

Spring 6-10-2017

ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AND DIGITALIZATION IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICE INDUSTRY: A CONTINGENCY APPROACH

Thomas Niemand

University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, thomas.niemand@uni.li

Coen Rigtering

Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, j.p.c.rigtering@uu.nl

Andreas Kallmünzer

University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria, andreas.kallmuenzer@uibk.ac.at

Sascha Kraus

University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, sascha.kraus@uni.li

Stevan Matijas

University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, stevan.matijas@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2017_rp

Recommended Citation

Niemand, Thomas; Rigtering, Coen; Kallmünzer, Andreas; Kraus, Sascha; and Matijas, Stevan, (2017). "ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AND DIGITALIZATION IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICE INDUSTRY: A CONTINGENCY APPROACH". In Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS), Guimarães, Portugal, June 5-10, 2017 (pp. 1081-1096). ISBN 978-989-20-7655-3 Research Papers.
http://aisel.aisnet.org/ecis2017_rp/70

This material is brought to you by the ECIS 2017 Proceedings at AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of AIS Electronic Library (AISeL). For more information, please contact elibrary@aisnet.org.

ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AND DIGITALIZATION IN THE FINANCIAL SERVICE INDUSTRY: A CONTINGENCY APPROACH

Research paper

Niemand, Thomas, University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein,
thomas.niemand@uni.li

Rigtering, J.P. Coen, Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, j.p.c.rigtering@uu.nl

Kallmünzer, Andreas, University of Innsbruck, Innsbruck, Austria,
andreas.kallmuenzer@uibk.ac.at

Kraus, Sascha, University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, sascha.kraus@uni.li

Matijas, Stevan, University of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein, stevan.mati-
jas@gmail.com

Abstract

Financial service firms, and banks in particular, are faced with a shift from traditional, interpersonal forms of service to online services. Digital technologies are more and more becoming today's standard and challenge traditional business models in the banking sector. Building on the concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO), this study of banks in Germany, Switzerland and Liechtenstein aims at developing insights that explain how banks can use the tactics and strategies associated with EO to achieve superior performance in the digitalization age. Results from a survey in 102 banks show that: 1) banks that display high levels of EO report a higher level of performance, and 2) the relationship between strategic vision on digitalization and performance is moderated by EO. These results indicate that the sheer level of digitalization of a bank does not affect profitability. Instead, banks should develop a clear vision on digitalization that is characterized by innovation, being ahead of the competition, and a willingness to take risks.

Keywords: Digitalization, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Financial Service Firms, Performance

1 Introduction

Financial service firms in general and the banking industry in particular, increasingly move towards online and digitalized value generation. As a consequence, many aspects such as hybrid customer interaction (Nüesch et al., 2015), network competition (Alt et al., 2015), or sharing economy-driven services (Puschmann and Alt, 2016) can be found as opportunities in the information systems (IS) research agenda. Concepts like ‘direct banks’, ‘crowdfunding’, or ‘crypto currency’ are gaining momentum and create pressure for traditional banks (e.g., Bouncken et al., 2015; Richter et al., 2015), especially in countries with a long banking tradition (e.g., Switzerland), to modify their business models. Hence, ‘digitalization’, that is implementing digital technologies (Setia et al., 2013), is vital to overcome time and place restrictions that customers no longer accept (Sachse et al., 2012). The trend of digitalization in the banking sector is particularly evident in Scandinavian countries. At present, online banking penetration in Norway, Finland, and Denmark are at 90%, 86%, and 85% respectively (Statista, 2016). In Eastern Europe (e.g., Bulgaria, Macedonia, Romania), online banking penetration rates are only at 5%, while countries like Germany and Austria are currently making the transition to online banking and have penetration rates of about 51% (Statista, 2016). Thus, it seems that the challenge of digitalization has been accepted differently by banks operating in different countries. However, no research has investigated the banks’ inherent ability to take up digitalization as a cause for its adaption and ability to generate new revenues.

Extant research suggests that when firms are faced with uncertain and unique challenges they benefit from an entrepreneurial response (Covin and Slevin, 1989; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Rauch et al., 2009). In established organizations, such an entrepreneurial response is likely to originate from the Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) of a firm, i.e. the willingness to engage in, and the strategic orientation of, a firm towards innovation, proactiveness and risk-taking (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011). However, for banks that are in the process of making the transition to digitalized value generation, the benefits of a more entrepreneurial approach are not clear-cut. The design, use, and perceived usefulness of digital services such as online banking tools are not generally agreed upon by clients and elderly clients in particular (Holzinger et al., 2007), meaning that a more conservative approach might be equally or more profitable for the bank than an entrepreneurial one. In addition, Banker et al. (2009) provide preliminary evidence that the introduction of online services increases cost efficiency but not sales efficiency per se. So far, traditional channels are associated with higher costs but also provide higher sales and therefore, can still lead to an overall positive effect. Especially in countries that are still making the transition to online banking: banks that decide to postpone digitalization may remain (equally) successful in terms of profitability.

We suggest that not solely the level of digitalization, but the extent to which banks ‘embrace’ digitalization strategically and seize opportunities in the marketplace is crucial to achieve a competitive advantage. Banks can develop a vision on digitalization and introduce consistent packages or new online services as part of their business strategy or they can operate without such a clear vision. In addition, they can take different approaches to digitalization, which can be characterized by different levels of entrepreneurial intensity. A non-entrepreneurial approach to digitalization in banks would be one that is typified by a ‘wait and see’ posture with which banks implement services and online features that have proven to be successful (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011; Covin and Slevin, 1989). An entrepreneurial approach to digitalization, in contrast, would be to introduce innovative online services ahead of the competition (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996), while accepting that such services might not result in additional sales, profitability, and/or customer satisfaction.

In detail, this study aims to answer three questions: 1) Is an entrepreneurial approach to digitalization successful within the banking sector? 2) Is the success of an entrepreneurial approach within the banking sector dependent on the existing level of digitalization? 3) Do firms need to develop a coherent vision on digitalization? To answer these questions, we investigate the influence of EO within the banking sector in relation to digitalization efforts by banks. We collected data on EO, digitalization, strategic

vision on digitalization, and performance in the banking sectors of Germany, Switzerland, and Liechtenstein. These countries all have a strong banking sector, high internet penetration rates, and are currently making the transition to digitalized banking (Internetlivestats, 2016; Statista, 2016). We use contingency theory (Drazin and Van de Ven, 1985; Hofer, 1975) to theorize how favorable returns in terms of firm performance might occur when the strategic apex of a local bank has a clear vision on digitalization combined with high levels of EO and digitalization in general. The remainder of this article is structured as follows: We first discuss existing work on EO, EO in the financial service industry, digitalization in the financial service industry, and vision on digitalization before we continue with building the hypotheses. Next, we explain our data collection, methodology, and the results. We conclude this article with a discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of our study and suggestions for future research.

