

Internal Organizational Dynamics Shaping Public Sector Entrepreneurship in Tanzania

Kelvin Luka Nzilano

Moshi Co-operative University

kelvin.nzilano@mocu.ac.tz

Abstract

Public sector organisations are advised to embrace entrepreneurship because it stimulates not only efficiency and creativity but also transforms public organisations into more flexible units that serve the taxpayers more effectively. The major thrust is not to make public sector more businesslike, rather to enhance opportunities, to take challengeable ideas and innovate ways to offer more public choice and benefits. Despite its importance, public sector entrepreneurship has been the subject of little research. The few available studies are limited to few countries such as United States, UK, Australia, New Zealand and Greece among others. Consequently, the field lacks sufficient results which would allow global generalisation and formation of universally accepted best practices. In Sub-Saharan Africa and Tanzania in particular, there are limited data on the internal organisational dynamics that shape public sector entrepreneurship. This paper fills this gap by presenting the survey results conducted in 2014 at the Moshi Co-operative University, using 120 respondents. The study hypothesized that internal organizational dynamics do not significantly influence public sector entrepreneurship development in Tanzania. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were used to measure the average

response and difference between responses. Hypotheses were tested using independent sample *t*-tests and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The principal findings revealed that internal organisational dynamics namely work discretion, rewards and reinforcement and organizational boundaries significantly influence public sector entrepreneurship development. Management support and resource availability had insignificance influence in public sector entrepreneurship. Irrespective of sex, educational level and employment category, respondents had the same perceptions on the internal dynamics that shape entrepreneurship. The study recommends that the government should create favorable environment for entrepreneurial practices in order to enhance public sector organisational capacity to respond to the ever-changing environment more promptly and effectively.

Key words: *Internal organisational dynamics, public sector, entrepreneurship, Tanzania.*

1.0 Introduction

Globalisation and the development of science and technology have completely changed the business world. Currently,

people have faster access to information and receive it almost as fast as it reaches leaders (Tubey *et al.*, 2015). Worldwide and Tanzania in particular, public sector is increasingly facing pressure due to rising costs, demand from citizens and businesses, demographic changes, globalization and climate and environmental concerns (Bloch and Bugge, 2012). We are living in an era of niche markets where customers demand high quality products and services and have a variety of choices (Tubey *et al.*, 2015). Consequently, public sector operation should base on adaptability, flexibility, speed, aggressiveness and innovativeness, all described under ‘corporate entrepreneurship’ (Morris and Kuratko, 2002). Entrepreneurship in public sector stimulates not only efficiency and creativity but also transforms public organizations into more flexible units that serve the taxpayers more effectively (Meynhardt and Diefenbach, 2012). Public sector entrepreneurship (PSE) is the process that exists within public sector organizations leading to innovative activities such as development of new and existing services, technologies, administrative techniques, and new improved strategies, risk-taking and proactivity (Kearney *et al.*, 2009).

Essentially, PSE embraces the participation of employees and the conscious effort to instill entrepreneurial practices within organizations in order to enhance firms’ ability to produce new products and services (Morris & Kuratko, 2002). This is an entrepreneurial behaviour exhibited fairly by the whole organization as it involves actors inside public sector organization (Morris, 2007).

Traditionally, entrepreneurship within existing organization ‘corporate entrepreneurship’ has been associated with private sector as a source of organizational survival and growth through increased sales, market share, profitability and growth potential (Kearney *et al.*, 2009). However, entrepreneurship holds potential to exist in virtually all types of organizations (Zerbinati & Suitaris, 2005). Currently, public sector organizations experience turbulent external environment with eroding tax bases, heightened accountability, rapidly changing technology and increasing diverse audiences to serve (Bloch and Bugge, 2012). In Tanzania, as in many developing economies, public sector organizations depend on the central government to finance their operations. However, recent trend reveals a

falling central government subvention, which endangers public service delivery. These challenges call for entrepreneurial behaviour within public sector organizations. The adoption of PSE could be a sound approach that generates alternative revenues, improves alternative processes, and develops innovative solutions to meet social and economic needs (Fox, 2015). Indeed, entrepreneurship in public sector is a driving force of change and innovation that opens-up innovative opportunities to achieve efficient and effective performance (Kim, 2010).

