Corporate Entrepreneurship and Performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria.

[1]Adudu, Chiangi Adudu; [2]Ojiba, Chinwe Nnajiofor, [3]Ogundare, Oladiran Olaniyi

[1, 3] Department of Business Administration / Management, Yaba College of Technology, Lagos Nigeria

[2]PhD Student, J.S Tarkaa University (Formerly, Federal University of Agriculture) Makurdi, Benue State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of corporate entrepreneurship on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria. The specific objectives examined were business venturing, strategic renewal, innovativeness, proactiveness and risk taking propensity on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria. The study adopts a survey design and questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. The population of the study comprises of 2,236 licensed SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria and a sample of 339 was determined through Stratified sampling. Validity results of KMO, and Bartlett's test indicate that variables are highly significant, and principal component analysis was suitable (0.734). The test-retest result of reliability reported a reliability index of (0.784). Data collected from the organizations' surveyed were analyzed and presented using regressions analysis. Results of tested hypotheses indicated that business venturing (40.3%), strategic renewal (44.4%), innovativeness (42.0%), proactiveness (41.8%), risk taking propensity (43.1%) all have positive and significant impact on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria.. It is established that, corporate entrepreneurship have influence on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria. The study recommends among others that it has become imperative for business organizations to exhibit corporate entrepreneurship and develop supportive organizational culture in order to survive, gain competitive advantage over competitors, and achieve superior performance.

Keywords: *corporate entrepreneurship, performance of SMEs, business venturing, strategic renewal, risk taking propensity.*

I. Introduction

It is not the strongest of the species that survives, nor the most intelligent, but the one that is most adaptable to change. Never has this been more true, than in today's highly competitive and rapidly changing business world. Large, established companies are being forced to find new ways to adapt to increasing pressure from smaller, faster and more agile companies. These new players are identifying and exploiting opportunities by disrupting markets, taking market share and threatening the very existence of established businesses. Globally, business environment has become highly dynamic, unpredictable, and competitive (Kuratko, Ireland, and Hornsby, 2004). This is aided by globalization, trade liberalization, and technological developments, particularly in the area of information and communication technology. All these developments have made the world to become a global market, where business organizations compete beyond national boundaries. Though not a new concept, corporate entrepreneurship is gaining momentum and is widely being recognized as the answer to these organizational woes. Behaving like a startup and harnessing the power of innovation, whilst retaining the benefits of being a large company, is allowing businesses to retain their competitive advantage and continue to flourish. Sharma and Chrisman (1999) define corporate entrepreneurship as the processes whereby an individual or a group of individuals, in association with an existing organization, create a new organization or strategic renewal or innovation within that organization. They emphasize three main categories of corporate entrepreneurship encompassing corporate venturing, strategic renewal, and innovation in products and services.

Corporate entrepreneurship, which has become an important field of management study, was developed as a strategic orientation to overcome the external adaptation problems faced by firms which have been looking for sustainable competitive advantage in global competition in last thirty years. (Miller and Friesen, 1978). Corporate entrepreneurship which is also defined as entrepreneurial orientation and activities in an established organization is an important dimension of wealth creation and economic development. Researchers and practitioners have been interested in the concept since the early of 1980s because of its profitable effect on firms' performance (Zahra, 1991; Antoncic and Hisrich, 2004). Corporate entrepreneurship encompasses the actual entrepreneurial acts or market-oriented results, and differs from constructs such as entrepreneurial orientation, which are predispositions of firms with respect to their strategy-making processes, practices, and activities, that stimulate corporate entrepreneurship (Simsek and Heavey, 2011).

In developing countries like Nigeria, corporate entrepreneurship is vital for the survival of companies in harsh business environments. Small and medium enterprises play crucial roles in the development process in most of the developed and developing countries. Many nations have realized the value of small businesses. They are characterized by dynamism, witty innovations, efficiency, and their small size allows for faster decision making process (Adegbuyi, Akinyele and Akinyele, 2015). Small and medium enterprises have been considered as the engine of economic growth and for promoting equitable development. The major advantage of the sector is its employment potential at low capital cost. The labor intensity of the SMEs sector is much higher than that of the large enterprises. The role of small and medium enterprises in the economic and social development of the country is well established. The sector is a nursery of entrepreneurship, often driven by individual creativity and innovation (Aremu and Adeyemi, 2011). Corporate entrepreneurship encourages employees to design numerous techniques for new business lines, models or design strategies that will contribute to the growth of the company. It is important for companies to maintain competitive advantage or relevance in the market so as to attract investors. Over the past decade, Nigerian companies have invested vastly on innovations all over the country most especially technological innovations. Financial technology has impacted Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) massively, allowing businesses to make online transactions with suppliers and costumer in a safer and more convenient way (Abiola, 2016). Online banking has allowed other initiatives (such as online shopping and food delivery services) to develop and improve their innovations; because of this, online vendors and food delivery services are still functioning during the COVID-19 lockdown.

Corporate entrepreneurship and SMEs performance has not been adequately investigated in earlier studies. The majority of studies on corporate entrepreneurship (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2004; Adele, 2015; Eze, 2018), have failed to cogently determine the extent to which corporate entrepreneurship have on the performance of SMEs in Nigeria. While some of these studies concluded that corporate entrepreneurship has a strong impact on performance, some found out that there may not be such a strong interaction. They argument that corporate entrepreneurship will have more positive impact on business performance if it is combined with other strategic business orientations is still debatable. Other researchers have also posited that the impact of corporate entrepreneurship on business performance depends on a multiplicity of different factors such as organizational structure, external environment, top management support, reward system, organizational culture, and organizational resources and competencies (Kuratko *et al.*, 2004; Rutherford and Holt, 2007). The studies showing the effect of corporate entrepreneurship on the performance of SMEs in Nigeria are sparse. Most of the related studies are from Eastern and Southern African regions, as well as from some developed and emerging countries, while such studies from the West African region remains sparse. This has given rise to the question: what is the effect of corporate entrepreneurship on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria? To provide answers to this question, the study is poised to fill the gap in the existing literature by examining the extent to which corporate entrepreneurship have on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study are to: investigate the effect of business venturing on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria, examine the effect of strategic renewal on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria, ascertain the effect of innovation on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria, find out the effect of proactiveness on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria, assess the effect of risk-taking propensity on the performance of SMEs in Federal Capital Territory, Abuja-Nigeria. To achieve these objectives, the study is alienated into five major components as follows: introduction, literature review, methodology, results and discussion and, conclusion and recommendations.

II. Literation Review

Corporate Entrepreneurship

There were initially mixed views on the scope of corporate entrepreneurship because it was not clearly differentiated from the common phenomenon of innovation or new product development in firms (Corbett *et al.*, 2013). Though its definition is somewhat contentious, the concept of corporate entrepreneurship is generally believing to refer to the development of new ideas and opportunities within large or establish businesses. Directly leading to the improvement of organizational profitability and an enhancement of competitive position or the strategic renewal of an existing business. Corporate entrepreneurship is the act of behaving like an entrepreneur while working within a large organization. Corporate entrepreneurship is known as the practice of a corporate management style that integrates risk-taking and innovation approaches, as well as the reward and motivational techniques that are being traditionally thought of as being the province of entrepreneurship. Corporate entrepreneurship focuses on innovation and creativity, and transforms an idea into a profitable venture, while operating within the organizational environment and, is a contemporary issue with pressing relevance for corporate managers.

