

The Bright Side of Organizational Politics as a Driver of Firm Competitiveness: The Mediating Role of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Monika Kulikowska-Pawlak, Katarzyna Bratnicka-Myśliwiec, Tomasz Ingram

Abstract—This study seeks to contribute to the literature on firm competitiveness by advancing the perspective of organizational politics that views this process as a driver which creates identifiable differences in firm performance. The hypothesized relationships were tested on the basis of data from 355 Polish medium and large-sized enterprises. Data were analyzed using correlation analysis, EFA and robustness tests. The main result of the conducted analyses proved the coexistence, previously examined in the literature, of corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance. The obtained research findings made it possible to add organizational politics to a wide range of elements determining corporate entrepreneurship, followed by competitive advantage, in addition to antecedents such as strategic leadership, corporate culture, opportunity-oriented resource-based management, etc. Also, the empirical results suggest that four dimensions of organizational politics (dominant coalition, influence exertion, making organizational changes, and information openness) are positively related to firm competitiveness. In addition, these findings seem to underline a supposition that corporate entrepreneurship is an important mediator which strengthens the competitive effects of organizational politics.

Keywords—Corporate entrepreneurship, firm competitiveness, organizational politics, sensemaking.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE process of organizational politics can be viewed from many perspectives. The paper acknowledges that the best one will be a resource-based approach to strategic management. A part particularly useful in this regard is the part of a strategic approach that refers to the dynamic capabilities of the organization. Bibliometric analysis and content analysis allowed the discovery of an intellectual core of research into the domain of dynamic capabilities [1]. It turned out that the theoretical roots of the dynamic capabilities of the organization lie first and foremost in the resource-based approach to strategic management, and partly in looking through the prism of knowledge, evolutionary economics, the behavioral theory of the firm, or transaction costs. The nature of these capabilities lies in facilitating the development of new activities or enhancing the existing ones, in order to turn to opportunities

Monika Kulikowska-Pawlak is Ph.D., Chair in Entrepreneurship, University of Economics in Katowice, Katowice-Poland (e-mail: 8Monika.kulikowska-pawlak@ue.katowice.pl).

Katarzyna Bratnicka-Myśliwiec is Ph.D., Department of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, University of Economics in Katowice, Katowice-Poland (e-mail: Katarzyna.bratnicka-mysliwiec@ue.katowice.pl).

Tomasz Ingram is Prof., Department of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management, University of Economics in Katowice, Katowice-Poland (e-mail: Tomasz.ingram@ue.katowice.pl).

and to adapt to the changing determinants of competitive advantage. We think that dynamic capabilities are closely related to both organizational resources and organizational politics. Our core research goal emerges against this backdrop, which aims to explain the role of organizational politics in shaping a company's competitive advantage.

Another important assumption is understanding organizational politics as an organizational process of sensemaking. Sensemaking and improvisation seem to be an effective behavioral strategy for making change [2], especially in dynamic conditions. In the rapidly changing environment, organizations launch a strategy of innovation from a broadly shared, though vague, strategic intent that creates a framework for sensemaking and improvisation [3]. Taking into account the above, we have chosen a definition by Sederberg [4] from among the many definitions of organizational politics, which describes organizational politics as a behavior for "creating, sustaining, modifying, and abandoning shared meanings" [4, p. 7]. In this study we are trying to present the consequences of such a methodological outlook and to specify the content of organizational politics as an organizational process of sensemaking.

We examine how the firm competitiveness unfolded focusing on the multidimensional process of organizational politics. We extend the strategic management perspective to examine the impact of organizational politics on firm performance. We argue that the existing theory largely ignores the role of organizational politics as a catalyst mobilizing the dynamics of firm competitiveness. The existing knowledge of the role of organizational politics in strategic management remains incomplete because little is known as to whether organizational politics may affect the strategic performance of firms. This is an unfortunate oversight in both theory and practice. We address this gap by building and empirically testing a theoretical model, positing that when organizational politics is supported by corporate entrepreneurship, firms emulate their competitive advantage. Therefore, the main purpose of the current research is to integrate and extend research on strategic management to examine whether organizational politics and corporate entrepreneurship encourage firm competitiveness.

A broader contribution of this paper is to link the key pillars of the organizational politics with firm performance. To that end, we offer a process theory of organizational politics, which provides a sharper relief of organizational politics for firm competitiveness. Using data from 355 Polish medium-sized

and large enterprises, we empirically prove the positive direct effect of organizational politics on firm performance as measured by subjective firm competitiveness. Furthermore, we find that these subjective measure effects are stronger in entrepreneurial enterprises.

