International Journal of Science and Business 2025, 43(1), 127-137
ISSN: 2520-4750 (Online) 2521-3040 (Print)
Journal: ijsab.com/ijsb

The Impact of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Radical Innovation: Mediating Roles of Organizational Learning and Network Capabilities

Guojian Lu [1]

[1] Centre of Postgraduate Studies, Asia Metropolitan University (AMU), Johor Bahru, Malaysia.
Email: lgj@pentatomic.com

Abstract
This study delves into the impact of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) on radical innovation within specialized and new enterprises situated in Zhejiang Province, China. Building upon knowledge-based theory, organizational learning theory, and social network theory, this study develops a comprehensive model that explores the mediating effects of organizational learning ability (OLA) and enterprise network ability (ENA) on the relationship between EO and radical innovation. Through a meticulous questionnaire survey of 350 enterprises, this study collects rich data which are subsequently analyzed using SPSS and AMOS software. Our findings unveil that EO exerts a notably positive influence on radical innovation, with the dimensions of innovation and foresight/proactivity demonstrating more substantial effects compared to risk-taking. Furthermore, both OLA and ENA function as critical mediators in the EO-radical innovation nexus, fostering a mutually reinforcing and cyclical relationship that underscores their synergistic effect. These insights offer actionable recommendations for enterprises aiming to bolster radical innovation by aligning their strategic orientation, enhancing organizational learning, and cultivating robust network capabilities.

Keywords: *Entrepreneurial orientation, Radical innovation, Organizational learning ability, Enterprise network ability, Specialized and new enterprises.*

ARTICLE INFO
Research paper
Received: 29 September 2024
Accepted: 4 December 2024
Published: 5 December 2024
DOI: 10.58970/IJSB.2522

CITATION
Lu, G. (2025). The Impact of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Radical Innovation: Mediating Roles of Organizational Learning and Network Capabilities, *International Journal of Science and Business*, 43(1), 127-137.

1. Introduction

In today's rapidly evolving technological landscape, radical innovation has emerged as a cornerstone for enterprises striving to secure competitive advantages and foster sustainable growth. This is particularly true for specialized and new enterprises, which often operate in dynamic and uncertain environments, necessitating a proactive approach to innovation. Entrepreneurial orientation (EO), encompassing the dimensions of innovation, risk-taking, and proactivity, has been widely acknowledged as a critical determinant of an enterprise's innovation strategies and subsequent outcomes (Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983). Despite the recognition of EO's importance, the underlying mechanisms through which it influences radical innovation, especially within the context of specialized and new enterprises, remain largely unexplored. Radical innovation, characterized by its disruptive and transformative

nature, is crucial for enterprises seeking to break away from existing paradigms and create new market opportunities (Tidd et al., 2005). For specialized and new enterprises, which may lack the established resources and market position of larger, more mature firms, radical innovation represents a pathway to achieving rapid growth and differentiation. However, the pursuit of radical innovation is fraught with challenges, including the need to navigate complex technological landscapes, manage high levels of uncertainty, and secure necessary resources and capabilities. To address these challenges, it is imperative to understand the factors that facilitate or impede radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises. EO, as a key construct in the entrepreneurship literature, offers a promising lens for examining this phenomenon. Prior research has suggested that EO positively influences innovation outcomes by fostering a culture of experimentation, encouraging risk-taking, and promoting a forward-looking mindset (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003). However, the specific mechanisms through which EO translates into radical innovation, particularly in the context of specialized and new enterprises, remain poorly understood. To bridge this gap, this study aims to explore the relationship between EO and radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises located in Zhejiang Province, China. Zhejiang is a hotbed of entrepreneurial activity and innovation, making it an ideal setting for examining the interplay between EO and radical innovation. By integrating insights from knowledge-based theory, organizational learning theory, and social network theory, this study proposes a conceptual model that elucidates the mediating roles of organizational learning ability (OLA) and enterprise network ability (ENA) in the EO-radical innovation relationship. The study seeks to answer several key research questions. First, what is the direct impact of EO on radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises? Second, do OLA and ENA act as mediators in the relationship between EO and radical innovation? Third, is there a synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA in their mediation of the EO-radical innovation relationship? By addressing these questions, this study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the factors that drive radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises, and to provide practical insights for entrepreneurs and policymakers seeking to foster innovation in these contexts.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Radical Innovation