Antoncic and Hisrich (2001), conclude that entrepreneurship has a positive impact on organizational growth and profitability. Organizations that build structures and embed values to support entrepreneurship are consequently more likely to have a high entrepreneurial Orientation and are more likely to grow than organizations with a low entrepreneurial Orientation. Entrepreneurial organizations are more innovative, they continually renew and this proactive approach leads to new business venturing. Their findings indicate that entrepreneurship could be particularly beneficial for transition economies. For creating sustained value through building entrepreneurship into the organization, a strong management commitment is essential. Corporate entrepreneurship is an important element in large and medium organizations. Also, entrepreneurship exists within the organizations. It plays an important role in organizational and economic development. Entrepreneurship leads not only to new ventures, but it also leads to other innovative activities and orientations. Such as the development of new products, technologies, services, strategies, and competitive postures. The management of the firm is eventually responsible for providing the conditions that facilitate individual entrepreneurial attitude with the aim of opening the employee's minds.

Zahra and Garvis (2000), defines corporate entrepreneurship as, the sum of a company's venturing and innovation activities, can help the firm acquire new capabilities, improve its performance, enter new business and develop new revenue streams in both domestic and foreign markets. Corporate entrepreneurship, as it is often referred to, is the concept of supporting employees to think and behave like entrepreneurs within the confines of an existing organizational structure. Employees with the right vision and skills are encouraged to identify opportunities and develop ideas which lead to innovative new products, services or even new lines of business. Corporate Entrepreneurship is a process used to develop new businesses, products, services or processes inside of an existing organization to create value and generate new revenue growth through entrepreneurial thought and action. Corporate entrepreneurship sets the context for innovation and growth. It provides a systems view of the resources, processes and environment that are needed to support, motivate and engage the organization in entrepreneurial thinking and action. Corporate entrepreneurship programs should produce ideas which are disruptive in nature, rather than smaller, incremental changes. Also, innovations tend to be led by employees, rather than being implemented by management. Innovation is the lifeblood of a company; without it, the company will die. But many larger organizations' struggle to innovate successfully due to their structures, bureaucracy and culture. Implementing a corporate entrepreneurship program provides companies with a systematic way of increasing their innovation capabilities, the benefits of which can be huge.

Successful corporate entrepreneurship ensures a consistent stream of new innovations in the product and service pipeline, which in turn leads to future revenues and growth for the organization. Corporate entrepreneurship programs allow employees to tackle new opportunities, immersing them in work which they find to be both challenging and interesting. When employees are engaged and feel that their contributions are valued by the company, productivity goes up. Employees are an organization's greatest asset when it comes to identifying opportunities and threats in the market. They can provide insights not available to competitors, and are a valuable source of ongoing competitive advantage. Allowing employees to pursue their ideas and opportunities for the business leads to higher levels of job satisfaction. A result of this is lower levels of staff turnover. In addition, companies that are known for encouraging corporate entrepreneurship will in turn attract other talented, entrepreneurially minded employees, creating a positive cycle. Guth and Ginsberg (1990), were among the first scholars attempting to clarify the domain by introducing two categories of corporate entrepreneurial activities, namely business venturing and strategic renewal. Zahra (1996) then divides corporate entrepreneurship into three components of innovation, venturing, and strategic renewal. This study adopts the dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship as advanced by Guth and Ginsberg (1990), business venturing and strategic renewal and, Zahra (1996) innovation, creativity and risk-taking propensity as Miller (1983).

Dimensions of Corporate Entrepreneurship

Business venturing: Business venturing refers to the birth of new business within existing organizations (Guth and Ginsberg, 1990). The business venture definition is a new business that is formed with a plan and expectation that financial gain will follow. Often, this kind of business is referred to as a small business, as it typically begins with a small amount of financial resources. A business venture is usually formed out of a need for a service or product that is lacking in the market. This need is often a product consumers are requesting or something that serves a particular purpose. After the need is determined, an investor or small-business person with the time and resources to develop and market the new service or product can start a business venture. Most likely, the development will be funded in its early stages by an investor, who is often the business owner or creator of the idea. Often times, business ventures are funded by more than one investor, with the expectation that the plan will be profitable in time. As the business gets off its feet, additional investors may become involved by providing support and capital to expand development and marketing of the venture. All this is done with the intention of sharing a substantial profit among all investors. The key essence of organizational new business venturing is that it constitutes a strategy to promote ongoing process of entrepreneurial activities to realize a competitive advantage through innovations (Kuratko and Morris, 2018). Venturing means the firm will enter new businesses by expanding operations in existing or new markets. The primary difference between startups and traditional business ventures is the way they consider growth. In contrast to traditional businesses, startups are designed to grow fast. This requires startups to have something to offer to a very large market, which is why most startups are tech companies. For most businesses, however, a large market is not a requirement. Another common difference between startups and traditional businesses is the source of funding. Startups often rely on capital from angel investors or venture capital firms, while traditional small businesses typically rely on grants and loans. After all, investors take the biggest risks when it comes to business ventures, and as such, they are more likely to give advice and offer a helping hand. As opposed to small businesses, startups also require an exit strategy. Investors will need to see their returns, often within a shorter timeframe than small businesses, which may be in business for decades or even longer. Tribo, Berrone and Surroca (2007), Latham and Braun (2009), Balsmeir, Buchwald and Stiebale (2014), and Zhang *et al.* (2014), Tsao, Lin and Chen (2015), argue that new business venturing innovation efforts and performance results largely depend on factors that are influenced by corporate governance mechanisms such as ownership structures, shareholder identity or the functioning of the board of directors (Asensio-López, Cabeza-García and González-Álvarez, 2019).

Strategic Renewal: Strategic renewal is defined as the transformation of organizations through renewal of the key ideas on which they are built (Guth and Ginsberg, 1990). Flier *et al.* (2001) describe strategic renewal as strategic actions to align organizational competencies with the environment to increase competitive advantage. The tension between the induced and autonomous perspectives on strategic renewal reflects the fundamental question of who initiates and implements strategic renewal within organizations. Schmitt *et al.* (2016) suggest this definition of strategic renewal. Strategic renewal describes the process that allows organizations to alter their path dependence by transforming their strategic intent and capabilities. This definition, we observe, emphasizes the time-related aspect of the organization-level renewal process and its transformational nature by focusing on the path-breaking transformation. Strategic renewal concerns revitalizing the company’s operations by changing the scope of its business, its competitive approach, or both (Zahra, 1996). Strategic renewal enables companies to stay ahead of their competitors and gaining competitive advantage that leads to superior performance. In making strategic renewal, organizations need to develop learning orientations, ambidexterity competencies, sustainable innovation capabilities, and the presence of transformational leaders (Wijaya and Sudhartio, 2020).

Innovation: Innovation refers to a company’s commitment to creating and introducing products, production processes, and organizational systems. (Bolton and Thompson, 2013), also associate innovation closely creativity, however they suggest that it must be linked to entrepreneurship if the innovation is to become a commercial opportunity to be exploited. The concept comes from and reflects a firm’s tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation and creative processes that may result in new products services and technological processes. Innovation is essential to driver of economic growth due benefit to both private and public sector. In the private sector, innovation can increase employment and reduce import which will benefit the economy. New technologies are flooding the market and will be either disruptive or sustainable to a company; Innovation is necessary for companies to survive in the competitive market. (Akinwale, Adepoju and Olomu, 2017). In developing countries, managers take the risk in developing new innovative ideas, which is one of the prospective of corporate entrepreneurship. Innovativeness includes fostering a spirit of creativity, supporting research and development and experimentation, developing new processes, introducing new products or services and technological leadership (Lumpkin, Treguier and Speer, 2002). Entrepreneurial organization that are innovative are often the first to market new product offerings (Covin and Slevin 2001), innovativeness can span a continuum from a willingness to make a marginal improvement to a major commitment to be a technological leader (Lumpkin and Dess, 1997) innovation can be thought of as applied creativity, similarly it is the tendency to support new ideas, experimentation and creative processes. In the entrepreneurial dimension literature, innovativeness can be described as a range of methods to develop or adopt new activities, services, or products which encompasses many of the innovation aspects in the field of innovation (Vora, Vora and Polley, 2012). However, the innovativeness dimension does not go into detail about the different kinds of innovation, such as incremental or radical innovation, or if it is an adoption or generation of innovation. Nonetheless, the broadness of the entrepreneurial dimension of innovativeness enables many different areas of innovativeness, such as product, service, and process innovation, to fit into the conceptualization.

