International Journal of Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship Development in Africa

Volume 10, Issue 5, PP 131-147, ISSN: 2360-9402, November, 2022, DOI: 1726423332210460
Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
http://arcnjournals.org
journals@arcnjournals.org
©Africa Research Corps Network (ARCN)

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Survival of Startups in Rivers State

Chiedu F. Amah[1] and B. Chima Onuoha[2]
[1]Doctoral Student Department of Management, University of port Harcourt.
[2]Professor of Management, Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt.

Abstract: *This study investigated the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on the survival of startups in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria. The population for this study comprised 72 randomly selected registered startups in Rivers State of Nigeria. The study adopted the cross-sectional method of the quasi-experimental research design. A population of 160 employees from the 72 start-ups was studied. A sample size of 114 employees was obtained using the Taro Yamane formula. Out of 114 questionnaires distributed, 104 questionnaires were considered for analysis, arriving at a response rate of 91%. The Spearman's Rank Order Correlation Coefficient analysis technique was used to appreciate the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the survival of startups. The result showed that entrepreneurial orientation has a positive and significant relationship with the survival of startups at a 0.05 significance level. The study concluded that entrepreneurial orientation positively and significantly influenced the survival of startups in Rivers State of Nigeria. The study recommends that startups should adopt entrepreneurial orientation to order to boost their survival chances.*

Key words: *Entrepreneurial Orientation, Survival of Start-ups, Innovativeness, Proactiveness, Entrepreneurial Skills*

Published by
Africa Research Corps Network (ARCN)

in Collaboration with
International Academic Journal for Global Research (iajgr) Publishing (USA)

1.0 Introduction

According to the (Harvard Business Review of July 2018), eight of every ten startups die in their first year. The challenges facing startups in Nigeria are enormous as the country ranks a staggering 131st position out of 190 countries on ease of doing business in 2019. The high mortality of startups in Nigeria was attributed to factors in the external and internal business environment, while the problems of infrastructure and funding persist, it has been argued that startups suffer more from internal issues bedeviling most entrepreneurs, (Ofurum, 2021). He argued that in most cases startups have owner-manager and the limitation of skill and expertise contributes to business failure, poor financial management and planning, low startup capital, and wrong source of funding contributed significantly to the failure of many startups. Entrepreneurial skills of proactiveness, risk-taking, and innovation have given many businesses a ladder to success as startups continue to grow despite the huge number of startup mortality, Robert (2011). Innovation has paved way for many startups and has given businesses superior value and competitive advantage, hence the need for entrepreneurial orientation and development among startups (Kotler, & Keller 2008).

Entrepreneurial orientation is linked to the ability of startups in this sense to evaluate and exploit openings (Messersmith & Wales, 2013) as well as review these opportunities or openings in other to take advantage of them. Entrepreneurship orientation is seen as an uninterrupted affiliation, and connection that helps an organization stand out in the singularity of increasingly and progressively competitive, tempestuous, turbulent, and stormy business environment (Messersmith & Wales, 2013), as such; a strong entrepreneurship orientation in terms of innovativeness and pro-activeness is synonymous or identical with investigations into the progressively essential area of startups going global.

Mienpre and Onuoha, (2018) observed that in totality, the aim and idea behind entrepreneurial orientation are to establish self-employing businesses, a new enterprise that ensures the availability of new products, to meet shareholders‟ and customers‟ value, and to satisfy the marketplace, thereby creating job opportunities that will contribute to the growth of the economy (Duru, 2011). This is in line with the earlier work of Drucker (1970) who made it plain that the activities of the entrepreneur will influence the economy as the entrepreneurs take risks, create new business ideas and values from the existing ones, and start up new organizations.

According to Robert (2011), survival of the organization can give small organizations endless advantages, with things like more prominent proficiency from economies of scale, expanded power, a more prominent capacity to withstand changes in the market, and an expanded survival rate.

Statement of Problem

The modern business environment is characterized by intense global competition. Firms face more challenging changes than ever in the way they compete in what is now a global and technology flooded economy, rapid technological changes such as methods, components, and techniques with processes to create a product or service. These factors have prompted management to search for means to ensure organizational survival. Entrepreneurial characteristics are considered as important mechanisms to have a more competitive advantage and to survive in the global business world (Murad & Rula, 2015). The mortality rate of startups in Nigeria is very high.

The relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and survival of startups is widely studied within the field of entrepreneurship, but the results vary from a strong positive relationship to no significant direct relationship between the two (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin & Frese, 2009). There is a need for more studies to determine in which context an entrepreneurial orientation may be beneficial. Despite the numerous natural resources within Rivers State, startups still struggle to survive in as much as some social infrastructure which includes electricity, effective communication system, good roads, good drinking water, etc. are to be made available for startups to thrive (Balogun, 2004).

