

## Factor Affecting Job Performance: A Literature Review

Ahmed Mohammed Saleh Ba Wazir, Qais Ahmed Almaamari and Sara Ravan Ramzani  
*Limkokwing University of Creative Technolog (LUCT), Selangor, Malaysia*

**Key words:** Leaders, competency, management, job performance and self efficacy, higher education institutes

### Corresponding Author:

Ahmed Mohammed Saleh Ba Wazir  
*Limkokwing University of Creative Technolog (LUCT),  
 Selangor, Malaysia*

Page No.: 3306-3313

Volume: 15, Issue 18, 2020

ISSN: 1816-949x

Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences

Copy Right: Medwell Publications

**Abstract:** The basic aim of the study was to review the literature related to the employee performance at job in the context of Saudi University leaders. For this purpose, background of the In the context of higher education industry of Saudi Arabia, the research revealed that there is a little empirical research work has been conducted to study the relationships between these three determinant factors and the job performance of leaders. Moreover, most of the work has been far from empirical-based research. Therefore, by studying this relationship in the context of one of the developing countries like Saudi Arabia, this study would add to the scarce empirical research stream. It is the first attempt to identify the mediation effect in the integration of three determinant factors and the university leader's job performance and the said relationship of the three determinant factors managerial competency, self-efficacy, learning orientation and the university leader's job performance with the mediation effect of entrepreneurial leadership and in the moderation influence of dynamic environment in the higher learning institutions in Saudi Arabia.

## INTRODUCTION

The growing demands for tertiary education liability according to Nayyar and Mahmood<sup>[1]</sup> is the result of expectancy of superior job performance and efficiency. Both at departmental and institutional levels as stated by Bolton leader performance in universities has become the main issue.

As a result of internationalization, globalization and liberalization of universities there are new challenges in the sector. Various requirements, approaches and dimensions to the university leaders have been brought by these challenges as suggested by Akhtar and Kalsoom<sup>[2]</sup>. A positive relationship between leader's self-efficacy and job performance has been revealed by many studies. For understanding their behaviour and motivation leader's

self-efficacy looks to be a promising construct. In the education sector however, it has been comparatively studied, especially<sup>[3]</sup> suggested that leader's self-efficacy research is still very much in its early years.

The current higher learning system of Saudi Arabia was not geared towards market principles and requirements and could be explained as 'non-market framed. In order to move ahead in the international competitive venture, universities are required to become customer oriented, adopt the marketplace and work as a full business environment. It would not be wrong to state in the context of the transformations that have happened in higher education that today's higher education institutions need learning orientation. According to Calantone, etc., learning orientation is the degree to which an organization gets and shares information about market

changes, customer requirements and competitor actions as well as advancements in new technologies to produce new services or products that are better to those of competitors.

Laverie *et al.*<sup>[4]</sup> and Long<sup>[5]</sup> found that research scholars still believe that the area of learning orientation with respect to job performance has been less studied. Darmanto *et al.*<sup>[6]</sup> suggested that learning orientation still needs more research due to the very small number of studies. Several studies<sup>[7]</sup> suggested that careful examination related to learning is sparse, particularly in the perspective of performance effects. Jantunen *et al.*<sup>[8]</sup> found that even though the importance of learning in the area of global business has been extensively accepted, researches concerning learning orientation across borders and in the framework of the exporting realm are limited.

It can be concurred from the above discussion that by focusing on their self-efficacy to make them confident in their abilities to take timely and productive actions, managerial competencies are very important. To make the university leaders managerially strong in addition to their scholastic capabilities and learning orientation to understand and cadre the prevailing needs of markets, clients and other stakeholders make a suitable mix of variables to increase their job performance.

