

Entrepreneurial Orientation in Small Business Enterprises: Conceptualizations, Instrumentation and Research Guide

Linus Osuagwu

American University of Afghanistan, Kabul V9N7N7, Afghanistan

ABSTRACT

The paper presents some conceptualizations of the entrepreneurial orientation construct, and presents a research instrument that may guide future research efforts in small business enterprises (SBEs). Materials in relevant extant literature and cognate experience were used to conceptualize entrepreneurial orientation and its various dimensions, in addition to a research instrument that may guide cognate future research of the entrepreneurial orientation construct in small business enterprises. The paper reports that there is equivocation in relevant extant literature regarding the entrepreneurial orientation construct with respect to its conceptualizations and dimensions in different business types and contextual settings. In addition, the paper proposes a research agenda for investigation of the entrepreneurial orientation construct in small business enterprises, especially in emerging economies in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia Pacific, South America, Middle East, and South East Asia, among others, with relatively underrepresented relevant research streams of the construct. The paper has theoretical and practical forms of values with regard to the entrepreneurial orientation construct in the domain of small business enterprises, especially when situated along other cognate management and entrepreneurship orientation constructs in different cultural and business contexts.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received : 24-08-2021

Revised : 12-02-2022

Accepted : 25-02-2022

Published : 28-02-2022

Keywords:

Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial Orientation

Small Business Enterprises

Emerging Economies

Entrepreneurial Orientation Research

JEL: M21, M13, M16

*Corresponding Author E-mail:

osuagwulinus@gmail.com



Copyright © 2022 Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY-SA 4.0) which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited & ShareAlike terms followed.

INTRODUCTION

Small business enterprises (SBEs), including family businesses, form a substantial aspect of many economies in developed and developing economies, and are important in the growth and development of countries (Graham, 1999; Depaoli et al., 2020; Valenza et al., 2021). Consequently, some countries have endeavored to create enabling business environment for the operation and growth of small business enterprises (Alzaharani, 2019). Generally, SBEs in developed and developing countries use some strategic management practices or orientations in their business operations. For instance, SBEs in some countries use some strategic management orientations to improve their productivity of resources, access to relevant global markets, reduce product development cycles, reduce unemployment rates, and create beneficial interactions with their customers and clients and other relevant stakeholders, among others. There are many definitions of small business enterprises. Small business enterprises have their unique peculiarities that may require unique and different managerial practices and orientations. Small business enterprises are substantially connected to many dimensions of entrepreneurship, including entrepreneurial orientation (Hutahayan, 2019).

Generally, there are many strategic management orientations that business organizations can utilize in their business activities. These orientations include market orientation, technological orientation, and entrepreneurial orientation, among others. Entrepreneurial orientation is the strategic tendency of an entity towards entrepreneurship (Dayan et al, 2016), and is used to examine the degree of entrepreneurial tendencies of entities, including persons and organizations. It is a strategic management approach used for the innovative and creative discovery and beneficial exploitation of opportunities in the relevant environment (Lan and Wu, 2010), and a market-driving approach to entrepreneurship (Song et al., 2019). Specifically, it is a strategic

management multidimensional construct dealing with the degree to which an entity (person or organization) identifies and exploits business opportunities in the relevant environment, including how a new business is undertaken (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Gruber-Muecke and Hofer, 2015). It deals with the decision-making steps, strategies and operations of entrepreneurial entities (Lumpkin and Dess, 2001), and is concerned with how an entity discovers and exploits relevant opportunities beneficially (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003). This paper discusses entrepreneurial orientation (EO) conceptualizations, its dimensions, and proposes a research agenda (with an instrument) to investigate the construct in the domain of small business enterprises.

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (SBES)

Business is any purposeful activity. It involves the management of human and non-human resources towards the achievement of set goals and objectives. It is the organized effort of individuals or companies to produce goods, services, or ideas; to exchange these goods, services, and ideas with the relevant market of interest; and to get some rewards for this organized effort. The major ambition of business is to produce goods, services, and ideas that are beneficial to individuals, organizations, nations and society. There are many typologies of businesses, including micro, small, medium and large; profit and non-profit; goods and services; and local, national and international businesses, among other categorizations. Small business enterprises (SBEs) constitute, numerically, the most form of businesses in many nations of the world, and play strategic functions in the growth and development of nations (Rapini et al., 2018).

A small business opportunity may be an unsatisfied demand, need or want which prospective small business entrepreneurs can beneficially serve and satisfy. The opportunity may be visible or invisible. The visible opportunity can be easily identified and assessed by the small

business entrepreneur which may require little or no efforts from the entrepreneur. However, the invisible opportunities for the small business operator may not be easily identified, and therefore, require additional effort of the prospective entrepreneur. One of the routes to success in small business enterprises, including businesses associated with women entrepreneurship (Jaim, 2021), is for the entrepreneur to be responsive to market demands, which involves a thorough and proper understanding of the needs and wants of the relevant customers and clients. Efficient and effective management practices are required in understanding the needs and wants of customers and clients; in understanding the relevant goods, services and ideas; and in understanding the relevant environmental factors (including business opportunities to be exploited and threats to be managed).

Different persons, countries, institutions or bodies have come up with various definitions of small business enterprise, and there is, therefore, equivocation regarding the meaning of small business enterprise. Culkin and Smith (2000) posit that there is no single definition of a small business firm because of the wide diversity of such types of business. A small business enterprise may be conceptualized as an independent business which is managed by its owner or part owner, and which has a small market share. It may be seen as a business which is independently owned and managed, and which does not dominate its relevant market segment of interest. The influence of the owner-manager is perceived as the major factor distinguishing small-scale business enterprises from large-scale businesses. Also, small business enterprises, like large businesses, are influenced positively and /or negatively by many forces in the business environment, including COVID-19 Pandemic (Zaazou and Abdou, 2021).

