**International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development**
**Online ISSN: 2349-4182, Print ISSN: 2349-5979**
**Impact Factor: RJIF 5.72**
**Received: 04-03-2018; Accepted: 04-04-2018**
**www.allsubjectjournal.com**
**Volume 5; Issue 4; April 2018; Page No. 26-32**

# Effect of entrepreneurship orientation on the performance of selected manufacturing firm in Enugu State, Nigeria

**Maduagwu Nneka Esther[1], Agu Okoro Agu[2], Emezue Leonard Nnadugwu[3]**
[1] Department of Business Administration, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Nigeria
[2] Department of Business Management, College of Management Sciences, Evangel University, Akaeze Ebonyi, Nigeria
[3] Department of Center for Entrepreneurship Development and Research, University of Nigeria Enugu Campus, Nigeria

**Abstract**
The study focuses on the effect of entrepreneurship orientation on the performance of selected manufacturing firm in Enugu State, Nigeria. The study sought to determine the effect of proactiveness on customer satisfaction in Iinnosson technical and industry limited, ascertain the nature of the relationship between innovativeness and product quality in Innosson technical and industry limited and determine the extent at which risk –taking affect productivity in Innosson technical and industry limited. The study had a population size of 1258, out of which a sample size of 303 was realised using Taro Yamene's formula at 5% error tolerance and 95% level of confidence. Instrument used for data collection was primarily questionnaire and interview. Out of 303 copies of the questionnaire that were distributed, 278 copies were returned while 25 were not returned. The survey research design was adopted for the study. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient and simple linear regression statistical tools. The findings indicate that Proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in Innosson technical and industry limited ($r = 0.890$; $F = 1054.328$; $t = 7.685$; $p < 0.05$). There is a positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality in Innosson technical and industry limited ($r = .771$, $P < .05$). Risk –taking significantly affects productivity in Innosson technical and industry limited ($r = 0.724$; $F = 303.480$; $t = 3.439$; $p < 0.05$). The study concluded that entrepreneurial firm is one that engages in product-market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is first to come up with 'proactive' innovations, beating competitors to the punch.The study recommended that All manufacturing firms should forecast into future to ascertain the likely needs of the customers, and adopt a proactive measures to address those needs for the achievement of customer satisfaction.

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship orientation, performance, proactiveness, innovativenes and risk–taking

## Introduction
The roots of entrepreneurial orientation can be traced to the strategic choice perspective on strategy (Lumpkin and Dess 1996) [18], thus essentially, environment alone does not determine the success of the corporation, but strategic decision making also has an impact on it. However, entrepreneurial orientation literature does acknowledge that environmental characteristics, as well as resources and other organizational factors are contingent to the EO-performance relationship.

Entrepreneurial orientation is a strategic orientation that captures the specifically entrepreneurial aspects of firms' strategies (Bhuian *et al*. 2005) [21]. Entrepreneurial orientation represents strategy making processes that provide organizations with a basis for entrepreneurial decisions and actions (Rauch, Wiklund, & Frese, 2009) [17]. It encompasses specific organizational-level behavior to perform risk-taking, self- directed activities, engage in innovation and react proactively and aggressively to out-perform the competitors in the marketplace and hence enhance firm performance (Hakala, 2011) [20]. The entrepreneurial tendencies toward risk taking, innovativeness

And proactiveness are considered as central to entrepreneurial orientation (Covin and Slevin 1989) [22].

EO can also help to explain which managerial processes lead to the early recognition of these signals which will likely lead to better performance than that of competitors. Furthermore, EO reflects the priority that firms place on the process of identifying and exploiting market opportunities (Baker, 2009). Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) is a significant factor for a firm's success (Wang, 2008). In a dynamic business environment, future profit streams are uncertain and businesses need to continuously seek out new opportunities and efficiently exploit them (Zhou *et al*., 2007b). EO refers to the strategy making processes that key decision makers of a firm use to enact their firm's organizational purpose, sustain its vision, and create competitive advantage(s) (Frese and DeKruif, 2000) [27].

