European Journal of Business and Management
ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online)
Vol.5, No.4, 2013

The Impact of the Key Dimensions of Entrepreneurship on Opportunities for the Success of New Ventures in the Greater Amman Municipality

Najim A. Najim[1*] Ghaleb A. El-Refae[2] Loay Alnaji[3]

1. Department of Business Administration, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Amman 11733, Jordan
2. College of Business Administration, Al Ain University of Science and Technology, P.O.Box 64141 Al Ain-UAE
3. Department of Business Administration, Al-Zaytoonah University of Jordan Amman 11733, Jordan

* E-mail of the corresponding author: Loay@Alnaji.net

Abstract

This research attempted to shed light on the effects of entrepreneurship dimensions on small businesses. The research aimed to study the impact of key dimensions of entrepreneurship on opportunities of venture survival and growth. The independent variables selected for this study are related to the five dimensions of entrepreneurship—characteristics of entrepreneur, entrepreneurship support policy, general environment, entrepreneurship activities, and information and electronic entrepreneurship—and their effect on survival and growth opportunities of small projects (the dependent variables). The research results and analysis revealed no significant impact on growth opportunities for small businesses. There is significant support for policy enhancing the general environment and chances for business survival and growth. There was no impact from information and electronic entrepreneurship on survival and growth chances .Finally, the authors present several recommendations including inviting Jordanian companies and governmental institutions and organizations to adopt entrepreneurship concepts and practices, bringing more attention to entrepreneurship concepts as well as providing technical and financial assistance to new entrepreneurs, issuing an annual report on the entrepreneurial activities and projects, and encouraging studies and research on the entrepreneurship in Jordan.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, leadership, entrepreneurial dimension properties, and chances of survival.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship is not a new phenomenon nor is it the product of the 18th or 19th centuries, as noted in Western literature (Jones and Wadhwani,2006,pp3-4) . Although as a word it was first used French economist Cantillon in 1755 and reused by Jan B. Say at the beginning of the 19th century, as a practice entrepreneurship is older than that. It was merchants from Lagash and Wekish and other civilizations located in Mesopotamia who were the first pioneers, according to Butler (2004, p. 45).Traders and craftsmen who came with the military campaigns and conquests were as also considered entrepreneurs.

Although most scholars agree on the importance of the functions of entrepreneurship in renewing the economy and its contribution to economic growth through innovation (with Schumpeter) and market opportunities (see Kirzner or the Chicago school) and the modernization of society (by pioneering social activists) as well as stimulating governments, scholars still argue about the definition and measurement tools of entrepreneurship. Compounding the importance of studying entrepreneurship is increasing talk about leading the community that reflects entrepreneurship properties and values (Audretsch, 2007, p. 19), as well as leading the economy in economic theory or in contributing to economic growth and competitiveness (Glancey &McQuaid, 2000, p. 3). Perhaps there is a growing call for leadership in different sectors and areas, aiding in the emergence of new patterns of leadership in intellectual, cultural, digital, global, ethnic, minority, and even community leadership.

Entrepreneurship gained importance throughout the past decades at the macroeconomic level, making it a powerful engine for economic growth; and at the micro-level as a factor for corporate renewal and innovation of new products and processes. Studying entrepreneurship in depth in general and entrepreneurship in business in Jordan in specific

will help in understanding pioneers as well as shedding light on the difficulties entrepreneurship projects face. The goal of this research is to provide a modest contribution toward this goal.

2. The study

The purpose of the study is to determine the impact of key dimensions of entrepreneurship on opportunities of survival and growth of new businesses. The problem of the study can be identified through the following questions:

1- What is the effect of the basic dimensions of entrepreneurship (properties of entrepreneur, entrepreneurship support policy, the general environment that entrepreneurship operates in it, entrepreneurship activities, and information and electronic entrepreneurship) on the chances of success of new projects in Jordan, its existence as well as in growth (expansion and opening new branches in the subsequent period) in the light of respondents' answers?

2- What are the main problems facing new Jordanian projects from the viewpoint of participants?

3. Study Importance

Experience confirms that entrepreneurship plays an important role in modernizing and developing the economy, as well as improving the lifestyle in the society adopting it. For these reasons, countries adopted national policies to stimulate the creation of entrepreneurship projects; although such projects are considered risky and have a high percentage of uncertainty and failure. This study has significant for dynamic administrative leadership and economic development, and reflects on the vitality of the national economy as a whole. Entrepreneurship is still represented as a form of effective improvement in the economy and in smart economic policies (Tobarrok, 2002, p. 4). In addition, there is a need to study the evolution of the entrepreneurship concept. Furthermore the little research done covering entrepreneurship in Jordan (and the Arab world) indicates the need for further studies in this area.

