

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Market Responsiveness in the Nigerian Telecommunications Industry

ThankGod Oyinpreye Apere (Ph.D)

Department of Economics Niger Delta University Wilberforce, Bayelsa State

thankgodapere@yahoo.com

doi: <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijbsber.2013/vol12n18289>

Published February 7, 2024

Citation: Apere T.O. (2024) Entrepreneurial Orientation and Market Responsiveness in the Nigerian Telecommunications Industry, *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol.12, No.1, pp.,82-89

ABSTRACT: *The study emphasis on the empirical relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and market responsiveness in the Nigerian telecommunications industry. The study is quantitative in nature with a cross-sectional research design. Twenty-eight (28) management level employees were inclusive to form the study participants from different downstream telecom firms in Bayelsa state. Structured questionnaire was established as the primary instrument for data collection, and the collected data was analysed inferentially using spearman rank correlational coefficient with the aid of SPSS software. From the analytical perspective, the result shows that there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurship orientation as a practice and market responsiveness. It was also revealed that all dimensions of the independent variable as a significant correlation with market responsiveness in the telecom firms. It was recommended that the studied firms need to find new market possibilities and gain domination, management of telecommunications companies must encourage innovation.*

KEYWORDS: Entrepreneurship Orientation, Market Responsiveness, Innovation

INTRODUCTION

To prosper and successfully contend, businesses need to adopt an entrepreneurial attitude, especially in industries that are changing quickly (Teece, 2007). Companies can benefit from strategically focusing on entrepreneurship as the profitability of their existing activities is uncertain in the future (Wiklund & Shepherd, 2015). In order to differentiate themselves from their competitors, they must be willing to innovate, take calculated risks, and actively participate in the market. Many studies have examined the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm success in light of the alleged importance of entrepreneurial activity for organizations. The results indicate a favorable association between the two (Rauch, Wiklund, Lumpkin, & Frese, 2019).

Promoting the launch of new enterprises is a practical strategy for increasing productivity, creating jobs, and lowering poverty. Researchers are becoming more interested in the relatively young field of

entrepreneurship studies (Ireland, Reutzell, and Webb, 2005). According to Sharma and Chrisman (1999), entrepreneurship entails starting new businesses or bringing old ones back to life or inventing. However, the majority of management research has focused on the application of entrepreneurship in real-world settings, sometimes referred to as the method of entrepreneurship and orientation (Ireland et al., 2005). The processes, techniques, and decision-making processes that result in entrepreneurship are referred to as entrepreneurial orientation (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Richard, Barnett, Dwyer, and Chadwick, 2004). This notion is similar to the entrepreneurial strategic stance proposed by Covin and Slevin (1989) in that it is characterized by frequent and extensive innovation, a competitive attitude, and a management readiness to take large risks. In this study, the need for better understanding of the theoretical and empirical interface between entrepreneurship orientation and desired organizational outcomes is underscored. In other words this seek to expand knowledge frontiers in relation to entrepreneurial orientation and market responsiveness.

The dynamic market environment, propelled by significant technology breakthroughs, necessitates strategic innovation to efficiently cater to the requirements of consumers and other relevant parties. Entrepreneurs are tasked with making sure their firms survive and thrive despite having limited resources and talents. In the telecommunications industry, being adaptive and agile offers chances to profit from unanticipated developments and coincidental discoveries.

Strategic investment is seen to need entrepreneurship as a critical component, particularly in light of changing external circumstances. This is valid for all kinds and sizes of enterprises. Making money in a demanding and competitive corporate climate requires diversifying resources. But a lot of telecom companies haven't used the entrepreneurial oriented approach, which has hurt their ability to compete. Therefore, this study aims to explore the correlation between entrepreneurial orientation and market responsiveness in the Nigerian telecommunications industry. The general objective of this study is primarily to examine the relationship between entrepreneurship orientation and market responsiveness in Nigeria Telecommunication industry. The specific objectives aimed are to: examine the extent to which innovativeness relates with market responsiveness; determine the extent to which risk taking propensity relates with market responsiveness; find out the extent to which proactiveness relates with market responsiveness; and ascertain the extent to which competitive aggressiveness relates with market responsiveness.

Entrepreneurial Orientation

According to Morris et al. (1996), a company's readiness to seek out and seize new possibilities as well as assume accountability for bringing about change is referred to as an entrepreneurial orientation. Entrepreneurial orientation, according to Rauch and Frese (2009), refers to firm-level strategic procedures that companies employ to obtain a competitive edge. According to Rauch and Frese (2009), entrepreneurial attitude is therefore tied to company level processes rather than person level factors as in the earlier entrepreneurship theories. Because they have limited management and financial resources,

newly created businesses in particular should exercise extreme caution while adopting strategic perspectives (Eisenhardt and Schoonhoven, 1990).

