



## ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF MEDIUM ENTERPRISES

Nafiu I. BADIRU<sup>1</sup>, Oluwafemi H. OYEDEPO<sup>2</sup>, John O. ADEBAYO<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Business Administration, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria. [nafiu.badiru@pgc.uniosun.edu.ng](mailto:nafiu.badiru@pgc.uniosun.edu.ng)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Business Administration, Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria. [hoyebamiji@yahoo.com](mailto:hoyebamiji@yahoo.com)

<sup>3</sup> Department of Business and Entrepreneurship Faculty of Management Sciences Kwara State University, Molete Kwara State, Nigeria. [johnadebs2@gmail.com](mailto:johnadebs2@gmail.com)

**JEL: C22, D24, J21,  
L81 M20, 21**

### Abstract

This study aims to determine the mechanisms by which entrepreneurial characteristics impact the organisational performance of Medium Enterprises (ME) in South-West, Nigeria. This study surveyed 370 owners/managers of MEs across the six states of South-West, Nigeria, using quantitative methods. And data were collected and analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The empirical data reveal that creativity impacted organisational innovativeness; competitive aggressiveness influences organisational innovativeness; and creativity and competitive aggressiveness collectively impacted the organisational innovativeness. Hence, the study concluded that the entrepreneurial characteristics dimension, specifically, creativity and competitive aggressiveness individually and collectively enhanced organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West, Nigeria.

© 2023 University of Economics – Varna

### Key words:

Competitive  
Aggressiveness,  
Creativity,  
Entrepreneurial  
Characteristics, Medium  
Enterprises  
Performance,  
Organisational  
Innovativeness

**Citation:** Badiru, N. I., Oyedepo, O. H., Adebayo, J. O. (2023). Entrepreneurial Characteristics and Organisational Performance of Medium Enterprises. *Izvestiya. Journal of Economics, Management and Informatics*, 67 (1), p. 5 – 23.

DOI: 10.56065/IJUEV2023.67.1.5

## 1. Introduction

Globally, scholars acknowledged the economic roles and contributions of both Small and Medium Enterprises to the growth and development of nations, resulting from the creation of wealth, employment generation, and creation of products and services (Ivan et al., 2018). Therefore, stakeholders have developed an increased interest like never before to provide a common ground to find a lasting solution to poor performance and failure among these enterprises in order to enhance performance and develop ways to achieve more participants to boost and increase the participation of the sector in a global market. However, the search for businesses to gain market share and improve their competitiveness over their competitors led to the recognition, and the need to be more creative in their business operation while at the same time seeing innovation as a vital ingredient for their survival and enhancing business performance.

Although many factors make a business successful, measuring an entrepreneur's attributes is relatively straightforward. However, every successful business owner has unique skills and personality quirks that set them apart from others in domain-specific competencies and personality traits. On the other hand, firms do well in markets where their competitive advantages stem from their ideas' quality and capacity to innovate.

Liang (2019) opines that the discussions involving government support and promotion, sociocultural trends, and the injection of economic capital have all contributed to the global agenda on the improvement of the performance of small businesses. However, Ayodeji (2015) argues that the performance of small and medium businesses is relatively poor as a result of their poor innovation and creative capability in respect of products and services development, coupled with a lack of competitive aggressiveness among local entrepreneurs, which negatively affects their global competitions, reduces their performance, growth and development when compared with foreign-owned medium enterprises.

The literature review revealed scanty studies on the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and organisational performance, considering the creativity and competitive aggressiveness as dimensions of entrepreneurial characteristics, except the studies of Liang (2019); Ivan et al. (2018) that found

entrepreneurship and personality traits to be positively related, and emphasised on entrepreneurs to be more confident and outgoing while being less insecure and amenable. In other words, these few studies did not explicitly focus on the Medium Enterprises (MEs), which are relatively bigger in terms of resources than small enterprises to pursue creativity and drive competition in their products and services globally. Also, few or no available studies tested the combined impact of creativity and competitive aggressiveness on the organisational innovativeness of MEs both locally and internationally.

Further review also revealed that most related studies on entrepreneurship and performance were discussed under a single theoretical framework, specifically on Resource-Based View (RBV) theory or dynamic capability theory. However, only few studies, if not none, were found to adopt a multi-theoretical framework, with entrepreneurship innovation theory and dynamic capability theory as a baseline to empirically explain the role of entrepreneurial characteristics on organisational performance. As a result of these gaps, it has become necessary to assess the mechanisms by which entrepreneurial characteristics impact the organisational performance of medium enterprises in South-West Nigeria.

