

## Investigating the Determinants of the Social Performance of Non-Business Entities\*

Jin-Hyuk Hong<sup>1</sup> · Dong-Hwan Cho<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Part-Time Instructor (the first author), Department of Venture and Business, Gyongnam National University of Science and Technology, 150, Chilamdong, Jinjushi, Gyongsangnamdo, Republic of Korea

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor (the corresponding author), Department of Venture and Business, Gyongnam National University of Science and Technology, 150, Chilamdong, Jinjushi, Gyongsangnamdo, Republic of Korea

**Abstract**—The main objective of this study is to analyze the effects of customer centeredness, the firm ambidexterity and the Entrepreneurial collaboration on the social performance of non-business entities in the Western Gyeongnam and Busan Regions in Korea. For this analysis, this model is to examine various theories related to have effects on the concept of non-business entities, and is to suggest the customer centeredness, the firm ambidexterity and the social performance by reviewing previous studies and setting research model and hypotheses. To collect data by distributing 142 questionnaires, this research performed the hierarchical multiple regression analysis. As a result, the customer centeredness and the entrepreneurial collaboration were shown to have significant effects on the social performance, the adaptiveness of the firm ambidexterity was also significant. In contrast, the proactiveness of the firm ambidexterity was not shown to have a significant effect. As this research holds quite a value by showing a direction in the current emphasis, it is to imply the practical point by developing non-business entities. It proposes the lack of sufficient resources of non-business entities and sector, to put a priority in keeping a close the non-profit organization, to go with the organizational reinforcement focused on the customer centeredness, the adaptiveness of firm ambidexterity and the entrepreneurial collaboration, eventually to differentiate their internal organization from others.

**Key Word**—Customer centeredness, Firm ambidexterity, Entrepreneurial collaboration, Social performance, Non-business entities

### I. INTRODUCTION

Non-business entities (abbreviated as NBEs) are getting more interested in Korea, and it has been getting more important the field of new academy. Especially, the NBEs receive attention with the quasi-public intensification. For example, they are on rapid growth scale, expending subsidies, representing civil rights (Lee, 2000).

The role of NBEs is steadies on an upward tendency in Korea. NBEs was shortly in the history, and the most of NBEs was the small business. But the some NBEs groups largely exist in the large-size church and the global-size relief group. They are placed in a difficult situation such as operations and business management. For example, NBEs was uncompleted a system establishment and management for the Human Resource Management, was lacked a development and system for the Fund Management, and was weak a vision suggestion for the Strategic Management.

The scale of Korea economy indicates an average of growth rate 4.16% in 1970 to 1997 by Korea. The scales of Korea gross expenditure indicates a 146.2 billion dollar (U.S.) and account for 3.07% of

\* This work was supported by Gyeongnam National University of Science and Technology Grant 2014

Gross Domestic Product(abbreviated as GDP) in 1997. In the active perspective, the environment of NBEs was charge of the cases for the all variety of social part. In other words, it was made up for a woman, an environment, an education, a youth, a consumer, a medical and welfare, a culture and art, a cooperative and so on. In the future of NBEs is expected to continue the practical alternatives for the qualitative improvement of national life.

In this way, many previous studies have been making on the increasing power part of NBEs. The existing NBEs research mostly belong to the leading part of this research in the field of humanity and social science(Han and Moon, 2003), and now the field of business administration interested in both the inside of organization and the social phenomenon. Namely, the academic part mainly discussed the effective management and administrative plan, and the management approach was sharply needed about the new organization experiment and effectiveness measures.

In this recently, NBEs was expected to use the business performance for effectiveness measures as well as the Profit Organizations. So, this main research extremely needs the profit activity about the social performance. The main objective of this study is to analyze the effects of customer centeredness, the firm innovativeness and the Entrepreneurial collaboration on the social performance of non-profit organization and sector in the Western Gyeongnam and Busan Regions in Korea.

This research is to use the questionnaires for the various variables, and to perform the empirical study. To be collected data by distributing 142 questionnaires as the research carried out data analysis using SPSS 20.0 and execute the hierarchical regression analysis.

