The Journal of Accounting and Management

Entrepreneurial Orientation and Innovative Performance of Selected Manufacturing Firms in Lagos State, Nigeria

Idris Adegboyega Onikoyi[1], Omoshaewa Maryam, Fetuga[2], Olufemi Samuel, Omoyele[3], Callistus Destiny Odeh[4]

Abstract: Enterprises are leaning toward entrepreneurship to foster constant innovation, rapid development, wealth generation, strategic advantage, increased performance and effectiveness. This study investigated the impact of entrepreneurial orientation on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State, Nigeria. The survey research design was adopted because the study focused on eliciting opinions from respondents about the variables of the study. The population of this study consisted of 5592 top and middle-level management employees of the five selected consumer goods firms listed on the Nigerian Exchange. The first hypothesis findings revealed a significant positive association between competitive aggressiveness and innovative performance (R^2 = 0.524, p=0.000 < 0.05). Hypothesis two showed a significant positive association between pro-activeness and innovative performance (R^2 = 0.554, p=0.000 < 0.05). The conclusion of the study is that all the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation: competitive aggressiveness, pro-activeness, risk-taking and autonomy had an impact on innovative performance and the moderating variable competitive environment also has an impact on innovative performance. Therefore, the study recommends that consumer goods manufacturing firms should make continuous and intense efforts to increase their competitive aggressive stance by out-performing their industry rivals in all business activities.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial orientation; Competitive aggressiveness; Pro-activeness; Risk-taking; Autonomy

JEL Classification: M

1. Introduction

Enterprises are leaning toward entrepreneurialism to foster constant innovation, rapid development, wealth generation, strategic advantage, and increased performance and effectiveness (Ferreira & Azevedo 2008; Okangi, 2019; Olowofeso & Ale, 2019). Entrepreneurship focuses on seizing opportunities via creative thinking to optimize potential earnings and growth (Gathenya, 2012). Entrepreneurship does not only energize business development, employment generation, economic advance, productivity, growth, and revenue income but also is a major driver of the innovative performance of any business (Okangi, 2019).

In the twenty-first century, when organizations operate on a global scale, they must act entrepreneurially to thrive and gain a competitive advantage over their competitors in an ever-

[1] Senior Lecturer, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria, Tel.: +2348039201211, Corresponding author: idris.onikoyi@uniosun.edu.ng.
[2] Lecturer, Fountaine University Osogbo, Nigeria, Tel.: +2347034212035, E-mail: mailshalewa@yahoo.com.
[3] Senior Lecturer, Osun State university, Osogbo, Nigeria, Tel.: +2358035634973, E-mail: olufemi5ng@gmail.com.
[4] Assistant Lecturer, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria, Tel.: +2347052659146, E-mail: Callistus.odeh@uniosun.edu.ng.

changing market situation (Kuratko, et al., 2011; Otache & Mahmood, 2015). Business environments have gotten increasingly hostile, unstable, and heterogeneous (Otache & Mahmood, 2015), posing several problems to organizations and managers throughout the globe. Given today's technology advancements, notable advancements in ICT, corporate settings have grown even more complex. As a result, the scope of rivalry among businesses has expanded outside their respective borders.

Campos et al. (2013) and Miller (1983) concurred that three measures of entrepreneurial orientation have been employed often in the literature: innovativeness, risk taking, and pro-activity. Innovativeness refers to a company's willingness to invest in new concepts and employ innovative methods to generate improved products and services. Risk-taking is defined as a strong desire to promote undertakings with uncertain rewards. Proactivity entails seizing and pursuing alternative business potential in emerging areas. Competitive aggressiveness and autonomy were introduced by Lumpkin and Dess (1996). Competitive aggressiveness refers to a person's willingness to take greater initiative to improve their market advantage. Autonomy refers to how empowered individuals and teams are to work independently, implement decisions, and respond to change. An organization's conduct can be classified on a scale ranging from extremely conventional to extremely enterprise development. The association between entrepreneurial orientation and performance has revealed that businesses with an entrepreneurial mindset outperform those with a conventional mindset (Rauch et al., 2009).

