (2011) says; An entrepreneur is an innovative person or organisation that implements change in the market. For this purpose, innovations can be made in the existence and quality of goods, production methods, exploration of new markets, renewal of supply sources and finally organisational form.

Importance of Middle Managers for Strategic Entrepreneurship

While Bower (1970) argues that middle managers are the architects of change, their contribution to business strategy and even how their strategic perspective (Zahra, 1991; Zahra & Covin, 1995) contributes to entrepreneurship is an important research topic. It is argued that the perspectives of these managers contribute to the creation of strategy (Bartlett & Ghoshal, 1993; Nonaka, 1994), strategy implementation (Floyd & Wooldridge, 1997) as well as strategic entrepreneurship. This situation, which is also a strategy learning process, is also important in terms of talent discovery and efforts to improve the process. The middle management perspective also sees the strategy process as a learning process. This process includes the discovery and development of new capabilities for long-term and sustainable competitive advantage (Floyd and Wooldridge, 2000).

In other words, middle managers are indispensable for the SE process (Kuratko, 2017). It is generally accepted that the middle level of management is above the operational structure for organisations and below the top managers (Dutton and Ashford, 1993). What makes them effective and differentiates them is that they have the power to integrate operational knowledge with top management. This highlights their ability to mediate and guide between the environment and the organisation, to carry information and to run effective operations (Hutzschenreuter and Kleindienst, 2006; Rouleau and Balogun, 2011). In addition, these managers collect and

analyse all reactions from the market and buyers, interpret this information and balance opportunities and threats (Dutton, Ashford and O'Neill 1997, Floyd and Wooldridge 1994, 1997, Van Cauwenbergh and Cool 1982, Wooldridge and Floyd 1990). The effectiveness of middle managers can be clearly seen in a study conducted by Balogun (2003). Using qualitative methodology, this study reveals how the influence of middle managers increases and how top managers can become uncertain.

In this context;

a. Implementation: The implementation of strategy is often seen as a routine of the top level. However, competitive and complex environment confronts organisations with new realities. In this case, while the roles of senior managers regarding the development of the strategy come to the fore, the task undertaken by the middle level for focus and implementation becomes more important. This is because middle managers, who manage the tactical proposals in the implementation process, also undertake resource management, which is indispensable for the existence of the strategy. In this case, implementation in the SE process plays a key role in achieving strategic advantage in a dynamic environment.

Hypothesis 1: The role of middle managers in the implementation process has a positive relationship with strategic resource management of SE.

b. Synthesis: According to Floyd and Wooldridge (1997), middle managers have a very central and decisive position and power in terms of organisational coordinates. This position highlights their role not only in the acquisition of knowledge but also in the transfer of knowledge by using their skills, expertise, etc. In other words, their synthesising power and analysing skills make them knowledge workers and operation experts (Dutton & Jackson, 1987). This role strengthens their ties with the environment and enables them to manage the data they obtain from the environment more easily and effectively. Thus, they contribute to the formation of the big picture and form the entrepreneurial mind with their comments.

Hypothesis 2: The synthesising role of middle managers is positively related to the entrepreneurial mindset dimension of SE.

c. Simplification/Facilitation:

Organisations aim to ensure that daily/routine operations run smoothly through the simple flow they have. Organisational flexibility contributes to this. Flexibility and simplicity are important for the correct functioning of the process and for the organisation to work in harmony with the environment. In this direction, middle managers take the initiative and find new and improvable ideas, which lead to flexibility, harmony and the right connection with the environment. Because these new and simple ideas are important for living in a dynamic and innovation-structured environment. What is more important is to find them and adapt them to the organisation (Kuratko et al., 2005). The facilitation process, managed by middle managers, creates the organisational culture necessary for innovation and creativity and contributes to the management of the entrepreneurial start-up with a balance of resource use.

Hypothesis 3: The facilitative role of middle managers is positively related to the entrepreneurial culture dimension of SE.

d. Championing: The creation of new capabilities and new variations of existing capabilities, creating new areas of use and thus supporting the strategic initiative has led to the emergence of this concept. For this, middle level managers are needed. This is because middle managers are called master translators who are able to understand the strategic development of the company, the market demand for different use of resources, the ability to reorganise and disrupt routines as well as manage them, and to see the future of the environment by going beyond the demands of the environment (Nordqvist and Melin,

2008: 327). This role is recommended to middle managers as a key role for SE and this role is recognised by internal and external stakeholders (Floyd and Wooldridge, 1997).