Proactiveness: Proactiveness is the opportunity-seeking, forward-looking perspective that involves introducing new products or services and acting in anticipation of future demand. Lumpkin and Dess (1997), describe proactiveness as a response to opportunities and competitive aggressiveness as responsive to threats, proactiveness involves a wide variety of activities including identifying opportunities and market trends assessing the strengths and weakness of opportunities and forming teams capable of exploiting them Kropp *et al.*, (2004), it implies a willingness to participate in emerging markets and acting opportunistically. Although entrepreneurs are predisposed to the formation of business ventures to pursue specific objectives (Kouriloff, 2000), they still need to be proactive in seeking out an attractive niche and creating the necessary resources to facilitate new entry (Lumpkin and Dess, 1997). Proactive business firms can capitalize first mover lead and dominate over market distribution channel. Some argue that proactiveness shapes the environment through, for example, new products, technology, and administrative processes in contrast to reacting to the environment. Proactive firms usually have a forward-looking perspective, being able to anticipate and being prepared for the future (Wiklund, Shepherd, 2003; Sciascia, Naldi and Hunter, 2006; Dada and Fogg, 2014). Pro-activeness illustrates the nature of entrepreneurial actions to gauge the future opportunities, both regarding products and technologies and in sync with markets and consumer demand.

Risk-taking propensity: Entrepreneurs generally accept that entrepreneurship involves risk-taking and are willing to take risks in return for partial rewards. Arguably entrepreneurs would prefer to lower the risk aspect of the risk return equation. As the Small business innovation research programme provides funds to explore technologies and develop proto-types by its nature, the small business innovation research programme also helps lower exposure to financial risks. Risk taking is associated with a willingness to commit more resources to project where the cost of failure may be high (Miller and Friesen 1982). It also implies committing resources to projects where the outcomes are unknown. Conceptualizing risk (Folani and Mullins, 2000), posits risk as the uncertainly and potential losses associated with the outcomes which may follow from a given set of behavior's specifically, aspects of strategic risk may include venturing into new and unknown territory, committing a relatively large share of assets and significant borrowing. Risk-taking is a key characteristic linked with entrepreneurship. It is the risk that individuals take by working for themselves rather than being employed. It is the tendency to take the uncharted path of being avant-garde in building a strategy. Risk taking refers to the tendency to engage in bold rather than cautious actions (Frank, Kessler and Fink, 2010; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). Risk-taking is introduced in the literature of entrepreneurship as a main element of entrepreneurship and a supporter of better performance. The risk-taking as a vital element of entrepreneurship has a protracted history (Linton and Kask, 2017). The risk-taking dimension covers mutual risks, uncertainty, basic governance chance, decision making risks, and commercial risks (Haider Asad and Fatima, (2017). Risk-taking tendency measures the inclination to invest the potential number of resources to the opportunities which would possess a rational likelihood of both success and failure (Altinay and Wang, 2011).Firms with high risk-seeking tendency tend to obtain superior growth and profitability in the long run (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2005).

Performance of SMEs

It is not only the study of performance features that is important, it is also relevant to mention research that focused on the factors that influence the performance of SMEs. To survive and succeed in a potentially austere environment, firms must effectively deploy and combine their physical, human and organizational assets. Thus, they will develop long-term competitive advantages and, in turn, achieve superior performance (Lonial and Carter, 2015). However, due to their limited resources, SMEs need to identify and exploit other means to be able to enhance their competitiveness and performance. SMEs' performance refers to the outcomes of firms' business activities Kotane and Kuzimina-Merlino (2017). It can be measured using various indicators. Firm growth indicators are among important SMEs' performance measures. Some past studies identified five common firm growth measures that have been used in past studies; these are growth in sales, employees, profit, assets, and equity. Small and medium enterprises (SMEs) are considered to be the backbone of the European Union's (EU) economy (European Commission, 2016), while the entrepreneurship is seen as an engine of economic growth (Audretsch, 2009). Slotte-Kock and Coviello (2010), argued that entrepreneurs engage in purposeful actions that are influenced predominately by forces external to a venture or network, affecting performance and business effectiveness Barlatier and Giannopoulou (2011). According to Connor (2002), differences in performance among different firms are much driven by intangible rather than physical assets since intangible assets unlike physical assets are not vulnerable to imitation. Business performance reflects firm's growth and capability, signifying outcomes over time, and the development of organizational capability from a complex blend of networks, knowledge, and innovation. In this study SMEs performance will be measured in the stated dimensions as follows: Profitability, market share, operational efficiency, organizational growth and, productivity.

Profitability: Profitability means the ability of a business to make profit and remain sustainable. It indicates and measures the success of the business. Profitability of an organization is an important financial indicator to reflect the efficiency of the organization and the owners'/managers' ability to increase sales while keeping the variable costs down. Profitability is the state of producing a profit in an organization or business or the degree to which a business or organization is profitable (Adudu; Asenge and Torough, (2020). Accounting profit of an organization is evaluated by comparing the amount of capital employed into the input with income or the output of the organization. This is popularly known as return on investment or return on capital employed. The net profit or income is an indicator of the firm's profitable operations, which is the surplus of total revenues over total expenses during the accounting year. The firm may be unprofitable if the total expenses are more than total revenues, known as net loss. Profit margin, return on assets, return on equity, return on investment, and return on sales are the common measures of financial profitability. From the above discussions, profitability measure shows the extent to which the organization is effective towards attainment of organizational set goals and objectives. Profit can also be the yardstick for judging not just the economic activities, but the managerial efficiency and social objectives of an organization (Adudu, Asenge and Torough, 2020).

Market Share: Firms with market shares below a certain level may not be viable. Similarly, within a firm's product line, market share trends for individual products are considered early indicators of future opportunities or problems (Farris *et al.* 2010). Market share competition drives companies to support climate change policies with a view to imposing costs on domestic competitors (Kennard, (2020). Experts, however, discourage making market share an objective and criterion upon which to base economic policies (Armstrong and Collopy, 1996). The aforementioned usage of market share as a basis for gauging the performance of competing firms has fostered a system in which firms make decisions with regard to their operation with careful consideration of the impact of each decision on the market share of their competitors. Market share is said to be a key indicator of market competitiveness, i.e. how well a firm is doing against its competitors. "This metric, supplemented by changes in sales revenue, helps managers evaluate both primary and selective demand in their market. That is, it enables them to judge not only total market growth or decline but also trends in customers' selections among competitors. Generally, sales growth resulting from primary demand (total market growth) is less costly and more profitable than that achieved by capturing share from competitors. Conversely, losses in market share can signal serious long-term problems that require strategic adjustments. Market share can be decomposed into three components, namely penetration share, share of customer, and usage index. These three underlying metrics can then be used to help the brand identify market share growth opportunities. Although market share is likely the single most important marketing metric, there is no generally acknowledged best method for calculating it. This is unfortunate, as different methods may yield not only different computations of market share at a given moment, but also widely divergent trends over time. The reasons for these disparities include variations in the lenses through which share is viewed (units versus dollars), where in the channel the measurements are taken (shipments from manufacturers versus consumer purchases), market definition (scope of the competitive universe), and measurement error (Farris *et al.* 2010).