To sum up, this paper contributes to our understanding of how and why organizational politics emerges to address the challenges of firm competitiveness. The study results refine and extend strategic management theory and studies of corporate entrepreneurship by drawing on organizational politics theory. Notably, we have emphasized organizational politics as a source of firm performance.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND FIRM PERFORMANCE

Organizational politics refers to exerting an informal influence by employees or teams, which may or may not overlap with the company's wider interests and which primarily takes place under the conditions of uncertainty and ambiguity [5], [6]. In such circumstances, reducing the variety of forms of job insecurity is becoming increasingly important, by increasing control over the organizational context, as well as enhancing the ability to constructively influence behavior and effects under the conditions of organizational ambiguity [7]. Taking this into account, we propose an approach based on Sederberg's proposal [4], which describes organizational politics as a behavior for "creating, sustaining, modifying, and abandoning shared meanings" [4]. Thus, organizational politics is understood as a process (1) of a social construct that includes actions to create, sustain, modify, and abandon collective cognitive structures, (2) based on power used to exert an influence and the cognitive processing of organizational ambiguities, (3) focused on creating, expanding, increasing, protecting and maintaining the strategic potential (of operative and gained resources and capabilities) in a desirable state that the organization possesses, controls or has access to. By adopting this operational definition, it can be assumed that: (1) organizational politics is a direct indication of firm performance, (2) organizational politics and strategic potential interact with each other, and this interaction influences firm performance. The conceptualization of organizational politics presented entails interesting methodological challenges. They refer to a process-based, non-linear and non-deterministic approach, referring to relational ontologies and emphasizing the role of time [8].

Politics of management is increasingly recognized as a positive driver of company's organizational effectiveness [9]. And recently, a critical review of research into organizational politics has indicated that it is important to return to the tradition of looking at organizational politics as an important managerial tool for dealing with uncertainty and strategic ambiguity [10]. Some researchers highlight the functional and positive aspects of this process [11]-[13]. The key role that organizational politics plays in implementing strategic initiatives that are inherently complex, dynamic and uncertain should also be highlighted [14]. Political behavior can also be beneficial to the effectiveness of the team or the whole company [15], [16]. Hardy [17] regards organizational politics

as a source of energy for organizational change and creativity. Especially in situations when it is necessary to go beyond the status quo, organizational politics is positive [18], [19]. Company employees can engage in such political activities that benefit both the efficiency of teams and businesses [20]. If political behaviors are conducive to firm performance, they can be considered the components of positive organizational politics [21], [22].

H1. Organizational politics positively influences firm performance.

III. CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND FIRM PERFORMANCE

Corporate entrepreneurship is commonly regarded as a main driver of firm performance [23], [24]. The notion that corporate entrepreneurship increases the level of organization performance has been added to the growing body of research on the entrepreneurial orientation vein [25], [26]. This is true, but only to a limited extent, because it may also be that entrepreneurial orientation is only predisposition to different corporate entrepreneurship activities [27]-[29]. Entrepreneurial orientation is the key construct in the entrepreneurship literature [30]. This construct has its roots in the work of Covin and Slevin [31] who theorized that the three dimensions – innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking – act together to comprise a basic strategic orientation. The point is that the high performance almost certainly arises as a function of the corporate venturing (bringing new business to corporation through internal corporate venturing, cooperative corporate venturing, and external corporate venturing) and strategic entrepreneurship (innovating in the pursuit of competitive advantage manifested in firm's strategy, product offerings, served markets, internal organization, and business model) as various forms that corporate entrepreneurship can take [32]. These arguments imply that organizations with a higher level of corporate entrepreneurship are more likely to be effective, leading to the following proposition. To sum up, we propose:

H2. Corporate entrepreneurship positively influences firm competitiveness.

IV. ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Organizational sensemaking is when organization participants support a specific point of view and try to affect the understanding of reality by other participants in the organization through the various tactics of influence. As a result, inter-subjective sense constructed socially appears. An integral part of this sensemaking process is action [33]. In short, action is used as a basis for new sensemaking, while simultaneously, it delivers feedback on the sense already established [34]. Therefore, organizational sensemaking is clearly political [35]. It should be noted that in previous research, organizational creativity and entrepreneurship were linked as important processes supported by sensemaking [36], [37].

Organizational politics is an important adaptation

mechanism in the conditions of organizational ambiguity [38] because the information gained through political behavior reduces the uncertainty faced by company's employees. In particular, active influence exertion leads to the creation of meanings and sensemaking [39], which are considered to be the aspects of politics processes [40], affecting the interpretations and formation of normative behavior [41]. Few empirical studies show that the creation of meanings by managers increases the positive effects of the implementation of change [39], helps overcome resistance to change [15], and also extends shared beliefs and builds social consensus [42].

