




Mediating Role of Entrepreneurial Leadership on the Relationship between Senior Team Attributes and Organizational Ambidexterity of Coffee Marketing Cooperative Societies in Kenya

 Hesbon Mbuthia Kiura ^{(a)*}  Kenneth Wanjau ^(b)  Richard Kiai ^(c)

(a,b,c) School of Business, Karatina University, P.O. BOX 1957-10101, Karatina, Kenya

Abstract: Coffee has been an important cash crop in Kenya's agricultural sector. Coffee is a foreign exchange earner to the country, main source of employment in rural areas, providing food security and income for the rural areas. This has been achieved through coffee cooperative societies that process and market coffee for the farmers. There has been a decline in coffee production in Kenya that has caused devastating effects to the economy impacting on social inequality problems and increasing poverty levels. This study was anchored on the transformational leadership theory and it used both exploratory and cross-sectional survey designs. The target population was coffee marketing cooperatives societies registered in Kenya. The sample frame was coffee marketing cooperatives while the sample size was 242 coffee marketing cooperative societies in Kenya. Primary data was obtained from cooperative society managers using a self-administered semi-structured questionnaire. Data analysis was done using descriptive and inferential statistics. Study found out that the entrepreneurial leadership, though found to be meritorious, had its indicators rated below three on average. This means entrepreneurial leadership in terms of innovation influence, creativity and risk taking consideration is still infrequently practiced which explains the reasons behind the low performance by coffee marketing cooperative societies. On mediating role of entrepreneurial leadership on the relationship between senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity of coffee marketing cooperative societies in Kenya. Entrepreneurial leadership is therefore a very crucial factor when modelling for the practice of senior team attributes towards achieving organizational ambidexterity. The study recommends that all training for coffee marketing cooperative societies include the senior team attributes, the content of organizational ambidexterity and entrepreneurial leadership. This important to enhance practice so as to move the cooperative societies from below to optimal performance

Keywords: Mediating, Entrepreneurial, Leadership, Senior Team Attributes, Organizational Ambidexterity, Cooperative Societies

I. Background

Around 40% of the world's population lives in extreme poverty and governments globally and development partners have been working tirelessly towards changing this narrative (World Bank, 2018). This has been through focusing on agriculture and bringing the farmers together to form farmer organizations such as farmer cooperative societies. Co-operative societies play a major role in resource mobilization, agro-processing and marketing of agricultural produce as envisioned in the Kenyans blue print of vision 2030. Whereas adding capital and labor in the economy can accelerate development in the short run to medium term, sustained and rapid growth requires technological advances and innovation that raise firms' productivity. Unfortunately, the management of coffee globally is in dire need as the sector has continued to deteriorate.

According to Envertas (2019) the vast majority of the world's 12.5 million coffee farms are considered small because they are less than 5 hectares in size. There are only about 20 countries in the world with an appropriate climate and soil for growing coffee. Nearly half of these farmers live in three countries: Ethiopia (2.2 million), Uganda (1.8 million), and Indonesia (1.3 million). More than half a million farmers work in Vietnam, Burundi, Kenya, and Columbia. Production, processing, trade, roasting, and marketing are the five stages that make up the global coffee value chain. Large, medium, and small farms are producers, and cooperative societies, private businesses, and governmental agencies are processors (ITC, 2021). Coffee farmers around the world often band together to form cooperative societies, which increase their purchasing power by leveraging economies of scale.

Under the economic pillar, the agricultural sector vision is to focus its central role in Kenya's economy to make it innovative, be commercially – oriented and modernize farm and livestock sector. To achieve the vision, focus will be on restructuring key organisations such as cooperative societies into high –performing entities that facilitate fast growth of the sector (RoK, 2007). Coffee remains an important commodity in many African countries both in terms of export earnings and generating income for smallholder farmers.

The economic benefits of exporting coffee around the world are felt in countries all along the supply chain, from coffee farms to coffee shops. According to the International Coffee Organization, the retail coffee industry is worth more than USD 200 billion each year (ICO, 2020). Kenya's coffee industry needs a shift of how things are done in order to its current status by embracing entrepreneurship in its operations. The goal of entrepreneurship is wealth creation, which in turn reduces poverty, generates new employment opportunities, boosts agricultural output for the underprivileged in rural areas, and boosts farmer incomes through increased value addition. Successful entrepreneurial leadership can be thought of as the impetus behind meeting a need in the market with a novel idea and a unified set of resources in response to that need. For this purpose, entrepreneurs rely on a triadic paradigm of originality, initiative, and risk-taking (Morris, Schindehutte, and LaForge, 2004; Pangarso, Astuti, Raharjo & Afrianty, 2020).

Not only should coffee cooperative societies in Kenya, adopt entrepreneurial process, they should also be ambidextrous. An ambidextrous business is one that can succeed in both established sectors, which value predictability, hierarchy, and gradual improvement, and emerging ones, which require boldness, agility, and a willingness to take risks (Mom, Chang, Cholakova Jansen 2019). For sustained success, and especially in the coffee sector, businesses must do two things, according to one of management's more enduring ideas: play to their strengths and develop substantive new ones. Recent studies have described ambidextrous organizations that can do both, but many of the earlier studies failed to find a way to resolve the inherent conflict between the two tasks.

The entrepreneurial process typically begins with the identification of an opportunity, which is followed by the enlistment of a team of people to help make it a reality and the provision of the leadership essential to the growth of those individuals and the achievement of the organization's greatest potential. Thus, effective entrepreneurial leadership is exercised in an environment rich in novel activities and cutting-edge developments, full of ideas and concepts that are always evolving and frequently defy straightforward classification. These social interactions are inherently fluid; consequently, their corresponding organizational structure must foster and accommodate ongoing adaptation and, in many cases, the ensuing conflicts (Utami & Wilopo, 2018b). For the success of the coffee cooperative societies in Kenya, the entrepreneurial process must be embraced. In the business arena organizational ambidexterity means actively looking for new opportunities while also maximizing those already available. By fostering a culture of ambidexterity, businesses can grow in both exploration and exploitation in a way that is both innovative and efficient (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008). The exploration process includes providing new layouts, creating new markets, and establishing new channels of distribution. The purpose of exploitation is to make the most of pre-existing resources, such as data, knowledge, and technology (Heavey & Simsek, 2017).

