

# AN EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ENTREPRENEURIAL VALUES BASED DEVELOPMENTAL INTERACTION CAPABILITY

Roy Setiawan<sup>1</sup>, Anis Eliyana<sup>2</sup>, Tatik Suryani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Kristen Petra / Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Perbanas, Indonesia

Corresponding author: [roy@petra.ac.id](mailto:roy@petra.ac.id)

## ABSTRACT

This research will develop a new conceptual model that is Entrepreneurial Values-Based Developmental Interaction Capability (EVBDIC), which is synthesized from the concepts of knowledge, work interaction in organizations, and entrepreneurial values. This study used a survey method for 756 business start-up respondents in Indonesia and was tested using Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with SPSS software. The test results show that the concept of EVBDIC can be measured by indicators: interaction for updating the work process, interaction for combining knowledge and skills, interacting for increasing individual capacity, idea generation, supporting others to act entrepreneurially.

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurial Values, Developmental Interaction Capability, Knowledge, Idea Generation.

## Correspondence:

Roy Setiawan

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Kristen Petra / Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia

Corresponding author: [roy@petra.ac.id](mailto:roy@petra.ac.id)

## INTRODUCTION

Knowledge is divided into two forms, namely explicit knowledge and tacit knowledge. Explicit knowledge or sometimes called formal knowledge, can be conveyed in language, also including numbers and words, mathematical signs, specifications, manuals, and others. Explicit knowledge is also ready to be spread to others. Besides, explicit knowledge can be quickly processed by computers, electronic devices, or storage databases. Tacit knowledge is stored in individual experiences and intangible factors, such as personal beliefs, perspectives, and value systems. Tacit knowledge is difficult to articulate in formal language. The contents include their understanding, intuition, and premonition. Before communicating tacit knowledge must be changed in the form of words, models, or numbers that can be understood (Polanyi, 1966).

There are four styles of conversion or knowledge creation obtained from both kinds of knowledge (Nonaka, 2007):

- a. Socialization: includes tacit knowledge sharing activities between individuals. The term socialization is used because tacit knowledge is spread through joint activities, such as living together, spending time together - not through writing or verbal instructions. Thus, in some instances, tacit knowledge can only be disseminated if someone feels free to become someone who has more excellent tacit knowledge than others. In practice, socialization is carried out through knowledge capture activities through physical closeness such as the interaction between leaders and followers, leaders and leaders, followers, and followers.
- b. Externalization: requires the presentation of tacit knowledge in a more general form so that it can be understood by others. At this stage of externalization, individuals are committed to a group and become one with the group. In practice, externalization is supported by two key factors. (i) articulation of tacit knowledge, i.e., conversion from tacit to explicit, as in

dialogue. (ii) translate tacit knowledge from experts into an understandable form, such as documents, manuals, and so on.

- c. Combinations include the conversion of explicit knowledge into more complex forms of explicit knowledge sets. In practice, the combination phase depends on the following three processes: (1) capture and integration of new explicit knowledge, including the collection of external data from within or outside the institution, and then combining the data. (2) the dissemination of explicit knowledge through presentations or face-to-face meetings. (3) the processing of explicit knowledge so that it is easier to re-use, for example, planning documents, reports, market data, and so on.
- d. Internalization: new knowledge is the conversion of explicit knowledge into tacit organizational knowledge. Individuals must identify knowledge relevant to their needs in the management of that knowledge. In practice, internalization can be done in two dimensions. First, the application of explicit knowledge in direct action and practice. Example through training programs. Second, the mastery of explicit knowledge through simulation, experimentation, or learning while working.

The concept of the knowledge chain was first introduced by Kouloupoulos, Torms, and Spinello in 1997 when researching to compile the book "Corporate Instinct." There are four links in the knowledge chain consisting of (Frappalo, 2017):

- a. internal awareness
- b. internal responsiveness (internal responsiveness)
- c. external responsiveness (external responsiveness)
- d. external awareness (external awareness)

Prusak, Quintas, Lefrere, and Jones stated that knowledge management includes the process or practice of creating, acquiring, capturing, sharing, and using knowledge to

## *An Exploratory Factor Analysis For Entrepreneurial Values Based Developmental Interaction Capability*

enrich learning and performance in an organization. Discovery is realized through conversation, debate, uncertainty, and doubt, and discovery is simply a significant result of the wrong idea at the right time or vice versa. Furthermore, creativity is not an experience that just appears, but it is an actual and imagined process of showing ideas (Falk & Adelman, 2003; Moffet, McAdam, & Parkinson, 2003).