## **Literature**

**Managerial competency and job performance of university leaders:** There are behavioural variables that predict job performance successfully and he named these variables ‘competencies’ as mentioned by McClelland<sup>[8]</sup>. A major module in the study of competencies is exploring the life-long characteristics of individuals which result in performance or success in a work was found by Mitchelmore and Rowley<sup>[9]</sup>. Mohd-Shamsudin and Chutipattana<sup>[10]</sup> found that many researchers appear to have the same opinion that if managers have a specific set of competencies, then they will be victorious in improving firm performance. For successful managerial performance, important basic managerial competency models cited in the literature include leadership skills such as intra-personal skills; business skills and interpersonal skills according to Asumeng<sup>[11]</sup> which are important.

Gilmore described that the term ‘managerial competencies’ is often used by successful managers and they are identified to have competence in their pertinent working field, decisions and mainly in relation to improving and developing their performance task. Managerial competencies as found by Bucur<sup>[12]</sup> are being used as performance predictors as well as measures for performance and are significant mostly for the viewpoint

of enhancing performance and also for predicting performance. Intervention and prediction for enhancing managerial performance can gain an immense advantage from managerial competencies<sup>[12]</sup>. There are some managerial competencies that are causally connected to superior and/or effective performance in a job. Some studies, Spreitzer *et al.*<sup>[13]</sup>, Goldstein *et al.*<sup>[14]</sup> and Russell<sup>[15]</sup> found that still there is a lack of empirical support that competencies are positively linked to individual performance.

To attain the strategic goals of the firm managerial competencies have been recognized as significant tools of human resource management. Various aspects of behaviour constitute managerial competencies which are essential to accomplish the necessary level of performance, in line with the efficient firm management. For becoming an important factor of achievement and also for a competitive advantage managerial competencies are crucial.

Martinette and Leeson<sup>[16]</sup> suggested that knowledge, activities, attitudes or skills and also individual characteristics essential to develop management performance constitute managerial competencies. A management competency framework for the development and coaching of university leaders was developed by Visser<sup>[17]</sup>. A wide literature review carried out in the South African tertiary education setting provides the ground for this management competency framework. The competencies are necessary for excellent or effective performance at work is shown by this framework. Aziz *et al.*<sup>[18]</sup>, however, suggested that formal coaching of university leaders is still necessary for the understanding of competencies required by them to maximise both personal and organizational performance. Lado *et al.*<sup>[19]</sup> also noted that the capitalisation of personal competencies and human resources have been shown to a competitive advantage of institutions that can improve performance. A positive connection between managerial competencies and performance has been confirmed by an increasing body of literature<sup>[9,20]</sup>. The first hypothesis formulated on the base of this argument.

## **SELF-EFFICACY AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY LEADERS**

Almost two thousand published researches investigating the function of self-efficacy in an array of performance areas were reviewed by Bandura<sup>[21, 21]</sup>. Thoughts about individual abilities for example were found to influence academic success, decision making, voter participation and organizational functioning, entrepreneurship, career choice, teaching performance, athletic performance, stress tolerance, drug and alcohol

abstinence. Performance self-efficacy has generally been linked to each other. In an area of entrepreneurship, a positive link between performance and a general measure of self-efficacy has been found by numerous empirical researches.

According to Eden<sup>[23]</sup> a method through which managers elevated their performance expectancy and increased self-efficacy which in turn, enhanced performance has been described as “Leadership”. Gist and Mitchell<sup>[24]</sup> stated that numerous researches have confirmed the significance of self-efficacy for enhancing performance in the organizational framework. Also concluded by Bandura and Locke concluded that self-efficacy is a dominant predictor of job performance. McCormick, etc., found that a general argument in the literature on self-efficacy and leadership validated that leader’s higher self-efficacy beliefs play a role towards leadership performance. As compared to the lower belief, a given job is certainly performed better by the persons with higher levels of self-efficacy.

Versland<sup>[25]</sup> found that those individuals who are deficient in self-efficacy about particular tasks often do not even try those tasks. Research has constantly revealed that even though there is a positive relationship between self-efficacy and performance achievement<sup>[26, 27]</sup> found that self-efficacy is a better determinant than past experience/performance for future performance.