## **2.0 Literature Review**

### **2.1. Entrepreneurial Characteristics**

Economic growth and competitiveness are two areas where entrepreneurship plays a crucial role over time. Therefore, there is a level of scrutiny placed on the entrepreneur's personality by stating the characteristics and traits that set entrepreneurs apart from managers. According to Rukundo et al. (2016), an entrepreneur is someone who takes the initiative to start a business and sees it through to fruition, despite the possibility of adverse financial, social, or psychological outcomes. Nwite (2016) sees the entrepreneur as a person who is willing to start a new business and is willing to accept complete responsibility for the results. Tanoğlu (2008) as cited in Wardhana and Pangestu (2021), defines entrepreneurial characteristics as a unique synthesis of an individual's mechanisms, personality behaviours, modes of thinking, desires and tendencies, talents, knowledge, personality, and ways of thinking, while Santos (2016) posits entrepreneurship characteristics to be human characters and traits that may influence

people's interpretations and responses to their business environment. Therefore, entrepreneurial characteristics can be defined as human characters and traits that may influence the interpretations and responses of entrepreneurs in their business environment.

### **2.1.1. Creativity**

The personal characteristics of an entrepreneur are essential for the decision-making process that can bring change in the society and the economy. Because, being an entrepreneur is no walk in the park; rather, it requires a constant pursuit of disruption, a willingness to adapt, and the maximisation of opportunity. Personal, social, creative, and practical abilities are all included in entrepreneurial characteristics that help seek out change, welcome innovation and progress, and find endless ways to advance and seize possibilities. Creativity is the creation of original ideas that solve a problem through innovative processes to create a better or new product or gain a competitive advantage in a specific sector. Liu et al. (2018) opined that creativity had positively impacted entrepreneurship intentions, mainly regarding entrepreneurial originality. However, the term creativity is the ability to generate and implement creative ideas that support the launch of new businesses or the revitalisation of the existing product of a business. Anna et al. (2021) state that having the right talents, skills, and characteristics can significantly increase a company's productivity and success.

### **2.1.2. Competitive Aggressiveness**

Competitive aggressiveness occurs when businesses respond negatively to competitors that are taking advantage of current opportunities to grow business and outperform other competitors. Competitive aggressiveness can be seen as a "combative attitude or aggressive response" to achieve a more advantageous market position or triumph over competitors. Meanwhile, Olubiyi et al. (2019) see competitive aggressiveness as a way businesses actively seek out and exploit opportunities presented by competitors to exceed one's competitors. Therefore, a competitively aggressive business strives to outperform and fiercely fight competitors in a specific market to either break into the market or strengthen its current foothold.

## **2.2. Organisational Performance**

### **2.2.1. Organisational Innovativeness**

In addition to being crucial to the long-term success of any company, innovative organisational practises are increasingly important in today's highly competitive environment. Due to the dynamic nature of the modern business world, entrepreneurs, managers, and academics constantly look for novel approaches to enhance organisational effectiveness, productivity, and performance. Asad (2018) states that product and process, radical and incremental, administrative and technological, are all forms that innovation may take in this highly competitive business environment. Asad (2018) asserted further that organisational innovativeness is vital for survival, enhancing market share, improving performance and providing a competitive edge in any given business environment. Product innovation refers to any change in the way a product is designed, manufactured, or prepared; process innovation refers to any shift in the way a product is created; and innovation procedures refer to any strategy for incorporating products and processes into an organisation's operations (Schumann, 1994). Therefore, the ability of a company to generate such innovations is contingent on the company's resources, in terms of both financial and non-financial resources attributable to the business.

## **2.3. Theoreticak Framework**

### **2.3.1. Entrepreneurship Innovation Theory**

Joseph Schumpeter proposed the theory of entrepreneurship innovation in (1949). Joseph Schumpeter defined entrepreneurs as persons who bring new ideas to a market and have the insight to see how such ideas might contribute to the growth of an economy. Schumpeter states that innovation occurs when an entrepreneur offers a novel product or manufacturing technique, opens a new market, discovers an untapped source of raw materials, or establishes an entirely new organisation in an existing industry. Therefore, this theory is relevant to this study, because firms operate in a highly competitive business environment, and the only way for an entrepreneur to outperform competitors is through the use of innovation and creativity in the company products/services development and process.