Despite its importance, PSE has been the subject of little research (Meynhardt and Diefenbach, 2012). Current research has not identified factors or practices that motivate entrepreneurial behaviour in public sector (Zerbinati & Suitaris, 2005). Existing literature focus on industrial and business corporations and little has studied the application of entrepreneurship in other context (Yeazdanshenas, 2014). Previous studies are limited to few countries such as United States, UK, Australia, New Zealand, and Greece among others. Consequently, the field lacks sufficient results for global generalization and formation of universally

accepted best practices (Zampetakis & Moustakis, 2010). Moreover, existing analysis is confined to top management, contrary, research suggest the importance of entrepreneurial process to all employees (Borins, 2002). Literature has been less clear on which specific organisational components influence entrepreneurship inside organisation (Strydom, 2013). Given the potential benefits of PSE, identifying internal organizational dynamics that shape entrepreneurship in public sector organisations is very important. Previous research has analysed psychological and behavioral characteristics of individuals which are insufficient to understand the very heart of PSE (Kim, 2010). So far, there is no agreement on which key internal organisational dynamics are more important in facilitating the development of entrepreneurship inside organisation (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002). Indeed, this creates a challenge for public sector managers when attempting to promote entrepreneurial spirit in public sector context.

In Africa and Tanzania in particular, the environment for entrepreneurship development particularly in public sector are relatively not attractive. This is partly

attributed by colonial rule which prohibited public servants to engage in entrepreneurial endeavors. During colonial era, entrepreneurship was made attractive only for the morally deviant individuals, which indeed affected the entrepreneurial mindset of Tanzanians (Chiraka, 2012). Existing entrepreneurship studies in Tanzania concentrates on the role of higher education in promoting entrepreneurship education (Kilasi, 2013), strategies and the associated challenges of integrating entrepreneurship in the education systems (Nkirina, 2010). Some scholars have mirrored on graduate entrepreneurial intentions (Mwasalwiba, 2012; Kambi, 2011), tendencies (Katundu and Gabagambi, 2014), status of entrepreneurship education in business schools (Olomi and Sabokwigina, 2010) and schools of education (Fulgence, 2015). There is lacuna of studies that examined the internal organizational dynamics that shapes PSE. Research in PSE is in infancy (Zerbinati & Suitaris, 2005). Little has been done to support PSE through the analysis of the effect of organizational factors (Kim, 2010). While many studies have examined various factors that contribute to or enhance the establishment of an entrepreneurial culture, only few studies have empirically

tested the existence of the hypothesized factors (Hornsby *et al.*, 1999) particularly in public sector. The study was therefore set to fill this gap by empirically testing the influence of internal organizational dimensions on PSE development.

2.0 Conceptualization of Internal Organizational Dynamics Influencing Public Sector Entrepreneurship Development

While the importance of fostering entrepreneurship in public sector is widely acknowledged by scholars (Kim, 2010; Westrup, 2013; Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012; Yeazdanshenas, 2014), much remains to be understood about how to embed it in public sector (Zerbinati & Suitaris, 2005). The existing debate has been centered on the existence; nature and application of entrepreneurship in public sectors. Existing studies have not addressed the methods of embedding entrepreneurship into public sector in spite of its emergence as force for public management reforms (Sadler, 2000). Although existing literature reveals how individual, organizational and environmental factors positively influence PSE, the current study will venture on the internal organizational dynamics. The internal

forces, both independently and collectively are important antecedents since they affect the internal environment of the organization consequently determines employees' willingness towards entrepreneurial practices (Yeazdanshenas, 2014). However, studies suggest that internal organizational dimensions are more influential in promoting entrepreneurship in established organization (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002).

Regarding the private sector, scholars (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002; Kuratko *et al.*, 2014; Kearney *et al.*, 2009) have identified a stable set of organisational antecedents as determinant dynamics that shape the environment for entrepreneurship prosperity. They identify perception of management support, work discretion, rewards and reinforcement, time availability and organisational boundaries as relevant internal organisational dynamics. The mentioned forces are required for individuals to perceive an innovative-friendly environment (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). This paper used similar structure to empirically test the perceptions of public servants on internal organisational dynamics that shapes entrepreneurship development in Tanzanian public sector organisations.

Entrepreneurial behaviour and activities should be adjusted before being transferred for application in public sector setting (Boyett cited by Kim, 2010) because there is limited detailed studies and rigorous theory testing in PSE research (Zerbinati & Suitaris, 2005). More research is therefore needed on the institutional settings that enable and constrain entrepreneurship development in public sector (Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012). The current study therefore contributes to government effort in creating entrepreneurial behaviour in public sector and eventually to the development of PSE theories.