Findings of the studies, Wood and Bandura<sup>[28]</sup>, Bandura and Schunk<sup>[29]</sup> and Bandura<sup>[21, 26, 27]</sup> on the effects of self-efficacy revealed that self-efficacy is the most effective determinant of performance. In the face of setbacks and hurdles, individuals with higher self-efficacy have a more built-in interest in the jobs, more eager to use their effort and demonstrate more determination and consequently, their performance is more effective. Javanmard *et al.*<sup>[30]</sup> revealed that greater levels of self-efficacy leads to improved performance in some educational assignments. In many researches the positive association between performance and self-efficacy has also been backed. Stajkovic and Luthans<sup>[31]</sup> and Judge and Bono<sup>[32]</sup> conducted two meta-analyses on the association between self-efficacy and work performance revealed corrected correlations of 0.38 and 0.23, respectively between job performance and self-efficacy as Tims *et al.*<sup>[33]</sup> found. Another meta-analysis was carried out by Cherian and Jacob<sup>[34]</sup> which examined the individual research outcomes related to the connection between employee motivation, self-efficacy and job-related performance of the personnel and it was noticed that self-efficacy theory can be implemented to job-related performance from the outcomes of the research.

Various efficacy constructs have been investigated extensively by organizational scholars such as means efficacy<sup>[35]</sup>, general efficacy<sup>[36]</sup>, forms of team or

collective efficacy<sup>[37, 38]</sup> and self-efficacy<sup>[31, 39, 40]</sup>. How each of these forms of efficacy is associated with desired performance effects have evidently been shown by this body of research. Valiante and Morris<sup>[41]</sup> and Holzberger *et al.*<sup>[42]</sup> stated that the magnitude of self-efficacy individuals perceived linked positively with their prior performances and compels them to show the confidence that persuades the making of another excellent performance two things have been highlighted from the investigation’s outcomes Olusola<sup>[43]</sup>. Firstly, job satisfaction, intrinsic motivation and self-efficacy predict the work performance of industrial employees and the idea that each of these constructs predicts the work performance of employees is the second one.

Yeo and Neal<sup>[44]</sup> and Bandura<sup>[21]</sup> revealed that self-efficacy affects both the actions that individuals seek and how much effort they assign to those actions and it is always associated with performance. By affecting the objectives people set for themselves, self-efficacy can influence performance. Higher performance objectives are set by persons with higher self-efficacy set and then develop and more competently perform effective job strategies as found by Bandura<sup>[27]</sup> than those persons low in self-efficacy. Above discussion provides the base to formulate the second hypothesis derivation as follows:

## **LEARNING ORIENTATION AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITY LEADERS**

Sadler-Smith *et al.*<sup>[45]</sup> claimed the higher-order and active learning are always recognised as a leading higher performance. Klimecki and Lassleben<sup>[46]</sup> found that it is this learning that permits organizations to respond to transformation and act effectively in a complex and turbulent business environment.

Previous researches, Pramono *et al.*<sup>[47]</sup> revealed that learning orientation indirectly affects both gains through innovation and firm performance. Slater and Narver<sup>[48]</sup> found that organization which has the capability to learn rapidly than their competitors will be on high performing and sustain in the market. Learning orientation demonstrated an important positive affiliation with financial performance for the small and medium enterprises and found that it was also positively and considerably associated with non-financial performance, many studies revealed<sup>[49-57]</sup> that small and medium enterprises with increased levels of learning orientation are linked with better innovation and usually outperform their competitors with greater performance.

Watkins and Marsick<sup>[58, 59]</sup>, however, found that significant works in the field of learning orientation have so far been descriptive and concentrated mainly on the theoretical implications. Many empirical researches have begun to review the learning orientation’s affiliation to different measures of performance and these researches

have validated some positive relations between learning orientation and performance. Lee and Tsai<sup>[60]</sup> and Hughes *et al.*<sup>[61]</sup> showed that empirical results also confirmed that learning orientation has a considerable positive effect on extensive innovation and performance.