Miller (1983) [14] states that EO involves an organization's willingness to innovate and rejuvenate its market offerings (innovativeness); to take risks by trying out new and uncertain products and services (risk taking); and to be more proactive than its competitors in seeking out new marketplace opportunities (proactiveness). In order to grow and succeed in today's rapidly changing business environment, companies

regardless of their size need to constantly seek for new opportunities, to which possessing an EO has been recognized as potentially beneficial (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005). EO as a driving force behind entrepreneurial activities has become a central theme of the discipline of entrepreneurship (Covin and Wales, 2011) [23].

EO is an important phenomenon that plays a crucial role in aligning businesses to market demands. As a result, studies have investigated the link between EO and firm's performance making it a popular area of study. Performance is important to many firms and a lot of them seek to maximize shareholder wealth and pay good dividends to their investors through high performance (Odhiambo, 2015).

**Statement of the problem**

With today's complexity in conducting business transactions, entrepreneurial orientation (EO) can be regarded as a crucial factor to ensure the success of a business. At the same time, firms are forced to be involved in seeking out new opportunities. EO reflects the behavior of the entrepreneurs like innovation, proactive and risk taking. In this manner, firms have to be innovative involving innovations of products, services and processes, have to be more proactive compared to competitors in all aspect and be risk-oriented. But organization that feel less concern on the turbulent nature of it business environment are bound to overwhelm by the threat that exist such business environment which might result into loss of customer base, decline in productivity and profitability. Thus the study seeks to investigate the effect of entrepreneurship orientation on the performance of selected manufacturing firm in Enugu State, Nigeria

**Objectives of the study**

The specific objectives of this study include the following:

1. To determine the effect of proactiveness on customer satisfaction in innosson technical and industry limited
2. To ascertain the nature of the relationship between innovativeness and product quality in innosson technical and industry limited
3. To determine the extent at which risk –taking affect productivity in innosson technical and industry limited

**Research Questions**

To achieve the above objectives, the following research questions were raised

1. What is the effect of proactiveness on customer satisfaction in innosson technical and industry limited
2. What is the nature of the relationship between innovativeness and product quality in innosson technical and industry limited
3. To what extent does risk –taking affect productivity in innosson technical and industry limited

**Research Hypotheses**

The study proposes the following hypotheses

1. Proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in innosson technical and industry limited
2. There is a positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality in innosson technical and industry limited
3. Risk –taking significantly affect productivity in innosson technical and industry limited

**Conceptual Framework**

**Concept of entrepreneurial orientation**

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) [18] define entrepreneurial orientation as the processes, practices and decision-making activities that lead to new-entry. The entrepreneurial orientation of a firm is demonstrated by the extent to which the top managers are inclined to take business-related risks (the risk-taking dimension), to favour change and innovation in order to obtain a competitive advantage for their firm (the innovation dimension), and to compete aggressively with other firms (the proactiveness dimension) (Miller, 1983) [14].

**Innovativeness and Business performance**

According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996) [18], innovativeness is defined as the firm's propensity to engage and support new ideas, upgrading, experimentation and creative processes which may produce a variety of products, services or new processes. Hence, innovativeness could be considered a treat to the existing business practices and technology (Atuahene-Gima & Ko, 2001) [4]. An innovative practice can be in the form of a research or engineering venture geared towards creating new technology, products or processes (Renko, Carsrud & Brannback, 2009) [5]. Innovativeness refers to a willingness to support creativity and experimentation to introduce new products or services, technological leadership and research and development in developing new processes (Lumpkin and Dess, 2001) [10].

**Proactiveness and Business performance**

Proactiveness involves a process conducted to determine and act on future needs and requirements through the search for new opportunities which may or may not be connected to the firm's current operations (Venkatraman, 1989) [6]. According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996) [18], proactiveness refers to how a firm connects itself with possible marketing opportunities in a new entry process. Hence, firms with high proactive outlook would be able to predict any changes or requirements in the market and thus able to take advantage quickly on a particular matter (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001) [10]. A firm's proactive outlook provides a good strategy as its quick and early action helps to guarantee high returns and further strengthens the firm's presence and brand (Lieberman & Montgomery, 1988) [11].

