

Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on the Performance of Retail Businesses in Kidapawan City

Aleyah K. Lauron¹  | Analyn A. Gonzales² 

¹⁻² University of Southern
Mindanao, Kabacan,
Philippines

Abstract

Introduction: Retail businesses face growing competition, technological changes, and shifting consumer behavior, making entrepreneurial orientation (EO) important for business performance. However, evidence on this relationship in local Philippine retail settings remains limited.

Objective: This study examined the influence of EO on retail business performance in Kidapawan City in terms of proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness.

Methods: A descriptive-causal design was employed with 305 retail business owners or managers selected through simple random sampling. Data were collected using a structured five-point Likert-scale questionnaire and analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis.

Results: All EO dimensions were rated highly: proactiveness (WM = 3.79), innovativeness (WM = 3.74), risk-taking (WM = 3.68), autonomy (WM = 3.74), and competitive aggressiveness (WM = 3.72). Business performance was also rated positively (WM = 3.77). The regression model was significant, $F(5, 299) = 14.40$, $p < .001$, explaining 19.4% of the variance in business performance ($R^2 = .194$; adjusted $R^2 = .180$). Among the five dimensions, only risk-taking significantly influenced business performance.

Conclusions: Retail businesses in Kidapawan City demonstrated strong EO and positive performance, with risk-taking emerging as the only EO dimension with a significant direct influence on performance. The findings provide context-specific evidence for entrepreneurship and business-support initiatives.

Correspondence

Analyn A. Gonzales DBM,
LPT, University of Southern
Mindanao, Philippines
Email: aagonzales@usm.edu.ph

Keywords: Entrepreneurial Orientation; Business Performance; Risk-Taking; Retail Businesses; Entrepreneurship; Kidapawan City

Cite as: Lauron, A. K., & Gonzales, A. A. (2026). Influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of retail businesses in Kidapawan City. *Review of Economics, Accounting, Business, and Management Studies*, 1(1), 44–65. <https://doi.org/10.68354/742144>



© The Author(s) 2026. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License.

1. Introduction

The retail sector plays an essential role in economies worldwide, connecting producers with consumers and contributing significantly to employment and economic growth. In the Philippines, retail businesses have expanded rapidly, helping to drive local economic development). However, these businesses face increasing challenges such as strong competition, technological changes, and shifting consumer behavior which require continuous adaptation to maintain strong performance (Sellappan & Shanmugan, 2021).

In the study of Abdulrab et al. (2021), entrepreneurial orientation (EO) refers to a business approach to decision-making and strategy that is characterized by innovation, willingness to take risks, proactive behavior, competitive drive and independent decision-making. Also, in their study on small and medium enterprises (SME) in Saudi Arabia confirmed that entrepreneurial orientation enhances both financial and non-financial performance, making businesses more competitive and sustainable. Similarly, the study of George and Elrashid (2020), on retail pharmacies in Bahrain suggests that innovation and risk-taking are particularly crucial for achieving business success, underscoring the value of an entrepreneurial mindset in highly competitive markets. However, although Salem et al. (2023) examined the link between EO and business performance, their study did not use a descriptive-causal design, limiting its ability to establish cause-and-effect relationships. Moreover, much of the existing literature faces methodological and contextual limitations, such as reliance on convenience sampling, which may reduce the generalizability of findings.

The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of retail businesses in Kidapawan City. Specifically, the study aimed to describe the business profile; assess the entrepreneurial orientation of retail businesses, assess the performance of retail businesses, and determine whether entrepreneurial orientation significantly influence the performance of retail businesses.

Based on these findings, the study aimed to offer recommendations to help retail owners and managers develop strategies that enhanced competitiveness and sustainability. It is further intended to support local government units and policymakers by supplying information useful for designing entrepreneurship-related programs such as skills training, financial support, and business-friendly regulations. The study was conducted in Poblacion, Kidapawan City, Cotabato, from September to October 2025. The area was selected because it is the city's commercial center, with diverse retail establishments ranging from micro to medium-sized businesses, making it suitable for examining entrepreneurial orientation and business performance. The period also allowed adequate time for data collection and analysis.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Research Design

This study was quantitative in nature and used both descriptive and causal research designs. The respondents' business profiles, including their type of business, years of operation, and number of employees, and the assessment of entrepreneurial orientation and the performance of retail businesses were described using the descriptive research design. Meanwhile, a causal research design was used to determine whether entrepreneurial orientation in terms of proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness significantly influence the performance of retail businesses.

2.2. Respondents and Sampling Procedure

The study has 305 respondents, consist of owners and managers of registered retail businesses operating at least one (1) year in Poblacion, Kidapawan City. The selected owners and managers aged between 25 to 59 years old were chosen as the respondents as they are likely the one who knows their business well. As a result, they are the most relevant participants to study in examining of how entrepreneurial orientation influence the performance of retail businesses. The study respondents, which

was selected using a random sampling technique. The researcher first compiled a complete list of registered retail businesses from the Business Permit and Licensing Office (BPLO) in Kidapawan city to determine the potential respondents. The required sample size was computed using the Raosoft online sample-size calculator with a 5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level; this resulted in a target of 305 respondents. The researcher then performed a drawing of lots and randomly selected respondents to ensure that each registered retail business in Kidapawan City had an equal chance of selection, thereby minimizing selection bias and enhancing representativeness.

2.3. Research Instruments

To obtain the necessary data, the researcher used an adapted questionnaire based on the research of Farrington et al. (2011) titled "The Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Small Business Success." This instrument measured five dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation: proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness. The researcher also adapted a questionnaire on business performance on the same authors. Additionally, the survey questionnaire was divided into three (3) parts. The first part comprises questions regarding the business profile of respondents. This part includes the respondents' type of business, years in operation and number of employees. The second part, on the other hand, contain twenty-five (25) statements that measures entrepreneurial orientation. Finally, the third part of the survey questionnaire consists of seven (7) statements that assess the performance of retail businesses.

