

Presenting a Theoretical Model of Organizational Components Affecting Entrepreneurship Development for NGOs Active in the Area of Environment

Mohammad Birjandi

PhD in Department of Environmental Education, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

*Maryam Larijani*¹

Assistant Professor in Department of Environmental Education, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

Seyed Mohammad Shobeiri

Professor in Environmental Education, Payame Noor University, Tehran, Iran

Received: 17 March 2018

Accepted: 1 July 2018

Extended Abstract

1. Introduction

Today, entrepreneurship is recognized as a key factor for growth and development. It is also regarded as a multidimensional concept with economic, social, cultural and environmental aspects. Various studies indicate that public participation in the form of NGOs is an essential factor for the development of entrepreneurship in the area of environment and the reduction of effects caused by lack of attention to this area in developing countries. The purpose of the present study is presenting a theoretical model and identifying the effective organizational factors on entrepreneurship development of NGOs that are active in the Iranian environment field.

2. Review of Literature

In the related literature, environmental entrepreneurship has been referred to in different forms including green entrepreneurship (Taylor & Walley, 2003; Schaper, 2002), ethical entrepreneurship (Taylor & Walley, 2003), and environmental entrepreneurship (Keogh & Polonsky, 1998). The term “environmental entrepreneurship” is comprised of the words environment and entrepreneurship which indicates the creation of innovative businesses that produce environmentally friendly products and services. Environmental entrepreneurship also involves the environmentalists’ market who are active in the field not only for profit, but also

¹ Corresponding author, larijani.research@yahoo.com

for its strong, substantial, and green values. Environmental entrepreneurship is a combination of strong environmental and social values with active entrepreneurship outlooks (Gibbs, 2009). Volery (2002) defines environmental entrepreneurship as environmental accountability in entrepreneurship. Isaak (2002) believes that environmental entrepreneurship is an objective form of business behavior which is committed to sustainability. Environmental entrepreneurship is considered as an act of entrepreneurship which helps conserve the natural environment (Schaper, 2005; Pastakia, 1998). Businesses in environmental entrepreneurship are carried out based upon sustainability principles (Kirkwood & Walton, 2010). The phenomenon is distinct from social entrepreneurship which emphasized the social welfare of the society (Zahra, Gedajlovic, Neubaum, & Shulman, 2009). Environmental entrepreneurship also differs from sustainability entrepreneurship which unifies the three major pillars of sustainable development, i.e. social, economic, and environmental sustainability. Tilley and Young (2009) argue that sustainability entrepreneurship ventures beyond environmental and social entrepreneurship and incorporates a vast domain of sustainability-related dimensions.

3. Method

The present qualitative study was conducted using semi-structured interviews with 12 experts in the area of NGOs and environment management. To ensure the reliability and validity of interviews, more interviews were required according to the experts' comments. Therefore, 4 NGO managers in the field of environment were interviewed and theoretical saturation was achieved. Following open and axial coding, the main, axial and secondary factors which influence entrepreneurship organizational factors of NGOs that are active in the field of environment in Iran were identified. These factors include organizational objectives, administrative capabilities of NGOs, organizational culture, organizational resources, the maturity level of technology in organizations, organizational process, communication with external organization networks, organizational structure, organizational strategies, and knowledge management. Furthermore, the results obtained from other studies in the area of entrepreneur companies confirm the accuracy of the results of the present study.

4. Results and Discussion

The results of this study are consistent with those of Judge, Liu-Thompkins, Brown, Pongpatipat (2015) and Petty, Zang (2011) in the context of the role of research and development units, formation of virtual networks, communication with external networks, and knowledge management. Moreover, the results are also consistent with findings of Petty and Zang (2014) and Bojica, Fuentes (2012) with

respect to the Concerning organizational components, there is no mention of the maturity level of NGO technology in any of the researchers' researches and is considered as a research innovation.

5. Conclusion

Given the results of the study, the strengthening of the organizational and spiritual objectives of NGOs in different sections along with their public interest purposes are recommended; special attention should also be paid to the economic purposes of NGOs. In order for the majority of NGOs to achieve success, it is recommended that a particular attention be paid to the administrative capabilities of NGOs active in the area of environment. Moreover, there should be a focus on the improvement of administrative styles, management experiences of NGOs, the level of knowledge and preparedness of environment management, values and beliefs of NGO management, management's degree of enthusiasm towards entrepreneurship, factors related to the levels of preparedness and recognition of the market and business atmosphere of NGO management, sustainable network building, interactions, access to management resources, and the extent of time allocated to the voluntary works of management in NGOs. Additionally, special attention must be made to organizational culture at NGOs via improving the experience and background of the organization, prompting teamwork and value creation culture in organization, developing innovation culture and focusing on normative structures of NGOs and the resolution of single issues, increasing the level of accountability culture and concerns over social affairs and raising the maturity level of the organization culture, internal trust building within the organization and the employment of guides in NGOs. On the other hand, organizational resources should be reinforced in NGOs; Therefore, financial, human and information resources along with the social capital and social resources of NGOs should be increased as well.

