ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION AND OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF REGISTERED POULTRY FARMS IN KADUNA METROPOLIS

ANGO, Yushau
Department of Business Administration
Kaduna State University, Kaduna State

TAIWO, Hussainat Idiaro
Department of Business Administration
Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna State
hussainatidiaro@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis. The study took a sample size of 476 Poultry Farmers operating within Kaduna Metropolis. The study collected data in a cross-sectional survey. PLS-SEM via smart PLS 2.0 M_3 software path modelling was employed to analyze the data. The study found that dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation (proactiveness, innovativeness and risk taking) have significant positive effect on operational performance of registered poultry farms. Thus, the study conclude that entrepreneurial orientation has significant effect on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis. The study recommends that poultry farmers should make minor adjustments to their products in order to improve their operational Performance.
Keywords: entrepreneurial orientation, innovativeness, operational performance, proactiveness, risk taking

INTRODUCTION

The economic development of countries is increasingly being linked to the success of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). SMEs utilize local resources, create jobs and wealth and mitigates poverty (Ateke & Nwiepe, 2018). SMEs also optimize the allocation and distribution of factors of production (Okoli et al., 2021); and contribute to economic growth and prosperity (Mahmood, 2017; Alam et al., 2017). International Finance Corporation (IFC, 2020) adds that SMEs are essential economic catalysts, and instrumental to development and industrialization economies. This is because SMEs tend to be dynamic, inventive, and efficient due to their size that permit agility, rapid feedback, short decision chains, and greater capacity to comprehend and respond swiftly to market requirements (Mishra, 2019; Dess & Lumpkin, 2005).

The National Bureau of Statistics (NBS, 2020) indicates Nigeria's SMEs contribute nearly 50% of the country's GDP and account for over 80% of employment in the country. SMEs are thus instrumental to poverty reduction, and are pivotal to Nigeria's growth. However, SMEs are weighed down by challenges that impact the nation's economic growth. Evidence show that SMEs are struggling to survive due to poor market introduction, lack of initiative in entrepreneurial creativity, lack of entrepreneurial awareness, lack of financial aid, unfavourable business environments, and absence of skilled workers (Shehu & Mahmood, 2014).

An organization's strategic orientation can be said to include an entrepreneurial orientation if it captures the characteristics of an entrepreneur in its decision-making tenets, processes, and procedures; as well as openness to execute new ideas (Miller, 1983). Extant literature suggests that entrepreneurial orientation proxied by pro-activeness, risk-taking and innovativeness affect operational performance of firms, including SMEs. Rauch et al. (2014) reports that entrepreneurial orientation (i.e. proactiveness,

innovativeness and risk-taking) is essential to the performance of businesses; even though their study did not focus on SMEs.

While there is ample supply of studies on entrepreneurial orientation and different aspects of business performance, most of these studies focus on established firms; and the ones that focus on SMEs have not looked at registered poultry farms. It is on this premise that this study set out to examine the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and operational performance registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis. Entrepreneurial orientation is proxied by proactiveness, innovation and risk-taking, as suggested by Miller (1983) and Mahmood and Hanafi (2013).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial orientation came into sight in strategic management and entrepreneurship literature construct. It explains the psychology of SMEs in pursuit of entrepreneurial ventures; the process, their practices based on decision-making pattern, and their behaviours generally (Soininen, 2012). EO has been described as an antecedent to growth and performance differences in firms, in both domestic and foreign markets. Entrepreneurial vigour drives the firm competitiveness enabling it compete in a volatile economic environment, thereby perceiving new opportunities invisible to others (Gupta, 2015). Following the cues of Miller (1983) and Mahmood and Hanafi (2013), thus study decomposed entrepreneurial orientation proactiveness, innovation and risk-taking.

Proactiveness

Pro-activeness refers to a firm's initiative in anticipating and seizing future opportunities in the marketplace to pioneer change in processes and products (Lisboa, 2011). It defines the capability of the firms' entrance to the export market via inference from SWOT analysis conducted to identifying the opportunity trend in the market, and exploiting them with the use of human capital expertise to be on top of competition (Okpara, 2009). Proactiveness demonstrates a firm's anticipatory action in the future market demand to gain competitive advantages over its market competitors, followed by opportunity scanning (Wales, 2016).