### **2.3.2. Dynamic Capability Theory**

Teece and Pisano first explicitly published the ideas of the dynamic capability theory in 1994. They imply that a firm is more endowed than the principle underlying the standard resource-based view would have it believe; it is not just the availability of resources that matters but also the firm's ability to learn and accumulate new skills that ultimately determines competitive advantage. Teece (2012) as cited in Rashid and Ratten (2020), states that the dynamic capacities approach is founded on the entrepreneur's capacity to think creatively, develop new products and services, and adapt quickly to shifting market conditions. Therefore, this theory is relevant to this study, because of the need for a firm's stock of resources to rapidly respond to increasingly dynamically changing environments.

### **2.4. Empirical Review**

Ivan et al. (2018) investigated the potential impact of innovation and creativity on SME profitability in Serbia. The study tested a conceptual model and six hypotheses with a survey of 717 SMEs in southern and south-eastern Serbia using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Path Analysis. The result showed the reliability of the data. Furthermore, the findings highlighted the need for an entrepreneurial mindset that values creativity, innovation, and risk-taking propensity to improve profitability.

Domi et al. (2019) conduct an empirical investigation of the relationship between innovativeness, innovation behaviour and the performance metrics of SMEs. The study involved in-person meetings and collected data for 211 cases that were analysed utilising SEM statistical methods. The findings show that innovativeness is highly associated with innovative behaviour. Even though innovativeness does not directly impact the performance of SMEs, it does have a considerable impact through the mediating role played by innovation behaviour.

The effects of innovativeness and firm resources on the growth of small enterprises in the Ga South Municipality in Ghana were empirically studied by Ayepa et al. (2019). A total of 368 registered SMEs were used as the population for this study, with a quantitative approach using a cross-sectional design on the sample size of 188 derived from the study's population. The respondents were selected using

a simple random sampling technique. The study revealed that both innovativeness and firm resources affected the growth of small enterprises and concluded that SMEs should be more innovative and strengthen and maximise the effective use of resources to boost growth and enhance performance.

Indriastuti (2019) empirical study was on entrepreneurial innovativeness, relational capabilities, and value co-creation on marketing performance of SMEs of apparel fashion industries in Central Java, Indonesia. Purposive sampling method was used to collect data from 150 respondents via a questionnaire. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used with the AMOS software to analyse the data. The study found that relational capabilities significantly affect value co-creation. The study concludes that value co-creation can bridge the gap between relational capabilities and marketing performance.

### **3.0 Methodology**

Descriptive survey research design was employed to investigate the impact of entrepreneurial characteristics on the organisational performance of selected Medium Enterprises (MEs) in South-West Nigeria. The population comprises of 9,654 registered Medium-Sized Enterprises (MEs) in the South-West (MSMEs Survey, 2021). The sample size of 370 was determined using 0.05 margins of error and a 95% confidence level from the sample size determination table developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). The researcher also adopted multistage sampling techniques; stratified, proportional, and simple random sampling method to select the respondents across the six states in South-West, Nigeria.

#### **3.1 Model Specification**

The model formulated for this study is stated below:

The dependent variable is Organisational Performance, while the independent variable is Entrepreneurial Characteristics.

Based on the above, the model that expresses the relationship between the two variables is specified as follows:

$$Y = f(X)$$

The independent Variable (X) = Entrepreneurial Characteristics

The dependent Variable (Y) = Organisational Performance (OP)

$X = (x_1, x_2)$ ,  $x_1 =$  creativity,  $x_2 =$  Competitive aggressiveness

$Y = (y)$ ,  $y =$  Organisational innovativeness

Functional relationships (fn)

$Y = f(X)$

$y = f(x_1)$ .....fn. i

$y = f(x_2)$ .....fn. ii

$y = f(x_1, x_2)$  .....fn. iii

Regression Model

$y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \mu$ .....equ. i

$y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_2 + \mu$  ..... equ. ii

$y = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \mu_i$  .....equ.iii

Where  $\alpha =$  the constant of the equation

$\beta_1 =$  the coefficient of variables in the equations;

$\mu_i =$  the stochastic function that accounts for the errors that may arise in the equation.

