

Corporate Entrepreneurship and Task Performance of SMES in Rivers State

Adiele, Linda Chinyere¹, B. Chima Onuoha¹

¹Department of Management, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract: *Using a survey design, this study looked into how SME corporate entrepreneurship affected their ability to complete tasks. We used the sample size determination table created by Krejcie and Morgan to select 169 out of a possible 300 SMEs in Rivers State to participate in our survey. In total, 169 surveys were sent out to SMEs, but only 147 were returned. The hypotheses were analyzed using the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Coefficient in SPSS 25.0, and the characteristics of the respondents were analyzed using a frequency distribution. Corporate entrepreneurship was found to be a significant contributor to productivity gains. The report's authors argue that corporate entrepreneurship is beneficial to SMEs in Rivers State. The findings of this investigation suggest that SMEs can benefit from increasing their innovativeness by developing unique processes and products and by entering new markets or developing their presence in existing ones. At this phase, effective strategic transformation comes from reengineering the company as a whole and from exploiting business opportunities through corporate venture.*

Keywords: *Corporate Entrepreneurship, Innovativeness, Proactiveness, Task Performance.*

© 2023. Adiele, Linda Chinyere, B. Chima Onuoha. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

An increasing body of literature details in which entrepreneurship contributes to economic expansion (Surya et al., 2021; Manzoor et al., 2021; Adeosun & Shittu, 2021; Ndubisi et al., 2021). This is especially true for developing countries. Previous studies on entrepreneurship have shown that SMEs, corporate entrepreneurship is frequently cited as component that has one of the greatest impacts on the performance of SMEs. This includes corporate entrepreneurship's behavioural traits as well as its psychological and demographic characteristics (Liu & Xi, 2021; Khanam & Sakib, 2020; Slevin & Terjesen, 2011; Ahrens et al., 2019; Pulka et al., 2021; Kisubi et al., 2022; Hussain et al., 2022). Business strategies and circumstances specific to the industry and firm all have a role in whether or not a small or medium-sized enterprise (SME) succeeds. (Schmitt et al., 2018; Gonzalez-Lopez et al., 2021).

Management and subordinates or employers and employees agree to carry out a work within the parameters of a contract, as defined by Pradhan and Jena (2016). Task performance, as defined by

Van Dyne et al. (1995) and quoted by Aslan et al. (2022), is an employee's proficiency in carrying out the responsibilities associated with their designated work role. This potential is contingent on the worker's performance. What this means is that it is related to how well and quickly the workforce completes its tasks. That's why how efficiently people do their jobs makes all the difference in the world for the company (Van Scotter, 1994, as referenced in Aslan et al., 2022). Employees typically define task performance as meeting expectations, receiving positive feedback, and earning positive reinforcement (Leung, 2007).

However, corporate entrepreneurship refers to the practise of inspiring workers to adopt an entrepreneurial mindset while working within an established organisation. Corporate entrepreneurship, as defined by many writers (Wahyudi et al., 2021; Kreiser et al., 2021; Oliver, 2017; Zehir et al., 2015), involves starting new enterprises within an established company by innovation or redesigning the operation to boost profits and defeat competitors. "the process of starting new businesses or seizing untapped opportunities outside the firm" is what Parker (2011) calls "corporate entrepreneurship" to increase a company's bottom line. In order to survive in today's global market, many established businesses are taking on an entrepreneurial spirit (Kelley, 2011). Corporate entrepreneurship is sometimes thought of as a strategy for revitalising a company because, in addition to innovation, there is a current desire for new businesses (Karacaoglu et al., 2013). At all phases of the organisational life cycle, there is tremendous economic growth and wealth creation as corporate entrepreneurship becomes established within an organisation (Kuratko et al., 2015). Likewise, businesses that engage in entrepreneurial activities early on have greater longevity success than other businesses (Antoncic & Hisrich, 2003; Kahkha et al., 2014; Bojica et al., 2011; Catherine et al., 2020).

Asekame and Mgbemena's (2021) investigation of the connection between corporate entrepreneurship and performance singled out inventiveness and proactivity as characteristics of corporate entrepreneurs. According to Karacaoglu, Bayrakdaroglu, and San (2013), innovation requires a departure from established ways of thinking and current technological norms and practices. To provide something novel and distinct to clients through the application of creative thought and the quest of information is a hallmark of an innovative organisation. To be proactive is to look ahead to what consumers and businesses will want in the future and meet those requirements before the competition does. It can also mean jumping on business opportunities before competitors do (Bulut & Yilmaz, 2008).