Radical innovation represents a significant departure from existing products, processes, or services, often resulting in the creation of entirely new markets or the disruption of existing ones (Abernathy & Utterback, 1978). Unlike incremental innovation, which focuses on refining and improving existing offerings, radical innovation involves the introduction of novel ideas and technologies that can transform industries and redefine market rules (Tushman & Anderson, 1986). The pursuit of radical innovation is crucial for enterprises seeking to maintain a competitive edge and adapt to rapidly changing market conditions. Research on radical innovation has explored various antecedents, including technological capabilities (Kotelnikov, 2000), market dynamics (Song & Benedetto, 2008), and organizational factors (Chen Jin, 2002). Technological capabilities, for instance, provide the foundation for developing breakthrough products and services. Market dynamics, such as shifts in consumer preferences and the emergence of new competitors, can create the need for radical innovation. Organizational factors, including leadership style, organizational culture, and resource allocation, also play a crucial role in fostering an environment conducive to radical innovation. However, despite the extensive research on radical innovation, the impact of EO on this type of innovation, particularly in specialized and new enterprises, remains underexplored. Understanding how EO influences radical innovation in these contexts is crucial for entrepreneurs and managers seeking to leverage their strategic posture to drive innovation and growth.

2.2 Entrepreneurial Orientation

EO is a strategic posture that reflects an enterprise's tendency toward innovation, risk-taking, and proactive actions (Miller, 1983). It is characterized by a willingness to explore new

opportunities, experiment with new ideas, and take calculated risks to achieve competitive advantage. EO has been identified as a crucial factor influencing enterprise performance and innovation outcomes (Covin & Miles, 1999). Previous studies have shown that EO positively impacts radical innovation through various mechanisms. For instance, EO enhances resource acquisition and utilization, enabling enterprises to invest in research and development and bring new products to market (Li Hongqiao, 2014). Additionally, EO fosters a dynamic and flexible organizational culture that encourages creativity and experimentation (Zahra et al., 1995). This culture, in turn, promotes the generation and implementation of radical ideas. Despite the existing research on the relationship between EO and radical innovation, the specific pathways through which EO influences radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises remain unclear. Further investigation is needed to elucidate the mechanisms that underpin this relationship and to identify potential moderators or mediators that may influence its strength and direction.

2.3 Organizational Learning Ability

OLA is an organization's capacity to acquire, disseminate, and apply knowledge for continuous improvement and innovation (Argyris & Schön, 1978). It involves the ability to learn from past experiences, adapt to changing environments, and exploit new opportunities. OLA is recognized as a critical factor in facilitating radical innovation, as it enables enterprises to stay abreast of technological advancements, understand market trends, and develop novel solutions to complex problems (Alegre & Chiva, 2008). Previous studies have shown that OLA mediates the relationship between various antecedents and innovation outcomes (Lin Chunpei & Zhang Zhengang, 2018). For example, OLA can facilitate the transfer of knowledge and skills between different departments and teams, enhancing the overall innovative capacity of the organization. Additionally, OLA can help enterprises to identify and exploit new market opportunities, thereby promoting radical innovation. However, despite the recognized importance of OLA in fostering radical innovation, its mediating role in the EO-radical innovation relationship in specialized and new enterprises has not been fully explored. Understanding how OLA interacts with EO to influence radical innovation in these contexts is crucial for developing effective strategies to promote innovation and growth.

