

## The Influence of Entrepreneurship on Enterprise performance: The Mediating Role of Staff innovation behavior

Yanling He<sup>1,a,\*</sup>, Xiaowen Jie<sup>2,b</sup>, Liang Wang<sup>3,c</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Business Administration, Baise University, No. 21 Zhongshan Road, Baise, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Business Administration, Sichuan University, No. 24 South Section 1, Yihuan Road, Chengdu, China

<sup>3</sup>Center of Chinese Graduate Students, Panyapiwat Institute of Management, 85/1 Moo 2, Chaengwattana Road, Nonthaburi, Bangkok, Thailand

<sup>a</sup> 12718628@qq.com, <sup>b</sup> jiexw@vip.163.com, <sup>c</sup> 153010292@qq.com

\*corresponding author

**Keywords:** Entrepreneurship, Staff innovation behaviour, Enterprise performance, Mechanism of action

**Abstract.** In order to clarify the relationship between entrepreneurship, staff innovation behaviour and enterprise performance, theoretical hypotheses were proposed based on the combining and summary of related studies that entrepreneurship has positive effect on the enterprise performance and staff innovation behaviour plays a mediating role in the process of influence of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance. Questionnaire was designed using maturity scale and 507 valid questionnaires were collected. Statistical analysis software SPSS21.0 was used to conduct various types of analysis on the valid data collected, including descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, exploratory factor analysis (EFA), confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), correlation analysis, regression analysis. The proposed theory model and hypotheses were verified at the same time. Data analysis results showed that: all dimensions of the entrepreneurship have remarkably positive effect on the enterprise performance; staff innovation behavior plays in part a mediating role between the entrepreneurship and the enterprise performance.

### 1. Introduction

In the current weak global economic environment, innovation is the foundation of a country's survival, enterprises are the most important subject of the market, and the most important determinant of the development of enterprises is entrepreneurs. China's economy also faces serious challenges. Chinese President Xi Jinping pointed out that if we want to carry out comprehensive reform, we must stimulate the vitality of the market economy. The vitality of the market mainly comes from entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship. We must stimulate entrepreneurship, stimulate the vitality of the market economy, promote the development of enterprises, and promote the transformation and upgrading of China's economy. How to stimulate entrepreneurship so as to enhance the core competitiveness of enterprises, enhance enterprise performance, promote the national economic transformation and development, promote the continuous renewal and better development of enterprises, and promote the development of national economy has become a hot topic in practice and theory circles.

Scholars all over the world attach great importance to the study of entrepreneurship, regarding as an important factor of production, and have done a lot of research. However, the fundamental problems of how to stimulate entrepreneurship and how entrepreneurship affects and promotes the improvement of enterprise performance have not been solved. This paper introduces staff innovation behavior as an intermediary into the study of the relationship between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance, and discusses the impact of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance from a new perspective and train of thought. Freeman, C. (1987) proposed that innovation activities are everywhere, and innovators include workers, managers, etc. He pointed out that innovation should be a process in which various elements and subjects interact and influence each other, and

innovation is a system.<sup>[2]</sup> Both entrepreneurs and staff are the most important and active factors of production in the market, and it is worth studying how they influence and conduct each other. This paper attempts to uncover the mechanism of the effect of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance in the context of China in the new era through the important intermediary of staff innovation behavior, so as to seek a new path and solution for promoting China's economic development. Based on this, this thesis puts forward the research topic of the impact of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance.

## **2. Literature review**

Scholars in China and other countries have different understandings of the concepts of entrepreneurship, enterprise performance and staff innovation behavior, and have different standards of measurement and evaluation. Typical viewpoints are as follows:

### **2.1. Entrepreneurship**

Different scholars have different understanding of entrepreneurship based on different research backgrounds, starting points and fields, and different perspectives on problems. Joseph Schumpeter (1908) believed that entrepreneurs are able to destroy old production methods through “creative destruction”, innovate, reorganize and recreate, and innovate products and production processes, which are highly innovative.<sup>[3]</sup> According to Marshall (1890), entrepreneurship refers to an individual characteristic of entrepreneurs themselves. For example, entrepreneurs are cautious but decisive when facing risks.<sup>[4]</sup> Peter Drucker (1985) argued that entrepreneurship is a characteristic of being able to cope with uncertainty and use change as a business opportunity. This paper puts forward that “entrepreneurship” refers to the individual characteristics of the entrepreneurs themselves, such as innovation, adventure and pioneering.<sup>[1]</sup>