In this paper, management support is defined as the extent to which employees perceive that top management support, facilitate and promote entrepreneurial behaviour (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). The perceived support include championing or adopting innovative ideas, recognising employees ideas, supporting small projects, providing expertise and institutionalising entrepreneurial activities within the organisation's system (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002). Similar to private sector, public servants are more likely to behave entrepreneurially when public sector

managers support such behaviour. In contrast, public servants are less likely to behave entrepreneurially when the top management discourages innovativeness, risk-taking and proactiveness (Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012). When the top management imposes strict rules and regulations, less innovations are likely to be achieved.

H1a: There is no management support for public servants to behave entrepreneurially in public sector organizations in Tanzania.

Work discretion and autonomy is the extent to which one believes that the organization is committed to tolerate failures, provide decision-making freedom and delegate responsibilities and authorities to lower level employees (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). Employees would perceive that they are provided with work discretion and autonomy when they have a freedom to decide on how to perform their given tasks effectively. In the public sector, public servants are more likely to behave entrepreneurially when they believe that public sector managers will not punish or criticize them for the mistakes associated with innovations. Public servants who are

encouraged to decide on how to achieve objectives are likely to come up with creative ways of doing so. According to Meynhardt and Diefenbach (2012) public servants are likely to experiment and innovate when fewer strict rules and regulations are in place.

H1b: Public servants have limited work discretion and autonomy to behave entrepreneurially in public sector organizations in Tanzania.

Rewards and reinforcement refers to the extent to which one perceives that the organization reward based on entrepreneurial activity and success (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). Appropriate use of rewards based on employees' performance, highlighting achievements made and encourage pursuit of challenging work potentially encourages employees to engage in entrepreneurship (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002). Like in private sector, public servants are likely to engage in entrepreneurship when they perceive that the organization is rewarding based on entrepreneurial activities and success. Public servants can be rewarded and encouraged for their entrepreneurial behaviour through increased responsibility, monetary incentives,

recognition and disseminating their innovative ideas. In the Tanzanian public sector, although public servants are promoted based on individual performance, rewarding based on entrepreneurial achievement remains a challenge.

***H1c:** There are limited rewards and reinforcement for public servants to behave entrepreneurially in public sector organizations in Tanzania.*

Resource availability is defined as the perceived availability of resources for innovative activities such as financial resources, time availability and human resources (Hornsby *et al.*, 2002). In this study, resource availability is used to mean the accessibility of necessary resources required for innovative activities. A perception that the workload schedules ensure extra time for individuals and groups to pursue innovations with jobs being structured in a way to support such efforts and achieve short and long-term organizational goals (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). When public servants perceive availability of resource as innovative activities, they are likely to experiment and take the associated risks (Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012). In addition, public servants need time to

oversee, develop and enhance experiments. For example, the availability of unstructured time or free time can enable public servants to consider opportunities that may otherwise be prohibited by the available work schedules. However, the availability of financial resources in most public sectors particularly in Tanzania remains a challenge.

***H1d:** Resource availability constrains public servants' entrepreneurial potential in Tanzanian public sector organizations.*

Organizational boundaries refer to the extent to which one perceives that there are flexible organizational boundaries useful in promoting entrepreneurial activities (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). The presence of flexible organizational structure facilitates the flow of information between external environment and the department within the organization. Public servants' entrepreneurial behaviour can be promoted by increasing flexibility in organization's policies and procedures (Zampetaksi & Moustaksi, 2010). Like the private sector, public servants are more likely to behave entrepreneurially when they believe that the organizational structure is flexible and they possess the work autonomy in performing

the given task. In addition, the absence of standard operating procedures, written rules, administrative procedures and supportive organizational structure significantly influences entrepreneurial behaviour. Productive outcomes are likely to be accomplished in the organization when uncertainty is kept at manageable levels (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). In the public sector, formalized structure is an impediment to public servants entrepreneurial behaviour.

H1e: Organizational boundaries and structure significantly impede public servants entrepreneurial behaviour in public sector organizations in Tanzania.

The dependent variable is PSE climate which is defined as the extent to which public sector organizations create an entrepreneurially-friendly environment for public servants to come-up with innovative idea. An entrepreneurial climate would encourage its employees to be creative and innovative as well as take risks and responsibility for their actions (Nayager & Van Vuuren, 2005). In order to be successful in promoting entrepreneurial activities, the internal environment must be open and supportive and allow employees to

be entrepreneurial at all levels (Bhardwaj & Momaya, 2006). Similar to private sector, public sector should create an environment where all public servants are encouraged and are willing to behave entrepreneurially. An organizational entrepreneurial climate is mostly dependent on the employees' perceptions and how things are done. However, most of the public sector's entrepreneurial environments are surrounded by red-tape and bureaucratic procedures which limit public servants' entrepreneurial behaviour.