Findings of some studies show<sup>[62-65]</sup> that relating learning orientation to performance usually shows that firms with higher levels of learning orientation demonstrate higher performance than firms having lower level of learning orientation. Mavondo *et al.*<sup>[66]</sup>, Liu *et al.*<sup>[67]</sup> and Limpibuntern and Johri<sup>[68]</sup> proved that this is especially true mainly in strong and unstable competitive environments. Some past studies<sup>[66, 69-72]</sup> also revealed that learning orientation is linked with as well as enhances the innovation and performance of the organization. Third hypothesis is proposed from the above-discussed literature.

## CONCLUSION

World Bank<sup>[73]</sup> reported that, higher education is experiencing unmatched challenges as the 21st-century starts, occurring from the convergent influences of globalization, growing significance of knowledge as the main driver of development and the communication and information revolution. Public and private universities itself and commissions are developing policies to respond to growing requirements for tertiary education that direct and govern higher education in diverse parts of the world. Cardno<sup>[74]</sup> stated that as liability stakes continue to be raised in tertiary education, it builds stresses on leadership which is more and more observed as a factor that affects educational conditions and consequently the quality of student education and Saudi Arabia is no exception to this trend. In Saudi Arabia the numbers of private and public sector universities were 69 and 89, respectively in July 2014 but these numbers has risen to 73 and 100, respectively as per the data updated on October, 2015. The need of a distinct and an inclusive leadership system to run universities that are growing at a fast pace has been aroused by this growth.

An examination of how those institutions can get better efficiency is of greater interest not only for policymakers but also for tertiary education managers as higher education institutions are multi-product organizations. Effective leadership is one of the normally accepted tasks of changing higher learning institutes towards higher performance as leaders are in the seats of power and they persuade and administer human, financial and other resources, according to Gappa *et al.*<sup>[75]</sup>, Bento<sup>[76]</sup> Yuki<sup>[77]</sup> in addition, to providing essential aid towards superior success and achievement. Al-Shuaiby<sup>[78]</sup> found that there is very sparse literature in recognizing certain variables that could be related to leadership efficacy of

university leaders. Therefore, improvement of university leadership based on issues and problems related to it addresses the variables that help university leader's to improve their job performance is the main focus of study. The performance of leader actually leads the performance of whole organization towards success. To study the mediating effect of entrepreneurial leadership and moderating impact of dynamic environment on the relationships between managerial competency, self-efficacy, learning orientation and the job performance of public sector university leaders of Punjab, Saudi Arabia is the focusing point of this study. The beneficiaries of this investigation would be researchers, scholars, practitioners and organization's leaders and managers.

The results of the extensive research work that has been carried out in the entrepreneurial and leadership literature in the light of the contingency theory and organizational change call for further research to resolve this inconsistency. This study would be an attempt to fill this theoretical gap in the existing literature in the view of lacking empirical studies investigating the university leader's job performance and implications of the interaction between three determinants managerial competency, self-efficacy and learning orientation in the presence of entrepreneurial leadership and dynamic environment in the higher education institutions of Saudi Arabia. Generally, the research has contributions to the boundary of knowledge and many added values.

In the context of higher education industry of Saudi Arabia, the research revealed that there is a little empirical research work has been conducted to study the relationships between these three determinant factors and the job performance of leaders. Moreover most of the work has been far from empirical-based research. Therefore, by studying this relationship in the context of one of the developing countries like Saudi Arabia, this study would add to the scarce empirical research stream. Secondly, it is the first attempt to identify the mediation effect in the integration of three determinant factors and the university leader's job performance and the said relationship of the three determinant factors managerial competency, self-efficacy, learning orientation and the university leader's job performance with the mediation effect of entrepreneurial leadership and in the moderation influence of dynamic environment in the higher learning institutions in Saudi Arabia.