In 2022, Aslan et al. conducted research on how telecommuting affected workers' productivity and happiness on the job in a call center. Employees who work from home either regularly or occasionally report higher satisfaction with their overall task performance than their in-office counterparts. Oladimeji, Abosede, and Eze (2019) conducted research on the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and the growth of Nigerian service firms. According to the data, 56% of the variation in service business success can be attributed to corporate entrepreneurship traits. The results strongly imply that service business performance is linked to innovative risk-taking, proactive management, and corporate venturing. Abosede et al. (2018) looked into how corporate entrepreneurship affected the international success of Nigerian banks. The characteristics of corporate entrepreneurship highlighted in the study—innovation, proactivity, risk-taking, strategic renewal, and corporate venturing—have been shown to have a positive and significant impact on the performance of banks worldwide. Success on the world arena for Nigerian banks, however, hinges on innovation more than anything else. Eze (2018) published research that analysed the impact of corporate entrepreneurship on the growth of manufacturing firms. The levels of

creativity, initiative, risk-taking, strategic renewal, and corporate venturing in manufacturing organisations were highly connected with their non-financial performance.

Despite these results, little is known about how company entrepreneurship and task performance are related. This is especially true in developing countries like Nigeria. Therefore, there are significant discrepancies due to variances in context. This study set out to quantify the extent to which corporate entrepreneurship is believed to impact the success of SMEs in the state of Rivers.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this research is to examine how SME corporate entrepreneurship affects their ability to do specific tasks. Thus, the following specific objectives are stated as:

- to evaluate the relationship between innovativeness and task performance.
- to x-ray the relationship between proactiveness and task performance.

Research Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between innovativeness and task performance.

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and task performance.

Concept of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Several authors (Kuratko, 2009; Jong, Parker, Wenoekers, & Wu, 2011; Shamsuddin et al., 2012) refer to corporate entrepreneurship by other names. To wit: (Botha & Nyanyom, 2011). Corporate entrepreneurship includes "a wide range of structured and unstructured actions taken to create new enterprises and other forms of innovation (including but not limited to: procedures based on novel resource combinations within existing firms" (Belousova et al., 2009, emphasis added). Entrepreneurship in business is often referred to by a variety of different names, such as intrapreneurship, intra-corporate entrepreneurship, corporate venturing, internal corporate entrepreneurship, making innovative and entrepreneurial strategies, and having an entrepreneurial profile at the firm level, and entrepreneurial orientation (Karacaoglu et al., 2013). According to Kuratko (2009), corporate entrepreneurship is defined as "enterprising activities that are approved by organizations and offered resources in exchange for innovative outcomes." It's a method that helps businesses tap into and make the most of their employees' ingenuity and originality (Rutheford & Holt, 2007).

Several causes, as identified by Kuratko (2009), have led to the growth of corporate entrepreneurship. The rise of new, more technologically advanced competitors; growing scepticism of conventional business practises; the exodus of skilled workers from large corporations; the mushrooming of international competitions; the downsizing of major businesses; and an overarching goal of maximising output all played a part. Ferreira (as referenced by Asekame and Mgbemena, 2021) argues that the high turnover of workers with an inventive attitude who are unsatisfied with bureaucratic organisations is another factor contributing to the emergence of corporate entrepreneurship.

Concept of Innovativeness

Innovation is the process by which value is created for a business, its suppliers, and its customers. When corporate entrepreneurs are in charge, innovation has a much greater effect on the company's growth. Incorporating new ideas into a business has been shown to boost productivity, expansion, and quality of life (Yunis et al., 2018). In addition, as Bigliardi (2013) showed, businesses might see short-term benefits from innovation in the form of a competitive edge, including greater sales

and growth. Innovative companies outperform their less creative counterparts, according to the literature (Nybakk & Jenssen, 2012). According to research by Bartolacci et al. (2015), innovative practises have a substantial effect on the efficiency of businesses since they affect every stage of production.