Hypothesis 4: The championing role of middle managers is positively related to the entrepreneurial leadership dimension of SE.

Methodology

In this study, we assume that middle management/manager roles serve as the foundation of the company's strategic entrepreneurship. At the same time, we aim to determine the relations between two distinct academic fields with each other. In order to test this assumption, a 31-item questionnaire was given to mid-level managers of medium-sized enterprises working for leading automotive supply companies in Bursa, Sakarya, Istanbul, Kocaeli and Konya provinces of Turkey. The measurement of strategic entrepreneurship was done with a statistically valid and reliable four-dimensional strategic entrepreneurship scale developed by Kimuli (2011). It was targeted to reach 330 middle managers. In this scale, there were 4 questions about entrepreneurial mindset, 4 questions about entrepreneurial culture, 3 questions about entrepreneurial leadership and 4 questions about strategic management of resources, which totals to 15 questions in the questionnaire. The scale was designed as a 5-point Likert scale. It was translated into Turkish by Türkmen and Yılmaz (2019) as a result of meticulous work. The second section was devoted to evaluating middle managers' actions and it was carried out by using a scale which was developed by Floyd and Wooldridge (1992) and previously used by Gokce et al. (2020). As a result of the fieldwork, 311 proper and evaluable questionnaires were obtained and analyzed.

| Strategic Roles of Middle Manager | | Dimensions of Strategic Entrepreneurship | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Facilitating | ← → | Entrepreneurial Culture | |
| Championing | ← → | Entrepreneurial Leadership | |
| Implementing | ← → | Managing Resources Strategically | |
| Synthesizing | ← → | Entrepreneurial Mindset | |

Figure 1. Research Model

As a result of the field research, it is expected to demonstrate a significant and strong relationship between the four strategic roles of middle managers and the four dimensions that reveal the strategic entrepreneurship of enterprises. In case the results of the analysis meet the expectations, the successful integration of these two fields can pave the way for the development of a new and important perspective for both researchers and practitioners. Another purpose is to present propositions that aim to shed light on future research and applications on these two subjects, which are very limited in the literature, based on the inferences from the analyses.

Findings

The scale was given out to 330 middle managers working in different departments of medium-scale enterprises operating in Turkey which have a leading position in the automotive supply industry in Bursa, Sakarya, Istanbul, Kocaeli and Konya provinces, yet readable and meaningful data could be obtained from 311 of the participants. Of the respondents, 47 (15.1%) were in Konya, 39 (12.5%) in Sakarya, 93 (29.9%) in Istanbul, 61 (19.6%) in Kocaeli, and 71 (22.8%) in Bursa. Due to both the development levels and population density in the automotive sector, it is understandable that Istanbul has more participants than the others.

Table 1. Participants' Cities

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|----------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Konya | 47 | 15,1 | 15,1 | 15,1 |
| | Sakarya | 39 | 12,5 | 12,5 | 27,7 |
| | İstanbul | 93 | 29,9 | 29,9 | 57,6 |
| | Kocaeli | 61 | 19,6 | 19,6 | 77,2 |
| | Bursa | 71 | 22,8 | 22,8 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 311 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

The research was completed with 311 participants, consisting of 156 (50.2%) males and 155 (49.8%) females. According to the results of the household labor force survey, 14.4% of senior and middle managers of companies was female in 2012, whereas it rose up to 19.3% in 2020. However, considering the

increasing education rate of women over the years (87.7% as of 2020) and the increase in the labor force participation rate of women with higher education degrees, the equal distribution of participants between genders is not surprising.

Table 2. Participants' Gender

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | Male | 156 | 50,2 | 50,2 | 50,2 |
| | Female | 155 | 49,8 | 49,8 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 311 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

As for the age scale of the participants, it can be seen that 22 of them (7.1%) are at and below 25 years, and 115 (37%) are aged 26 to 35. The number of managers between the ages of 36-45 is 106 (34.1%). The next sub-group consisted of those aged 46 to 55, which contained 55 participants (17.7%). There are

13 (4.2%) managers in the age group of 56 and over. When we look at the age distribution of middle level managers, it can be seen that there are 215 managers (71.1%) between the ages of 26 and 45. This represents a fairly understandable range for managers in the middle of their career.