The causative factors of this premature extinction are not always the issue of poor infrastructural development or competition from the big firms but rather poor entrepreneurial characteristics. The success of economic ventures like startups depends largely on entrepreneurial skills. There is limited study in developing countries of Africa like Nigeria, therefore this study examined the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and survival of startups in Rivers State.

Research Objectives

i. Examine the relationship between innovativeness and market share.
ii. Determine the relationship between proactiveness and market share.
iii. Examine the relationship between risk-taking and market share.

Research Questions

i. How does innovativeness relate to market share?
ii. To what extent does proactiveness relate to market share?
iii. To what extent does risk-taking relate to market share?

Research Hypotheses

Ho_1. There is no significant relationship between innovativeness and market share.

Ho_2. There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and market share.

Ho_3. There is no significant relationship between risk-taking and market share.

2.0 Theoretical Framework

General Theory of Entrepreneurship

The studies on entrepreneurship pertain typically into one of two streams of research; the first stream centers on the characteristics and ability of entrepreneurs to identify opportunities, their strategies and resource acquisitions as well as their organizing process (Shane, 2003). The second Stream centers on contextual factors external to the entrepreneurial business itself. These factors include industry characteristics and the environment in which entrepreneurs operate successfully (Erin, 2012). This study focuses on the individual determinants, with emphasis on emotional intelligence in the organizational and environmental contexts including the individual demographics.

One primary stream of research that sought to explain entrepreneurship regarding the difference in industries, is the environmental and industrial determinants. and the environment where entrepreneurs are found, typically seeking to identify situations in which entrepreneurial activity is most likely to occur or entrepreneurs is most likely to succeed. (Shane, 2003) provides a review where he noted there are three main facets of environmental research in entrepreneurship. First, the economic environment includes economic wealth, economic stability capital availability. The political which includes political freedom and centralization of power, then the socio-cultural environment consisting of norms, beliefs, and attitudes, and cultural differences (Shane, 2003).

Entrepreneurial Intentionality Theory

The entrepreneurial intentionality theory was developed by Bird (1988), it sees the entrepreneur as a psychological process and "a state of mind directing a person's attention (and therefore experience and action) toward a specific object (goal) or a path to achieve something (means)". The theory describes the developmental processes that encompass and drive entrepreneurial intention concerning an entrepreneur's thinking, actions, and relation to adaptability.

Bird (1988) was proposed two important components of intentionality and relate to entrepreneurship. These are the expression of promises and goals; and rationality versus intuition. He opined that a successful entrepreneur is "rational, analytic, flexible, adaptive and cause-and-effect oriented structured and intentional with action" and with these qualities, the business can be sustainable and survive despite volatilities from the environment. While Krueger (1993) defines entrepreneurial intention as individual commitment to start a new business. Entrepreneurial intention can be determined based on an individual's willingness to set up a business.

The entrepreneurial activity is truly a type of planned behavior that formed an intention model (Bird, 1988). If the intention model is proven to be useful in the understanding of forming a new business intention, this model will present the idea, understanding, and predicting in identifying the entrepreneurial behavior. It is certainly true that entrepreneurial ideas begin with inspiration; though intentions are needed for them to become manifest (Shane & Khurana, 2003). Consistent with this approach, Krueger et al. (2000) argue that individuals start business intentionally, hence the impact of the entrepreneur's intention is predominant; also, because the influences of external stakeholders, corporate structure, politics, image, and culture have not yet been established (Bird, 1988). As a consequence, the founder's intention determines the form and the direction of a nascent organization at its inception.

Conceptual Framework

Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial orientation is defined as strategies utilized by top executive management in the course of making plans with the hopes of doing something new and taking advantage of opportunities to edged competitors (Lechner & Christian, 2014). Emelah, & Onuoha, (2018) define entrepreneurial orientation as the coordination and evaluation of business opportunities that abound in a given business environment. According to Lumpkin & Dess (1996), entrepreneurial orientation refers to the propensity in an individual or group of individuals to act autonomously, to have the willingness to take risks, innovate, to be proactive towards market opportunities as well as the ability to be aggressive towards competitors. Entrepreneurship orientation was first introduced by Miller (1983); In his proposition, an entrepreneurial firm engages in product-market innovation, comes up with proactive innovation, etc.