Theoreticians of management sciences agree that corporate entrepreneurship is one of the most important tools to reduce uncertainty, and in particular, it is the main driver of creating and appropriating value. As a result, the relationship between organizational politics and corporate entrepreneurship can be hypothetically assumed in terms of emerging organizational effects such as undertaking ventures or strategic renewal. In the literature on strategic entrepreneurship, combining strategic management and corporate entrepreneurship, Baron, Lux, Adams and Lamont [43] highlight the potentially important role of organizational politics in launching and developing new ventures. They consider politics to be important both for activities undertaken in the context of new ventures and their link with external stakeholders (e.g. venture capitalists, business angels, suppliers and recipients.) To sum up, participants in corporate entrepreneurship are subject to significant situational forces, which induce the use of social influence, and in short, organizational politics. This is the reason why entrepreneurs with high political skills are more effective in performing tasks that play a key role in the success of a new venture. Exerting an influence on others is especially important in acquiring the necessary resources, in negotiating with a wide range of other people, or in seeking support for the introduction of new products or services. To sum up, organizational politics is a critical factor in the survival and development of new ventures. All this leads to two further hypotheses:

- H3. Organizational politics is positively related with corporate entrepreneurship.*
- H4. Corporate entrepreneurship plays a mediating role in the relationship between organizational politics and firm competitiveness.*

V. ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS AND CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

In order to test the research hypotheses and a model, quantitative research was conducted among companies from Poland. The Research and Expertise Center at the University of Economics in Katowice was responsible for the technical data collection by means of a questionnaire. Data were collected between May and September 2015 among medium-sized enterprises (employing between 50 and 249 employees) and large enterprises employing over 250 employees. The reason for conducting research among such research subjects was the core subject of organizational research – organizational politics, the intensity of which is greater in large organizations.

In micro and small enterprises, a narrow range of influence techniques applied is observed, and the organizations are less likely to use the mechanisms of organizational politics.

A total of 371 completed questionnaires were collected, which resulted in a satisfactory, relatively high level of 33% of the sample result. In the first stage, the completeness of the questionnaires was analyzed, and 16 questionnaires were rejected at this stage due to data deficiencies that could potentially be a source of errors in the estimation of the variables tested. Finally, 355 companies were surveyed for further statistical analysis. Due to the random selection of companies for the test sample and their stratification, the data collected can be considered representative of the population studied.

The first group of enterprises (from 50 to 99 employees) included 50.10% of the companies, the second group (from 100 to 249 employees) - 18.60% of the respondents, the third group (from 250 to 499 employees) - 12.40% and the group of over 500 employees accounted for 18.87% of respondents.

In order to test a research model and the related hypotheses, a survey was used, in which information was collected through personal interviews [44], using the relevant questionnaire. Thus, a specific survey method was used, which is one of the most commonly used research methods in social sciences [45].

A seven-point Likert scale was used in all questions [44]. The respondents were asked to indicate the number on a seven-point scale (from 1 - I strongly disagree, to 7 - I strongly agree). Using the seven-point scale made it possible to increase measurement accuracy.

When designing empirical research, firm performance was measured through the subjective assessments of competitive advantage. The company's competitive advantage was assessed using a scale whose psychometric properties had been tested in previous empirical research [46]. The entire tool covers 10 issues. An example of a question is "Average dynamics of market share in the last three years".

A new scale of organizational politics covering 16 issues was designed using the recommendations by DeVellis [47]. K-M-O statistics, which has a value of 0.881, indicates that exploratory factor analysis can be used to isolate the major factors of organizational politics. According to the criterion of a scree plot, four factors should be separated, which will explain 60.717% of the original variance.

Going on to the detailed results of the statistical analysis conducted, it should be emphasized that factor 1 of the dominant coalition creates five issues. The value of Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.824. Factor 2 also covers five issues. Exploratory analysis allowed maintaining these five issues. The content of this factor is the strategies of exerting an influence. The value of Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.766. Factor 3 consisted of five issues that remained after the confirmation analysis. The content of this factor is the issue of making organizational changes. The value of Cronbach's alpha for this scale is 0.792. Finally, one issue forms factor 4, which refers to information openness.