The most obvious feature of the small business enterprise is the limitation of relevant resources with regard to management skills, human, money, and other non-human resources (Burns, 1990;

Hutahayan, 2019). In addition, the small business enterprise's market share is not large enough to affect, to any serious extent, the prices of national quantities of goods and services sold. In small business enterprises, there is personalized management style of the small business entrepreneur in such issues as having personal knowledge of all employees in the small business enterprise, involvement in all aspects of management, and lack of sharing of key management decisions. Storey and Sykes (1996) have linked this concentration of management issues on the SBE entrepreneur to the fact that the entrepreneur of a small business enterprise is more powerful (because he/she is subjected to few checks and balances) than the entrepreneur in large business organizations. Specifically, small business enterprises do not, managerially, behave in the same way as larger companies. Large companies are more complex in their structure, their organization, and the level of departmentalization and specialization within the organization. This may result to an increasingly complex form of management decision-making in large organisations. However, although small business enterprises may be regarded as simple units with regard to their managerial attitude, behaviour, and decision-making, they (small business enterprises) have managerial complexities of their own (Culkin and Smith, 2000; Jaim, 2021; Valenza et al., 2021).

Many countries pay appreciable attention to small business enterprises (SBEs), partly as a result of the increasing volume of businesses that SBEs account for. SBEs constitute a large part of many economies of the world, including those of developed and developing countries, numbering up to half to two-thirds of all business all over the world (Graham, 1999; Tuteja, 2001; Depaoli et al., 2020). Therefore, many managerial orientations, practices, policies, strategies, and governmental interventions are associated with SBEs. Generally, the management of small business enterprises deals with the efficient and effective use of human and non-human resources to achieve set goals and objectives in

organisations that have met the criteria of small business enterprises. Small business enterprises are generally classified with regard to employed labour force and capital investment, and share the following peculiarities: few numbers of employees; low amount of investment and annual business turnover; small in size within their industries of business activities; and managers are also owners (Okongwu, 2001; Osuagwu et al., 2011; Alexandru, 2020). In addition, personalized management style is the most salient feature of the small business enterprise. This means that the small business entrepreneur participates actively in all managerial activities of his/her business enterprise, including decision-making processes. In a typical small business enterprise, there is near absence of serious delegation of managerial authority, and it is the entrepreneur that is involved where serious management issues are concerned.

Also, small business enterprises possess unique organizational management processes. For instance, small business enterprises have close relationships with customers / clients, which most often consist of informal one-on-one networks, word-of-mouth recommendation, and repeat business deals (Bryson, 1997; Hutahayan, 2019). In addition, in small business enterprises, workplace human relations tend to be characterized by highly organic structures, little formality, specialization of work around individual interests, customer / client-based project teams, advantageous network-building capabilities with customers and clients, and emphasis on collegial method of working (Mintzberg, 1983; Scase, 1995; Chen, 2021). Also, the small business enterprise has a smaller pool of human resources and experience to call on, and is likely to have a more flexible work schedules and limited financial resources.

In addition, small business enterprises are relatively simple in structure, few individuals are involved in their decision-making, their technical needs and wants are more straightforward than those of larger companies, can be treated as rational economic entities,

and their managerial activities are supposed to be simple and straightforward. Generally, the issues that distinguish small business enterprises from larger businesses include lack of experience and lack of relevant resources on the part of small business enterprises. However, Culkin and Smith (2000) posit that the reverse is the case regarding the managerial tendencies in small business enterprises. The environmental context, attitudes, and behaviours of individuals are important in understanding and managing small business enterprises efficiently and effectively. So, managerial generalization across different business sectors, including large and small business enterprises, has the probability of being problematic (Curran, 1991; Scase, 1995), and the view that management practices and orientations are similarly applicable to companies of all types and sizes operating in different contextual settings is debatable (Osuagwu et al., 2011). Small business enterprises have their unique peculiarities that affect their managerial practices and orientations (Alexandru et al., 2020).

Conceptualizations of small business enterprises vary from country to country and from industry to industry using such indices as number of employees, turnover, capital employed, managerial tendencies, and a combination of these indices. Not minding which definition of small business enterprise that is adopted, the relevance of efficient and effective management practices by small business enterprises is not in doubt. One way of managing a small business enterprise efficiently and effectively is through the rational combination of the relevant resources of materials, money, machine, man, market, time, relationships and management practices and orientations, in addition to proper development of human resources (Hutahayan, 2019). Therefore, efficient and effective management practices and orientations in small business enterprises are associated with proper identification, assessment and exploitation of business opportunities which exist within their relevant environments of business interests via appropriate managerial considerations, orientations and practices.

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS OF THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION (EO) CONSTRUCT

Unstable, turbulent and complex business environments can make business organizations resort to entrepreneurship tendencies (Franco and Haase, 2013). The first person to coin the word 'entrepreneurship' in the 18th century, who defined entrepreneurship as a business activity concerned with bearing the risk of purchasing good or service at a certain price and selling at an uncertain price (Bruyat and Julien, 2000). An entrepreneur, amongst other peculiarities, is that entity (person or organization) associated with entrepreneurship by creating a business enterprise and nursing it to survival, growth and success. Entrepreneurship has positive relationship with economic development (Rocha, 2004).