### **2.2. Enterprise performance**

Enterprise performance is an important index used by enterprises to judge and measure their operating efficiency and performance. Covin&Slevin (1991) believed that enterprise performance measures should cover sales growth rate, profit rate, return on assets, etc. Kaplan&Norton (1992) studied on several leading enterprises in the practice, put forward the method of balanced scorecard BSC performance evaluation system, which breaks through the traditional method of measuring of enterprise performance by financial performance only, achieve balanced status like keeping a balance between financial indicators and non-financial indicators, covering four aspects like the financial, customer, business management and personnel training and development.<sup>[6]</sup> Chen Guoquan (2009) believed that enterprise performance should be evaluated in financial performance, operational efficiency, customer and staff satisfaction, loyalty and other aspects.<sup>[10]</sup> This paper thinks that enterprise performance is an important index to evaluate and measure the performance of enterprises in multiple aspects.

### **2.3. Staff innovation behavior**

Staff innovation behavior refers to the activities in which staff actively come up with new methods and technologies, improve and optimize workflow, improve management methods and promote and implement these new methods and measures in the process of production. Staff innovation behavior refers to individual creativity and is the foundation of enterprise innovation. Scott&Bruce(1994) believes that the innovation behavior of staff is the process of putting forward new ideas that have never been put forward by others, generating new ideas, coming up with solutions to problems, and promoting and practicing the generated ideas thus transforming them into products or systems. Liu Zhiqiang, Deng Chuanjun, Liao Jianqiao and Long Lirong (2014) pointed out that the innovation behavior of staff refers to the activities in which staff come up with new ideas and put them into practice to carry out and implement, including putting forward ideas, promoting ideas and implementing ideas. This paper adopts Liu Zhiqiang, Deng Chuanjun, Liao

Jianqiao and Long Lirong (2014) 's understanding of the connotation of staff innovation behavior for reference.<sup>[11]</sup>

## **2.4. Research comment**

Based on the literature review above, we find that scholars have been making continuous efforts to study , and have achieved some research results. However, the research in this field still has the following shortcomings:

First, there are many literatures on the individual variables of entrepreneurship, staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance, and the research is also in-depth. There are also literatures on the research of the three variables in the same theoretical framework, but not many. These variables still have their own limitations and cannot reveal the internal mechanism of entrepreneurship affecting enterprise performance.

Second, the innovation behavior is a complex and dynamic process. The research mainly focuses on the innovation behavior of individual entrepreneurs or the entire enterprise organizations, and there is little literature on the innovation behavior of ordinary staff.

## **3. Research methods and design**

### **3.1. Research methods**

Empirical research is the basic means of this research, this paper mainly uses the literature analysis method, questionnaire survey method and statistical analysis method. The specific research methods of this paper are as follows: first, make full use of various databases, including EBSCO, SPRINGER, China journal network and wipp database, to collect relevant literature. On the basis of reviewing the literatures, this paper proposes the research model and hypothesis, and forms the research framework. Then, a questionnaire was designed and a questionnaire survey was carried out. Entrepreneurs were mainly measured by measuring core variables such as entrepreneurship, enterprise performance and staff innovation behavior. The validity of the questionnaire can be guaranteed, using relatively mature scale, using statistical analysis software SPSS21.0 for effective recovery of data descriptive statistics analysis, reliability analysis, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), correlation analysis, regression analysis, for the construction of the theory model and hypothesis test. Finally the empirical analysis of the results and discussion were carried out.