Implementing innovative organisational approaches into a company's operations, external relations, and corporate structure is referred to as organisational innovation (Berkhout et al., 2010). Organizational innovations are intended to improve worker satisfaction, obtain access to non-tradable assets, and reduce transaction, administrative, and supply expenses in order to raise an organization's performance (Atalay et al., 2013). Innovative businesses had better overall exports and sales, especially those with high scores for process, product, and organisational innovation (Kuratko et al., 2015). This is because organisational innovation is more likely to result in lower administrative transaction costs and higher workplace happiness (Simao et al., 2016).

Concept of Proactiveness

Being proactive can be viewed as an organization's decision-making methodology as well as a method of utilising other aspects of entrepreneurial ability and business practises as a key component of a sustainable business model (Frank et al., 2010). Companies that actively seek to improve their offerings through innovation are more likely to thrive over time, as evidenced by the findings of Perez-Luno et al. (2011). Companies that take the initiative to monitor industry trends and seize opportunities when they arise are more likely to succeed. These firms are able to corner a sizable portion of the market and establish a commanding position that is difficult for competitors to overtake because of their superior understanding of the industry's most pressing issues and their exclusive access to the sector's most valuable resources (Johannes, 2009). Some characteristics of those who tend to be proactive are initiative, future-oriented thinking, adaptability, and the capacity to anticipate and plan for potential threats (Rosemond et al., 2012). Market demands and needs, and by extension, customer wants, can be predicted by proactive SMEs (Eggers et al., 2013). According to research done by Fatoki (2014) on MSMEs' entrepreneurial orientation in South Africa's retail sector, small and medium-sized businesses don't make much of an effort to be proactive compared to large corporations. Oni's (2012) study of the importance of entrepreneurs' proactivity and how it affects enterprise performance found that businesses with high levels of proactivity have effects on key performance indicators proportional to the hiring of skilled workers and the company's size.

Concept of Task Performance

Organizational performance has been the subject of substantial study in the strategic management literature (Anwar, 2018; Sadiku-Dushi et al., 2019). They're graded based on how well their organizations do (Islam et al. 2022; Agarwal et al. 2022; Blevins et al. According to the literature (Ferreira & Otley, 2009), a company's performance is directly proportional to its competitive advantage. The multidimensional study of a company's current financial and non-financial state, developed by Kaplan and Norton in 1996, is one of the most well-known methodologies for evaluating organisational success. According to Kaplan and Norton (1996), a balanced scorecard considers not only financial measures but also those linked to customers, internal business processes, and the organization's ability to learn and grow. Li et al. (2006) reviewed the literature and assessed financial and market variables such sales margin, ROI, ROI growth, market share, sales growth, and competitive standing. Business success was calculated using a six-factor model

developed by Antony and Bhattacharyya (2010). These included originality, efficacy, effectiveness, productivity, innovation, originality, creativity, and competition.

Theoretical framework

Resource-based Theory

To reiterate, the theoretical foundations and hypotheses of this study are obtained from the resource-based theory (Wernerfelt, 1984; Galbreath, 2005). Entrepreneurship and strategic management are two areas where resource-based theory has emerged as the dominant paradigm (Hitt et al., 2016). To stay ahead of the competition and provide customers with the best possible service, firms should differentiate themselves from the competition (Hitt et al., 2016; Wernerfelt, 1984; Galbreath, 2005), as suggested by resource-based perspective. According to resource-based theory, a company's chances of success improve when it adopts value-creating strategies like corporate entrepreneurship. Barney's key work (1991, p. 102) claim that a corporation can get an edge over its competitors by adopting a value-creating strategy that no other company in its industry employs at the same time. One definition of a persistent competitive advantage is when a company enjoys an advantage over its rivals because it has adopted a value-creating strategy that neither its current nor potential rivals are undertaking at the same time.

For better task performance, the current research suggests hypotheses grounded in resource-based theory that emphasize the need of value-creating approaches including launching new businesses within existing firms or strategically revitalizing existing businesses. This study also made use of resource-based theory to make predictions about the connection between task performance and corporate entrepreneurship.

Innovative Theory of Entrepreneurship

Schumpeter's (1934) innovation theory places an emphasis on the role of the entrepreneur by examining profit margins, discovery of novel methods of adding value and the formulation of novel ways to boost the revenue cycle. This might be achieved by the risk-taking, ingenuity, and initiative of the business owners, as well as by fostering the discovery of new avenues for expansion and capitalizing on the expertise of the company's top executives. According to the notion, management or business owners who are inventive, aggressive, and risk-takers tend to increase the organization's growth and profitability.