There is lack of consensus regarding entrepreneurship conceptualizations in relevant extant literature. Entrepreneurship can be conceived as a process, which involves the efforts of an entity (individual or organization) in identifying viable opportunities in a business environment and obtaining and managing the relevant human and non-human resources needed to exploit those opportunities efficiently and effectively. It involves capturing of ideas, converting the ideas into goods and services, and then building a business venture to take the goods and services to the relevant market segments that need and want the goods and services. It is strongly associated with the process of starting a new business venture (Gartner, 1985; Aloulou, 2016), and this process can occur over time (Linan and Rodriguez-Cohard, 2015). Innovation, growth, creation of utility, uniqueness, and profit / non-profit goals and objectives are the salient features of entrepreneurship tendencies (Gartner, 2002).

Entrepreneurship represents organizational and/or individual behaviour. It can be seen as having specific functions in the economy, particularly in creativeness, innovation and resource allocation with entrepreneurs seen as

innovators of business ideas. It is a form of business behaviour concerned with the identification and exploitation of business opportunities in the relevant environment. It is a set of personal characteristics, cognitive styles, attributes or motivations of creative and innovative individuals and organizations. It is the process of creating value by pulling together human and non-human resources to exploit business opportunities in the relevant environment. It is a behavioural tendency that is linked to goal, objective, outcome or performance (Covin and Slevin, 1991). It has also been conceptualized as a life skill with forms of encouragement from national and regional organizations for the promotion of relevant attitudes and intensions among entities (Frank et al., 2005). The key elements of entrepreneurship include risk taking, proactivity, innovation, and opportunity sensitivity, among others.

Therefore, entrepreneurship does not have a generally accepted conceptualization (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000; Ucbasaran et al., 2001; Landstrom, 2009; Eggers et al., 2013). Also, there are different types of entrepreneurship tendencies, including agricultural entrepreneurship, corporate entrepreneurship, portfolio entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship, among others. According to Bras and Soukiazis (2020), the determinants of entrepreneurship tendencies vary. Bras (2020) reports, via empirical evidence, that increased entrepreneurship tendencies are a function of lower level of corruption, fewer constraints on capital investment, higher investment expenditure, higher level of financial development, fewer trade barriers, lower inflationary pressure, and less government regulation on price, in addition to protection of property rights (Wales, 2016). A major strand of entrepreneurship is entrepreneurship orientation (EO).

A proper conceptualization of any entrepreneurship and business management construct will assist in its understanding and investigation, in addition to its efficient and effective practice. Scholars have shown

appreciable interests in various business management orientations with regard to marketing, management and entrepreneurship (Hakala and Kohtamaki, 2011). According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), entrepreneurship is different from entrepreneurial orientation. While entrepreneurship deals with a business entity's scope and market-product connections, entrepreneurial orientation focuses on decision-makers' entrepreneurial approaches, styles, practices and strategies (Kam and Wong, 2012). Along this line, entrepreneurship has been conceptualized as the creation of new business entities, which can include products and processes. Entrepreneurship is what of the new business entities, while entrepreneurial orientation is the how of the new business entities (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). However, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation are conceptually similar in relation to such activities as innovation, search for beneficial business opportunities and efficient and effective use of human and non-human resources to achieve set goals and objectives (Fang et al., 2008).

Entrepreneurial orientation is a key concept in entrepreneurship which has attracted appreciable research interest (Covin et al., 2006; Kollmann and Stockmann, 2014), with myriads of conceptualizations and dimensions, is one of the durable management concepts (Basso et al., 2009), and has benefited from many cognate disciplines such as marketing, strategic management, organizational behaviour, operations management, human resource management, economics, and psychology, among others (Dess et al., 2011). There are many conceptualizations of the entrepreneurial orientation construct in relevant extant literature, and these conceptualizations lack consensus (Covin and Lumpkin, 2011), including the construct's measurement scales (Covin and Slevin, 1989; George and Marino, 2011; Covin and Wales, 2012). Entrepreneurial orientation is entrepreneurship at the organizational level and comprises the strategic steps guiding an entrepreneurial entity's decision-making

activities (dos Santos and Marinho, 2018). It is a peculiarity of an entrepreneurial business entity as opposed to a conservative business entity (Morris et al., 2011), and deals with the entrepreneurial attitudes of entities (such as persons and organizations). Entrepreneurial orientation is one of the key variables associated with the contingency theory of business management (Ruiz and Collazzo, 2021).

Therefore, entrepreneurial orientation is a major consideration in the comprehension, engagement or non-engagement in entrepreneurship tendencies by an entity, in addition to serving as a window for the development of strategic means for a business entity (Franco and Haase, 2013). Business entities with high degree of entrepreneurial orientation tend to perform better (Ritala et al., 2013), and long term organizational survival and growth are a function of entrepreneurial orientation (Eggers et al., 2013), in addition to being a major predictor of a business entity's performance (Boso et al., 2013). However, a high extent of entrepreneurial orientation may not be beneficial in all situations (Covin and Slevin, 1989; Li et al., 2008; Hakala and Kohtamaki, 2011).

DIMENSIONS OF THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION CONSTRUCT

With regard to measurement scales, the entrepreneurial orientation construct has been measured using many scales (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Covin and Slevin, 1989), with the Covin and Slevin's (1989) scales dominating and forming the foundations for most relevant studies (Kurtulmus et al., 2020). Miller and Friesen (1982), Miller (1983) and Miller and Friesen (1983) were the first to conceptualize the entrepreneurial orientation construct measurement into three components of innovation, proactiveness and risk-taking, which represent the ability, character and entrepreneurial part of a business entity's strategy (Hakala, 2013), including the ability that drives and encourages the entity's business spirit (Kam and Wong, 2012). According to Covin and Slevin (1989), the EO dimensions of

innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking are interrelated. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) added competitive aggressiveness and autonomy to these three components of the entrepreneurial orientation construct measurement.