Compared to other countries with a similar per capita income, Kenya has a comparatively high level of managerial capacity, which is seen as essential for increasing productivity through innovation. However, the overall management competencies in Kenya still provide a barrier to the needed economic growth, despite efforts to boost the quality of higher education and strengthen ties between the academic world and the corporate world (World Bank, 2016). As a result of the ever-changing nature of the global coffee market, Kenya's coffee marketing cooperative societies are gradually embracing a new style of leadership that allows them to effectively operate in both the domestic and international markets.

The other major problems facing coffee marketing in Kenya is the fluctuation of coffee prices in the international market. According to a report by the International Coffee Organization (ICO,2021) the coffee market has been affected by various factors such as climate change, political instability, and the COVID-19 pandemic, which have contributed to a decrease in demand and lower prices for coffee producers in Kenya and other African countries. Another challenge facing coffee marketing in Kenya is the lack of access to credit and financing for small-scale coffee farmers. Many farmers struggle to access loans and other financial support to invest in their farms, improve their production processes, and access international markets. Additionally, there is a lack of transparency and accountability in the coffee supply chain in Kenya, which has led to cases of corruption, price manipulation, and exploitation of farmers. This has undermined the confidence of both local and international buyers in the Kenyan coffee industry. This is why the current study sought to establish the mediating role of entrepreneurial leadership on the relationship between senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity of coffee marketing cooperative societies in Kenya.

II. Research and Methodology

This study adopted the interpretivism philosophy. Interpretivists believe that the informants are independent and mutually interactive (Hudson and Ozone, 1988). The study combined exploratory and cross-sectional survey methods. The target population for the study was farmers' coffee marketing cooperatives. The sample size was determined by use of Yamane, Taro (1967) formula where a sample size of 242 was identified. The data for the study was secondary which was collected by use of data collection sheet and primary data that was collected by use of semi-structured, self-administered questionnaires.

III. Literature Review

This section reviews theories and literature related to the paper variables and other related works from; books, published journals, papers and unpublished academic works.

IV. Theoretical Review

Cognitive Evaluation Theory

Cognitive Evaluation Theory was introduced in the 1970s (Deci, 1975) and refined during the early 1980s (Deci & Ryan, 1980a; Ryan, 1982; Ryan, Mims, & Koestner, 1983), and yet its core elements have remained largely intact and empirically well supported since that time. Cognitive evaluation theory is a psychological theory that deals with internal or external also called intrinsic and extrinsic motivation related to the level of competence that people feel. Cognitive evaluation theory pronounces that when people are intrinsically motivated the feelings of competence and their desire to succeed also come from within. The theory focuses on a person's cognitive evaluation of an activity and the reasons for engaging in the activity. The theory predicts and interprets the effects of external events on intrinsic motivation (Ryan,Mimsand Koester,1983).The theory affects extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation (Deci, Ryan, 1972a, 1972b).Motivation is the driving force which leads people to want to act, perform or do something without pressure or undue manipulation (Eshun,Duah,2011). According to the theory, the effects of intrinsic motivation of external events such as offering rewards, the delivery of evaluation, the setting of deadlines other motivated inputs are a function of how these events influence a person's perceptions and self-determination (Deci, Koenster and Ryan ,2001). Contingent can mean either that subjects are rewarded for working on the task on for completing. Malhotra defines rewards as " all

forms of financial return, tangible services and benefits an employee as part of an employment relationship". Every employee expects some level of reward after delivering a function or task (Malhotra, 2007:2097).

Contingency rewards embrace intrinsic motivation, performance contingency and unexpected rewards. Motivated behaviors have no apparent reward except the activity itself. The behaviors are intrinsically or extrinsically. Intrinsically motivated behavior is performed to increase or decrease the level of stimulation. This is an attribute behavior. The theorists posit that when people are internally motivated, their feelings of competences and their drive to succeed also come from within (Deci 1972 a,1972b). Managers use motivation in workplaces to inspire people to work, both individually and in groups to produce the best results in most efficient and effective manner (Besel, 2002:1). One relevant psychological principle related to cognitive evaluation theory is called locus of control. People's locus of control determine whether internal or external influences will have more of an effect on their successful completion of the tasks and their accompanying feelings of competence. Thus, people whose locus of control is strong feel that they are in charge of how they behave and their proficiency when they complete tasks. Those whose external locus control of control is stronger believe that other people or their environment have more influence over what they do than they personally do themselves.

Cognitive evaluation theorists maintain that intrinsic motivation can be affected by a change in perceived locus of causality from internal or external. Such changes cause a decrease in intrinsic motivation. The situation occurs when one receives an extrinsic reward for intrinsically motivated activity. Intrinsic motivation can be affected by a change in feeling of competence and self-determination with their diminution intrinsic motivation will decrease. The theorists further assert that events such as rewards and communication have two functional aspects: informational and controlling aspects. There is a preposition that every reward has a relative salient that is operative from the two functional aspects. If the control aspect is salient changes are initiated in perceived locus of causality to external. If information aspect is more salient changes in feelings of competence and self-determination will be initiated. The information aspect may be positive or negative leading to increases and negative leading to decreases in feelings of competence and self-determination. The result is an increase or decrease in motivation. Deci, Ryan (1972 a, 1972b) posit that first the intrinsic motivation can be affected by change in perceived locus of causality from internal or external. Such changes cause a decrease in intrinsic motivation.