Schumpeter (1934) differentiates between physical and intellectual capital, as well as between savings and innovation in terms of their effects on each. Technological progress, according to his idea, is the outcome of creative destruction brought about by enterprises motivated by market forces. A competitive edge can be gained by the introduction of new products, methods, and markets, as suggested by this theory. It also implies that innovation makes some earlier innovations outdated and that it will most likely be replaced by future innovations (Schumpeter, 1934). Innovation speeds up technological development by spawning new markets, products, and processes, which are generally the byproducts of economic activity.

Methodology

Research Design

A questionnaire was used as the research tool for this investigation. This study randomly sampled 300 SMEs from the city of Port Harcourt in the state of Rivers. We used the table for determining sample sizes created by Krejcie and Morgan and settled on a total of 169 participants. The instrument's reliability, as determined by Cronbach's alpha, is within the .70-.80 range

recommended by Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). We used both external and internal validity. There were 169 copies of the survey given out to staff, but only 147 were filled out and returned. Corporate entrepreneurship (innovativeness and proactivity) were scored across four categories, each with a five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree = 5 to agree = 4, disagree = 3, severely disagree = 2, and neither agree = 1. The hypotheses were analyzed using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient in SPSS Version 25.0, and the characteristics of the participants (gender, age, and level of education) were analyzed using a frequency distribution.

Result and Discussions

Table 1: Respondents' Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	93	63.3	63.3	63.3
	Female	54	36.7	36.3	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Responses were broken down by gender in Table 1. The survey received responses from 93 men (63.3% of the total) and 54 women (36.7%).

Table 2: Respondents' Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	30-39	62	42.2	42.2	42.2
	40-49	41	27.9	27.9	70.1
	50-59	31	21.1	21.1	91.2
	60 and Above	13	8.8	8.8	100.0
	Total	147	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 shows the demographic breakdown of the sample by age. A total of 62 responders (42.2% of the total) were between the ages of 30 and 39; forty-one respondents, or 27.9%; thirty-one respondents, or 21.1%; thirteen respondents, or 8.8%, were aged 60 and up.

Table 3: Respondents' Educational Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Others	21	14.0	14.0	14.0
	OND/HND	43	29.3	29.3	43.3
	Bachelor	66	45.0	45.0	88.3
	MSc/MBA	17	11.7	11.7	100
	Total	147	100	100	

Table 3 shows the respondents' average degree of education. Sixty-six respondents, or 45 percent, have a bachelor's degree; seventeen respondents, or 11 percent, have a master's degree; and 21 respondents, or 14 percent, have other educational qualifications.

Analyses of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between innovativeness and task performance

Table 4: Correlation between innovativeness and task performance

		Innovativeness	Task Performance
Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	1	.826**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	147	147
<u>Task Performance</u>	Correlation Coefficient	.826**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	147	147

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 shows the results of a bivariate analysis of how inventiveness and task performance are related. The correlation coefficient between originality and task accomplishment is 0.826**, and as shown in the table, it reaches statistical significance at the 0.000 level. We accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null.

Hypothesis Two

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and task performance.

Table 5: Correlation between proactiveness and task performance

		Proactiveness	Task Performance
<u>Proactiveness</u>	Correlation Coefficient	1	.842**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	147	147
<u>Task Performance</u>	Correlation Coefficient	.842**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	147	147

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The task performance and proactiveness bivariate analysis is shown in Table 5. The data in the table suggest that the alternative hypothesis, that proactiveness is positively related to task performance, is correct ($p.05; .842^{**}$).

Discussion

The correlation between innovativeness and task performance is high and statistically significant ($\rho = .826, p .05$), which means that a change of one unit or percentage in innovativeness will cause a corresponding change in performance for SMEs of 82.6% either way. Multiple authors' prior studies came to similar conclusions (Eniola, 2021; Anjum et al., 2020; Chandler & Krajcsak, 2021). Luo et al. (2005) found that business owners, managers, and entrepreneurs who can develop novel products, processes, or promotional methods had a leg up on the competition. Our second consideration was proactiveness, and we found that for every one percentage point or unit variation in the proactiveness value, small and medium-sized business (SME) performance might fluctuate by 84.2%. The ability of a manager to anticipate problems in the workplace and devise preventative measures is directly correlated with the success of their organization (Johannes, 2009). Therefore, prior research in the field concurs with the current study's conclusions.