**Risk-taking and Business performance**

Risk-taking involves the propensity of the firm's management to make decision on investment and plan strategic action on uncertain matters (Covin & Slevin, 1988; Miller, 1983) [12, 14]. According to Miller and Friesen (1978) [13], it is defined as "the readiness level of the managers to commit to huge resources and risk, while facing a reasonable chance of costly failure'. Therefore, risks are closely related to elements such as uncertainty, capital opportunities as well as commitment to anticipated sources and returns (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Miller, 1983) [18, 14]. However, Coulthard (2007) [15] found that risk-taking involves making decisions which are planned and taken into consideration by the firm. Risk taking refers to a tendency to take bold actions, such as entering unknown new

markets, committing a large portion of resources to ventures with uncertain outcomes or borrowing heavily (Lumpkin and Dess, 2001) [10]

**Theoretical Review**

The theory of achievement is one of the most applied theories on entrepreneurship introduced by McClelland (1961). Individuals with strong need for achievement demonstrated a higher performance in challenging tasks and through innovativeness, looked for new and better ways to improve their performance (Littunen 2000; Utsch & Rauch 2000) [16, 9]. McClelland's theory stated that, starting a business required people who took moderate risks, assumed personal responsibilities, paid attention to feedback of costs and profits, and found new innovative ways of developing new products or services. People with high needs for achievement and motivation were found with those characteristics (Raposo, do Paco & Ferreira 2008) [8]. McClelland‟s theory depicted an ideal type of „entrepreneurial personality‟ which included the needs of achievement, affiliation and power

**Empirical Review**

Dzulkarnain, Abdullah and Shuhymee (2014) [19] conducted a study on Linking Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: The Examination toward Performance of Cooperatives Firms in Northern Region of Peninsular Malaysia**.** entrepreneurial orientation (EO) and its influence on the performance of business firms have received widespread attention in the fields of entrepreneurship and strategy. A survey was conducted to assess the influence of five constructs of EO, including innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness toward the firm's business performance to provide additional knowledge on this subject. Assessments took place at the company level involved 104 cooperatives firms in the Northern region of Peninsular Malaysia. Multiple regression analysis carried out revealed that only the innovativeness and proactiveness constructs had significant and positive relationship with the firm's business performance. On the other hand, the constructs of risk-taking, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness do not show significant relationship with the firm's business performance. These findings are useful for a better understanding of strategies of entrepreneurial orientation and its role in improving business performance in the cooperative sector.

Ali and Abdel (2014) conducted a study on entrepreneurial orientation and performance of women owned and managed micro and small Enterprises In Somalia. The main aim of this study is to examine the role of entrepreneurial orientation on performance of women owned and managed enterprises in Somalia. Specifically, the study investigates the effect of 1) innovation, 2) risk taking; and 3) Pro-activeness of entrepreneur orientation on business performance. By using purposive sampling, 200 women from women owned companies in Somalia participated in the study. The findings indicate that innovation (β=. 362, t=4.697, $p < 0.05$)

Washington, James and Peter (2016) did a study on entrepreneurial orientation, Business Development Services, Business Environment, and Performance: A Critical Literature Review. This paper examines the role of business development services, internal and external business environments on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm's performance. The article is a theoretical discourse and uses literature from secondary sources in the analysis. The paper finds that past studies conceptualized entrepreneurial orientation as a three factor single-dimensional model and a five factor multidimensional model. Studies using the three factor model have reported different results to those adopting the five factor approach. This has led to inconsistencies in the empirical results of entrepreneurial orientation on firm's performance. This article also finds that business development services play a mediating role in the entrepreneurial orientation and performance relationship, and that external environment moderates this relationship. However, the paper finds no role of internal environment in the EO-firm's performance relationship. The paper concludes that the link between entrepreneurial orientation and performance is still a worthy area for further study since contradictions still exist in empirical studies. This study recommends that future studies can use a contingency framework to focus on how other factors are likely to affect this relationship.