Although many studies mainly concentrate on the three initial factors, most entrepreneurial orientation studies employ the aggregated five aspects described above (Hossain et al., 2019, Musawa & Ahmad, 2019). Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) has been identified as a critical component of organizational effectiveness, leading to improved company profits or profitability (Soininem, 2013; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). Sumon, et al (2010) found that an enterprise's entrepreneurial orientation has a strong association with its innovativeness in a study of Malaysian public companies. On the other hand, the overall performance of Malaysia's public companies continues to be a key source of worry. Perhaps the under-performance of these businesses is related to their entrepreneurial focus being so close to shore.

As a result, entrepreneurial orientation is one of the areas of entrepreneurship study where a growing body of knowledge is being accumulated. It's past time to compile, study, and assess the body of evidence on the link between entrepreneurial orientation and innovative performance in Nigeria using competitive environment as a moderating factor.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the impact of entrepreneurial orientation on innovative performance in selected manufacturing firms in Lagos, Nigeria. The competitive environment is investigated in the study to serve as moderating variable in the link between entrepreneurial orientation and innovative performance. To address the above-stated problem, the study answered the following questions: To what extent does competitive aggressiveness affect the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria? How does pro-activeness affect the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria?

This research was predicated on the following null hypotheses;

Ho_1: Competitive aggressiveness has no significant impact on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

$Ho_{2:}$ Pro-activeness has no significant influence on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial orientation in this study is defined by agreeing with the definition from literature that describes it as a firm's ability to incorporate innovative activities and take risks in order to develop new products or services and incorporate fresh markets, as well as proactively move ahead of its competitors in taking advantage of new market opportunities (Musawa & Ahmad, 2019; Soininen et al., 2012).

Oni et al. (2019), describes EO as a company's readiness to take risks, implement new manufacturing processes, and serve consumers ahead of the competition.

According to most research, EO has three basic measurements: inventiveness, pro-activeness, and risk-taking (Haider et al., 2017). Nevertheless, there are still some disagreements in the literature about the multi-dimensionality of entrepreneurial orientation (Haider et al., 2017, Wales et al., 2013). Innovativeness, which is separated into products, processes, and technical innovations, and risk-taking, which covers monetary, interpersonal, and emotional risks, are among the factors to be examined in this study. Predicting and preventing problems, being action-oriented, and adopting an opportunity-seeking strategy are all examples of pro-active posture.

2.2. Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Orientation

This EO framework includes the same five dimensions as the ones determined by Lumpkin and Dess (1996): pro-activeness, risk-taking, innovativeness, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness. Additionally, it is worth-mentioning that even though initially these dimensions were positively associated with the entrepreneurial behavior of the firm, their occurrence in different combinations and their dependence on environmental and organizational factors lead to the need of analyzing them individually to truly explain their actual effect on the firm's innovative performance Oni et al. (2019).

2.2.1. Pro-activeness

Proactivity is described as taking action ahead of time to address a potential problem. Lumpkin and Dess (2001) stressed the relevance of this component in determining a company's entrepreneurial orientation, which is primarily concerned with the forward-looking viewpoint that comes with any inventive or new enterprise activities (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). Furthermore, pro-activeness is described as the method of trying to anticipate and taking actions on future demand by pursuing growth avenues that may or may not be involved in numerous transactions, introducing new offerings abreast, and advantageously eradicating transactions that are in the sophisticated or shrinking phases of the life cycle (Musawa & Ahmad, 2019).

Proactivity may also be described as the development and introduction of new products or services ahead of the competition in order to take advantage of strategic initiatives and impact demand (Joshi et al., 2015; Shan et al., 2016). It is debatable whether organizations that detect and analyze new prospects and monitor market developments are considered aggressive. Pro-activeness is linked to the

amount to which companies progressively creative and useful goods, launch new products, and penetrate new markets, according to research (Yeniaras & Unver, 2016)

A proactive company is forward-thinking and on the lookout for new opportunities (Wong, 2012). Whereas innovativeness, as previously said, represents the company's willingness to participate in and encourage new ideas, curiosity development, and generation of ideas, pro-activeness relates to how these activities are implemented in terms of predicting and exploiting potential prospects (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001).

2.3. Innovativeness

The entrepreneurial orientation's innovativeness factor assesses a company's willingness to pursue and promote innovation, fresh exploration, and creativeness that may lead to additional goods, services, or technical processes (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001). This concept is based on Schumpeter's (1934) recognition of innovation as a vital component for allowing entrepreneurial activity to have an impact on capital formation by upsetting existing market mechanisms with the emergence of various possibilities.