In addition to knowledge, no less critical in organizational studies is human behavior as a member of the organization. If it is related to the ability of humans as members of an organization to apply the knowledge gained, it will form a creative behavior in solving problems that can be called Entrepreneurial behavior. Entrepreneurial behavior in organizations involves the discovery or development and exploitation of previously unknown opportunities. There is increasing evidence to suggest that such behavior is essential and strategic for renewal, innovation in existing companies. Entrepreneurial behavior tends to vary depending on the individual who is stimulated by the role of management (Deniz, Boz, & Ertosun, 2011; Dutta & Thornhill, 2008; Janney & Dess, 2006; Li, Wang, Huang, & Bai, 2013; Marcati, Guido, & Peluso, 2008; Mustafa, Martin, & Hughes, 2016; Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003).

### **Literature Review**

Knowledge has developed into a concept that is so influential on the organization, even in specific communities. Knowledge has a crucial impact on organizational achievement. Knowledge can be divided into two perspectives, namely ownership and practical. The ownership perspective regards knowledge as something we already have due to habits, sources of knowledge. Meanwhile, the realistic view considers that knowledge is something done by someone and usually through interaction with the social environment. Knowledge in organizations needs to be organized or managed. The process of managing knowledge is more popular with the terms knowledge management, and knowledge management is very dependent on the role of Knowledge Sharing (Hau, Kim, Lee, & Kim, 2013; Kim & Lee, 2013; Kuah, Wong, & Tiwari, 2013; Zhu, 2016).

Knowledge Sharing is defined as the process by which the exchange of knowledge or experience between individuals within an organization to equip the abilities, skills, and views of the individual to produce maximum results to the individual or organization. Knowledge is a tangible asset, so it is effortless and possible to be shared with others in equipping themselves. Knowledge Sharing is the process of communication between people in an organization and in that process sharing information or ideas, or knowledge is shared (Raab, Ambos, & Tallman, 2014; Reyhav & Te'eni, 2009; Yeşil, Koska, & Büyükbeşe, 2013).

The process of interaction within an organization is essential for achieving organizational goals. This interaction occurs between leaders, followers, and work units. The ability of an organization to identify the resources, processes, context and expected results of each follower becomes the basis for anticipating change. Besides, the organization is also deemed necessary to improve social and emotional relations between members of the organization to create strong cohesiveness. Relationships and interactions that occur are expected to trigger the emergence of knowledge sharing. With the knowledge sharing between leaders,

followers, and coworkers will educate each individual to improve their skills and competencies; this is what is called the concept of developing interaction (Karpen, Bove, Luke, & Zyphur, 2015).

The practice of knowledge sharing that occurs in each individual will involve cognitive and affective processes. The cognitive process means that the individual will know and clarify the work and its attributes. While the effective method will energize individuals to have positive feelings, be responsible, responsive, interested in sharing knowledge, be strongly motivated to find the best solution, inspire, and be inspired to always act creatively in improving performance. Significant efforts have been devoted to understanding entrepreneurial interaction behavior. Until now, it has been shown that a combination of individual and organizational factors can facilitate entrepreneurial interaction behavior. At the organizational level, factors such as management support, management policies, rewards, time availability, have all been repeatedly found to influence entrepreneurial interaction behavior. Through this process, developmental interaction will occur which will form individuals to be able to create entrepreneurial added values in their work-life which in this study is called the concept of entrepreneurial values based on developmental interaction capability (Budworth, 2011; Deniz et al., 2011; Dutta & Thornhill, 2008 Han, Lee, Beyerlein, & Kolb, 2017; Janney & Dess, 2006; Li et al., 2013; Marcati et al., 2008; Matošková & Směšná, 2017; Mustafa et al., 2016; Shane et al., 2003; Sulistyani & Ferdinand, 2018).