2 Theory

2.1 Entrepreneurial orientation

The concept of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) refers to the decision making styles, practices, and behaviors of managers that lead to new business development in new or established markets with new or existing goods or services (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003). The most common conceptualization of EO has been advanced by Miller (1983) and Covin and Slevin (1989), and denotes the strategic orientation of the strategic apex of a firm towards innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking. Innovativeness refers to novel and creative processes and the development of new ideas through experimentation (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). Proactiveness refers to “seeking new opportunities which may or may not be related to the present line of operations, introduction of new products and brands ahead of the competition and strategically eliminating operations which are in the mature or declining stage of the life cycle” (Venkatraman, 1989, p. 947). Risk-taking is used to describe the uncertainty that follows when top-managers or firms behave entrepreneurially. Since its introduction, EO has become one of the most dominant research streams within entrepreneurship research (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011) with studies conducted in various cultural contexts (e.g., Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001; Hughes et al., 2007; Semrau et al., 2016) and industries (e.g., Lee and Lim, 2009; Rigtering et al., 2013). In 2009, Rauch et al. (2009) performed a meta-analysis of the EO – performance relationship and found a positive relationship between EO and business performance in different cultural contexts, countries, and industries.

The theoretical roots of EO can be traced back to upper echelon theory (Hambrick and Mason, 1984), which suggests that firms, over time, become a reflection of their top management (teams). Indeed, the strategic apex of a firm has the largest impact on key decisions such as: which market to enter, which technologies to invest in, and what type of service levels to provide (Hambrick, 2007; Eggers et al., 2016). However, actors at different organizational levels can initiate and perform entrepreneurial actions on behalf of the organization (Covin and Slevin, 1991; Wales et al., 2011). As such, EO is commonly understood as a combination of the disposition of the top management (team) towards entrepreneurship and the behaviors of organizations that can be defined as entrepreneurial through their emphasis on proactivity, innovativeness and risk-taking at the firm and managerial level (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011; Covin and Wales, 2012). Central to the concept of EO is the understanding that the strength of the EO – performance relationship is contingent on other factors. As EO represents a forward-looking orientation that favors innovation and risk-taking behavior, the outcomes of EO are not always positive. The element of risk-taking, although such risks are conceptualized as calculated risks, can especially result in negative outcomes (Bouncken et al., 2016). Covin and Slevin (1989) show that EO is of particular relevance in hostile environments. In those environments, firms have to be innovative to stay ahead of the competition and cannot rely on existing sources of competitive advantage as those advantages may quickly disappear. Under such conditions, the benefits of an entrepreneurial approach outweigh the risks.

Lumpkin and Dess (2001) report similar findings and show that environmental hostility moderates the EO – performance relationship. In addition, Wiklund and Shepherd (2005) show that the effectiveness of EO does not only depend on the type of operating environment, but also on the access to capital a firm has.

2.2 Entrepreneurial orientation in the financial service industry

Only a few articles have studied the role of EO within the financial service industry. Richard et al. (2004; 2009) focus on how the characteristics of the top management team of a bank affect the EO – performance relationship. Next to a direct relationship between EO and performance, their findings suggest that the industry tenure of a CEO, and diversity in the top management team, positively moderate the relationship. However, the position tenure of a CEO moderates the EO – performance relationship in a negative way. George and Khan (2001) take a different approach and show that EO has a positive effect on the networking strategy of a bank. As such, EO affects the competitive advantage of a firm by creating integrated networking arrangements with strategic customers and suppliers (Larson, 1990). This resonates with Auger et al. (2003) who show that EO has a positive effect on “the processes of sharing business information, maintaining business relationships, and conducting business transactions by means of the internet” (p. 140). To summarize, previous research on EO in the financial service industry indicates that networking intensity with customers and suppliers, as well as firm performance, are fostered by EO.

2.3 Digitalization in the financial service industry

Digital technologies are increasingly affecting customer relations, business relationships and IT, particularly in industries such as the financial service industry where a shift to online services is happening (Setia et al., 2013). Financial service firms must react to the change in behavior and customers’ needs. Large banks, in particular, are still focusing on efficient transfer systems and cost strategies, instead of adapting their services to digitalization (Tallon, 2010). In a first attempt to address this lack of advanced customer service, Pole et al. (2011) developed a classification tool for web 2.0 applications in private banking. This tool investigates possible applications, potential risks, and the general importance of web 2.0 applications. Findings of Nüesch et al. (2012) confirm that banks are just starting to explore the opportunities of digital services to develop closer and more trustful customer relations. Most banks are only providing basic services such as instant messaging, wikis, blogs, and rating-applications. This keeps costs to a minimum, but jeopardizes business potential to acquire new customers, to intensify customer relationships and to gain customers’ loyalty to offer cross-selling products. Möwes et al. (2011), therefore, label this trend to use web 2.0 technologies an ‘interactive aspect’ of banking.

Further opportunities to intensify customer relations by the use of digital technologies are integral banking, multi-functional banking, and mobile banking (Sachse et al., 2012). ‘Integral’ banking provides the customer with greater transparency. Customers are able to retrieve the same information that is available to the bank advisor. A key advantage of multi-functional banking is the possibility to use different tools such as computers, phones, and local banks for banking. In a similar manner, mobile banking mostly refers to the possibilities to use banking services through mobile devices, being independent from time and place restrictions. Customers expect banks to provide their services electronically, while still relying on personal contact when needed (Sachse et al., 2012). In addition, Setia et al. (2013) show that information quality directly affects customer service efforts and perception. The ability to provide appropriate services to customers (Slater and Narver, 1994) and to respond to customer needs (Eggers and Kraus, 2011) prove to be key qualities of perceived customer service (Fornell et al., 1996). In this relationship, digital technologies can be a useful means to improve customer service (Setia et al., 2013).