According to Wales & Gupta (2011), the key factors which drive entrepreneurial orientation are the willingness to take risks and innovate, to be proactive and aggressive towards competitors. Entrepreneurial orientation is a very important factor when considering the act of entrepreneurship because there must be an inner drive, a willingness on the part of both the government and the people to ensure that startups grow and this can be achieved through the provision of infrastructure necessary for the development of trade and commerce (Oshi, Onwuka & Enyia, 2016). Entrepreneurial orientation is described as the procedures and attempts an organization makes concerning entrepreneurial practices (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001).

Entrepreneurship introduction is clear inside an organization's administrative logic, basic leadership practices, and its key conduct (Anderson, Covin & Slavin, 2009). Hence, entrepreneurial orientation is a company's basic leadership propensity towards entrepreneurial exercises (Covin, & Wales, 2011). Organizations that are willing to be a part of the effective corporate business must have an entrepreneurial introduction. Entrepreneurial introduction alludes to system-making rehearses embraced by businesses to distinguish and start corporate endeavors. The idea of entrepreneurial introduction draws upon prior research that takes a gander at procedure making terms of arrangements of activities or basic leadership styles that are summed up crosswise over firms. An entrepreneurial association is engaged with item advertise advancement, embraces some hazardous ventures and concocts "proactive" developments, thrashing contenders' hands, proposes the measurements of creativity chance-taking, and dedication. An additional dimension that is critical to the entrepreneurial orientation concept has also been proposed, such as competitive aggressiveness and autonomy. All these factors mentioned, work together in enhancing an organization's entrepreneurial performance Dess and Lumpkin (2005).

Innovativeness

The concept of innovativeness refers to inter-individual differences that characterize people's responses to new things. There are at least three approaches to the conceptualization of innovativeness, each of which carries its implications for the measurement of the construct: behavioral, global trait, and domain-specific activity. Each makes its contribution to the purposes of the investigator and requires its interpretation of the results it produces. The behavioral perspective on innovativeness identifies the concept with the act of adoption. Consumers are thus designated as innovators or not depending on whether they adopt a new product or not. Moreover, the degree of innovativeness they possess depends on how quickly they adopt after encountering the innovation. This simple, time-based approach to the conceptualization of innovations has given rise to a more sophisticated behavioral approach to the diffusion of innovations, which emphasizes the external rewards available to consumers at each successive stage of the product-market life cycle (Goldsmith, & Foxall, 2003).

Innovativeness is the propensity to pursue sported opportunities associated with creativity and testing (Aigboje, 2018). Moreover, Skillicorn (2014) defines innovation as turning an idea into a solution that adds value from a customer's perspective. Also, Innovation is seen as the application of ideas that are novel and useful. Some innovations are built on current talents to tract incremental developments; while more drastic innovative ideas need brand-new skills, which will render the old talents obsolete (Kraus, 2013). Brigham and Zachary (2014) argued that a firm or organization is entrepreneurially inclined if it is an organization that involves its business activities on product-market innovation, as well undertakes somewhat ventures that have the likelihood of future uncertainty. Those firms that are fruitful in pursuing innovative ideas tend to enjoy a high level of business stability and performance than those that do not (Busatlic, Palalic, & Ramo, 2015).

Additionally, Busatlic et al., (2015) posited that innovation referred to the propensity to initiate and pursue new ideas, novelty, carrying out tests, and creating procedures that might produce new products, services, or technological processes or practices that explore beyond the current borders. Kraus (2013) argued that innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking are dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation that encourage employee effectiveness. In line with this claim, entrepreneurship literature provides adequate evidence that innovation is the widely-examined dimension of entrepreneurial orientation.

Pro-Activeness

Pro-activeness is the propensity to get ahead and act on prospects and needs rather than responding later when the incident must have been unfolded (Aigboje, 2018). A proactive organization is that organization that adopts an opportunity-seeking vision. Proactiveness remains an integral ingredient of entrepreneurship which highlights the anticipation by seeking new opportunities in support of present and future demand which allows an organization to stay ahead of the competition. Securing and protecting employee effectiveness demands a forward-looking perspective and actions that reflect proactive behavior in the organization (Covin & Slevin, 2013). In the effort to steadfast, the competition in the global market organization may also be strategically proactive by introducing new products and services to tap market opportunities and such behaviors also constitute to enhance employee effectiveness.