TABLE I
INDICATORS MAKING UP TWO DIMENSIONS OF THE TASK-BASED ENVIRONMENT

		Exploratory Factor Analysis			
No.	Name of the variable	Factor 1. Dominant coalition	Factor 2. Influence exertion	Factor 3. Making organizational changes	Factor 4. Information openness
1	Employees build relationships with influential groups inside and outside the company to influence the strategic intentions and directions of action.	0.718	0.215	0.128	0.285
2	Employees form alliances and coalitions that is a common front of a group of people, resulting in a highly influential part of an enterprise that no one can ever oppose.	0.739	0.021	0.230	0.292
3	Employees strive for rational justifications: they refer to facts, figures, numbers, and logical arguments that arise from them in order to increase the strength of their request or justify a given point of view.	0.200	0.664	0.273	0.014
4	Employees try to gain control over important resources to strengthen their position.	0.684	0.155	0.367	-0.092
5	Employees perceive conflict as a characteristic of the situation and assume that the conflict can be resolved through the involvement of parties interested (e.g. through negotiations).	0.121	0.636	0.321	-0.217
6	Employees maneuver subtly trying to hide their true intentions.	0.711	0.217	0.097	-0.223
7	Employees perceive the relationships of power as natural.	0.168	0.778	-0.109	0.096
8	Employees use co-optation which is connecting with influential individuals or groups of people, or incorporating them into their sphere of influence, to increase control of the opponent or to silence him.	0.696	0.205	0.238	-0.151
9	Managers set a deadline for acceptance or action in order to create a sense of action indispensability.	0.292	0.601	0.076	0.267
10	Employees sincerely express their opinions even when they are critical of dominant ideas.	-0.041	0.204	0.243	0.785
11	Employees mutually support each other to achieve mutual benefit.	-0.016	0.676	0.300	0.229
12	Employees use key managers to support initiatives, mobilize support or opposition to organizational strategies, policies, and practices.	0.352	0.274	0.660	-0.087
13	Employees strive for the autonomy of action that enables experimentation and stimulates bottom-up change.	0.272	0.180	0.748	0.094
14	Employees refer to superior objectives, common values, and ideals to inspire specific behaviors of others.	0.122	0.342	0.542	0.189
15	Employees strive to determine what gives sense to new events	0.117	0.073	0.698	0.269
16	Employees question the previous perception of organizational reality in order to go beyond the existing state of affairs.	0.463	-0.013	0.571	0.008
	Variance explained	3.130	2.700	2.717	1.168
	Share	0.196	0.169	0.170	0.073

a. N=355; Pearson correlation coefficients between the individual characteristics and their dimensions (factors) they create

TABLE II
TAU-B KENDALL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS, CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP, FIRM COMPETITIVENESS AS WELL AS THE SIZE AND AGE OF THE COMPANY (N=355)

No.	Correlations between variables							
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1. Dominant coalition	1.000							
2. Organizational influence exertion	0.335**	1.000						
3. Organizational change-making	0.451**	0.399**	1.000					
4. Information openness	0.148**	0.238**	0.233**	1.000				
5. Corporate entrepreneurship	0.229**	0.200**	0.281**	0.180**	1.000			
6. Firm competitiveness	0.103**	0.091*	0.181**	0.121**	0.312**	1.000		
7. LN_size	0.107**	0.140**	0.145**	0.038	0.109**	0.076*	1.000	
8. LN_age	0.007	0.018	-0.029	-0.011	-0.018	-0.075*	0.152**	1.000
	0.860	0.632	0.430	0.781	0.619	0.043	0.000	.

a. In the table, statistically significant correlations are highlighted

To measure corporate entrepreneurship, we asked managers to indicate the extent to which their firm used corporate venturing and/or strategic entrepreneurship [48]. More specifically, corporate venturing was measured using a three-item scale, which aggregates internal corporate venturing, cooperative corporate venturing and external corporate.

Strategic entrepreneurship was measured using a five-item scale, which aggregates strategic renewal, sustained regeneration, domain redefinition, organizational rejuvenation and business model reconstruction. As a result, we obtained one dimensional scale, which contains eight items (for example: The firm creates new businesses, which it owns or

co-owns). Cronbach’s α for this scale is 0.919.

Continuing the research practice, control variables such as company’s size and age were also taken into account. Values referring to age as the number reflecting the duration of the company and the size of the company as the number of employees were presented as a natural logarithm in order to normalize their distribution [49], [50].


VI. RESEARCH RESULTS

A multi-stage analytical process was adopted to test research hypotheses. In the first stage, tau-B Kendall correlations were calculated to assess relationships between constructs creating the model. For that purpose, SPSS for Mac version 24 statistical software was used. Correlation analysis is presented in Table II.

The correlation table reveals significant relationships between the dimensions of organizational politics, corporate entrepreneurship and firm competitiveness. All the correlations in this regard have positive sign and they vary from 0.091 to 0.451. Also, a natural logarithm of the number of employees (the measure of a size of a company) is related to all the dimensions of organizational politics - except for information openness - and is positively related to corporate

entrepreneurship and firm competitiveness, although these relationships are moderate. The age of a company, as measured by the natural logarithm of years on the market, is related to firm competitiveness. Thus, hypotheses H1, H2 and H3 are well empirically founded and proven.

To gain better understanding of the relationships we decided to employ a structural equation modeling approach. We treated the dimensions of organizational politics, corporate entrepreneurship and firm competitiveness as latent variables, and for the calculations we used Mplus 7.2 statistical package. Moreover, we added size and age to the model as control variables. The structural model of relationships between variables (Fig. 1) was well fitted with RMSEA (root mean square error of approximation) equaling 0.051 (acceptable levels are below 0.06), CFI is 0.911 and TLI is 0.899 (levels above 0.9 cutoff line are acceptable). The model shows only main constructs and significant relationships. Above relationships coefficients and errors are given. The model allowed for explanation of 20.7% of a variability of competitive advantage and 16% of the variability of corporate entrepreneurship. Thus, the explanatory power of the model is moderate, but still statistically significant.