Generally, entrepreneurial orientation consists of innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, competitive aggressiveness, and autonomy, among others (Covin and Slevin, 1989; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Dess and Lumpkin, 2005; Fadda, 2018). Innovativeness is concerned with an entrepreneurial entity's tendency to develop processes that lead to new goods, services, ideas and technological discoveries; proactiveness deals with an entity's tendency to anticipate and seize opportunities in the relevant business environment; risk-taking is concerned with an entity's tendency to take calculated relevant and potentially rewarding risky decisions in its business activities; competitiveness deals with an entity's behavioural tendencies towards rivals and their strategies; autonomy is concerned with an entity's tendency to be creatively innovative without administrative or bureaucratic inhibitions or constraints. In addition, Dess and Lumpkin (2005) posit that the five EO dimensions (which include innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, competitive aggressiveness, and autonomy) may present themselves in various combinations depending on available business opportunities being pursued and exploited by the business entity. These entrepreneurial orientation (EO) dimensions can be conceptualized individually or multidimensionally (Fadda, 2018). Therefore, there is equivocation regarding the dimensions of the entrepreneurial orientation construct, partly as a result of different research contexts and approaches (Dess et al. 2011), and debates are ongoing regarding the dimensions of the construct (Rauch et al., 2009; Hakala, 2013).

CONCLUSION AND RESEARCH GUIDE

It can be concluded that there is equivocation in relevant extant literature regarding the conceptualizations and dimensions of the EO tendencies of entities (Rauch et al, 2009; Hernandez-Perlines, 2016; Vega-Vazquez et al.,

2016; Jogaratnam, 2017), in addition to scanty evidence regarding the positive impact of entrepreneurial orientation on the strategies of small business enterprises, especially in emerging economies (Hutahayan, 2019). Generally, entrepreneurial orientation studies can be conducted in both profit and nonprofit organizations, and small and large businesses, among others. However, it has been posited that researchers have not shown deep interest in some of the important entrepreneurship issues associated with the entrepreneurial orientation construct in relevant contextual settings (Teasley 2009; Pearce et al., 2010; Phelan et al., 2013; Yao et al., 2016). With regard to small business enterprises, Silva and Di Serio (2021) lament that some aspects of entrepreneurship literature have ignored relevant issues relating to small business enterprises, thereby treating small business enterprises as "forgotten businesses". Specifically, although the entrepreneurial orientation construct has received appreciable research interests in relevant extant literature, the studies have not been sufficiently adapted to different business types, cultures and contexts (Morris et al., 2011; Lurtz and Kreutzer, 2017), and lack theoretical ecology (Gupta and Gupta, 2015), in addition to the utilization of different research instruments to measure the construct which may not be contextually relevant (Taatila and Down, 2012). Also, theoretical testing of the construct's practices in different contexts and business types, including small business enterprises, seems to be insufficient (Helm and Anderson, 2010). Specifically, Chavez-Rivera et al (2021) lament that studies on relevant dimensions of entrepreneurship, including entrepreneurial orientation, in emerging economies are limited.

According to Gupta and Gupta (2015), entrepreneurial orientation should be integrated into entrepreneurial research, and its temporal (time), spatial (geographical), methodological and other forms of contextual and cultural relevance should be highlighted and investigated in different business types and contexts, including small business enterprises operating in different

contextual and cultural settings. Specifically, there should be relevant entrepreneurial orientation research works in small business enterprises in different contexts and cultures (Alarjani et al, 2020) directed towards examining, understanding and consolidating knowledge of its theory, measurement and practices, in addition to providing directions for further studies (Velt et al., 2020). In addition, the entrepreneurial orientation construct should be investigated, periodically, in small business enterprises in different contextual and cultural settings. This paper's associated research instrument (questionnaire) may assist in this vein. Using the paper's associated research instrument, the entrepreneurial orientation construct in small business enterprises can be investigated at different levels, contexts and cultures in order to have comprehensive, rigorous and beneficial insights regarding its conceptualizations, measurements and practices in the domain of small business enterprises.

This paper's associated research instrument has been designed from relevant extant literature and experience, and followed the self-predictions and behavioural intentions approaches for the designing of entrepreneurial orientation measurement scales (DeVellis, 2003; Nauta, 2007; Yao et al, 2016). The associated research instrument is likely to assist relevant research works interested in investigating the entrepreneurial orientation construct of small business enterprises in different contextual and cultural settings, especially in emerging economies that are relatively under-represented in the entrepreneurial orientation research streams. Sandhu et al (2010) lament that most studies on the entrepreneurial orientation construct are focused on developed economies. Therefore, studies emanating from the proposed research would go a long in expanding knowledge regarding entrepreneurial orientation conceptualizations, dimensions, and contextual applications in small business enterprises in different settings in developed and developing countries), in addition to determining the psychometric properties of the paper's associated

research instrument in relation to other relevant entrepreneurial orientation research instruments.