For practitioners the managerial significance of this study is of a great value for having many implications described in the following passage: Firstly, these three determinants (managerial competencies, self-efficacy and learning orientation) have a significant role, for the effective and efficient performance of university leaders which ultimately impact their organizational performance. Within their faculties, the quality management practices is established by the leaders.

It is implied that because of their leaders all, the highly performance-oriented activities conducted by the employees. Secondly, the leaders of schools/faculties in the higher education institutions of Saudi Arabia should establish and develop an entrepreneurial cultural that encourage pro-active behavior, innovation and risk tolerance as learning opportunities and growth drivers is revealed from the results of the study regarding the significant impact of entrepreneurial leadership on the university leader's job performance. Some insights into how the integration of entrepreneurialism in their leadership behavior could help in building the competitive advantage to increase the overall performance can be obtained by focusing on the study of the effect of mediation of entrepreneurial leadership on the relationship between three determinant factors and the leader's job performance of the higher education institutions in Saudi Arabia.

Therefore, policy makers, this study could be very informative and of a significant value to for many reasons. Firstly, the importance of quality initiatives towards the university leader's performance which has the influence on the overall organizational performance of higher education institutions in Saudi Arabia in particular and thus to the overall economy in general would be revealed by it. The policymakers can help university leaders to achieve a high level of products and services quality and offer them the required training and consultation. Secondly, the significance of entrepreneurialism to the organizational performance would be shown by this study.

Therefore, organizations can be facilitated to be entrepreneurial/more entrepreneurial by providing many incentives and opportunities and by encouraging the training and consultation by the policy makers. Russell and Russell<sup>[79]</sup> stated that all the organizational members should be engaged and involved in knowledge activities to enhance entrepreneurialism. In addition to this as how to use entrepreneurial leadership to create and enhance the competitive advantage of an organization there must be a guide for policymakers. Therefore, the policymakers should give more attention to the higher education institutions when they plan for the long-term development process as the higher education sector is the heart of economy for countries and one of the effective drivers of the economic prosperity.

## REFERENCES

01. Nayyar, J. and R. Mahmood, 2014. The effect of corporate entrepreneurship determinants on performance of public higher education institutions in Pakistan. *Bus. Entrepreneurship J.*, 3: 19-31.
02. Akhtar, M.M.S. and T. Kalsoom, 2012. Issues of universities governance in Saudi Arabia. *J. Elementary Educ.*, 22: 81-94.
03. Leithwood, K. and D. Jantzi, 2008. Linking leadership to student learning: The contributions of leader efficacy. *Edu. Administration Q.*, 44: 496-528.
04. Laverie, D.A., S. Madhavaram and R.E. McDonald, 2008. Developing a learning orientation: The role of team-based active learning. *Marketing Edu. Rev.*, 18: 37-51.
05. Long, H.C., 2013. The relationship among learning orientation, market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance of Vietnam marketing communications firms. *Philippine Manage. Rev.*, 20: 37-46.
06. Darmanto, D., H.S. Running, M. Harsono and T. Haryono, 2014. The relationship between strategy orientation and marketing performance: The role of organizational change capability. *Am. Int. J. Contemp. Res.*, 4: 221-229.
07. Jantunen, A., N. Nummela, K. Puumalainen and S. Saarenketo, 2008. Strategic orientations of born globals-do they really matter?. *J. World Bus.*, 43: 158-170.
08. McClelland, D.C., 1971. *Assessing Human Motivation*. General Learning Press, New York, USA.,
09. Mitchelmore, S. and J. Rowley, 2010. Entrepreneurial competencies: A literature review and development agenda. *Int. J. Entrepr. Behav. Res.*, 16: 92-111.
10. Mohd-Shamsudin, F. and N. Chuttipattana, 2012. Determinants of managerial competencies for primary care managers in Southern Thailand. *J. Health Organ. Manage.*, 26: 258-280.
11. Asumeng, M., 2014. Managerial competency models: A critical review and proposed holistic-domain model. *J. Manage. Res.*, 6: 1-21.
12. Bucur, I., 2013. Managerial core competencies as predictors of managerial performance on different levels of management. *Procedia-Social Behav. Sci.*, 78: 365-369.
13. Spreitzer, G.M., M.W. McCall and J.D. Mahoney, 1997. Early identification of international executive potential. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 82: 6-29.
14. Goldstein, H.W., K.P. Yusko and V. Nicolopoulos, 2001. Exploring black-white subgroup differences of managerial competencies. *Personnel Psychol.*, 54: 783-807.
15. Russell, C.J., 2001. A longitudinal study of top-level executive performance. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 86: 560-573.
16. Martinette, L.A. and A.O. Leeson, 2012. The relationship between learning orientation and business performance and the moderating effect of competitive advantage: A service organization perspective. *J. Serv. Sci.*, 5: 43-58.