Concerning changes in business relationships, institutional investors use, for example, algorithmic trading, ‘intelligent’ order routing-techniques or Direct Market Access (DMA) (Ende, 2010). These technologies allow for independent trading and mean lower costs for institutional investors. Control of trading, urgencies and anonymity are further intentions that motivate institutional investors to apply these techniques. Consequently, classic brokers become of less use. Also, E-brokers provide self-service placement costs, such as transaction processing costs, for a lower price than classic brokers do. This development will likely change the business models of brokerages (Bakos et al., 2005). This change in business relationships can also be observed at stock exchanges. Digital trading platforms change the relevance of established stock exchanges (Lucas et al., 2009). Suppliers have to radically change or adapt new business models to survive. Digital technologies allow for new business models, which enable people to pursue loan transactions through online platforms and change the way banks and credit institutions must act. Originally, their competence was to act as intermediaries. Now, ‘open point banking’ has appeared as a new term (Möwes et al., 2011). Non-banks start to compete with traditional actors in the financial service industry. A recent study of ‘digital natives’ showed that already half of the respondents show interest in using the services of these non-banking institutions. This finding shows the tendency in the market towards a more heterogeneous market with increasing disintermediation of banks (Sachse et al., 2012).

IT changes the interaction between users and technique: information is increasingly digitized (Granados et al., 2006). Customers are not relying on local bank offices anymore to use banking services; the competition of financial investors changes from the trading floor to an electronic emporium (Lucas et al., 2009). Humans no longer compete with only each other anymore, but now they must compete with challenging technological innovations, such as high-frequency or algorithmic trading, which encompasses “the use of computer algorithms to automatically make trading decisions, submit orders, and manage those orders after submissions” (Hendershott et al., 2011, p. 1). High-frequency trading is part of algorithmic trading, but is more complex and focuses on the speed of connection and process (Zhang and Riordan, 2011). Therefore, these authors follow that algorithmic trading has an advantage to human action concerning the speed of how data is processed, prepared and modified: In the USA, 60% of all orders are already processed by high-frequency trading.

2.4 Strategic vision digitalization

The execution of strategic plans towards digitalization is an organization-wide phenomenon and requires the cooperation of employees working at different levels (Floyd and Lane, 2000). Resistance to change at lower levels in organizations can disrupt a strategic change initiative, not always through active opposition, but also in the form of apathy or inaction (Wernham, 1985). In addition, employees will be better able to execute a strategy when they understand the added value for the firm (Aaltonen and Ikävalko, 2002). This also applies to middle managers, who fulfill a pivotal role in strategy execution, as they combine access to top management with knowledge about the day-to-day activities (Wooldridge et al., 2008). A clear vision on the role of digitalization, that is communicated and shared throughout the organization, can aid the process of aligning interests and improve strategy execution (Wilson, 1992). Webster (1992) finds that strategy should be in line with the organization’s orientation or culture, which encompasses the fundamental values and beliefs that guide the organization. A vision on what the company stands for in terms of digitalization and how digitalization will aid goal attainment in the future provides guidance in the formulation of strategy itself, and sequentially, a justification for the strategic decisions made.

3 Hypotheses

Banks with a strong focus on EO will display higher levels of innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking (Miller, 1983). Through a focus on innovation and proactiveness, banks will more actively search for opportunities in the marketplace and will exploit those opportunities more quickly and with more

innovative solutions than other banks (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). As such, these banks will be better able to discover new market segments, attract new customers, and will provide innovative solutions and products to their existing clients as well. In addition, a focus on innovation and proactive firm behavior makes banks more responsive to change, customers, and technology requirements. EO denotes a forward-looking orientation and when the strategic apex of a bank fosters this orientation, banks will be more open to new initiatives and technologies. Previous studies on EO in banks point toward network effects of EO (George et al., 2001). Diverse networks allow top-managers to be more aware and effectively scrutinize the different opportunities in the marketplace. Top managers of banks with a disposition towards EO are, therefore, more likely to spot new (digital) opportunities and better assess the risk associated with those (digital) opportunities. Risk can, however, never be eliminated and can result in more diverse outcomes in terms of profitability (Slevin and Terjesen, 2011). Nonetheless, on balance, overall, the returns are expected to be positive (Rauch et al., 2009). This leads to the first hypothesis.

H1: There is a positive relationship between EO and firm performance within the banking sector.

Digitalization can help banks cut costs and optimize their customer service / relations (Rai et al., 2012; Setia et al., 2013). Even though the implementation of IT solutions can be costly (Banker et al., 2009) and new digital banking tools are not always embraced by customers (Holzinger et al., 2007), developing a clear vision on digitalization would enable banks to overcome the downsides associated with it. A clear vision on digitalization would 'smoothen' the introduction, integration, and acceptance rate of new digital tools internally. When there is a clear vision on digitalization, employees are better able to understand the importance of switching towards digital services and online banking tools. As such, they will be more acceptant of digitalization, strategically reducing the amount of internal conflict (Floyd and Lane, 2000; Wernham, 1985), and better able to explain the use of such new tools to (new) clients. Aligning the internal organizational culture with the type of products and services that the financial services firm would like to offer is crucial to maximize the marketing efforts of a firm and, ultimately, the performance of firms (Webster, 1992).

H2: There is a positive relationship between vision on digitalization and firm performance within the banking sector.

Banks can be characterized by different approaches to digitalization. Some banks might develop a coherent strategic vision on digitalization while the online services they provide are not necessarily very innovative. In such cases, the strategic apex of a bank evaluates successful digitalization efforts by other banks and tries to replicate these efforts. Such banks will be reluctant to take action themselves or to volunteer for pilot programs initiated by corporate headquarters. Crucial to our understanding of sustainable competitive advantages is, however, that these acts of replication are unlikely to lead to sustainable competitive advantages (Porter, 1996). Instead, firms need to build unique resources (Barney, 1991) and need to constantly adapt their products and services ahead of the competition (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). A more entrepreneurial approach to digitalization would result in such unique resources. When the top management of a bank develops a coherent vision on digitalization that focusses on innovation, being ahead of the competition when introducing new digital services (proactiveness), and that allows for reasonable costs incurred while experimenting with new digital solutions (risk-taking), the digital services and online banking tools of those banks are more likely to be innovative and unique. As a result, these services and online tools are more likely to allow a bank to differentiate themselves from other banks and to attract new clients.

H3: The relationship between vision on digitalization and firm performance is moderated by EO. Banks that combine a vision on digitalization with EO will display higher levels of firm performance.