The research results revealed that organizational change-making is a significant antecedent of corporate entrepreneurship and competitive advantage. It is influenced by the size of the organization, and the size also influences information possession and dominant coalition dimensions of organizational politics; neither information openness, dominant coalition, and nor organizational influence exertion, affect entrepreneurship nor firm competitiveness. Compared with previous analysis (see Table I), hypothesis H1 can be only partially proven. While only organizational change-making influences corporate entrepreneurship, hypothesis H2 gains partial statistical support. However, corporate entrepreneurship is a significant predecessor of firm competitiveness and it

supports hypothesis H3. The research results also show that corporate entrepreneurship is a viable mediator of the relationship between organizational change-making as a dimension of organizational politics and firm competitiveness, which is partially proven by hypothesis H4. Table II illustrates the mediation effect.

While both direct and indirect effects of organizational change-making on competitive advantage are present, we conclude that in this case, the partial mediation occurs. Thus, it brings support to our hypothesis H4 that corporate entrepreneurship plays a mediating role in the relationship between organizational politics and firm competitiveness.

TABLE III
TAU-B KENDALL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ORGANIZATIONAL POLITICS, CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP, FIRM COMPETITIVENESS AS WELL AS THE SIZE AND AGE OF THE COMPANY (N=355)

<i>Effect</i>	<i>Coefficient B</i>	<i>Confidence Intervals – 95%</i>	<i>Is the relationship significant?</i>
Direct effect of organizational change-making	0,196	(0.031; 0.362)	Yes (p=0.02)
Specific indirect effect of organizational change making on competitive advantage by the corporate entrepreneurship	0.125	(0.018; 0.136)	Yes (p=0.007)
Total effect	0.321	-----	-----
Direct effect of organizational change-making	0,196	(0.031; 0.362)	Yes (p=0.02)

VII. ROBUSTNESS TESTS

To check for the robustness of our research results, additional analyses were conducted. First, Harman's Single Factor test was conducted, see [51] to check, if a single factor does not explain significant part of the variance and address potential common method bias. Although the test itself is not sufficient to determine whether a common method variance exists, it is recommended as a first step in the ex-post approaches. Exploratory factor analysis without specified rotation conducted on the entire tool (dependent and independent variables were analyzed) revealed that observations do not significantly load to one dimension. Hypothesized one-factor structure explained only 23.387% of the variance and that is below the cutoff line of 50% explained variance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for the analysis was 0.871 and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was statistically significant at $p=0.000$, with approximate chi-square equal to 6200.049 and 630 degrees of freedom.

Subsequently, the model with the additional dependent variable was calculated – the firm growth as measured by the natural logarithm increase in the number of employees. The model was well fitted with RMSEA equaling 0.051 and improved CFI and TLI statistics were respectively, 0.933 and 0.923. Although the growth was not significantly influenced by other variables, the r-square for competitive advantage rose to 21% and the level of explanation of organizational entrepreneurship accounted for nearly 17%. This allows for the conclusion that adding another dependent variable does not change the model significantly.

In the following step, the order between the dimensions of organizational politics and corporate entrepreneurship was reversed to see if the opposite direction or relationships is not present and if in this case the level of firm competitiveness is not better explained by the alternative model. The model was poorly fitted with RMSEA equaling 0.053, CFI equaling 0.903 (barely acceptable) and Tucker-Levis Index equaling 0.890 – the level below the cutoff line of 0.9. In this case, the level of explanation of firm competitiveness decreased to 19.7% and mediation effects were insignificant (except for the mediation between corporate entrepreneurship and organizational change making that still remained significant, although at a lower strength of 0.118 and at a lower p-level = 0.039). This allows for the statement that the model was created correctly and reversing the order of independent variables decreases the variance explained of the firm competitiveness.

Finally, the order of variables in the model was reversed to

see if corporate entrepreneurship is not determined by firm competitiveness. The model was similarly fitted as our initial research model and the level of explanation of firm competitiveness decreased to 11.3% (as measured by the r-square). Also, the mediation effects were insignificant. This leads to conclusion that the research model was adequately created and both the dimensions of organizational politics and corporate entrepreneurship influence firm competitiveness. All additional analyses prove that the common method variance does not exist in this particular case.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

The main result of the analyses conducted is proving the coexistence, known in the literature, of corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance. The research findings obtained made it possible to add organizational politics to a wide range of elements determining corporate entrepreneurship, followed by competitive advantage, in addition to antecedents such as strategic leadership, corporate culture, opportunity-oriented resource-based management, etc. [52]. Research showed a statistically significant relationship between the dimensions of organizational politics (dominant coalition, influence exertion, making organizational change, and information openness) and firm performance as measured by subjectively assessed competitiveness. In particular, it turned out that organizational politics as regards making organizational change is an important driver of competitiveness in entrepreneurial organizations. Moreover, the strength of the briefly outlined relationships grows as the business grows.