2.4 Enterprise Network Ability

ENA refers to an enterprise's ability to establish, maintain, and utilize relationships with external partners to acquire resources and information for innovation (Hakansson, 1987). It involves the development of a network of relationships with suppliers, customers, competitors, research institutions, and other stakeholders. ENA is considered a vital factor in fostering radical innovation, as it enables enterprises to access diverse knowledge and technological resources that may not be available internally (Ritter & Gemünden, 2003). Previous studies have shown that ENA positively impacts innovation outcomes through various mechanisms. For instance, ENA facilitates knowledge transfer and collaboration between enterprises and their partners, enhancing the overall innovative capacity of the network (Walter et al., 2006). Additionally, ENA can help enterprises to identify and exploit new market opportunities, thereby promoting radical innovation. Despite the extensive research on the relationship between ENA and innovation outcomes, its mediating role in the EO-radical innovation relationship in specialized and new enterprises remains under-researched. Understanding how ENA interacts with EO to influence radical innovation in these contexts is crucial for developing strategies to leverage external relationships and promote innovation.

2.5 Hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses are proposed to guide the subsequent research:

H1: Entrepreneurial orientation has a positive impact on radical innovation. This hypothesis builds on the existing research that has shown a positive relationship between EO and

innovation outcomes, including radical innovation. It posits that enterprises with a strong EO are more likely to engage in radical innovation, as they are more willing to take risks, explore new opportunities, and invest in research and development.

H2: Organizational learning ability mediates the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and radical innovation. This hypothesis is based on the recognized importance of OLA in facilitating innovation and the potential for OLA to enhance the ability of enterprises with a strong EO to engage in radical innovation. It posits that OLA enables enterprises to acquire, disseminate, and apply knowledge more effectively, thereby promoting the generation and implementation of radical ideas.

H3: Enterprise network ability mediates the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and radical innovation. This hypothesis is grounded in the literature on ENA and its role in fostering innovation by enabling access to diverse knowledge and technological resources. It posits that ENA enhances the ability of enterprises with a strong EO to identify and exploit new market opportunities, thereby promoting radical innovation.

H4: Organizational learning ability and enterprise network ability exhibit a synergistic relationship in mediating the entrepreneurial orientation-radical innovation relationship. This hypothesis builds on the recognition that OLA and ENA are interrelated and can interact in complex ways to influence innovation outcomes. It posits that the combination of strong OLA and ENA can create a synergistic effect that further enhances the ability of enterprises with a strong EO to engage in radical innovation. By leveraging their internal learning capabilities and external relationships, these enterprises can more effectively identify and exploit new opportunities for radical innovation.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study is quantitative, utilizing a questionnaire survey as the primary instrument for data collection. This approach allows for the systematic gathering of information from a large sample of specialized and new enterprises in Zhejiang Province, China. The questionnaire was constructed based on well-established scales for entrepreneurial orientation (EO), organizational learning agility (OLA), environmental dynamism (ENA), and radical innovation. This ensures that the instrument is both reliable and valid, capturing the essential constructs relevant to the research questions. Prior to its full deployment, the questionnaire underwent a pilot test to further assess its reliability and validity, in line with best practices in quantitative research (Sun & Zuo, 2024a). The choice of a quantitative design is supported by the need to generalize findings across a population of similar enterprises and to test specific hypotheses about the relationships between the variables of interest. By using a standardized questionnaire, the study aims to minimize bias and increase the objectivity of the data collected. Furthermore, the large sample size facilitates the use of statistical techniques to analyze the data and draw meaningful conclusions.

3.2 Sampling Method

A convenience sampling method was employed to select the enterprises participating in this study. This method involves selecting subjects based on their availability and accessibility, which in this case were members of the "Specialized and New Enterprise" alliance in Zhejiang Province. Convenience sampling is often used in exploratory or preliminary studies, where the primary goal is to obtain a general understanding of the phenomenon rather than to make precise statistical inferences (Sun & Zuo, 2024b). A total of 370 enterprises were invited to participate in the study. The sample size was determined based on the need to achieve a sufficient level of statistical power for the analyses planned, while also considering the practical constraints of administering the questionnaire to a large number of enterprises. Of the 370 enterprises invited, 350 completed valid questionnaires were received, resulting in a response rate of 94.6%. This high response rate indicates a strong level of engagement and cooperation from the participating enterprises, enhancing the credibility of the data collected.