Results that seem to contradict each other have been found in the past (Chittithaworn et al., 2011; Marmaya et al., 2018). According to Marmaya et al. (2018), a lack of correlation exists between an organization's emphasis on entrepreneurship and its financial success. The association between SME success and entrepreneurial spirit has been studied by other academics in the same Malaysian context. According to research by Tajudin et al. Chittithaworn et al. (2011) reached the same verdict on the relationship between business owners' managerial abilities and the performance of their companies.

Quantitative studies have shown, finally, that business owners gain knowledge and wisdom through hands-on experience. As a result, practical examples should be incorporated into training in addition to theoretical information. Training focused on real-world cases and examples would be more beneficial than theoretical knowledge (Khan et al., 2020; Hwang et al., 2020). Several more studies (Wahyudi et al., 2021; Kreiser et al., 2021; Fis & Cetindamar, 2019; Vanacker et al., 2021) in this field support the results of this one.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This research uses empirical data to draw the conclusion that corporate entrepreneurship in Rivers State has an effect on productivity in a business setting, especially amongst SMEs.

According to the results and conclusion, the following were recommended:

1. SMEs must identify and enhance those aspects of corporate entrepreneurship that have an impact on task performance, including proactiveness and creativity.
2. In order to increase performance and successfully compete on the global market, it is further advised that SMEs' corporate entrepreneurship level be strongly focused towards being persistently inventive, act pro-actively, and continually renew its process.
3. It is advised that corporate entrepreneurship be taken seriously by management of SMEs as well as those pursuing further market expansion, with a focus on innovation and proactivity. By doing this, it will be simpler to benefit from new markets in a novel setting.

References

- Abosedo, J. A., Fayose, J., & Eze, B. U. (2018). Corporate entrepreneurship and international performance of Nigerian banks. *Journal of Economics and Management*, 32(2), 5-17.
- Adeosun, O. T., & Shittu, A. I. (2021). Small–medium enterprise formation and Nigerian economic growth. *Rev. Econ. Political Sci.*, 7(1), 17-29.
- Agarwal, S., Kant, R., & Shankar, R. (2022). Exploring sustainability balanced scorecard for performance evaluation of humanitarian organizations. *Clean. Logist. Supply Chain*, 3, 100026.
- Ahrens, J.-P., Calabrò, A., Huybrechts, J., & Woywode, M. (2019). The Enigma of the Family Successor–Firm Performance Relationship: A Methodological Reflection and Reconciliation Attempt. *Entrep. Theory Pract*, 43, 437–474.
- Anjum, T., Farrukh, M., Heidler, P., & Tautiva, J. A. D. (2020). Entrepreneurial intention: Creativity, entrepreneurship, and university support. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex*, 7(11), 9-18.
- Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. (2003). Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *J. Small Bus. Enterp. Dev.*, 10, 7–24.
- Antony, J. P., & Bhattacharyya, S. (2010). Measuring organizational performance and organizational excellence of SMEs–Part 2: An empirical study on SMEs in India. *Meas. Bus. Excell.*, 14, 42–52.
- Anwar, M. (2018). Business model innovation and SMEs performance—Does competitive advantage mediate? *Int. J. Innov. Manag.*, 22, 1850057.
- Asekhome, F. F., & Mgbemena, G. C. (2021). Corporate entrepreneurship and performance: A theoretical review. *International Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship*, 3(1), 52-66.
- Aslan, M., Yaman, F., Aksu, A., & Güngör, H. (2022). Task performance and job satisfaction under the effect of remote working: Call center evidence. *Economics and Sociology*, 15(1), 284-296. doi:10.14254/2071-789X.2022/15-1/18.
- Atalay, M., Anafarta, N., & Sarvan, F. (2013). The relationship between innovation and firm performance: An empirical evidence from turkish automotive supplier industry. *Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 75, 226–235.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bartolacci, F., Castellano, N., & Cerqueti, R. (2015). The impact of innovation on companies' performance: An entropy-based analysis of the STAR market segment of the Italian stock exchange. *Technol. Anal. Strateg. Manag.*, 27, 102–123.
- Belousova, O., Benoit, G., & Olivier, B. (2009). *An Integrated Model of Corporate Entrepreneurial Behaviour: A Working Paper*.
- Berkhout, G., Hartman, D. G., & Trott, P. (2010). Connecting technological capabilities with market needs using a cyclic innovation model. *R D Manag*, 40, 474–490.
- Bigliardi, B. (2013). The effect of innovation on financial performance: A research study involving SMEs. *Innov. Manag. Policy Pract.*, 15, 245–255.
- Blevins, D. P., Ragozzino, R., & Eckardt, R. (2022). Corporate governance” and performance in nonprofit organizations. *Strateg. Organ.*, 20, 293–317.
- Bojica, A. M., Fuentes, M. D. M., & Gómez-Gras, J. M. (2011). Radical and incremental entrepreneurial orientation: The effect of knowledge acquisition. *J. Manag. Organ.*, 17, 326–343.