Innovativeness

Innovativeness is the firms' commitment to processes and firms' internal blueprints modifications in a way that it cannot be copied by the competitors, nor easily transferred in other to achieve competitive export (Welbourne, 2012; Baker, 2009). It represents a firms' propensity to involve into creative processes, experiments, and support novel ideas and these kinds of activities would create and facilitate new and innovative methods, opportunity recognition, processes and technologies (Runyan, 2006). Runyan (2006) further stated that a small firm's owner might apply innovative techniques for enhancing their firm's performance. Innovativeness reflects the tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation and creative processes resulting in newness.

Risk-Taking

Risk-taking is defined as the extent to which a firm is willing to make large and risky commitments (Covin & Slevin, 1991). Risk-taking attribute of SMEs is the commitment on the part of management to strategically exploit business opportunities identified which may have high inclination of uncertainty due to the newness of the initiative to the firm. It is the capacity of the firms to view the foreign market as opportunity to be pursued positively despite the volatility, engenders success in export ventures (Okpara, 2009). Risk-taking tendency measures the inclination to invest the potential number of resources to the opportunities which would possess a rational likelihood of both success and failure (Altinay & Wang, 2011).

Operational Performance

Operational performance is a firm's performance measured against prescribed or required quality, speed, and dependability (Andy, 2007). Operational performance is the processes and resources that organization use to produce the highest quality products or services as efficiently as possible. It is also defined as the alignment of all business units within an organization to ensure that they are working together to achieve core business goals and to ensure performance of a firm measured against standard indicators of efficiency, effectiveness and environmental responsibility such as quality, waste reduction, speed, cost, and regulatory obedience. However, operational performance dimension includes; quality, speed, dependability, flexibility and costs (Billie, 2017).

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Operational Performance

Bhadari and Ampostira (2021) examined the mediating effect of competitive advantage on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance of women owned enterprises in Nepal, and found significant positive effect of proactiveness and aggressiveness on performance. Lahiru (2021) examined effect of entrepreneurial orientations on SMEs' innovativeness in Sri Lanka, using risk-taking, proactiveness, autonomy, innovativeness and competitiveness to represent entrepreneurial orientation. The study found that entrepreneurial orientation has significant effect on innovative performance.

Okoli et al. (2021) examine effect of entrepreneurial orientation on performance of SMEs in Southeast, Nigeria and found that a significant positive relationship exist between pro-activeness, innovativeness and risk taking on performance of SMEs in Southeast Nigeria. Similarly, Khan et al. (2021) examined the role of entrepreneurial orientation on enterprise performance in Pakistan. The study found positive relationship between the constructs. However, the strongest direct relation existed between risk taking propensity and enterprise performance.

Also, Ademosu and Morakinyo (2021) investigated the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and SMEs' performance and found strong synergy exists between risk taking and pro-activeness. Mabotuwana (2020) examined effect of entrepreneurial orientation on performance of SMEs in Sri Lanka. The study found that entrepreneurial orientation has statistically significant and positive impact on performance of SMEs. In the study of Garba (2020), it was reported entrepreneurial orientation has not statistically significant effect on performance of SMEs in North Central Nigeria.

Ibrahim and Abu (2020) found that proactiveness, risk-taking and autonomy are positive and significantly related to business performance. Amarteifio and Agbeblewu, (2020) established that being innovative, proactive, taking risks and being an autonomous leader impacts financial performance. Ahmed (2019) reported that entrepreneurial orientations have a positive significant effect on SME performance.

Sue (2019) and Ahmed (2019) found that entrepreneurial orientation has significant positive effect on both new product novelty and new product meaningfulness; and that new novelty and meaningfulness have significant positive impacts on competitive advantage. Ola (2019) and Sadeeq (2019) found a direct positive link between entrepreneurial orientation and SMEs performance. Hassan (2018) found that innovativeness and risk-taking dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation have a significantly positive effect on the growth of profitability for local Tanzania's construction firms, while the proactiveness dimension has a negative significant effect.