Table 3. Participants' Age

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 25 years and below | 22 | 7,1 | 7,1 | 7,1 |
| | 26-35 | 115 | 37,0 | 37,0 | 44,1 |
| | 36- 45 | 106 | 34,1 | 34,1 | 78,1 |
| | 46 – 55 | 55 | 17,7 | 17,7 | 95,8 |
| | 56 and above | 13 | 4,2 | 4,2 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 311 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Distribution by professional experience in the current position shows that 103 (33.1%) managers have been working in the same place for 1 to 3 years; 66 (21.2%) for 4 to 7 years; 64 (20.6%) for 8 to 11 years; 33 (10.6%) for 12 to

15 years, and 45 managers (14.5%) have been working for 16 years and longer. The employment period of a significant one-third of the managers in the current position varies between one year and three years.

Table 4. Participants' Service Period in Current Company

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 1-3 | 103 | 33,1 | 33,1 | 33,1 |
| | 4-7 | 66 | 21,2 | 21,2 | 54,3 |
| | 8-11 | 64 | 20,6 | 20,6 | 74,9 |
| | 12-15 | 33 | 10,6 | 10,6 | 85,5 |
| | 16 years and above | 45 | 14,5 | 14,5 | 100,0 |
| | Total | 311 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

As regards the education level of the participants, a significant portion, 193 persons (62.1%), have a bachelor's degree. When master's and doctorate graduates are also counted in, 222 of the managers (71.4%) have education at undergraduate and graduate level.

This implies the importance of education level in adapting to the ever-changing and developing environment and thus to business life. As the level of education increases, the performance of the managers is also expected to be higher.

Table 5. Participants' Educational Level

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | High school | 46 | 14,8 | 14,8 | 14,8 |
| | Associate degree | 43 | 13,8 | 13,8 | 28,6 |
| | Bachelor | 193 | 62,1 | 62,1 | 90,7 |
| | Graduate | 28 | 9,0 | 9,0 | 99,7 |
| | PhD | 1 | ,3 | ,3 | 100,0 |
| Total | | 311 | 100,0 | 100,0 | |

Analyses

In order to test the validity of the findings obtained from the field research, factor analysis was performed. As a result of Bartlett's test and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)

sampling suitability test, the value obtained for KMO is .879 and the value obtained for Bartlett is .000 (for $p \leq .05$) and it is understood that it is suitable for factor analysis.

Table 6. KMO and Bartlett's Test

| | | |
|--|--------------------|----------|
| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy. | | ,879 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 4680,593 |
| | df | 465 |
| | Sig. | ,000 |

The questionnaire used for the field research was organised on a five-point Likert scale and consisted of 31 questions in total. The variables included in the questionnaire could be listed as follows; entrepreneurial oriented culture, entrepreneurial leadership, entrepreneurial mindset, strategic resource

management, championing role of the middle manager, facilitating role, synthesising role and implementation role. In the factor analysis, eleven questions that were not compatible with the factor distribution were removed. Eight factors to be used for the analysis emerged and are shown in Table 7.