All item were rated using a 5-point Likert scale interpreted as 5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, and 1=Strongly Disagree. A reliability test was also utilized in the study to determine the Cronbach Alpha value, which must have an acceptable value ranging from 0.70 to 0.95 or higher. Based on the results, proactiveness obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.719, indicating acceptable reliability. Innovativeness recorded a value of 0.872. Risk-Taking obtained a value of 0.857. Autonomy has a value of 0.871, while competitive aggressiveness yielded 0.740, which also reflects reliable measures. Furthermore, the performance of retail businesses obtained a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.824, indicating reliability. Therefore, all items under each variable used in the study were considered reliable and acceptable for analysis.

2.4. Data Collection and Analysis

The study employed a structured procedure for collecting primary and secondary data. Ethical approval was secured through the Research Ethics Committee (RECO) Office, and the survey questionnaire was accompanied by an informed consent form following the issuance of the certificate of conduct. After approval, structured questionnaires were administered to the respondents, with standardized instructions and clarification provided as needed. Adequate time was allowed for completion, and all collected data were handled in accordance with Republic Act No. 10173, or the Data Privacy Act of 2012. Secondary data were obtained through a review of relevant scholarly articles, books, reports, and other credible sources to establish the theoretical and empirical foundation of the study and inform the interpretation of findings. Descriptive statistics, including frequency and percentage, were used to summarize the respondents' business profiles. Weighted means and standard deviations were computed to describe entrepreneurial orientation and retail business performance. Responses were interpreted using a five-point Likert scale, wherein 4.50–5.00 indicated Strongly Agree, 3.50–4.49 Agree, 2.50–3.49 Neutral, 1.50–2.49 Disagree, and 1.00–1.49 Strongly Disagree. Multiple regression analysis was employed to examine the associations between the five dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation and retail business performance. The regression model was specified as:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \epsilon$$

where Y represents retail business performance; X_1 = proactiveness, X_2 = innovativeness, X_3 = risk-taking, X_4 = autonomy, and X_5 = competitive aggressiveness; β_0 is the intercept; β_1 – β_5 are the regression coefficients representing the estimated associations between each entrepreneurial orientation dimension and business performance, holding the other predictors constant; and ϵ represents the error

term accounting for unexplained variation in the dependent variable. Statistical significance was evaluated using the predetermined level of significance.

2.5 Ethical Considerations

This study ensured the integrity, confidentiality, and protection of all participants. Informed consent was obtained from each participant, who was informed of the study's purpose, procedures, and their right to withdraw at any time. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained by ensuring no personal identifiers were collected. All data were secured and used solely for academic purposes. Honesty and integrity were upheld throughout the entire research process, with all sources properly cited.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Business Profile of the Respondents

The data presented in Table 1 shows the business profile of the respondents in terms of types of business, years in operation, and number of employees. The findings indicate that 98% or 299 operate as sole proprietorships, while 2% or 6 operate as corporation. When it comes to years in operations, the highest number of businesses had been running for 1 to 5 years (37.70%), followed by those operating for 6 to 10 years (24.27%) and 11 to 15 years (18.03%). Other businesses had operated anywhere from 16 to 20 years (18.03%) up to 21 years and above (1.97%), showing that the group included both new and long-established businesses. In terms of employees, the majority of respondents managed businesses with 1 to 5 employees (90.49%). Only few had 6 to 10 employees (8.20%), while only 11 to 15 employees (0.66%) or 16 and above employees (0.66%).

Table 1. Business profile of the respondents.

Variables	Frequency (n=305)	Percentage (%)
Types of Business		
Sole Proprietorship	299	98.00
Corporation	6	2.00
Years of Operation		
1 to 5 years	115	37.70
6 to 10 years	74	24.27
11 to 15 years	55	18.03
16 to 20 years	55	18.03
Above 21 years	6	1.97
Number of Employees		
1-5	276	90.49
6-10	25	8.20
11-15	2	0.66
16 and above	2	0.66

3.2.

Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Proactiveness.

Table 2 below presents the entrepreneurial orientation in terms of proactiveness. The results show an overall mean score of 3.79 with a standard deviation of 0.61 corresponds to the qualitative

description agree, which indicates that the businesses actively seek market opportunities and adopt forward-looking strategies. This is supported by Hapsari et al. (2024), who emphasized that proactive firms tend to anticipate market trends and secure a competitive advantage. Furthermore, Rezaei et al. (2022), concluded that proactive behavior positions SMEs for sustained competitive performance by enabling them to respond early to emerging opportunities and threats. Among the statements, the retail businesses agreed that continually pursuing new opportunities is vital to the performance of the business, resulting in the highest weighted mean of 3.83 (SD=0.85).

In line with Gunasekara et al. (2020), proactive behaviors enable small businesses to respond effectively to changing consumer demands, supporting the high proactiveness observed in the present study. Ogundare and van der Merwe (2024) further affirmed that opportunity-seeking promotes competitive advantage, significantly enhancing business performance. On the other hand, the lowest mean scores but still favorable statement, with a mean of 3.74 (SD=0.79), shows that while businesses value innovation, some may not consistently prioritize the development of new products, services, or processes. As emphasized by Sellappan and Shanmugam (2021), proactive firms are more competitive because they anticipate trends and adjust earlier than others. Kiss et al. (2022), also noted that proactiveness leads to innovation only when firms possess adequate internal capacities, leadership support, and resources.

Table 2. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of proactiveness.