17. Visser, I.L., 2009. Development of a proposed management competency training framework. Master's Thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
18. Aziz, S., M.E. Mullins, W.K. Balzer, E. Grauer, J.L. Burnfield, M.A. Lodato and M.A. Cohen-Powless, 2005. Understanding the training needs of department chairs. *Stud. Higher Educ.*, 30: 571-593.
19. Lado, A.A., N.G. Boyd and P. Wright, 1992. A competency-based model of sustainable competitive advantage: Toward a conceptual integration. *J. Manage.*, 18: 77-91.
20. Mahembe, E., 2011. Literature review on small and medium enterprises' access to credit and support in South Africa. Underhill Corporate Solutions, National Credit Regulator (NCR), Pretoria, South Africa.
21. Bandura, A., 1977a. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychol. Rev.*, 84: 191-215.
22. Bandura, A., 1997b. Self Efficacy the Exercise of Control. W.H. Freeman and Co., New York.
23. Eden, D., 1992. Leadership and expectations: Pygmalion effects and other self-fulfilling prophecies in organizations. *Leadersh. Q.*, 3: 271-305.
24. Gist, M.E. and T.R. Mitchell, 1992. Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 17: 183-211.
25. Versland, T.M., 2009. Self-efficacy development of aspiring principals in education leadership preparation programs. Ph.D. Thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana.
26. Bandura, A., 1982. Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *Am. Psychol.*, 37: 122-147.
27. Bandura, A., 1986. Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ., USA., ISBN-13: 978-0138156145, Pages: 617.
28. Wood, R.E. and A. Bandura, 1989. Social cognitive theory of organizational management. *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, 14: 361-384.
29. Bandura, A. and D.H. Schunk, 1981. Cultivating competence, self-efficacy and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *J Personality Soc. Physiol.*, 41: 586-598.
30. Javanmard, A., M. Hoshmandja and L. Ahmadzade, 2012. Investigating the relationship between self-efficacy, cognitive and metacognitive strategies, and academic self-handicapping with academic achievement in male high school students in the tribes of Fars province. *J. Iife Sci. Biomed.*, 3: 27-34.
31. Stajkovic, A.D. and F. Luthans, 1998. Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychol. Bull.*, 124: 240-261.
32. Judge, T.A. and J.E. Bono, 2001. Relationship of core Self-evaluations traits-self-esteem, generalized Self-efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability-with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 86: 80-92.
33. Tims, M., A.B. Bakker and D. Derks, 2014. Daily job crafting and the self-efficacy-performance relationship. *J. Managerial Psychol.*, 29: 490-507.
34. Cherian, J. and J. Jacob, 2013. Impact of self efficacy on motivation and performance of employees. *Int. J. Bus. Manage.*, 8: 1-9.
35. Eden, D., 2001. Means Efficacy: External Sources of General and Specific Subjective Efficacy. In: *Work Motivation in the Context of a Globalizing Economy*, Erez, M., U. Kleinbeck and H. Thierry (Eds.). Lawrence Erlbaum, Hillsdale, New Jersey, pp: 65-77.
36. Chen, G., S.M. Gully and D. Eden, 2001. Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organiz. Res. Methods*, 4: 62-83.
37. Tasa, K., S. Taggar and G.H. Seijts, 2007. The development of collective efficacy in teams: A multilevel and longitudinal perspective. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 92: 17-27.
38. Prussia, G.E. and A.J. Kinicki, 1996. A motivational investigation of group effectiveness using social-cognitive theory. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 81: 187-198.
39. Multon, K.D., S.D. Brown and R.W. Lent, 1991. Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *J. Counseling Psychol.*, 38: 30-38.
40. Holden, G., 1992. The relationship of self-efficacy appraisals to subsequent health related outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Social Work Health Care*, 16: 53-93.
41. Valiante, G. and D.B. Morris, 2013. The sources and maintenance of professional golfers self-efficacy beliefs. *Sport Psychol.*, 27: 130-142.
42. Holzberger, D., A. Philipp and M. Kunter, 2013. How teacher's self-efficacy is related to instructional quality: A longitudinal analysis. *J. Educ. Psychol.*, 105: 774-786.
43. Olusola, O., 2011. Intinsic motivation, job satisfaction and self-efficacy as predictors of job performance of industrial workers in Ijebu zone of Ogun State. *J. Int. Social Res.*, 4: 570-577.
44. Yeo, G.B. and A. Neal, 2006. An examination of the dynamic relationship between self-efficacy and performance across levels of analysis and levels of specificity. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 91: 1088-1101.
45. Sadler-Smith, E., D.P. Spicer and I. Chaston, 2001. Learning orientations and growth in smaller firms. *Long Range Plann.*, 34: 139-158.
46. Klimecki, R. and H. Lasseleben, 1998. Modes of organizational learning: Indications from an empirical study. *Manage. Learn.*, 29: 405-430.