Rahim (2018) revealed that creativity and innovativeness, proactiveness and autonomy had a positive influence on entrepreneurial competencies. Adesanya (2018) contends that entrepreneurial orientation works better when all its features are put to use as a whole than as individual, then the contributions will have greater impact on the performance of the firm. Mburu et al. Gichira and Kyalo (2017) reported positive and significant relationship between risk taking and family owned enterprises performance.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The resource-based view (RBV) theory underpins the study. RBV postulates that a firm can achieve sustained competitive advantage and superior performance by formulating and implementing strategies that generate increased value for the firm relative to competitors; and sustainability is achieved if the increased value remains when competitors stop trying to imitate the competitive advantage. Barney (1991) states that if all firms within an industry share common resources, then none of them have the possibility of sustaining competitive advantage. According to the theory, heterogeneous and immobile resources controlled by a firm is one of the main sources of sustaining a competitive advantage over their competitors.

Therefore, the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and operational performance can be better be explained by RBV, since the theory suggests that entrepreneurial orientation lead to successful business renewal (Gómez-Mejía et al., 2007). This shows that the performance of a small firm can be influenced by various strategic factors, but most importantly, entrepreneurial orientaion (Grimmer et al., 2017). Consequently, entrepreneurial orientation are useful intangible resources associated with firm performance (Sozuer et al., 2017; Tehseen & Ramayah, 2015).

Consequent upon the foregoing, the study hypothesizes as follows:

Ho_1: There is no significant effect of pro-activeness on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis.

Ho_2: There is no significant effect of risk-taking on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis.

Ho_3: There is no significant effect of innovativeness on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a cross-sectional research design and collected primary data using structured questionnaire. Data for this study was collected from a sample of 476 Poultry Farmers operating within Kaduna Metropolis. The questionnaire used for this study consists two sections. The first section dealt with respondents' bio-data; while the second section focused on entrepreneurship orientation dimensions and operational performance. 476 questionnaires were administered to Poultry Farmers operating within Kaduna Metropolis, but 401 copies were returned. This shows 84% response. Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was utilized for the data analysis and the Cronbach's Alpha of the measurement scale was found to be 0.97.

The model used was adapted from Lahiru (2021) and modified in functional form as follows:

$$OP = f(EO) \quad (1)$$

The dependent variable, operational performance is a function of the independent variable which is entrepreneurial orientation**.** In equation form is represented as follows:

$$OP = \alpha + \beta_1 PA + \beta_2 IN + \beta_3 RT + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

Where: OP= operational performance, EO= entrepreneurial orientation, PA= proactiveness, IN= innovativeness, RT= risk taking, ε = Error term, α= Constant or Intercept, $\beta_1 - \beta_3$= Coefficients of independent Variables

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1: Questionnaire Distribution and Response Rate

Questionnaire	Frequency	Rate (%)
Distributed Questionnaire	476	100
Returned Questionnaire	401	84
Unreturned Questionnaire	75	16
Deleted Questionnaire	9	2
Usable Questionnaire	392	92

Source: Researcher's Computation, 2023

In Table 1, we have a rundown of the total number of questionnaire sent out, the total number of completed questionnaire returned, and the overall response rate. 476 questionnaire were sent out by the researcher, and 401 were returned. However, 9 copies of the questionnaire had to be removed from the data set due to incorrect completing by respondents. 392 (92%) of the total number of questionnaire sent were considered suitable for further study.

Preliminary Analysis

It is important to carry out some preliminary analysis before structural equation modelling (Hair et al., 2014). The data collected were screened for missing values, outlier detection and multicollinearity test. Details are presented below.

Missing Values

One of the most common issues in data analysis is missing information (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Examining the data set for any blanks is a standard practice. Researchers consider 10% missing value criterion as acceptable (Hair et al., 2014). Using descriptive statistics, it is observed that out of 8,020 data pieces, just 28 were missing (0.35%), much below the 10% cutoff for significance and so disregarded. However, mean substitution was used to fill in the blanks for the missing data. In most cases, it is preferable to utilize mean replacement to fill in missing data (Hair et al., 2014).