Attention should be paid to the maturity level of organization. This is possible by increasing the level of technology readiness in NGOs. Emphasis on the improvement and design of organizational process in NGOs through reforming the research and development process, communication with external organizational networks via creating real and virtual communication networks, social networks among homogenous groups, chain networks of value NGOs and communication with networks and government organization institutions, preventing accurate organizational structure of NGO case to prevent bureaucracy, adoption of organization strategies through adopting innovation and development strategies are done; it is recommended for entrepreneurship development in NGOs.

Keywords: Theoretical Model, Effective Organizational Components, NGOs, Entrepreneurship Development, Environment

References

1. Arshed, N., Carter, S., & Mason, C. (2014). The ineffectiveness of entrepreneurship policy: Is policy formulation to blame? *Small Business Economics*, 43(3), 639–659.
2. Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, 18(1), 93–117.
3. Bennett, S. (1991). *Ecopreneurship: The complete guide to small business opportunities from the environmental revolution*. New York, NY: Wiley.
4. Berle, G. (1991). *The green entrepreneur: Business opportunities that can save the earth and make you money*. Blue Ridge Summit, PA: Liberty Hall Press.
5. Biernacki, P., Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: Problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 10(2), 141–163.
6. Blue, J. (1990). *Ecopreneuring: Managing for results*. London, England: Scott Foresman.
7. Bojica, A. M., & Fuentes, M. D. M. F. (2012). Knowledge acquisition and corporate entrepreneurship: Insights from Spanish SMEs in the ICT sector. *Journal of World Business*, 47(3), 397-408.
8. Bruton, G. D., Ahlstrom, D., & Li, H. L. (2010). Institutional theory and entrepreneurship: Where are we now and where do we need to move in the future? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 34(3), 421–440.
9. Choi, Y. R., & Phan, P. H. (2006). The influences of economic and technology policy on the dynamics of new firm formation. *Small Business Economics*, 26(5), 493-503.
10. Dean, T. J., & McMullen, J. S. (2007). Toward a theory of sustainable entrepreneurship: Reducing environmental degradation through entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(1), 50-76
11. Elkington, J., & Burke, T. (1989). *The green capitalists*. London: Victor Gallanz.
12. Ertugut, R. (2008). The importance of disarmament from the point of view of providing global peace and contribution of ngo's to this process. *International NGO's Conference Proceedings* (pp. 505-513). Çanakkale: UNIDIR. Retrieved from https://www.peacepalacelibrary.nl/ebooks/files/UNIDIR_pdf-art2580.pdf
13. Estrin, S., Mickiewicz, T., & Stephan, U. (2013). Entrepreneurship, social capital, and institutions: Social and commercial entrepreneurship across nations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(3), 479–504.
14. Friedman, J. & Silberman, J. (2003). University technology transfer: do incentives, management, and location matter? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 28(1), 17–30, 2003.

15. Geels, F. W. (2011). The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 1, 24–40.
16. Gibbs, D. (2009). Sustainability entrepreneurs, ecopreneurs, and the development of a sustainable economy. *Greener Management International*, 55, 63–78.
17. Heede, R. (2014). Tracing anthropogenic carbon dioxide and methane emissions to fossil fuel and cement producers, 1854–2010. *Climatic Change*, 122(1–2), 229–241.
18. Horisch, J. (2015). The role of sustainable entrepreneurship in sustainability transitions: A conceptual synthesis against the background of the multi-level perspective. *Administrative Sciences*, 5, 286–300.
19. Isaak, R. (2002). The making of the ecopreneur. *Greener Management International*, 38, 81–91.
20. Judge, W. Q., Liu-Thompkins, Y., Brown, J. L., & Pongpatipat, C. (2015). The impact of home country institutions on corporate technological entrepreneurship via R&D investments and virtual world presence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(2), 237–266.
21. Kao, R. W. Y., Kao, K. R., & Kao, R. R. (2002). *Entrepreneurism: A philosophy and a sensible alternative for the market economy*. London: Imperial College Press.
22. Keogh, P. D., & Polonsky, M. J. (1998). Environmental commitment: A basis for environmental entrepreneurship. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 11(1), 38–49.
23. Kirkwood, J., & Walton, S. (2010). What motivates ecopreneurs to start businesses? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 16(3), 204–228.
24. Koester, E. (2011). *Green entrepreneur handbook*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group.
25. Kuratko, D. F., & Hodgets, R. M. (2002). *Entrepreneurship: A contemporary approach*. Fort Worth, TX: Dryden Press, 5th edition.
26. Kyro, P. (2001). To grow or not to grow: Entrepreneurship and sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology*, 8(1), 15–28.
27. Larson, A. L. (2000). Sustainable innovation through an entrepreneurial lens. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 9(5), 304–17.
28. Linnanen, L. (2002). An insider's experiences with environmental entrepreneurship. *Greener Management International*, 38, 71–80.
29. Martín-Rojas, R., García-Morales, V. J., & Bolívar-Ramos, M. T. (2013). Influence of technological support, skills and competencies, and learning on