According to attribution view, a person will be more likely to perceive himself extrinsically motivated if he is presented with a salient reward for performance. This situation occurs when one receives an extrinsic reward for intrinsically motivated activity. Contingency is a term used to refer to "zero-sum" situations which two or more people compete for a reward. Performance contingent reward is interpreted to mean a reward is given for a specified level of performance that is meeting the criteria, norm or level of competence. Performance contingency reward convey that the recipient is skillful or competent at that activity. Obtaining rewards means one is performing better Deci, Ryan (1972 a, 1972b).The theorists further avers that extrinsic reward such as money presented contingently for intrinsically motivated activities will act to increase the salience of control aspect of reward.

The process by which intrinsic motivation can be affected is change feeling of competence and self-determination with their diminution intrinsic motivation will decrease. Performance contingent reward is interpreted to mean a reward that is given for a specified level of performance that is meeting the criterion, norm or level of competence. Performance contingency reward convey that the recipient is skillful or competent at that activity. Obtaining reward means one is performing better. Performance rewards have an incentive effect on employees because they believe that it can establish a more direct and clear connection amongst effort, performance and reward to encourage employee to show behavior (Gerhat and Rynes,2003). Extrinsic motivation refers to the performance of an activity because it leads to external rewards. The presence of money is an external reward for intrinsically motivating a person to do the activity. It suggested that when a person performs intrinsically motivated task for money, his perception of reason for performing the task shifts. It is intrinsically motivated by money. On the other hand unexpected rewards make people pay more attention to what happens next combining them with intrinsic motivation attribute (Gerhat and Rynes,2003). Cognitive evaluation theory is important in explaining the influence of senior team attribute of contingenc

Schumpeterian Innovation Theory

One of first precursors of innovation have been as influential as the Schumpeter (1912). According to him, consumer preferences are already given and do not undergo spontaneously and cannot be cause of the economic change. Moreover, consumers in the process of economic development play a passive role. In Theory of economic development and further work, Schumpeter described development as historical process of structural changes, substantially driven by innovation which was divided by him into five types launch of a new product or a new species of already known product application of new methods of production or sales of a product (not yet proven in the industry); opening of a new market (the market for which a branch of the industry was not yet represented); acquiring of new sources of supply of raw material or semi-finished goods; new industry structure such as the creation or destruction of a monopoly position. Schumpeter argued that anyone seeking profits must innovate. That will cause the different employment of economic system's existing supplies of productive means. Schumpeter believed that innovation is considered as an essential driver of competitiveness and economic dynamics. He also believed that innovation is the center of economic change causing gales of "creative destruction", which i a term created by Schumpeter in Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. According to Schumpeter innovation is a "process of industrial mutation, that incessantly revolutionizes the economic structure from within, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one" (Clemence , 2009).

Schumpeter described development as historical process of structural changes, substantially driven by innovation. He divided the innovation process into four dimensions: invention, innovation, diffusion and imitation. Then he puts the dynamic entrepreneur in the middle of his analysis. In Schumpeter's theory, the possibility and activity of the entrepreneurs, drawing upon the discoveries of scientists and inventors, create completely new opportunities for investment, growth and employment. In Schumpeter's analysis, the invention phase or the basic innovation have less of an impact, while the diffusion and imitation process have a much greater influence on the state of an economy. The macroeconomic effects of any basic innovation are hardly noticeable in the first few years (and often even longer). What matters in terms of economic growth, investment and employment, is not the discovery of basic innovation, but rather the diffusion of basic innovation, which is the period when imitators begin to realize the profitable potential of the new product or process and start to invest heavily in that technology (Sledzik,2013).

Development consists in the carrying out of innovations, which are new combinations for which possibilities exist in the stationary state. Schumpeter (1934) postulated that an innovation may consist of the introduction of a new product, the introduction of a new method of production, the opening up of a new market, the conquest of a new source of supply of raw materials or semi-manufactured good, or the carrying out of a new organization of an industry, for example the creation of a monopoly (Śledzik, 2013; Pittaway, 2011).

This theory holds that improvements of any form can only be brought about by the entrepreneur, without whom the economy remains fixated in the circular flow, where profits (income-outlay differentials) are non-existent (Śledzik, 2011; Van Praag, 1999). Profits can only arise due to changes occasioned by an innovation, consequent upon which they continue to exist until they are dissipated by the innovation becoming general (Van Praag, 1999). To conduct his economic function, the entrepreneur utilizes technical knowledge and his power of disposal over factors of production in the form of credit. The entrepreneurs' motivation is to found a private commercial kingdom, prove his superiority, and savour the joy of achievement (Śledzik, 2013).

The theory also implies that entrepreneurial firms should continuously monitor the setting in of inertia (tendency towards the circular flow), both in their internal environments as well as the external environment. To fend off internal inertia a firm needs to "agitate" itself through "asset renewal and accumulation" in order to create possibilities of new combinations, keeping track of shifting customer tastes, and introducing timely innovations to destroy moribund solution sets. Proactive development of unique innovations positions coffee marketing cooperatives on the frontline of economic development, facilitates establishment of competitive advantages, delivers to them full first-mover advantages, and increases the odds in favour of securing customer loyalty and consequent firm performance.

Organizational Ambidexterity Concept

Research on finding a balance between exploration and exploitation has been extensive because of the significance of this struggle in ambidextrous organizations. These results suggest that several paths to ambidexterity are increasingly being recognized in the scientific literature. Sequential ambidexterity is a method that can be used to promote periods of exploration and exploitation simultaneously (Chou, Yang, & Chiu, 2017). Sequential ambidexterity is the procedure of aligning a firm's structure to fit the environmental condition or strategies. In this assessment, changes within an organization are made on a sequential basis bestowing to recorded changes in the environment (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013). Sequential ambidexterity is grounded on temporal separation, where firms move the focus of their consideration from exploitation in one historical of time to attention on exploration in the next period of time (Chen, 2017).