When taking into account the impact of entrepreneurial attitude on the performance of a business, it can be a useful metric for identifying and seizing market opportunities (Barringer and Bluedorn, 1999; Zahra and Garvis, 2000; Ireland et al. 2003). A company can be considered entrepreneurial if it enters new markets and produces novel goods and services that surpass industry standards (Jennings ve Lumpkin, 1989). Entrepreneurial orientation is composed of independent factors, according to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), and it is being examined as a multidimensional concept in recent study (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Kreiser et al., 2002; Rauch et al., 2009).

Miller (1983) distinguished three characteristics of an entrepreneurial orientation: inventiveness, willingness to take risks, and proactiveness. Then, Miller's three aspects were supplemented with aggressive competitiveness and autonomy by Lumpkin and Dess (1996). We employ five (5) characteristics of entrepreneurship in this study: innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, aggressive competitiveness, and autonomy, based on various corporate entrepreneurship paradigms.

"Willingness to encourage ingenuity and in presenting novel goods or services and novelty, leadership in technology and R&D in developing new processes" is what Lumpkin and Dess (1996) define as innovativeness. One of the scholars who first highlighted the role of innovation in entrepreneurial processes was Schumpeter, who described innovation as either creating something new or approaching something that already exists in a novel way (Schumpeter, 1947). Innovativeness is the most crucial aspect of entrepreneurship, according to Drucker (1985), and Lumpkin and Dess (1996) also considered it to be a crucial element of entrepreneurship.

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) defined risk-taking propensity as an entrepreneurial firm's readiness to incur large debt or allocate large resources in the hopes of chasing big returns through market possibilities. Entrepreneurs are distinguished from others by their pursuit of chances in spite of the possibility of losses and inconsistent performance (Morris and Kuratko, 2002). It is a crucial component of an entrepreneurial mindset that is opportunity-focused (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996).

Venkatraman (1989) described proactiveness as aggressively searching for new market possibilities, projecting future needs, engaging in developing markets, influencing the environment, and launching new goods and brands ahead of rivals. By taking advantage of opportunities before their competitors and reacting swiftly to developments in the market, proactive businesses beat their competition (Hughes and Morgan, 2007).

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) defined competitive aggressiveness as a company's propensity to take direct and aggressive aim at competitors in an attempt to break into the market, strengthen its position there, and eventually surpass rivals in the industry. Additionally, businesses view it as a way to get a competitive edge in the marketplace.

According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), autonomy is the ability for people or groups to operate independently while concentrating on developing and implementing a company idea or goal. Entrepreneurial autonomy is linked to an individual's independence, enabling them to make their own decisions and take decisive, perhaps hazardous acts (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Mintzberg and Waters, 1985).

Market Responsiveness

Evaluating a company's performance is a major focus in today's corporate world. Nonetheless, a wide range of criteria are applied in performance evaluation and research. According to Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986), performance may be evaluated through the use of both operational (non-financial) and financial indicators. They divide performance data into major and secondary dimensions. While secondary data is gained from publically accessible sources, primary data is directly acquired from organizations.

METHODOLOGY

For this study, a cross-sectional correlation survey research approach was employed. The questionnaire instrument might be used by the researcher to collect data thanks to this design. We received a total of twenty-eight management staff members from the human resource departments of the four downstream telecommunication companies that were identified. These employees fell into the following categories: regional coordinator, marketing manager, financial manager, production manager, HRM, customer relations manager, and operational supervisor. In order to compile and measure the topics of the research, questionnaires are employed to extract data from respondents who are the subjects of the study. The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was employed as the statistical technique to examine the relationship between the variables, and inferential statistics was utilized to interpret the findings.

RESULT AND ANALYSIS

Test of hypotheses stated were analyzed using the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient statistical techniques

Correlation outcome between innovativeness and market responsiveness**Correlations**

			Innovativene ss	market responsivene ss
Spearman's rho	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.524**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	24	24
	Market responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.524**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	24	24

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a substantial correlation between innovativeness and market responsiveness, as seen by the result in the above table, with $\rho = .524$. Additionally, it is noteworthy @ $[p = 0.00 < 0.01]$. This suggests that the previously stated null hypothesis is not true. This indicates that inventiveness and market response are significantly correlated.