H2: The prevailing environment for public sector entrepreneurship development in public sector organizations in Tanzania is below the average.

3.0 Methodology

Data were collected through survey questionnaires using Corporate Entrepreneurship Assessment Instrument (CEAI) developed by Hornsby *et al.*, (2002). The unit of analysis was employees of the then Moshi University College of Co-operative and Business Studies (MUCCoBS), now Moshi Co-operative University (MoCU). In 2014, when the survey was conducted, the University College had 380 employees, out of whom,

144 were academic staff and 236 administrative staff. The target sample size was 140, obtained through systematic sampling technique. The sampled population involved academic and administrative staff working at the Moshi headquarters. This list was obtained from the Directorate of Human Resource and Administration (DHRA) office. A cross-sectional design was employed where individual employees formed a sampling unit. The design allows data collection from different groups of respondents at a time. The design allows variety of analytical techniques and comparisons of many variables at the same time (Katundu and Gabagambi, 2014).

The independent variables analyzed included management support, work discretion and autonomy, rewards and reinforcement, resource availability and organizational boundaries while the dependent variable was climate for PSE development. The distributed questionnaire had a total of 56 questions which would take less than 45 minutes for a respondent to complete filling. Five-point Likert scale ranging from 1="strongly disagree" to 5="strongly agree" were used to measure employees perceptions on internal

organizational dynamics that influence the development of entrepreneurship. Management support had 19 items, work discretion and autonomy 10 items, rewards and reinforcement 6 items; time availability 6 items, organizational boundaries 7 items and the dependent variable consisted of 8 items. The collected data were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 20 and the Microsoft Excel computer packages. Descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations were used to measure the average response and differences between responses. Hypotheses were tested using one sample t-tests. The influence of respondents' demographic characteristics on the perceptions of internal organizational dimensions was tested using independent *t*-test and one way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The significance level was determined at $p < 0.05$ standard.

Cronbach Alpha analysis was used to test the reliability of the measuring instruments. The test results indicated 0.903 for management support, 0.825 for work discretion and autonomy, 0.673 for rewards and reinforcement, 0.232 for resource availability, 0.707 for organizational boundaries and 0.785 for PSE climate.

Nearly all constructs had high internal consistency and reliability with acceptable Alpha values above 0.700, except rewards and reinforcement and resource availability. However, some scholars recommend that it is not necessary to ignore a construct if the coefficient is smaller than the required Alpha value, especially when an attitude is measured rather than ability (Field, 2008). Since the study measured the perceptions of public servants on the internal organizational dynamics, all constructs were included in the analysis. Skewness and Kurtosis were employed to test the normality status of the variables. The results indicated Skewness ($\leq |1.08|$) and Kurtosis

($\leq |2.53|$). This implies none of the items had greater than cut-off points of $|3.00|$ and $|8.00|$ as recommended by Kline (1998).

4.0 Results and Discussion

4.1 Inferential Results

To test the research hypotheses, the study employed one sample *t*-test to compare the mean score of the community (MoCU) with hypothetical mean ($\mu = 3$) as cut-off point of five Likert-scale. The test statistics for each hypothesis was $H_0 \mu \geq 3$ and $H_1 \mu < 3$ respectively. The interpretation rules were when *p*-value score is significant at $p > 0.05$ level null hypothesis should be accepted and alternative hypothesis be rejected.

Table 4.1: One Sample *t*-test, Comparing Community and Hypothetical Mean (μ)

	N	Mean	Std Dev.	Std Error Mean	Mean Diff.	Df	T	Sign.
Internal Factors:								
1. Management support	120	3.045	.646	.059	.044	119	.759	.449
2. Work discretion	120	3.156	.686	.063	.156	119	2.487	.014*
3. Rewards & reinforce	120	3.349	.683	.062	.348	119	5.592	.000*
4. Resource availability	120	2.996	.500	.046	-.004	119	-.091	.927
5. Organ. boundaries	120	3.507	.616	.056	.507	119	9.012	.000*
6. PSE climate	120	3.425	.602	.055	.425	119	7.736	.000*