Table 7. Results of Explanatory Factor Analysis on Variables

| Statement | | Factor load | Alpha | MO | AVE | CR |
|-----------|--|-------------|-------|--------|------|------|
| EOC | We possess more promising ideas than the time and resources that are available to us. | ,779 | 0,598 | 0,645* | 0,48 | 0,78 |
| | Changes in society rarely lead to commercially promising ideas in our company. | ,736 | | | | |
| | We always have ideas that can turn into profitable services. | ,649 | | | | |
| | We focus on improving our company's existing services. | ,584 | | | | |
| EL | Good interpersonal relations and courteous and diplomatic leadership come first for me as the founder. | ,771 | 0,572 | 0,631* | 0,55 | 0,79 |
| | My leadership comes from persuading others perfectly from my point of view. | ,753 | | | | |
| | We encourage people and try to build self-confidence through reassuring behavior and counselling. | ,705 | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------|---|------|-------|--------|------|------|
| EM | We passionately follow entrepreneurial opportunities. | ,867 | 0,748 | 0,632* | 0,59 | 0,85 |
| | We attach importance to following the most promising opportunities in a disciplined manner. | ,804 | | | | |
| | We usually focus on consistency of practices. | ,709 | | | | |
| | We focus on involving everyone in the process of identifying and pursuing venture opportunities. | ,668 | | | | |
| SRM | We often focus on certain resources of the company to maintain competitive advantage. | ,840 | 0,724 | 0,710* | 0,55 | 0,83 |
| | Our resources are strategically managed to exploit simultaneous opportunities and encourage advantage-seeking behavior. | ,764 | | | | |
| | Our managers have the ability to strategically structure the resource portfolio. | ,739 | | | | |
| | We encourage progressive and strategic monitoring of resource acquisition, retention and disposal. | ,611 | | | | |
| CRM | I explain the job description and necessity of new programs to my subordinates. | ,801 | 0,759 | 0,695* | 0,59 | 0,85 |
| | I thoroughly evaluate new offers. | ,794 | | | | |
| | I search for new opportunities. | ,736 | | | | |
| | I recommend projects/programs to senior managers. | ,734 | | | | |
| FRM | I encourage informal interviewing, discussion and information sharing. | ,823 | 0,740 | 0,654* | 0,56 | 0,84 |
| | I soften the arrangement as needed so that new projects can be launched. | ,786 | | | | |
| | I make time for experimental programs. | ,746 | | | | |
| | I make time for research projects. | ,639 | | | | |
| SRMM | I provide a safe environment for experimental programs. | ,898 | 0,699 | 0,625* | 0,71 | 0,91 |
| | I gather information about the feasibility of new projects. | ,845 | | | | |
| | I keep in touch with other colleagues and students. | ,829 | | | | |
| | I take advantage of changes in my external environment. | ,793 | | | | |
| ARMM | I monitor activities that support senior management objectives. | ,827 | 0,684 | 0,670* | 0,52 | 0,81 |
| | I turn goals into action plans. | ,754 | | | | |
| | I turn organizational goals into individual goals. | ,709 | | | | |
| | I give initiative to lower level managers. | ,575 | | | | |

It is possible to understand the consistency between the mean relationships between judgements or questions by reliability analysis. The factor reliability values for each

of the eight factors were analysed and it was understood that the model was reliable based on the combined reliability value of .70. It is possible to see the values obtained in Table 7.

Table 7 shows that the reliability coefficients of all factor groups are above 50%. These values indicate a sufficient level of reliability. Descriptive statistics are used to summarize a large number of numerical data obtained in research in a few simple terms. Descriptive statistics cover the number of times each value or set of values occurs in a

variable, the distribution of values around a centrally chosen point, and the distance to the midpoint or relative distance to each other. The mean and standard deviation values of some of these statistics were calculated for the factors and are given in Table 7. Based on all these data, all the hypotheses tested in the study were accepted.

Table 8. Results of Regression Analysis on Variables

| | | R Square | F-Value | Std. Beta | Sig. | Decision |
|---|----------|----------|---------|-----------|------|----------|
| 1 | ARMM→SRM | 0,26 | 109,705 | 0,512 | ,000 | Accept |
| 2 | SRMM→EM | 0,19 | 71,332 | 0,433 | ,000 | Accept |
| 3 | FRMM→EOC | 0,09 | 27,256 | 0,285 | ,000 | Accept |
| 4 | CRMM→EL | 0,15 | 55,435 | 0,390 | ,000 | Accept |

Regression analysis was performed in order to understand the accuracy/inaccuracy of the hypotheses. With the help of regression analysis, the relationship between the roles of middle managers and the dimensions of strategic entrepreneurship was tried to be understood. As seen in Table 8, the hypotheses are confirmed.

Conclusion

Strategic entrepreneurship is an important concept on which many researches have been carried out as well as a new one. Knowing how to use strategic entrepreneurship in terms of the future of companies reveals that it will increase their competitiveness and sustainability power. Although each management level has important duties in managing this process, focusing on the activities of middle managers in particular will contribute to how organizations should learn and manage the concept of strategic entrepreneurship. Developing the capabilities of middle managers within the framework of many concepts such as environment, dynamism, competition, knowledge transfer and operational efficiency also means developing the capabilities of organizations.