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The retail business places a strong emphasis on new & innovative products/services.	3.74	0.79	Agree
2. The retail business is continually pursuing new opportunities.	3.83	0.85	Agree
3. The retail business is continuously seeking out new products/services/processes.	3.79	0.79	Agree
4. The retail business places a strong emphasis on continuous improvement in products, service delivery/ processes.	3.78	0.85	Agree
5. The retail business is continuously scanning the business environment to identify future opportunities.	3.80	0.92	Agree
Overall Mean	3.79	0.61	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.2.1. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Innovativeness.

The Table 3 below presents the entrepreneurial orientation in terms of innovativeness with a mean score of 3.74 and a 0.60 standard deviation, indicating that respondents generally perceive their businesses as open to creativity, experimentation, and continuous improvement. The respondents agreed with statements describing an increase in the number of products and services offered, encouragement of experimentation and the regular introduction of new offerings and processes both resulting the highest mean statement of 3.78 (SD=0.75) and (SD=0.82) respectively, this implies that experimentation and creativity are strongly encouraged in these businesses, reflecting their willingness to explore new approaches that can enhance their offerings.

This aligns with Permatasari and Praswati (2024), who emphasize that innovation reflects entrepreneurial orientation and enables firms to create their own market space through unique products, services, and processes. Moreover, Paredes (2024), experimentation fosters employee-generated ideas and drives continuous improvement, which supports innovation even in resource-constrained small firms. Meanwhile, the lowest mean of 3.68 (SD=0.82) indicates that while innovation is practiced, some retailers do not frequently increase or expand their product or service lines.

This implies that businesses may prefer refining current offerings rather than diversifying extensively. It was supported by Wahyuni and Sara, (2020) Fransisca and Soelaiman, (2023). the that innovative firms often achieve higher performance because their unique value propositions help attract and retain customers. In addition, the growing digital transformation in the retail sector highlights that the use of technological advancements can improve operational efficiency and customer engagement (Khan et al., 2021).

Table 3. Differences in the Dimensions of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy Between Private and Public School Teachers

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The retail business has increased the number of services/products offered during the past years.	3.68	0.82	Agree
2. Experimentation and creativity to continuously come up with new products and/or processes are encourage in the business.	3.78	0.75	Agree
3. The retail business regularly introduces new services/products/processes.	3.78	0.85	Agree
4. In the past few years, the retail business has introduced many new lines of products and/or services.	3.72	0.81	Agree
Overall Mean	3.74	0.60	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.2.3. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of risk-taking

The table 4 presents the entrepreneurial orientation in terms of risk-taking. Risk-taking recorded a mean score of 3.68 and a standard deviation of 0.60, indicating that respondents show openness to pursuing ventures or decisions involving considerable uncertainty. This result aligns with Dionysus (2020), who defines risk-taking as a firm's readiness to allocate resources despite uncertainty, and with Upadhyay et al. (2022) and Widodo (2023), who emphasize that risk-taking is essential for sustaining competitiveness, especially in dynamic retail environments.

Furthermore, the highest statements recorded a mean of 3.72 (SD=0.82), reflecting retailers' willingness to commit significant assets to high-risk and high-return ventures, suggesting strong

confidence in pursuing profitable opportunities. This implies that local retailers are inclined to invest strategically when returns are foreseeable, and maybe willing to allocate resources to opportunities perceived to have potentially favorable returns. Supported by Abdulrab et al. (2021), who conclude that calculated risk-taking enhances financial performance and enables firms to generate profit. Also, Tang et al. (2021), businesses with a strong willingness to commit resources to uncertain

Table 4. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of risk-taking.

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1. The retail business is willing to commit a relatively large portion of assets to pursue a high-risk, high-return project.	3.72	0.82	Agree
2. The retail business has a strong preference for high projects (with chances of very high returns).	3.69	0.82	Agree
3. The retail business is very often the first among competitors to introduce new products/services, and/or operating technology when dealing with customers.	3.64	0.84	Agree
Overall Mean	3.68	0.60	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

On the other hand, the lowest statements but still favorable recorded a mean of 3.64 (SD=0.84), related to being early adopters of new products, services, or technologies, indicate a more cautious stance toward pioneering innovations. This confirms the view of Saputra et al. (2022) that firms often hesitate to lead in new product or technology introduction, even though early adoption can result in competitive advantages. In addition, Pilawa (2022), shows that the business often adopts fast-follower strategies rather than pioneering innovations due to financial and operational constraints.

3.2.4. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Autonomy.

The data presented in Table 5 shows the entrepreneurial orientation in terms of autonomy, with a mean of 3.74 and a 0.55 standard deviation, which reflects agreement among respondents that their employees are empowered to act independently and exercise discretion in their tasks. This implies that retailers appear to encourage employees to manage responsibilities with minimal oversight, contributing to more responsive service delivery. This finding aligns with Ma (2022) highlights that autonomous employees are more proactive in addressing customer needs, while Rigtering and Weitzel (2020) found that autonomy strengthens initiative-taking and problem-solving in small business settings.

Respondents supported statements indicating that employees are encouraged to manage their own work, exercise independence in their duties, and employ different creative methods to accomplish their tasks, resulting in both a mean score of 3.83 (SD=1.34) and (SD=0.78), respectively. This indicates that granting autonomy can enhance employee engagement, creativity, and operational efficiency, which is aligned with Hernández-Linares et al. (2020) who emphasize that autonomy fosters creativity and strengthens innovation. Moreover, it is supported by Bhandari and Amponstira (2020) who note that autonomy leads to better work performance and higher motivation. Furthermore, Covin et al. (2020) highlight that organizations that grant autonomy achieve higher employee engagement, improving service delivery and operational efficiency.

Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, with a mean of 3.66 (SD=0.91), shows that some firms still require employees to go through justification and approval procedures before making decisions. This implies that while autonomy is encouraged, some structured processes remain to ensure accountability. It is aligned with Permatasari and Praswati (2024), who report that balancing autonomy with procedures improves job satisfaction and reduces employee turnover. Additionally, Ardhi et al. (2021) note that granting employees some decision-making authority, even with oversight, enables faster identification and capture of market opportunities.

Table 5. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Autonomy.

Statements	M	SD	Interpretation
1. Employees are encouraged to manage their own work.	3.83	1.34	Agree
2. Employees have enough flexibility to resolve problems.	3.83	0.78	Agree
3. Employees have autonomy in doing the job.	3.74	0.83	Agree
4. Employees do the job without continual supervision.	3.69	0.83	Agree
5. Employees are allowed to be creative and try different methods to complete the job.	3.77	0.78	Agree
6. Employees are allowed to make decisions without going through elaborate justification and approval procedures.	3.62	0.91	Agree
7. Employees seldom have to follow the same work methods or steps while performing their day-to-day tasks.	3.66	0.84	Agree
Overall	3.74	0.55	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.2.5. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Competitive Aggressiveness.

The data presented in Table 6 presents the entrepreneurial orientation in terms of competitive aggressiveness. The result shows a mean score of 3.72 and a 0.58 standard deviation, indicating that retail businesses adopt assertive strategies to outperform competitors. The highest statement recorded a mean of 3.77 (SD=0.81) where respondents agreed that their businesses operate aggressively and competitively in the marketplace, this reflects a strategic posture where businesses actively position themselves against competitors and seek to secure market dominance.

It implies that retailers actively implement strategies, such as competitive pricing, promotions, and service enhancements, to outperform competitors and strengthen their market position. This finding is aligned with Aroyeun et al., (2019), shows that such aggressive strategies can generate immediate increases in sales and strengthen customer loyalty. Hapsari et al. (2024), competitive aggression reflects the intensity with which firms compete for market domination. In addition, Doulani et al. (2020) emphasize that such aggressive strategies help firms secure market share. Also, Fransisca and Soelaiman (2023) note that strategic expansion initiatives further enhance competitiveness.

Meanwhile, the lowest mean of 3.67 (SD=0.82) indicates that retailers are less proactive in assuming an aggressive posture to address industry trends that may threaten their survival or competitive position. Al-Harthi et al. (2024) explain that taking a combative stance is essential for confronting competitors and also, they explained that aggressive competitive strategies contribute substantially to firm performance, particularly in highly saturated markets. While, Sellappan and Shanmugam (2021) note that reluctance to act aggressively may restrict potential performance gains.

Table 6. Entrepreneurial orientation in terms of Autonomy.

Statements	M	SD	Interpretation
------------	---	----	----------------

1. In dealing with competitors, the retail business typically adopts a very competitive “outdo the competitor” approach.	3.76	0.84	Agree
2. The retail business is aggressive and intensely competitive.	3.77	0.81	Agree
3. The retail business effectively assumes an aggressive posture to combat industry trends that may threaten its survival or competitive position.	3.67	0.82	Agree
4. The retail business assumes an offensive, combative posture to overcome threats posed by competitors.	3.69	0.81	Agree
5. The retail business strives to obtain the “first-mover” advantage.	3.69	0.88	Agree
Overall	3.72	0.58	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.3. Performance of Retail Businesses.

The data in Table 7 presents the business performance of retail businesses. It obtained an overall mean score of 3.77 and a standard deviation of 0.62, which has a qualitative description of agree that indicates that respondents view their businesses as financially stable, profitable, and experiencing positive growth. This finding is consistent with Setiawan et al. (2025), who emphasize that increased sales and effective capital utilization contribute substantially to stronger financial outcomes in retail firms. Bhattacharyay (2023) likewise noted that effective working capital management enhanced liquidity, solvency, and profitability, thereby reinforcing financial strength. Similarly, Odonkor et al. (2024) asserted that strategic financial practices such as cost control, risk mitigation, and investments in technology supported sustainable growth in small and retail enterprises. Among the statements, attainment of planned growth rates resulted in the highest mean of 3.83 (SD= 0.75), it implies that many retailers were able to meet or exceed their internal performance targets. This aligned with the findings of Mandipa and Sibindi (2022), who reported that effective management of current assets and liabilities enabled firms to maintain consistent growth. Arinaitwe and Byamukama (2025) further emphasized that budgeting, forecasting, and cash flow management served as essential drivers of business growth, particularly among SMEs. Respondents agreed that their businesses experienced growth in turnover, maintained profitability, and demonstrated financial security. These indicators reflect a positive assessment of business performance, consistent with the relatively high entrepreneurial orientation observed earlier. Meanwhile, the lowest-rated item, with a mean of 3.73 (SD=0.78), which expressed slightly lower confidence in their overall financial security. This implies that despite the generally positive performance, some retailers may still face challenges related to financial security or cash flow. Mayasari and Nengzih (2023) highlight that sound capital management and proper liquidity control are crucial for sustaining financial stability in retail businesses.