Innovativeness is defined by Rauch et al. (2004), Musawa and Amad (2019), as a company's behavior that develops fresh concepts that allow for new or enhanced operations, products, or services. Furthermore, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) offered a new realm of technical innovation that had previously been unnoticed by earlier research, which had a product-market-oriented approach to innovation. He suggested that innovation is defined as the willingness of an organization to abandon established technology in favor of new ways of doing things.

Innovation has the potential to be viewed as a profession that can be studied and practiced. Business owners must look for the causes of innovation, as well as the developments and indications that suggest potential for effective innovation, with zeal. They also need to understand how to put the concepts of innovation into practice. Several scholars believe that innovation adaptation a is a key driver for organizational change and transformation in order to increase firms' performance, particularly in settings such as limited resources, a competitive dynamics, fierce rivalry, and increasing consumer demands for higher quality (Jansen et al., 2016).

Namusonge et al. (2016) similarly relate innovation to creativity, but they argue that if the invention is to become a commercial opportunity, it must also be tied to entrepreneurship. According to Mohammed et al. (2012), innovation is seen as a means of boosting productivity expansion. Innovation is important for both huge corporations and small businesses.

Milling and Stumpfe (2000), as well as Olawoye (2016), identified three types of innovations: product, process, and technology. Product innovation includes shortening the product life cycle, improving the commercial manufacturing process, boosting sales and income, and recouping development costs. It also denotes the number of product portfolio innovations that have been implemented. In today's fast-paced business world, a company's capacity to provide new and improved goods is critical to its success (Milling & Stumpfe, 2000). The amount of inventions affecting the production or service process is referred to as process innovation. To accomplish specified production objectives, product and process innovations are linked and interlinked. According to Kim et al. (2006) and Olawoye (2016), technical innovation comprises the acquisition of more and more flexible process equipment, as well as more flexible organizational and administrative processes that help or support many

modifications in the production line. According to Mahrdad (2011), businesses with higher levels of innovation will be more effective in adapting to changing environments and establishing new skills that will enable them to attain higher levels of performance. This study divided innovativeness into three categories: product, process, and technology advances. Product innovation refers to the introduction of new or considerably better products or services in terms of their attributes or associated applications (Olawoye, 2016).

2.3. Risk Taking

For a long time, the notion of taking risks has been linked to entrepreneurship. Earlier conceptions of entrepreneurship focused on an entrepreneur's ability to take measured business risks. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) identified stepping into the unexpected as a common concept of risk-taking, albeit it can be hard to measure. This is due to the fact that, in addition to financial risk, it also involves psychological and social dangers (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Gasse, 2011). Risk-taking primarily demonstrates the organization's willingness to depart from the attempted endeavor and journey into the unknown (Olawoye, 2016).

Risk-taking is also defined as a proclivity for embarking on high-risk initiatives (Miller 1983, Covin & Stevin, 1989; Mario, 2013). It is assumed that companies that perform better would have a higher risk inclination (Leko-Simic & Horvat, 2006). These writers went on to say that the desire to take or avoid risks is an individual trait. Despite the fact that risk can be defined in a variety of ways, Forlani and Mullins (2000) (cited in Kropp et al., 2005; Olawoye, 2016) defined risk for entrepreneurs as the uncertainty and potential losses associated with outcomes that may result from a specific set of actions or behavior. The willingness to take risks is determined by risk inclination and risk perception. That is, the lesser the worry about risk or taking risks, the higher the risk inclination (Olawoye, 2016).

According to current research, entrepreneurs take more chances than non-entrepreneurs, and they are typically thought to take more risks than non-entrepreneurs since this business owner have a much more unpredictable set of options (Musawa & Ahmad, 2019; Olowoye, 2016). Organizations that embrace an entrepreneurial mindset are frequently associated with high risk-taking behavior, such as investing on substantial loans or devoting significant resources to initiatives to generate enormous profits depending on existing prospects (Musawa & Ahmad, 2019; Olowoye, 2016).

2.4. Competitive Aggressiveness

Competitive Aggressiveness refers to a company's willingness to confront and battle its competitors directly and passionately to exceed them in the industry. These techniques include cheap pricing, distinctiveness, and focusing on a competitor's vulnerabilities, as well as outbidding competitors on advertising, quality of services, promotional offers, and advertisement (Namusonge et al., 2016).