- Botha, M., & Nyanyom, M. D. (2011). *Corporate Entrepreneurship Orientation*, and the Pursuit of innovating opportunities in Botswana.
- Bulut, C., & Yilmaz, C. (2008). Innovative Performance Impacts of Corporate Entrepreneurship: An Empirical research in Turkey. *Proceeding of Academy of Innovation and Entrepreneurship conference*. 414-417, Beigina, China.
- Catherine, K., Mwando, G. M., & Zengeni, N. (2020). Corporate entrepreneurship strategy and the survival of small to medium tourism enterprises in Zimbabwe. *Afr. J. Hosp. Tour. Leis.*, 9, 732–746.
- Chandler, N., & Krajcsák, Z. (2021). Intrapreneurial Fit and Misfit: Enterprising Behavior, Preferred Organizational and Open Innovation Culture. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex*, 7, 61.
- Chittithaworn, C., Islam, A., Keawchana, T., & Yusuf, D. H. M. (2011). Factors Affecting Business Success of Small & Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Thailand. *Asian Soc. Sci.*, 7, 180–190.
- Eggers, F., Kraus, S., Hughes, M., Laraway, S., & Snyckerski, S. (2013). Implications of customer and entrepreneurial orientations for SME growth. *Manag. Decis*, 51, 524–546.
- Eniola, A. A. (2021). The entrepreneur motivation and financing sources. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex*, 7, 25.
- Eze, B. U. (2018). Corporate entrepreneurship and manufacturing firms' performance. *Emerging Markets Journal*, 8(1), 11-17.
- Fatoki, O. (2014). The causes of the failure of new small and medium enterprises in South Africa. *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci*, 5, 922–927.
- Ferreira, A., & Otley, D. (2009). The design and use of performance management systems: An extended framework for analysis. *Manag. Account. Res*, 20, 263–282.
- Fis, A. M., & Cetindamar, D. (2019). Unlocking the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance. *Entrep. Res. J.*, 11, 1–22.
- Frank, H., Kessler, A., & Fink, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance—A replication study. *Schmalenbach Bus. Rev.*, 62, 175–198.
- Galbreath, J. (2005). Which resources matter the most to firm success? An exploratory study of resource-based theory. *Technovation*, 25(9), 979-987.
- González-López, M. J., Pérez-López, M. C., & Rodríguez-Ariza, L. (2021). From potential to early nascent entrepreneurship: The role of entrepreneurial competencies. *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.*, 17, 1387–1417.
- Hitt, M. A., Xu, K., & Carnes, C. M. (2016). Resource based theory in operations management research. *Journal of Operations Management*, 41, 77-94.
- Hussain, A., Akbar, M., Shahzad, A., Poulouva, P., Akbar, A., & Hassan, R. (2022). E-Commerce and SME Performance: The Moderating Influence of Entrepreneurial Competencies. *Adm. Sci.*, 12, 13.
- Hwang, W.-S., Choi, H., & Shin, J. A (2020). mediating role of innovation capability between entrepreneurial competencies and competitive advantage. *Technol. Anal. Strat. Manag.*, 32, 1–14.
- Islam, R., French, E., & Ali, M. (2022). Evaluating board diversity and its importance in the environmental and social performance of organizations. *Corp. Soc. Responsib. Environ. Manag.*, 29, 1134–1145.
- Johannes, N. (2009). *An Assessment of Corporate Entrepreneurship in the Finishing Units of Steel Manufacturer*. Ph.D. Dissertation, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa.