In the next section, the literature is reviewed and theory of customer centeredness, firm innovativeness, Entrepreneurial collaboration, and social performance is introduced. Then, we develop an empirical model of non-business entities and describe how the key variables are measured. Our data, hypotheses and methodology are described. We analyzed this report the results. Finally, we are concluded some limitations of discussion of this study, suggestions for the future research, and implications for non-profit organization theory and practice.

## **II.LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Non-Business Entities & Social Performance**

The non-profit organization is neither a legal nor technical definition but generally refers to organizations that use surplus revenues to achieve its goals rather than to distribute as profit or dividends(from Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia). This concept was mainly used in U.S. and E.U. and it called 'the voluntary private sector'. In accordance with the non-profit organization support law that was enacted the law in 1999, it was defined to seek the non-profit enterprise by the private sectors.

This NBEs was mainly accomplished to crate the public activity, it do not realize the benefits(Jang and Bahn, 2010). With regard to the NBEs standard and sphere, it was suggested the research(Salamon and Anheirer, 1996) and the law(non-profit organization support law, 1999).

Firstly, Salamon and Anheier(1996) define NBEs that share five common features, which are attempt one of most of comprehensive overviews of the sector. They are: (a) formally constituted, (b) separately from government, (c) non-profit seeking, (d) self-governing and (e) voluntary to some significant degree. They point out that through voluntary organizations is non-profit seeking them often engage in commerce, and private fees are their largest single source of income followed by public sector support.

Secondly, the non-profit organization support law that was enacted the law in 1999 define NBEs as those organizations that share three common features. There are: (a) non-profit organization; (b) nonpolitical organization; and (c) nonreligious organization. For the purposes of this law, six further restrictions were introduced to limit attention organizations that are also: (d) functional organization;

(e) social organization; (f) union; (g) academic organization; (h) arts organization; and (i) religious organization.

The main research was selected by the NBEs that share two features. There are: (a) public sectors; and (b) private sectors as the intermediary, the participating orientation, non-profit orientation, and networking activity.

The social performance is usually called as the corporate social performance in the literature. We use the more inclusive term of business social performance in this article.

The social performance seeks to profit activity in the NBEs. In other words, it is through that the internal side was offered to share the wealth and to prepare the welfare for the stakeholder and the employee, and the external side was provided to offer the social service activity in the make-work programs and the vocational training.

Bowen(1953), Wood(1991), and Lee(2007) announced the definition of social performance.

Firstly, Bowen(1953) suggest that it was offered to seek the desirable policy for the social target and the value outlook and to determined the comfortable tactics for the decision making and the activity. Secondly, Wood(1991) announce that it mean both the social power and the enterprise policy for the various stakeholders and the external environment. Thirdly, Lee(2007) means the reinvestment of benefits that the internal side was offered to share the wealth and to prepare the welfare for the stakeholder and the employee, and the external side was provided to offer the social service activity in the make-work programs and the vocational training.

This research suggests that social performance means the social standard(eg. the problem-solving, and the contributiveness) for the NBEs and it represents the social service(eg. the sharing wealth, and the distributing welfare) for the NBEs.

## **2.2. Customer Centeredness, Firm Ambidexterity and Entrepreneurial Collaboration**

Market orientation is an activity system in which the actions of identifying and responding to the attitudes of potential customers and competitors utilize and develop the company's process, organization, and management system. Therefore, it is possible that the market-oriented leading company can establish the strategic establishment and execution goal of attracting more customers than other competitors, and the research shows that the organization of the market-oriented leading company positively affects the corporate performance in the existing research (Jaworski And Kohli, 1993; Slater and Naver, 1994)..

This research infer from the literature that customer centeredness suggest on the consist of three components—the customer centeredness, the competitor orientation, and the inferfunctional coordination(Narver and Slater, 1990).