Lindgreen et al. (2012) describe it as a company's proclivity to actively and strongly battle competitors to gain entrance or enhance advantages in the consumer market, and therefore surpass existing rivals. Having a significant market share in comparison to competitors is a sign of competitive aggression. Developing new products or services, as well as pricing, budget, reputation, and logistics, may all help you gain a competitive edge (Lindgreen et al., 2012).

In their pursuit of rapid expansion, some businesses have a distinct and conspicuous primary direction on 'gaining market share' (Wang, 2008). These sales-oriented enterprises' promotion strategy is rarely effective, and it delays marketplace success in the long term (Wang, 2008).

2.5. Autonomy

Autonomy constitutes an important dimension of entrepreneurial orientation. The entrepreneurial attitude required to inspire new companies is one of the key drivers of learning interest. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) define firm independence as an individual's actions or a team's autonomous activity in drawing forth a concept or a purpose and seeing it through to fruition. Similarly, Nordqvist et al. (2009) defined autonomous as the flexibility given to individuals within an organization to be innovative, propose new initiatives, and modify present practices by developing the notion of freedom.

Employees gain a light touch to investigate and utilize market possibilities is what independence is all about. Workers generate creative and fresh concepts (Ireland et al., 2006; Kuratko, 2009; Kuratko et al., 2011; Otache & Mahmood, 2015), hence workers are expected to experimenting with their concepts and develop them to fruition without being stifled by the organization's bureaucracy.

2.6. Empirical Review

2.6.1. Entrepreneurial Orientation Dimensions and Innovative Performance

The association between SME performance and entrepreneurial orientation (EO) in Bangladesh was investigated by Hossain et al. (2019). The information was gathered from small business owners in Dhaka, Bangladesh. A total of 193 entrepreneurs' information (out of 300) was kept utilizing a pre-tested questionnaire method after convenience sampling. The hypotheses were tested using correlation analysis and hierarchical regression. Risk-taking, innovativeness, pro-activeness, competitive aggressiveness, and autonomy were all examined in the study. All characteristics of entrepreneurial orientations, with the exception of competitive aggressiveness, have a positive substantial influence on SME success. being collected for correlation and regression analysis. The R-square for regression analysis was 0.426, indicating that independent factors influenced 43 percent of the change in company performance. Three of the characteristics, namely range of innovation (= 0.198, *p*-value = 0.000), pro-activeness (= 0.076, *p*-value = 0.010), and competitive aggressiveness (= 0.191, *p*-value = 0.000), were also shown to be significant and favorably impact the performance of the hotel business. Risk-taking (= -0.095, *p*-value = 0.001) was significant, but had a negative impact on the hospitality industry's performance. Nevertheless, autonomy (= -0.101, *p*-value =0.091) has no significant impact on the hotel industry's performance.

Kosa et al. (2018) explored the role of entrepreneurial orientation on the success of small firms across a variety of industries and geographical locations. To accomplish this goal, primary data was collected from 210 small businesses in Ethiopia's central region, utilizing a two-level multi-stage sampling technique. The hypotheses were tested using regression analysis. The study's findings show that entrepreneurial attitude has a beneficial impact on venture success, but it matters more when businesses are located in urban regions and are active in the manufacturing sector.

3. Methodology

This study used a survey research design. The survey research design was used because the study focused on obtaining subjective opinion of respondents and aims at drawing correct assessment of the entire population by studying samples derived from the population through the use of questionnaire.

3.1. Population of the Study

The population of this study consist of 5592 employees of the five selected consumer goods companies quoted on the Nigerian Exchange Group NGX (2021) and which are in the category of medium and large scale firms and that has submitted their five-year financial reports. The study employs quantitative methodologies, including a 5-point Likert scale survey questionnaire format. A total of 122 copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the 122 proprietors of hotels and guest homes in the research region, with 108 copies least 10 years. The selection of the target population for this study was based on the fact that manufacturing firm in the consumer goods sector has potential for contributing to the nation's economic growth, job creation and contribution towards sustainable development and improved gross domestic product (GDP).