Entrepreneurial Values-based developmental interaction capability makes a person have new knowledge and abilities about a matter because it makes the learning environment in the organization more effective and efficient. Organizations do not need to incur high costs in equipping someone to gain knowledge and abilities on a matter.

In Entrepreneurial Values-based developmental interaction capability, there is an exchange of knowledge or experience between individuals in an organization to equip the abilities, skills, and views of the individual to produce maximum results for the individual or organization. These things are tangible assets, so it is straightforward and possible to be shared with others in equipping themselves. Through the process of communication between people in an organization, sharing information or ideas or knowledge is shared. With adequate information or data, an individual's ability will develop, be it performance, the ability to decide on something, and make the individual more creative, because creativity requires new knowledge or information (Brandstätter, 2011; Budworth, 2011; De Clercq, Dimov, & Thongpapanl, 2010; Deniz et al., 2011; Han et al., 2017; Matošková & Směšná, 2017; Mustafa et al., 2016; Phillips, Tracey, & Karra, 2013; Restuccia, 2009; Shane et al., 2003; Sulistyani & Ferdinand, 2018).

The formation of constructive work interactions in organizations is strongly influenced by the work environment which is oriented to growth (Crouter, 1984; Dziallas, 2018; Elizur & Shye, 1990; Frishammar, 2014; Gillespie, 2011), so this work interaction determines whether the leader will perform empowering followers to mature and prepare to become future leaders. The concept of empowerment has been widely studied in previous research, for example in the concept of

## An Exploratory Factor Analysis For Entrepreneurial Values Based Developmental Interaction Capability

psychological empowerment (Abukhait, Bani-Melhem, & Zeffane, 2019; Flohrer, 2014; Matsuo, 2019; Meyerson & Kline, 2007; Rapp, Gilson, Mathieu, & Ruddy, 2019, 2016; Spreitzer, 1995; Sulisty & Siyamtinah, 2016).

Entrepreneurial Values based on developmental interaction capability have five indicators that explain their formation and measurement (Mustafa et al., 2016; Sulistyani & Ferdinand, 2018):

1. interaction for updating work process: Some interactions occur in the work environment to improve work processes, as measured by the statement:
  - a. Leaders and coworkers interact with me to enhance work processes (EVBIDIC-1)
2. interaction for combining knowledge and skills: Some interactions occur in the work environment actively to combine knowledge and skills, as measured by the statement:
  - a. My leader and colleague interact with me actively to combine knowledge and skills (EVBIDIC-2).
3. interaction for increasing individual capacity: Some interactions occur in the work environment to increase individual capacity, as measured by the statement:
  - a. My leader and coworkers interact with me to increase my capacity (EVBIDIC-3)
4. Idea generation: Some interactions occur in the work environment to generate ideas, as measured by the statement:
  - a. I get a new idea when I see people interacting in their work (EVBIDIC-4).
  - b. I get a new idea when interacting with customers (EVBIDIC-5).
  - c. I got a new idea when I saw what was happening in the broader business environment (EVBIDIC-6).
5. Supporting others to act entrepreneurially: Some interactions occur in the work environment to support each other applying the entrepreneurial spirit, as measured by the statement:
  - a. I encourage others to have a new way of getting their work done (EVBIDIC-7).
  - b. I help others to improve their work (EVBIDIC-8).

### Research Method

Factor analysis is a statistical analysis tool that is used to reduce the factors that affect a variable to just a few sets of indicators, without losing essential information. As an illustration, there are 50 indicators identified as influencing consumer purchasing decisions. With factor analysis, the 50 indicators will be grouped into several subsets of similar indicators. Each subset group is then named according to the clustering indicator. The grouping is based on the closeness of the correlation between each indicator. Factor analysis is used for initial research where the factors that influence a variable have not been well identified (explanatory research). In addition, factor analysis can also be used to test the validity of a series of questionnaires. As an illustration, if an indicator does not group to the variable, but instead groups to another variable, it means that the indicator is invalid. The principle underlying factor analysis is to simplify the description of the data by reducing the

number of variables/dimensions. Factor analysis is a statistical method used to explain the variability between observable variables (manifest variables) or correlated variables with amounts that describe the number of unobserved variables called factors (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019).