Firstly, the customer centeredness is the sufficient understanding of one's target buyers to be able to create superior value for them continuously. A customer centeredness requires that a seller understand a buyer's entire value chain, not only as it is today but also as it will evolve over time subject to internal and market dynamics(Narver and Slater). Eventually, the customer centeredness for the NBEs means that it comprehended the customer needs and offered the customer value.

Secondly, competitor orientation is defined as the ability of competitors in the industry and potential competitors to enter in the future to recognize strength and weakness in the short term and capability and strategy in the long term. And then searching for the corresponding point(Narver and Slater, 1990). After all, the competitor orientation for the NBEs means that it understood the customer analysis and contemplated the seller's target or buyer's target.

Third, inter-departmental coordination can be defined as internal consolidation of corporate resources that pursues value creation and profit realization to meet customer needs. Any point in the buyer's value chain affords an opportunity for a seller to create value for the buyer's firm(Narver and Slater, 1990). Namely, the NBEs was required to the interfunctional coordination and reflected on the strategic management.

Lumpkin and Dess(1996) announced the dimensions of firm ambidexterity which were divided innovativeness, and openness towards risk-taking(Miller, 1983; Covin and Slevin, 1989). Most empirical studies of firm ambidexterity have utilized the instrument developed by Miller(1983) and extended by Covin and Selvin(1989), Lumpkin and Dess(1996), and Matsuno and John(2002), and Li et al. (2008), and Gonzalez-Benito et al(2009).

First, risk taking is a tendency to take reckless actions such as investing enormous resources and heavy borrowing in a venture to adventure entry or uncertain outcome of an unknown new market. In other words, if there is a risk, but the pursuit method seizes opportunities, the managerial characteristic within the scope of utilizing the existing resources can be considered as considering the resources first and then building the opportunity. And, the NBEs have the social entrepreneurs and the other risk related the management system. In order to manage business entrepreneurs, the other NBEs should be highly constrained. This research can be argued that all business endeavors involve some degree of risk, such that it is not meaningful to think in the absolutely non-risk.

Second, adaptiveness represents a tendency to escape from existing execution systems or technologies by helping and facilitating new products, new ideas, experiments, and creative processes. And it is focused exclusively on the product market aspect of innovation activities. In other words, the NBEs were asked to rate the extent to which they emphasize the technological development and seek to build a reputation for trying new methods and technologies. And, this important aspect of innovativeness is based on the survival company and the success in adopting new business.

The entrepreneurial collaboration included variables such as the acceptance of the idea of the venture in the public discourse, and existence or absence of support and infrastructure services. The process dimension focused on variables such as identifying need, opportunity, planning, network building, creating partnerships, acquiring legitimacy and resources, and ability to stand the market test. This dimension between the variables according to four sectors is for analytical purposes only and it is clearly not absolute(Moshe and Lerner, 2006).

The entrepreneurial collaboration is offered to mobilizing resources and expertise includes allocating capital, labor and efforts. So, it is the most of important resources, and serves in the non-profit organization. Eventually, entrepreneurial collaboration is distinct to be envisaging with regarded to it.

The entrepreneurial collaboration has provided a solution for social networks in non-profit organizations (Cooper, 1993), measuring the performance of individuals or entrepreneurs, organizations, environments, processes, and entrepreneurs, organizations and environments (Schutzens and Wever, 2000), and Shane (2003) also suggested that the relationship between entrepreneurial process components and entrepreneurs affects organizational performance.

### **III. RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT**

#### **3.1. Hypotheses Development**

The results of previous studies are summarized as follows: First, the customer centeredness is the main determinant of social performance in most existing studies (Narver and Slater, 1990; Jaworski and Kohli, 1993; Slater and Narver, 1994; Matsuno et al., 2002). Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater (1990) demonstrate that customer centeredness has high organizational performance. This is because the members of the department in the organization have high performance in business integration and business promotion activities respectively. In addition, Narver and Slater (1990) suggested and identified important factors that improve and create profitability of the firm.

customer centered organizations that respond positively to customers' desires and preferences and that they can achieve higher results because they are more satisfied with their customers. Pelbam (2000) and Matsuno et al. (2002) also show that the higher the customer centeredness, the higher the

managerial performance. Kara et al. (2004) also found that the relationship between customer centeredness and organizational performance and that it has a direct impact. These results show that there is a positive (+) relationship between customer centered firms and social performance. Based on these prior studies, the following research hypotheses were established.