EO not only enables banks to pursue their vision on digitalization more effectively, but banks that have made the switch to the digitalization of their services and online banking can also pursue different opportunities than banks that have not made this switch. Digitalization allows banks to communicate more quickly, frequently, and more effectively with their clients (Jayachandran et al., 2004; Slater and Narver, 2000). Also, new business opportunities in the banking sector, dynamic currency conversion (see Gerritsen et al., 2015) for example, often require the use of IT applications. Consequently, banks that have a high digitalization rate will be better able to develop required skills and to adapt their business models to allow for the pursuit of such opportunities. Over time, banks become acquainted with digital technologies and solutions if they frequently implement and experiment with new technologies. Therefore, banks with relatively high levels of digitalization will be able to pursue business opportunities that require digital solutions more quickly and effectively than banks that have little experience with them, leveraging the effect of their EO.

H4: The relationship between EO and firm performance is moderated by the level of digitalization. Banks that combine EO with high level of digitalization will display higher levels of firm performance.

4 Methodology

4.1 Sample

To draw valid conclusions about the banking sector and generate the most representative sample possible, a systematic sampling approach was applied. First, 1,500 e-mail addresses of banks were extracted from the German *Schober Information Group* database and checked for mistyping, actuality, and duplicates, eventually yielding 300 addresses. Second, as this database contains German banks only, we also used the information provided at www.schweizer-banken.info that contains lists of all banks in Switzerland and Liechtenstein to search for additional addresses. For both datasets, we subsequently used webpages of these banks to obtain e-mail addresses of top management executives. If no executive was identified, a general address with an e-mail directed at the top-managers was used. Overall, the sampling yielded 850 e-mail addresses.

After two pre-tests within the research team, as well as with two top-managers with banking background to improve the structure and understandability of the questionnaire, the final survey was implemented online via *Unipark*. The survey included a personalized salutation (if possible) and the affirmation of privacy and anonymity. A reminder e-mail sent one week after the initial e-mail and the promise to provide a of summary results for respondents were used to improve response rates. Subtracting 13 invalid e-mail addresses and 71 incomplete questionnaires, the final sample consisted of 102 complete responses. This number of respondents is comparable to other studies building on primary data collection with top-managers in the fields of entrepreneurship research (Klassen and Jacobs, 2001; Zahra, 1991). The final return rate of 12.0% is also well comparable to the average response rate of 10 to 12% in prior studies (e.g., Sieger et al., 2013).

Among the 102 responding banks, approximately 80 percent of the key respondents were from upper (chief officers: 31.4 percent, $n = 32$) or top-management (executives: 48.0 percent, $n = 49$) of different types of banks¹ (Raiffeisen: 44.1 percent; Canton: 24.5 percent; local: 12.8 percent) with a mean number of employees of 2,912 (standard deviation = 11,601). Five banks had over 10,000 employees, 13 banks over 1,000 employees, 44 banks over 100 employees and 40 banks equal to or less than 100 employees.

¹ It should be noted that Raiffeisen banks are privately owned banks founded by a cooperative society, while Canton banks are state-specific federal banks in Swiss states ("Cantons"). Both types are representative for the German-speaking banking sector and do not imply any major difference in terms of operations or philosophy.

4.2 Measures

The questionnaire contained previously validated multi-item measures from entrepreneurial research as well as sector-specific variables and control variables (Table 1 for item labels). Firm performance was measured with four items by Chen et al., 2007. Level of digitalization was assessed as a singular construct (Bergkvist and Rossiter, 2007) and developed for this study. EO measurement followed the approach by Eggers et al. (2013) and consisted of 14 items reflecting risk-taking (4 items), proactiveness (5 items), and innovativeness (5 items). For the strategic vision variable, strategic vision digitalization (Müller et al., 2016) reflected by 5 items was used. Following Müller et al. (2016), the level of digitalization was measured by querying the concrete degree of digitalization in percent. All other variables were based on a five-point Likert-type scale (1: “does not fit at all”, 5: “fits perfectly”).

To assess psychometric properties, i.e., reliability and validity, Exploratory Factor Analyses (EFA) using minimum residual estimators, the coefficients Cronbach’s Alpha and Omega (Revelle and Zinbarg, 2009), as well as the newly introduced HTMT procedure (Henseler et al., 2015), were applied. For sample size reasons, a traditional Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was not recommended (Hu and Bentler, 1998). It should be noted that HTMT also outperforms CFA irrespective of sample size (Henseler et al., 2015). All calculations were done using *R* and appropriate packages (e.g., *car* and *psych*). In a first step, EFA confirmed that all constructs but entrepreneurial orientation were unidimensional. As expected, EO yielded the three dimensions of risk-taking, proactiveness and innovativeness with all related items loading highly on the respective dimension. Table 1 illustrates the loadings and item wordings for all constructs focused hereafter.

Construct	Item wording	Loading*
Firm performance	Last year we achieved a higher sales growth than our (direct/ indirect) competitors.	.88
	Last year we achieved a higher profit growth than our (direct/ indirect) competitors.	.82
	Last year we achieved a higher growth on number of employees than our (direct/indirect) competitors.	.45
	Last year we achieved a higher growth on market shares than our (direct/indirect) competitors.	.77
Level of digitalization	Please evaluate to what degree (percent) your business model is digitalized.	1.00
Risk-taking (Entrepreneurial orientation)	We value new strategies/plans even if we are not certain that they will always work.	.44
	To make effective changes to our offering, we are willing to accept at least a moderate level of risk of significant losses.	.61
	We encourage people in our company to take risks with new ideas.	.76
	We engage in risky investments (e.g., new employees, facilities, debt, stock options) to stimulate future growth.	.60
Proactiveness (Entrepreneurial orientation)	We continuously try to discover additional needs of our customers of which they are unaware.	.76
	We consistently look for new business opportunities.	.88
	Our marketing efforts try to lead customers, rather than respond to them.	.53
	We incorporate solutions to unarticulated customer needs in our products and services.	.75
Innovativeness (Entrepreneurial orientation)	We work to find new businesses or markets to target.	.67
	When it comes to problem solving, we value creative new solutions more than solutions that rely on conventional wisdom.	.73
	We highly value new product lines.	.74
	We consider ourselves as an innovative company.	.78
	Our business is often the first to market with new products and services.	.68

	Competitors in this market recognize us as leaders in innovation.	.85
Strategic vision digitalization	Our business has a clear vision of how to stay competitive in the next 5-10 years with respect to the digital strategy.	.75
	Our business has a clearly defined digital strategy.	.87
	Our digital strategy is implemented in all business units.	.67
	Our digital strategy is evaluated and adapted steadily.	.81
	We have established new business models on the basis of our digital technologies.	.60
Notes. *: Loading based on exploratory factor analysis with minimum residual estimation for one factor.		