4. Study Hypotheses

The study hypotheses consist of five core assumptions covering five basic dimensions of entrepreneurship and their impact on the survival and growth of new business opportunities:

H01: There is no statistically significant impact from entrepreneurship properties on the chances of survival and growth of new enterprises. This hypothesis contains two sub-hypotheses according to two dependent variables: survival and growth opportunities.

H02: There is no statistical significance of the effect of new policies supporting entrepreneurship projects and the chances of survival and growth of new enterprises (This hypothesis contains two sub-hypotheses).

H03: There is no statistically significant impact on the overall environment in the community's opportunities for survival and development of new projects (This hypothesis contains two sub-hypotheses).

H04: There is no statistically significant impact of entrepreneurship activities on chances of survival and growth of new enterprises (This hypothesis contains two sub-hypotheses).

H05: There is no statistically significant impact of informatics and electronic entrepreneurship on the survival and growth of new projects (This hypothesis contains two sub-hypotheses).

5. Society and Sample

The study population is large: it includes all small business owners (including entrepreneurship projects).The study is a supervised sample; it includes three targeted groups:

- Small business owners participating in training courses organized by the Oman Chamber of Commerce during the 4 months of February, March, April, and May, 2012.
- A group of companies working in the field of trade and computer services (including software) in Amman (the capital city of Jordan).
- Small organizations that grew into multiple branches in Jordan.

The number of forms distributed to respondents was 80. 67 were retrieved for a total of 84% of the sampled population. The questionnaire used for the research included a brief selection of basic concepts (the concept of entrepreneurship and suggested properties of entrepreneurs) as well as the following three sections:

- Personal and professional data of respondents.
- Paragraphs relating to the five dimensions of entrepreneurship: characteristics of entrepreneur, entrepreneurship-support policy, general environment related to entrepreneurship, entrepreneurship activities, information and electronic entrepreneurship.

  Survival and growth opportunities.
- Problems facing new project entrepreneurship in Jordan.

6. Statistical Methods

To apply the proper statistical tools, SPSS version 17 was used. The following analytical means were used for the research:

Reliability analysis was used to test the questionnaire's reliability and internal consistency by calculating Cronbach's alpha.

Basic data tables contained questionnaire data and sample characteristics. We calculated the standard deviation of the averages in the sample selections to all the words or phrases for every entrepreneurship dimension, as well as calculating the average and standard deviation for each of the five dimensions.

We calculated the correlation coefficients, decline, and *F*-tests to test the hypotheses of the study.

7. Validity and reliability test.

To test the face validity of the questionnaire, researchers tested its face and content validity to discern how much the questionnaire related to the topic under research (Newman &Benz, 1998, pp. 38–39). For this purpose a reference group of seven specialists assessed the initial questionnaire and made observations that were used in drafting the questionnaire in its final form.

To test the consistency of the questionnaire's paragraphs, the reliability analysis was conducted; a Cronbach's alpha test verified the internal consistency of the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the alpha value for the five core dimensions of leadership collectively and individually, ranging between 0.731 and 0.867, which are acceptable because the values are greater than 0.60.

Table 1: Evaluation of the Stability of the Tool Using Cronbach's Alpha

Basic variables	Number of Paragraphs	(α)
*All five dimensions of leadership	5	0.807
Leadership properties	8	0.731
entrepreneurship projects support policy	7	0.867
General environment	6	0.769
entrepreneurship activities	6	0.802
Electronic and info-entrepreneurship	6	0.771

8. Literature review

An extensive literature review was conducted covering the basic concepts of leadership and entrepreneurship, its properties, its dimensions, and the criteria used to measure and evaluate the entrepreneurship. The concept of entrepreneurship, while in use for over 2 and a half centuries, is one of the few concepts that remain vague; some

consider its definition bewildering and it concepts elusive. Furthermore, there is no universally accepted consensus conceptualization (Williams, 2006, p. 16). Entrepreneurship is originally a French word derived from "entreprendre," used to refer to the person who bears the risk in a new project (Ivancevich et al., 1994, p. 556). Webster Dictionary defines an entrepreneur as "one who organize, manages, and assume the risk of a business or enterprise" (1985, p.416). It must be emphasized that entrepreneurship has been linked to new projects and acts, usually small businesses; hence, the term small business entrepreneurship.

As can be seen in Table 2, there are different definitions of entrepreneurship; the focus of the definition was on new products and innovative technology (Schumpeter, 1934). Later, the definition developed to define entrepreneurship as the essence of leadership in the process of creating value for the customer (Drucker, 1986, 1993, pp. 21–22). Drucker shifted the focus of entrepreneurship from innovation (such as introducing a new product) to capturing the opportunity in the market to get closer to the customer. Researchers now tend to emphasize the definition that focuses on an opportunity in the marketplace to introduce a new product or service that generates higher customer value (Kirzner,1985, Drucker,1986).