- Jong De, J. P. J., Parker, S. K., Wenoekers, S., & Wu, C. (2011). *Corporate Entrepreneurship at the Individual Level: Measurement and Determinants* EIM Research Reports. Working paper, www.entrepreneurship-SME.eu.
- Kahkha, A. O., Kahrazeh, A., & Armesh, H. (2014). Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance important role of small and medium enterprise. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 4, 8–25.
- Kaplan, R. S. & Norton, D. P. (1996). Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system. *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, 74, 75–85.
- Karacaoglu, K., Bayrakdaroglu, A., & San, F. B. (2013). The impact of corporate entrepreneurship on firms' financial performance: Evidence from Istanbul stock exchange firms. *Int. Bus. Res.*, 6, 163.
- Kelley, D. (2011). Sustainable corporate entrepreneurship: Evolving and connecting with the organization. *Bus. Horiz.*, 54, 73–83.
- Khan, M. A., Rathore, K., & Sial, M. A. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance of small and medium enterprises: Mediating effect of entrepreneurial competencies. *Pak. J. Commer. Soc. Sci. (PJCSS)*, 14, 508–528.
- Khanam, T., & Sakib, M. N. (2020). A Conceptual Research Model for Studying the Relationship between Entrepreneurial Competences and the Performances of Small and Medium Size Enterprises in Bangladesh. *Jahangirnagar Univ. J. Manag. Res.*, 3, 75–88.
- Kisubi, M. K., Aruo, F., Wakibi, A., Mukyala, V., & Ssenyange, K. (2022). Entrepreneurial competencies and performance of Ugandan SMEs: The mediating role of firm capabilities. *Cogent Bus. Manag.*, 9, 2115622.
- Kreiser, P. M., Kuratko, D. F., Covin, J. G., Ireland, R. D., & Hornsby, J. S. (2021). Corporate entrepreneurship strategy: Extending our knowledge boundaries through configuration theory. *Small Bus. Econ.*, 56, 739–758.
- Kuratko, F. D. (2009). *Introduction to Entrepreneurship*. (8th Ed.). South-Western, a part of centage learning.
- Kuratko, D. F., Hornsby, J., & Hayton, J. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship: The innovative challenge for a new global economic reality. *Small Bus. Econ.*, 45, 245–253.
- Leung, A. (2007). Matching Ethical Work Climate to In-Role and Extra-Role Behaviors in a Collectivist Work Setting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 79(1/2), 43-55.
- Li, S., Ragu-Nathan, B., Ragu-Nathan, T. S., & Rao, S. S. (2006). The impact of supply chain management practices on competitive advantage and organizational performance. *Omega*, 34, 107–124.
- Liu, Y., & Xi, M. (2021). Linking CEO Entrepreneurial Orientation to Firm Performance: The Perspective of Middle Managers' Cognition. *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, 46, 10422587211033571.
- Lopes, J., Oliveira, M., Silveira, P., Farinha, L., & Oliveira, J. (2021). Business dynamism and innovation capacity, an entrepreneurship worldwide perspective. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex.*, 7, 94.
- Luo, X., Zhou, L., & Liu, S. S. (2005). Entrepreneurial firms in the context of China's transition economy: An integrative framework and empirical examination. *J. Bus. Res.*, 58, 277–284.
- Manzoor, F., Wei, L., & Siraj, M. (2021). Small and medium-sized enterprises and economic growth in Pakistan: An ARDL bounds cointegration approach. *Heliyon*, 7, e06340.
- Marmaya, N. H., Razak, N. A., Wee, M., Karim, R., & Ridzuan, A. R. (2018). Factors affecting Firm Performance of SMEs in Malaysia. *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 8, 789–798.