Table 1. Measures

In step two, reliability was found to be satisfactory for all constructs (firm performance: $\alpha = .82$; entrepreneurial orientation: $\alpha = .88$; strategic vision digitalization: $\alpha = .86$). It should be noted that level of digitalization consists of a single item and thus cannot be assessed for reliability by Alpha. Further, the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, risk-taking ($\alpha = .69$), proactiveness ($\alpha = .84$) and innovativeness ($\alpha = .87$) indicate that risk-taking itself is not measured reliably. However, Omega as a second indicator showed better results indicating that risk-taking is rather multi-dimensional for bankers. Since the composite of EO is applied, we continue with this flaw instead of removing items that may contribute to our research. In the third step, average variances extracted (as of EFA) and HTMT values below .85 confirmed convergent and discriminant validity. Overall, no items had to be removed from our constructs. Table 2 and 3 provide information about the measures and psychometric properties. Position, type of bank and number of employees (cf., sample description) were applied as organizational control variables since all of the focus constructs were at the organizational level.

Construct	Alpha	Omega	Mean	SD	Items
Firm performance	.82	.90	2.71	1.10	4
Level of digitalization	1.00		43.94	21.26	1
Risk-taking (EO)	.69	.77	3.26	1.07	4
Proactiveness (EO)	.84	.91	2.24	.97	5
Innovativeness (EO)	.87	.93	2.84	1.05	5
Entrepreneurial orientation (EO)*	.88	.92	2.75	1.03	14
Strategic vision digitalization	.86	.89	2.09	.83	5
Notes. *Items for entrepreneurial orientation: all items for EO sub-dimensions; SD = Standard deviation.					

Table 2. Reliability and descriptive statistics of constructs

Construct	Firm performance	Level of digitalization	Entrepreneurial orientation	Strategic vision digitalization
Firm performance	.82	-	-	-
Level of digitalization	.32	1.00	-	-
Entrepreneurial orientation	.52	-.50	.91	-
Strategic vision digitalization	.35	-.30	.41	.84
Notes: Diagonal elements are average variances extracted (AVE) from exploratory factor analyses. Below diagonal values are HTMT averages per construct (Henseler et al., 2015). AVE > .5 indicates convergent validity. HTMT < .85 indicates discriminant validity.				

Table 3. Convergent and discriminant validity of constructs

4.3 Common method bias

An enduring issue with questionnaire designs is that common method bias is possible. That is, correlations among constructs may be caused by their measurements within one source (Podsakoff et al., 2003). To check for this issue, the Harman one factor test was applied, that is, an EFA for all appropriate

variables from the questionnaire is conducted. The solution for a single factor should then show low variance extraction if a common method bias is absent (Spector, 2006). Following this procedure, this one-factor solution is highly insufficient (TLI = .56; RMSEA = .14; average variance explained = .31). Hence, a common method bias is unlikely.

5 Results

5.1 Model approach

In order to assess our hypotheses as best as possible with the given sample, a robust bootstrapping approach with 5,000 resamples was applied on stepwise multivariate regression models (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994). Constructs were based on standardized index scores while ordinal variables (position, type of bank) were used as contrasts. Beginning with a base model that only contains control variables (position, type of bank, number of employees, country of the bank), a subsequent model 1 integrated entrepreneurial orientation to test its predictive validity for firm performance. Hereafter, model 2 integrated level of digitalization and strategic vision digitalization to address their incremental contribution. Finally, two-way interactions between entrepreneurial orientation and a) level of digitalization, as well as, b) strategic vision digitalization (model 3) were introduced. To assess the incremental contribution of each model over the other, difference tests and cross-validated mean square errors (MSE) were applied (Stone, 1974).

5.2 Model results

Our stepwise regression approach confirmed that model 3 with interactions between EO and level of digitalization, as well as EO and strategic vision digitalization, explains the underlying data as best as possible while the base model and models 1 and 2 illustrate the shift of effects from control variables to interactions.

Model parameters	Base model			Model 1			Model 2			Model 3 (selected)		
	b	t	p	b	t	p	b	t	p	b	t	p
Intercept	-.61	-2.27	*	-.39	-1.35		-.42	-1.40		-.49	-1.69	*
Effect variables												
Entrepreneurial orientation (EO)				.45	5.04	***	.35	3.66	***	.30	2.86	**
Level of digitalization (LD)							-.01	-.12		.03	.33	
Strategic vision digitalization (SV)							.20	1.92	*	.15	1.39	
EO*LD							-.42	-1.40		-.08	-.81	
EO*SV										.24	2.06	*
Control variables												
Bank [Major]	-.94	-.13		-.96	-.16		-.70	-.14		-.79	-.15	
Bank [Private]	.64	1.40		.62	2.01	*	.38	1.18		.58	1.72	*
Bank [Raiffeisen]	-.15	-.59		-.34	-1.55		-.28	-1.27		-.16	-.70	
Bank [Local]	.31	1.26		.11	.44		.14	.57		.25	.91	
Bank [Other]	.30	.81		-.11	-.34		-.07	-.21		-.05	-.15	
Position [Executive Officer]	.66	2.99	**	.46	1.78	*	.49	1.91	*	.40	1.58	
Position [Leading executive]	.47	2.19	*	.41	1.71	*	.39	1.54		.32	1.26	
Position [Other]	.12	.48		-.32	-1.11		-.27	-.95		-.19	-.63	
Number of employees	.00	-.01		.00	.01		.00	.01		.00	-.02	
Country [Germany]	.45	2.28	*	.47	2.65	**	.45	2.56	**	.24	2.06	*
Fit statistics												
R-squared	.25			.43			.46			.50		
Model F (df1, df2)	3.09 (10, 91)**			6.13 (11, 90)***			5.72 (13, 88)***			5.76 (15, 86)***		

CV MSE	.94	.75	.70	.68
Notes: All models bootstrapped with 5,000 resamples; [Value] indicates contrast to reference (Bank: Canton; Position: Executive employee, Country: Switzerland or Liechtenstein); Estimate is unstandardized; t: t-value of estimate; p: *** < .001, ** < .01, * < .05; CV MSE: Mean square error from cross-validation with 34 folds (lower is better); Base model: Controls only, Model 1: Base model + entrepreneurial orientation, Model 2: Model 1 + level of digitalization + strategic vision digitalization, Model 3: Model 2 + interaction effects of EO and LD, EO and SV.				