**H<sub>1</sub>: Customer centeredness has positive effect on social performance of non-business entities.**

The main reason why firm ambidexterity has been studied in various ways and attracted more attention in recent years is that individual companies pursuing firm ambidexterity have positively influenced social performance for the realization of social purpose. Firm ambidexterity is an important factor for nonprofit organizations, suggesting that many scholars have a significant impact on social performance. This suggests that entrepreneurial behavior of nonprofit organizations has a great impact on the creation of new businesses and that it can secure competitive advantage.

Lee Kwang-woo (2009) suggests that firm ambidexterity of social enterprise improves social performance, and Hwang Mi-ae (2007) also argues that characteristics of women's entrepreneurs influence social performance. In addition, Jang Sung Hee et al. (2010) suggested that entrepreneurship of a social enterprise pursuing sustainable social purpose has a positive effect on social performance. These results show that firm ambidexterity has a significant effect on social performance. Based on these prior studies, the following research hypotheses were established.

**H<sub>2</sub>: Firm ambidexterity has positive effect on social performance of non-business entities.**

**H<sub>2-1</sub>: Proactiveness has positive effect on social performance of non-business entities.**

**H<sub>2-2</sub>: Adaptiveness has positive effect on social performance of non-business entities.**

Social networks are classified into various types according to scholars. In this study, social network is composed of various factors such as the domain of industry, the stage of growth and development, the structure of industry, the demand change. In other words, the industrial structure affects the behavior of the company and the social performance is determined by the behavior of the company. It is a very important factor for the growth and sustainability of the company through the favorable relationship. Therefore entrepreneurial collaboration has been shown to be very beneficial as social support, governmental institutional support, and subsidies can influence organizational outcomes (Wheeler et al., 2003), and that human, academic, lag, and social friendships are high (Moshe and Lerner, 2007).

In the case of not-for-profit organizations as well as for-profit organizations, human, academic, lag, and thick social contacts are beneficial to the growth and development of the organization. In addition, social support, government subsidies, and institutional support are very important factors affecting the social performance of nonprofit organizations because of the nature of nonprofit organization that maximizes public profit instead of goal of profit maximization. In addition, it has been pointed out that inducing capital and labor investment in future projects of nonprofit organizations is also a great help in supplementing one human capital (Baron and Markman, 2000). Based on these prior studies, the following research hypotheses were established.

**H<sub>3</sub>: Entrepreneurial collaboration has positive effect on social performance of non-business entities.**

### **3.2. Variables and Measures**

Measurements in previous studies were developed in order to use empirically validated metrics. Except for the demographic variables, all variables were measured as 5-points scale. [Table 1] is a summary of variable items.

**Table 1. Research Variables Items**

Research Variables		Measure Items	Author(s)	Items
Customer centeredness		market orientation, competitor orientation, interfunctional coordination	Joworski & Kohil(1993) Greenley(1995)	6
Firm ambidexterity	Proactiveness	capture new opportunities, risk-taking firms should seek opportunities	Slater & Narver(1994)	4
	Adaptiveness	supporting and encourages new ideas, experimentation and creativity	Lumpkin & Dess(1996)	4
Entrepreneurial collaboration		the human resource, the school relation, the kinship, and the social position	Matasuno & Mentzer(2002)	6
Social performance		seeking to profit activity in the NBEs	Kare et al.(2004) Hee Tae Lee(2000)	5

#### IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

##### 4.1. Sample and Survey

Data collection was performed from November 20 to December 03, 2009 in the western part of Gyeongsangnam-do and Busan area in South Korea. A total of 156 questionnaires were collected . The questionnaire was used for final analysis. SPSS 20.0 was used and analyzed for statistical analysis of data collected for this study. The frequency and percentage of the demographic characteristics, the validity and reliability of the measurement tools, and the chromeback alpha coefficient were used to identify the general characteristics of the subjects. The relationship between the theoretical variables included in the analysis was calculated by calculating the Pearson correlation and the hierarchical regression was used for the hypothesis test.