### **3.2. Research design**

The data of this paper was collected from some major provinces and municipalities in China, including Guangxi, Guangdong, Zhejiang, Shandong, Anhui, Beijing, Sichuan, Heilongjiang, Guizhou, Hainan and other major provinces and municipalities in the east, central and western regions of China. The research objects are mainly senior managers with decision-making power in Chinese enterprises and some middle managers with decision-making power in key positions. The data was collected from January to May 2018. Most of the data came from entrepreneur workshops where entrepreneurs filled in answers on the spot. In this paper, there are 42 questions, with 8 questions about company and personal information, and 34 questions directly related to the actual research content. A total of 520 questionnaires were submitted and collected, and 13 invalid questionnaires were eliminated. Finally, 507 valid questionnaires were submitted, with an effective rate of 97.5%.

## **4. Research hypothesis**

### **4.1. Entrepreneurship and enterprise performance**

Covin&Slevin(1991) proposed that entrepreneurship affects enterprise performance and can improve enterprise performance by stimulating entrepreneurship.<sup>[5]</sup>Zahra (1995) believed that entrepreneurship plays an important role in the development of new products, the search for new business opportunities and the improvement of core competitiveness of enterprises.<sup>[8]</sup>Entrepreneurs have the advantage of market preemption to obtain higher profits, and their innovation, pioneering and risk-taking have obvious positive impact on enterprise performance. Based on the above analysis, this paper proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis H1: Entrepreneurship is positively correlated with enterprise performance.

Hypothesis H1a: There is a positive correlation between innovation and enterprise performance.

Hypothesis H1b: There is a positive correlation between pioneering and enterprise performance.

Hypothesis H1c: There is a positive correlation between risk-taking and enterprise performance.

### **4.2. Entrepreneurship and staff innovation behavior**

Based on different points of view,Scott & Bruce (1994), Tierney & Farmer (2002), and other foreign scholars did a lot of research in different periods, they studied the effect of corporate leadership and enterprise performance relationship, personal characteristics of entrepreneurs, entrepreneurial spirit, the influence of the entrepreneurs' innovation behavior and staff behavior relationship.<sup>[9]</sup>Most empirical studies show that different styles of leaders and entrepreneurship are related to staff innovation behavior, and have a significant positive impact.The innovative, pioneering and adventurous spirit of entrepreneurs can play a role in modeling, influencing and guiding the innovative behavior of staff, and can also play a helpful role in helping staff to better display their creativity. Based on the above analysis, this paper proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis H2: Entrepreneurship is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior.

Hypothesis H2a: Innovation and staff innovation behavior are positively correlated.

Hypothesis H2b: Pioneering is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior.

Hypothesis H2c: Risk-taking is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior.

### **4.3. Staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance**

Scott&Bruce(1994) pointed out that the innovation behavior of staff is the basis of any high profit and high performance.<sup>[7]</sup>Innovation is an important factor of production in an enterprise. Only through continuous innovation, focusing on individual and team innovation, cultivating staff innovation consciousness and spirit, and stimulating their innovation behaviors, can an enterprise have its core competitiveness. Innovation is the first driving force of economic development, and the most active subject in the market is the enterprise. It can stimulate staff to actively put forward ideas and put them into practice, which will greatly enhance the core competitiveness of the enterprise and promote the improvement of enterprise performance. Based on the above theoretical analysis, this paper proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis H3: Staff innovation behavior has a significant positive impact on enterprise performance.

### **4.4. The mediating role of staff innovation behavior**

Freeman,C.(1987) proposed that innovation activities are everywhere, innovators include workers, managers, etc. Innovation is a systematic engineering, and it should be a process in which various elements and subjects interact and influence each other in various links.<sup>[2]</sup>The innovative thinking and activities of staff are the source of continuous innovation. Staff, as the main elements

within the enterprise, are the premise and foundation of enterprise innovation. Therefore, the innovation behavior of ordinary staff is a bridge between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance, and a necessary path. Through interviewing with entrepreneurs, many entrepreneurs also agree with this view. Therefore, the author believes that the innovation behavior of staff plays an important mediating role between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance. Based on the above theoretical analysis, this paper proposes the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis H4: Entrepreneurship positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior.

Hypothesis H4a: Innovation positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of estaff innovation behavior.

Hypothesis H4b: Pioneering positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior.

Hypothesis H4c: Risk-taking positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior.