47. Pramono, R.B., U. Nimran and H.N. Utami, 2015. The influence of market orientation and learning orientation on performance through competitive advantage: An empirical study on combined farmer groups of the tidal area in South Sumatera province. *Eur. J. Bus. Manage.*, 7: 232-239.
48. Slater, S.F. and J.C. Narver, 1995. Market orientation and the learning organization. *J. Market.*, 59: 63-74.
49. Baron, R.A., K.M. Hmieleski and R.A. Henry, 2012. Entrepreneurs dispositional positive affect: The potential benefits-and potential costs-of being up. *J. Bus. Venturing*, 27: 310-324.
50. Avlonitis, G.J. and H.E. Salavou, 2007. Entrepreneurial orientation of SMEs, product innovativeness and performance. *J. Bus. Res.*, 60: 566-575.
51. Nasution, H.N., F.T. Mavondo, M.J. Matanda and N.O. Ndubisi, 2011. Entrepreneurship: Its relationship with market orientation and learning orientation and as antecedents to innovation and customer value. *Ind. Market. Manage.*, 40: 336-345.
52. Brettel, M. and J.D. Rottenberger, 2013. Examining the link between entrepreneurial orientation and learning processes in small and medium-sized enterprises. *J. Small Bus. Manage.*, 51: 471-490.
53. Grinstein, A., 2008. The effect of market orientation and its components on innovation consequences: A meta-analysis. *J. Acad. Marketing Sci.*, 36: 166-173.
54. Lin, C.H., C.H. Peng and D.T. Kao, 2008. The innovativeness effect of market orientation and learning orientation on business performance. *Int. J. Manpower*, 29: 752-772.
55. Pesamaa, O., A. Shoham, J. Wincent and A.A. Ruivo, 2013. How a learning orientation affects drivers of innovativeness and performance in service delivery. *J. Eng. Technol. Manage.*, 30: 169-187.
56. Wincent, J., S. Thorgren and S. Anokhin, 2014. Entrepreneurial orientation and network board diversity in network organizations. *J. Bus. Venturing*, 29: 327-344.
57. Real, J.C., J.L. Roldan and A. Leal, 2014. From entrepreneurial orientation and learning orientation to business performance: Analysing the mediating role of organizational learning and the moderating effects of organizational size. *Br. J. Manage.*, 25: 186-208.
58. Watkins, K.E. and V.J. Marsick, 1996. In action: Creating the LO. ASTD Press, Alexandria, Virginia.
59. Watkins, K.E. and V.J. Marsick, 1997. Dimensions of learning organization questionnaire. Partners for the Learning Organization, Warwick, Rhode Island.
60. Lee, T.S. and H.J. Tsai, 2005. The effects of business operation mode on market orientation, learning orientation and innovativeness. *Ind. Manage. Data Syst.*, 105: 325-348.
61. Hughes, P., R.E. Morgan and Y. Kouropalatis, 2008. Market knowledge diffusion and business performance. *Eur. J. Marketing*, 42: 1372-1395.
62. Gima, K.A., S.F. Slater and E.M. Olson, 2005. The contingent value of responsive and proactive market orientations for new product program performance. *J. Prod. Innov. Manage.*, 22: 464-482.