Table 1. Population

S/N	Selected Consumer Goods Manufacturing Firms	Number of Employees
1	PZ Cusson Nigeria	1392
2	Unilever Nigeria	994
3	UAC Foods Limited	220
4	Nestle Nigeria	2201
5	Honeywell Flourmill	785
	Total	**5592**

Source: Nigerian Exchange Group, (2022)

Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The sampling size, for the questionnaire respondent, was determined using Yaro Yamane (Yamane, 1973) formula with a 95% confidence level. The calculation formula of Yaro Yamane is presented as follows;

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

Where:

n = Sample size required

N = Number of people in the population

e = Allowable error (e.g., 95% confidence level)

Computing with the above formula, the sample size is obtained

$$n = \frac{5592}{1+5592(0.05)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{5592}{14.98}$$

n = 373.2977303071 Approximately = 373

Then sample size was proportionately distributed across firms. Furthermore, the study adopted a purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling technique was used to select the participant based on the variability in the characteristics attached which is the management category or level (middle and top level).

4. Results and Discussion

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: Competitive aggressiveness has no significant impact on innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

Table 2. Analysis of the Interaction between Competitive aggressiveness and Innovative Performance.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.724[a]	.524	.519	.790	1.518
a. Predictors: (Constant), Competitive Agressiveness (EOCA4, EOCA2, EOCA1, EOCA3)					
b. Dependent Variable: Innovative Performance (INNPERv)					

Source: Author's Computation (2022).

Table 2 indicates the model summary of the regression analysis of the interaction between competitive aggressiveness and innovative performance of the selected manufacturing firms. With (R) value of .724 (72%), this indicates a positive

strong association between competitive aggressiveness and innovative performance. This magnitude of direct interaction is statistically significant at a 5% level of significance. The R Square value of 0.524 implies that 52% changes in the level of innovative performance are explained by the competitive aggressive stance of the selected manufacturing firms. While other factors that are not included in this model but represented under the stochastic error term account for the remaining 48% variability. Durbin Watson's statistics result is 1.518 which is close to two and this indicates that positive autocorrelation is present in the model.

Table 3. Regression Showing Significance of Predictors to Innovative Performance

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	252.972	4	63.243	101.274	.000[b]
	Residual	229.805	368	.624		
	Total	482.777	372			
a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Performance (INNPERv)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Competitive Agressiveness (EOCA4, EOCA2, EOCA1, EOCA3)						

Source: Author's Computation (2022).

Table 3 shows the F-statistics value for regression to test the overall significance of the independent variables in explaining the criterion variable. Figures in the table 2 shows that competitive aggressiveness in the selected study area significantly predicted innovative performance F (1,249), 101.274, *p*-value < 0.05 (Sig .000). This indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis, as there is less than 5% probability that null hypothesis is correct. F-statistics indicates that the overall regression model is highly statistically significant in terms of its goodness of fit since the value of F_{tab} (1, 249) > F_{cal} (101.274).

Table 4. Contribution of Each Predictor Variable on Innovative Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.476	.131		11.266	.000
	EOCA1	.381	.054	.433	7.091	.000
	EOCA2	.025	.035	.027	.701	.044
	EOCA3	-.165	.069	-.187	-2.413	.016
	EOCA4	.472	.069	.514	6.815	.000

Source: Author's Computation (2022)

Table 4 shows the regression coefficients of the contribution of each independent variable to the criterion variable. The results show that the EOCA4 standardized beta coefficient is 0.514. This means that the market share position makes the highest unique contribution in explaining innovative performance when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled. The results show that the EOCA1 standardized beta coefficient is 0.433. This also contributes uniquely to explaining innovative performance. That is firms prefer to sacrifice profitability to gain market share. The results show that EOCA3 and EOCA2 standardized beta coefficients are 0.187 and 0.027 respectively. Both variables contribute uniquely in explaining innovative performance but not as much as the first two variables. This means that the firms are cautious about cutting prices below competitors or increasing market share. From the results obtained from table 3, the *p*-value calculated for 0.000 is less than 5%, 0.05 critical value. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The study, therefore, concluded that competitive aggressiveness has a significant impact on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

Hypothesis Two: Pro-activeness has no significant influence on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

Table 5. Analysis of the Interaction between Pro-activeness and Innovative Performance.

MModel	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.744[a]	.554	.549	.765	1.509
a. Predictors: (Constant), Pro-activeness (EOPR4, EOPR3, EOPR2, EOPR1)					
b. Dependent Variable: Innovative Performance (INNPERv)					

Source: Author's Computation (2022).