## 5. Data analysis

### 5.1. The influence of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance

In order to test the relationship between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance, this paper adopts the method of hierarchical regression analysis and uses SPSS21.0 for linear regression analysis. Secondly, the regression model M2 was constructed by using demographic variables as control variables, entrepreneurship as independent variables and enterprise performance as dependent variables. The test results are shown in Table 1:

Table 1 Test of the relationship between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance

	<b>Dependent variable:enterprise performance</b>					
	Model 1			Modle 2		
	$\beta$	Sig	VIF	$\beta$	Sig	VIF
<b>Control variable</b>						
<b>Sex</b>	-0.032	.474	1.027	0.034	.306	1.037
<b>Age</b>	0.043	.364	1.133	-0.022	.529	1.143
<b>Degree of education</b>	-0.014	.759	1.081	-0.013	.698	1.081
<b>Founder or not</b>	0.172**	.001	1.330	0.102**	.007	1.341
<b>Years of incorporation</b>	-0.065	.302	2.066	0.001	.988	2.076
<b>Enterprise nature</b>	0.039	.418	1.214	-0.018	.621	1.221
<b>Number of staff</b>	0.039	.525	1.896	-0.043	.339	1.911
<b>Enterprise growth cycle</b>	0.071	.229	1.795	0.002	.973	1.806
<b>Independent variable</b>						
<b>Entrepreneurship</b>				0.678***	.000	1.052
<b>R2</b>	0.037*	0.017		0.473***	.000	
<b><math>\Delta R2</math></b>	0.021*	0.017		0.464***	.000	
<b>F</b>	2.364*	0.017b		49.635***	0.000c	
<b><math>\Delta F</math></b>	49.635***	0.017		412.187***	.000	

It can be seen from Table 1 that after controlling for the influence of demographic variables, entrepreneurship significantly affects enterprise performance. Specifically, VIFs are all less than 5, indicating that there is no multicollinearity between demographic variables and entrepreneurship as independent variables incorporated into the regression model.R2 is 0.473, and entrepreneurship can be explained as 47.3% variation .And entrepreneurship (P<0.001) has a significant regression

coefficient, indicating that there is a significant positive correlation between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is verified.

Further test was carried out on the relationship between three dimensions of entrepreneurship, namely innovation, pioneering and risk-taking, and enterprise performance. The test results show that after controlling for the influence of demographic variables, the three dimensions of entrepreneurship, innovation, pioneering and risk-taking, significantly affect enterprise performance. Specifically, all VIFs are less than 5, which shows that there is no multiple collinearity between demographic variables and entrepreneurship when they are included in the regression model at the same time. R<sup>2</sup> is 0.477, and entrepreneurship can be explained as 47.7% variation. Innovation, pioneering, risk-taking P values are less than 0.001, the regression coefficient is significant, which shows that the three dimensions of entrepreneurship, namely, innovation, pioneering and risk-taking, have a significant positive correlation with enterprise performance, indicating hypothesis H1a, H1b, H1c are verified.

## 5.2. The influence of entrepreneurship on staff innovation behavior

According to the above test methods, the relationship between entrepreneurship and staff innovation behavior is tested. The test results are shown in Table 2:

Table 2 Test of the relationship between entrepreneurship and staff innovation behavior

	<b>Dependent variable:staff innovation behavior</b>					
	Model 1			Model		
	$\beta$	Sig	VIF	$\beta$	Sig	VIF
<b>Control variable</b>						
<b>Sex</b>	-.011	.813	1.027	.044	.234	1.037
<b>Age</b>	-.003	.953	1.133	-.056	.148	1.143
<b>Degree of education</b>	-.064	.163	1.081	-.063	.096	1.081
<b>Founder or not</b>	.154	.002	1.330	.096	.023	1.341
<b>Years of incorporation</b>	-.142	.025	2.066	-.087	.099	2.076
<b>Enterprise nature</b>	.036	.455	1.214	-.011	.780	1.221
<b>Number of staff</b>	.039	.516	1.896	-.028	.572	1.911
<b>Enterprise growth cycle</b>	.039	.511	1.795	-.019	.697	1.806
<b>Independent variable</b>						
<b>Entrepreneurship</b>				.563***	.000	1.052
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	0.040**	0.009		0.341***	.000	
<b><math>\Delta R^2</math></b>	0.024**	0.009		0.329***	.000	
<b>F</b>	2.580**	0.009b		28.584***	0.000c	
<b><math>\Delta F</math></b>	2.580**	0.009		227.233***	.000	