Operational efficiency: The exact definition of these performance indicators varies between industries, but typically covers input and output. Kamaga and Ismail (2016) define operational efficiency as the proficiency of a corporation to curtail the unwelcome and maximize resource capabilities to deliver quality products and services to customers. An organizational operational efficiency depends on factors like skillful and proficient workers, proper technological progression, and proper procurement carries out, return to scale of the businesses, supply chain controlling among many others. Operational efficiency is used as a measure of non-financial performance as outlined by Richard *et al.* (2009) and (Ketchen and Short, 2012), who averred that operational efficiency leads to improved productivity and consequently profitability as compared to other non-financial performance measures (Ndolo (2015). Operational efficiency is suitable in the organizational because, the key to create value and achieve competitive edge among banks lies in the better operational efficiency and productivity (Kamaga and Ismail, 2016). Since operational efficiency is about the output to input ratio, it must be measured on both the input and output side. Even though important, input indicators like the unit production cost should not be seen as sole indicators of operational efficiency. When measuring operational efficiency, a company should define, measure and track a number of performance indicators on both the input and output side. Quite often, company management is measuring primarily on the input side, e.g., the unit production cost or the man hours required to produce one unit. From the literature above, an organization that curtails the unwelcome and maximize resource capabilities to deliver quality products and services to customers to maximize profits, growth and even productivity.

Responsiveness to Change: Firms are affected by environmental and structural changes Stafford *et al.* (2010). According to Wang and Poutziouris (2010). Organizational capabilities influence long-term business performance. Zulkifli and Rosli (2013), proposed that responsiveness to change can be regarded as an organizational capability, enabling companies to face environmental fluctuations. Supporting this notion (Maguire, Koh and Magrys (2007), noted that flexibility, agility, and responsiveness to change and uncertainty are vital for creating sustainable, long-term competitive advantage, growth, and survival.

Organizational growth: growth is an evidence of the return of the entrepreneur's investment and self-fulfillment. Growth is also a condition of survival for young and small businesses, as growing firms are found less vulnerable to failure than non-growers (Stam *et al.*, 2006). Organizational opportunities are highly related to its current organizational production activities which also impact on the growth. Organizational growth has the potential to provide small businesses with a myriad of benefits, including things like greater efficiencies from economies of scale, increased power, a greater ability to withstand market fluctuations, an increased survival rate, greater profits, and increased prestige for organizational members. The macroeconomic importance of firm expansion was recognized in the 1980s, when the phenomenon of gazelles or high-growth firms was first described as those capable of intense size increases within a limited time span (Acs, Parsons and Tracy, 2008; Coad, 2009).Many small firms desire growth because it is seen generally as a sign of success, progress. Organizational growth is, in fact, used as one indicator of effectiveness for small businesses and is a fundamental concern of many practicing managers. Organization growth is manifested through increase in the number of employees', income, profit, or market share. The viability of growth in an organization is high and unpredictable. They went further to state that even though growth is highly unpredictable in an organization, organizations can achieve growth through different ways since one single growth indicator cannot measure multidimensional growth.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on theory of resource based-view by Barney 1991 which states that organizational resources which are valued, rare, and difficult to duplicate and substitute are a source of competitive advantage, which is capable of resource based-view theory, is acknowledged as a valuable organizational resource, which can give business organizations competitive edges over rivals in the marketplace. Thus, corporate entrepreneurial activities contribute significantly to superior business performance (Lumpkin and Dess, 2001). Corporate entrepreneurship is a source of competitive and growth strategies. Corporate entrepreneurship rejuvenates and ensures continued existence of an organization. All business organizations, whether new or old, small or large, must be proactive and innovative in their behaviours in order to flourish and compete successfully in the marketplace (Kuratko *et al.,* 2004).

Empirical Review

Korhan, Ali and Firat (2013), in this study, it is aimed to show the interaction between financial performance and corporate entrepreneurship which can be identified as whole activities of new product, process, market, technology, strategy and improving management technique. In this respect, alternative two models to explain the interaction which is mentioned above were tested in an empirical research on 140 industrial manufacturing firms which are publicly trading in Istanbul Stock Exchange (ISE). Developed models and hypothesis are analyzed by means of the Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) using LISREL. According to research findings it was determined that original dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship which is compound of innovation, risk taking and proactiveness has positive relation and interaction with financial performances of the firms. In addition; in the latest development in the related literature, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness variables which was added to the original dimension later on, did not show any relation with financial performances of firms.

Eze, (2018) evaluated the effect of corporate entrepreneurship (measured by innovation, proactiveness, risk-taking, strategic renewal and corporate venturing) on the non-financial performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria (measured by market share and employees satisfaction). The study employed survey research design, through the administration of structured questionnaire to management staff of eight manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). It is recommended that manufacturing firms should employ corporate entrepreneurship elements towards the enhancement of their non-financial performance. The study is in line with the current study based on the constructs of the explanatory variable and the some response variables.

Abosede, Fayose and Eze (2018). This study investigated the effect of corporate entrepreneurship (measured by innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing) on the international performance (measured by managers' perceived measures of international business performance) of Nigerian international banks. The study employed a census survey, in which the entire 427 management staff of strategy, foreign operation and finance departments of the ten CBN (Central Bank of Nigeria) licensed international banks constituted the population and the sample (census survey). The models were estimated using ordinary least square, using STATA 14 software. Findings from this study revealed that corporate entrepreneurship elements (innovation, proactiveness, risk taking, strategic renewal and corporate venturing) all have individual and combined positive and significant effect on banks international performance at 95% confidence level. However, innovation has the most effect on Nigerian banks international performance. The study is in line with current study but differs its focus on the banking while the current is tailored to SMEs performance.

Azzam and Ghaith (2018) discovered that corporate venturing and entrepreneurial orientation are extensively used as proxies of corporate entrepreneurship. Small and large companies are likely to face different challenges; therefore, both of them need to adopt different business strategies for achieving high performance. For instance, managerial and technical issues are faced by the small and large firms to generate innovation. The study has aimed to assess the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance. A survey approach was used to collect and evaluate the primary data, and 152 questionnaires were distributed in different firms of Jordan. 40.1% of the participants have supported the role of corporate entrepreneurship in improving firm's performance. Moreover, 42.8% of the participants have supported the role of corporate venturing in the growth and development of an organization. The positive association was identified between corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance. In response to this statement, 77 participants were neutral; however, 48 of them were agreed to this statement. Therefore, the study concluded that there is a strong relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance.

Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), examines the effect of corporate entrepreneurship as measured by innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing on service firm non-financial performance as measured by market share, employee's satisfaction, efficiency, productivity and workforce development. The study employed a survey research design through the administration of a structured questionnaire on 636 employees of 21 service firms, purposively selected. The questionnaire was validated by eight assessors (four academics and four management staff of service firms), in order to ensure that the instrument measures what it is designed to measure. The findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance. It is therefore recommended that in employing corporate entrepreneurship elements to enhance non-financial performance, service firm managers should focus on innovation, risk taking, corporate venturing and proactiveness, while strategic renewal should be employed cautiously.

From above literature review, the following hypotheses are formulated.

H_{01}. Business venturing has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{02}. Strategic renewal has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{03}. Innovation has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{04}. Proactivenss has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{05}. Risk taking propensity has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

3. Methodology

This study adopt the survey research design, this is because it will enable the researcher to gather information from respondents who are owners / employees of the SMEs with regards to study variables. The choice of SMEs being the backbone of major developed economies, as well as important contributor to employment, economic and export growth. In Nigeria, SMEs contribute about 48% of national GDP, account for 96% of businesses and 84% of employment. The focus on federal capital territory, Abuja is based on the fact that it is the headquarter of Nigeria.