63. Nazdrol, W.M., J. Breen and A. Josiassen, 2011. The relationship between strategic orientation and SME firm performance: Developing a conceptual framework. Proceedings of the 8th AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange, February 1-4, 2011, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia, pp: 713-724.
64. Eris, E.D., O. Neczan and T. Ozmen, 2012. The effect of market orientation, learning orientation and innovativeness on firm performance: A research from Turkish logistics sector. *Int. J. Econ. Sci. Applied Res.*, 5: 77-108.
65. Julian, C.C., 2010. The market orientation-marketing performance relationship: The empirical link in international joint ventures. *Int. J. Trade Global Markets*, 3: 414-431.
66. Mavondo, F.T., J. Chimhanzi and J. Stewart, 2005. Learning orientation and market orientation: Relationship with innovation, human resource practices and performance. *Eur. J. Marketing*, 39: 1235-1263.
67. Liu, C.L., 2012. An investigation of relationship learning in cross-border buyer-supplier relationships: The role of trust. *Int. Bus. Rev.*, 21: 311-327.
68. Limpibuntern, T. and L.M. Johri, 2009. Complementary role of organizational learning capability in New Service Development (NSD) process. *Learn. Organ.*, 16: 326-348.
69. Alegre, J. and R. Chiva, 2008. Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: An empirical test. *Technovation*, 28: 315-326.
70. Richey, R.G. and C.W. Autry, 2009. Assessing interfirm collaboration/technology investment tradeoffs. *Int. J. Logistics Manage.*, 20: 30-56.
71. Akgun, A.E., H. Keskin and J. Byrne, 2008. The moderating role of environmental dynamism between firm emotional capability and performance. *J. Organizational Change Manage.*, 21: 230-252.
72. Nguyen, D.T. and N.J. Barrett, 2006. The role of market orientation and learning orientation in quality relationship: The case of Vietnam exporting firms and their customers. *Int. Marketing J.*, 14: 116-147.
73. World Bank, 2002. Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education. The World Bank, Washington, DC., USA.
74. Cardno, C., 2014. The functions, attributes and challenges of academic leadership in New Zealand polytechnics. *Int. J. Edu. Manage.*, 28: 352-364.

75. Gappa, J.M., A.E. Austin and A.G. Trice, 2007. Rethinking Faculty Work: Higher Education's Strategic Imperative. John Wiley and Sons, San Francisco, California,.
76. Bento, F., 2011. A discussion about power relations and the concept of distributed leadership in higher education institutions. *Open Edu. J.*, 4: 17-23.
77. Yukl, G.A., 2010. *Leadership in Organizations*. 7th Edn., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
78. Al-Shuaiby, A., 2009. Factors contributing to leadership effectiveness among Deans of Graduate Schools of Education. Ph.D. Thesis, The George Washington University, Washington, DC., USA.
79. Russell, R.D. and C.J. Russell, 1992. An examination of the effects of organizational norms, organizational structure and environmental uncertainty on entrepreneurial strategy. *J. Manage.*, 18: 639-656.