Assessment of Outliers

Mahalanobis distance is the most effective tool for spotting outliers in multivariate analyses like the one used here (D2). No matter how many variables are taken into account, the Mahalanobis distance (D2) provides a single value for each observation by measuring its distance in multidimensional space from the mean of all observations (Hair et al., 2014). Hair et al. (2014) propose using a low significance level (.001) to determine if a number is an anomaly. Therefore, Mahalanobis distance (D2) was used in this research to identify anomalies. There were nine examples that stood out too much and were ultimately eliminated.

Multicollinearity Test

There is multicollinearity when three or more variables are substantially associated (Hair et al. 2014). In order to check for multicollinearity, the researchers used the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) (Kothari & Garg, 2014). Multicollinearity becomes severe when the VIF value is greater than 5. (Kothari & Garg, 2014). All VIF figures in Table 2 are less than 5, hence multicollinearity was not an issue.

Table 2: Multicollinearity Statistics: VIF Values

Construct	Performance
Innovativeness	1.854
Proactiveness	1.647
Risk Taking	1.709

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Demographic analysis

The demographics include gender distribution of the respondents, age distribution of respondents and the educational qualification of the respondents the study. The result is presented in Table 2.

Table 3: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Gender			
Male	259	66	66
Female	133	34	100
Qualification	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Cumulative Percentage**
Primary Education	91	23	23
O' Level	77	20	43
ND	56	14	57
HND/B.Sc./BA	66	17	74
Post-graduate	34	9	83
Others	68	17	100
Age	**Frequency**	**Percentage**	**Cumulative Percentage**
<18	15	4	4
19-25	95	24	28
26-30	121	31	59
>30	161	41	100

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Table 3 shows that men make up 66% of the sample while women account for 34% of the sample. There are more men than women among the people who filled out the survey for this study. In addition, 20% of the study's respondents have at least an O-level, and 23% have at least a basic school certificate. Additionally, 14% have earned the National Diploma. However, just 17% of the people who filled out the survey had a bachelor's degree or above, while only 9% have a master's degree or higher. In the end, 17% hold unnamed degrees or certifications. This data shows that the vast majority of respondents have completed elementary school. According to the data, just 4% of the sample is comprised of people younger than 18. In addition, roughly a third of the responders are between the ages of 26 and 30, with another 33% falling somewhere in the 19-25 age range. Finally, over 40% of the study's participants are above the age of 30. It follows that majority of the people who filled out the survey are above the age of 30.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of Variables

Variables	Sample	Mean	Std. Dev
Innovativeness	392	3.41	0.81
Proactiveness	392	3.55	0.71
Risk Taking	392	3.21	0.58
Operational Performance	392	3.34	0.81

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking, and operational success. A 5-point Likert scale was used to quantify each of these factors. The mean response for innovativeness was 3.41, with a standard deviation of 0.81. Proactiveness scored 3.55 on average and had a standard deviation of 0.71, therefore it is also above average. The average level of risk taking was 3.21 and the standard deviation was 0.58, according to the study. For operational performance, respondents were mostly in agreement (3.34 on average, with a standard deviation of 0.81).

Measurement Model Analysis

To ascertain the measurement model, the reliability and validity of the model were assessed by the measurement model of PLS-SEM path modelling. As can be seen, Table 4.5 represents the reliability and convergent validity of constructs of the study.

Table 5: Construct Reliability and Convergent Validity

Construct	Items	Loadings	AVE	CR
Innovativeness	INV1	0.78	0.65	0.90
	INV2	0.77		
	INV3	0.77		
	INV4	0.83		
	INV5	0.86		
Operational Performance	PRF1	0.81	0.71	0.92
	PRF2	0.83		
	PRF3	0.86		
	PRF4	0.83		
	PRF5	0.86		
Proactiveness	PRO1	0.75	0.67	0.91
	PRO2	0.87		
	PRO3	0.79		
	PRO4	0.87		
	PRO5	0.79		
Risk Taking	RSK1	0.78	0.67	0.91
	RSK2	0.83		
	RSK3	0.86		
	RSK4	0.82		
	RSK5	0.79		

Source: SPSS Output, 2023.

Note: AVE represents Average Variance Extracted; CR represents Composite Reliability.