It can be seen from Table 2 that after controlling for the influence of demographic variables, entrepreneurship significantly affects the innovation behavior of staff. Specifically, VIFs are all less than 5, indicating that there is no multicollinearity between demographic variables and entrepreneurship as independent variables incorporated into the regression model at the same time. R<sup>2</sup> is 0.341, and entrepreneurship can be explained as 34.1% variation. And entrepreneurship (P<0.001) has a significant regression coefficient, indicating that there is a significant positive correlation between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance. Therefore, hypothesis H2 is verified.

Further test was carried out on the relationship between three dimensions of entrepreneurship, namely innovation, pioneering and risk-taking, and staff innovation behavior. The test results show that the P value of innovation, pioneering and risk-taking is less than 0.001, and the regression

coefficient is significant, which shows that the three dimensions of entrepreneurship, namely, innovation, pioneering and risk-taking, have a significant positive correlation with staff innovation behavior, indicating hypothesis H2a, H2b, H2c are verified.

### 5.3. The impact of staff innovation behavior on enterprise performance

According to the above test methods, the relationship between staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance is tested, and the test results are shown in Table 3:

Table 3 Test of the relationship between staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance

	Dependent variable: enterprise performance					
	Model 1			Model 2		
	$\beta$	Sig	VIF	$\beta$	Sig	VIF
<b>Control variable</b>						
Sex	-.032	.474	1.027	-.025	.445	1.027
Age	.043	.364	1.133	.044	.189	1.133
Degree of education	-.014	.759	1.081	.030	.363	1.086
Founder or not	.172**	.001	1.330	.065	.079	1.354
Years of incorporation	-.065	.302	2.066	.033	.477	2.087
Enterprise nature	.039	.418	1.214	.014	.685	1.215
Number of staff	.039	.525	1.896	.011	.797	1.898
Enterprise growth cycle	.071	.229	1.795	.044	.300	1.796
<b>Independent variable</b>						
Staff innovation behavior				.692***	.000	1.041
R2	0.037*	0.017		0.497***	0.000	
$\Delta R2$	0.021*	0.017		0.460***	0.000	
F	2.364*	0.017b		54.574***	0.000c	
$\Delta F$	2.364*	0.017		455.014***	0.000	

It can be seen from Table 3 that after controlling for the influence of demographic variables, staff innovation behavior significantly affects enterprise performance. Specifically, VIFs are all less than 5, indicating that there is no multicollinearity between demographic variables and staff innovation behavior incorporated into the regression model at the same time. Entrepreneurship ( $P < 0.001$ ) has a significant regression coefficient, indicating that there is a significant positive correlation between staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance. Therefore, hypothesis H3 is verified.

### 5.4. Test of the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior

According to Baron & Kenny's (1986) view of mediation effect, this thesis regards enterprise performance as the dependent variable, entrepreneurship as the independent variable, gender, age, degree of education, founder or not, years of incorporation, enterprise nature, number of staff, enterprise growth cycle, as control variables, the staff innovation behavior as a mediating variable in order to test the mediating role between staff innovation behavior and enterprise performance.

As can be seen from Table 4, after the addition of the mediating variable, the coefficient of the independent variable entrepreneurship is significantly reduced, which proves that the innovation behavior of staff is partially mediated between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance. Therefore, hypothesis H4 can be verified.