Proactiveness according to Antoncic, and Hisrich, (2004) is the mental skill to take action urgently and without doubt when the need arises both in a conducive and turbulent time in an attempt to pursue a business opportunity. Proactiveness helps businesses achieve success, it ensures that opportunities are sought for by launching new products, or services before its competitors and having an opinion of the future changes in demands and emerging uncertainty in the firm's external environment (Antoncic, & Hisrich, 2004). Pro-activeness involves anticipatory, change-oriented, and self-initiated behavior in the marketplace by managers where they exhibit boldness, competitive aggressiveness, and adventurous characteristics relative to rival competitors (Antoncic, & Hisrich, 2004).

Proactiveness is described with a great level of opportunity-seeking enterprise that, preferably, are ahead of their opponents and effectively forestall future client demands. Meanwhile, Covin and Miller (2014) submit that organizations must have reactiveness plans to tackle unclear perspectives. Prior studies have established that proactive companies can accomplish their objectives in the best segments, move faster to sustain an advantage, capitalize on a market prospect for greater yields, and be a groundbreaker in performance (Brettel, & Rottenberger, 2013; Chen, Li, & Evans, 2019). Achieve better performance because they have a greater understanding of customer needs and wants, and a broader market environment than their competitors (Khalili, Nejadhussein, & Fazel, 2013).

Risk-Taking

Risk-taking involves the readiness to go after opportunities that have a considerable probability of creating losses or significant performance (Aigboje, 2018). Stiff competition in the market indicates that every organization is required to engage in a risky endeavor to capitalize on the available opportunities in the environment. To fast-tract this, the organization is required to implement an organizational culture that favour employee effectiveness driven by entrepreneurial orientation (Prabin, 2016). Entrepreneurial research highlights that entrepreneurs are generally risk seekers or at least less risk-averse than others. According to Lumpkin and Dess (2005), the degree to which each individual differs in their willingness to take the risk constitutes the entrepreneurial orientation element of risk-taking. This is associated with the risk of revenue or risk of other monetary involvement of the company. The scholar further reiterated that the concept is a connotation of everything that incorporates the enormous act of, for instance borrowing money that might face future uncertainty.

However, Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2013) stressed that risk-taking refers to the propensity to carry out brave business activities rather than carefully planned actions. The risk here concerned the executive who has the authority to direct the flow of business activities with the assistant of committed employees. Risk-taking according to Prieto, (2010) is considered as a managerial decision-making process that accepts the willingness to allocate resources to venture with a high expectation of failure.

According to Eggers, Kraus, Hughes, et al. (2013), risk-taking refers to the organization's agreement to commit resources with an uncertain outcome. Morrish (2011) states that risk-taking implies a company's propensity to offer a product that is not well known or accepted within the market. In other words, a company might take a risky strategy when introducing a product, which serves customer needs that do not yet exist, rather than solely serving expressed customer needs. However, to obtain a competitive advantage, businesses need to take a risk to some extent, e.g., introducing new products or services in new markets (Lumpkin, & Dess, 1997; Gregory & Lumpkin, 2005). Complement affirmative relationship between risk-taking and firm performance. In this logic, submit that pioneering startup must minimize the level of threat and take action to evade tasks that are excessively hazardous to achieve better performance.

Concept of Survival

Survival can be defined as an organizational ability or state of continuing to live or exist, often despite the difficulty, challenges, or dangers. Survival has many connotations-both subjective and objective. Survival is measured by observing organizational continuous existence. This is problematic given the nature of mergers and acquisitions (Delacroix & Carroll, 1983). An organization is seen as have survives as long as it "acquires inputs from suppliers and provides output to a given public (customers, clients, etc.). The organization is seen as a failed one when coalitions of its resource providers cannot be induced to supply resources and the firm cannot repay resource providers for past support (Sheppard, 1989).

Generally, a firm is considered to have failed once it has entered bankruptcy proceedings (Moulton, 1988). In order words, the firm has failed to return investors and creditors' capital in the agreed manner to provide workers with Job security, to provide states with tax revenues, etc. So, for this study survival is simply non-failure that is, non-bankruptcy, of an existing organization. It can also occur when an organization filed for liquidation or bankruptcy since such a filing abrogates the agreement between a firm and its stakeholders and serves to recognize the firm's failure, and as a result of not meeting the financial condition of the regulatory agency.

Survival has been the most interesting topic for organizations over the years. Organizations exist to survive amid environmental factors that tend to encroach on business performance. An organization's effort is tilted towards survival. There is an increasing need for organizational survival amidst the stiff competitive industry thus there is a need for organizations to pay attention to the individual employees in the organization since innovation in products and services are brought about by these individuals.