Table 4. Model results

In summary, this confirms our assumption that looking at EO alone is not sufficient to explain success ($b = .30$, $p < .01$, Hypothesis 1 confirmed). Strategic vision digitalization does not significantly predict firm performance ($b = .15$, $p > .05$, Hypothesis 2 rejected). Instead, interaction of EO with strategic vision digitalization should be considered ($b = .24$, $p < .05$, Hypothesis 3 confirmed). Consistent with our theorization, the level of digitalization does not predict firm performance ($b = .03$, $p > .05$). However, the joint effect of EO and level of digitalization was not confirmed ($b = -.08$, $p > .05$, Hypothesis 4 rejected). Further models with more interactions (three-way interactions) showed no considerable improvement in model prediction and yielded comparable results to model 3. Table 4 illustrates the results for the incrementally contributing models (base, models 1-3). Finally, the interplay of entrepreneurial orientation, level of digitalization, strategic vision digitalization, and only two control variables (private banks are more successful than other forms; German banks are slightly more successful than banks from Switzerland or Liechtenstein) explained up to 50 percent of firm performance in the banking sector.

In order to assess the robustness of our results regarding bank size, we additionally used the number of employees as additional interaction terms with EO, level of digitalization, and strategic vision digitalization and proposed interactions (model 3). Equally, we constructed an interaction dummy for large and small banks (with 1,000 or more employees representing a “large bank”). Both specifications showed no changes in significance and direction of model 3 effects, indicating that the results are applicable to larger and smaller banks.

6 Discussion and Conclusions

Within the challenge to foster digitalization in the banking sector, previous research did not investigate the effect of strategic vision and EO on the performance of banks. We closed this gap and found novel findings: 1) banks that display high levels of EO report higher levels of performance. More importantly, 2) the relationship between strategic vision on digitalization and performance is moderated by EO. That is, neither strategy nor technology itself can improve a bank’s success, but rather, the alignment of the strategic vision with the bank’s inherent entrepreneurial ability can. These findings offer new and long overdue insights in the role of entrepreneurship and digitalization within the banking sector.

Incumbent firms in each sector face unique challenges and opportunities within their operating environment. Firms in the financial service industry and banks, in particular, are currently faced with the transition to digital services and online tools. Preliminary results suggested that banks do not benefit from offering digital services in terms of profitability because of the additional costs associated with the development and maintenance of IT applications. In addition, traditional service channels were described as more effective in terms of client acquisition, leading to enhanced profitability of those firms that focus on non-digital service solutions (Banker et al., 2009). Our results confirm that the sheer level of digitalization of a bank does not affect profitability. Instead, banks should develop a clear vision on digitalization that is characterized by innovation, being ahead of the competition, and a willingness to take risks. The fact that the novel digital services that are associated with EO improve firm performance points towards the importance of entrepreneurial action, even in sectors in which digital innovations are not welcomed by large groups of clients (Holzinger et al., 2007). EO is thus crucial for banks that want to achieve competitive advantages and they need to combine a strategic vision on digitalization with EO, as a strategic vision alone does not improve performance.

Interestingly, the interaction between the level of digitalization and EO was insignificant within our model. This suggests that there are no first mover advantages in terms of experience with digital services and the use of EO. Even if banks make the transition to digital services and online banking after direct competitors, they can still be successful as long as the services they introduce are highly innovative and differentiate from those offered by competitors. The fact that previous experience with digitalization does not play a key role, can be explained by the assumption that most banks, and especially the smaller ones, probably will not develop digital services and online banking tools in-house. Instead, they are likely to rely on external developers and IT consultants to develop IT applications on their behalf. Banks, therefore, do not develop digitalization resources that allow them to build sustainable competitive advantages, but are able to achieve competitive advantages through a strategic focus on entrepreneurship that enables them to co-develop and introduce innovative applications ahead of the competition. We argued that the network effects associated with EO in the banking sector exposes the top-management team of banks with the latest developments in the market and, as a consequence, they would be more open to experiment with new technologies. EO, therefore, synthesizes the strategic orientation needed within a bank to explore and exploit new digital opportunities.

7 Limitations

The results of our study should be interpreted in light of a couple of limitations. First, our results are based upon a sample of banks from German-speaking regions in Europe. Although we did not find any indications for specific sample selection bias and specifically selected this region because of the ongoing transition towards digitalization, the German-speaking banking sector is different from those in other European countries. The main difference is the large number of small banks that still operate independently. In the United Kingdom or the Netherlands, for example, banks are substantially larger. Therefore, our results should be validated by using samples from multiple countries. Research on the effects of bank size on digitalization efforts and opportunities is important as small banks may have different opportunities and may suffer from more budget constraints when it comes to developing new online banking tools. However, decision-making may be much quicker and their digital systems may be less complex allowing more innovative digital solutions to be developed. Second, we collected our performance data through a set of subjective performance measures together with the questions on EO, digitalization, and strategic vision digitalization. Even though this method is commonly used within EO research (Rauch et al., 2009), we found no indications for a common method bias and strong evidence for the convergent validity of perceived measures of performance is provided in different studies (e.g., Sarkar et al., 2001; Dess and Robinson, 1984; Wall et al., 2004). Future studies should confirm our findings by including objective indicators of firm performance to avoid these and other biases as well (e.g., overconfidence bias).