However, this suggests that a sequential ambidextrous firm can not only count on on the transformational capability to shift between exploitation and exploration shapes but also desires to efficiently combine an enactment capability to be able to realize the best results in each region (Kortmann, 2012). Moreover, the adjustment from one state to the other can be vastly disruptive to the organization later, as it involves the reconfiguration of strategies, structures and processes and consequently can take a long period and cause disruptions within organizations and are likely to diminish core capabilities of the firm (Chen, 2017; O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013).

In eras of rapid change sequential ambidexterity will not serve, instead a structural approach is favored. Inside structural ambidexterity, the equilibrium between exploration and exploitation is achieved through complete guiding simultaneous efforts towards both areas (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013). Within structural ambidexterity exploration undertakings and exploitation activities are detached into diverse business areas surrounded by one firm (Chen, 2017). This permits the different business units to accept different strategies and structures to suitably fit the business unit emphasis on either exploration or exploitation (Chen, 2017). Kortmann (2012) plugs out that businesses create dual structures that distinct the contradictory responsibilities and purposes within one organization.

As a final point, contextual ambidexterity places its importance on the individual rather than the organization (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013). Gibson and Birkinshaw (2004) devised the term and describe it as "the behavioral capacity to simultaneously establish alignment and adaptability across an entire business unit" (p. 209). Alignment, the rationality across committed efforts and adaptability, the aptitude to change rendering to the needs of the surroundings here work self-possessed to achieve contextual ambidexterity. It works by relating a set of procedures to stimulate individuals to action in ways that support contextual ambidexterity. Firms

applying contextual ambidexterity allow and motivate their employees to get vigorous in exploration activities while their prescribed tasks relate more to exploitation actions (Chen, 2017). Exploration consequently is not limited to generalized business units or time periods but can develop at any time without exceptional organizational purpose for it (Chen, 2017). This replicates also a inadequacy of contextual ambidexterity, as it does not qualify a firm to simultaneously encompass strong forms of exploration or exploitation, but contextual ambidextrous organizations assume that exploration will just happen somewhere in the organization (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013). Chen (2017) transcripts that contextual ambidexterity is not capable to facilitate exploration actions that are fundamentally diverse from the organizational core, as totally different ideas need a different perspective to prosper. Consequently, a firm potency not realize full ambidexterity by solitary pursuing contextual ambidexterity (Chen, 2017; O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013).

Finally, findings show that in the long run, a grouping of these three forms of ambidexterity can be functional to handle the tautness between exploitation and exploration (Raisch, 2008). Nevertheless, ambidexterity achieved often depends on the commercial environment in which it functions (O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2013). Hitherto, Kauppila (2010) records that firms will generally influence ambidexterity through a permutation of structural and contextual exertions but not with just a solitary form of it. Chen (2017) consequently, summarizes the three diverse forms of ambidexterity, sequential, structural and contextual, to the term dynamic ambidexterity. Dynamic ambidexterity employs all three forms at different organizational levels and therefore allows firms to positively handle the inconsistency between exploration and exploitation (Chen, 2017).

Concept of Entrepreneurial Leadership

Entrepreneurial leadership is viewed by some studies as a style of leadership characterized by risk-taking, proactivity, innovation, creativity and is very effective in addressing business difficulties in a dynamic business environment (Bagheri,2013,chen,207,Harison,2018,Surie and Ashley,2008,Swiercz and Lyon,2002). In reviewing the relevant literature with the objective of identifying the most significant dimensions that reflect entrepreneurial leadership, a list of essential attributes, including vision, opportunity-focused, influencing, planning, motivating, creativity, achievement-oriented, flexibility, persistence, patience, risk-taking, high ambiguity tolerance, tenacity, power-oriented, self-confidence, proactive behaviour and internal locus of control (Becherer, Mendenhall & Eickhoff, 2008; Stogdill, 1948) has been unravelled where the concepts of entrepreneurship and leadership converge. Furthermore, entrepreneurial leadership is a process in developing an entrepreneur vision and mission that will inspire the organization to create an objective that need to be achieved (Agbim, Owutuamor & Oriarewo, 2013).

Creativity is a thinking process that is motivating in realizing new idea and as a new venture that is more on reality. In context of creativity, it is can be defined as a combination of new and old idea. New idea is needed and old idea need to be studied and assessed. It is a process in looking back, choosing, replacing, intervention of two ideas and skills (Burton, 2012). Innovative in the entrepreneurial leadership is a tendency and ability to create a creatively, develop a novel and useful a quality idea in opportunity recognition, resources of utilization, innovative development dedicated to achievement, value making and problem solving (Pihie, Asimiran & Bagheri, 2014). Risk taking in entrepreneurial leadership is a willingness to absorb uncertainty and take the burden of responsibility for the future. In this study, the concept of entrepreneurial leadership is important in explaining the behaviour mangers of coffee marketing cooperatives in Kenya.

Senior Teams Attributes

Senior teams in ambidextrous organizations are therefore expected to recognize and translate different, ambiguous, and conflicting expectations into workable strategies. Achieving ambidexterity may enhance self-interested behaviour in which senior team members perceive direct competition regarding the allocation of scarce resources (Bower, 1970). Achieving ambidexterity may enhance self-interested behaviour in which senior team members perceive direct competition regarding the allocation of scarce resources (Bower, 1970). Senior teams in ambidextrous organizations are therefore expected to recognize and translate different, ambiguous, and conflicting expectations into workable strategies. How these conflicting tensions are resolved

within senior teams is a crucial element in the ability of firms to create integrative and synergetic value among exploratory and exploitative activities and to achieve organizational ambidexterity. To uncover how senior teams are able to reconcile conflicting interests and overcome barriers associated with combining exploratory and exploitative innovation, we consider how senior team attributes and leadership affect the achievement of ambidexterity. Effectiveness of senior teams in ambidextrous organizations is associated with a set of senior team attributes including : shared vision, social integration, and group contingency rewards (Hambrick, 1994; O'Reilly and Tushman, 2004; Siegel and Hambrick, 2005; Smith and Tushman, 2005). These are the senior attributes dimensions that have been adopted.