Population of the study

The target population for this study comprises of 2,236 of SMEs operating in six councils of federal capital territory, Abuja.

Sample and Sample Techniques

The sample size from the population of the study was computed scientifically, using Yamen's (1967), this is because the formula is concerned with applying a normal approximation with a confidence level of 95% and a limit of tolerance level (error level) of 5%. According to Baridam (2001), this formula can be used for a homogeneous population like the one used in this study. The formula is stated below;

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where: N = Total population

e = Level of significance (tolerable error) at 5%

n = Sample size

1 = Constant

Simple random sampling technique was used in the selection of the respondents. In this technique, every member of the population has equal chances of being selected to participate in the survey. Level of significance according to Avwokeni (2004) indicates the confidence the researcher has on the sample that the subject drawn has all the characteristics of the population. He explains further that in management and social sciences, the degree of significance is arbitrary fixed at 5% (0.05). Iacobucci (2010), recommends a sample of 200 as fair and 300 as good. Considering the challenges of survey methodology in developing countries which can lead to low response rates, this technique has the potentials of increasing the response rates because the researchers engage the respondents' multiple times, using physical visits and reminders. This means that we are 95% (1-d=1-0.95=95%) confident that the sample members have all the essential characteristics of the population.

N = 2236

e = 0.05

n = ?

n = 2236

$$n = \frac{2236}{1+2236\,(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{2236}{1+2236\,(0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{2236}{1+5.59}$$

$$n = \frac{2236}{6.59}$$

$$n = 339$$

Instrumentation

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire distributed to staff of Nigerian deposit money banks at their various headquarters in Lagos, Nigeria. The research derived measures for key constructs from existing scales in the literature. The questionnaire contains closed-ended questions developed on five-point Likert Scale measurements as follows: Strongly disagree (1), Disagree (2), Undecided (3), Agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The instrument was administered to the participants through resource persons.

Validity and Reliability of Instrument

In ensuring the validity of the instruments, the application of principal component analysis using SPSS version 21 was employed to investigate the latent factors linked to the items. The Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin and Bartletts Test of Sphericity was carried out to check the strength and sufficiency of the sample and relationship among variables. KMO is used to find out whether data are suitable for applying the factor analysis or not and explains which variable (s) should be dropped to overcome the multicollinearity problem, its ranges from 0 to 1, where a higher value greater than 0.6, indicates the significance of the data, and factor analysis can be employed. If its value is less than 0.60 then several items should be deleted, which are unnecessary variables based on the anti-image values. Results of KMO and Bartletts test indicate that variables are highly significant, and principal component analysis was suitable at 0.734 as shown in Table: 1.

Table 1: KMO and Bartletts Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		0.734
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square Df Sig.	56.322 18 .000

Source: Researchers Computation from SPSS Output, 2021

In order to determine the reliability of the instrument, a pilot test will be conducted, $^1/_3$ of 261 questionnaires were administered to 87 respondents in the study area ($^1/_3$ ×339 = 0.3333 ×339 =113 respondents). To ensure reliability of the instrument, the test-retest method of reliability was applied with Cronbach Alpha for each of the constructs calculated. The result gave a reliability index of (0.784) indicating a high degree of consistency (Table: 2), this result shows that all the constructs are consistent and reliable to be used in this study.

Table 2: Reliability Test Results

Variables	**Items**	**Cronbach's Alpha**
Business venturing	6	0.602
Strategic renewal	6	0.694
Innovation	6	0.701
Proactiveness	6	0.648
Risk taking propensity	6	0.722
SMEs performance	20	0.790
Overall		**0.784**

Source: Researchers Computation from SPSS output, 2021.

Model Specification

This study contains the dependent and independent variables. The independent variable Corporate entrepreneurship (CE) comprises of business venturing, strategic renewal, innovation, proactiveness and, risk taking propensity. The dependent variable is SMEs performance (SMEs Perf.), in this study is regarded as a function of corporate entrepreneurship (CE).

SMEs Perf. =f (CE)

Where:

SMEs Perf. = SMEs Performance (dependent variable)

CE= Corporate entrepreneurship (independent variable)

Given that SMEs Performance comprises of five dimensions, the implicit form of the model is given as follows:
SMEs Performance = (BV, SR, IN, PN, RP)
Where:
BV= Business venturing
SR= Strategic renewal
IN = Innovation
PN = Proactiveness
RP = Risk taking propensity

Thus, the explicit form of the model for the study will be as follows:
$OE = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BV + \beta_2 SR + \beta_3 IN + \beta_4 PN + \beta_5 PN + \varepsilon$

Where:
B_0 = Intercept of the Model (Constant)
$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ β5= regression coefficient
ε = error term

Techniques of Data Analysis

The study applied descriptive statistics as a tool to analyze bio-data of the respondents and multiple linear regression was used to test hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. All analyses were done through the application of the Special Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 21version).

4. Results and Discussion

Results

Data collected from the respondents were analyzed using multiple linear regression and presented in tables.

Regression Analysis Result

The result of the model summary in Table 3 shows an R^2 value of .642, meaning that 64.2% of the variation in the dependent variable (SMEs performance) is explained by the predictor variables, while 35.8% is explained by the other variables outside the model. The R value of 0.784 indicates that there is a strong positive correlation between the dependent variable (SMEs performance) and the set of independent variables (business venturing, strategic renewal, innovation, proactiveness, risk taking propensity).

Table 3: Model Summary

R	R-Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of The Estimate	Durbin-Watson
.0784[a]	.642	.682	.5323	1.624

a. Predictors (Constant), business venturing, strategic renewal, innovation, proactiveness, risk taking propensity
b. Dependent Variables: SMEs performance
Source: Field Survey, 2021.

A p-value of less than 0.05 (p-value = 0.000) was obtained. This implies that the linear model with corporate entrepreneurship as an independent variable is significant. Therefore, as corporate entrepreneurship dimensions are used, the performance of SMEs improves.

Table 4: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	42.312	5	8.828	42.644	.000[b]
Residual	31.231	423	.326		
Total	73.543	428			

Dependent Variable: SMEs performance
Predictors (Constant), business venturing, strategic renewal, innovation, proactiveness, risk taking propensity.
Source: Field Survey, 2021.

The result in the Table 5 shows that taking all other independent variables at zero, a unit increase in business venturing will lead to 40.3% changes in SMEs performance, a unit increase in strategic renewal will lead to 44.4% change in SMEs performance. Again, a unit increase in innovation will lead to 42.0% changes in SMEs performance. A unit increase in proactiveness will lead to a 41.8% changes in SMEs performance. Finally, a unit in risk taking propensity will lead to a 43.1% changes in SMEs performance.

At 5% level of significance and 95% level of confidence, business venturing showed a beta value of 34.0 % and .020 level of significance. Strategic renewal showed a beta value 30.2% and .030 level of significance, while innovation showed a beta value of 41.4% and .010. Proactiveness showed a beta value of 43.0% and .040 level of significance. Finally, risk taking propensity showed a beta value of 44.8% respectively. The regression coefficient further shows that knowledge acquisition has more effect on the effectiveness of Nigerian deposit money banks. This is followed by knowledge storage, then knowledge sharing and finally, knowledge creation.