- corporate entrepreneurship in European technology firms. *Technovation*, 33(12), 417-430.
30. McMullen, J. S., Bagby, D. R., & Palich, L. E. (2008). Economic freedom and the motivation to engage in entrepreneurial action. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(5), 875–895.
31. Meek, W. R., Pacheco, D. F., & York, J. G. (2010). The impact of social norms on entrepreneurial action: Evidence from the environmental entrepreneurship context. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(5), 493–509.
32. O’Shea, R. P., Chugh, H., & Allen, T. J. (2008). Determinants and consequences of university spinoff activity: a conceptual framework. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33(6), 653-666.
33. Pastakia, A. (1998). Assessing ecopreneurship in the context of a developing country: The case for India. *Greener Management International*, 38, 93-108.
34. OECD. (2008). Eco-innovation policies in the United States. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/unitedstates/44247543.pdf>
35. Petti, C., & Zhang, S. (2011). Factors influencing technological entrepreneurship capabilities: Towards an integrated research framework for Chinese enterprises. *Journal of Technology Management in China*, 6(1), 7-25.
36. Petti, C., & Zhang, S. (2014). Factors influencing technological entrepreneurship in Chinese firms: evidence from Guangdong. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 65(1-4), 70-95.
37. Quinn, J. B. (1971). Next big industry: Environmental improvement. *Harvard Business Review*, 49(5), 120-131.
38. Razeghi, N., & Lotfi Khachaki, B. (2018). A sociological analysis on the survival challenges and sustainability of NGOs active in social problems: With an emphasis on their relationship with the state. *Sociology of Social Institutions*, 5(11), 97-128. doi:10.22080/ssi.2018.1910
39. Schaltegger, S. (2005). The framework and typology of ecopreneurship: Leading bioneers and environmental managers to ecopreneurship. In M. Schaper (Ed.), *Making entrepreneurs: Developing sustainable entrepreneurship* (pp. 43-60). Hampshire, GU11 3HR: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
40. Schaltegger, S. (2005). The framework and typology of ecopreneurship: Leading bioneers and environmental managers to ecopreneurship. In M. Schaper (ed.), *Making Ecopreneurs* (pp. 95-114). London, England: Routledge.
41. Schaper, M. (2002). The essence of ecopreneurship. *Greener Management International*, 38, 26-30.
42. Schaper, M. (2005). Understanding the green entrepreneur. In M. Schaper (Eds.), *Making ecopreneurs: developing sustainable entrepreneurship* (pp. 3-12). Hampshire, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
43. Schnick, H., Marxen, S., & Freiman, J. (2002). Sustainability issues for startup entrepreneurs. *Greener Management International*, 38, 59-70.

- 44.Scott, W. R. (1995). *Organization theory: from Chester Barnard to the present and beyond*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- 45.Shrivatava, P. (1995). The role of corporations in achieving ecological sustainability. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 936–960.
- 46.Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L. M., & Stride, C. (2015). Institutions and social entrepreneurship: The role of institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 46(3), 308–331.
- 47.Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1999). *Základy kvalitativního výzkumu: postupy a techniky metody zakotvené teorie*.
- 48.Suh, C. S., Chang, P. Y., & Lim, Y. (2012). Spill-up and spillover of trust: An extended test of cultural and institutional theories of trust in South Korea1. *Sociological Forum*, 27(2), 504–526.
- 49.Tadbiri S. R. A. (2005). *Managment and Organization*. Tehran, Iran: Islamic Azad University Press.
- 50.Taylor, D. W., & Walley, E. E. (2003). *The green entrepreneur: visionary, maverick or opportunist?* Retrieved from <http://econwpa.repec.org/eps/mic/papers/0307/0307002.pdf>
- 51.Thompson, N., Kiefer, K. and York, J. (2011), Distinctions not dichotomies: Exploring social, sustainable, and environmental entrepreneurship. In G. Lumpkin, & J. Katz (eds.), *Social and sustainable entrepreneurship (advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth)* (pp. 201-229, Vol. 13). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- 52.Tillery, F. (1999). The gap between the environmental attitude and the behavior of small firms. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 8(4), 238-248.
- 53.Umam, K. K., Dhewanto, W., & Larso, D. (2008). Higher education institution and technology transfer. *Proceedings of the 5th AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange, Melbourne* (pp. 461-474). AGSE
- 54.Utting, P. (2000). Business responsibility for sustainable development, Retrieved from <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/148835>
- 55.Volery, T. (2002). Ecopreneurship: Rationale, current issues and future challenges. In U. Figlisteraller, H. J. Pietner, T. Volery, & W. Weber. (Eds.), *Radical change in the world: Will SMEs soar or crash?* (pp. 541-553). St. Gallen: KMU Verlag.
- 56.Yildirim, A. (2003). Instructional planning in a centralized school system: Lessons of a study among primary school teachers in Turkey. *International Review of Education*, 49(5), 525-543.
- 57.Zahra, S. A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D. O., & Shulman, J. M. (2009). A typology of social entrepreneurs: Motives, search processes and ethical challenges. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(5), 519-532.