In this context, in order to learn about strategic entrepreneurship in Turkey, the automotive sub-industry sector, in which Turkey has competitive power in the international arena, has been selected. Five provinces (Bursa, Sakarya, Istanbul, Kocaeli,

Kocaeli and Konya), where both OEM and aftermarket companies are located, were selected and the impact of middle managers in these companies in terms of strategic entrepreneurship was analysed through four main hypotheses. The findings obtained as a result of the field research were analysed and a same-directional relationship was found between the roles undertaken by middle managers and strategic entrepreneurship dimensions for the automotive supplier industry.

This situation will contribute to understanding the competitiveness of automotive supply industry enterprises in Turkey on an international scale. In other words, it also shows that Turkish automotive supply industry companies have talented middle managers who establish the link between a competitive, dynamic and uncertain environment and the organisation. In other words, there is a positive relationship between the facilitating role of the middle manager and entrepreneurial culture, between the championing role and entrepreneurial leadership, between the implementation role and resource management and finally between synthesising and entrepreneurial mindset. In this context, middle managers have a direct contribution to strategic entrepreneurship.

- This study was supported by BAP (Scientific Research Project) project no 221236002. Project name: Strategic Entrepreneurship From Middle Management Perspective.

References

- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (2003). Innovation and technological change. In Handbook of entrepreneurship research (pp. 55-79). Springer, Boston, MA.
- Alvarez, S. A., & Busenitz, L. W. (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 755-775.
- Balogun, J. (2003). 'From blaming the middle to harnessing its potential: creating change intermediaries'. *British Journal of Management*, 14, 69-83.
- Bartlett, C. A., & Ghoshal, S. (1993). Beyond the M-form: Toward a managerial theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14(S2), 23-46.
- Bettis, R. A., & Hitt, M. A. (1995). The new competitive landscape. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(S1), 7-19.
- Bower, G. H. (1970). Mental imagery and associative learning. In Lee Gregg (Ed.), *Cognition in learning and memory*. New York: Wiley.
- Brock, W. A., & Evans, D. S. (1989). Small business economics. *Small business economics*, 1(1), 7-20.
- Bruton, G. D., Filatotchev, I., Si, S., & Wright, M. (2013). Entrepreneurship and strategy in emerging economies. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 7(3), 169-180.
- Cooper, H. M. (1979). Statistically combining independent studies: A meta-analysis of sex differences in conformity research. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(1), 131-146.
- Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., and McGee, J. E. (1999). Linking corporate entrepreneurship to strategy, structure, and process: suggested research directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3), 85-102.
- Dutton, J. E., & Ashford, S. J. (1993). Selling issues to top management. *Academy of management review*, 18(3), 397-428.
- Dutton, J. E., Ashford, S. J., O'neill, R. M., Hayes, E., & Wierba, E. E. (1997). Reading the wind: How middle managers assess the context for selling issues to top managers. *Strategic management journal*, 18(5), 407-423.
- Dutton, J. E., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Categorizing strategic issues: Links to organizational action. *Academy of management review*, 12(1), 76-90.
- Floyd, S. W., and Wooldridge, B. (1992). Middle Management Involvement in Strategy and Its Association with Strategic Type: A Research Note. *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 153-167.
- Floyd, S. W. and Wooldridge, B. (1994). 'Dinosaurs or dynamos? Recognizing middle management's strategic role'. *Academy of Management Executive*, 8, 47-57.
- Floyd, S. W., & Wooldridge, B. (1997). Middle management's strategic influence and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(3), 465-485.
- Floyd, S. W., & Lane, P. J. (2000). Strategizing throughout the organization: Managing role conflict in strategic renewal. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 154-177.
- Floyd, S. W., & Wooldridge, B. (1997). Middle management's strategic influence and organizational performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 34(3), 465-485.
- Foss, N. J., & Lyngsie, J. (2011). *The Emerging strategic entrepreneurship field: Origins, key tenets, and research gaps*. Edward Elgar.
- Gökçe, Ş. , Diken, A. and Kahraman, Ü. M. (2020). The Impact of Role Conflict Originating from Mid-Level Manager Actions on Intention to Leaving the Job and Performance. *The Journal of Selcuk University Social Sciences Institute* (43) , 368-379.
- Hitt, M. A., & Reed, T. S. (2000). Entrepreneurship in the new competitive landscape. *Entrepreneurship As Strategy: Competing on the Entrepreneurial Edge*. GD Meyer and KA Heppard.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6-7), 479-491.
- Hitt, Michael A., R. Duane Ireland, S. Michael Camp ve Donald L. Sexton (2001) Guest Editors' Introduction to the Special Issue Strategic Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Strategies for Wealth Creation. *Strategic Management Journal*, 22, 479-491.
- Hutzschenreuter, T., & Kleindienst, I. (2006). Strategy-process research: What have we learned and what is still to be explored. *Journal of Management*, 32(5), 673-720.
- Ireland, D., Harrall, R., Curry, V., Holloway, G., Hackney, R., Hazleman, B., & Riley, G. (2001). Multiple changes in gene expression in chronic human Achilles tendinopathy. *Matrix Biology*, 20(3), 159-169.
- Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 13(1), 43-57.
- Ireland, R., Kuratko, D. F., and Covin, J. G. (2003). Antecedents, elements, and consequences of corporate entrepreneurship strategy. In D. H. Nagao (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixty-third Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management (CD)*, ISSN 1543-8643.