- Ndubisi, N. O., Zhai, X. A., & Lai, K.-h. (2021). Small and medium manufacturing enterprises and Asia's sustainable economic development. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.*, 233, 107971.
- Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric Theory 3rd edition* (MacGraw-Hill, New York).
- Nybakk, E., & Jenssen, J. I. (2012). Innovation strategy, working climate, and financial performance in traditional manufacturing firms: An empirical analysis. *Int. J. Innov. Manag.*, 16, 1250008.
- Oladimeji, M. S., Abosede, A. J., & Eze, B. U. (2019). Corporate entrepreneurship and service firms' performance in Nigeria. *Economic Review – Journal of Economics and Business*, XVII(1), 3-15.
- Oliver, K. (2017). *Exploring the Nature and Extent of Entrepreneurial Intensity in the Insurance Industry in Hyper-Inflationary Zimbabwe 2007–2010*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.
- Oni, E.O. (2012). Relevance of entrepreneurial proactiveness on business performance: Nigerian companies experience. *Arab. J. Bus. Manag. Rev.*, 1, 92–108.
- Parker, S. C. (2011). Intrapreneurship or entrepreneurship? *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 26, 19–34.
- Pérez-Luño, A., Wiklund, J., & Cabrera, R. V. (2011). The dual nature of innovative activity: How entrepreneurial orientation influences innovation generation and adoption. *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 26, 555–571.
- Pradhan, R., & Jena, L. (2016). Employee Performance at the Workplace: Conceptual Model and Empirical Validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1), 1-17.
- Pulka, B. M., Ramli, A., & Mohamad, A. (2021). Entrepreneurial competencies, entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneurial network, government business support and SMEs performance. The moderating role of the external environment. *J. Small Bus. Enterp. Dev.*, 28, 586–618.
- Rosemond, B., Edward, M.-Y., & Moses, A. Y. (2012). An empirical analysis of the effect of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance of auto artisans in the cape coast metropolis. *Dev. Ctry. Stud.*, 2, 77–87.
- Rutherford, W. M., & Holt, T. D. (2007). Entrepreneurship: An Empirical Look at the Innovativeness Dimension and its Antecedents. *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, 20(3), 429 – 446. Emerald Group. www.Emerald.in.sight.com.
- Sadiku-Dushi, N., Dana, L.-P., & Ramadani, V. (2019). Entrepreneurial marketing dimensions and SMEs performance. *J. Bus. Res.*, 100, 86–99.
- Schmitt, A., Rosing, K., Zhang, S. X., & Leatherbee, M. (2018). A Dynamic Model of Entrepreneurial Uncertainty and Business Opportunity Identification: Exploration as a Mediator and Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy as a Moderator. *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, 42, 835–859.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shamsuddin, S., Othman, J.M., Shahadan, M.A. & Zakaria, Z. (2012). The Dimensions of Corporate Entrepreneurship and the performance of Establish Organisations. *ACRN Journal of Entrepreneurship perspective*, 1 (12), 111 – 131, ISSN: 2224 – 9729.
- Simao, L. B., Rodrigues, R. G., & Madeira, M. J. (2016). External relationships in the organizational innovation. *RAI Rev. Adm. Innov.*, 13, 156–165.
- Slevin, D. P., & Terjesen, S. A. (2011). Entrepreneurial Orientation: Reviewing Three Papers and Implications for Further Theoretical and Methodological Development. *Entrep. Theory Pract.*, 35, 973–987.

- Surya, B., Menne, F., Sabhan, H., Suriani, S., Abubakar, H., & Idris, M. (2021). Economic growth, increasing productivity of SMEs, and open innovation. *J. Open Innov. Technol. Mark. Complex*, 7, 20.
- Tajudin, A., Aziz, R. A., Mahmood, R., & Abdullah, M. H. (2014). The Relationship between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance of SMEs in Malaysia. *Int. J. Manag. Excel.*, 2, 221–226.
- Van Dyne, L., Cummings, L., & Parks, J. (1995). Extra-role behaviors: In pursuit of construct and definitional clarity. *Research in Organizational Behaviour*, 17, 215-285.
- Van Scotter, J. (1994). *Evidence for the Usefulness of Task Performance, Job Dedication, and Interpersonal Facilitation as Components of Overall Performance*. Unpublished Dissertation. The University of Florida, Florida, USA.
- Vanacker, T., Zahra, S. A., & Holmes, R. M. (2021). Corporate entrepreneurship, country institutions and firm financial performance. *J. World Bus.*, 56, 101162.
- Wahyudi, I., Suroso, A. I., Arifin, B., Syarief, R., & Rusli, M. S. (2021). multidimensional aspect of corporate entrepreneurship in family business and SMEs: A systematic literature review. *Economies*, 9, 156.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2), 171-180.
- Yunis, M., Tarhini, A., & Kassab, A. (2018). The role of ICT and innovation in enhancing organizational performance: The catalysing effect of corporate entrepreneurship. *J. Bus. Res.*, 88, 344–356.
- Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and financial outcomes of corporate entrepreneurship: an exploratory study. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(4), 259-285.
- Zehir, C., Can, E., & Karaboga, T. (2015). Linking entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The role of differentiation strategy and innovation performance. *Procedia-Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 210, 358–367.