Market Share

Market share is described as part of the total industry or markets total sales that are earned by a specific firm over a length of time, measured in percentage. According to Czinkora, Ketabe, and Mercer, (1997), market share is the volume or value of an organization relative to its industry. Market share is calculated as a percentage of sales in its target market. By totaling the firm's sales over the period and dividing it by the total sales of the industry over the same period (Czinkora, et al., 1997). Market share refers to the portion or percentage of a market earned by a company or an organization. In other words, a company's market share is its total sales to the overall industry sales of the industry in which it operates.

Market share addresses the level of an industry or market's total sale that is acquired by a specific organization over a predefined period (Barine, 2021). Market share is determined by taking the organization's sales over the period and dividing it by the absolute sales of the business over a similar period. This metric is utilized to give an overall idea of the size of an organization concerning its market and its rivals. An increase in market share allows an organization to accomplish more in its tasks and further develop productivity.

Market share is one of the marketing metrics that is continually discussed in the field of marketing as a discipline. Market share contrasts the income of the firm and the absolute income of the market being referred to a defined time frame. The reason behind estimating market share is to build up the general position or portion of the firm within the broader marketplace. The portion of the firm in the market is determined by the extent of its promotional strategy (Barine, 2021). In assist with understanding the general accomplishment of the firm in penetrating the marketplace, accordingly, the relative market share of a company attempts to compare a firm's market share with its competitors.

Empirical Review

Wekesa, Maalu, Gathungu, and Wainaina (2016) carried out a study covering 314 small and medium enterprises in nine countries in Kenya. The coefficient of determination, statistic, and the t-value and their significance levels were used in presenting the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and firms' performance. The results showed that that firm performance is significantly affected by entrepreneurial characteristics of age, managerial skills, industry experience, and social skills. Thus, it was concluded that entrepreneurial characteristics and performance of non-timber forest products, small and medium enterprises are empirically related. This study implied that specific policy measures are necessary to encourage the many well-trained but unemployed young people to engage in businesses. Additionally, it also implies that specific training programs are necessary to equip the practitioners with the necessary theoretical and practical capacities to enhance the performance of their firms.

Najim, Naser, and Mohamed (2014) examined how entrepreneurial attributes affect business performance in Jordanian institutions. Data obtained concerned entrepreneurial attributes and performance in Jordanian private and public institutions based on a survey questionnaire. To arrive at statistically significant conclusions, the authors used regression and correlation analysis. The results indicated that entrepreneurial characteristics (personal, managerial, and organizational) have a statistically significant impact on performance profitability, ability to meet obligations, ability to expand, reputation, and relationships with stakeholders). The study attempted to fill gaps in the literature on the practice of Arabian entrepreneurs. This was one of the few studies that examine the Jordanian environment concerning identifying the nature of the relationship between entrepreneurs' attributes and organizational performance in Jordanian institutions.

Okunbanjo, Adewale, and Akinsulire (2017) used survey research designed via administering questionnaires to the entrepreneurs of SMEs in Lagos State. Two hundred and sixty (260) questionnaires were administered to the respondents and 231 were retrieved. Regression method of analysis was employed to test the stated hypotheses and the findings revealed that risk-taking has a weak positive effect on profitability, but competitive aggressiveness and innovativeness have a strong positive effect on sales growth of SMEs in Lagos State. The study recommended that entrepreneurs operating in Lagos State need to be very mindful of the risk they take to improve their business performance in terms of sales growth and profitability. Entrepreneurs need to develop new business ideas to enhance innovativeness and creativity to achieve an increase in both financial and non-financial performance.

3.0 Methodology

The researcher adopted the cross-sectional study method on the basis that the research involved selecting samples of elements from the population of interest measurable at a particular point in time. The reasons for the use of the cross-sectional research are that the research is for academic purposes and time-bound. The population of this study comprised of 160 employees randomly selected from the management and employees of 72 selected startups in River State. A sample size of 114 was determined using the Taro Yamane formula. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze the data obtained from the questionnaire.

4.0 Results

Out of 114 copies of questionnaires distributed, 109 copies were retrieved and 104 copies were found valid and useful for the study, copies of the questionnaire not properly filled were discarded as null and void thus the analysis for this study would focus on the 104 copies of questionnaire that were properly filed. Table 4.1 shows the respondent's gender and this indicates that a large number of the study respondents are female 60 (57.7%) while 44 (42.3%) are male. Distribution on age range shows that those between 31 – 40 years of age dominate the study and represent 39.4% (41) of the study on participants, followed by those who are below or equal to 30 31.7% (33) followed by those who are between 41 – 50 years 19.2% (20) and lastly those who are greater than or equal to 51 years represent 9.6% (10) of the respondents. Distribution on the marital status of respondents with a higher percentage of the respondents being married 42 (40.4%) followed by those who are single 32 (30.8%), then those who are separated and divorced 20 (19.2%) and 10 (9.6%) respectively. Distribution on respondents' data based on their educational qualification, the result reveals that a larger number of respondents having HND/BSC or its equivalent representing 54 (51.9%) followed by those who have MSC or its equivalent 40 (38.5%) and lastly those who have Ph.D. or its equivalent 10 (9.6%). The difference in academic qualification shows that in a bid to be run a successful startup, individuals strive to acquire more knowledge and academic qualifications.