Table 2: Definitions of Entrepreneurship

Author	Definition	Notes
R. Cantillon (1755)	Entrepreneurship is the process of bringing money, work and businesses to the market to generate new businesses	Entrepreneurship is the use of company formation for economic growth
A.Smith (1776)	Entrepreneurship is a human activity that leads to changes in the work process	Steven Michel deduced this definition of Adam Smith pilot who saw the growth of the wealth of nations depends on changes in the labor force and that entrepreneurship is the change in work distribution among laborers.
J.B.Say (1803)	Entrepreneurship is synthesizing resources (land, capital and labour) to better manage them in order to have higher productivity and greater returns.	The transfer of resources from one domain to another means something initiative gives the process the ability to achieve higher returns.
F.Knight (1921)	Entrepreneurship is a project that bears high risks associated with real uncertainty (Cannot determine its chances of success)	Knight was the one who differentiated between Risk and Uncertainty
J. Schumpeter (1934)	Entrepreneurship is a change process leading to the introduction of a new product, a new process, a new way, a new market price, or a new source of raw material for processing.	Emphasis on innovative personalities by leading customization which enters five forms of innovation is the engine of economic growth.
I.Kirzner (1985)	Entrepreneurship is awareness of the untapped opportunities in current market conditions.	Awareness or Alertness refers to the ability to see what is not present in the current circumstances, but what can be created in the future.
P.F.Drucker (1986)	Entrepreneurship is the process of creating a new market and a new customer; in essence, it is the process of creating value for the customer.	Drucker does not see Entrepreneurship as innovative, but simply re-applying concepts and methods to create value for the customer
European Commission (2004)	Entrepreneurship is the process needed to generate creativity and/or innovation with sound management, within a new company or list	This definition is closer to the broad selection of entrepreneurship definitions which takes into consideration the state of mind and expressive processes.

9. Entrepreneurship Properties

Some researchers tried to personalize entrepreneurship by linking it to a “new breed” (Isenbers, 2008, p. 107). Others questioned whether there was a special gene in the DNA giving people with that gene the ability to be entrepreneurs (Watson, 2010, p. 1). In every historical era there were cultural entrepreneurs including scientists and prophets. Some that stand out are the Prophet Mohammad, Jesus, and Moses. Table 3 contains several definitions of leadership that include selections of properties. As can be seen in Table 3, many properties describe entrepreneurs; however, the following characteristics seem to be shared among the different definitions: capture and highlight opportunity, risk, ability to work with a combination of resources, confidence and desire for success, independent, need for achievement, initiative, and ability to innovate.

Table 3: Entrepreneurs characteristics

Author	Properties	Notes
R. Cantillon	Acting combination of materials and money and work, and brought to the market by new company formation.	This is a traditional style of leadership based on company formation resources for economic growth.
F.Knight 1921	Ability to invest resources, desire, power of giving guarantee success, confidence in all these factors, high courage	In his book "risk, uncertainty, and profit" linking entrepreneurship with individualism and discussed how groups go against entrepreneurship.
J. Schumpeter 1934	Innovative, and works outside the normal routine and corporate bureaucracy (creative destruction) (McCaffrey, 2009, p10). The ability to determine new chances (McDaniel, 2005, P1)	The stereotype created by the Schumpeterian and still strongly prevalent in the entrepreneurship which is innovative entrepreneurship.
J.A. Hornaday 1982	Self confidence and optimism, with calculated risk, positive response to the challenge, adaptability, market knowledge, independent thinking, knowledge, energy and perseverance, the need for achievement, a dynamic leader, responding to the proposals, the initiative, measure and patience, forward-looking vision responding to criticism.	This broad selection of properties in this context is intended for encyclopedia topics which tend to be comprehensive for the widest range of topics given.
Jones and George 2003	The underpinnings of experience, risk-taking, internal site, a high level of self-esteem, sense of ability, need for achievement.	This selection focuses on the personal characteristics of the relationship without consideration to the environment itself.

10. Entrepreneurship Dimensions

Detailed revision of the entrepreneurship literature reveals different trends relating entrepreneurship to entrepreneurs. Stevenson and Lundstrom (2005, pp. 43–44) noted two trends that stand out in the research:

1. Linking entrepreneurship with leadership characteristics and the behavior of individuals.
2. Linking entrepreneurship to the community-economic phenomenon.