V. Analysis and Findings

Entrepreneurial Leadership and Organizational Ambidexterity

The objective of the study was to assess whether entrepreneurial leadership mediates the relationship between senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity in coffee marketing cooperative societies in Kenya. Entrepreneurial leadership model expounded by Bass, Burns and Avilio (1978) considered innovation influence as a major factor of transformational leadership that followers can emulate the leader to achieve higher productivity levels. The study first analyzed entrepreneurial leadership from four aspects that included Innovation, creativity, risk taking and motivation.

Innovation Influence

According to Breaux (2010) "Innovation influence" is defined as having transformational leaders who behave in ways that result in their being role models for their followers. This study was conducted to determine whether innovation influence inspires and motivates followers as a factor of transformational leadership, where behavioral statements were developed to interrogate the factor and the respondent's expressions were summarized below:

Table 1: Factor 1: Innovation Influence

S.N	Statement	N	0	1	2	3	4	NR	MEAN	SD
1.	I make others feel good to be around me	210	7 (3.3%)	7 (3.3%)	27 (12.9%)	57 (27.1%)	110 (52.4%)	2 (1%)	3.2308	1.0237
2.	I make others to have complete faith in me	210	6 (2.9%)	6 (2.9%)	18 (8.6%)	61 (29%)	116 (55.2%)	3 (1.5%)	3.3462	.9905
3.	I make others to be proud of being associated with me	210	9 (4.3%)	4 (1.9%)	31 (14.8%)	61 (29.0%)	103 (49.0%)	2 (1.0%)	3.1779	1.0412
4.	I express with a few simple words what we could and should do	210	5 (2.4%)	6 (2.9%)	44 (21.0%)	50 (23.8%)	103 (49.0%)	2 (1.0%)	3.1538	1.0098
5.	I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	210	12 (5.7%)	20 (9.5%)	50 (23.8%)	61 (29.0%)	64 (30.5%)	3 (1.4%)	2.7005	1.1730

The indicators of innovation influence were majorly rated as fairly fitting the leader. These included making others feel good, making others having complete faith on the leader, making others to be proud of being associated with the leader, and being focused in giving direction. The parameter that was rated highest was, making others having complete faith on the leader which was 84.2%, this was followed by making others feel good at 79.5%. The lowest rated parameter was letting others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before which was 59.50%. However, respondents that occasionally does the leader allow for space for critical thinking by the subordinates. The average rating of innovation influence was computed including the kurtosis and skewness to find out the extremes of the responses as indicated in Table 1.

Table 2: Summary of innovation influence

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
210	3.0926	.79261	4.557	-1.859

Generally, innovation influence was found to be fairly often practiced by the respondents. However this average was leptokurtic (kurtosis > 3) showing very extremes in the response with negative skewness meaning that majority of the responses were on the higher side of the scale. This means that if the scale was to be collapsed into binary response of frequent (0-2) and infrequent (3-4) then innovation influence is frequently practiced by the respondents.

The findings indicate that, the leaders in the coffee cooperative societies do practice entrepreneur leadership. This is line with Luu, (2015) who indicated that entrepreneur leadership is ‘Leadership that creates visionary scenarios that are used to assemble and mobilize a ‘supporting cast’ of participants who become committed by the vision to the discovery and exploitation of strategic value creation. Innovation influence as an attribute of entrepreneur leadership, Utami & Wilopo (2018b) noted that innovation influence represents the degree to which leaders are admired, respected, and trusted. Other studies in support of this attribute emphasizing on the importance of innovation influence as a factor of transformational leadership have been done by Chen and Baron (2006) in their research study in Taiwan nursing leaders attributed innovation influence having positive effect on organizational success; McGuire and Kennerly (2006) concluded that innovation influence has positive outcomes from this transformational factor; Moe,Pappas and Murray (2007) concluded that innovation influence as part of transformational leadership model had a significant impact upon positive attitudes and motivation of staff; Olsen, Eid and Johnsen (2006) Luu, Dinh & Qian (2019) concluded that the application of innovation influence collated positively with transformational leadership. This is coming out clearly from this study.

Creativity

Creativity is defined as having a leader who encourages innovation and creativity as well as critical thinking and problem solving Breaux (2010).Through creativity, leaders continuously encourage team members to think and perform new ways challenging their own beliefs and supporting new and innovative ways of actions. It’s an important component of transformative leaders Cardona, Soria and Gumbau, (2018). This study examined how Creativity a may stimulate team learning from managers whose responses were derived from statements summarized below:

Table 3: Factor 2: Creativity

Statement	N	0	1	2	3	4	NR	MEAN	SD
I enable others to think about old problems in new ways	210	12 (5.7%)	23 (11.0%)	46 (21.9%)	49 (23.3%)	78 (37.1%)	2 (1.0%)	2.7596	1.2277
I provide others with new ways of looking at puzzling things	210	11 (5.2%)	20 (9.5%)	31 (14.8%)	64 (30.5%)	82 (39.0%)	2 (1.0%)	2.8942	1.1830
I get others to rethink ideas that they had never questioned before	210	13 (6.2%)	21 (10.0%)	39 (18.6%)	74 (35.2%)	61 (29.0%)	2 (1.0%)	2.7163	1.1719
I am satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards	210	5 (2.4%)	7 (3.3%)	25 (11.9%)	38 (18.1%)	133 (63.3%)	2 (1.0%)	3.3798	.9854
I give personal attention to others who seem rejected	210	6 (2.9%)	10 (4.8%)	24 (11.4%)	40 (19.0%)	127 (60.5%)	3 (1.5%)	3.3221	1.0482

The indicators of the creativity had majority of the respondents agreeing that they are frequently practiced. The respondents mostly said that they are satisfied when others meet agreed-upon standards at 81.40%, this was followed by those who give personal attention to others who seem rejected at 79.50%. The lowest rated was

leaders enable others to think about old problems in new ways at 60.40%. From the results, majority of the respondents rated the three indicators as fairly often practiced. The creativity value was computed in terms of mean and the spread checked through standard deviation while the shape of the curve revealed by measure of kurtosis and skewness as indicated in the table 4 below.