**Table 2. Overview of Sample Statistics**

Classification		Frequency(person)	Percentage(%)
Gender	Male	52	36.6
	Female	90	63.4
Age	Above 20 age	18	12.7
	Above 30 age	42	29.6
	Above 40 age	50	35.2
	Above 50 age	25	17.6
	Above 60 age	7	4.9
Education	High School(Graduates)	25	16.2
	College/Univ.(Enrolled)	55	39.7
	University(Graduates)	52	36.6
	Graduates(MS/PH.D)	12	8.5
Position	Employee	29	20.4
	Chief/Duty Section Chief	19	13.4
	Section Chief	45	31.7
	Director	17	12.0

	General Manager/CEO	32	22.5
Career Year	Under 2 year	16	11.3
	2 to 4 year	34	23.9
	5 to 9 year	41	28.9
	10 to 14 year	30	21.1
	Above 15 year	21	14.8
Entrepreneurship	Experience	49	34.5
Education	Non Experience	93	65.5

#### 4.2 Reliability and Validity Analysis

In this study, the validity of the hypothesis test results should be verified to verify the reliability and validity of the measurement tools. In this study, we used Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficient, which is the internal correlation of survey items, for the reliability analysis of measurement tools. Factor analysis was used to analyze the validity of the measurement variables.

Table 3 shows the reliability coefficients of the questionnaire, summarizing Cronbach's  $\alpha$  as a single factor of customer centeredness, entrepreneurial collaboration and social performance and two factors of firm ambidexterity. The reliability coefficient was 0.6 or more for each item, confirming that there was no problem in using the item as a reliable measurement tool.

*Table 3. Reliability Test*

Variable	Before Items	After Items	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Customer centeredness	6	6	.734
Firm ambidexterity	Proactiveness	4	.823
	Adaptiveness	4	.853
Entrepreneurial collaboration	6	5	.793
Social performance	5	5	.837

*Table 4. Validity Test*

Variable	①	②	③	④	⑤
Customer centeredness2	.843				
Customer centeredness1	.821				
Customer centeredness3	.802				
Customer centeredness6	.793				
Customer centeredness4	.771				
Customer centeredness5	.735				
Entrepreneurial collaboration3		.831			
Entrepreneurial collaboration2		.824			
Entrepreneurial collaboration4		.798			
Entrepreneurial collaboration5		.776			
Entrepreneurial collaboration1		.682			
Firm ambidexterity	Adaptiveness2		.834		
	Adaptiveness3		.799		
	Adaptiveness4		.783		
	Adaptiveness1		.746		
	Proactiveness1			.822	
	Proactiveness3			.811	
	Proactiveness2			.787	
	Proactiveness4			.724	

Social Performance2					.832
Social Performance4					.805
Social Performance5					.801
Social Performance3					.787
Social Performance1					.755
<hr/>					
Eigen Value	3.677	3.558	2.724	2.435	2.525
Index of dispersion(%)	18.37	18.532	13.543	12.765	12.655
Cumulative Variance(%)	18.27	36.802	50.345	63.11	75.765

Parameters and limits in this study are exceeding 0.5. And, If the validity concept is higher than 1, it is considered valid. Thus, it has the reliability and the validity. [Table 3] and [Table 4] show the reliability and the validity analysis.

### 4.3. Hypotheses Testing

Firstly, as a result of hypothesis testing, hypothesis 1 was accepted, which is that the customer centeredness has a positive effect on the dependent variable ( $t=3.63, p=.000$ ). Secondly,  $H_2$  was also accepted; the firm adaptiveness has a positive effect on the dependent variable. From the other point of view, the proactiveness does not have a positive influence on the dependent variable ( $t=0.675, p=0.661$ ), and the adaptiveness has a positive effect on the dependent variable ( $t=3.35, p=.001$ ). Lastly,  $H_3$  was also accepted; the Entrepreneurial collaboration has a positive effect on the dependent variable ( $t=3.56, p=.000$ ). [Table 6] is a summary on the results of hypothesis testing.