Based on those trends, one can collate entrepreneurship dimensions to the following properties:

- Entrepreneur properties. Entrepreneur characteristics are one of the most important dimensions in the literature review for entrepreneurship. These characteristics could play a major role in influencing the success of new projects.
- entrepreneurship support policy. A set of regulations and rules, and the incentives the government uses to support entrepreneurship projects that could affect its success (Hart, 2003, p. 5).
- The overall environment for entrepreneurship. A set of values and attitudes that can promote or hinder entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs.

- Entrepreneurship activities. A set of properties and new forms adopted by new projects that introduce new products, services, and ways of working and processing sources.
- Information and electronic entrepreneurship. The process of creating new projects in the web economy (Kollmann, 2006, p. 322). This sector is full of opportunities and the development of entrepreneurship projects based on information as well as the Internet.

11. Entrepreneurship Measurements

It was necessary to measure and evaluate entrepreneurship and the entrepreneurship activity level in each country. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) adopted one standard called self-employment. This trend enabled one to compare the different OECD countries. The World Bank Group for Entrepreneurship Survey used the number of new companies registered in the general registry (Desai, 2009, p. 5). The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor relied on total entrepreneurial activity, which includes two dimensions (Allen et al., 2008, p. 1):

a. New business activities in the start-up phase (during the period 24 months). The proportion of the adult population that is engaged in new projects that are less than 42 months old.
b. Innovative entrepreneurship is the percentage of the adult population engaging in the creation of new companies (Desai, 2008, p. 5; Iversen et al., 2008).

The Denmark Entrepreneurship Index, it adopts two measurements:

1. The number of companies created in a given period. This measurement can be used for comparison between states (National Agency for Enterprise & Construction, 2004, pp. 15–16).
2. The growth of new firms: this criterion implies the importance of an entrepreneurship company surviving as well as growing in the market world.

12. View and Result Analysis of the Field Study

In addition to these attempts on the general level, there are contributions by researchers to identify entrepreneurship standards. Such contributions include setting out four measurement criteria: a self-employment rate of business ownership, the Global Entrepreneurship Measurement (pilot companies seeking and emerging as leadership), outcome measures, and innovation (Iversen et al., 2008, p. 5).

The third section covered the five dimensions of entrepreneurship where each was addressed by a number of terms using a 5-point scale. Descriptive standards were calculated (mean standard deviation) and are shown in Table 5. All five dimensions were above average (3) and the entrepreneurship support policy occupied the first place by respondents. Next were entrepreneur's properties, followed by information and electronic entrepreneurship, then the general environment, and lastly entrepreneurship activities (see table 4).

Table 4: Personal and professional information for the study sample

Professional Information				**Personal Information**			
Properties	*Data*	Frequency	%	%	Data	Frequency	%
Project Ownership	Individual	40	60	Gender	Male	87	87
	One Partner	18	27		Female	13	13
	More than one partner	9	13	**Total**		67	100
Total		67	100	Age	Less than 25	3	5
Participate in the Seminars or workshops	Yes	53	79		25-34	20	30
	No	14	21		35-44	28	42
Total		67	100		45-54	12	18
Number of Seminars or workshops	Less than 4	6	11		Over 55	4	6
	2-1	4	8	**Total**		67	100
	4-3	43	81	Marital Status	Single (single, divorced, widow)	43	64
Total		67	100		Married	24	36
Initiative project	I am the initiative	52	78	**Total**		67	100
	A friend or relative is the initiative	14	21	Education	Less than High school	2	3
	Another side is the initiative	1	2		High School	15	22
Total		67	100		College	12	18
Previous projects initiative	43	64			Bachelor	36	54
	14	21			Masters	2	3
	10	15			Ph.D.	0	0
Total		67	100	**Total**		67	100

Table 5: Mean and Standard Deviation of Dimensions of Entrepreneurship

Dimensions	Mean	Standard deviation (*SD*)	Importance level
Characteristics of entrepreneur	3.672	0.760	2
Policy of supporting entrepreneurship projects	4.082	0.781	1
General environment of entrepreneurship	3.301	0.791	3
Entrepreneurship activities	3.428	0.929	5
Information and E-entrepreneurship	3.560	0.767	3

The questionnaire included a question about what defined an entrepreneur. The result was that the ability to take advantage of the opportunities in the marketplace was foremost and was confirmed by all respondents (100%), followed by activating a new product or method (99%), experience in the market (97%) and building relationships in the marketplace (97%), carrying higher risk and commitment and passion for the project (96%) and independence (79%).

13. Hypotheses Testing

To test the hypotheses and indicate the degree of the effect of the independent variables (entrepreneurship dimensions) on the dependent variables (the chances of survival and growth of new enterprises), the correlation coefficient (R) and the coefficient of determination (R^2) were collected. There were positive correlations between various independent variables and the dependent variable as the tables below show. To measure the impact of entrepreneurship dimensions and growth opportunities on new projects, a simple regression coefficient were calculated. The resolution in hypothesis testing—having the effect of statistical significance—depends on the value of the F test. If the amount calculated as the sample size F at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) is less than the tabular value of F, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. If the tabular value of $F$is greater than value calculated, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. We offer the following to test the hypotheses.