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) is a statistical method used to build a structural model that consists of a set of many variables. EFA is one of the factor analysis methods to identify the relationship between manifest variables or indicator variables in constructing a construct. EFA is used in conditions where researchers do not have preliminary information or hypotheses that must be grouped into any variable set of indicators that have been made. So, the researcher departs from the indicator (manifest) then forms a variable. EFA is also used in conditions where latent variables have unclear indicators. one latent variable indicator may overlap with other latent variable indicators (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009; Henson & Roberts, 2016; Reio & Shuck, 2014).

This study uses SPSS software to analyze EFA. The input used is data from indicator variables. Because there is no assumption as to where the indicators will cluster, usually in the EFA analysis, it is unknown how many latent factors or variables will be formed. Measures that indicate that an indicator is included in a particular indicator in the EFA is the value of the loading factor. When the value of loading an indicator is greater than one particular factor, then the indicator can be grouped into these factors (Hayton, Allen, & Scarpello, 2016; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019). The study used a sample of 756 respondents who were business start-up employees in Indonesia.

### Results and Discussions

The EFA test requirements are as follows (Fabrigar et al., 1999; Hayton et al., 2016; Henson & Roberts, 2016; Reio & Shuck, 2014; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2019; Watkins, 2018):

1. KMO and Bartlett's Test values must be high (minimum > 0.5)
2. Components Matrix must be in 1 column
3. If there are numbers contained in 2 columns, then the indicator must be discarded, then reprocessed until the matrix data is in 1 column

From data processing, 756 respondents who obtained the results as in table 1 and table 2 as follows.

**Table 1.** KMO and Bartlett's Test (Sequence 1)

*An Exploratory Factor Analysis For  
Entrepreneurial Values Based Developmental Interaction Capability*

<b>KMO and Bartlett's Test</b>		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.916
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3115.208
	df	28
	Sig.	.000

**Table 2.** Componen Matrix (Sequence 1)

<b>Component Matrix<sup>a</sup></b>	
	Component 1
EVBDIC3	.792
EVBDIC2	.791
EVBDIC6	.779
EVBDIC4	.768
EVBDIC8	.763
EVBDIC1	.759
EVBDIC5	.755
EVBDIC7	.751
<b>Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.</b> <b>a. 1 components extracted.</b>	

In table 1, the KMO and Bartlett's Test scores show 0.916, which means that the results meet the requirements because the value is more than 0.5. In table 2, all the measurement indicators are in one column matrix component, so testing at this stage is immediately declared to meet the requirements, and there are no indicators eliminated and grouping accordingly.

### Conclusions

Through the results of the EFA test above, it can be concluded that the measurement of Entrepreneurial Values-Based Developmental Interaction Capability (EVBDIC) can be done with the following indicators:

1. Interaction for updating work process.
2. Interaction for combining knowledge and skills.
3. Interaction for increasing individual capacity.
4. Idea generation.
5. Supporting others to act entrepreneurially.

In future studies, the concept of PWE can be used to examine the relationship between antecedents and consequences variables in the same context as this study and different settings.