Table 4: Summary of creativity

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
210	2.9857	.86682	1.885	-1.256

The value for creativity was approximately three indicating that the respondents fairly frequently practice it. The small standard deviation indicated that the respondents were almost all in agreement of the fairly often. The kurtosis of less than three indicated a platykurtic distribution thus less extremes with negative skewedness where lesser extreme although almost settled at the middle scale on average, more respondents had indicated higher measure in the scale, frequent practice.

As noted by Augusto & Moel (2014) creativity has been defined as the degree to which leaders stimulate their followers' effort to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems, and approaching old situations in new ways. This is well coming out from the results that the leaders used creativity. This is supported by studies done by Manalel & Deepa (2016) who established that application of creativity by transformative leaders ensured that followers put in extra effort showing satisfaction with their leader emphasizing goal attainment. Further initiative conducted by Augusto & Moel (2014) concluded that creativity as a factor ensures that the leader articulates new ideas that prompt followers to rethink conventional practice thinking. Breaux (2010) Avers that Transformational leaders intellectually stimulate their followers efforts to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, refraining problems and approaching old situations in new ways. Therefore, Transformational leadership with emphasis on creativity is a model of leadership that when applied leads to success in organizations as depicted in this study.

Risk Taking

Risk taking consideration is the inclusion of people into the transformation of an organization (Conger, 2014). Risk taking constitutes developing followers through coaching, mentoring and teaching. A risk taking consideration leader demonstrates high concern for their followers, treats them as individuals and gets to know well about them and listens to their concerns and ideas (Kirkbride, 2006; Hoffman and Frofst, 2006). The researcher generated statements for assertion by the respondents in order to determine transformational leadership factor of risk taking influence in an organization and the findings are summarized below:

Table 5: Factor 3: Risk Taking

S.N	Statement	N	0	1	2	3	4	NR	MEAN	SD
1.	I help others develop themselves	210	6 (2.9%)	16 (7.6%)	35 (16.7%)	46 (21.9%)	105 (50%)	2 (1.0%)	3.0962	1.1122
2.	I let others know how I think they are doing	210	14 (6.7%)	24 (11.4%)	41 (19.5%)	71 (33.8%)	58 (27.6%)	2 (1.0%)	2.6490	1.1946
3.	I give personal attention to others who seem rejected	210	6 (2.9%)	15 (7.1%)	26 (12.4%)	40 (19.0%)	121 (57.6%)	2 (1.0%)	3.2260	1.0998
4.	Whatever others want to do is OK with me	210	60 (28.6%)	28 (13.3%)	55 (26.2%)	38 (18.1%)	27 (12.9%)	2 (1.0%)	1.7308	1.3882
5.	I make others feel good to be around me	210	10 (4.8%)	10 (4.8%)	32 (15.2%)	48 (22.9%)	108 (51.4%)	2 (1.0%)	3.1250	1.1352

The highly rated indicator was giving personal attention to others who seem rejected at 76.60%. This was followed by helping others develop themselves at 71.90%. The least rated indicator was whatever others want to do is okay with me at 31% indicating leaders who are concerned about the people they lead. The standard

deviation was approximately equal to the mean showing that the responses were near equally spread amongst the measurement scales. The findings are presented using table 5.

Table 6: Summary of Risk Taking

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
210	2.7390	.84858	.814	-.819

The risk taking was rated as fairly often practiced as shown by the mean of three with small standard deviation showing less disparity in the overall rating. This is confirmed by the platykurtic distribution whose value is less than three while the negative skewness show the rating was higher on the scale.

Research in support of transformational leadership including risk taking consideration is exemplified: McGuiro and Kennerly (2006) who concluded that risk taking consideration had positive outcome and job satisfaction: Manalel & Deepa (2016), declared that risk taking consideration ensured followers put extra effort. Other studies have indicated that risk taking consideration is used by leaders to enhance the effectiveness of a shared senior team vision by providing ideological explanations that link exploratory and exploitative efforts of individual senior team members to the achievement of shared goals and values. In that case, there is motivation of the senior members of the organization and as a result, there is more involvement of the members towards achieving the goals of the organization (Jansen,George, bosch and Volberda,2007).

Transformational leadership with emphasis on the factor of individualized consideration model when applied leads to successful teams and organizations as clearly shown by this study. The study went further to find out the relationship between the leadership style and the influence the leaders' action in the cooperative societies. The results were as in table 7 the respondents were requested to indicate their level of agreement on their level on decision making.