- Ireland R.D., Webb J.W. (2007). Strategic entrepreneurship: creating competitive advantage through streams of innovation. *Business Horizons*, 50: 49– 59.
- Kimuli, S. N. L. (2011). *Strategic Entrepreneurship and Performance Of Selected Private Secondary Schools In Wakiso District*, Doctoral Dissertation, Makerere University.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2017). Corporate entrepreneurship 2.0: Research development and future directions. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, 13(6), 441-490.
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Bishop, J. W. (2005). Managers' corporate entrepreneurial actions and job satisfaction. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(3), 275-291.
- McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. (2000). *The entrepreneurial mindset: Strategies for continuously creating opportunity in an age of uncertainty* (Vol. 284). Harvard Business Press.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14-37.
- Nordqvist, M., & Melin, L. (2008). Strategic planning champions: Social craftspersons, artful interpreters and known strangers. *Long Range Planning*, 41(3), 326-344.
- Peng, M. W. (2001). The resource-based view and international business. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 803-829.
- Pitelis, C. N. (2009). The co-evolution of organizational value capture, value creation and sustainable advantage. *Organization Studies*, 30(10), 1115-1139.
- Rouleau, L., & Balogun, J. (2011). Middle managers, strategic sensemaking, and discursive competence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(5), 953-983.
- Sandberg, W. R. (1992). Strategic Management's Potential Contributions to a Theory of Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(3), 73–90.
- Schendel, D. E. and C. W. Hofer. (1979). 'Research needs and issues in strategic management'. In Schendel, D. and C. Hofer (eds), *Strategic Management*, Little, Brown, Boston, MA, 1979, pp. 515-530.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Stevenson, D. J., Spohn, T., & Schubert, G. (1983). Magnetism and thermal evolution of the terrestrial planets. *Icarus*, 54(3), 466-489.
- Tanțău, I., Feurdean, A., de Beaulieu, J. L., Reille, M., & Fărcaș, S. (2011). Holocene vegetation history in the upper forest belt of the Eastern Romanian Carpathians. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 309(3-4), 281-290.
- Türkmen, İ. and Yılmaz, H. (2019). Stratejik Girişimcilik ve Bilgi Yönetimi Performansı Arasındaki İlişki: Bilişim 500 Şirketlerinde Bir Araştırma . *Yaşar Üniversitesi E-Dergisi*, 14 (53) , 1-12.
- Wooldridge, B., & Floyd, S. W. (1990). The strategy process, middle management involvement, and organizational performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11(3), 231-241.
- Van Cauwenbergh, A., & Cool, K. (1982). Strategic management in a new framework. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(3), 245-264.
- Zabriskie, N.B. and Huellmantel, A.B. (1991). "Long Range Planning", vol. 24, no. 6, pp.25-32.
- Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of business venturing*, 10(1), 43-58.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.