Table 4 Test of the mediating role of staff innovation behaviors between entrepreneurship and enterprise performance

	<b>Dependent variable:enterprise performance</b>			
	M1	M2	M3	M4
<b>Control variable</b>				
Sex	-0.032	0.034	-0.025	0.014
Age	0.043	-0.022	0.044	0.004
Degree of education	-0.014	-0.013	0.030	0.016
Founder or not	0.172	0.102	0.065	0.058
Years of incorporation	-0.065	0.001	0.033	0.040
Enterprise nature	0.039	-0.018	0.014	-0.013
Number of staff	0.039	-0.043	0.011	-0.030
Enterprise growth cycle	0.071	0.002	0.044	0.010
<b>Independent variable</b>				
Entrepreneurship		0.678***		0.420***
<b>Mediating variable</b>				
Staff innovation behavior			0.692***	0.459***
R2	0.037*	0.473***	0.497***	0.612***
ΔR2	0.021*	0.464***	0.488***	0.604***
F	2.364*	49.635***	54.574***	78.215***
ΔF	2.364*	412.187***	54.574***	177.129***

Table 5 Test of the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior on innovation, pioneering and risk-taking and enterprise performance

	<b>Dependent variable:enterprise performance</b>			
	M1	M2	M3	M4
<b>Control variable</b>				
Sex	-.032	.035	-.025	.015
Age	.043	-.026	.044	-.001
Degree of education	-.014	-.013	.030	.016
Founder or not	.172	.105	.065	.061
Years of incorporation	-.065	-.004	.033	.035
Enterprise nature	.039	-.022	.014	-.018
Number of staff	.039	-.042	.011	-.029
Enterprise growth cycle	.071	.002	.044	.011
<b>Independent variable</b>				
Innovation		.302***		.214***
Pioneering		.307***		.199***
Risk-taking		.219***		.099***
<b>Mediating variable</b>				
Staff innovation behavior			.692***	.461***
R2	0.037*	0.477***	0.497***	0.617***
ΔR2	0.021*	0.465***	0.488***	0.608***
F	2.364*	41.032***	54.574***	66.347***
ΔF	2.364*	138.909***	54.574***	180.840***

To further test whether the staff innovation behavior plays a mediating role in the three

dimensions of entrepreneurship, namely, innovation , pioneering and risk-taking, and enterprise performance. The test results are shown in Table 5.

As can be seen from Table 5, after the addition of mediating variables, the coefficients of innovation, pioneering and risk-taking in the three dimensions of entrepreneurship of independent variables are significantly reduced, which proves that there is a partially mediating relationship between innovation, pioneering and risk-taking in the three dimensions of entrepreneurship and enterprise performance. Therefore, H4a, H4b and H4c are verified.

## 5.5. Summary and discussion of hypothesis testing results

### 5.5.1. Summary of hypothesis testing results

This paper includes four general hypotheses, nine sub-hypotheses, and a total of 13 hypotheses, all of which have passed the hypothesis test. The test conclusions obtained are summarized as shown in Table 6:

Table 6 Summary of research hypothesis testing results

Number	Hypothesis	Testing results
<b>H1</b>	Entrepreneurship is positively correlated with enterprise performance	pass
<b>H1a</b>	There is a positive correlation between innovation and enterprise performance	pass
<b>H1b</b>	There is a positive correlation between pioneer and enterprise performance	pass
<b>H1c</b>	There is a positive correlation between risk-taking and enterprise performance	pass
<b>H2</b>	Entrepreneurship is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H2a</b>	Innovation and staff innovation behavior are positively correlated	pass
<b>H2b</b>	Pioneering is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H2c</b>	Risk-taking is positively correlated with staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H3</b>	Staff innovation behavior has a significant positive impact on enterprise performance	pass
<b>H4</b>	Entrepreneurship positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H4a</b>	Innovation positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H4b</b>	Pioneering positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior	pass
<b>H4c</b>	Risk-taking positively affects enterprise performance through the mediating effect of staff innovation behavior	pass

### 5.5.2 Results of hypothesis testing are discussed

The empirical results showed that all 13 hypotheses passed the hypothesis test. The results are discussed below:

First, hypothesis H1 and H1a, H1b and H1c pass the test. Enterprise performance is influenced by the role of entrepreneurship. The more fully entrepreneurs play in the innovation, pioneering and risk-taking spirit, the stronger the role will be. The results show that the role of entrepreneurship on enterprise performance is greater.