Table 7. Performance of retail businesses

Statements	Weighted Mean	Standard Deviation	Qualitative Description
1.The retail business has experience growth in turnover in the past years.	3.78	0.79	Agree
2. The retail business has experienced growth in profits in the past year.	3.74	0.75	Agree
3. The retail business is achieving its planned growth rate.	3.83	0.75	Agree
4. The retail business can be regarded as successful.	3.81	0.79	Agree

5.The retail business is profitable.	3.77	0.81	Agree
6. The retail business is financially secure.	3.73	0.78	Agree
7.The retail business is achieving the financial goals that have been set for it..	3.74	0.79	Agree
Overall Mean	3.77	0.62	Agree

Note: Interpretation of the weighted mean are as follow: 4.50 – 5.00 (Strongly Agree); 3.50 – 4.49 (Agree); 2.50 – 3.49 (Neutral); 1.50 – 2.49 (Disagree); 1.00 – 1.49 (Strongly Disagree)

3.4. Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on the Performance of Retail Businesses

The data in table 3.4. below shows the regression analysis indicated that the model was statistically significant, $F(5, 299) = 14.40$ ($p < .001$), suggesting that the combined predictors of proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness have a significant influence on the performance of retail businesses. Also, the assumptions underlying the multiple regression analysis were assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk and Breusch-Pagan tests. The Shapiro-Wilk test indicated that the residuals did not significantly deviate from normality ($W = 0.996$, $p = .719$). The Breusch-Pagan test was also not statistically significant ($\chi^2(5) = 6.26$, $p = .281$), indicating no significant evidence of heteroscedasticity. The reported p -values were greater than the 0.05 significance level, indicating that there was no statistically significant evidence of violation of the normality and homoscedasticity assumptions. Thus, the residuals were considered sufficiently consistent with the assumptions required for the regression analysis.

The model produced an R^2 value of 0.194, it means that 19.4% of the variation in retail business performance can be explained by these five dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation. This shows that nearly one-fifth of business performance is influenced by the entrepreneurial behaviors and decision-making styles of retail owners. The adjusted $R^2 = 0.180$ provides a more precise estimate by considering the number of predictors in the model. This indicates that 18% of the variation in business performance is reliably explained after adjusting for model complexity. Although this explained variance is moderate, it is meaningful in business where performance is also shaped by external factors such as market competition, customer demand, inflation, and economic conditions. This supports the view of Abu-Rumman et al. (2021), who emphasized that entrepreneurial orientation affects firm performance, though the level of impact may vary depending on industry and environmental conditions. Among the five predictors, risk-taking was the only factor that significantly influence the retail business performance ($\beta = 0.2032$, $p = 0.007$). This means that a one-unit increase in risk-taking behavior corresponds to a 0.20-unit increase in business performance, holding other factors constant. This implies that retailers who take calculated risks such as adopting new technologies, entering new markets, expanding product lines, or investing in high-return ventures are more likely to achieve better financial outcomes.

This finding aligns with Abdulrab et al. (2022), who highlighted that calculated risk-taking strengthens business performance by enabling firms to seize growth opportunities. Similarly, Upadhyay et al. (2022) and Widodo (2023) noted that risk-taking helps firms stay competitive in changing markets, while Saputra et al. (2022) pointed out that it supports market expansion and business diversification. In contrast, proactiveness ($p = 0.079$), innovativeness ($p = 0.626$), autonomy ($p = 0.065$), and competitive aggressiveness ($p = 0.858$) did not show a significant influence on retail performance. Although these dimensions had high mean scores, their influence may not immediately translate into measurable performance results. This is consistent with Kharisma et al. (2020) and Abu-Rumman et al. (2021), who suggested that the influence of entrepreneurial orientation depends on factors like market stability, competition, and resource availability. For example, proactiveness and innovativeness may require long-term application to generate financial benefits, while autonomy and competitive aggressiveness may only affect performance under strong market pressures. Even though these predictors were not statistically significant, the positive coefficients of proactiveness and autonomy indicate that they may

still contribute positively to business performance. This agrees with Sellappan and Shanmugam (2021), who stated that proactive and autonomous behaviors can strengthen a firm's strategic position, but their effect on financial outcomes may take time and require alignment with overall business strategies.

Table 8. Influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of retail businesses

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	1.7098	0.2510	6.813	< .001
Proactiveness	0.1333	0.0755	1.765	.079
Innovativeness	0.0399	0.0817	0.488	.626
Risk-taking	0.2032	0.0755	2.693	.007
Autonomy	0.1628	0.0880	1.849	.065
Competitive aggressiveness	0.0144	0.0802	0.180	.858

4. Conclusion

This study was conducted to determine the influence of entrepreneurial orientation on the performance of retail businesses in Kidapawan City by assessing the five key dimensions: proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness. A descriptive-causal research design was employed, utilizing a structured survey questionnaire to collect data from selected retail business owners/managers. The findings revealed that respondents demonstrated high levels of agreement across all entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, indicating that retail businesses consistently show forward-looking behavior, openness to new ideas, willingness to pursue uncertain opportunities, employee independence, and assertive competitive strategies. The performance of retail businesses was also evaluated positively, with respondents reporting satisfactory levels of profitability, financial security, and growth in turnover. Regression analysis showed that entrepreneurial orientation, as a whole, contributed to explaining the performance of retail businesses. However, among the five dimensions, only risk-taking significantly influenced business performance, highlighting the role of bold and calculated decisions in shaping financial outcomes. The results collectively show that while retail businesses possess strong entrepreneurial qualities, risk-taking plays a uniquely influential role in determining their performance within the current competitive environment. Based on the results of the study, it is concluded that retail businesses in Kidapawan City exhibit a strong entrepreneurial orientation, demonstrating proactive behavior, creativity, strategic risk-taking, employee empowerment, and competitive assertiveness. These behaviors suggest that the local retail sector is dynamic and responsive to market changes. Despite this, only risk-taking was found to have a significant direct influence on business performance. This implies that the capacity of business owners to engage in calculated risks remains essential to achieving growth, profitability, and stability. While the other dimensions did not show a significant direct influence on performance, their high mean scores indicate that they remain integral to shaping the long-term strategic posture and competitiveness of retail businesses. Overall, the study concludes that entrepreneurial orientation is evident among retailers in the city, but its influence on performance is primarily driven by the willingness to take well-considered risks. The findings of this study recommended that retail owners to further refine their risk-taking strategies by adopting a more systematic approaches in evaluating opportunities. Additionally, the retail business may conduct market research, financial risk-taking strategies or analysis and strategic planning. To institutions like the local government unit, business chambers, and academic organizations, it is recommended to develop specific training programs that focus on innovation, financial literacy, recognition opportunities, and competitive strategies. Lastly, to future researchers, it is recommended to considered other variables like adoption of technology, customer behavior, market competition, and other factors that may influence the performance of retail businesses.

5. Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to 305 owners and managers of registered retail businesses operating for at least one year in Poblacion, Kidapawan City. Therefore, the findings may not be directly generalizable to retail businesses located in other cities or municipalities, different geographic areas, or businesses with different characteristics, sizes, and operating conditions. The study also focused only on retail businesses, which may limit the applicability of the findings to other types of businesses or industries. The study utilized a quantitative descriptive and causal research design and employed multiple regression analysis to examine the influence of the five dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation—proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking, autonomy, and competitive aggressiveness—on business performance. However, the data were gathered at a particular period and analyzed based on the respondents' survey responses. Therefore, the findings indicate statistical influence or predictive relationships among the variables but should not be interpreted as establishing definitive cause-and-effect relationships. In addition, the study relied on self-reported responses from business owners and managers using an adapted questionnaire with a 5-point Likert scale. Although the instrument demonstrated acceptable reliability, respondents' perceptions of their entrepreneurial orientation and business performance may differ from objectively measured business outcomes. Actual business performance may also be affected by other factors not included in the study, such as market competition, customer demand, inflation, economic conditions, technology adoption, and resource availability. Future researchers may consider broader populations and geographic areas, longitudinal or mixed-method approaches, objective financial performance measures, and additional variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and retail business performance.

Supplementary Details

Supplementary Materials & Data availability statement:

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The data are not publicly available due to privacy and confidentiality restrictions, as they contain information that could compromise the anonymity of the research participants.

Author Contributions:

Aleyah K. Lauron contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, resources, data curation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, and project administration. Analyn A. Gonzales contributed to the conceptualization, methodology, validation, writing of the original draft, writing–review and editing, visualization, supervision, and project administration. Both authors contributed substantially to the completion of the study and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Name of Author	C	M	So	Va	Fo	I	R	D	O	E	Vi	Su	P	Fu
Aleyah K. Lauron	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Analyn A. Gonzales	✓	✓		✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Ethical compliance was maintained throughout the study in accordance with institutional guidelines for human subject research. The complete research protocol and supporting documents were formally reviewed and approved by the University of Southern Mindanao Research Ethics Committee (USM-RECO), which granted official clearance under a Certificate to Conduct Research issued on September 25, 2025.

Informed Consent Statement:

nformed consent was obtained from all individual participants prior to questionnaire administration. Respondents were explicitly informed of the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of their involvement, and the measures taken to safeguard their privacy, confidentiality, and identity.

Acknowledgments:

Sincere appreciation is extended to everyone who supported this study. The authors offer their highest gratitude to Almighty God for His guidance and clarity. Special thanks are also due to the examining committee and university leadership for their academic direction, to the respondents for their vital participation, and to family and friends for their steadfast encouragement.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial, financial, or personal relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest or bias.

Disclosure Statement:

The authors used Grammarly only for language editing. No AI tools were used in the data analysis or in generating the study's results. The authors reviewed and validated all content and take full responsibility for the article's accuracy, originality, and integrity.

References

- Abdulrab, M., Al-Mamary, Y. H. S., Alwaheeb, M. A., Alshammari, N. G. M., Balhareth, H., & Al-Shammari, S. A. (2021). Mediating role of strategic orientations in the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance of Saudi SMEs. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 18(4), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2021.029>
- Abdurokhim, A., Putra, M., Nendi, I., Harsela, C., Alifah, N., & Askarno, A. (2023). Examining variables affecting competitive advantage as an effort to improve business performance in property companies in Pati Regency. *Journal of Advanced Zoology*, 44(3), 1381-1387. <https://doi.org/10.17762/jazv44i3.1752>
- Abu-Rumman, A., Al-Madi, S., & Alfalah, T. (2021). Entrepreneurial networks, entrepreneurial orientation, and performance of small and medium enterprises: Are dynamic capabilities the missing link? *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(29). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-021-00170-8>
- Akinwale, Y.O., Adelowo, C.M., & Surujlal, J. A. (2025). Entrepreneurial orientation and financial performance among SMEs in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research (IJBIR)*, Vol. 36, No. 1, <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijbir.2022.10045392>
- Al-Dhaafri, H. S. (2020). The impact of innovation and risk-taking on business performance: Evidence from retail pharmacies in Bahrain. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(3), 23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1108/inmr-06-2018-0039>
- Al-Harthi, S., Bachkurov, A.A., Al-Riyami, S. & Al-Jahwari, M. (2024). Entrepreneurial orientation and competitive aggressiveness: A need for conceptual refinement and contextualization, *Arab Gulf Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol. 42 No. 3, pp. 825-835. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AGJSR-04-2023-0161>
- Al Mamun, A., Fazal, S. A., & Muniady, R. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation, marketing capability, and performance of informal microenterprises in Malaysia. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 13(4), 783–806. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-03-2021-0090>
- Amin, M., Akpan, E. J., & Otache, I. (2024). Impact of entrepreneurial orientation on small and medium enterprises performance: The role of competitive aggressiveness. *Journal of Asian Business and Economic Studies*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096241295639>
- Amrullah, M., Sari, D. M., & Nugroho, R. (2023). The role of risk-taking in enhancing competitive advantage through innovation. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 17(3), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.18535/ijserm/v11i02.em06>