13.1. Hypothesis 1 (H_{o1})

This hypothesis points to the absence of an effect of the independent variable entrepreneur properties on the variables chances of survival and growth opportunities for new projects. These included the basic premise for two sub-categories:

a. Subsidiary premise I ($\mathbf{H_{o1a}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of the entrepreneur's properties on new projects' chances of survival. To test the hypothesis, the regression coefficient was calculated and the F-value can be seen in Table 6. Note in this table that the regression coefficient was about 0.12, and that the calculated F value is 4.026, which is greater than the tabular value of $F_{65,0.05}$: 3.339 at liberty degree 65 and level of significance $P < 0.05$. From the calculated values, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable, entrepreneur's properties, does affect new projects' chances of survival by 12%. This result is consistent with the results of previous studies (Hamzah et al., 2009, p. 542) and studies referred to in Table 3 on the entrepreneur's properties. It is also consistent with the important role of leadership in a project, which is usually highly subjective, and the level of commitment required for a project that is the dream of the entrepreneur's life and the high risk born for it.

Table 6: Impact of Entrepreneur Characteristics on Chances of Survival and Growth

	R	R^2	*B*	*F* value	*df*	sig
Chances of Survival	0.178	0.032	0.124	4.026	65	0.000
Chances of Growth	0.201	0.040	0.210	2.649	65	0.040

b. Subsidiary premise II ($\mathbf{H_{o1b}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of the entrepreneur's properties on new projects' chances of growth. As can be seen in Table 6, the coefficient of regression is 0.21, and the calculated *F*-value is 2.649, which is less that the tabular value at the level of significance $P < 0.05$. So, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. The result can be explained as follows: despite the importance of the entrepreneur in the first phase of the project, the entrepreneur's role becomes less important in the second phase, project expansion, mostly due to the fact that the project, at that stage, requires more stable and structured technical experience (more management and supervision than bearing of risk).

13.2 Hypothesis 2 (H_{o2})

This hypothesis refers to the absence of a statistically significant effect of the independent variable entrepreneurship support policy on chances of survival and growth as noted in the following two subsidiary premises.

a. Subsidiary premise I ($\mathbf{H_{o2a}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of entrepreneurship policy support on new projects' chances of survival. As can be seen in Table 7, the value of the coefficient of regression is 0.35, and the calculated *F* value is 5.605, and the largest tabular value for F with 65 degrees of freedom and level of significance $P < 0.05$, is 3 339. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable (entrepreneurship support policy) affects the survival of new projects by about 35%. This higher impact results from the entrepreneur's leadership properties.

Table 7: Impact of Policy of Supporting Entrepreneurship Projects on Chances of Survival and Growth

	R	R^2	*B*	*F* value	*df*	sig
Chances of Survival	0.460	0.212	0.354	5.603	65	0.000
Chances of Growth	0.229	0.069	0.264	4.702	65	0.034

b. Subsidiary premise II ($\mathbf{H_{o2b}}$): Entrepreneurship support policy has no statistically significant effect on new project growth opportunities. From Table 7 above, the regression coefficient value was 0.26, and the calculated value of *F* was 4.700, larger than the indexed value of *F* when the sample size is 65 and the level of significance is $P < 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable (entrepreneurship support policy) affects 35% of new growth opportunities, which is greater than the impact of leadership properties. For the interpretation of the test results on the subsidiary premises, this result is consistent with the results of other studies (Peredo et al., 2004, p. 1), demonstrating the importance of entrepreneurial support policies. The general trend in states or territories (such as in the OECD) that entrepreneurship support is considered economic success (in and out of the market) does not reflect the ability of firms' entrepreneurship or the ability of states to support pioneering activity.

13.3 Hypothesis 3 (H_{o3})

This hypothesis refers to the absence of a statistically significant effect of the independent variable general environment on the chances of survival and growth opportunities of new businesses.

a. Subsidiary premise I ($\mathbf{H_{o3a}}$): There is a statistically significant effect of the general environment on the chances of survival for new projects. Note from Table 8 the value of the coefficient of regression (0.22), and the calculated value of *F* (2.188) is less than the tabular value of *F* at $P < 0.05$ (3.339). So the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. Thus independent variable (General environment) does not affect new projects' survival according to the sample.