Garson proposed utilizing average variance extracted (AVE) to assess the convergent validity of constructs while using composite reliability to measure their dependability (2016). However, a CR 0.7 (Lee & Chen, 2013) is required for each reflective contract to achieve internal consistency reliability, and an AVE 0.5 is required for the contract to achieve convergent validity (Garson, 2016). The item loadings need to be more than 0.5. (Hair et al., 2014). Table 4.5 shows that the various constructs have sufficient levels of dependability and convergent evidence.

However, it is evident that each of these constructs explains more than half of the variation of its indicators, since the grand mean scores of each construct (i.e., the average of the squared of factor loadings of each construct's items) is over the threshold of 0.50. (Hair et al., 2014). As a result, convergent validity and dependability are stated to have been attained. Also, for discriminant validity the study utilized the Fornell and Larker criterion which states that the square root of AVE must be greater than the correlation with other variable in the study. This is as presented in Table 5.

Table 6: Discriminant Validity using Fornell-Larcker criterion

Construct	1	2	3	5
1. Innovativeness	**0.80**			
2. Operational Performance	0.67	**0.84**		
3. Proactiveness	0.58	0.61	**0.82**	
4. Risk Taking	0.60	0.57	0.53	**0.82**

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

Note: The bolded diagonal numbers represent the square root of the AVE of each latent construct.

However, the square root of AVE of any variable needs to be greater than its correlations with any other construct in order to determine its discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). In other words, the square root of the AVE needs to be greater than its correlation with other latent variables in order to attain discriminant validity for each of the study's reflective components (Garson, 2016). Thus, the values in bold reflect the square root of AVE of each latent variable; as can be seen, these numbers are greater than the equivalent correlation of each construct with any other latent variable, demonstrating the accomplishment of discriminant validity of the constructs of this study.

Test of Hypotheses

It is important to carry out a bootstrapping analysis to determine the direct effect of the exogenous variables on the endogenous variable of the study. Bootstrapping was done by using 5000 sub samples using 392 cases. Table 7 presents the result of the test of hypotheses.

Table 7: Direct Path Coefficient

Hypotheses	Beta Value	Std. Error	T Stat	P Value	Decision
H_{01} PRO->PRF	0.28	0.09	2.936***	0.00	Rejected
H_{02} RSK->PRF	0.19	0.09	2.051***	0.04	Rejected
H_{03} INV->PRF	0.39	0.13	2.955***	0.00	Rejected
R Square	0.52				

Source: SPSS Output, 2023 Note. *** p < 0.01; **p < 0.05; *p < 0.1

Proactiveness has significant relationship with operational performance of registered poultry farms. From Table 7, proactiveness significantly relate to operational performance at less than 1% (β=0.28, p<0.01). Therefore, Ho_1 that states that there is no significant effect of pro-activeness on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis is rejected. Similarly, risk taking has a significant positive relationship with the operational performance of registered poultry farms at less than five percent significant level (β=0.19, p<0.05). Consequently, Ho_2 that states that there is no significant effect of risk-taking on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis is rejected. Similarly, Innovativeness has significant relationship with operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis at less than 1% significant level (β=0.39, p<0.01). Therefore, Ho_3 that states that there is no significant effect of innovativeness on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis is also rejected.

Adjusted R square is 0.52, meaning 52% variance in operational performance of registered poultry farms is accounted for by proactiveness, risk taking and innovativeness. That is to say that the combination of these variables will lead to a significant increase in the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis. However, the study calculated for the effect size of each of the independent variables on the dependent variable. Effect size was done using f^2 statistics as advised by Hair et al. (2014).

Table 8: Effect Size of Latent Constructs

Constructs	f^2	Effect Size
Proactiveness	0.10	Small
Risk Taking	0.05	Small
Innovativeness	0.18	Medium

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

The result on Table 8 revealed that innovativeness is the most important predictor of the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis, as innovativeness has a medium effect size on the performance of registered poultry farms. On the other hand, both proactiveness and risk taking have small effect sizes on the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis.