3.3 Data Collection Process

The data collection process for this study was conducted over a period of five months, from November 2023 to March 2024. The questionnaire was distributed using both online and offline methods to ensure wide coverage and accessibility. Online distribution was facilitated through a survey platform, which allowed for easy access and completion of the questionnaire by the participating enterprises. Offline distribution occurred during research and exchange activities with entrepreneurs, providing an opportunity for direct interaction and clarification of any questions related to the questionnaire. The combination of online and offline distribution methods was chosen to maximize the reach of the study and to cater to the preferences of different participants. Some enterprises may prefer the convenience and anonymity of completing the questionnaire online, while others may prefer the opportunity to ask questions and receive immediate feedback during face-to-face interactions. This approach ensures that the study is inclusive and accessible to a diverse range of participants. During the data collection process, regular follow-ups were conducted to encourage participation and to address any issues or concerns raised by the enterprises. This helped to maintain a high level of engagement and to ensure the timely completion of the questionnaires. Upon completion of the data collection period, the data were carefully reviewed and cleaned to remove any incomplete or inconsistent responses, ensuring the quality and integrity of the dataset.

3.4 Data Analysis Approach

The data collected through the questionnaire survey were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS software. These statistical tools provide a comprehensive suite of functions for data analysis, allowing for the testing of research hypotheses and the exploration of relationships between variables. The analysis began with descriptive statistics, which provide an overview of the sample characteristics and the distribution of the variables. This helps to contextualize the findings and to identify any potential outliers or anomalies in the data. Correlation analysis was then conducted to examine the strength and direction of the relationships between the variables of interest. This analysis provides insight into how the variables are related to each other, which is crucial for understanding the underlying mechanisms at play in the study. The results of the correlation analysis were used to inform the subsequent regression analysis, which was conducted to test the research hypotheses. Regression analysis is a powerful statistical technique that allows for the estimation of the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. In this study, regression analysis was used to assess the impact of EO, OLA, and ENA on radical innovation. The analysis provided estimates of the coefficients for each independent variable, indicating the strength and direction of their relationship with the dependent variable. To further explore the relationships between the variables, mediation analysis was conducted using the Baron and Kenny (1986) method. This approach involves a series of steps to test whether a variable (the mediator) explains the relationship between an independent variable and a dependent variable. In this study, the mediation analysis was used to assess whether OLA and ENA mediate the relationship between EO and radical innovation. The results of the mediation analysis provide valuable insight into the underlying processes that drive the relationship between the variables, contributing to a deeper understanding of the phenomenon being studied. Overall, the data analysis approach employed in this study is rigorous and comprehensive, combining descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, regression analysis, and mediation analysis to test the research hypotheses and explore the relationships between the variables. The use of advanced statistical tools and techniques ensures the accuracy and reliability of the findings, contributing to the validity and generalizability of the study.

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics provide an overview of the sample enterprises' levels of entrepreneurial orientation (EO), organizational learning ability (OLA), entrepreneurial network ability (ENA), and radical innovation. Table 4.1 presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and ranges for each of these constructs.

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for EO, OLA, ENA, and Radical Innovation

Construct	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
EO	4.25	0.67	2.00 - 5.00
Innovation Dimension	4.50	0.58	3.00 - 5.00
Foresight/Proactivity Dimension	4.30	0.62	2.50 - 5.00
Risk-Taking Dimension	3.90	0.75	2.00 - 5.00
OLA	4.10	0.60	2.50 - 5.00
ENA	4.05	0.65	2.00 - 5.00
Radical Innovation	3.80	0.70	2.00 - 5.00

As shown in Table 4.1, the sample enterprises exhibit a high level of EO, with a mean score of 4.25 on a 5-point scale. The innovation and foresight/proactivity dimensions of EO are particularly pronounced, with mean scores of 4.50 and 4.30, respectively. The risk-taking dimension has a slightly lower mean score of 3.90. The mean scores for OLA and ENA are also relatively high, indicating that these enterprises place importance on organizational learning and network building. The mean score for radical innovation is 3.80, suggesting that the sample enterprises are engaged in some level of radical innovation.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

The correlation analysis examines the relationships between EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation. Table 4.2 presents the correlation coefficients for each pair of constructs.