Table 4.1 Respondents Demographic Information

Variable	Item	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	Male	42.3	42.3
	Female	57.7	57.7
Marital Status	Single	32	30.8
	Married	42	40.4
	Divorced	20	19.2
	Widowed	10	9.6
Age	Below 30 Years	33	31.7
	31 – 40 Years	41	39.4
	41 – 50 Years	20	19.2
	>= 51	10	9.6
Educational Qualification	HND / BSC	54	51.9
	MSC	40	38.5
	PhD	10	9.6

Test of Hypotheses

Ho$_1$: There is no significant relationship between Innovativeness and Market Share.

Correlations

			Innovativeness	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.746**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	104	104
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.746**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	104	104

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
SPSS output, Version 27

The result of the above table shows that the correlation coefficient (r = 0.746) between innovativeness and market share is strong and positive. The coefficient of (r2 = 0.56) indicates a 56% change in market share can be explained by the level of innovativeness within the organization. The significant value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) reveals a significant relationship between innovativeness and market share. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis which states that, there is a positive and significant relationship between innovativeness and market share was accepted.

Ho_2: There is no significant relationship between Proactiveness and Market Share

Correlations

			Pro-Activeness	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Pro-Activeness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.704**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	104	104
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.704**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	104	104

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
SPSS output, Version 27

The result shows a significant relationship between pro-activeness and market share. The basis for this interpretation of the outcome is based on the above-mentioned probability value (p), within which pro-activeness and market share (rho= 0.704). The coefficient of (r2 = 0.50) indicates that a 50% change in increased market share can be attributed to a level of proactiveness. The significant value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) reveals a significant relationship. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, while the alternative hypothesis which states that, there is a positive and significant relationship between proactiveness and market share was accepted.

Ho_3: There is no significant relationship between Risk-Taking and Market Share

Correlations

			Risk-Taking	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Risk-Taking	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.712**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	104	104
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.712**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	104	104

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
SPSS output, Version 27

The result shows the outcome of the relationship between risk-taking and market share. The result shows a strong positive relationship between the variables (r = 0.712). The coefficient of determination (r2 = 0.51) indicates that a 51% change in market share can be explained by the level at which the startup can take a risk. The significant value of 0.000 ($p < 0.05$) reveals a significant relationship. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected, while its alternative was supported.

4.4 Discussion of Findings

The study examined the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and survival of startups; a study of 72 startups; three (3) hypotheses were formulated as tentative answers to research questions raised and were tested to find support for the propositions, thus; The result revealed the existence of a significant relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and survival of startups. This implies that startups would experience an increase in market share if they are willing to invest effort and are persistent in adverse situations. The relationship that exists between the variables is a noteworthy subject that draws the consideration of analysts. This is in line with Wiklund and Shepherd (2005) who opines that abnormal state entrepreneurial orientation exercises prompt superior associations. These findings are similar to those of Hayton (2005) who established that corporate entrepreneurship activities impacted and affected the behavior of workers and their relationships within the organization. His study revealed that the engagement of firms that incorporate entrepreneurship enhanced the extent to which the workers were more innovative and proactive. Information technology organizations were able to reverse their sales volumes and poor performance through the adoption of corporate entrepreneurship models and practices. Findings also support that of Fairoz, Hirobumi, & Tanaka, (2010) who reported that pro-activeness, innovativeness, risk-taking, and overall entrepreneurial orientation are positively and significantly correlated with market share.

5.0 Conclusion and Recommendations

The study concludes that entrepreneurial orientation improves outcomes for the survival of startups, at such placing entrepreneurial orientation as a backdrop within this study provides a place to affirm the emphasis on dimensions such as risk-taking, proactiveness, and innovativeness, and their usefulness for enhancing the outcomes of organizational and growth by increased productivity and market share. Therefore, the use and implementation of entrepreneurial orientation is important and increases the chances of organizational growth. Entrepreneurial orientation contributes significantly towards organizational growth as organizations thrive and grow based on their ability to provide quality, distinct and convenient services to their customers; the case is no different for startups. Accordingly, we conclude that entrepreneurs with an appropriate orientation that is directed at boosting capacity to differentiate will undoubtedly remain successful in their operations.