Empirical research findings highlight several important relationships. First of all, organizational politics in the dimension of organizational change making has a positive influence on both firm competitiveness and corporate entrepreneurship. In other words, the revival of the processes of organizational politics is functional in terms of firm performance as measured by firm competitiveness and corporate entrepreneurship. Secondly, the intensity of political behavior is an important driver of the entrepreneurial creation and use of opportunities.

The results of the research conducted allow us to formulate some guidelines for managerial practice. Managers seeking to increase firm competitiveness through entrepreneurship should create conditions conducive to political behavior such as: (a) using key managers to support initiatives, mobilize support or opposition to organizational strategies, policies and practices, (b) seeking to achieve autonomy of action enabling experimentation and the stimulation of the bottom-up change;

(c) referring to superior objectives, common values and ideals to inspire specific behavior of others, (d) questioning the perception of organizational reality so as to go beyond the existing state of affairs, (e) striving to determine what sense to give to new events.

Generally speaking, when designing a change-focused company, you need to bear in mind that you need to prepare your employees for tasks that have to deal with ambiguous situations and for which no procedures have been established yet. The way in which a company is organized has to emphasize the large role of self-control supported by employees' independence, so that sensitivity to the realities of the business is ensured as well as sufficient freedom to take advantage of surprises, discontinuities, and discrepancies within the overall priorities.

A condition for drawing justified conclusions is, in addition to affirming the co-occurrence of the cause and effect, making sure that the cause precedes the effect. Our empirical research fulfills the first condition. However, to exclude the inverse relationship, longitudinal studies are necessary. For example, Zhao and Murrell [53] repeated classic research [54] into the relationship between corporate social performance and financial performance, greatly increasing the sample size and extending the time horizon taken into account. It turned out that the relationship studied is more complicated than originally assumed. The positive impact of financial performance on corporate social performance was again reaffirmed, but the inverse relationship regarding the positive impact of social performance on financial performance was not found to be so unequivocal. To specify, corporate social performance positively influences its financial performance, however, in a statistically insignificant way. Finally, to measure firm performance, it would also be useful to use indicators related to financial performance, social performance, and creating and capturing value.

Empirical research into political skill has focused so far on links with corporate entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, the results provide a good basis for the initial recognition of the role of political skill in strategic management. The strength of political skill as a predictor of the effectiveness of tasks is growing in the context of entrepreneurial activity [55]. It is interpersonal competence that strengthens the influence of organizational determinants on the effectiveness of entrepreneurial tasks. Most of the recent, rare research into the relationship between political skill and entrepreneurship concerned ventures. Fang, Chi, Chen and Baron [56] consider the creation and development of ventures as a social process in which individuals and their social networks contribute to entrepreneurial success. In particular, entrepreneurs that have political skill create more stable and dynamically developing networks than entrepreneurs lacking this competence. Moreover, such entrepreneurs have more extensive social ties. It also turns out that in entrepreneurial activity, political skill is conducive to mobilizing social capital, which is reflected in making better use of key social links for the success of ventures than in the case of less politically-skilled entrepreneurs.