### REFERENCES

1. Abukhait, R. M., Bani-Melhem, S., & Zeffane, R. (2019). Empowerment, Knowledge Sharing and Innovative Behaviours: Exploring Gender Differences. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, 23(01), 1950006. doi: [10.1142/s1363919619500063](https://doi.org/10.1142/s1363919619500063)
2. Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2009). Exploratory Structural Equation Modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 16(3), 397-438. doi: [10.1080/10705510903008204](https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903008204)
3. Brandstätter, H. (2011). Personality aspects of entrepreneurship: A look at five meta-analyses. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(3), 222-230. doi: [10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.07.007)
4. Budworth, M.-H. I. n. (2011). Individual learning and group performance: the role of collective efficacy. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 23(6), 391-401. doi: [10.1108/13665621111154403](https://doi.org/10.1108/13665621111154403)
5. Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 10(7). doi: [10.7275/jyj1-4868](https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868)
6. Crouter, A. C. (1984). Participative Work as an Influence on Human Development. *JOURNAL OF APPLIED DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 5, 71-90.
7. De Clercq, D., Dimov, D., & Thongpapanl, N. (2010). The moderating impact of internal social exchange processes on the entrepreneurial orientation-performance relationship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 87-103. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.01.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2009.01.004)
8. Deniz, N., Boz, İ. T., & Ertoşun, Ö. G. (2011). The Relationship between Entrepreneur's Level of Perceived Business-Related Fear and Business Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 579-600. doi: [10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.038)
9. Dutta, D. K., & Thornhill, S. (2008). The evolution of growth intentions: Toward a cognition-based model. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 23(3), 307-332. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusvent.2007.02.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2007.02.003)
10. Dziallas, M. (2018). How to evaluate innovative ideas and concepts at the front-end? *Journal of Business Research*. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.008)
11. Elizur, D., & Shye, S. (1990). Quality of Work Life and its Relation to Quality of Life. *APPLIED PSYCHOLOGY: AN INTERNATIONAL REVIEW*, 39(3), 275-291.
12. Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Psychological Research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272-299.
13. Falk, J. H., & Adelman, L. M. (2003). Investigating the Impact of Prior Knowledge and Interest on Aquarium Visitor Learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(2).
14. Flohrer, N. (2014). Psychological Empowerment: Quantitative Research on Antecedents and Outcomes

*An Exploratory Factor Analysis For  
Entrepreneurial Values Based Developmental Interaction Capability*