* $p < 0.05$

The findings reveal that management support construct was significant at $p > 0.05$ level, above the maximum level of error (0.05). Hence, the null hypothesis H_{1a} was accepted. This implies that there was no clear top management support for public servants to behave entrepreneurially. The

percentage, mean and standard deviation scores also support this finding as the construct was ranked the second from the last. Previous studies emphasize that in order to enhance innovativeness and entrepreneurial potential, public servants should perceive that top management

facilitate and promote entrepreneurial behaviour (Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012). The findings further suggest that work discretion and autonomy was significant at $p < 0.05$ level, consequently the null hypothesis *H1b* was rejected. The implication is that employees had considerable work discretion and autonomy to practice entrepreneurship. Theories suggest that employees are likely to engage in entrepreneurship when they perceive that organization reward based on entrepreneurial activities and success (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). This means that the University considerably provides suitable context for employees to apply their creativity and innovation in the way of doing their tasks.

Rewards and reinforcements was significant at $p < 0.05$ level, eventually, hypothesis *H1c* was rejected. The implication is that employees felt that they are considerably rewarded and encouraged to engage in entrepreneurship. Previous studies emphasized that proper rewards and reinforcement systems encourage employees' risk-taking behaviour (Kuratko *et al.*, 2014). If individual initiatives are not recognized and rewarded, employees will be

discouraged from assuming risks associated with entrepreneurship. The findings further revealed that resource availability was significant at $p < 0.05$ level, consequently the hypothesis *H1d* was accepted. This implies that there were relatively inadequate resources readily available for innovations. When public servants perceive that resources are readily available for innovative activities, they are likely to experiment and take the associated risks (Meynhardt & Diefenbach, 2012). In order to foster innovative behaviour, public sector managers must evaluate workloads of public servants to ensure necessary time needed to pursue innovation.

Organizational boundaries were significant at $p > 0.05$ level, hence the null hypothesis *H1e* was rejected. The implication is that organizational boundaries and structure considerably encourage public servants to behave entrepreneurially. Employees understand what is expected of them as employees (entrepreneurs) in terms of amount, quality, and timeframe outputs. Previous findings emphasized that public servants' entrepreneurial behaviour can be promoted by increasing flexibility in organization's policies and procedures

(Zampetaksi & Moustaksi, 2010). Lastly, the independent variable PSE atmosphere was significant at $p < 0.05$ level, hence the null hypothesis H3 was rejected. The implication is that the climate for entrepreneurship development was above the average. Employees perceive that the environment were considerably conducive to behave entrepreneurially. Previously studies emphasized that an entrepreneurial climate would encourage its employees to be creative and innovative as well as take risks and responsibility for their actions (Nayager & Van Vuuren, 2005).

4.2 Respondents Perceptions on Internal Organizational Dynamics

The study further examined the influence of respondents' demographic characteristics on the perceptions on internal organizational factors. Demographic characteristics such as sex, education level working experience and employed category were tested to determine its influence on the perceptions on the studied factors using independent sample *t*-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Table 4.2: Independent Sample *t*-test, Sex vs. Internal Organizational Factors

Internal Organizational factors	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	T	Df	Sign.
1. Management support:				1.220	118	.272
Male	76	3.038	.666			
Female	44	3.055	.616			
2. Work discretion & autonomy:				.156	118	.694
Male	76	3.213	.712			
Female	44	3.057	.635			
3. Rewards & reinforcement:				.993	118	.321
Male	76	3.368	.723			
Female	44	3.314	.612			
4. Time availability:				.442	118	.508
Male	76	3.050	.521			
Female	44	2.902	.452			
5. Organisational boundaries:				1.037	118	.311
Male	76	3.662	.623			
Female	44	3.240	.512			
6. PSE climate:				7.886	118	.006*
Male	76	3.401	.676			
Female	44	3.468	.452			

* $p < 0.05$

The findings revealed that all constructs were significant at $p > 0.05$ level. The

implication is that irrespective of sex, employees had the same perceptions on

internal dynamics that shape the development of entrepreneurship. The PSE atmosphere was significant at $p < 0.05$ level. The implication is that respondents had diverse perceptions on the perceived climate for PSE. To identify the magnitude of diverse perceptions, *Cohen's d* test was employed. The *Cohen's d* effect size for *t*-test¹ calculations revealed that there was very minimal effect size with *d* value 0.118. This implies that despite the observed differences in perceptions, the differences were very minimal. In addition, the findings revealed that there was no significance differences observed with respect to employment category and education level as all constructs were significant at $p > 0.05$ level. The implication is that irrespective of the employment category and education level, respondents had the same perceptions on the internal factors that influence entrepreneurship development.