Recently, the understanding of the important role played by

perseverance in influencing entrepreneurial behavior and firm performance is growing. Empirical research has proven that perseverance, perceived as a persistent pursuit of long-term goals followed by a single person, is a main quality of entrepreneurs which positively influences the success of ventures, measured by subjectively assessed competitiveness [57]. If so, it is reasonable to assume that perseverance is a moderator that makes it possible to better explain the mechanism linking organizational politics with corporate entrepreneurship. When thinking about future empirical research, the already developed measure of perseverance should be taken into account [58]. This scale is related to the level of an individual; however, we think that the modification of this measurement tool can be used to estimate perseverance across the organization. In any case, organizational perseverance is a desirable, complementary extension of our model.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Di Stefano, M. Peteraf, and G. Verona, "Dynamic capabilities deconstructed", Paper presented at the Academy of Management Conference, Chicago, 2009.
- [2] M. P. Cunha and J. V. Cunha, "Organizational improvisation and change: Two syntheses and a filled gap", *J. Organ. Change Manag.*, vol. 16, pp. 169-185, 2003.
- [3] R. C. Wood, "How strategic innovation really gets started", *Strat. Leadership*, vol. 35(1), 21-29, 2007.
- [4] P. Sederberg, "The politics of meaning: Power and explanation in the construction of social reality", Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1984.
- [5] H. Mintzberg, "Power in and around organizations", Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1983.
- [6] J. Pfeffer, "Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations", Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press, 1992.
- [7] W. A. Hochwarter, W. A. 2012. "The positive side of organizational politics", In: G.R. Ferris, & D.C. Treadway (eds.), *Politics in organizations. Theory and research considerations*, New York/ Hove: Routledge, 2012, pp. 27-65.
- [8] A. Langley and H. Tsoukas, "Introducing perspectives on process organizational studies", In: T. Hernes i S. Maitlis (eds.), *Process sensemaking and organizing*, London: Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 1-26.
- [9] B. P. Ellen III, R. G. Ferris, and M. R. Buckley, "Leader political support: Reconsidering leader political behavior", *Leadership Quart.*, vol. 24, pp. 842-857, 2013.
- [10] G. Gavetti, H. R. Greve, D. A. Levinthal, and W. Ocasio, "The behavioral theory of the firm: assessment and prospects", *Acad. Manag. Ann.*, vol. 6, pp. 1-40, 2012.
- [11] A. Drory and E. Vigoda-Gadot, "Organizational politics and human resource management: A typology and the Israeli experience", *Hum. Resour. Manag. R.*, vol. 20, pp. 194-202, 2010.
- [12] G. N. Gotsis and Z. Kortezi, "Ethical considerations in organizational politics: Expanding the perspective", *J. Bus. Ethics*, vol. 93, pp. 497-517, 2010.
- [13] Y. Liu, J. Liu, and L. Wu, "Are you willing and able? Roles of motivation, power, and politics in career growth", *J. Manage.*, vol. 36, pp. 1432-1460, 2010.
- [14] C. Lechner and S. W. Floyd, "Group influence activities and the performance of strategic initiatives", *Strateg. Manage. J.*, vol. 33, pp. 478-495, 2012.
- [15] D. A. Buchanan, "You stab my back, I'll stab yours: Management experience and perceptions of organization political behaviour", *Brit. J. Manage.*, vol. 19, pp. 49-64, March 2008.
- [16] S. Lux, G. R. Ferris, R. L. Brouer, M. D. Laird, and J. K. Summers, "A Multilevel conceptualization of organizational politics", In: C.C. Cooper and J. Barling (eds.), *The Handbook of organizational behavior*, Newbury Park, CA.: Sage Publication, 2008.
- [17] C. Hardy, "Understanding power: Bringing about strategic change", *Brit. J. Manage.*, vol. 7, pp. S3-S16, December 1996.