Mehrdad, Abdolrahim, Hamidreza, Mohsen and Ramin (2011) carryout a study on Entrepreneurial Orientation and Innovation Performance: The Mediating Role of Knowledge Management. This study tried to accentuate the role of Knowledge Management (KM) in the relations of Entrepreneurial Orientation (EO) and innovation performance. The population in the study was 164 Iranian SMEs. This study developed and simultaneously tested three hypotheses about: (1) The impact of EO on innovation performance, (2) The impact of EO on KM, and (3) The impact of km on innovation performance. LISREL software was used to test the hypotheses. The results indicated that entrepreneurial orientation both directly (B = 0.38) and indirectly through the knowledge management (B = 0.377) affected innovation performance. Hence, knowledge management acts as a mediator between entrepreneurial orientation and innovation performance

**Research Method and Materials**

The study adopted survey method by administering structured questionnaire with aim to gather primary data from the staff of Innoson Technical limited Emene as regard to competitive intelligence and competitive advantage. The scope of the study covered the staff of Innoson Technical limited. The population of the study is 1258. A sample size of 303 was determined using Taro Yamane and the validity of the instrument was given to management experts who modified and made the necessary correction so that the instrument can measure what it ought to measure. The reliability was obtained using Cronbach's Alpha, which had a value of 0.970, which indicates that there is internal consistency of the instrument. Out of the 303 questionnaires, 278 were correctly filled and returned. The hypotheses were tested using Pearson Product moment correlation coefficient and Simple linear regression.

## Result and Discussion

**Table 1:** Proactiveness and customer satisfaction

| Questionnaire items | Agree/strongly agree | Disagree/strongly disagree | Undecided | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| organizations that consider their customer needs always achieve customer satisfaction | 228 | 38 | 12 | 278 |
| Proactiveness positively affect customer satisfaction | 239 | 32 | 7 | 278 |
| Total | 467 | 70 | 19 | 556 |

***Source*:** Fieldwork, 2017

According to table (1) based on aggregate response 467 (84%) indicated strongly agree, 70(13%) indicated disagree while 19(3%) indicated undecided. This implies that proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in innosson technical and industry limited

Hi: Proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in innosson technical and industry limited

**Table 1a:** Model Summary[b]

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .890[a] | .793 | .792 | .19844 | .290 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), proactiveness | | | | | |
| b. Dependent Variable: customer satisfaction | | | | | |

**Table 1b:** ANOVA[a]

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 41.520 | 1 | 41.520 | 1054.328 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 10.869 | 276 | .039 | | |
| | Total | 52.388 | 277 | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: customer satisfaction | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), proactiveness | | | | | | |

**Table 1c:** Coefficients[a]

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .238 | .031 | | 7.685 | .000 |
| | proactiveness | .758 | .023 | .890 | 32.470 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: customer satisfaction | | | | | | |

R = 0.890
$R^2$ = 0. 793
F = 1054.328
T = 7.685
DW = 0. 290

### Interpretation

The regression sum of squares (41.520) is greater than the residual sum of squares (10.869), which indicates that more of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model. The significance value of the F statistics (0.000) is less than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance.

R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.890, indicates that there is positive relationship between proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction. R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 79.3% of the variation in customer satisfaction is explained by the model. With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low, with a value of about. 19844. The Durbin Watson statistics of 0.290, which is not more than 2, indicates there is no auto correlation.

Proactiveness coefficient of 0. 890, indicates a positive significance between proactiveness and affect customer satisfaction, which is statistically significant (with t = 7.685). Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted. Thus proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in

**Table 2:** There is a positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality.

| Questionnaire items | Agree/strongly agree | Disagree/strongly disagree | Undecided | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Organization that support new ideas produce quality product | 247 | 27 | 4 | 278 |
| There is positive link innativeness and product quality | 261 | 15 | 2 | 278 |
| Total | 508 | 42 | 6 | 556 |

***Source*:** Fieldwork, 2017

According to table (2) based on aggregate respond 508 (91%) indicated strongly agree, 42(8%) indicated disagree while 6(1%) indicated undecided. This implies that there is a positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality in innosson technical and industry limited

**Table 2a:** Descriptive Statistics

| | Mean | Std. Deviation | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| Innovativeness | 1.1295 | .37685 | 278 |
| Product quality | 1.0683 | .27990 | 278 |

**Table 2b:** Correlations

| | | Innovativeness | Product quality |
|---|---|---|---|
| Innovativeness | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .771** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 278 | 278 |
| Product quality | Pearson Correlation | .771** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 278 | 278 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | |

Table (1a) shows the descriptive statistics of the innovativeness and product quality with a mean response of 1.1295 and std. deviation of. 37685 for innovatveness and a mean response of 1.0683 and std. deviation of. 27990 for product quality and number of respondents (278). By careful observation of standard deviation values, there is not much difference in terms of the standard deviation scores. This implies that there is about the same variability of data points between the dependent and independent variables.