- Anis, M., Siddiqui, D. A., & Muneer, S. (2023). Impact of retail management practices on consumer satisfaction: A case study approach. *Journal of Retail and Consumer Services*, 75, 102879. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.102879>
- Ardhi, M. K., Mulyo, J. H., & Irham, N. (2021). How does entrepreneurial orientation affect the business performance of coffee shop MSMEs in Indonesia? *E3S Web of Conferences*, 306, 03011. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202130603011>
- Arinaitwe, S., & Byamukama, A. (2025). Budgeting, forecasting, and cash flow management as drivers of SME success. *Journal of Small Business Studies*, 8(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118106754.ch17>
- Aroyeun, T. F., Adefulu, A. D., & Asikhia, O. U. (2019). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation on performance of selected small and medium scale enterprises in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 8(1), 16–27.
- Bascur, C., & Rusu, C. (2020). Customer experience in retail: A systematic literature review. *Applied Sciences*, 10(21), 7644. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app10217644>
- Bhandari, P., & Amponstira, F. (2020). Effect of entrepreneurial orientation on profitability of women owned enterprises in Pokhara city, Nepal. *International Business Research*, 13(10), 66. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v13n10p66>
- Bhattacharyay, S. (2023). Distinguished competency and efficacy of working capital management ensuing firm survival, liquidity, solvency and profitability: A study on automotive industry. *American Business Review*, 26(1), 19–64. <https://doi.org/10.37625/abr.26.1.19-64>
- Budiatmo, A., Hidayat, W., Dewi, R. S., Handoyo, D. W., & Widayanto. (2021). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation on innovation. *Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Studies*, 4(6), 01–10. <https://doi.org/10.47191/jefms/v4-i6-04>
- Complete Controller. (2020). Top challenges facing traditional retailers. <https://www.completecontroller.com/top-challenges-facing-traditional-retailers/>
- Covin, J., Rigtering, J. C., Hughes, M., Kraus, S., Cheng, C., & Bouncken, R. (2020). Individual and team entrepreneurial orientation: Scale development and configurations for success. *Journal of Business Research*, 112, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.02.023>
- Dionysus, R., Arifin, A. (2020). Strategic orientation on performance: The resource-based view theory approach. *Jurnal Akuntansi*, 24(1), 131. <https://doi.org/10.24912/ja.v24i1.661>
- Doulani, A., Sahebi, S., & Saberi, M. K. (2020). Assessing the entrepreneurial orientation of the librarians. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 69(4/5), 253-268. <https://doi.org/10.1108/gkmc-10-2019-0120>
- Farrington, S. M., & Matchaba-Hove, M. T. M. (2011). The influence of entrepreneurial orientation on small business success. In *The 23rd Annual Conference of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v7i1.6>
- Fang, S., Li, Y., & Zhao, J. (2022). The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on firm performance: The mediating role of competitive advantage. *Journal of Business Research*, 140, 123-134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.12.045>
- Fernandes, J. J. M., Ferreira, P. M., Veiga, P. M., Hu, Q., & Hughes, M. (2025). Dynamic capabilities as a moderator: Enhancing the international performance of SMEs with international entrepreneurial orientation. *Review of Managerial Science*, 19, 1073–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-024-00784-8>
- Fransisca, T., & Soelaiman, L. (2023). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation and market orientation on Jakarta's culinary business performance. *International Journal of Application on Economics and Business*, 1(3), 1503–1511. <https://doi.org/10.24912/ijaeb.v1i3.1503-1511>

- Garcia, M., & Thompson, L. (2021). Retail after COVID-19: The new normal. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 49(7), 890–905.
- George, S., & Elrashid, S. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance in retail pharmacies: Evidence from Bahrain. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(5), 178–187. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2020.8517>
- Gunasekara, N., Shukri, S., Khatibi, P., & Azam, S. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance in star class hotels of Sri Lanka. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 15–19. <https://doi.org/10.34257/gjhssevol20is1pg15>
- Hapsari, P., Wiksuana, I., Artini, L., & Dewi, S. (2024). Entrepreneurial orientation and funding decisions on the financial performance of small and medium industries. *Indonesian Journal of Multidisciplinary Science*, 3(8). <https://doi.org/10.55324/ijoms.v3i8.884>
- Hernández-Linares, R., Kellermanns, F., Fernández, M., & Sarkar, S. (2020). The effect of socioemotional wealth on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and family business performance. *BRQ Business Research Quarterly*, 23(3), 174–192. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2340944420941438>
- Irawan, T. T., Mansor, M. N. B., & Ramlee, A. A. (2023). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance: A systematic review. *European Business & Management*, 9(3), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ebm.20230903.12>
- Karimi, A., Daryani, M. A., & Rahmani, S. (2021). The influence of entrepreneurial orientation on firm growth among Iranian agricultural SMEs: The mediation role of entrepreneurial leadership and market orientation. *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research*, 15(3), 90–100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40497-021-00282-1>
- Khan, M., Zubair, S., Rathore, K., Ijaz, M., Khalil, S., & Khalil, M. (2021). Impact of entrepreneurial orientation dimensions on performance of small enterprises: Do entrepreneurial competencies matter? *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2021.1943241>
- Kharisma, P. P., Irawanto, D. W., & Rofiq, A. (2020). Entrepreneurial orientation and its effect toward SMEs performance through strategic flexibility on fashion industry in Malang. *Jurnal Bisnis: Teori dan Implementasi*, 11(2), 182–194. <https://doi.org/10.18196/bti.112139>
- Kihm, S., & Kamal, R. (2020). Bridging the gap between management and finance: Entrepreneurial orientation and idiosyncratic risk. *Managerial Finance*, 47(1), 98–118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/mf-05-2019-0256>
- Kiss, A. N., Cortes, A. F., & Herrmann, P. (2022). CEO proactiveness, innovation, and firm performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 33(3), 101545. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101545>
- Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135–172. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161568>
- Ma, F. (2022). Entrepreneurial willingness, practice, and management path of college graduates in a green development environment. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2022, 5453097. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/5453097>
- Madi, R., Sarita, B., Tangalayuk, A., & Yulianti, E. (2021). The effect of business orientation on small business performance in Kendari City. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation and Applied Sciences*, 1(1), 19–30. <https://doi.org/10.47540/ijiasv1i1.158>
- Majumder, H., & Mahapatra, S. K. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: A study on micro and small entrepreneurs of Assam. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*, 12(10), 7272–7290. <https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v12i10.5618>
- Mandipa, G., & Sibindi, A. B. (2022). Financial performance and working capital management practices in the retail sector: Empirical evidence from South Africa. *Risks*, 10(3), 63. <https://doi.org/10.3390/risks10030063>