References

- Aaltonen, P. and H. Ikävalko (2002). "Implementing strategies successfully." *Integrated Manufacturing Systems* 13 (6), 415-418.
- Alt, R., C. Eckert and T. Puschmann (2015). "Network Management and Service Systems: The Case of German and Swiss Banks." *Information Resources Management Journal* 28 (1), 38-56.
- Antoncic, B. and R. D. Hisrich (2001). "Intrapreneurship: Construct Refinement and Cross-Cultural Validation." *Journal of Business Venturing* 16 (5), 495-527.
- Auger, P., A. BarHir and J. M. Gallagher (2003). "Strategic orientation, competition, and internet based electronic commerce." *Information Technology and Management* 4 (2-3), 139-164.
- Bakos, Y., H. C. Lucas, W. Oh, G. Simon, S. Viswanathan and B. W. Weber (2005). "The Impact of E-Commerce on Competition in the Retail Brokerage Industry." *Information Systems Research* 16 (4), 352-371.
- Banker, R., P.-Y. Chen, Y.-C. Liu and C.-S. Ou (2009) *Business Value of IT in commercial banks*, ICIS 2009 Proceedings, Vol. 76.
- Barney, J. (1991). "Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage." *Journal of Management* 17 (1), 99-120.
- Bergkvist, L. and J. R. Rossiter (2007). "The predictive validity of multiple-item versus single-item measures of the same constructs." *Journal of Marketing Research* 44 (2), 175-184.
- Bouncken, R., M. Komorek and S. Kraus (2015). "Crowdfunding: The Current State Of Research." *International Business & Economics Research Journal* 14 (3), 407-416.
- Bouncken, R. B., B. D. Plüschke, R. Pesch and S. Kraus (2016). "Entrepreneurial orientation in vertical alliances: joint product innovation and learning from allies." *Review of Managerial Science* 10 (2), 381-409.
- Chen, C.-N., L.-C. Tzeng, W.-M. Ou and K.-T. Chang (2007). "The Relationship among Social Capital, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Organizational Resources and Entrepreneurial Performance for New Ventures." *Contemporary Management Research* 3 (3), 213-232.
- Covin, J. G. and G. T. Lumpkin (2011). "Entrepreneurial Orientation Theory and Research: Reflections on a Needed Construct." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (5), 855-872.
- Covin, J. G. and D. P. Slevin (1989). "Strategic management in small firms in hostile and benign environments." *Strategic Management Journal* 10 (1), 75-87.
- Covin, J. G. and D. P. Slevin (1991). "A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 16 (1), 7-24.
- Covin, J. G. and W. J. Wales (2012). "The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 36 (4), 677-702.
- Dess, G. G. and R. B. Robinson (1984). "Measuring Organizational Performance in the Absence of Objective Measures: The Case of the Privately-Held Firm and Conglomerate Business Unit." *Strategic Management Review* 5 (3), 265-273.
- Drazin, R. and A. H. Van de Ven (1985). "Alternative Forms of Fit in Contingency Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 30 (4), 514-539.
- Efron, B. and R. J. Tibshirani (1994). *An introduction to the bootstrap*. Boca Raton et al.: CRC Press.
- Eggers, F., I. Hatak, S. Kraus and T. Niemand (2016). "Technologies that support marketing and market development in SMEs – Evidence from social networks." *Journal of Small Business Management* (in press).
- Eggers, F. and S. Kraus (2011). "Growing Young SMEs in Hard Economic Times: The Impact of Entrepreneurial and Customer Orientations - A Qualitative Study from Silicon Valley." *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* 24 (1), 99-111.
- Eggers, F., S. Kraus, M. Hughes, S. Laraway and S. Snyckerski (2013). "Implications of customer and entrepreneurial orientations for SME growth." *Management Decision* 51 (3), 524-546.
- Ende, B. (2010) *IT-Driven Execution Opportunities in Securities Trading: Insights into the Innovation Adoption of Institutional Investors*, ECIS 2010 Proceedings.

- Floyd, S. W. and P. J. Lane (2000). "Strategizing Throughout the Organization: Managing Role Conflict in Strategic Renewal." *Academy of Management Review* 25 (1), 154-177.
- Fornell, C., M. D. Johnson, E. W. Anderson, J. Cha and B. E. Bryant (1996). "The American customer satisfaction index: nature, purpose, and findings." *Journal of Marketing* 60 (4), 7-18.
- George, G., R. W.D. and R. Khan (2001). "Networking strategy of boards: implications for small and medium-sized enterprises." *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 13 (3), 269-285.
- Gerritsen, D. F., J. P. C. Rigtering, S. Bouw and S. Vonk (2015). "Travelers' conversion behavior at foreign cash withdrawals: An experimental study." *Annals of Tourism Research* 50 (1), 162-165.
- Granados, N. F., A. Gupta and R. J. Kauffman (2006). "The impact of IT on market information and transparency: A unified theoretical framework." *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 7 (1), 148-178.
- Hambrick, D. C. (2007). "Upper echelons theory: An update." *Academy of Management Review* 32 (2), 334-343.
- Hambrick, D. C. and P. A. Mason (1984). "Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers." *Academy of Management Review* 9 (2), 193-206.
- Hendershott, T., C. M. Jones and A. J. Menkveld (2011). "Does algorithmic trading improve liquidity?" *Journal of Finance* 66 (1), 1-33.
- Henseler, J., C. M. Ringle and M. Sarstedt (2015). "A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 43 (1), 115-135.
- Hofer, C. W. (1975). "Toward a Contingency Theory of Business Strategy." *Academy of Management Journal* 18 (4), 784-810.
- Holzinger, A., G. Searle and A. Nischelwitzer (2007) *On some aspects of improving mobile applications for the elderly*, 4th International Conference on Universal Access in Human-Computer Interaction, Vol. 4554 (Ed, Stephanidis, C.) Springer, Beijing, pp. 923-932.
- Hu, L. and P. M. Bentler (1998). "Fit indices in covariance structure modeling: Sensitivity to underparameterized model misspecification." *Psychological Methods* 3 (4), 424-453.
- Hughes, M., P. Hughes and R. E. Morgan (2007). "Exploitative Learning and Entrepreneurial Orientation Alignment in Emerging Young Firms: Implications for Market and Response Performance." *British Journal of Management* 18 (4), 359-375.
- Internetlivestats (2016) *Internet users by country (2016)*, Vol. 2016 internetlivestats.com, <http://www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users-by-country/>.
- Jayachandran, S., K. Hewett and P. Kaufman (2004). "Customer response capability in a sense-and-respond era: the role of customer knowledge process." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 32 (3), 219-233.
- Klassen, R. D. and J. Jacobs (2001). "Experimental comparison of web, electronic and mail survey technologies in operations management." *Journal of Operations Management* 19 (6), 713-728.
- Larson, A. (1990). "Partner networks: leveraging external ties to improve entrepreneurial performance." *Journal Business Venturing* 6 (3), 173-188.
- Lee, S. and S. Lim (2009). "Entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of service business." *Service Business* 3 (1), 1-13.
- Lucas, H. C., W. Oh and B. W. Weber (2009). "The defensive use of IT in a newly vulnerable market: The New York Stock Exchange, 1980-2007." *Journal of Strategic Information Systems* 18 (1), 3-15.
- Lumpkin, G. T. and G. G. Dess (1996). "Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance." *Academy of Management Review* 21 (1), 135-172.
- Lumpkin, G. T. and G. G. Dess (2001). "Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle." *Journal of Business Venturing* 16 (5), 429-451.