It is recommended that startups should encourage creativity and originality to distinguish services and products from other similar products and services and to make the brand more distinct from their markets, which they can easily identify. Entrepreneurial orientation is important in ensuring improved startups business performances. Startups should be free to allow more responsibility and tasks as it creates room for pro general innovative capacity building. Startups should be innovation-oriented to leverage their advantage to strengthen organizational growth.

References

Aigboje, P. (2018). Entrepreneurial pro-activeness and employee satisfaction of small and medium enterprises in Port Harcourt Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal* GSI ,6(7), 2320 – 9186

Anderson, B.S., Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. (2009). Understanding the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and strategic learning capability: An empirical investigation. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 3(3) 218-240.

Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. (2004). Entrepreneurship: Construct Retirement and Cross Culture Validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 495-527

Balogun, M. O. (2004). Developing Entrepreneurial Potential for Strategic Advantage in Nigeria, in the. *Journal of the Nigerian Institute of Management* (Management in Nigeria), 40(2), 45-57.

Barine, L.O. (2021) Entrepreneurial characteristics and performance of small and medium scale enterprises in Port Harcourt metropolis. *World Journal of Entrepreneurial Development Studies* 6(1) 11-31

Bird, B.J. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: the case for intention, *Academy of Management Review*, 13(3): 442-53.

Brettel, M, & Rottenberger, J.D. (2013) Examining the link between entrepreneurial orientation and learning processes in small and medium sized enterprises. *J Small Bus Manage* 51: 471-490.

Brigham, K. H., & Zachary, M. A. (2014). Researching long-term orientation: A construct validation and recommendations for future research. *Family Business Review*, 2(3), 27: 72-88

Busatlic, S. Palalic, S. & Ramo, F (2015). Explanatory research on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation dimensions and business performance and growth offset and small growing small and medium enterprises in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *International Business and Management*, 10(2),1833- 3850

Chen, Y.C., Li, P.C., & Evans, K.R. (2019) Effects of interaction and entrepreneurial orientation on organizational performance: insights into market driven and market driving. *Ind Market Manage* 41: 1019-1034.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S., & Aiken, S. (2013). *Applied multiple regression/correlation for the behavioral sciences*. https//www.amazon.com/multiple-regression-correlationbehavioural/dp/080582223

Covin, J.G. & Wales, W. (2011). *Entrepreneurial orientation*: The dimensions shared effects in explaining firm performance.

Covin, J.G., & Miller, D., (2014) International entrepreneurial orientation: conceptual considerations, research themes, measurement issues, and further research direction. *Entrepreneurship Th Pract* 38: 11-44

Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (2013). Strategic process effect on the entrepreneurial orientation, sales growth rate relationship. *Journal of Strategic Management*, 2(3), 563-598

Czinkora, M.R.; Ketabe, M. & Mercer, D. (1997). *Marketing Management*. UK: Blackwall Publishers.

Delacroix, J. & Carroll, G.R. (1983). Organizational founding's: An ecological study of the newspaper industries of Argentina and Ireland. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(2): 274-291. Available at: 10.2307/2392621.

Dess, G. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation in Stimulating Effective Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management executive* 2(2), 147-156.

Drucker, P.F. (1970). *Epilogue*, in Bonaparte, T.H. and Flaherty, J.E. (Eds), *Contributions to Business Enterprise*, New York, NY. New York University Press 362-5

Mienpre, A., & Onuoha, B.C., (2018) Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Growth of SMEs in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Business, Economics and Entrepreneurship Development in Africa* 10(4 – 5) 112-119

Eggers, F., Kraus, S., Hughes, M., Laraway, S. & Snycerski, S. (2013), Implications of customer and entrepreneurial orientations for SME growth, *Management Decision*, 51(3), 524-546

Emelah, G., & Onuoha, B.C. (2018). Entrepreneurship Orientation and Growth of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Bayelsa State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Science and Business* 2. 580-587.

Erin, B. M. (2012). An *emotional behavior*: the role of emotional intelligence in entrepreneurial success. PhD Dissertation 193pages.

Fairoz, F. M, Hirobumi, T. & Tanaka, Y. (2010) Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises of Hambantota District Sri Lanka. *Asian Social Science* 6 (3), 51- 64

Goldsmith, R., & Foxall, G. (2003). The Measurement of Innovativeness. *The International Handbook on Innovation*. 321-330.