Table 5: Regression Coefficients

Unstandardized coefficients			Standardized coefficients		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**T**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	.628	.130		5.231	0.000
Business venturing	.403	.048	.340	4.886	0.020
Strategic renewal	.444	.038	.302	16.333	0.030
Innovation	.420	.040	.414	12.456	0.010
Proactiveness	.418	.034	.430	10.343	0.040
Risk taking propensity	.431	.043	.448	14.222	0.010

Dependent Variable: SMEs performance

Source: Field Survey, 2021.

Test of Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at 0.005 level of significance:

H_{01}. Business venturing has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

The strength of the effect on SMEs performance in federal capital territory, Abuja was measured by the calculated p-value=.020 at a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (*p-value* .020 ≤ α 0.05), the null hypotheses was rejected, and we concluded that business venturing have positive significant effect on the SMEs performance in federal capital territory, Abuja.

H_{02}. Strategic renewal has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

The strength of the effect on SMEs performance in federal capital territory, Abuja was measured by the calculated p-value=.030 at a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (*p-value* .030 ≤ α 0.05), the null hypotheses was rejected, and we concluded that strategic renewal have a positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{03}. Innovation has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

The strength of the effect on SMEs performance in federal capital territory, Abuja was measured by the calculated p-value=.010 at a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (*p-value* .010 ≤ α 0.05), the null hypotheses was rejected, and we concluded that knowledge sharing have positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{04}. Proactivenss has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

The strength of the effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria was measured by the calculated p-value=.040 at a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (*p-value* .040 ≤ α 0.05), the null hypotheses was rejected, and we concluded that proactiveness have positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

H_{05}. Risk taking propensity has no significance effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

The strength of the effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria was measured by the calculated p-value=.010 at a significance level (α) of 0.05. Since the computed p-value is less than the significance level (α) of 0.05 (*p-value* .010 ≤ α 0.05), the null hypotheses was rejected, and we concluded that proactiveness have positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

Analysis of the data collected from the researchers' field survey indicates that business venturing has positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria. To confirm the findings above, regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance and the (*p-value* .020) was lower than the significance level of 0.05. This can be statistically given as *p-value* .020 ≤ α 0.05. This result is in consonance with Korhan, Ali and

Firat (2013), whose findings it was determined that original dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship which is compound of innovation, risk taking and proactiveness has positive relation and interaction with financial performances of the firms. The study is consistent with that of Eze (2018) whose findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). In the same vein, Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), the findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance. Asogwa *et al*. (2020) in their study offers insight through Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) into the joint impact of corporate absorptive capacity and corporate new business venturing on the performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria as moderated by the quality governance mechanisms. Using the structured survey design, and respondents' data from 330 employees of manufacturing firms, we provide evidence that both absorptive capacity and corporate new venturing entrepreneurship dimensions do not directly yield significant positive impact on firms' performance. Rather, the significant effect depends on the quality of the corporate governance mechanisms.

Findings of the study on hypothesis two also indicated that strategic renewal has positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria. To confirm the findings above, regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance and the (*p-value* .030) was lower than the significance level of 0.05. This can be statistically given as *p-value* .030 ≤ α 0.05. The result is in line with Korhan, Ali and Firat (2013), whose findings it was determined that original dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship which is compound of innovation, risk taking and proactiveness has positive relation and interaction with financial performances of the firms. Eze (2018) findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). In the same vein, Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), the findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance.

Findings of the study on hypothesis three also indicated that innovation has positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria. To confirm the findings above, regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance and the (*p-value* .010) was lower than the significance level of 0.05. This can be statistically given as *p-value* .010 ≤ α 0.05. The result is in agreement with Korhan, Ali and Firat (2013), whose findings it was determined that original dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship which is compound of innovation, risk taking and proactiveness has positive relation and interaction with financial performances of the firms. Eze (2018) findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). In the same vein, Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), the findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance.

Findings of the study on hypothesis four also indicated that proactiveness has a positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria. To confirm the findings above, regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance and the (*p-value* .040) was lower than the significance level of 0.05. This can be statistically given as *p-value* .040 ≤ α 0.05. The result of this study disagree with that of Korhan, Ali and Firat (2013), whose findings in the latest development in the related literature, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness variables which was added to the original dimension later on, did not show any relation with financial performances of firms. Eze (2018) findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). In the same vein, Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), the findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance.

Findings of the study on hypothesis five also indicated that risk taking propensity has positive significant effect on the performance of SMEs in federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria. To confirm the findings above, regression was used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance and the (*p-value* .010) was lower than the significance level of 0.05. This can be statistically given as *p-value* .010 ≤ α 0.05. The result of this study disagree with that of Korhan, Ali and Firat (2013), whose findings in the latest development in the related literature, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness variables which was added to the original dimension later on, did not show any relation with financial performances of firms. Eze (2018) findings revealed that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness, strategic renewal and corporate venturing are all significantly related with manufacturing firms' non-financial performance. It can therefore be concluded that corporate entrepreneurship elements (risk-taking, innovation, corporate venturing, proactiveness and strategic renewal) enhance manufacturing firms' non-financial performance (market share and employees' satisfaction). In the same vein, Oladimeji, Abosede and Eze (2019), the findings suggest that innovation, risk taking, proactiveness and corporate venturing significantly affect service firm performance, while strategic renewal does not significantly affect service firm performance.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study showed a positive and significant effect building on corporate entrepreneurship to influence the overall performance of SMEs. This study also proves that corporate entrepreneurship dimensions like innovativeness, proactiveness, risk taking, autonomy and, competitive aggressiveness do impact performance of SMEs. The study further found that innovativeness is the highest predictor of performance of SMEs among the dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship under review. Based on the findings of the study, it has become imperative for business organizations to exhibit corporate entrepreneurship and develop supportive organizational culture in order to survive, gain a competitive advantage over competitors, and achieve superior performance. In the other way round, corporate entrepreneurship activities within existing business organizations are a source of vitality and competitive advantage, which can lead to superior business performance. This study therefore conclude that corporate entrepreneurship have influence on the performance of SMEs in FCT, Abuja, Nigeria.

Recommendations

It is recommended that management of SMEs should encourage the interplay of differentiated but interconnected forms, with strategic entrepreneurship that result in new businesses and, corporate venturing that may result in the strategic renewal of the firms' competitive advantage. This is because it leads to strategic corporate venturing in which simultaneous opportunity-seeking and advantage seeking behavior can be found in new business creation processes.

Since strategic renewal enables companies to stay ahead of their competitors and gaining competitive advantage that leads to superior performance. It is recommended that organizations need to develop learning orientations, competencies, sustainable innovation capabilities, and the presence of transformational leaders so as to embrace corporate entrepreneurship that is the gate way for superior performance.

The study recommends that innovativeness can be gauged by executives considering how many new products or services the organization has been developed in the past years and how many patents the firm has obtained in order to know whether it will help or impede innovativeness. This is because, innovative activities refresh existing business organizations, irrespective of their sizes and nature.

Management of SMEs should be encouraged by making proactive as opposed to reactive decisions because this will enable employees in understanding how they can help to support corporate entrepreneurship within their business organizations.

The study also recommend that taking sensible risks should be rewarded through raises and bonuses, regardless of whether the risks pay off or not and compensation system should not penalize risk taking. To properly understand how the organization develops and reinforces autonomy, top executives should administer employee satisfaction surveys and monitor employee turnover rates. This is because, organizations that effectively develop autonomy should foster a work environment with high levels of employee satisfaction and low levels of turnover.