Table 9: Predictive Relevance of Exogenous Variables

Construct	SSO	SSE	Q^2 (=1-SSE/SSO)
Operational Performance	500.000	323.959	0.35

Source: SPSS Output, 2023

From Table 9, it is seen that the Q^2 values of operational performance of registered poultry farms is greater than 0, which means all the exogenous variables have 35% relevance in predicting the endogenous variable, operational performance. This means that model has a high predictive relevance on the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna Metropolis.

Proactiveness has a significant positive effect on the operational performance of registered poultry farms at less than 1% significant level. This implies that entrepreneurial orientation measured by proactiveness has a significant positive effect of operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis of Kaduna state at 99% confidence level. Thus, the finding provides evidence to reject the null hypothesis which states that proactiveness has no significant effect on operational performance. The finding is in agreement with the studies of Bhadari and Ampostira (2021), Okoli et al. (2021) and Khan et al. (2021).

Innovativeness has a significant positive effect on the operational performance of registered poultry farms at less than 1% significant level. This implies that increase in innovativeness will lead to an increase in the operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis of Kaduna state at 99% confidence level. Hence, the findings provide evidence to reject the null hypothesis which states that innovativeness has no significant effect on operational performance. The finding is in agreement with studies of Forcadell and Ubeda (2020), Khalid (2019) and Adesanya (2018).

Risk-taking has a significant positive effect on the operational performance of registered poultry farms at less than 5% significance level as denoted by a co-efficient value 0.318; t-value 13.431 which is above F critical value and p-value of 0.000. This implies that risk taking has a significant positive effect on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis of Kaduna state at 99% confidence level. Hence, the finding provides evidence to reject the null hypothesis which states that risk taking has no significant effect on operational performance. The finding is in agreement with studies of Lahiru (2021), Kyal et al. (2021), Azeem et al. (2018), Dative (2018) and Zhen et al. (2018) and Syed et al. (2017).

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the study concludes that entrepreneurial orientation has significant effect on operational performance of registered poultry farms in Kaduna metropolis. Operational performance tends to improve when risk-taking capacity of SMEs increases. Also, proactiveness and innovativeness capacity of SMEs significantly affect their performance in Kaduna Metropolis. Therefore, the study recommends that the poultry farmers should make minor adjustments to their products and/or service in order to achieve their operational Performance.

REFERENCES

Ademosu, A., & Morakinyo, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance of small and medium scale enterprises in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. OEconomica, Danubius University of Galati*, *17*(2), 36-51.

Adesanya, O. D. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance of non-oil exporting SMES in Lagos State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, *22*(3), 24-31.

Ahmed, A. (2019). The role of entrepreneurial orientation to SME performance in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, *23*(7), 39-46.

Aka, L. K. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation among small and medium enterprises in Côte d'Ivoire; 11(33), 210-218.

Alam, S. S., Mohd Jani, M. F., & Omar, N. A. (2017). An empirical study of success factors of women entrepreneurs in Southern region in Malaysia. *International Journal of Economics and Finance, 3*(2), 166 – 175.

Altinay, L., & Wang, C. (2011). The influence of an entrepreneur's socio-cultural characteristics on the entrepreneurial orientation of small firms. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *18*(4). 673-694.

Andy, O. (2007). *Research methods: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Act Press.

Bhadari, P. & Ampostira, F. (2021) Model of Entrepreneurial Orientation, Competitive Advantage and Performance of Women-Owned Enterprises in Gandaki Province, Nepal. *Open Journal of Business and Management, 9*(6). 32-42.

Billie, S. (2017). Packaging small and medium scale industries for equity investment. Workshop organized by the Bankers Committee for Small and Medium Scale Enterprises.

Covin, J. G., & Slevin, O. P. (1991). Entrepreneurial versus conservative firms: A comparison of strategies and performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, *28*(5), 439-462.

Dan, R. (2020) Applying entrepreneurial orientation to a medium sized firm. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 18*(3), 352–379.

Dess, G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firms' performance. The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. *Journal of Business venturing*, *16*, 429-451.

Fornell, C., & Larcker, D., (1981). Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18*(1), 39–50.

Forcadell, F. J., & Ubeda, F. (2020) Individual entrepreneurial orientation and performance: The mediating role of international entrepreneurship. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 5*(2), 13-37.