Table 7: Leadership style and leaders' action in cooperative relationships

S.N	Statement	N	SD	D	N	A	SA	NR	MEAN	SD
1.	People are unafraid to express their views and options about coffee marketing business	210	36 (17.1%)	34 (16.2%)	26 (12.4%)	59 (28.1%)	43 (20.5%)	12 (5.7%)	3.0287	1.5625
2.	People are encouraged to look for new business opportunities	210	14 (6.7%)	25 (11.9%)	38 (18.1%)	74 (35.2%)	48 (22.9%)	11 (5.3%)	3.4163	1.3881
3.	Decisions made are quickly acted upon in our society	210	9 (4.3%)	30 (14.3%)	40 (19.0%)	83 (39.5%)	42 (20.0%)	6 (2.9%)	3.4976	1.2213
4.	People with expertise are valued and listened to	210	12 (5.7%)	24 (11.4%)	36 (17.1%)	79 (37.6%)	52 (24.8%)	7 (3.4%)	3.5598	1.2926
5.	Knowledge and experience is shared across the organization	210	6 (2.9%)	13 (6.2%)	29 (13.8%)	90 (42.9%)	66 (31.4%)	6 (2.9%)	3.8894	1.1260
6.	Genuine debate is encouraged in the organization	210	16 (7.6%)	5 (2.4%)	31 (14.8%)	89 (42.4%)	63 (30.0%)	6 (2.9%)	3.7981	1.2307

The parameter that had the highest rating was that genuine debate is encouraged in the organization at 74.30%. This was followed by knowledge and experience is shared across the organization at 62.40%. The lowest rated was people are unafraid to express their views and options about coffee marketing business at 48.60%. The results in this connote well with the discussion other sections which were rated highly.

Motivation Attribute

The motivation attribute value was computed in terms of mean and the spread checked through standard deviation while the shape of the curve revealed by measure of kurtosis and skewness as indicated in the table 8 below:

Table 8: Motivation attribute

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kurtosis	Skewness
210	3.5087	.97158	2.720	-1.242

This attribute was rated as fairly often practiced as shown by the mean of 3.5 with small standard deviation showing less disparity in the overall rating. This is confirmed by the platykurtic distribution whose value is less than three while the negative skeweness show the rating was higher on the scale.

With the rating of innovation influence, creativity and risk taking consideration and the same with decision making in the cooperative societies, this agrees with Chang, & Hughes (2012) who observed that leadership behavior has a great influence in organ organizational ambidexterity. For there to organizational ambidexterity, there must be the ability and freedom of making decision with proper guidance among leaders.

Leadership style in general in cooperative societies as contended by Ranville (2021) as democratic since democracy within cooperative is generally defined by the principle “one man one vote” inscribed in the International Cooperative Alliance declaration on cooperative identity. He further alludes that studies explain democracy on cooperative societies through concept of participation which is not measured in a single way and usually mix various dimensions such as economic participation, membership (Pitts, 2018), control, ownership (Fethi, Venugopal, Guday & Alemayehu,2016), member’s perception of their participation (Österberg & Nilsson, 2009), and other factors like trust, loyalty and motivation to participate (Verhees, Sergaki, & Van Dijk, 2015; Xiang & Sumelius, 2010).

For the organization to achieve ambidexterity, entrepreneur leadership becomes critical (Luu, Dinh & Qian, 2019). Transformational leaders exhibit innovation influence, arouse inspirational motivation, provide creativity, and treat followers with risk taking consideration (Utami & Wilopo, 2018b). This is well confounded in the research findings in this study.

Mediating Effect

Objective was assessing whether entrepreneurial leadership mediates the relationship between team attributes and organizational ambidexterity

Table 9: The relationship between Senior Team Attributes (STA) and Organizational Ambidexterity (OA) Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized		Standardized		95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
	Coefficients		Beta	t	Sig.		
	B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	.888	.178		4.987	.000	.537	1.239
1 STA	.752	.061	.648	12.273	.000	.631	.873

a. **Dependent Variable: OA**

There is statistically significant relationship between senior team attribute and organizational ambidexterity. This confirms the first condition for testing mediation effect that the independent variable and dependent variable be significantly related.

The relationship between Senior Team Attributes (STA) and Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL)

Table 10: The relationship between Senior Team Attributes (STA) and Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL) Coefficients

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	.913	.178		5.138	.000	.563	1.263
1 STA	.711	.059	.644	12.150	.000	.596	.826

a. Dependent Variable: EL

There is statistically significant relationship between entrepreneurial leadership and senior team attribute. This confirms the second condition for testing mediation effect that the mediator variable and dependent variable be significantly related. The relationship between Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL) and Organizational Ambidexterity (OA)

Testing the mediating effect of Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL) on the relationship between Senior Team Attributes (STA) and Organizational Ambidexterity (OA).

Table 11: Testing the mediating effect of Entrepreneurial Leadership (EL) on the relationship between Senior Team Attributes (STA) and Organizational Ambidexterity (OA) Coefficients

Coefficients ^a							
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 (Constant)	.888	.178		4.987	.000	.537	1.239
STA	.752	.061	.648	12.273	.000	.631	.873
2 (Constant)	.553	.180		3.073	.002	.198	.907
STA	.445	.083	.383	5.367	.000	.281	.608
EL	.408	.079	.370	5.180	.000	.253	.563

a. Dependent Variable: OA

The relationship between senior team attribute and organizational ambidexterity through entrepreneurial leadership is significant indicating that there is partial mediating effect. The study thus confirms that entrepreneurial leadership statistically significantly partially mediates the relationship between senior team attributes and the organizational ambidexterity. The discussed steps in mediation are summarized in Table 12.

Table 12: Summary of the mediation test

Step	Relationship	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Condition
Step 1		.752	12.273	.000**	Met
Step 2		.711	12.150	.000**	Met
Step 3		.408	5.180	.000**	Met
Step 4		.445	5.367	.000**	Partially met

**significant at 5% level of significance

The study modelled from the relationships contained

Entrepreneurial leadership is therefore a very crucial factor when modelling for the practice of senior team attributes towards achieving organizational ambidexterity.

Conclusion

In pursuit to achieve organizational ambidexterity from senior team attributes, the study established that entrepreneurial leadership must play handy. Entrepreneurial leadership was found to statically significantly partially influence the contribution of senior team attribute to organizational ambidexterity. The entrepreneurial leadership, though found to be meritorious, had its indicators rated below three on average. This means entrepreneurial leadership in terms of innovation influence, creativity and risk taking consideration is still infrequently practiced which explains the reasons behind the low performance by coffee marketing cooperative societies. This finding strongly supports entrepreneurial passion theory but rejects the resource based view theory by arguing that, resources may be available but when the manager lacks entrepreneurial leadership skills then the organization may stall at its status quo and prevent innovation and invention that propel the performance of the organization.