Limitations and Suggestions for Further Studies

Some limitations in this study should be considered as opportunities for future research. This study was carried out to examine corporate entrepreneurship and performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises FCT, Abuja, Nigeria. The study only focused on selected SMEs within FCT, Abuja, hence it is limited in scope and the findings cannot be generalized to other sectors. To augment the research finding of this study, the study recommends that another research be done on a wider geographical area. Furthermore, conducting a replication study in other industries is also needed; for example in the manufacturing sector. Although the research has revealed that corporate entrepreneurship extensively affect performance of SMEs, it is not clear how the entrepreneur acquires such. Could it be an inherent trait or could it be environmentally acquired and this should be an area for further research. Although the study revealed that corporate entrepreneurship significantly relate to the performance of small and medium scale enterprises, there is no evidence that business performance is entirely dependent on the five independent variables. As such further research need to be carried out to establish what other factors contribute significantly to the performance of SMEs.

Practical Implications of Findings

This research contributes to the corporate entrepreneurship literature by integrating prior studies on corporate entrepreneurship including the conceptualization, antecedents, and outputs. More importantly, it identifies missing links and knowledge in the extant literature and suggest paths for future research. The findings from this study are essential for practical reasons as business owners and entrepreneurs are expected to evaluate and explore business opportunities in seeking their career path by developing self-competencies. This study contributes to an evolving body of literature on the effect of corporate entrepreneurship on the performance of small and medium scale enterprises. The insights are meant to create an understanding to the policy makers, practitioners and other stakeholders on the need to promote corporate entrepreneurship and create the infrastructures necessary so that the manifestation of these traits through business venturing, strategic renewal, innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk taking can increase. The findings will challenge the entrepreneurs and business owners to strategize and promote the corporate entrepreneurship in their organizations for good performance.

Reference

[1] Abiola A, B. 2016. Micro-savings mobilization innovations and poverty alleviation in Nigeria. Savings and Development, 40 (1), 1-28.

[2] Abosede, A; Fayose, J and Eze, B. U 2018. Corporate Entrepreneurship and International Performance of Nigerian Banks: Journal of Economics and Management 32(32):5-17

[3] Acs, Z., Parsons, W. & Tracy, S. 2008. High-impact firms: gazelles revisited. Washington: Small Business Administration.

[4] Adegbuyi, O. A, Akinyele, F.A. & Akinyele, S.T. 2015. Effect of Social Media Marketing on Small Scale Business Performance in Ota-Metropolis, Nigeria. International Journal of Social Science and Management. (IJSSM) 2, (3) 275-283

[5] Adele, H.A. 2015. Corporate entrepreneurship as prerequisite for corporate financial performance of public liability companies: A study of selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economic Development Research and Investment. 6(3), pp. 1-18.*

(6) Adudu, C.A; Asenge, E.L & Torough, S.M 2020. Outsourcing Strategies and Organizational Performance of Deposits Money Banks (DMBs) in Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal: Vol. 8(3) pp. 2484-2505.*

[7] Akinwale, Y. O., Adepoju, A. O., & Olomu, M. O. 2017. The impact of technological innovation on SME's profitability in Nigeria. International Journal of Research, Innovation and Commercialization, 1(1), 74-92.

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

[9] Antoncic, B. & Hisrich, R.D., 2001. Construct Refinement and Cross-Cultural. *Journal of Business Venturing, 16(99), pp.495–527.*

[10] Antoncic, B., & Hisrich, R. D. 2004. Corporate entrepreneurship contingencies and organizational wealth creation. *Journal of Management Development.* 23(6), 518–550.

[11] Aremu, M.A. & Adeyemi, S.L. 2011. Small and Medium Scale Enterprises as A Survival Strategy for Employment Generation in Nigeria. Journal of Sustainable Development. 4(1) 200-206.

[12] Armstrong, S. J and Collopy, J 1996. *Competitor Orientation: Effects of Objectives and Information on Managerial Decisions and Profitability"(PDF)*. Journal of Marketing Research. American Marketing Association. 23: 188–199.

[13] Asensio-López, D., Cabeza-García, L., & González-Álvarez, N. 2019. Corporate governance and innovation: A theoretical review. *European Journal of Management and Business Economics*, 28(3), 266–284.

[14] Asogwa, C. I; Ugwu, O. C Uzuagu, A. U; Abolarinwa, S. I; Okereke, G. K Anorue, H. C; Moghalu F. A & Ntim, C.G 2020. Absorptive Capacity, and Business Venturing and Performance: Corporate Governance Mediating Roles, Cogent Business & Management, 7:1, DOI:

[15] Audretsch, D. B. 2009. The entrepreneurial society. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *3*, 245–254.

[16] Avwokeni, A. J. 2004. *Practical Research Methodology*: *Design Analysis Reporting*, Port-Harcourt; Devine Press Ltd.

[17] Azzam, A. A. & Ghaith A, 2018. Evaluating the Association between Corporate Entrepreneurship and Firm Performance. International Journal of Entrepreneurship. Vol: 22 (4)

[18] Balsmeier, B., Buchwald, A. & Stiebale, J. 2014. Outside directors on the board and innovative firm performance. Research Policy, 43 (10), 1800–1815.

[19] Baridam, D. M. 2001. *Research methods in Administrative science*. Port Harcourt: Sherbrooke.

[20] Barlatier, P. J., & Giannopoulou, E. 2011. The dual perspective of sustainable development in service innovation: A conceptual model proposition for research and technology organizations.

[21] Barney, J. 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120.

[22] Bolton, B., & Thompson, J. 2013. Entrepreneurs: talent, temperament and opportunity. Rutledge.

[23] Coad, A. 2009. The growth of firms: a survey of theories and empirical evidence. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

[24] Connor, T. 2002. The resource-based view of strategy and its value to practicing managers. *Strategic Change*, 11, 307–316.

[25] Corbett, A., Covin, J. G., O'Connor, G. C., & Tucci, C. L. 2013. Corporate Entrepreneurship: State-of-the-Art Research and a Future Research Agenda. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 3(5): 812–820.

[26] Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. 2001. A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behavior. Entrepreneurship theory and practice, 16(1), 7-26.

[27] Dada, O., & Fogg, H. 2014. Organizational learning, entrepreneurial orientation, and the role of university engagement in SMEs. *International Small Business Journal* Vol. advance online publication.

[28] European Commission. 2016a. Annual report on European SMEs 2015/2016. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/performance-review-2016_ro [Crossref], [Google Scholar]

[29] Eze, B.U 2018. Corporate Entrepreneurship and Manufacturing Firms' Performance: EMAJ Emerging Markets Journal: 8(1):12-17.

[30] Farris, P W.; Neil T. B; Phillip E. P; David J. R, 2010. *Marketing Metrics: The Definitive Guide to Measuring Marketing Performance.* Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc. ISBN 0137058292. The Marketing Accountability Standards Board (MASB) endorses the definitions, purposes, and constructs of classes of measures that appear in *Marketing Metrics* as part of its ongoing Common Language: Marketing Activities and Metrics Project.

[31] Fasnacht, D. 2009. Developing entrepreneurs In: Open Innovation in the Financial Services. Hamburg: Springer. pp. 163-168.

[32] Flier, B., Van Den Bosch, F.A.J., Volberda, H.W., Carnevale,C.A., Tomkin, N., Melin, L., Quelin, B.V. and Kriger, M.P, 2001. The changing landscape of the European financial services sector. Long Range Planning, 34, pp. 179–207.

[33] Forlani, D., & Mullins, J. W. 2000. Perceived risks and choices in entrepreneurs' new venture decisions. Journal of business Venturing, 15(4), 305-322.

[34] Frank, H., Kessler, A., Fink, M. 2010. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance a replication study. *Schmalenbach Business Review, 62(2), 175-198.*

[35] Guth, W., & Ginsberg, A. 1990. Guest Editor's Introduction. *Strategic Management Journal*, 11: 5–15.