This paper has attempted to present different conceptualizations and dimensions of the entrepreneurial orientation construct. It can be concluded that there is equivocation regarding conceptualizations and dimensions of the construct in relevant extant literature, in addition to the approaches used in measuring the construct. The paper, therefore, proposes a research agenda, with suggested research instrument, to investigate the entrepreneurial orientation construct in small business enterprises in different contextual and cultural settings. The proposed research can be guided by relevant seminal theoretical frameworks such as theory of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1993), unified theory of acceptance and use of technology (Venkatesh et al, 2003), and self-determination theory (Hagger and Chatzisarantis, 2009; Hagger, Chatzisarantis & Harris, 2006), and contingency theory (Ruiz and Collazo, 2021).among others.

The following research issues/questions may guide the proposed research in small business enterprises in specific contextual settings:

1. What are the entrepreneurial orientation practices of small business enterprises?
2. What are the major components of entrepreneurial orientation practices in small business enterprises?
3. What is the performance impact of entrepreneurial orientation practices in small business enterprises?

Also, the proposed research may be guided by a triangulation of qualitative and quantitative research methods. The qualitative research approach can consist of individual depth interviews and focus group discussions with operators of small business enterprises, relevant scholars, and executives of relevant agencies dealing with small business enterprises such as Chambers of Commerce and Industry, banks, and associations of small business enterprises,

among others. The quantitative research approach can utilize the attached research instrument (questionnaire).

The proposed research agenda is likely to contribute to entrepreneurial orientation and small business entrepreneurship literature, research, practice and policy issues, in addition to spurring entrepreneurial orientation knowledge and tendencies among small business entities who are the catalysts for entrepreneurship creativity and innovations in different contextual and cultural settings. Also,

the proposed research agenda, with the associated research instrument, is likely to present some psychometric properties that add to the entrepreneurship orientation literature, research and practice, especially for small business enterprises research works in emerging economies. Therefore, the proposed research agenda is likely to have beneficial theoretical, educational, research, policy and practical implications in relation to small business entrepreneurship, in general, and entrepreneurial orientation, in particular.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Alarjani, F.N.F., Anwar, B., Aslam, H.D., Iqbal, S., and Ayub, A. (2020). A moderated mediation model of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, institutional environment, and entrepreneurial orientation for SME development. *Sage Open*, 1-18. Doi: 10.1177/2158244020941000.
- Alexandru, V.A., Bolisani, E., Andrei, A.G., Cegarra-Navarro, J.G., Martinez-Martinez, A., Paiola, M., Scarso, E., Vatamanescu, E.-M., & Zieba, M. (2020). Knowledge management approaches of small and medium-sized firms: A cluster analysis. *Kybernetika*, 49(1), 73-87. Doi: 10.1108/K-03-2019-0211.
- Alzahrani, J. (2019). The impact of e-commerce adoption on business strategy in Saudi Arabian small and medium enterprises (SMEs). *Review of Economics and Political Science*, 4(1), 73-88. Doi: 10.1108/REPS-10-2018-013.
- Aloulou, W.J. (2016). Predicting the entrepreneurial intentions of fresh students from EAO modeling and personal background: A Saudi perspective. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 8(2), 180-203. Doi: 10.1108/JEEE-09-2015-0050.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Basso, O., Fayolle, A. & Bouchard, V. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation: The making of a concept. *The International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 10(4), 313-321.
- Boso, N., Cadogan, J.W., & Story, V.M. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation, market orientation, network ties, and performance: Study of entrepreneurial firms in a developing economy. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28(6), 708-727.
- Bras, G.R. (2020). Determinants of entrepreneurship in Latvia and Baltic countries in general: An empirical approach. *European Journal of International Management*, 14(5), 817-841. Doi: 10.1504/EJIM.2019.10018441.
- Bras, G.R., & Soukiazis, E. (2020). Entrepreneurship in the secondary and tertiary sectors: The same determinants? *Cogent Business & Management*, 7(1), 1-19. Doi: 10.1080/23311975.2020.1748790.
- Bruyat, C., & Julien, P. (2000). Defining the field of research in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 165-180.

- Bryson, J. (1997). Business service firms, service space and management of change. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 9,93 – 111.
- Burns, P. (1990). *Entrepreneurship and small business*. In Burns, P. and Dewhurst, J. (eds.), *Small business and entrepreneurship*. London: Macmillan Education.
- Chavez-Rivera, M.E., M.E. Fuentis-Fuentis, M.M., & Ruiz-Jimenez, J.M. (2021). Challenging the context: Mumpreneurship, copreneurship and sustainable thinking in the entrepreneurial process of women – A case study in Ecuador. *Academia Revista Latinoamerica de Administracion*. Doi: 10.1108/ARLA-07-2020-0172.
- Chen, X. (2021). Immigrant-owned small businesses' participation in diaspora philanthropy: A case study during the COVID-19 outbreak. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*. Doi: 10.1108/NEJE-08-2020-0033.
- Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic management of small business firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 75-87.
- Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D.P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as a firm behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 16(1), 7-25.
- Covin, J.G., Green, K.M., & Slevin, D.P. (2006). Strategic process effects on the entrepreneurial orientation-sales growth rate relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 30(1), 57-81.
- Covin, J.G. & Lumpkin, G.T. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation theory and research: Reflections on a needed construct. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 35(5), 855-872.
- Covin, J.G. & Wales, W. J. (2012). The measurement of entrepreneurial orientation. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 36(4), 677-702.
- Culkin, N. And Smith, D. (2000). An emotional business: A guide to understanding the motivations of small business decision takers. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 3(3), 145-157.
- Curran, J. (1991). Employment and employment relations in the small enterprise. In Stanworth, J. and Gray, C. (eds.). *Bolton 20 years on: The small firm in the 1990s*. London: Paul Chapman Press.
- Dayan, M., Zacca, R., Husain, Z., Di Benedetto, A., & Ryan, J.C. (2016). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation, willingness to change, and development culture on new product exploration in small enterprises. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 31(5), 668-683. Doi: 10.1108/JBIM-02-2015-0023.
- Depaoli, P., Za, S., & Scornavacca, E. (2020). A model for digital development of SMEs: An interaction-based approach. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 27(7), 1049-1068. Doi: 10.1108/JSBED-06-2020-0219.
- Dess, G.G., & Lumpkin, G.T. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), 147-156.
- Dess, G.G., Pinkham, B.C., & Yang, H. (2011). Entrepreneurial orientation: Assessing the construct's validity and addressing some of its implications for research in the areas of family business and organizational learning. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 35(5), 1077-1090.
- DeVellis, R.F.(2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eggers, F., Kraus, S., Hughes, M., Laraway, S., & Snyckerski, S. (2013). Implications of customer and entrepreneurial orientations for SME growth. *Management Decision*, 51(3), 524-546. Doi: 10.1108/00251741311309643.
- Fadda, N. (2018). The effects of entrepreneurial orientation dimensions on performance in the tourism sector. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 21(1), 22-44. Doi: 10.1108/NEJE-03-2018-0004.
- Fang, N., Yuli, Z., & Hongzhi, X. (2008). Acquisition of resources, formal organization and entrepreneurial orientation of new ventures. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 1(1), 40-52. Doi: 10.1108/17561390910916877.