- Miller, D. (1983). "The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms." *Management Science* 29 (7), 770-791.
- Möwes, T., T. Puschmann and R. Alt (2011) *Service-based Integration of IT-Innovations in Customer-Bank-Interaction*, Wirtschaftsinformatik Proceedings, Vol. 16.
- Müller, S. C., M. Böhm, M. Schröer, A. Bakhirve, B.-C. Baiasu, H. Krcmar and I. M. Welpé (2016) *Geschäftsmodelle in der digitalen Wirtschaft*, Technical University of Munich, Munich, pp. 1-148.
- Nüesch, R., R. Alt and T. Puschmann (2015). "Hybrid customer interaction." *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 57 (1), 73-78.
- Nüesch, R., T. Puschmann and R. Alt (2012) *A framework for assessing Web 2.0 customer interaction maturity: The case of the banking industry*, Paper presented at Bled eConference.
- Podsakoff, P. M., S. B. MacKenzie, J.-Y. Lee and N. P. Podsakoff (2003). "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 88 (5), 879-903.
- Pole, A., T. Puschmann, M. Fischbach and R. Alt (2011). "Web 2.0 applications in private banking - Classification, potentials, and application fields." *ECIS 2011 Proceedings*.
- Porter, M. E. (1996). "What is Strategy?" *Harvard Business Review* 74 (6), 61-78.
- Puschmann, T. and R. Alt (2016). "Sharing economy." *Business & Information Systems Engineering* 58 (1), 93-99.
- Rai, A., P. A. Pavlou, G. Im and S. Du (2012). "Interfirm IT capability profiles and communications for cocreating relational value: evidence from the logistics industry." *MIS Quarterly* 36 (1), 233-262.
- Rauch, A., J. Wiklund, G. T. Lumpkin and M. Frese (2009). "Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33 (3), 761-787.
- Revelle, W. and R. E. Zinbarg (2009). "Coefficients alpha, beta, omega, and the glb: Comments on Sijtsma." *Psychometrika* 74 (1), 145-154.
- Richard, O. C., T. Barnett, S. Dwyer and K. Chadwick (2004). "Cultural diversity in management, firm performance, and the moderating role of entrepreneurial orientation dimensions." *Academy of Management Journal* 47 (2), 255-266.
- Richard, O. C., P. Wu and K. Chadwick (2009). "The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance: the role of CEO position tenure and industry tenure." *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 20 (5), 1078-1095.
- Richter, C., S. Kraus and R. Bouncken (2015). "Virtual Currencies Like Bitcoin As A Paradigm Shift In The Field Of Transactions." *International Business & Economics Research Journal* 14 (4), 575-586.
- Rigtering, J. P. C., S. Kraus, F. Eggers and S. H. Jensen (2013). "A comparative analysis of the entrepreneurial orientation/growth relationship in service firms and manufacturing firms." *The Service Industries Journal* 34 (4), 275-294.
- Sachse, S., R. Alt and T. Puschmann (2012) *Towards customer-oriented electronic markets: A survey among digital natives in the financial industry*, Paper presented at Bled eConference.
- Sarkar, M. B., R. Echambadi and J. S. Harrison (2001). "Alliance Entrepreneurship and Firm Market Performance." *Strategic Management Journal* 22 (6/7), 701-711.
- Semrau, T., T. C. Ambos and S. Kraus (2016). "Entrepreneurial orientation and SME performance across societal cultures." *Journal of Business Research* 69 (5), 1928-1932.
- Setia, P., V. Venkatesh and S. Joglekar (2013). "Leveraging Digital Technologies: How Information Quality Leads to Localized Capabilities and Customer Service Performance." *MIS Quarterly* 37 (2), 565-590.
- Sieger, P., T. Zellweger and K. Aquino (2013). "Turning agents into psychological principals: aligning interests of non - owners through psychological ownership." *Journal of Management Studies* 50 (3), 361-388.

- Slater, S. F. and J. C. Narver (1994). "Does competitive environment moderate the market orientation-performance relationship?" *Journal of Marketing* 58 (1), 46–55.
- Slater, S. F. and J. C. Narver (2000). "The positive effect of a market orientation on business profitability: A balanced replication." *Journal of Business Research* 48 (1), 69-73.
- Slevin, D. P. and S. A. Terjesen (2011). "Entrepreneurial Orientation: Reviewing Three Papers and Implications for Further Theoretical and Methodological Development." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (5), 973-987.
- Spector, P. E. (2006). "Method variance in organizational research truth or urban legend?" *Organizational Research Methods* 9 (2), 221-232.
- Statista (2016) *Online banking penetration in selected European markets in 2015*, Vol. 2016 The Statistics Portal, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/222286/online-banking-penetration-in-leading-european-countries/>.
- Stone, M. (1974). "Cross-validated choice and assessment of statistical predictions." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 36 (2), 111-147.
- Tallon, P. P. (2010). "A Service Science Perspective on Strategic Choice, IT, and Performance in U.S. Banking." *Journal of Management Information Systems* 26 (4), 219–252.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989). "Strategic Orientation of Business Enterprises: The Construct, Dimensionality and Measurement." *Management Science* 35 (8), 941-962.
- Wales, W., E. Monsen and A. McKelvie (2011). "The Organizational Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Orientation." *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 35 (5), 895-923.
- Wall, T. D., J. Michie, M. Patterson, S. J. Wood, M. Sheehan, C. W. Clegg and M. West (2004). "On the validity of subjective measures of company performance." *Personnel Psychology* 57 (1), 95-118.
- Webster, F. E. J. (1992). "The changing role of marketing in the corporation." *Journal of Marketing* 56 (4), 1-17.
- Wernham, R. (1985). "Obstacles to Strategy Implementation in a Nationalized Industry." *Journal of Management Studies* 22 (6), 632-648.
- Wiklund, J. and D. A. Shepherd (2003). "Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium sized business." *Strategic Management Journal* 24 (13), 1307-1314.
- Wiklund, J. and D. A. Shepherd (2005). "Entrepreneurial Orientation and Small Business Performance: A Configuration Approach." *Journal of Business Venturing* 20 (1), 71-91.
- Wilson, I. (1992). "Realizing the power of strategic vision." *Long Range Planning* 25 (5), 18-28.
- Wooldridge, B., T. Schmid and S. W. Floyd (2008). "The middle management perspective on strategy process: contributions, synthesis, and future research." *Journal of Management* 34 (6), 1190-1221.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). "Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: An exploratory study." *Journal of Business Venturing* 6 (4), 259-285.
- Zhang, S. and R. Riordan (2011). "Technology and market quality: the case of high frequency trading." *ECIS 2011 Proceedings*.