- Mayasari, D., & Nengzih, R. (2023). The impact of liquidity and capital management on retail income quality. *Journal of Retail Financial Management*, 15(2), 45–59. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jrfm.2023.01502>
- Odonkor, B., Urefe, E., Biney, E., & Obeng, P. (2024). Comprehensive financial strategies for achieving sustainable growth in small businesses. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal*, 6(8), 1349–1374. <https://doi.org/10.51594/farj.v6i8.1376>
- Ogundare, A., & van der Merwe, M. (2024). The role of competitor orientation and proactiveness. *Southern African Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management*, 16(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajesbm.v16i1.786>
- Ozigi, E., Gambo, N., Nwobilor, C., & Ibrahim, U. (2023). Proactiveness and competitive aggressiveness as a predictor on entrepreneurial intention among female undergraduates in northwest Nigeria federal universities. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 11(3), 12–27. <https://doi.org/10.37745/ijbsber.2013/vol11n31227>
- Paredes, K. M. B., & Olander Roese, M. (2024). Towards innovation capability in retail services: managing the tensions of exploration and exploitation. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, 34(5), 551–570. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09593969.2024.2312892>
- Permatasari, A., & Praswati, A. (2024). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation on performance mediated by innovation and network capability. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen Kesatuan*, 12(1), 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.37641/jimkes.v12i1.2394>
- Pilawa, J., Witell, L., Valtakoski, A., & Kristensson, P. (2022). Service innovativeness in retailing: Increasing the relative attractiveness during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 67, 102962. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2022.102962>
- Rezaei, J., & Ortt, R. (2018). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 139, 275–297. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-03-2017-0092>
- Rigtering, J. P. C., Weitzel, U., & Muehlfeld, K. S. (2019). Increasing quantity without compromising quality: How managerial framing affects intrapreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 34(2), 224–241. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2018.11.002>
- Rokhman, W., et al. (2023). Intellectual resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and MSME marketing effectiveness. *Sustainability*, 14(10), 6308. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14106308>
- Salem, L., & Hashem, A. (2023). The relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and family business performance in Egypt. *The Academic Journal of Contemporary Commercial Research*, 3(3), 21–43. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ajccr.2023.318182>
- Saputra, A., Sudibia, I., Purbadarmaja, I., & Dewi, M. (2022). The influence of entrepreneurial orientation and business performance in improving the welfare of business actors. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, 5(12), 25–36. <http://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2022.51203>
- Sellappan, P., & Shanmugam, K. (2021). Delineating entrepreneurial orientation efficacy on retailer's business performance. *Management Decision*, 59(4), 858–876. <https://doi.org/10.1108/md-01-2019-0062>
- Setiawan, R., Hutomo, B., & Rizal, S. (2025). Profit growth, capital structure, liquidity, and earnings quality in retail companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. *Baileo: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora*, 2(3), 269–273. <https://doi.org/10.29300/baileo.v2i3.17558>
- Tang, J., Yang, J., Ye, W., & Khan, S. A. (2021). Now is the time: The effects of linguistic time reference and national time orientation on innovative new ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 36(5), 106142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2021.106142>

- Upadhyay, N., Upadhyay, S., Al-Debei, M., Baabdullah, A., & Dwivedi, Y. (2022). The influence of digital entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial orientation on intention of family businesses to adopt artificial intelligence: Examining the mediating role of business innovativeness. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 29(1), 80–115. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijebr-02-2022-0154>
- Wales, W. J., Patel, P. C., Parida, V., & Kreiser, P. M. (2021). Why are entrepreneurial orientation and performance inconsistent? A meta analytic examination. *Journal of Business Research*, 128, 306–318. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.02.051>
- Wahyuni, N., & Sara, I. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurial orientation variables on business performance in the SME industry context. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 32(1), 35–62. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jwl-03-2019-0033>
- Widodo, D. (2023). The nexus of entrepreneurial orientation and knowledge management on business performance of SMEs in West Java: role of competitive advantage. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(7), e1364. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i7.1364>
- Zahra, S. A., Neubaum, D. O., & Huse, M. (2022). Entrepreneurial orientation and new venture performance in emerging markets: The mediating role of opportunity recognition. *Journal of Management and Governance*, 26, 765–785. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00457-w>
- Zhang, X., & Liang, H. (2024). Dynamic capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation: Enhancing firm performance in competitive markets. *Strategic Management Journal*, 45(2), 290–310. <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3324>