Second, H2 and H2a, H2b and H2c are verified. Entrepreneurship and its three dimensions are positively correlated with staff innovation behavior, among which, entrepreneurs' innovation, pioneering and risk-taking have an increasing effect on staff innovation behavior, while risk-taking

and pioneering has a relatively greater effect on staff innovation behavior.

Third, hypothesis H3 is verified. Staff innovation behavior has a significant positive correlation with enterprise performance. Staff innovation behavior has a significant positive effect on enterprise performance. The stronger the innovation behavior of staff, the greater the impact on enterprise performance.

Fourth, hypothesis H4 and H4a, H4b and H4c are verified. Staff innovation acts as a partial intermediary between entrepreneurship together with its three dimensions and enterprise performance. Entrepreneurship has a significant positive effect on enterprise performance. With the addition of staff innovation behavior variables, entrepreneurship still has an effect on enterprise performance, but the regression coefficient becomes smaller and the effect becomes weaker. The mediating effect of staff innovation behavior on the three dimensions of entrepreneur and enterprise performance increases successively.

## 6. Conclusion

This paper takes entrepreneurship as the independent variable, enterprise performance as the dependent variable, and staff innovation behavior as the mediating variable between independent variable and dependent variable, and the theoretical model is verified. Although this article has certain limitation, it has also made the beneficial attempt in the practice aspect. In view of the current situation of lack of entrepreneurship in China and insufficient motivation of enterprise staff to create, the management suggestions for this paper are as follows:

First, we need to attach great importance to the protection of intellectual property rights. Market competition is increasingly fierce, the core competitiveness of enterprise survival is the core technology, core products. Therefore, a sound intellectual property protection system should be established to provide a strong legal system guarantee for promoting the transformation and upgrading of China's economic structure.

Second, increase communication between entrepreneurs and staff. Entrepreneurs should understand the life and work of their staff, be good at exploring innovation leaders and giving full play to the innovation ability of each staff. Encourage and recognize staff who are brave to make breakthroughs and innovations.

Third, provide support and help for staff innovation behavior. For innovative individuals and teams, relevant systems and regulations should be formulated to guarantee them, to provide financial support and technical support.

In short, through empirical analysis, we know that entrepreneurship plays a positive role in promoting enterprise performance, and entrepreneurship positively promotes enterprise performance through staff innovation behavior. More attention should be paid to the transmission and influence between the two aspects, so as to give full play to their maximum effects, jointly promote the improvement of enterprise performance, promote the transformation and upgrading of Chinese enterprises, and promote China's economic development.

## References

- [1]Peter Drucker(1985). Innovation and entrepreneurship.HaiKou.Hainan press.
- [2]Freeman,C.(1987) .Technology Policy and Performance: Lessons from Japan, London and New York, London: Pinter.
- [3]Joseph Alois Schumpeter(1990) . Economic development theory.Beijing. Commercial press.
- [4]Marshall(1990). Principles of economics. Beijing. Commercial press.
- [5]Covin,,J.G.and Slevin,T.,J.(1991).Acomeptnal model of entreprenership as firm behavior.Entreprenership theory and practice,16(1) ,7-24.
- [6]Kaplan,R. S., & Norton,D. P.(1992).Using the Balanced Scorecard As A Strategic Management

System? Harvard Business Review, 74(1), 75-85.

[7]Scott,S.G. and Bruce, R.A. (1994).Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual in the Workplace. The Academy of Management Journal, (37), 580-607.

[8]Zahra,S.A.(1995). Corporate Entrepreneurship and financial Performance: The Case of Management Leveraged Buyouts. Journal of Business Venturing, Vol.10, 225-247 .

[9]Tierney,P.,&Farmer,S.M.(2002). Creative self-efficacy: Its potential antecedents and relationship to creative performance. Academy of Management Journal, (45),1137-1148.

[10]Chen Guoquan(2009).Organizational learning and learning organization:Concept, Competency model, Measurement, and Impact on performance. Management review,21(1),107-116.

[11]Liu Zhiqiang,Geliang,Panxin,Liufen(2014).Research on strength of variable payment,Motivation of status competition and Employee innovation behavior.Journal of management,11(10),1460-1468.