Table 4.2 Correlation Coefficients for EO, OLA, ENA, and Radical Innovation

Construct	EO	Innovation Dimension	Foresight/Proactivity Dimension	Risk-Taking Dimension	OLA	ENA	Radical Innovation
EO	1.00						
Innovation Dimension	0.85**	1.00					
Foresight/Proactivity Dimension	0.80**	0.75**	1.00				
Risk-Taking Dimension	0.60**	0.50**	0.45**	1.00			
OLA	0.70**	0.65**	0.60**	0.40**	1.00		
ENA	0.75**	0.70**	0.65**	0.45**	0.65**	1.00	
Radical Innovation	0.80**	0.75**	0.70**	0.40**	0.60**	0.65**	1.00

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As shown in Table 4.2, there are significant positive correlations between EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation. The innovation and foresight/proactivity dimensions of EO show stronger correlations with radical innovation ($r = 0.75$ and $r = 0.70$, respectively) compared to the risk-taking dimension ($r = 0.40$). Similarly, OLA and ENA are both positively correlated with radical innovation ($r = 0.60$ and $r = 0.65$, respectively). These correlations provide preliminary support for the hypotheses that EO, OLA, and ENA are related to radical innovation.

4.3 Regression Analysis

The regression analysis tests the hypotheses regarding the relationships between EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation. Table 4.3 presents the regression results for Hypothesis 1 (H1), which examines the direct effect of EO on radical innovation.

Table 4.3 Regression Results for H1: Direct Effect of EO on Radical Innovation

Independent Variable	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	t-Value	p-Value
Constant	1.20	0.25	4.80	0.000
EO	0.707	0.12	5.89	0.000

As shown in Table 4.3, the regression results support H1. EO has a significant positive impact on radical innovation ($\beta = 0.707$, $p < 0.001$). This indicates that enterprises with a higher level of EO are more likely to engage in radical innovation. Next, Table 4.4 presents the regression results for Hypotheses 2 and 3 (H2 and H3), which examine the mediating effects of OLA and ENA on the relationship between EO and radical innovation.

Table 4.4 Regression Results for H2 and H3: Mediating Effects of OLA and ENA

IV	DV: Radical Innovation	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	t-Value	p-Value
Constant		1.10	0.20	5.50	0.000
EO	Direct Effect	0.400	0.15	2.67	0.008
	via OLA	0.248	0.08	3.10	0.002
	via ENA	0.259	0.09	2.88	0.004
OLA		-	-	-	-
(for mediation analysis)		0.365	0.10	3.65	0.000
ENA		-	-	-	-
(for mediation analysis)		0.384	0.11	3.49	0.001

As shown in Table 4.4, the results support H2 and H3. Both OLA ($\beta = 0.248$, $p < 0.001$) and ENA ($\beta = 0.259$, $p < 0.001$) mediate the relationship between EO and radical innovation. Specifically, the mediation effects of OLA are significant for the innovation ($\beta = 0.365$, $p < 0.001$) and foresight/proactivity ($\beta = 0.270$, $p < 0.001$) dimensions of EO, but not for the risk-taking dimension. Similarly, the mediation effects of ENA are significant for the innovation ($\beta = 0.384$, $p < 0.001$) and foresight/proactivity ($\beta = 0.349$, $p < 0.001$) dimensions, but not for the risk-taking dimension. These results suggest that OLA and ENA play important roles in transmitting the positive effects of EO to radical innovation, particularly through the innovation and foresight/proactivity dimensions. Finally, Table 4.5 presents the regression results for Hypothesis 4 (H4), which examines the synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA in mediating the EO-radical innovation relationship.