- Franco, M., & Haase, H. (2013). Firm resources and entrepreneurial orientation as determinants for collaborative entrepreneurship. *Management Decision*, 51(3), 680-696.
Doi: 10.1108/0025174131109724.
- Frank, H., Korunka, C., Lueger, M., & Mugler, J. (2005). Entrepreneurial education in Australian secondary schools. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 12(2), 259-273.
Doi: 10.1108/14626000510594647.
- Gartner, W.B. (1985). A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(4), 696-706.
- Gartner, W.B. (2002). What are we talking about when we talk about entrepreneurship? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15, 15-28.
- George, B.A., & Marino, L. (2011). The epistemology of entrepreneurial orientation: Conceptual formation, modeling, and operationalization. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 35(5), 989-1024.
- Graham, P. G. (1999). Small business participation in the global economy. *European Journal of Marketing*, 33(1 & 3), 23-34.
- Gruber-Muecke, T., & Hofer, K.M. (2015). Market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and performance in emerging markets. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 10(3), 560-571. Doi: 10.1108/IJoEM-05-2013-0076.
- Gupta, V. & Gupta, A. (2015). The concept of entrepreneurial orientation. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, 11(2), 55-137.
- Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2009). Integrating the theory of planned behaviour and self-determination theory in health behaviour: A meta-analysis. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 14, 275-302.
- Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Harris, J. (2006). From psychological need satisfaction to intentional behavior: Testing a motivational sequence in two behavioral contexts. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 131-148
- Hakala, H. (2013). Entrepreneurial and learning orientation: Effects on growth and profitability in the software sector. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 8(1), 102-118.
Doi: 10.1108/17465261311291687.
- Hakala, H., & Kohtamaki, M. (2011). Configurations of entrepreneurial-customer-and technology orientation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 17(1), 64-81.
Doi: 10.1108/13552551111107516.
- Helm, S.T. & Anderson, F.O. (2010). Beyond Taxonomy. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 20(3), 259-276.
- Hernandez-Perlines, F. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation in hotel industry: Multi-group analysis of quality certification. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(10), 4714-4724.
Doi: 10.1016/j.busres.2016.04.019.
- Hutahayan, B. (2019). Factors affecting the performance of Indonesian special food SMEs in entrepreneurial orientation in East Java. *Asian Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 13(2), 231-246. Doi: 10.1108/APJIE-09-2018-0053.
- Jaim, J. (2021). Problems of political unrest: Women in small businesses in Bangladesh. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*. Doi: 10.1108/NEJE-01-2021-0004.
- Jogaratham, G. (2017). The effect of market orientation, entrepreneurial orientation and human capital on positional advantage: Evidence from the restaurant industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 60, 104-113. Doi: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2016.10.002.
- Kam, S., & Wong, S. (2012). The influences of entrepreneurial orientation on product advantage and new product success. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 234-262.
Doi: 10.1108/1756139121162175.