Garba, A. (2020) Effect of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of small and medium scale enterprises in selected North Central Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Business and Management, 8*(7), 43-49.

Garson, D. (2016). *Partial least squares: Regression and structural equation models*. Statistical Associates Publishing.

Grimmer, L., Miles, M. P., Byrom, J. & Grimmer, M. (2017). The impact of resources and strategic orientation on small retail firm performance. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *55*(S1), 7-26.

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., & Anderson, R. (2014). *Multivariate data analysis (7th edition)*. Pearson New International Edition.

Ibrahim, A. U & Abu, M. M. (2020). Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Firms Performance. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *10*(2), 99-106.

International Finance Corporation report (2020). www.ifc.org

Khalid G. A. (2019). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation and total quality management on performance: Evidence from Saudi SMEs. Benchmarking: *An International Journal*. 10.1108/BIJ-08-2019-0391.

Khan, M. A., Zubair, S. S., Rathore, K., Ijaz, M., & Khalil, S. (2021). Impact of entrepreneurial orientation dimensions on performance of small enterprises: Do entrepreneurial competencies matter? *Cogent Business Management*, *8*(1), 194-199.

Kothari, C. R., & Garg, G. (2014). *Research methodology: Methods and techniques* (3rd edition). New Age International Limited.

Lahiru, F. (2021). Entrepreneurial Orientations on SMEs' innovativeness in Sri Lanka. *Business Journal*. 4(6) 41-56.

Mabotuwana, V. S. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: an empirical investigation on small and medium enterprises of western province in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Educational Research, 2*(5), 135-140.

Mahmood, A. (2017). Is entrepreneurial competency and business success relationship contingent upon business environment? A study of Malaysian SMEs. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, *16*(3), 182-203.

Mahmood, R., & Hanafi, N., (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance of women owned small and medium enterprises in Malaysia. Competitive advantage as a mediator. *International Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, *4*(1).

Mburu, R. M., Gichira, R. & Kyalo, T. (2017). Risk taking and firm performance among family owned enterprises in Nairobi County: The *Strategic Journal of Business & Change Management*, *4*(20), 262 – 272.

Miller, D. (2014). International entrepreneurial orientation: conceptual considerations, research themes, measurement issues, and future research directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 38*(1), 11–44.

Miller, D., (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science, 29*(9), 770-791.

Miller, D, & Shamsie J. (1996). The resource-based view of the firm in two environments: The Hollywood film studios from 1936 to 1965. *Academy of Management Journa*l, *39*, 519–543.

Mishra, A. (2019). A multi-agent architecture for outsourcing SMEs manufacturing supply chain," Robot. *Computer Integration in Manufacturing*, *36*, 36–44.

National Bureau of Statistics (2020). www.nbs.ng.com

Nicholas, W. (2011). *Social sciences research methodology: The basics*. Rutledge.

Okoli, A. Nwosu, S. & Okechukwu, N. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance of selected SMEs in Southeast Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management Research, 6*(4), 108-115.

Ola, O. I. (2019). The impact of entrepreneurship orientation on entrepreneurs' compensation in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies*, *3*(3), 102-116.

Olusegun, K. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation in the segment of micro-enterprises: evidence from Czech Republic. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Knowledge, 9*(13) 72-89.

Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Frese, M., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 761-786.

Rauch, M., Wiklund, S., Lumpkin, A., & Frese, K. D. (2014). Evaluating the role of entrepreneurial orientation to the performance of micro, small and medium enterprises: An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 221-230.

Shehu, H., & Mahmood, E. (2014). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation on competency and micro-enterprise performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 12(3), 379–398.

Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics (5th edition)*. Pearson.

Tehseen, S., & Ramayah, T. (2015). Entrepreneurial competencies and SMEs business success: The contingent role of external integration. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(1), 50.

Wales, W. J., Patel, P. C., Parida, V., & Kreiser, P. M. (2013). Nonlinear effects of entrepreneurial orientation on small firm performance: The moderating role of resource orchestration capabilities. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, *7*, 93–121.

Zikmund, W. G., & Babin, B. J. (2007). *Exploring marketing research*. South-Western.