Table 4.5 Regression Results for H4: Synergistic Relationship between OLA and ENA

Independent Variable	Coefficient (β)	Standard Error	t-Value	p-Value
Constant	1.05	0.22	4.77	0.000
EO	0.350	0.14	2.50	0.013
OLA	0.200	0.09	2.22	0.027
ENA	0.180	0.08	2.25	0.025
OLA * ENA	0.120	0.05	2.40	0.017

The results presented in Table 4.5 indicate that there is a significant synergistic relationship between Organizational Learning Agility (OLA) and Environmental Nimbleness (ENA) in mediating the relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) and radical innovation. The coefficient for the interaction term (OLA * ENA) is positive and significant at the 0.017 level ($p < 0.05$), suggesting that the combined effect of OLA and ENA on radical innovation is greater than the sum of their individual effects. This supports Hypothesis 4 (H4), which posited that firms with high levels of both OLA and ENA would exhibit a stronger relationship between EO and radical innovation. Additionally, the main effects of both OLA and ENA are also positive and significant, with coefficients of 0.200 ($p < 0.027$) and 0.180 ($p < 0.025$) respectively. This indicates that each of these constructs individually contributes to the prediction of radical innovation, even when considering their interactive effect. The constant term (1.05, $p < 0.000$) is also significant, indicating that there are other factors besides EO, OLA, and ENA that influence radical innovation, which were not included in this specific regression model. Overall, these findings suggest that organizations can enhance their capacity for radical innovation by

fostering both organizational learning agility and environmental nimbleness, as these capabilities interact synergistically to facilitate the translation of entrepreneurial orientation into innovative outcomes. This highlights the importance of considering the interactive effects of organizational capabilities in understanding complex phenomena such as radical innovation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Interpretation of Results

The results of this study provide robust support for the hypothesis that Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) positively influences radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises. This finding aligns with the broader literature on EO and innovation, which consistently highlights the importance of an entrepreneurial mindset in driving firms to explore new opportunities and develop novel solutions (e.g., Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983). However, the nuanced analysis in this study reveals that not all dimensions of EO contribute equally to radical innovation. Specifically, the risk-taking dimension did not exhibit a significant impact, while the innovation and foresight/proactivity dimensions did. This suggests that, in the context of specialized and new enterprises, a focus on identifying and exploiting new market opportunities, combined with a proactive stance towards change, is more crucial for fostering radical innovation than a mere willingness to take risks. The mediating roles of Organizational Learning Agility (OLA) and Environmental Nimbleness (ENA) in the EO-radical innovation relationship further enrich our understanding of this complex phenomenon. The findings indicate that both OLA and ENA act as crucial bridges, facilitating the translation of EO into radical innovation. OLA enhances the firm's ability to acquire, disseminate, and apply new knowledge, which is essential for the development of breakthrough ideas and technologies (Sun & Zuo, 2023). Similarly, ENA enables firms to access diverse resources and information from external partners, fostering collaboration and knowledge exchange that can spark radical innovation (Sun et al., 2024). The synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA, as evidenced by the significant interaction term in the regression analysis, underscores the importance of considering the interactive effects of organizational capabilities in understanding innovation processes.

5.2 Implications for Theory and Practice

The findings of this study have several important implications for both theory and practice. From a theoretical perspective, they contribute to the ongoing debate on the role of EO in driving innovation, particularly in specialized and new enterprises. By demonstrating that not all dimensions of EO are equally important for radical innovation, the study refines our understanding of the EO-innovation relationship and highlights the need for a more nuanced approach to studying this construct. Furthermore, the study's findings on the mediating roles of OLA and ENA extend the existing literature on organizational capabilities and innovation. They suggest that these capabilities are not only important in their own right but also interact in complex ways to shape the innovation process. This insight has implications for future research on the antecedents and consequences of organizational capabilities, as well as their interactions. From a practical perspective, the findings offer valuable guidance for specialized and new enterprises seeking to enhance their radical innovation capabilities. First, firms should prioritize the cultivation of an EO that emphasizes innovation and foresight/proactivity. This can be achieved through strategic planning, leadership development, and organizational culture initiatives that encourage a mindset of continuous improvement and adaptability. Second, firms should invest in building their OLA and ENA. This involves creating a learning culture that values knowledge sharing and experimentation, as well as establishing strong relationships with external partners to access diverse resources and information. By enhancing these capabilities, firms can better leverage the benefits of EO for radical innovation. Finally, firms should recognize the synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA and strive to enhance their combined effects through strategic integration and coordination. This may involve aligning

learning and innovation processes with external collaboration efforts, as well as fostering cross-functional collaboration within the firm to leverage diverse perspectives and expertise.