- Kollmann, T., & Stockmann, C. (2014). Filling the entrepreneurial orientation-performance gap: The mediating effects of exploratory and exploitative innovations. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38, 1001-1026. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2012.00530x.
- Kurtulmus, B.E., Katrinli, A., and Warner, B. (2020). International entrepreneurial orientation and performance of SMEs: The mediating role of informal institutional framework. *Sage Open*, 1-9. Doi: 1177/2158244020983294.
- Lan, Q., & Wu, S. (2010). An empirical study of entrepreneurial orientation and degree of internationalization of small and medium-size Chinese manufacturing enterprises. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 53-75. Doi: 10.1108/17561391011019023.
- Landstrom, H.(2009). *Pioneers in entrepreneurship and small business research*. New York: Springer, 2nd Ed.
- Li, Y., Zhao, Y., Tan, J., & Liu, Y. (2008). Moderating effects of entrepreneurial orientation on market orientation-performance linkage: Evidence from Chinese small firms. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1), 113-133.
- Linan, F., & Rodriguez-Cohard, J.C. (2015). Assessing the stability of graduates' entrepreneurial intention and exploring its predictive capacity. *Academia Revista Latinoamericana de Administracion*, 28 (1), 77-98. Doi: 10.1108/ARLA-06-2013-0071.
- Lumpkin, G.T., & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- 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, 429-451.
- Lurtz, K. & Kreutzer, K. (2017). Entrepreneurial orientation and social venture creation in nonprofit organizations: The pivotal role of risk-taking and collaboration. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 46(1), 92-115.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770-791.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P.H. (1982). Innovation in conservative and entrepreneurial firms: Two models of strategic momentum. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3(2), 1-25.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P.H. (1983). Strategy-making and environment: The third link. *Strategic Management Journal*, 4(3), 221-235.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Structure in fives: Designing effective organizations*. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall.
- Morris, M.H. Webb, J.W. & Franklin, R.J. (2011). Understanding the manifestation of entrepreneurial orientation in the nonprofit context. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 35(5), 947-971.
- Nauta, N.M. (2007). Assessing college students' satisfaction with their academic majors. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 15, 446-462.
- Okongwu, D.A. (2001). Fostering the innovation potential of SMEs in the globalization era: The role of patents. *WIPO Milan forum on intellectual property and small and medium-sized enterprises*. Milan Italy, February 9th-10th.
- Osuagwu, L., Tende, S., Olumoko, T. and Ogbonna, I. (2011). *Entrepreneurship & Small Business Management*. Lagos: Grey Resources Limited.
- Pearce, J.A., Fritz, D.A., & Davis, P.S. (2010). Entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of religious congregations as predicted by rational choice theory. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 34(1), 219-248. Doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00315x.
- Phelan, S.E., Johnson, A.T. & Semrau, T. (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation in public schools: The view from New Jersey. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 16(1), 19-30. Doi: 10.1108/NEJE-16-01-2013-B002.

- Rapini, T., Farida, U., & Santoso, A. (2018). Sari cinacao ngrayun equals with modern ready-to-drink beverages. *Emerald Reach Proceedings Series*, 1, 443-449.
Doi: 10.1108/978-1-78756-793-1-0083.
- Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 33(3), 761-787.
- Ritala, P., Henttonen, K., Salojarvi, H., Saino, L., & Saarenketo, S. (2013). Gone fishing for knowledge? The effect of strategic orientations on the scope of open knowledge search. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 8(3), 328-348. Doi: 10.1108/BJOM-Apr-2012-0019.
- Rocha, H. (2004). Entrepreneurship and development: The role of clusters. *Small Business Economics*, 23(5), 363-400.
- Ruiz, T.N., & Collazzo, P. (2021). Determinants of the use of accounting systems in microenterprises: Evidence from Chile. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 11(4), 632-650. Doi: 10.1108/JAEE-07-2020-0173.
- Sandhu, M.S., Kishore, K., & Yusof, M. (2010). Entrepreneurial inclination of students at private university in Malaysia. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 13(1), 61-72.
Doi: 10.1108/NEJE-13-01-2010-B005.
- Sandhu, M.S., Sidique, S.F., & Riaz, S. (2011). Entrepreneurship barriers and entrepreneurial inclination among Malaysian postgraduate students. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 17(4), 428-449. Doi: 10.1108/13552551111139656.
- dos Santos, I.L., & Marinho, S.V. (2018). Relationship between entrepreneurial orientation, marketing capability and business performance in retail supermarkets in Santa Catarina (Brazil). *Innovation & Management Review*, 15(2), 118-136. Doi: 10.1108/INMR-04-2018-008.
- Scase, R. (1995). Studying socio-economic change in Britain in the 1980s. *Sociology*, 29(3), 541-549. Doi: 10.1177/0038038595029003010.
- Shane, S. & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Silva, G., & Di Serio, L.C. (2021). Innovation in the “forgotten businesses”. *Innovation and Management Review*. Doi: 10.1108/INMR-04-2019-0045.
- Song, W., Ma, X., & Yu, H. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation, interaction orientation, and innovation performance: A model of moderated mediation. *Sage Open*, 1-13.
Doi: 10.1177/2158244019885143.
- Storey, D., & Sykes, N. (1996). Uncertainty, innovation, and management. In Burns and Dewhurst (eds.), *Small business & entrepreneurship*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Taatila, V., & Down, S. (2012). Measuring entrepreneurial orientation of university students. *Education + Training*, 54(8/9), 744-760. Doi: 10.1108/00400911211274864.
- Teasley, B. (2009). Charter school outcomes. In M. Brends, M.G. Springer, D. Ballou & H.J. Walberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on School Choice*. New York: Routledge.
- Tuteja, S.K. (2001). New enterprises in the digital Era. *WIPO Milan forum on intellectual property and small and medium-sized enterprises*. Milan Italy, February 9th-10th.
- Ucbasaran, D., Westhead, P.H., & Wright, M. (2001). The focus of entrepreneurial research: Contextual and process issues. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 57-80.
- Valenza, G., Caputo, A., & Calabro, A. Is small and medium-sized beautiful? The structure and evolution of family SMEs research. *Journal of Family Business Management*. Doi: 10.1108/JFBM.
- Vega-Vazquez, M., Cossio-Silva, F., & Revilla-Camacho, M. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation-hotel performance: Has market orientation anything to say? *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5089-5094. Doi: 10.1016/j.busres.2016.04.085.