Table 5 indicates the model summary of the regression analysis of the interaction between the pro-activeness and innovative performance of the selected manufacturing firms. With (R) value of .744 (74%), this indicates a positive strong association between pro-activeness and innovative performance. This magnitude of direct interaction is statistical significance at a 5% level of significance. The R Square value of 0.554 implies that 55% changes in the level of innovative performance is explained by the pro-activeness stance of the selected manufacturing firms. While other factors that are not included in this model but represented under the stochastic error term account for the remaining 45% variability. Durbin Watson's statistics result is 1.509 which is close to two and this indicates that positive autocorrelation is present in the model.

Table 6. Regression Showing Significance of Predictors to Innovative Performance

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	267.562	4	66.891	114.377	.000[b]
	Residual	215.215	368	585		
	Total	482.777	372			
a. Dependent Variable: Innovative Performance (INNPERv)						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Pro-activeness (EOPR4, EOPR3, EOPR2, EOPR1)						

Source: Author's Computation (2022).

Table 6 shows the F-statistics value for regression to test the overall significance of the independent variables in explaining the criterion variable. Figures in Table 6 shows that pro-activeness in the selected study area significantly predicted innovative performance F (1,249), 114.377, *p*-value < 0.05 (Sig .000). This indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis, as there is less than a 5% probability that the null hypothesis is correct. F-statistics indicates that the overall regression model is highly statistically significant in terms of its goodness of fit since the value of F_{tab} (1, 249) > F_{cal} (114.377).

Table 7. Contribution of Each Predictor Variable on Innovative Performance

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.962	.147		6.531	.000
	EOPR1	.348	.044	.379	7.849	000
	EOPR2	028	040	032	.701	.048
	EOPR3	.133	.047	127	2.834	.005
	EOPR4	.330	.043	370	7.577	.000

Source: Author's Computation (2022)

Table 7 shows the regression coefficients of the contribution of each independent variable to the criterion variable. The results show that the EOPR1 standardized beta coefficient is 0.379 and makes the highest unique contribution in explaining innovative performance when the variance explained by all other variables in the model is controlled. This implies that firms typically respond more to actions initiated by competitors and rarely initiate changes in their sector. The results show that EOPR4 standardized beta coefficient is 0.370. This also contributes strongly to explaining innovative performance. That is the selected firms prefer to live and let live posture. The results show that EOPR3 and EOPR2 standardized beta coefficients are 0.127 and 0.032 respectively. Both variables contribute uniquely in explaining innovative performance but not as much as the first two variables. This implies that the selected firms are less radical in changing products compared to their competitors and are usually not the first to introduce new products.

From the results obtained from Table 7, the *p*-value calculated for 0.000 is less than 5%, 0.05 critical value. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. The study, therefore, concluded that pro-activeness has a significant influence on the innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

The Null Hypothesis (H_1) states that competitive aggressiveness has no significant impact on innovative performance. The result of the analysis showed a positive and significant association

between the two variables, hence the alternative hypothesis was accepted, while the null hypothesis was rejected, which implies that there is significant association between competitive aggressiveness and innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

The findings are supported by R Square value of 0.524 which means that 52% changes in the level of innovative performance is explained by competitive posture of the selected firms. The result of this study is in contradiction with the findings of Kozubikova et al. (2017) which posited that regardless of the entrepreneurial motives some entrepreneurs seem to have non-aggressive strategy against the competition because they do not consider their enterprise to be aggressive and as result do not bother carrying out aggressive activities against their competitors. The result of this study however, aligns with Okunbanjo et al. (2017) the more firms are competitively aggressive, the more the increase in innovative performance.

The Null Hypothesis (H_2) states that pro-activeness has no significant influence on innovative performance. The result of the analysis showed a positive and significant association between the two variables, hence the alternative hypothesis was accepted, while the null hypothesis was rejected, which implies that there is significant association between pro-activeness and innovative performance of selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria.

The findings are supported by R Square value of 0.554 which means that 55% changes in the level of innovative performance is explained by pro-active stance of the selected firms. The result of this study agrees with the findings of Etim et al. (2017) that in most circumstances firms make use of proactive behavior to improve their competitive positioning and foresight to grasp new opportunities to remain in the market environment.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study has established that competitive aggressiveness has a significant impact on innovative performance. Also, the findings show that pro-activeness has a significant impact on innovative performance. Similarly, risk-taking has a significant impact on innovative performance. Furthermore, autonomy has a significant impact on innovative performance.