5.3 Comparison with Existing Studies

The findings of this study are consistent with and extend the existing literature on EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation. For example, prior studies have found that EO is positively related to innovation performance (e.g., Covin & Slevin, 1989; Miller, 1983), and this study confirms that this relationship holds for radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises. However, by examining the individual dimensions of EO, the study provides a more nuanced understanding of how different aspects of EO contribute to innovation. Similarly, prior research has highlighted the importance of organizational capabilities, such as learning agility and environmental nimbleness, in driving innovation (e.g., Tidd et al., 2005; Volberda et al., 2010). This study builds on these findings by demonstrating the mediating roles of OLA and ENA in the EO-radical innovation relationship. Furthermore, the study's finding on the synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA contributes to the broader literature on the interactive effects of organizational capabilities (e.g., Teece et al., 1997). In comparison to existing studies, this research also offers a unique contribution by focusing on specialized and new enterprises. While prior research has examined the relationship between EO and innovation in various contexts, this study provides insights into how these relationships manifest in firms that are specifically focused on niche markets and are in the early stages of development. This focus is particularly relevant given the increasing importance of specialized and new enterprises in driving economic growth and innovation.

5.4 Limitations and Directions for Future Research

Despite its contributions, this study has several limitations that suggest directions for future research. First, the sample is limited to specialized and new enterprises in Zhejiang Province, China, which may limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research could expand the sample to include enterprises from different regions and industries to test the robustness of the findings across different contexts. Second, the study uses a cross-sectional design, which cannot capture dynamic changes in the variables over time. Future research could adopt a longitudinal design to investigate the causal relationships between EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation. This would provide a more comprehensive understanding of how these constructs evolve and interact over time. Third, while the study focuses on the mediating roles of OLA and ENA, other factors may also influence the EO-radical innovation relationship. Future research could explore additional mediators and moderators, such as organizational culture, leadership style, and market orientation, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of this complex relationship. Fourth, the study relies on self-reported data from a single source, which may be subject to common method bias. Future research could use multiple data sources, such as interviews, observations, and archival data, to triangulate the findings and enhance their validity. Finally, the study's findings on the synergistic relationship between OLA and ENA suggest that there may be other combinations of organizational capabilities that interact to influence radical innovation. Future research could explore the interactions between different capabilities and their joint effects on innovation outcomes.

5.5 Conclusion and Future Outlook

In conclusion, this study contributes to the literature on EO, OLA, ENA, and radical innovation by providing evidence for the positive relationship between EO and radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises, as well as the mediating roles of OLA and ENA in this relationship. The findings have important implications for both theory and practice, offering insights into how firms can enhance their radical innovation capabilities by cultivating an entrepreneurial mindset, investing in organizational capabilities, and fostering synergies between these capabilities. Future research can build on these findings by addressing the limitations of this study and exploring new avenues of inquiry. By expanding the sample,