- [18] D. B. Fedor, J. M. Maslyn, S. Farmer, and K. Bettenhausen, "The contribution of positive politics to the prediction of employee reactions", *J. App. Soc. Psych.*, vol. 38, pp. 76–96, 2008.
- [19] F. Pichault, "The management of politics in technically related organizational change", *Organ. Stud.*, vol. 3, pp. 449–460, 1995.
- [20] D. Katz and R. L. Kahn, "The social psychology of organizations", New York: Wiley, 1978.
- [21] M. W. McCall and R. E. Kaplan, "Whatever it takes: The realities of managerial decision making", Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990.
- [22] D. W. Organ, "O.C.B.: The good soldier syndrome", Lexington, MA: Lexington Book, 1988.
- [23] P. Burns, "Corporate entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurship and innovation in large organizations", New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- [24] R. D. Hisrich and Amr Al-Dabbagh, "Governpreneurship: Establishing a thriving entrepreneurial spirit in government", Edward Elgar Publishing, 2012.
- [25] A. Rauch, J. Wiklund, G. T. Lumpkin, and M. Frese, "Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for future", *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 33, pp. 761–787, 2009.
- [26] S. Zahra, D. F. Jennings, and D. J. Kuratko, "Antecedents and consequences of firm-level entrepreneurship: The state of the field", *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 24, pp. 45–66, 1999.
- [27] G. G. Dess and G. T. Lumpkin, "The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship", *Acad. Manage. Exec.*, vol. 19, pp. 147–156, 2005.
- [28] D. Miller, "Miller (1983) revisited: A reflection on EO research and some suggestions for the future", *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, vol. 35, pp. 873–894, 2011.
- [29] J. C. Short, J. C. Broberg, C. C. Coglisier, and K. H. Brigham, 2009. "Construct validation using computer-aided text analyses (CATA): An illustration using entrepreneurial orientation", *Organ. Res. Methods*, vol. 12, pp. 1–28, 2009.
- [30] B. A. George, "Entrepreneurial orientation: Theoretical and empirical examination of the consequences of differing construct representations", *J. Manage. Stud.*, vol. 48, pp. 1291–1313, 2011.
- [31] J. G. Covin and D. P. Slevin, "Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environment", *Strateg. Manage. J.*, vol. 10, pp. 73–87, 1989.
- [32] M. H. Morris, D. F. Kuratko, and J. G. Covin, "Corporate entrepreneurship and innovation (3rd edition)", Mason: Thomson South-Western, 2011.
- [33] K. E. Weick, "Enacted sensemaking in crisis situations", *J. Manage. Stud.*, vol. 25, pp. 305–317, 1988.
- [34] J. W. Rudolph, J. B. Morrison, and J. S. Carroll, "The dynamics of action-oriented problem solving: Linking interpretation and choice", *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 34, pp. 733–756, 2009.
- [35] E. Clark, and M. Geppert, "Subsidiary integration as identity construction and institution building: A political sensemaking approach", *J. Manage. Stud.*, vol. 48, pp. 395–416, 2011.
- [36] R. Drazin, M. A. Glynn, and R. K. Kazanjian, "Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemaking perspective", *Acad. Manage. Rev.* vol. 24, pp. 286–307, 1999.
- [37] J. Jay, "Navigating paradox as a mechanism of change and innovation in hybrid organizations", *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol 56, pp. 137–159, January 2013.
- [38] G. R. Ferris, and W. A. Hochwarter, "Organizational politics". In S. Zedeck (ed.), *APA Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (Vol. 3)*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2011, pp. 435–459.
- [39] C. Hope, "The politics of middle management sensemaking and sensegiving", *J Change Manage*, vol. 10, pp. 195–215 February 2010.
- [40] S. Maitlis and T.B. Lawrence, "Triggers and enablers of sensegiving in organizations", *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 50, pp. 57–84, January 2007.
- [41] A. P. Ammenter, C. Douglas, W. L. Gardner, W. A. Hochwarter and G.R. Ferris, "Toward a political theory of leadership", *Leadership Quart.*, vol. 15, pp. 751–796, December 2002.
- [42] J. Silvester, "The good, the bad, and the ugly: Politics and politicians at work", *Int. Rev. of Industr. and Organ. Psych.*, vol. 23, p. 107, January 2008.
- [43] R. A. Baron, S. Lux, G. L. Adams, and B. T. Lamont, "Organizational politics in strategic management and entrepreneurship". In G.R. Ferris and D. C. Treadway (eds.), *Politics in organizations. Theory and research considerations*, New York/ Hove: Routledge, 2012.
- [44] E. Babbie, "The Basics of social research", Wadsworth: Cengage Learning, 2011.
- [45] A. Leon-Guerrero, Ch. Frankfort-Nachmias, "Essentials of social statistics for a diverse society, 2nd Edition", Los Angeles/London/New Delhi/ Singapore/ Washington DC: Sage Publications, 2015.
- [46] R. F. DeVellis, "Scale development. Theory and applications", Thousand Oaks/London/New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2003.
- [47] "Organizational positivity, high performance factors, creativity and creative strategy as antecedents of competitive advantage", The paper presented at the Annual British Academy of Management Conference, Belfast, 2014.
- [48] 2012. "Organizational creativity and firm's growth: the moderating role of corporate entrepreneurship", In: *Creating Opportunities through innovation: Local energy, global vision*, Dublin: Institute for Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 2012, pp. 1–15.
- [49] R. A. Baron and J. Tang, "The role of entrepreneurs in firm-level innovation: Joint effects of positive affect, creativity, and environmental dynamism", *J. Bus. Venturing*, vol. 26, pp. 49–60, 2011.
- [50] J. He and Z. Huang "Board informal hierarchy and firm financial performance: Exploring a tacit structure guiding boardroom interactions", *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 54, pp. 1119–1139, 2011.
- [51] P. M. Podsakoff, S. B. MacKenzie, J. Y. Lee, and N. P. Podsakoff, "Common method biases in behavioral research: A Critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *J. App. Psych.*, vol. 88, pp. 879–903, May 2003.
- [52] "Political micro-foundations of strategic management", In Krupski, R. (ed.), *Zarządzanie strategiczne. Rozwój koncepcji i metod*, Wałbrzych: Prace Naukowe Wałbrzyskiej Wyższej Szkoły Zarządzania i Przedsiębiorczości, 2014, vol. 27, pp. 109–127.
- [53] X. Zhao and A. J. Murrell, "Revisiting the corporate social performance – financial performance link: A replication of Waddock and Graves", *Strateg. Manage. J.*, vol. 37, pp. 2378–2388, 2016.
- [54] S. A. Waddock and S. B. Graves, "The corporate social performance – financial performance link", *Strateg. Manage. J.*, vol. 18, pp. 303–319, 1997.
- [55] G. Blickle, J. John, G. R. Ferris, T. Momm, Y. Liu, R. Haag, G. Meyer, K. Weber, K. Oerder, "Fit of political skill to the work context: A two-study investigation", *App. Psych.: Int. Rev.*, vol. 61, pp. 295–322, February 2011.
- [56] R. Fang, L. Chi, M. Chen, and R. A. Baron, "Bringing political skill into social networks: Findings from a field study of entrepreneurs", *J. Manage. Stud.*, vol. 52, pp. 175–212, 2015.
- [57] B. A. Mueller, M. T. Wolfe, and I. Syed, 2017. "Passion and gift: An exploration of pathways leading to venture success", *J. Bus. Venturing*, vol. 32, pp. 260–279, 2017.
- [58] A. L. Duckworth and P. D. Quinn, "Development and validation of the short grit scale (GRIT-S)", *J. Pers. Assess.*, vol. 91, pp. 166–174, 2009.