The study scientifically contributes to the new knowledge that there is significant interplay between senior team attributes and organizational ambidexterity as mediated by entrepreneurial leadership. The study findings uphold the tenets of the following theories: need for achievement theory, transformational leadership theory, experiential learning theory and entrepreneurship passion theory. The study findings rejects resource based view theory by opining that even well-endowed resourced organization cannot balance between exploration and exploitation in the absence of organizational ambidexterity as influenced by senior team attributes.

Recommendation

The study recommends that all training for coffee marketing cooperative societies include the senior team attributes, the content of organizational ambidexterity and entrepreneurial leadership. This important to enhance practice so as to move the cooperative societies from below to optimal performance. The study predicts this will reduce costs of management and operations since the cooperative societies are operating in a very dynamic and unpredictable environment today.

References

- [1.] Augusto, C. & Moel, J. (2014). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance moderated by the government policy (a study on SMEs in Timor Lester), *International Journal of Business Management invention*, 3(8), 64 – 71.
- [2.] Bagheri, A., & Harrison, C. (2020). Entrepreneurial leadership measurement: a multi-dimensional construct. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27, 659-679.
- [3.] Breaux, P. (2010). EMS leadership part 5: Innovation influence transformational leadership in
- [4.] EMS.
- [5.] Chen, Q., & Liu, Z. (2018). How does openness to innovation drive organizational ambidexterity? The mediating role of organizational learning goal orientation. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 99, 1–14.
- [6.] Chen, Y. (2017). Dynamic ambidexterity: How innovators manage exploration and exploitation. *Business Horizons*, 60(3), 385–394. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2017.01.001>
- [7.] Chou, C., Yang, K.-P., & Chiu, Y.-J. (2017). Managing sequential ambidexterity in the electronics industry: Roles of temporal switching capability and contingent factors. *Industry and Innovation*, 1-26, 752–777. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13662716.2017.1334538>

- [8.] Clemence R.V., (ed.) 2009, Essays on Entrepreneurship, Innovations, Business Cycles and the Evolution of the Capitalism, Joseph A. Schumpeter, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey,
- [9.] Fethi, O, Venugopal, K, Guday, A, & Alemayehu B. (2016). *An assessment of factors influencing the market performance of coffee farmers' cooperative societies in Melka Balo Woreda; A case of Kurtu cooperative societies society*, Ethiopia, Gondar: University of Gondar.
- [10.] Gibson, C. B. and Birkinshaw, J. (2004) The Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Role of Organizational Ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47 pp209–26.
- [11.] Gibson, C. B. and Birkinshaw, J. (2004), The Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Role of Organizational Ambidexterity, *Academy of Management Journal*, 47, pp. 209-226.
- [12.] Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The Antecedents, Consequences, and Mediating Role of Organizational Ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 209–226. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20159573>.
- [13.] Heavey, C., & Simsek, Z. (2017). Distributed cognition in top management teams and organizational ambidexterity: The influence of transactive memory systems. *Journal of Management*, 43(3), 919–945.
- [14.] Luu, T. T. (2015). Ambidextrous leadership, entrepreneurial orientation, and operational performance: Organizational social capital as a moderator. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(6), 229–253.
- [15.] Luu, T. T., Dinh, K., & Qian, D. (2019). Ambidextrous leadership, entrepreneurial orientation and job crafting : The moderating role of organizational social exchange. *European Business Review*, 31(2), 260–282.
- [16.] Manalel, J. & Deepa K.G. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm's performance: A critical examination, *IOSR journal of business management*, 18(4), 21 – 28.
- [17.] McGuire E, Kennerly SM. (2006). Nurse managers as transformational and transactional leaders. *Nursing Economic* 24(4):179-185.
- [18.] Mom, T. J. M., Chang, Y.-Y., Cholakova, M., & Jansen, J. J. P. (2019). A multilevel integrated framework of firm HR practices, individual ambidexterity, and organizational ambidexterity. *Journal of Management*, 45(7), 3009–3034.
- [19.] Tushman, M. L & O'Reilly, C. A., (2013). & Organizational ambidexterity: Past, present, and future. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27, 324–338.
- [20.] O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Organizational Ambidexterity: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 27(4), 324-338.
- [21.] Pangarso, A; Astuti, E.S; Raharjo, K; aAfrianty, T.W. (2020). A New Theoretical Framework of Organizational Effectiveness from Knowledge and Ambidexterity Perspectives, *J. Mgt. Mkt. Review*, 5(4) 213 – 225. [https://doi.org/10.35609/jmmr.2020.5.4\(3\)](https://doi.org/10.35609/jmmr.2020.5.4(3))
- [22.] Pitts, S. (2018). Impact of Cooperative Membership on Members' Household Economies: The Case of Chiapas Coffee Farmers. Master's Theses. 1079
- [23.] Raisch, S. and Birkinshaw, J. (2008), Organizational Ambidexterity: Antecedents, Outcomes, and Moderators, *Journal of Management*, 34, pp. 375-409.
- [24.] Śledzik K., (2013), Schumpeter's view on innovation and entrepreneurship (in:) *Management Trends in Theory and Practice*, (ed.) Stefan Hittmar, Faculty of Management Science and Informatics, University of Zilina & Institute of Management by University of Zilina
- [25.] Utami, A. K., & Wilopo, S. (2018a). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation toward competitive advantage and business performance. *RJOAS*, 7(79), 140–149.
- [26.] Utami, A. K., & Wilopo, S. (2018b). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation toward competitive advantage and business performance. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 79(7).
- [27.] Verhees, F.J.H.M. & Sergaki, Panagiota & Dijk, Gert. (2015). Building up active membership in cooperative societies. *New Medit*. 14. 42-52.