Table 8: Environment effect on chances

	R	R^2	*B*	*F* value	*df*	sig
Chances of Survival	0.279	0.079	0.225	2.189	65	0.000
Chances of Growth	0.264	0.053	0.229	3.495	65	0.066

b. Subsidiary premise II ($\mathbf{H_{o3b}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of environment variables on new projects' growth opportunities. As can be seen in Table 8, the value of the coefficient of regression is 0.23, and the calculated value of *F* (3 494) and is larger than the indexed value of *F* (3.339) for the sample size (65) and level of significance ($P < 0.05$). So the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable (general environment) does affect new projects' growth. Indeed, the interpretation of the absence of influence of the environment on the new pilot's survival does not seem easy, but the experience of respondents indicating a negative impact exerted by the environment surrounding a new project might cause them not to submit a potentially high-risk project in the first phase.

13.4 Hypothesis 4 (H_{o4})

This hypothesis addresses the effect of the independent variable *entrepreneurship activities* on *chances of survival* and *growth opportunities* of new businesses.

a. Subsidiary premise I ($\mathbf{H_{o4a}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of entrepreneurship activities on new project opportunities. As can be seen from Table 9, the regression coefficient value was 0.26, and the calculated value of *F* (4.082) was greater than the tabular value of *F* at $P < 0.05$ (3.339). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable entrepreneurship activities do affect the survival of new projects from the point of view of the sample.

Table 9: The Impact of Entrepreneurship Activities on the Survival and Development

	R	R2	B	F value	df	sig
Chances of Survival	0.256	0.066	0.256	4.089	65	0.040
Chances of Growth	0.431	0.186	0.431	14.378	65	0.000

b. Subsidiary premise II ($\mathbf{H_{o4b}}$): There is no statistically significant effect of entrepreneurship activities on growth opportunities for new projects. As can be seen in Table 9, the regression coefficient value was 0.43, and the calculated value of *F* (14.378) was greater than the tabular value of *F* (3.339) at $P < 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The independent variable entrepreneurship activities do affect new projects' growth. To explain this we say that entrepreneurship activities introduce products and services and new ways to play an important role in the project's ability to attract customers, achieving sales sufficient for survival and return to growth in the market. Furthermore, entrepreneurship is always related to introducing something new to the market, as supported by this premise.

13.5 Hypothesis 5 (H_{o5})

This hypothesis points to the absence of a statistically significant effect of the independent variable *informatics and electronic entrepreneurship* on *chances of survival* and *growth opportunities*.

a. Subsidiary premise I ($\mathbf{H_{o5a}}$). There is no statistically significant effect of entrepreneurship and electronic opportunities for new projects. As can be seen in Table 10, the value of the coefficient of regression is 0.04, and the calculated value of *F* is 0.092, which is less than the tabular value of *F* (3.339) at a $P < 0.05$.

Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the alternative hypothesis is rejected. The independent variable Informatics and electronic does not affect the survival of new projects from the point of view of the sample. This looks fairly acceptable these days where new small enterprises are still largely based on physical, not digital, activity.

Table 10: The Influence of Electronic Entrepreneurship on the Chances of Survival and Growth of New Projects

	R	R^2	*B*	*F*-Value	Sigma	*df*
Chances of survival	0.038	0.001	0.038	0.092	0.763	65
Chances of growth	0.243	0.059	0.243	3.958	0.050	65

b. Subsidiary premise II ($\mathbf{H_{o5b}}$). There is no significant statistical effect of informatics and electronic entrepreneurship on new projects' growth opportunities. As can be seen in Table 10, the regression coefficient value is 0.24, and the calculated value of *F* (3.958) is greater than the tabular value of *F* (3.339) at $P < 0.05$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable informatics and electronic entrepreneurship affects new projects' growth. This can be explained because, in the sample, entrepreneurs have a clear perception of the impact of the next computer and digital projects and the possibility of expansion in the future.

14. Problems Facing Entrepreneurial Projects

The questionnaire included specific questions about problems entrepreneurial projects can face from the respondents' point of view. From the point view of the sample respondents, financing seems to rank first among the problems. This result is consistent with the results of studies conducted in Scotland spanning the years 2003 through 2005 examining entrepreneurship project obstacles with a sample of respondents totaling 1604 (www.scotland.gov.uk). The study reported that financial difficulties, including fear of getting loans (57%) or fear of getting financial support (51%), ranked as the highest reasons standing in the face of entrepreneurship projects. Market relationship ranked second, and legal problems ranked third as can be seen from Table 11.