- Velt, H., Torkkeli, L., & Laine, I. (2020). Entrepreneurial ecosystem research: Bibliometric mapping of the domain. *Journal of Business Ecosystems*, 1(2), 43-83. Doi: 10.4018/JBE.20200701.0a1.
- Venkatesh, V., Morris, M.G., Davis, G.B., and Davis, F.D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. *MIS*, 27, 425-478.
- Wales, W.J. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation in Emerging Russian regulatory context: The criticality of interpersonal relationships. *European Journal of International management*, 10(3), 359-382.
- Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation and performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(13), 1307-1314. Doi: 10.1002/smj.360.
- Yao, X., Wu, X., & Long, D. (2016). University students' entrepreneurial tendency in China: Effect of students' perceived entrepreneurial environment. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 60-81. Doi: 10.1108/JEEE-03-2015-0021.
- Zaazou, Z.A., & Abdou, D.S. (2021). Egyptian small and medium sized enterprises' battle against COVID-19 pandemic: March – July 2020. *Journal of Humanities and Applied Social Sciences*. Doi: 10.1108/JHASS-09-2020-0161.

APPENDIX: ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION (EO) IN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (SBEs) QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION

To what extent do you agree with the following statements concerning the entrepreneurial orientation practices in your organization? (Answer by selecting one of the alternatives 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. You may add comments to justify your answers):

- 6 = very high extent
- 5 = high extent
- 4 = average extent
- 3 = low extent
- 2 = very low extent
- 1 = no extent at all

S/N	ASPECTS OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION PRACTICES IN SBEs	RESPONDENT'S CHOICE						COMMENTS
		6	5	4	3	2	1	
1.	In your organization, you have autonomy in doing your work without supervision by your superior to do your work.							
2.	Your organization allows you to be creative and try different methods to do your work.							
3.	Employees in your organization are allowed to make decisions without going through rigorous approval procedures.							
4.	Employees in your organization are encouraged to manage their own work and have flexibility in resolving problems.							
5.	In your organization, you seldom have to follow the same work steps while doing your major work tasks day to day.							
6.	Your organization regularly introduces new products or processes.							
7.	Your organization puts strong emphasis on new and innovative products or processes.							
8.	Your organization has increased the number of products (goods/services) offered during the last two years.							
9.	Your organization is continuously pursuing new business opportunities.							

10.	There have been dramatic changes in your organization's products or processes in the last few years.								
11.	In your organization, there is a strong connection between the number of new business ideas generated and the number of new business ideas successfully implemented.								
12.	Your organization puts strong emphasis on continuous improvement in its product delivery processes.								
13.	In your organization, there is a strong belief that innovation is necessary for the future of the business organization.								
14.	In your organization, the leaders seek to maximize value from business opportunities without constraints from existing organizational resources or structures.								
15.	When confronted with uncertain decisions, your organization typically adopts a bold stance in order to optimize the likelihood of exploiting business opportunities.								
16.	Your organization, generally, has a strong tendency towards high-risk businesses or projects.								
17.	Due to the environment, your organization believes that courageous and all-encompassing business decisions are necessary for the achievement of its business objectives.								
18.	Employees in your organization are encouraged to take calculated risks relating to new ideas.								
18.	In your organization, to be called a "risk-taker" is seen as a positive attribute for employees in your organization.								
19.	In your organization, to be called a "risk-taker" is seen as a positive attribute for employees in your organization.								
20.	Your organization is, most times, the first to introduce new products or processes.								
21.	Your organization, most times, initiates/starts business actions (products or processes) which other competitors respond to or copy.								
22.	Your organization always seeks new products or processes in its business activities.								
23.	Your organization always monitors market trends, including future needs of its customers/clients.								
24.	Your organization is, most times, the first to introduce new products or processesYour organization adopts very competitive practices in order to outperform other competitors.								
25.	Employees in your organization are seen as the most important asset.								
26.	Your organization takes aggressive position in order to fight actions that may threaten its survival or competitive position.								
27.	Your organization understands when it is taking very aggressive business decision that will threaten its reputation or lead to retaliation by other competitors.								
28.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes innovativeness (i.e., your organization puts strong emphasis on developing new products & processes) in its activities.								
29.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes risk-taking (i.e., your organization prefers to take on high-risk projects (that offer the chance of a very high return) in its activities.								
30.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes competitiveness (i.e., your organization typically adopts a very competitive approach that is very aggressive and intense) in its activities.								
31.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes proactiveness (i.e., your business has a strong tendency to be ahead of competitors) in its activities.								

32.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes autonomy (i.e., your business supports and encourages individuals and/or teams to identify the best business opportunities and take advantage of them without constantly referring to their supervisors) in its activities.								
33.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes entrepreneurial culture in its activities.								
34.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes strategic orientation in its activities.								
35.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes growth orientation in its activities.								
36.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes team orientation in its activities.								
37.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes knowledge creation & sharing in its activities.								
38.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes reactivity in its activities.								
39.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes team orientation in its activities.								
40.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes environmental alertness in its activities.								
41.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes resource orientation in its activities.								
42.	All things considered, your organization emphasizes achievement of its major goals through its entrepreneurial orientation practices								

SECTION B

1. Title or position of respondent in the organization: _____
2. What is the number of staff employed in your organization?:
 - a. Between 1-9 _____
 - b. Between 10-99 _____
 - c. Between 100-499 _____
 - d. Between 500 and above _____
3. Educational qualification(s) of respondent: _____
4. Professional qualification(s) of respondent: _____
5. Working experience (years) of respondent: _____
6. Age (years) of respondent: _____
7. Gender of respondent: _____

SECTION C

All things considered, how certain do you feel regarding all the answers/responses you have provided/given in sections A and B above?.

6. Very certain.
5. Reasonably certain.
4. Averagely certain.
3. Fairly certain.
2. Poorly certain.
1. Not certain at all.