¹ Cohen's *d* measures difference in means in standard deviation units. visit: www.danielsoper.com

Table 4.3: ANOVA Test, Work Experience vs. Internal Organizational Constructs

Internal organizational factor		Sums of squares	Df	F	Sign.
1. Management support	Between groups	5.462	3	4.781	.004*
	Within groups	44.176	116		
	Total	49.638	119		
2. Work discretion & autonomy	Between groups	2.566	3	1.855	.141
	Within groups	53.490	116		
	Total	56.056	119		
3. Rewards and reinforcements	Between groups	2.587	3	1.890	.135
	Within groups	52.913	116		
	Total	55.500	119		
4. Time availability	Between groups	0.847	3	1.132	.339
	Within groups	28.956	116		
	Total	29.804	119		
5. Organizational boundaries	Between groups	1.365	3	1.203	.312
	Within groups	43.854	116		
	Total	45.218	119		
6. PSE climate:	Between groups	3.513	3	3.424	.020*
	Within groups	39.666	116		
	Total	43.179	119		

$P^* < 0.05$

Regarding work experience, the findings revealed that management support and climate for PSE were significant at $p > 0.05$ level. The implication is that there were

diverse perceptions on management support and the climate for PSE. To identify where the observed differences lies, Tukey HSD multiple comparisons were employed.

Table 4.4: Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of Management Support Construct

(I) Work Experience	(J) Work Experience	Mean Dif. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sign.
1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	-.055	.156	.985
	11 - 15 (experienced staff)	-.767*	.211	.002*
	16+ (highly-experienced staff)	-.214	.136	.395
6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	.055	.156	.985
	11 - 15 (experienced staff)	-.711*	.222	.009*
	16+ (highly experienced staff)	-.159	.152	.726
11 - 15 (experienced staff)	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	.767*	.211	.00*
	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	.711*	.222	.009*
	16+ (highly-experienced staff)	.553*	.208	.044*

	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	.214	.136	.395
16+ (highly-experienced staff)	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	.159	.153	.726
	11 - 15 (experienced staff)	-.553*	.208	.044*
<i>P</i> * < 0.05				

The findings revealed statistical differences between the newly-recruited staff against mid-experienced, experienced and highly-experienced staff. The observed differences suggest that newly-recruited staff had negative perceptions on management support construct compared to mid-experienced, experienced and highly-experienced staff. However, the observed difference was statistically significant on experienced staff at $p < 0.05$ level. In addition, there was statistical significant difference between mid-experienced staff against newly-recruited, experienced and highly-experienced staff. The observed differences suggest that mid-experienced staff had negative perceptions on management support compared to experienced staff and highly-experienced staff. However, the observed difference was statistically significant on experienced and newly-recruited staff at $p < 0.05$ level.

The findings further revealed statistical difference between experienced against mid-experienced, highly experienced and

experienced staff. The observed differences suggest that experienced staff had positive perceptions on management support compared to mid-experienced and highly-experienced staff. However, the observed differences were statistically significant on mid-experienced and highly experienced staff at $p < 0.05$ level. The findings further revealed that there was a significance difference between mid-experienced and highly-experienced staff. The observed difference suggests that highly-experienced staff had negative perceptions on management support compared to experienced staff but had positive perceptions compared to mid-experienced staff. However, the observed difference was statistically significant on experienced staff at $p < 0.05$ level. This may be attributed by the fact that most of the experienced and highly-experienced staffs hold managerial positions of the University. This makes them to perceive negatively on management support entrepreneurship compared to newly and mid-experienced staff felt.

Table 4.5: Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons of PSE Climate at MoCU

(I) Work Experience	(J) Work Experience	Mean Dif. (I-J)	Std. Error	Sign.
1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	.099	.148	.907
	11 - 15 (experienced staff)	-.212	.199	.713
	16+ (highly-experienced staff)	-.311	.128	.079
6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	-.099	.148	.907
	11 -15 (experienced staff)	-.312	.210	.452
	16+ (highly-experienced staff)	-.412*	.145	.027*
11 - 15 (experienced staff)	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	.212	.199	.713
	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	.312	.210	.452
	16+ (highly-experienced staff)	-.099	.197	.958
16+ (highly-experienced staff)	1 - 5 (newly-recruited staff)	.311	.128	.079
	6 - 10 (mid-experienced staff)	.411*	.145	.027*
	11 - 15 (experienced staff)	.099	.197	.958