Table (2b) is the Pearson correlation coefficient for innovativeness and product quality. The correlation coefficient shows 0.771. This value indicates that correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2tailed) and implies that there is a significant positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality (r =. 771). The computed correlations coefficient is greater than the table value of r =. 195 with 276 degrees of freedom (df. = n-2) at alpha level for a two-tailed test (r =. 771, p<. 05). However, since the computed r =. 771, is greater than the table value of. 195 we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant relationship between innovativeness and product quality (r =.771, P<.05)

**Table 3:** Risk–taking significantly and productivity

| Questionnaire items | Agree/strongly agree | Disagree/strongly disagree | Undecided | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Plan strategic action on uncertain matter improve productivity | 268 | 7 | 3 | 278 |
| Discovery a new market and wining customer increase productivity | 254 | 21 | 2 | 278 |
| Total | 522 | 28 | 5 | 556 |

***Source*:** Fieldwork, 2017

According to table (3) based on aggregate response 522(94%) indicated strongly agree, 28(5%) indicated disagree while 5(1%) indicated undecided. This implies that risk –taking significantly affect productivity in innosson

**Table 3a:** Model Summary[b]

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Durbin-Watson |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .724[a] | .524 | .522 | .21812 | .266 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Risk –taking | | | | | |
| b. Dependent Variable: Productivity | | | | | |

**Table 3b:** ANOVA[a]

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 14.438 | 1 | 14.438 | 303.480 | .000[b] |
| | Residual | 13.130 | 276 | .048 | | |
| | Total | 27.568 | 277 | | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: Productivity | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Risk –taking | | | | | | |

**Table 3c:** Coefficients[a]

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .185 | .054 | | 3.439 | .001 |
| | Risk – taking | .865 | .050 | .724 | 17.421 | .000 |
| a. Dependent Variable: Productivity | | | | | | |

R = 0.724
$R^2$ = 0. 524
F = 303.480
T = 3.439
DW = 0. 266

**Interpretation**

The regression sum of squares (14.438) is greater than the residual sum of squares (13.130), which indicates that more of the variation in the dependent variable is not explained by the model. The significance value of the F statistics (0.000) is less than 0.05, which means that the variation explained by the model is not due to chance.

R, the correlation coefficient which has a value of 0.724, indicates that there is positive relationship between risk – taking and productivity. R square, the coefficient of determination, shows that 52.4% of the variation in productivity is explained by the model.

With the linear regression model, the error of estimate is low, with a value of about. 21812. The Durbin Watson statistics of 0.266, which is not more than 2, indicates there is no autocorrelation.

The risk –taking coefficient of 0.724 indicates a positive significance between risk –taking and productivity, which is statistically significant (with t = 3.439). Therefore, the null hypothesis should be rejected and the alternative hypothesis accordingly accepted. Thus Risk –taking significantly affect productivity in innosson technical and industry limited

**Summary of Findings**

Findings at the end of the research were:

1. Proactiveness significantly affect customer satisfaction in

innosson technical and industry limited (r = 0.890; F= 1054.328; t = 7.685; p< 0.05)
2. There is a positive relationship between innovativeness and product quality in innosson technical and industry limited (r =.771, P<.05)
3. Risk –taking significantly affect productivity in innosson technical and industry limited (r = 0.724; F = 303.480; t = 3.439 ; p< 0.05)

**Conclusion**

The study concluded that entrepreneurial firm is one that engages in product-market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures, and is first to come up with 'proactive' innovations, beating competitors to the punch. Such characteristics are associated with improved firm performance in today's business environments where product and business model life cycles are shortened and where the future profit streams from existing operations are uncertain and businesses need to constantly seek out new opportunities

**Recommendation**

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made.