- in Research & Development Projects. (Doctoral), Universität München, Germany.
15. Frappaolo, C. (2017). Implicit knowledge. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice*, 6(1), 23-25. doi: [10.1057/palgrave.kmmp.8500168](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.kmmp.8500168)
  16. Frishammar, J. (2014). Organizational Environment Revisited: A Conceptual Review and Integration. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 36(3), 22-49. doi: [10.2753/imo0020-8825360302](https://doi.org/10.2753/imo0020-8825360302)
  17. Gillespie, S. (2011). Employment and Support Allowance Work Capability Assessment review. United Kingdom: MS Society.
  18. Han, S. J., Lee, Y., Beyerlein, M., & Kolb, J. (2017). Shared leadership in teams the role of coordination, goal commitment, and knowledge sharing on perceived team performance. *Team Performance management: An International Journal*. doi: [10.1108/tpm-11-2016-0050](https://doi.org/10.1108/tpm-11-2016-0050)
  19. Hau, Y. S., Kim, B., Lee, H., & Kim, Y.-G. (2013). The effects of individual motivations and social capital on employees' tacit and explicit knowledge sharing intentions. *International Journal of Information Management*, 33(2), 356-366. doi: [10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.10.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2012.10.009)
  20. Hayton, J. C., Allen, D. G., & Scarpello, V. (2016). Factor Retention Decisions in Exploratory Factor Analysis: a Tutorial on Parallel Analysis. *Organizational Research Methods*, 7(2), 191-205. doi: [10.1177/1094428104263675](https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428104263675)
  21. Henson, R. K., & Roberts, J. K. (2016). Use of Exploratory Factor Analysis in Published Research. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(3), 393-416. doi: [10.1177/0013164405282485](https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405282485)
  22. Janney, J. J., & Dess, G. G. (2006). The risk concept for entrepreneurs reconsidered: New challenges to the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(3), 385-400. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.06.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2005.06.003)
  23. Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2013). Hospitality employee knowledge-sharing behaviors in the relationship between goal orientations and service innovative behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34, 324-337. doi: [10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.009)
  24. Kuah, C. T., Wong, K. Y., & Tiwari, M. K. (2013). Knowledge sharing assessment: An Ant Colony System based Data Envelopment Analysis approach. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 40(8), 3137-3144. doi: [10.1016/j.eswa.2012.12.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2012.12.027)
  25. Li, Y., Wang, X., Huang, L., & Bai, X. (2013). How does entrepreneurs' social capital hinder new business development? A relational embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(12), 2418-2424. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.05.029)
  26. Marcati, A., Guido, G., & Peluso, A. M. (2008). The role of SME entrepreneurs' innovativeness and personality in the adoption of innovations. *Research Policy*, 37(9), 1579-1590. doi: [10.1016/j.respol.2008.06.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2008.06.004)
  27. Matošková, J., & Směšná, P. (2017). Human resource management practices stimulating knowledge sharing. *Management & Marketing*, 12(4). doi: [10.1515/mmcks-2017-0036](https://doi.org/10.1515/mmcks-2017-0036)
  28. Matsuo, M. (2019). Antecedents of psychological empowerment: the effects of developmental experience, learning goal orientation and authenticity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources*. doi: [10.1111/1744-7941.12228](https://doi.org/10.1111/1744-7941.12228)
  29. Meyerson, S. L., & Kline, T. J. B. (2007). Psychological and environmental empowerment: antecedents and consequences. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 29(5). doi: [10.1108/01437730810887049](https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730810887049)
  30. Moffet, S., McAdam, R., & Parkinson, S. (2003). An Empirical Analysis of Knowledge Management Applications. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(3).
  31. Mustafa, M., Martin, L., & Hughes, M. (2016). Psychological Ownership, Job Satisfaction, and Middle Manager Entrepreneurial Behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 23(3), 272-287. doi: [10.1177/1548051815627360](https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051815627360)
  32. Nonaka, I. (2007). *The Knowledge-Creating Company*. Harvard Business Review.
  33. Phillips, N., Tracey, P., & Karra, N. (2013). Building entrepreneurial tie portfolios through strategic homophily: The role of narrative identity work in venture creation and early growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(1), 134-150. doi: [10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2011.12.002)
  34. Polanyi, M. (1966). The Logic of Tacit Inference. *The Journal of The Royal Institute of Philosophy*, 41(155).
  35. Raab, K. J., Ambos, B., & Tallman, S. (2014). Strong or invisible hands? – Managerial involvement in the knowledge sharing process of globally dispersed knowledge groups. *Journal of World Business*, 49(1), 32-41. doi: [10.1016/j.jwb.2013.02.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2013.02.005)
  36. Rapp, T. L., Gilson, L. L., Mathieu, J. E., & Ruddy, T. (2016). Leading empowered teams: An examination of the role of external team leaders and team coaches. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 109-123. doi: [10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2015.08.005)
  37. Reio, T. G., & Shuck, B. (2014). Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 17(1), 12-25. doi: [10.1177/1523422314559804](https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422314559804)
  38. Restuccia, M. (2009). Value Co-Creation Orientation: Conceptualization, Measurement and Impact on Firm Performance. Doctoral Workshop Naples Forum on Services. HEC Montréal.
  39. Reyshav, I., & Te'eni, D. (2009). Knowledge exchange in the shrines of knowledge: The "how's" and "where's" of knowledge sharing processes. *Computers & Education*, 53, 12. doi: [10.1016/j.compedu.2009.06.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2009.06.009)
  40. Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 257-279. doi: [10.1016/s1053-4822\(03\)00017-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(03)00017-2)
  41. Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological Empowerment in The Workplace: Dimensions, Measurement, And Validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5).
  42. Sulistyani, E., & Ferdinand, A. T. (2018). Value Oriented Developmental Interaction Capability: A Driver for Teamwork Performance. *Business: Theory and Practice*, 19, 9. doi: [10.3846/btp.2018.30](https://doi.org/10.3846/btp.2018.30)
  43. Sulistyono, H., & Siyamtinah. (2016). Innovation capability of SMEs through entrepreneurship, marketing capability, relational capital and empowerment. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 21(4), 196-203. doi: [10.1016/j.apmr.2016.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2016.02.002)
  44. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2019). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (Seventh edition ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

*An Exploratory Factor Analysis For  
Entrepreneurial Values Based Developmental Interaction Capability*

45. Watkins, M. W. (2018). Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 44(3), 219-246. doi: [10.1177/0095798418771807](https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418771807)
46. Yeşil, S., Koska, A., & Büyükbeşe, T. (2013). Knowledge Sharing Process, Innovation Capability and Innovation Performance: An Empirical Study. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 75, 217-225. doi: [10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.025)
47. Zhu, Y.-Q. (2016). Solving knowledge sharing disparity: The role of team identification, organizational identification, and in-group bias. *International Journal of Information Management*, 36(6), 1174-1183. doi: [10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2016.08.003)