### 3.2 Research Instrument

The researcher employed the use of primary data with the use of structured questionnaires adapted from the study of Lumpkin and Dess (1996), and Marina et al. (2018). The questionnaires were administered across the six states in the South-West: Ondo, 43; Oyo, 51; Ogun, 72; Osun, 15; Lagos, 189; and Ekiti, Nil. The questionnaire was designed using a five-point modified scale structure, with responses to individual items ranging from Strongly Agree (SA) to Strongly Disagree (SD). The study also conducted a pilot test to strengthen and modify the questionnaire before distribution to the focus; respondents. Additionally, face, concept, and content validity were assessed using Average Variance Extracted, with scores between 0.8 and 0.9. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) results in between 0.665 and 0.854 reported following the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (1974) threshold. Cronbach's Alpha was also adopted to determine the reliability of the study's instrument, with the value ranging between 0.837-0.891.



## Research Hypotheses

Three null hypotheses were formulated for this study viz.:

- i. Creativity has no significant impact on organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria.
- ii. Competitive aggressiveness has no significant influence on organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria.
- iii. The combined impact of creativity and competitive aggressiveness does not significantly influence organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria.

## 4.0. Results and Discussion

### 4.1. Test of Hypotheses

**Hypothesis One:** Creativity does not have a significant impact on the organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria

**Table 1**

**Regression Model of Creativity on Organisational Innovativeness**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	
1	.835 <sup>a</sup>	.697	.694	.719	.234	
Model	Sum of Squares		Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	434.069	4	108.517	210.010	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	188.604	365	.517		
	Total	622.673	369			
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Innovativeness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Creativity						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022).*

**Hypothesis One:** Creativity does not have a significant impact on the organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria

**Table 1** shows the regression analysis of the interaction between Creativity and Organisational Innovativeness with an (R) value of 0.835, which indicates a positive interaction. The result also indicates an R Square value of 0.697; this indicates that creativity is responsible for roughly 69.7% of the organisational innovativeness of

MEs. The stochastic error factor accounts for the remaining 30.3% of changes driven by causes or variables excluded in this model. Table 1 further revealed that this model is statistically significant with  $F_{tab} (4,369) > F_{cal} 210.010$ , and (Sig .000) less than 0.05 threshold.

**Table 2**  
**Contribution of Each Predictor Variable on Organisational Innovativeness**

Model		Coefficients				
		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.397	.159		-2.506	.013
	The enterprise continuously allocated budget to foster the growth of research and development on innovation	-.231	.064	-.229	-3.632	.000
	The enterprise is always working on something new, be it a product or a process	.468	.060	.496	7.776	.000
	The business is always on the lookout for information on the potential integration of new technologies and processes	.323	.081	.272	3.990	.000
	The focus of the company's investment strategy is on emerging technology in the industry	.534	.080	.460	6.675	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Innovativeness						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022)..*

The regression coefficients for each independent variable's effect on the criterion variable are displayed in **table 2**. A standardised beta coefficient of 0.496 was found after analysis that the enterprise is always working on something new, be it a product or a process. This result reveals a substantial and distinctive contribution of this variable with 49.6% in explaining organisational innovativeness.

The result of the analysis that the business is always on the lookout for

information on the potential integration of new technologies and processes gives a standardised beta coefficient value of 0.272, and this reveals a 27.2% contribution of this variable to organisational innovativeness.

The result of regression coefficients based on the focus of the company's investment strategy on emerging technology in the industry reveals a standardised beta coefficient of 0.460. The result suggests that a 46% increase in the rate of organisational innovation may be attributed to a 1% rise in the willingness to invest in new technologies among MEs in the sector. The results that the enterprise continuously allocated budget to foster the growth of research and development on innovation gives a standardised beta coefficient of -0.229. This result means a 1% increase in this variable led to a 22.9% reduction in organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria.

From the overall results, the sig. value was 0.000 less than 5% critical value threshold. Hence the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, the study concludes that creativity does have an impact on the organisational innovativeness of MEs.

**Hypothesis Two:** Competitive aggressiveness has no significant influence on the organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria

**Table 3**  
**Interaction of Competitive Aggressiveness and Organisational Innovativeness**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	
1	.892 <sup>a</sup>	.795	.794	.590	.212	
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	495.176	3	165.059	473.828	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	127.497	366	.348		
	Total	622.673	369			
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Innovativeness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Competitive Aggressiveness						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022).*

The summary of this model in **Table 3** gives an (R) value of 0.892, and an R Square value of 0.795; it means that competitive aggressiveness accounts for about 79.5% of contribution to organisational innovativeness. The stochastic error term

captures the remaining 20.5% of changes because it is driven by causes not included in this model. Table 3 further indicates that this model is statistically significant with  $F_{tab} 3,369 > F_{cal} 473.828$ , and p value less than 0.05 threshold.