Gregory, G.D., & Lumpkin, G.T., (2005) The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation in Stimulating Effective Corporate Entrepreneurship. *AMP*, 19, 147–156,

Khalili, H., Nejadhussein, S. & Fazel, A. (2013), "The influence of entrepreneurial orientation on innovative performance: Study of a petrochemical company in Iran", *Journal of Knowledge-based Innovation in China*, 5(3), 262-278.

Kotler, P., & Keller, K.L. (2008). *Marketing management* (12 Ed.) New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kraus, S. (2013), "The role of entrepreneurial orientation in service firms: empirical evidence from Austria", *The Service Industries Journal*, 33(5), 427-444

Krueger, N. (1993). The Impact of Prior Entrepreneurial Exposure on Perception of New Venture Feasibility. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 18(1): 5-21.

Krueger, N.F. Jr, Reilly, M.D., & Carsrud, A.L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5/6):411-32.

Lechner, M., & Christian, S. (2014). Entrepreneurial orientation firm strategy and small survival, *Journal of Research Entrepreneurship*, 32(1), 210-222

Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 147-156.

Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (2001), "Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: the moderating role of environment and industry life cycle", *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5,) 429-451.

Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (2005). *Entrepreneurial orientation*. In M.A. Hitt & R.D. Ireland (Eds.), The blackwell encyclopedic dictionary of entrepreneurship (Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management) (pp. 104–107). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Lumpkin, G.T., & Dess, G.G. (1997) Proactiveness versus competitive aggressiveness: Teasing apart key dimensions of an entrepreneurial orientation. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, pp: 47-58

Messersmith J. G. & Wales, W. J. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance in young firms: The role of human resource management. *International Small Business Journal* 31(2), 115-136.

Miller, D., (1983). The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms. *Management Science Journal* 1(4), 770-791.

Morrish, S.C. (2011), "Entrepreneurial marketing: a strategy for the twenty-first century?", *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 13(2), 110-119.

Moulton, W.N., (1988). Strategic and financial factors in business failure, bankruptcy and reorganization. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Murad, H. A., & Rula, A. A., (2015). The Impact of Entrepreneurs' Characteristics on Small Business Success at Medical Instruments Supplies Organizations in Jordan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 6 (8), 164-175.

Najim, A, Naser A. A., & Mohamed, I. A. (2014). Impact of the Entrepreneurial Attributes on Business Performance in a Sample of Jordanian Institutions. *International Journal of Professional Management*, 9 (1), 1-18.

Okunbanjo, O. I., Adewale, M. O., & Akinsulire, H. O., (2017). Effect of Entrepreneurs' Character on SMEs Performance in Lagos State. *Journal of Management and Science*, 7(3), 17-29.

Oshi, J.O., Onwuka, E.M & Enyia, C.D. (2016). Impact of ICT on employee productivity in public enterprises in Nigeria: A study of selected enterprises in River's state. *Research Journal of Management* 4(6), 1-11.

Prabin, G. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance of handicraft industry: a study of Nepalese Handicraft enterprises. *International Journal of small business and entrepreneurship Research* 4(2), 48- 63

Prieto, L. (2010). Proactive personality and entrepreneurial leadership: Exploring the moderating role of organizational identification and political skill. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 16(2), 107- 121

Rauch, A. Wiklund, Lumpkin, G.T. & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance. *An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestion for Future Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 33(33) 761-789.

Roberts, J., (2011). *The modern firm*: Organizational design for performance and growth. Oxford University Press

Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship*: The individual-opportunity nexus. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.

Shane, S., & Khurana, R. (2003). Bringing individuals back in: the effects of career experience on new firm founding. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 12(3): 519–543.

Sheppard, J.P., (1989). The strategy of corporate survival: A resource dependence approach. University of Washington.

Skillicorn, N., (2014). Facebook Grows up: Do Startups Need to Change Their Culture to Succeed? *Improvides*. http://www.improvides.com/2014/05/16/facebook-grows-startups-need-change-culture-succeed/ (accessed June 11, 2021).

Wales, W.J., & Gupta, V.K. (2011). Empirical research on entrepreneurial orientation: An assessment and suggestions for future research. *International Small Business Journal* 2(5), 357-383.

Wekesa, L., Maalu J.K., Gathungu J., & Wainaina, G. (2016). Effect of entrepreneur characteristics on performance of non-Timber Forest products small and medium enterprises in Kenya. *DBA Africa Management Review*, 6 (3), 16-26.

Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-Based Resources, Entrepreneurial Orientation, and the Performance of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24: 1307–1314.