P * < 0.05

With respect to climate for PSE at MoCU, the findings revealed statistical difference between mid-experienced staff against experienced, highly experienced and newly-recruited staff. The observed difference suggests that mid-experienced staff had negative perceptions on PSE climate than experienced and highly-experienced staff but had positive perceptions than newly-recruited staff. The implication is that newly-recruited and mid-experienced staff believes the environment to engage in entrepreneurship is not conducive compared to experienced and highly-experienced staff. However, the observed difference was statistically significant on highly-experienced staff at $p < 0.05$ level. It can be deduced that newly-recruited and mid-experienced staff had negative perceptions

on climate for entrepreneurship development than experienced and highly experienced staff. Again, one probably deduces that most of the experienced and highly-experienced staff holds managerial positions of the University. This makes them to have positive perceptions on climate for entrepreneurship atmosphere than newly-recruited and mid-experienced staff.

5.0 Conclusion and Policy Implication

The study concludes that of the five internal organizational factors that shape entrepreneurship in established organization, work discretion and autonomy, rewards and reinforcement, and organizational boundaries significantly shape entrepreneurship development in public sector organizations. The findings further

reveal that management support and time availability had insignificant influence on entrepreneurship development in public sector organizations. Irrespective of sex, educational level and employment category, respondents had the same perceptions on the studied constructs. There were different perceptions between respondents working experience on management support and PSE climate. The observed differences suggest that newly-recruited and mid-experienced staff had negative perceptions on management support and PSE climate than experienced and highly-experienced employees. This could be attributed by the fact that many experienced and highly-experienced staff holds managerial positions of the University. The study suggests that top management should strive to create favorable environment for newly and mid-experienced staff as they are change agents and would serve the University longer than experienced and highly-experienced staff.

The study implication is that it is a high time for the government to set various strategies of embedding entrepreneurship in the public sector in order to meet the overgrowing demand of different stakeholders. We are living in an era of niche markets where

customers demand high quality products and services and have a variety of choices. Unfortunately, free market economy allows private sector organization to engage in public service provision previously monopolized by public sector. Under such scenario, the public sector must embrace entrepreneurship where creativity and innovation should be a norm rather than exception. The findings suggest that although entrepreneurship has traditionally been associated with private sector, it holds the potential of prospering in public sector context. In order to make this a reality, the public sector managers should pay attention on the internal organizational dynamics namely management support, rewards and reinforcement, organizational boundaries, work discretion and autonomy and resources availability among others. This will strengthen public sector ability to meet the growing demand of public services.

The findings could serve a benchmark for future research on strategies for embedding entrepreneurial behaviour in public sectors in developing countries like Tanzania. In fact, since entrepreneurship development in the public sector context in most of the developing countries and Tanzania in

particular are relatively limited and still new, these findings could stimulate future studies. As such, an area for future research could include the influence of human resource management practices on public sector entrepreneurship development. Scholars recommend that human resource practices have a significant influence on entrepreneurship development in public sector. However, there is a limited empirical evidence to support this argument. Lastly, future studies should examine the influence of entrepreneurship on the performance of public sector organizations. This is because it is believed that public sector organizations that embrace entrepreneurship have the potential of performing better than those which do not. However, there is limited evidence to support this argument particularly in public sector organizations.

6.0 REFERENCES

- [1] Balkienė, K., & Jagminas, J. (2010). "Allusion to public policy: innovative entrepreneurship". *Public Policy and Administration*, (34): 32-46.
- [2] Bhardwaj, B. R., & Momaya, K. (2006). "Role of organisational flexibility for corporate entrepreneurship: case study for FedEx Corporation". *Global Journal of Flexible Systems Management*, 7 (1/2):37-44.
- [3] Bloch, C., & Bugge, M. M. (2012). *How to measure innovation in the public sector? innovation indicators in the public sector context*. University of Urbino.
- [4] Borins, S. (2002). "Leadership and innovation in the public sector" *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 28(3):467-76.
- [5] Chiraka, M. (2012). *"Entrepreneurship Education: The Road to Sustainable Development in Tanzania"* Dar-es-Salaam. HAKIELIMU [hakielimu.org/publication/download.php?En=234].
- [6] Field, A. (2008). *Reliability analysis*. [http://sussex.ac.uk/users/andyF/reliability.pdf]
- [7] Fox, J. (2015). *Entrepreneurship in public organizations*. Ohio State University Extension.
- [8] Fulgence, K. (2015). "Assessing the Status of Entrepreneurship education Courses in Higher Learning Institutions: The Case of Tanzania Education Schools" *Emerald Insight*, 57(2): 239-258.
- [9] Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. F., & Zahra, S. A. (2002). "Middle managers' perception of the internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship: assessing a measurement scale". *Journal of Business Venturing*, 17 (3): 253-273.
- [10] Hornsby, J. S., Kuratko, D. S., & Montagno, R. V. (1999). "Perception of internal factors for corporate entrepreneurship: A comparison of Canadian

and US managers" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24:9-24.