[36] Haider, S. H., Asad, M., & Fatima, M. 2017. Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance of manufacturing sector small and medium scale enterprises of Punjab Pakistan. *European Business and Management,* 3(2), 21-28.

[37] Heavey, C., & Simsek, Z. 2013. Top Management Compositional Effects on Corporate Entrepreneurship: The Moderating Role of Perceived Technological Uncertainty. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 46(8): 1289–1314.

[38] Iacobucci, D. 2010. Structural equations modelling: Fit Indices, sample size, and advanced topics. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 20 (1) pp 90-98.

[39] Kamaga, F. N & Ismail, N. S. 2016. Effects of Outsourcing on Organization Performance in Manufacturing in Kenya: A case of Del Monte Kenya Limited: *European Journal of Logistics, Purchasing and supply Chain Management*, *4*(3):32-58.

[40] Kennard, A. 2020. The Enemy of My Enemy: When Firms Support Climate Change Regulation. International Organization. **7**4 (2): 187–221.

[41] Ketchen, D., & Short, J. 2012. *Strategic Management: Evaluation and Execution (v.1.0).* Chapter 2, 70–75

[42] Korhan, K. Ali B & Firat B. S. 2013. The Impact of Corporate Entrepreneurship on Firms' Financial Performance: Evidence from Istanbul Stock Exchange Firms International Business Research; Vol. 6, No. 1; pp 163-175.

[44] Kotane, I., & Kuzimina-Merlino, I. 2017. Analysis of small and medium sized enterprises' business performance evaluation practice at transportation and storage services sector in Latvia. *Procedia Engineering*, *178*, 182–191.

[45] Kouriloff, M. 2000. Exploring perceptions of a priori barriers to entrepreneurship: a multidisciplinary approach. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 25(2), 59-80.

[46] Kropp, P. R. 2004. Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment. Violence against women, 10(6), 676-697.

[47] Kuratko, D. F., & Morris, M. H. 2018. Corporate entrepreneurship: A critical challenge for educators and researchers. *Entrepreneurship Education and Pedagogy*, 1(1), 42–60.

[48] Kuratko, D. F., Ireland, R. D., & Hornsby, J. S. 2004. Corporate entrepreneurship behavior among managers: A review of theory, research, and practice. Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence and Growth, 7(04), 7–45.

[49] Latham, S. F., & Braun, M. 2009. Managerial risk, innovation, and organizational decline. *Journal of Management*, 35(2), 258–281.

[50] Linton, G & Kask, J 2017. Configurations of entrepreneurial orientation and competitive strategy for high performance. *Journal of Business Research: Vol. 70. Pp 168-176.*

[51] Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *21*, 135–172.

[52] Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. 1997. Proactiveness versus competitive aggressiveness: Teasing apart key dimensions of an entrepreneurial orientation. Frontiers of entrepreneurship research, 1997, 47-58.

[53] 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(01), 429–451.

[54] 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(01), 429–451.

[55] Lumpkin, R., Treguier, A. M., & Speer, K. 2002. Lagrangian eddy scales in the northern Atlantic Ocean. Journal of physical oceanography, 32(9), 2425-2440.

[56] Maguire, S., Koh, S. C. L., & Magrys, A. 2007. The adoption of e-business and knowledge management in SMEs. Benchmarking: *International Journal of management, 14(1): 37-58.*

[57] Mohamad, O., Ramayah, T., & Puspowarsito, H. 2011. Corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: The role of business environment as a moderator. The IUP Journal of Management Research, X (3) 7–27.

[58] Ndolo, P. A. 2015. The Relationship between Operational Efficiency and Financial Performance of Firms listed at the Nairobi Securities Exchange: School of Business, University of Nairobi, and MSc Finance.

[59] Oladimeji, A; Abosede, B.U and Eze, M.S, 2019. Corporate Entrepreneurship and Service Firms' Performance in Nigeria: Economic Review. *Journal of Economics and Business*, Vol. 17 (1) *PP* 1-15

[60] Otache, I, and Mahmoud, R, 2015. Corporate Entrepreneurship and Business Performance: The Role of External Environment and Organizational Culture: A Proposed Framework Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences Vol. 6(4) pp 523-553

[61] Richard, P. Devinney, M. George, Y.S. and Johnson. G. 2009. Measuring organizational Performance: towards methodological best practices. *Journal of Management*, 35(3): 718- 804.

[62] Schmitt, A., Barker, V.L., Raisch, S. and Whetten, D. 2016.Strategic renewal in times of environmental scarcity. Long Range Planning 49, pp. 361–376.

[63] Sciascia, S., Naldi, L., & Hunter, E. 2006. Market orientation as determinant of entrepreneurship: an empirical investigation on SMEs. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal, 2*(1), 21–38.

[64] Sharma, P., & Chrisman, S. J. J. 1999. Toward a Reconciliation of the Definitional Issues in the Field of Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 23(3): 11–27.

[65] Sickles, R., & Zelenyuk, V. 2019. Measurement of Productivity and Efficiency: Theory and Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[66] Slotte-Kock, S., & Coviello, N. 2010. Entrepreneurship Research on Network Processes: A Review and Ways Forward. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 34(1):31-57.

[67]Stafford, K., Bhargava, V., Danes, S., Haynes, G., & Brewton, K. 2010. Factors Associated with Long-Term Survival of Family Businesses: Duration Analysis. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 31(4):442-457.

[68] Stam, E., Suddle, K., Hessels, J. & Von Stel, A. (2006). High-growth entrepreneurs, public policies and economic growth. EIM Business & Policy Research; Scale Scientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs: Zoetermeer.

[69] Tribo, J. A., Berrone, P., & Surroca, J. 2007. Do the type and number of block holders Influence R&D investments? New evidence from Spain. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 15(5), 828–842.

[70] Tsao, S. M., Lin, C. H., & Chen, V. Y. 2015. Family ownership as a moderator between R&D investments and CEO compensation. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), 599–606.

[71] Vora, D., Vora, J., & Polley, D. 2012. Applying entrepreneurial orientation to a medium sized firm. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 18*(3), 352–379.

[72] Wang, C. L. 2008. Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 44(0), 635–657.

[73] Wang, Y., & Poutziouris, P. 2010. Entrepreneurial risk-taking empirical evidence from UK family firms. *Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research, 16*(5), 370-388.

[74] Wijaya K. G. & Sudhartio, L. 2020. The Impact of Strategic Renewal in Banking Industry Performance (June 10, 2020). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3623905 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3623905.

[75] Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. 2005. Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: a configurational approach. *Journal of Business Venturing, 20*(1) 71–91.

[76] Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. 2003. Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal, 24(13)*

[77] Yamen, T. 1967. *Statistics: Introductory Analysis, 4th Edition,* New-York: Harper and Row Publishers.

[78] Zahra, S. A. 1996. Governance, Ownership, and Corporate Entrepreneurship: The Moderating Impact of Industry Technological Opportunities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(6): 1713–1735.

[79] Zahra, S. A., & Garvis, D. M. 2000. Inter-national Corporate Entrepreneurship and Firm Performance: The Moderating Effect of International Environment Hostility, Journal of Business Venturing. 15(2), pp. 469-492.

[80] Zhang, Q., Chen, L., & Feng, T. 2014. Mediation or moderation? The role of R&D investment in the relationship between corporate governance and firm performance: Empirical evidence from the Chinese IT industry. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 22(6), 501–517.

[81] Zulkifli, R. M., & Rosli, M. M. 2013. Entrepreneurial orientation and business success of Malay entrepreneurs: religiosity as moderator. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 3*(10) 264–275.