*Table 6. Summary of Hypotheses Testing Results*

Path	t-value	p-value	Test Results
$H_1$ : Customer centeredness → Social Performance	<b>3.63</b>	<b>.000*</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
$H_2$ : Firm ambidexterity → Social Performance	-	-	<b>Partially Accepted</b>
$H_{2-1}$ : Proactiveness → Social Performance	.675	.661	Rejected
$H_{2-2}$ : Adaptiveness → Social Performance	<b>3.35</b>	<b>.001*</b>	<b>Accepted</b>
$H_3$ : Entrepreneurial collaboration → Social Performance	<b>3.56</b>	<b>.000*</b>	<b>Accepted</b>

\*\*  $P < 0.005$ , \* $P < 0.001$

## V. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study aims to analyze the effects of customer centeredness, the firm adaptiveness and the entrepreneurial collaboration on the social performance of non-business entities in the Western Gyeongnam and Busan Regions in South Korea.

The followings are the main results of this study. Firstly, the customer centeredness was shown to have a positive relationship with the social performance. The customer centeredness as well as the understanding customer demand, the value creation, the degree of discussion on employer, the degree of organizational reaction, and the interfunctional communication was shown to have a positive relationship with the social performance. And, the competitor perspective, and interfunctional coordination has shown to have a positive relationship with the social performance. On the other side, Hart and Diamantopoulos(1993) has not positive effect on the social performance, and as like Geenly(1995) has not positive effect. And, Jeong and Ruy(2007) also was empirically shown that the customer centeredness appears to have a partial positive influence on the social performance. In sum,

the literature review was mainly accomplished the profit organization, as well as this research was equally shown the non-profit organization.

Secondly, the firm ambidexterity showed to have partial positive relationship with the social performance. The entrepreneurial adaptiveness appears to have positive relationship with the organizational performance (Jeong and Ruy, 2007). However, the firm adaptiveness as like the corporate strategy appears to have positive relationship with social performance. The firm adaptiveness as like the adaptiveness showed the positive relationship with the business performance, and the enterprise culture has consider to be change the business process. And, Jang and Bahn (2010) also has positive relationship with the social performance. In other words, the firm ambidexterity showed to have partial positive influence on the social performance, as well as this research was equally shown the non-profit organization.

Thirdly, the entrepreneurial collaboration was proven to have positive relationship with the social performance. Namely, the social performance is most important the company group through the social environment. Lee (2009) was investigated the entrepreneurial collaboration group (eg. the personal connection and the in-lawship, the local resident, the local company, the government and the local government, the local bank). And, the entrepreneurial collaboration for the social firm showed to have relationship. Therefore, this research suggested that the entrepreneurial collaboration are most important the human relationship. Also, Moshe and Lerner (2006) argued that the success factor of social venture is important both the social connection and the human network. Eventually, the entrepreneurial collaboration for NBEs similarly showed to have positive relationship with the social performance.

In sum, through the empirical analysis results, customer centeredness and the entrepreneurial collaboration showed the positive relationship with the social performance of NBE. But, the firm ambidexterity appears to have partial positive relationship. In other words, the adaptiveness dimension is an influential factor but he proactiveness was not significant. Therefore, in the future researches it is expected to be useful for development of NBEs.