The study also disclosed that competitive environment moderates the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and innovative performance of the selected manufacturing firms in Lagos State Nigeria. The study recommends that; Consumer goods manufacturing firms have a duty to make continuous and intense efforts to increase their competitive aggressive stance by outperforming their industry rivals in all business activities. This would enable the firms to acquire the industry leader position which would give the company a competitive edge.

Second, the firms must be consistent in being pro-active which implies that they should have foresights to seize business opportunities at all times. This will enable them take first mover advantage and become strong market competitor

References

Campos, H. M.; Acuna, L.S.A.; Parra, J.P.N & Valenzuela, F.A.A (2013). Entrepreneurial orientation and opportunities. *Journal of Management, and Innovation, 9* (3), pp. 45-48.

Covin, J. G.; Slevin, D. P. & Schultz, R. L. (1994). Implementing strategic missions: Effective strategic, structural and tactical choices. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31(4), pp. 481–505.

Drucker, P. F. (1985). The discipline of innovation. *Harvard Business Review*, 63(3), pp. 67-72.

Etim, J. J.; Adabu, M. U. & Ogar, C. A. (2017). Influence of entrepreneurial orientation as survival strategy for small and medium enterprises: The Nigeria experience. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5(8), pp. 502-518.

Ferreira, J. & Azevedo, S. G. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation and growth of firms: Key lessons for managers and business professionals. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 6(1), pp. 82-88.

Forlani, D. & Mullins, J. W. (2000). Perceived risks and choices in entrepreneurs' new venture decisions. *Journal Business Venturing*, 15(4), pp. 305-322.

Gasse, Y. (2011). Entrepreneurial beliefs and intentions: A cross-cultural study of university students in seven countries. *International Journal of Business*, 16(4), p. 303.

Gathenya, J. W. (2012). Entrepreneurial strategic planning practices and firm performance among Kenyan women led small and medium enterprises. *Unpublished PhD thesis Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology***.**

Haider, S. H., Asad, M., & Fatima, M. (2017). Responsibility of global corporations towards human resource to attain competitive advantage: A review. *Journal of Research in Administrative Sciences*, 6(2), pp. 8-11.

Hossain, M. U.; Rahman, A. & Al Asheq, A. (2019). The role of entrepreneurial orientation to SME performance in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 23(1), pp. 1-6.

Ireland, R. D.; Covin, J. G. & Kuratko, D. F. (2006). Conceptualizing corporate entrepreneurship strategy. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), pp 19-46.

Jansen, M.; Lennon, C., & Piermartini, R. (2016). Income volatility: whom you trade with matters. *Review of World Economics*, 152(1), pp. 127-146.

Joshi, M. P.; Das, S. R. & Mouri, N. (2015). Antecedents of innovativeness in technology-based services (TBS): peering into the black box of entrepreneurial orientation. *Decision Sciences*, 46(2), pp. 367-402.

Kim, P. H.; Aldrich, H. E. & Keister, L. A. (2006). The impact of financial, human, and cultural capital on entrepreneurial entry in the United States. *Small business economics*, 27(1), pp. 5-22.

Kosa, A.; Mohammad, I. & Ajibie, D. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and venture performance in Ethiopia: the moderating role of business sector and enterprise location. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 8(1), pp. 1-17.

Kuratko, D. F. (2009). *Introduction to entrepreneurship*, (8th Ed.). South-Western Centage, Learning.

Kuratko, D. F.; Hornsby, J. S. & Covin, J. G. (2011). Diagnosing a firm's internal environment for corporate entrepreneurship. *Business Horizons*, 57(1), pp. 37-47.

Kozubíková, L.; Sopková, G.; Krajčík, V. & Tyll, L. (2017). Differences in innovativeness, proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness in relation to entrepreneurial motives. *Journal of International Studies*, 10(4), pp. 207-218.

Leko-Simic, M. & Horvat, J. (2006). Risk taking propensity and export performance of Croatian exporters. *Managing Global Transitions*, 4(4), p. 313.

Lindgreen, A.; Hingley, M. K.; Grant, D. B. & Morgan, R. E. (2012). Value in business and industrial marketing: Past, present, and future. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 41(1), pp. 207-214.