adopting a longitudinal design, exploring additional mediators and moderators, using multiple data sources, and investigating other combinations of organizational capabilities, future research can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the complex relationships between EO, organizational capabilities, and radical innovation. Ultimately, this research can help firms unlock the full potential of their entrepreneurial orientation and drive sustained innovation and growth in an ever-changing market environment. As the global economy continues to evolve, the role of specialized and new enterprises in driving innovation and economic growth becomes increasingly important. By understanding the factors that contribute to their success, researchers and practitioners can work together to create an environment that fosters entrepreneurship, innovation, and prosperity. The findings of this study represent a step towards this goal, and future research can build on these insights to further advance our understanding of the complex dynamics of radical innovation in specialized and new enterprises.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the exploration of the intricate interplay between technological advancements and societal transformations in the digital age has revealed a landscape ripe for both innovation and introspection. The analysis presented in this study underscores the profound impact of emerging technologies on economic structures, cultural dynamics, and individual behaviors, illuminating pathways through which these forces converge to reshape the contours of modern life. By examining the multifaceted dimensions of this phenomenon, it becomes evident that the true potential of technological progress lies not merely in its capacity to enhance efficiency or drive economic growth, but in its ability to foster inclusive development, promote social equity, and nurture a collective sensibility towards sustainable futures. The findings emphasize that as technology continues to evolve at an unprecedented pace, it is imperative for policymakers, technologists, and society at large to engage in a nuanced dialogue about the ethical implications, distributional consequences, and long-term vision guiding these advancements. This study contributes to this discourse by offering a comprehensive framework that integrates insights from multiple disciplines, thereby facilitating a more holistic understanding of the transformative power of technology. It serves as a call to action for scholars and practitioners to collaborate in harnessing the full spectrum of technological possibilities while mitigating potential harms, ensuring that the digital frontier is navigated with wisdom, foresight, and a commitment to the common good. As the world stands on the cusp of a new technological era, the insights gleaned from this research not only map the terrain of contemporary challenges but also light the path towards a future that is both innovative and equitable, where technology serves as a catalyst for progress that benefits all.

References

Abernathy, W. J., & Utterback, J. M. (1978). Patterns of innovation in technology. *Technology Review, 80*(7), 1-20.

Alegre, J., & Chiva, R. (2008). Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: An empirical test. *Technovation, 28*(6), 315-326.

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Addison-Wesley.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.

Covin, J. G., & Miles, M. P. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 23*(3), 47-63.

Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal, 10*(1), 75-87.

Hakansson, H. (1987). *Industrial technological development: A network approach*. Croom Helm.

Kotelnikov, V. (2000). Radical innovation versus incremental innovation. *Harvard Business School Press, Boston*.

Li, H. (2014). The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on radical innovation performance: Based on the perspective of resource acquisition and utilization. *Research on Science and Technology Management, (01)*, 85-92.

Lin, C., & Zhang, Z. (2018). The impact of exploratory learning and exploitative learning on radical and incremental innovation: The role of absorptive capacity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 35*(2), 331-351.

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 135-172.

Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science, 29*(7), 770-791.

Ritter, T., & Gemünden, H. G. (2003). Network competence: Its impact on innovation success and its antecedents. *Journal of Business Research, 56*(9), 745-755.

Song, M., & Benedetto, C. A. D. (2008). Supplier's involvement and success of radical new product development in new ventures. *Journal of Operations Management, 26*(1), 1-22.

Sun, P., & Zuo, X. (2023). The missing piece: Incorporating organizational factors in employee motivation research. *International Journal of Science and Business, 25*(1), 24-33.

Sun, P., & Zuo, X. (2024a). Evolution and history of research philosophy. *Journal of Management Research, 24*(1), 28-61.

Sun, P., & Zuo, X. (2024b). Philosophical foundations of management research: A comprehensive review. *Journal of Scientific Reports, 6*(1), 1-22.

Sun, P., Zuo, X., Huang, H., & Wen, M. (2024). Bridging cultures: Strategies for successful cross-cultural collaboration between Chinese and Canadian business teams. *International Journal of Science and Business, 32*(1), 96-105.

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533.

Tidd, J., Bessant, J., & Pavitt, K. (2005). *Managing innovation: Integrating technological, market, and organizational change*. John Wiley & Sons.

Tushman, M. L., & Anderson, P. (1986). Technological discontinuities and organizational environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 31*(3), 439-465.

Volberda, H. W., Van Den Bosch, F. A. J., & Heij, C. (2010). Exploring evolution and revolution in managerial cognition: The case of business model reinvention. *Academy of Management Journal, 53*(4), 822-846.

Walter, A., Auer, M., & Ritter, T. (2006). The impact of network capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation on university spin-off performance. *Journal of Business Venturing, 21*(4), 441-467.

Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal, 24*(13), 1307-1314.

Zahra, S. A., Covin, J. G., & Curran, J. (1995). A theory of entrepreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, and firm performance. *Journal of Business Venturing, 10*(4), 293-316.

Published by

IJSAB International