## References

- [1] Claudia Flowers, "Advanced Statistics(sub-note).", The College of Education at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 2012.
- [2] Dong Jin Lee, "Policy Trends and Projects on the Corporate Social Responsibility.", Korea Gas Corporation (Internal Document), 2007.
- [3] Govin J. G., D. P. Slevin, "Strategic Management of Small Firms in Hostile and Benign Environment.", *Strat Man Journ.* 10(1): 75-87, 1989.
- [4] Fremont E. Kast, G. R. Foxall, "External Moderation of Association Among Stakeholder Orientations and Company Performance.", *Inter J of Res in Mar*, 15(1): 51-69, 1998.
- [5] Greenley G. E., "Customer orientation and Company Performance: Empirical Evidence from UK Companies", *Brit J Man*, 6(1): 1-13, 1995.
- [6] Joworski B. J., Kohil A. K., "Customer orientation: Antecedents and Consequences.", *J of Mar*, 57(3): 52-70, 1993.
- [7] Hart S., Diamantopoulos, "Linking Customer orientation and Company Performance: Preliminary Work on Kohil and Jaworski's Framework.", *J of Strat Mar*, 1(2): 93-122, 1993.
- [8] Hee Tae Lee, "An analysis on the NGOs Support Project in the Local Government: forcing on the Buasn City.", *K Loc Gove Stu*, 4(1): 131-151, 2000.
- [9] Hyung Taek Lee, Myung Su Chea, "The Relationship Between Entrepreneurship, IT Competency, Customer orientation, and Performance: Empirical Study Focused on Foreign Investment Firms.", *J of Inter Tra and Indu Stu*, 12(3): 205-229, 2007.
- [10] Joon Goo Han, Hyoung Goo Moon, "Business Perspectives to Not-For-Profit Organizations: Research Trends and Future Directions.", *K N-P Organ Res*, 2(2): 47-98, 2003.
- [11] Kare A. Spillan J. E., DeShields O. W., "An Empirical Investigation of the Link Between Customer orientation and Business Performance in Non-Profit Service Providers.", *J of Mar Theo and Pract*, 12(2): 59-72, 2004.
- [12] Kohil A. K, B. J. Jaworski, "Customer orientation: The Construct, Research Propositions and Managerial Implication.", *J of Market*, 54(2): 1-18, 1990.

- [13] Kwang Woo Lee, “An Empirical Study on the Success Factors of Sustainable Social Enterprise, PH.”, D Disse, Soongsil Uninvestiy, 2009.
- [14] Laster M. Salamon, Helmut K. Anheier, “The Emerging Nonprofit Sector: An Overview(John Hopkins Nonprofit Sector Series 1).”, Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1996.
- [15] Lumpkin G. T., G. G. Dess, “Clarifying the Firm innovativeness Construct and Linking it to Performance.” T A of Man Re. 21(1): 135-172, 1996.
- [16] Matasuno Ken, John T. Mentzer, “The Effects of Entrepreneurial Proclivity and Customer orientation on Business Performance.”, J of Mar, 66(4): 1-16, 2002.
- [17] Mee Ae Hwang, “The Effects of Characteristics of Woman Entrepreneurs on Managerial and Social Performance.”, PH. D Diss, Soongsil Uninvestiy, 2007.
- [18] Moshe Sharir, Miri Lemer, “Gauging the Success of Social Ventures Initiated by Individual Social Entrepreneurs.”, J of Wo Bus, 41(1), 6-20, 2006.
- [19] Miller D., “The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms, Man Sci.”, 29(7): 770-791, 1983.
- [20] Naman J. L., Slevin D. P., “Entrepreneurship and the Concept of Fit: A Model and Empirical Tests.” Stra Man J, 14(2): 137-153, 1983.
- [21] Narver J. C., S. F. Slater, “The Effect of a Customer orientation on Business Profitability.”, J of Mar, 54(4), 20-35, 1990.
- [22] Schonnhoven C. B., “Problems with Contingency Theory: Testing Assumptions Hidden within the Language of Contingency Theory.”, Ad Sci Quart, 26(3): 349-377, 1981.
- [23] Slater S. F., J. C. Narver, “Product-Market Strategy and Performance: An Analysis of the Miles and Snow Strategy Types.”, Euro J of Mar, 27(10): 33-51, 1994.
- [24] Sung Hee Jang, Sung Sik Bahn, “The Effect of Firm innovativeness and Customer orientation on the Economic and Social Performance of a Social Enterprise, K J of Bus Ad.”, 23(6): 3479-3496, 2010.
- [25] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonprofit\\_organization](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nonprofit_organization).