[11] Kambi, B. (2011). *University students entrepreneurial intentions in Tanzania: A case of Mzumbe of University. Unpublished Masters Thesis.* Kristiansand: University of Agder.

[12] Katundu, M. A., & Gabagambi, M. (2014). "Entrepreneurial Tendencies of Tanzanian University Graduates: Evidence from University of Dar-es-Salaam". *European Academic Reserch*, 1(12).

[13] Kearney, C., Hisrich, R. D., & Roche, F. (2009). "Public and private sector entrepreneurship: similarities, differences or a combination?" *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 16(1):26-46.

[14] Kilasi, P. (2013). *The Role of Higher Education in Promoting Entrepreneurship Education: The Case of Public Universitues in Tanzania, A PhD Thesis.* Pretoria. University of Pretoria.

[15] Kim, Y. (2010). "Stimulating entrepreneurial practices in the public sector: The roles of organisational characteristics" *Administration and Society*, 20(10): 1-35.

[16] Kline, R. B. (1998). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling.* New York: Guilford.

[17] Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J. S., & Covin, J. G. (2014). "Diagnosing a firm's internal environment for corporate

entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons*, 57: 37-47.

[18] Meynhardt, T., & Diefenbach, F. E. (2012). "What Drives Entrepreneurial Orientation in the Public Sector? Evidence from Germany's Federal Labor Agency" *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22:761-792.

[19] Morris, M. H., & Kuratko, D. F. (2002). *Corporate entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial development within organizations.* Thomson South Western: United States of America.

[20] Morris, R. (2007). *Lesson of corporate entrepreneurship for motivating public sector employees.* [http://eprints.qut.edu.au/12943/1/Morris_robyn.pdf].

[21] Mwasalwiba, E. S. (2012). *University entrepreneurship education in Tanzania: Teaching context, students' profile, expectations and outcomes: Unpublished PhD Thesis.* Vrije Universiteit Amstardam.

[22] Nayager, T., & Van Vuuren, J. J. (2005). "An analysis of organizational strategy, structure and culture that support corporate entrepreneurship in established organizations" *South African Journal of Economics and Management Sciences*, 8(2):29-38.

[23] Nkirina, S. P. (2010). "The challenges of integrating entrepreneurship education in the vocational training system".

Journal of European Industrial Training,
34(2):153-166.

[24] Olomi, D. R., & Sabokwigina, D. (2010). *Entrepreneurship Education in Tanzanian Business Schools: A Nationwide Survey*. accessed [https:// www.academia.edu/5333702/Title_ENTREPRENEURSHIP_EDUCATION_IN_TANZANIAN_BUSINESS_SCHOOLS_A_NATIONWIDE_SURVEY].

[25] Sadler, R. J. (2000). "Corporate entrepreneurship in the public sector: The dance of chameleon". *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 56(2): 25-43.

[26] Strydom, A. S. (2013). *The influence of organisational behaviour variables on corporate entrepreneurship*. University of South Africa.

[27] Tubey, R. J., Chebet, W. T., & Rotich, J. K. (2015). "Re-engineering the public sector: Integration of innovation and entrepreneurship in Africa's development agenda" *European Journal of Business*,

Economics and Accountancy, 3(5): 2056-6018.

[28] Westrup, U. (2013). "Internal entrepreneurship in the public sector: the challenges of integrating innovative project into the regular organization" *Scandinavian Journal of Public Administration*, 16(4): 97-112.

[29] Yeazdanshenas, M. (2014). "Designing a Conceptual Framework for Organizational Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector in Iran" *Iranian Journal of Management Studies*, 7(2):3 65-390.

[30] Zampetakis, L. A., & Moustakis, V. S. (2010). "An exploratory research on the factors stimulating corporate entrepreneurship in the Greek public sector" *International Journal of Manpower, International Journal of Manpower*.

[31] Zerbinati, S., & Souitaris, V. (2005). "Entrepreneurship in the Public Sector: A framework of Analysis in European Local Governments" *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 17: 43-64.