1. All manufacturing firms should forecast into future to ascertain the likely needs of the customers, and adopt a proactive measures to address those needs for the achievement of customer satisfaction
2. Manufacturing firms should continuously embark on creativity and innovation, in order to improve the quality of their product and launch a new product that will stand for the test of time
3. Risk is wealth, so manufacturing firms should careful calculate risk associated with any business venture, before going into it, for the purpose of improving productivity

**References**


1. Ali YSA, AbdeL HA. conducted a study on entrepreneurial orientation and performance of women owned and managed micro and small Enterprises In Somalia, ZENITH International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research. 2014; 4(1):12.
2. Washington O, James M, Peter K Entrepreneurial Orientation, Business Development Services, Business Environment, and Performance: A Critical Literature Review, European Scientific Journal. 2016; 12(28):1857 - 78.
3. Baker WE, Sinkula JM. The Complementary Effects of Market Orientation and Entrepreneurial Orientation on Profitability in Small Businesses. Journal of Small Business Management. 2009; 47(4):443-464.
4. Atuahene-Gima K, Ko A. An empirical investigation of the effect of market orientation and entrepreneurship orientation alignment on product innovation. Organization Science. 2001; 12(1):54-74.
5. Renko M, Carsrud A, Brannback M. The effect of a market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and technological capability on innovativeness: A study of young biotechnology ventures in the United States and in Scandinavia. Journal of Small Business Management. 2009; 47(3):331-369.
6. Venkatraman N. Strategic orientation of business enterprises: The construct, dimensionality and measurement. Management Science. 1989; 35(8):942-962.
7. McClelland DC. 'The achieving society', Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand, 1961.
8. Raposo M, do Paco A, Ferreira J. Entrepreneur's profile: taxonomy of attibutes and motivations of university students, Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development. 2008; 15(2):405-418.
9. Utsch A, Rauch A. 'Innovativeness and initiative as mediators between achievement orientation and venture performance, European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology. 2000; 9(1):45-62.
10. Lumpkin G, Dess G. Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle. Journal of Business Venturing. 2001; 16:429-451.
11. Lieberman M, Montgomery DB. First-mover advantages. Strategic Management Journal. 1988; 9:41-58.
12. Covin J, Slevin D. The influence of organization structure on the utility of an entrepreneurial top management style. Journal of Management Studies. 1988; 25(3):217-234.
13. Miller D, Friesen P. Archetypes of strategy formulation. Management Science, 1978, 921-933.
14. Miller D. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. Management Science. 1983; 29(7):770-791.
15. Coulthard M. The role of entrepreneurial orientaion on firm performance and the potential influence of relational dynamism. Journal of Global Business and Technology. 2007; 3(1):29-39.
16. Littunen H. Entrepreneurship and the characteristics of the entrepreneurial personality, International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research. 2000; 6(6):295-309.
17. Rauch A, Wiklund J, Lumpkin G, Frese M. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 2009, 761-787.
18. Lumpkin G, Dess G. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. The Academy of Management Review. 1996; 21(1):135-172.
19. Dzulkarnain M, Abdullah AG, Shuhymee A. Linking Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: The Examination toward Performance of Cooperatives Firms in Northern Region of Peninsular Malaysia, International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship. 2014; 4(2):247.
20. Hakala H. Strategic Orientation Management in Literature: Three Approaches to Understanding the Interraction between Market, Technology, and Entrepreneurial Orientation. International Journal of Management Review. 2011; 13(2):198-205.
21. Bhuian SN, Menguc B, Bell SJ. Just entrepreneurial enough: the moderating effect of entrepreneurship on the relationship between market orientation and performance, Journal of Business Research. 2005; 58(1):9-17.
22. Covin JG, Slevin DP. Strategic management of small

firms in hostile and benign environments, Strategic Management Journal. 1989; 10(1):75-87.
23. Covin JG, Wales WJ. The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, [e-journal] Published online. Available through: Wiley Online Library, Accessed, 2011.
24. Wiklund J, Shepherd D. Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. Strategic Management Journal. 2003; 24(13):1307-1314.
25. Wang CL. Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. Entrep. Theory Pract. 2008; 32(4):635-657.
26. Zhou L, Wu W-P, Luo X. Internationalization and the performance of born-global SMEs: the mediating role of social networks. J. Int. Bus. Stud. 2007b; 38:673-690.
27. Frese M, DeKruif M. Psychological success factors of entrepreneurship in Africa: a selective literature review. In Successand failure of microbusiness owners in Africa: a psychological approach, edited by M Frese. Quorum: Westport, Conn, 2000, pp. 1-30.