Lumpkin, G. T. & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), pp. 135-172.

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

Mario, F. (2013). Firm resources and entrepreneurial orientation as determinants for collaborative entrepreneurship. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *7*(1), 1-24.

Mehrdad, H. O. (2011). A study of factors affecting entrepreneurship in lorestan province with an emphasis on education. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Administration*, *2*(8), pp. 97-114.

Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29, pp. 770-791.

Milling, P. M. & Stumpfe, J. (2000, August). Product and process innovation: A system dynamics-based analysis of the interdependencies. In *18th international conference of the system dynamics society sustainability in the third millennium, Bergen, Norway*.

Mohammed, H.; Mohammed, S. & Halimu, B. L. (2012). Relationship between Entrepreneurial orientation, firm resources, SMEs branding and firm is innovation the missing link? *American Journal of Industrial / Business Management, 2*, pp. 153-155.

Musawa, M. S. & Ahmad, k. (2019). A Conceptual framework for the Influence of Environmental dynamism on marketing innovation performance in Small and Medium Enterprises. *Journal of Economics and Management Systems*, 4, pp. 187-203.

Namusonge, G.S.; Muturi, W. & Olaniran, o. (2016). The role of innovation on performance of firms on Nigerian stock exchange. *European Journal of Research and reflection in Management sciences, 4* (1), pp. 40-50.

Nigerian Exchange Group, NGX (2021). *Annual Financial Report of Quoted Firms*.

Nordqvist, M.; Habbershon, T. G. & Zellweger, T. (2009). *A qualitative research approach to the study of transgenerational entrepreneurship. In Transgenerational entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Okangi, P. (2019). The impacts of entrepreneurial orientation on the profitability growth of construction firms in Tanzania. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(1), pp. 1-23.

Olowofeso, E. & Ale, O.A. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance of hospitality industry in Akure, Nigeria. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 2(1), pp. 119-134.

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

Oni, O.; Agbobli, E. & Iwu C. (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance of small business in Vryburg Region North West Province South Africa. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics*, *8*(1), pp. 63-71.

Olawoye, O. (2016). Role of entrepreneurial orientation on performance of firms in the Nigerian stock exchange.*Ph.D thesis Submitted in partial fulfillment for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Entrepreneurship in the Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.*

Otache, I. & Mahmood, R. (2015). Corporate entrepreneurship and business performance: The role of external environment and organizational culture: A proposed framework. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, *6*(4 S3), pp. 524-531.

Rauch, A.; Wiklund, J.; Lumpkin, G. T. & Frese, M. (2009), Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 33* (3), pp. 761-787.

Rauch, A.; Wikund, J.; Freese, M. & Lumpkin, G. T (2004). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance; cumulative empirical evidence. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, pp. 164-177.

Reulink, R. B. J. (2012). Strategic orientation and innovation performance at Dutch manufacturing SME's*:* The overrated role of Market Orientation and Entrepreneurial Orientation (Master's thesis, University of Twente).

Shan, P.; Song, M. & Ju, X. (2016). Entrepreneurial orientation and performance: Is innovation speed a missing link? *Journal of Business Research*, 69(2), pp. 683-690.

Soininen, J. S, (2013). The impact of global economic crisis on SMEs: Does entrepreneurial orientation matter? *Management Research Review*, 35(10), pp. 33-941.

Sumon, B. K.; Fraser, S. & Wright, M. (2010). What do we know about entrepreneurial finance and its relationship with growth?. *International small business journal*, *33*(1), pp. 70-88.

Wales, W. J.; Gupta, V. K. & Mousa, F. T. (2013). Empirical research on entrepreneurial rientation: An assessment and suggestions for future research. *International small business journal*, 31(4), pp. 357-383.

Wang, C. L. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 32(4), pp. 635-657.

Wong, K. (2012). The influences of entrepreneurial orientation on product advantage and new product success. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 4 (3), pp. 243-262.

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

Yeniaras, V. & Unver, S. (2016). Revisiting the mediating effect of entrepreneurial behaviour on proactiveness–performance relationship: the role of business ties and competitive intensity. *European Management Review*, 13(4), pp. 291-306.

Yamane, T. (1973). Research Methodology/Sample Size. *Florida: University of Florida*.