Table 11: Problems Facing Entrepreneurship Projects Ordered Based on Importance

Problem	Sample selection	Frequency
Financial	84%	56
Market relationships	70%	47
Legal difficulties	60%	40
Management and administration	58%	39

15. Conclusions

Basic entrepreneurship development during the last two and a half centuries was the shift in focus of innovation-based entrepreneurship (introduction of products, processes, or new ways) to focus on capturing market opportunities to create value for the customer and create new market opportunities. The study showed the importance of entrepreneurial support policy and leadership characteristics. The study also revealed that there are significant importance of entrepreneurship properties on the survival of new projects especially that as the first phase of a project requires a high commitment and passion usually shown by the entrepreneur. The research also found no significant effect of entrepreneurship on growth of new projects (expansion and opening branches). Since this period seems in many cases the building structures, systems and rules that depend on the rational organizational and managerial experience, which holds a lot of valuable knowledge (Najim, Mohamed, & Alnaji, 2012) , is not unique,

furthermore, organizations at this stage, Jordanian organizations seem to expect a lot of support from the government and society.

Finally, it's important to explore quantitative methods as well as the role of intellectual capital in pharmacies and its role in running the business, according to (Najim, Mohamed, & Alnaji, 2012) such knowledge can generate value to the business and might be another factor, together with reducing medicine interruptions, to improve businesses.

References

Acs, Z. J. (2006). *Entrepreneurship, geography, and American economic growth.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Allen, I. E., Cole, M., Dean, M., Phinisee, I., Onachie, J., & Rogoff, E. (2008). *U.S. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor.* Wellesley, MA: Babson College.

Audretsch, D. B. (2007). *The entrepreneurial society.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Beattie, A. (2010). *Who coined the term "entrepreneur"?* Retrieved from http://www .investopedia.com/ask/answers/08/origin-of-entrepreneur.asp#axzz2FRGt6KHb

Braunerhjelm, Pontus (2008). Entrepreneurship, knowledge, and economic growth: The essence knowledge, Now Publishers, Inc., Hanover.

Burnett, D. (2000). *The supply of entrepreneurship and economic development.* Retrieved from http://technopreneurial.com/articles/heffalump.asp

Burns, Tim (2001). Entrepreneurship.com, Chicago, Dearborn Publishing, inc..

Carter, N. M., Henry, C., Cinneide, B. O., & Johnston, K. (2006). *Female entrepreneurship: Implications for education, training and policy.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Chandler, S. (2007). *From entrepreneur to infoprenuer: Make money with books, E-books and information products.* Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.

Chell, E. (2008). *The entrepreneurial personality.* London, England: Routledge.

Christensen, C. M. (2000). *The innovator's dilemma.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Cooney, T. M., & Kidney, E. (n.d). *Entrepreneurship and innovation policy in European countries.* Dublin, Ireland: Dublin Institute of Technology.

Dana, L. P. & Anderson, R. B. (2007). *International handbook of research on indigenous entrepreneurship.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Davis, T. (2008). Understanding entrepreneurship. In E. Congregado (Ed.), *Measuring entrepreneurship* (pp. 39–63). New York, NY: Springer.

Desai, S. (2009). *Measuring entrepreneurship in developing countries.* Helsinki, Finland: United Nations University.

Dholakia, R. H. (1992). Book review: Entrepreneur in microeconomic theory. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, 1,* 251–254.

Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Innovation and entrepreneurship.* New York, NY: Harper Business.

European Commission. (2004). Action plan: The European agenda for entrepreneurship. Brussels, Belgium: Author.

Faris, S. (1999). Seeking entrepreneurial origins: Are entrepreneurs born or made? *CELCEE Digest*, 99-1.

Ghosh, S. (1998). Making business sense of the Internet. *Harvard Business Review, 76*(2), 126–135.

Glancey, K. S., & McQuaid, R. W. (2000). *Entrepreneurial economics.* New York, NY: Macmillan Press.

Godin, K., Clemens, J., & Veldhuis, N. (2008). Measuring entrepreneurship: Conceptual frameworks and empirical indicators. *Studies in Entrepreneurship Markets, 7,* 1–66.

Golden, W., Higgins, E., & Lee S. H. (2003). *National innovation systems and entrepreneurship* (Institute for Innovation and Structural Change Working Paper No.8). Retrieved from http://www.nuigalway.ie/cisc

Hamzah, M. S. G., Yusof, H. B., & Abdullah, S. K. (2009). Headmaster and entrepreneurship criteria. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 11,* 535–543.

Hart, D. M. (2003). Entrepreneurship policy: What it is and where it came from. In D. M. Hart (Ed.), *Emergence of entrepreneurship policy* (pp. 3–19). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Dholakia, R. H. (1992). Book reviews: Humberto Barreto, Entrepreneur in microeconomic theory: Disappearance and explanation, London: Routledge, 1989, pp. xii+158. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship, 1,* 251–254. doi:10.1177/097135579200100204

Isaac, A. G. (1998). Marx on entrepreneurship. See: (http://archives.econ.utah.edu) (accessed August 16, 2012)

.Ivancevich, J. M., Lorenzi, P. Skinner, S. J., & Crosby, P. B. (1994). *Management: Quality and competitiveness.* Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.