Correlational outcome relationship between risk taking propensity and market responsiveness**Correlations**

			Risk taking propensity	Market responsivene ss
Spearman's rho	Risk taking propensity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.612**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	24	24
	Market responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.612**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	24	24

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The preceding table's result, $\rho = .612$, indicates a substantial correlation between the inclination to take risks and market responsiveness. Additionally, it is noteworthy @ $[p = 0.00 < 0.01]$. This suggests that the previously stated null hypothesis is not true. This indicates that a strong correlation exists between the inclination to take risks and market responsiveness.

Correlational outcome relationship between proactiveness and market responsiveness Correlations

			Proactiveness	Market responsiveness
Spearman's rho	Proactiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.592**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	24	24
	Market responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.592**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	24	24

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Proactiveness and responsiveness to the market have a substantial association, as seen by the result in the above table, with $\rho = .592$. Additionally, it is noteworthy @ $[p = 0.00 < 0.01]$. This suggests that the previously stated null hypothesis is not true. This indicates that proactiveness and market responsiveness are significantly correlated.

Correlational outcome relationship between competitive aggressiveness and market responsiveness Correlations

			Competitive aggressiveness	Market responsiveness
Spearman's rho	Competitive aggressiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.592**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	24	24
	Market responsiveness	Correlation Coefficient	.592**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	24	24

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a substantial correlation between competitive aggressiveness and market responsiveness, as seen by the result in the above table, with $\rho = .592$. Additionally, it is noteworthy @ [$p = 0.00 < 0.01$]. This suggests that the previously stated null hypothesis is not true. This indicates that competitive aggressiveness and market responsiveness are significantly correlated.

CONCLUSION

This research work has succeeded in bringing to bear the relationship that exist between entrepreneurship orientation and market responsiveness in the telecommunication sector. The study is guided by four research questions. The analytical level was macro therefore the management level respondent provided the data. The study concludes that dimensions of entrepreneurship orientation such as; innovativeness, risk taking propensity, proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness had a significant relationship with market responsiveness. Based on the findings of the study, the following recommends that: to find new market possibilities and gain domination, management of telecommunications companies must encourage innovation and in order to determine if new concepts and initiatives are feasible, telecommunications businesses want to consult with risk management experts. Also businesses should be aware of the market to the degree that they are able to anticipate and fulfill changing needs from their clients and to grow their market share at all levels, the management of the firms under study ought to take a more assertive stance, implementing tactical advertising campaigns, among other measures.

REFERENCES

- Covin, J.G. & Slevin, D. (1989) Strategic Management of Small Firms in Hostile and Benign Environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 75-87.
- Eisenhardt, J.A., & Schoonhoven, M., (1990). *Service Management*, 4th ed. Irwin McGraw-Hill, Boston
- Ireland, R. D., et. al, (2005). From The Editors: Entrepreneurship Research in AMJ: What Has Been Published, and What Might the Future Hold? [Editorial]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(4), 556–564.
- Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996) Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation Construct and Linking It to Performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 135-172.
- Morris, M. H. & Sexton, D.L. (1996), The concept of entrepreneurial intensity: Implications for company performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 36(1): 5-14.
- Rauch, A., et. al, (2019) Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance: An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future. *Entrepreneurship Theory Practice*, 33, 761-787.
- Rauch, O. C. & Frese, K. (2009), The Impact of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Firm Performance: The Role of CEO Position Tenure and Industry Tenure, *The international Journal of Human Resource Management*, 20, 1078-1095.
- Richard, O. C., et. al. (2004). Cultural Diversity in Management, Firm Performance, and the Moderating Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation Dimensions,” *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 47, No. 2, pp. 255-266.

- Schumpeter, J. A. [1942] 1994, *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, London: Routledge.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1947), The creative response in economic history. *Journal of Economic History*, 7, (2): 149-159.
- Sharma P. & Chrisman, J. J. (1999). Toward a Reconciliation of the Definitional Issues in the Field of Corporate Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 11-27.
- Venkatraman, N. (1989), "Strategic Orientation of Business Enterprises: The Construct, Dimensionality, and Measurement." *Management Science* 35(8): 942-962.
- Venkatraman, N. & Ramanujam, V. (1986), Measurement of business performance in strategy research: A comparison of approaches, *Academy of Management Review*, 1(4), 801-808.
- Wiklund, J. & Shepherd, D. (2015) Knowledge-Based Resources, Entrepreneurial Orientation, and the Performance of Small and Medium-Sized Businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2(4), 307-314.