Iversen, Jens, Jorgensen, Rasmus and Malch0w-Moeller, Nikolaj (2005). *Defining and Measuring entrepreneurship.* Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre For Economics and Business Research.

Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2003). *Contemporary management.* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill/Irwin

Jones, G., & Wadhwani, R. D. (2006). *Schumpeter's plea: Historical methods in the study of entrepreneurship* (Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 06-036).

Jones, M. V., & Dimitratos, P. (2004). *Emerging paradigms in international entrepreneurship.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Kerzner, I. M. (1985). *Discovery and the capitalist process.* Chicago, IL: The University Chicago Press.

Keuschnigg, C., & Nielsen, S. B. (2003). Taxes and venture capital support. *European Finance Review, 7,* 515–539.

Klapper, L., Laeven, L., & Rajan, R. G. (2004). *Business environment and firm entry: Evidence from international data* (CEPR Discussion Papers 4366). Cambridge, England: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Kollman, T. (2005). What is e-entrepreneurship? *International Journal of Technology Management, 33,* 322–340.

Jones, Geoffrey and R. Wadhwani, Daniel(2006): *Entrepreneurship and Business History: Renewing the Research Agenda*, available at: www.hbs.edu/faculty (accessed September 12, 2012)

Laroch, L. (2003). *Managing cultural diversity in technical profesionals.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Butterworth Heinemann.

Langlois, R. N. (2003). Schumpeter and the obsolescence of the entrepreneur. *Advances in Austrian Economics, 6,* 283–298.

Lundstrom, A., & Stevenson, L. A. (2005). *Entrepreneurship policy: Theory and practice.* Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Mair, J., & Martı, I. (2006). Social entrepreneurship research: A source of explanation, prediction, and delight. *Journal of World Business, 41,* 36–44.

Martins, S. (Coordinator). (2004). *Barriers to entrepreneurship and business creation.* Arouca, Portugal: European Entrepreneurship Cooporation.

Matlay, H. (2004). E-entrepreneurship and small e-business development: Towards a comparative research agenda. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 11,* 408–414.

Maxwell, J. A. (1996). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McCaffrey, M. (2009). Entrepreneurship, economic evolution, and the end of capitalism: Reconsidering Schumpeter's thesis. *The Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics, 12*(4), 3–21.

McDaniel, B. (2005). A contemporary view of Joseph A. Schumpeter's theory of the entrepreneur. *Journal of Economic Issues, 39,* 485–489.

Michael, S. C. (2008). Entrepreneurship, growth, and Adam Smith. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1,* 287–289.

Najim A., Mohamed A., & Alnaji (2012). Impact of Intellectual Capital on Realizing University Goals in a Sample of Jordanian Universities. European Journal of Business and Management, 4 (14), 153-162.

National Agency for Enterprise & Construction. (2004). *Entrepreneurship Index 2004.* Byggecentrum, Denmark:

Nandram, S. S., & Samson, K. J. (2006). *The spirit of entrepreneurship.* Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Newman, I., & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative–quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2002). *Benchmarking: Fostering firm creation and entrepreneurship.* Paris, France: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2004). *Venture capital: Trends and policy recommendations.* Paris, France: Author.

Peredo, A. M., Anderson, R. B., Galbraith, C. G., Honig, B., & Dana, L. P. (2004). Towards a theory of indigenous entrepreneurship. *International Journal Entrepreneurship & Small Business, 1,* 1–20.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shane, T. (2004). *Academic entrepreneurship.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Sijde, P. v. D., Ridder, A., Blaauw, G., & Diensberg, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Teaching entrepreneurship.* Heidelberg, Germany: Physica-Verlag.

Stevenson, H. H., Roberts, M., & Grousbeck, H. I. (1998). *New business ventures and the entrepreneur.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Tabarrok, A. (2002). *Entrepreneurial economics: Bright ideas from the dismal science.* Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

Vance, C. M., & Paik, Y. (2006). *Managing a global work force.* Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Vinig, T., & Voort, R. v. D. (Eds.). (2005). *The emergence of entrepreneurial economics.* Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier.(1985): *Webster Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*, Merriam-Webster, Inc., Massachusetts.

Wickham, P. A. (2001). *Strategic entrepreneurship.* Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.

Williams, C. C. (2006). *Hidden enterprise culture.* Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar.

Wood, J. S. (2005, March). *Development and present state of the theory of entrepreneurship in product and asset markets.* Paper presented at the Austrian Scholars Conference, Auburn, AL.

Zhao, F. (2006). *Entrepreneurship and innovation e-business.* Hershey, PA: Idea Group.