**Table 4**  
**Contribution of Each Predictor Variable on Organisational Innovativeness**

(iii) Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.475	.128		-3.703	.000
	Our company is intensely competitive	.119	.023	.123	5.137	.000
	When dealing with market competitors, our company typically takes an aggressive stance to outsmart the market.	.870	.033	.794	26.641	.000
	The company actively works to eliminate competition in the market.	.126	.033	.115	3.856	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational innovativeness						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022).*

Regression coefficients for each independent variable's contribution to the criterion variable are shown in **Table 4**. The standardised beta coefficient is calculated to be 0.794 for the MEs, that when dealing with market competitors, the enterprise typically takes an aggressive stance to outsmart competitors in the market. This result makes a contribution of 79.4% in explaining organisational innovativeness when the variation explained by all other factors in the model is controlled.

The firm's competitiveness in the operating sector shows a standardised beta coefficient of 0.123. The result means a 1% increase in being intensely competitive led to a 12.3% increase in the rate of organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria. The standardised beta coefficient contribution on the company

actively working to eliminate market competition indicates a 0.115 value. This result reveals that a 1% increase in active work by the company to eliminate competition in the market led to an 11.5% increase in the rate of organisational innovativeness. Therefore, the overall results show p-value of 0.000 less than the 5% threshold. As a result, hypothesis two was rejected. In light of these findings, the study concludes that competitive aggressiveness influences the organisational innovativeness of MEs.

**Hypothesis Three:** Creativity and Competitive Aggressiveness do not significantly enhance the organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria.

**Table 5**

**The Combined Interaction of Creativity and Competitive aggressiveness on Organisational Innovativeness**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson	
1	.804a	.647	.645	.774	.128	
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	402.871	2	201.436	336.334	.000b
	Residual	219.802	367	.599		
	Total	622.673	369			
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational Innovativeness						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Creativity, Competitive Aggressiveness						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022).*

**Table 5** shows the model summary of the interaction between the combined impact of creativity, competitive aggressiveness, and organisational innovativeness with an (R) value of 0.804, and R Square value of 0.647; means that creativity and competitive aggressiveness collectively account for about 64.7% contribution to organisational innovativeness. Although the stochastic error term captures the remaining 35.3% of changes, they are not accounted for in this model. The result

further indicates that this model is statistically significant with  $F_{tab} (2,369), > F_{cal} 336.334$ , and sig value less than 0.05 threshold.

**Table 6**  
**Contribution of Each Predictor Variable on Organisational Innovativeness**

iii) Coefficients						
Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.875	.176		-4.962	.000
	Creativity	.461	.070	.319	6.626	.000
	Competitive aggressiveness	.778	.070	.533	11.057	.000
a. Dependent Variable: Organisational innovativeness						

*Source: Author's Computation (2022).*

The regression coefficients for how much each independent component of entrepreneurial characteristics contributed to the criterion variable were revealed in **Table 6**. The result shows that a standardised beta coefficient for creativity is 0.319. When the variance in the model caused by other factors is controlled, the creativity of MEs led to a 31.9% rise in the rate of organisational innovation, The result further revealed a standardised beta coefficient of 0.533 on the competitive aggressiveness, indicating that a 1% increase of competitive aggressiveness of MEs led to a 53.3% increase in contribution to organisational innovativeness. Therefore, the sig value of 0.000 is less than the 5% critical value, making a shred of solid evidence to reject the null hypothesis three for this study. Hence, it is concluded that the combined impact of creativity and competitive aggressiveness impacts the organisational innovativeness of MEs.

#### 4.2. Discussion of Findings

Hypothesis one for this study was tested with the aid of Regression, that creativity does not impact MEs' organisational innovativeness. The result in Table 1 reveals the interaction between creativity and organisational innovativeness of MEs in the South-West, with an (R) value of 0.835, which reveals a positive interaction

between creativity and organisational performance. The result of R Square reveals a value of 0.697, indicating a total contribution of about 69.7% of creativity to the organisational innovativeness of MEs. Therefore, the null hypothesis one was rejected, implying that creativity has a significant impact on organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West, Nigeria. The findings are consistent with the study of Ivan et al. (2018) assertion that creativity and innovation affect the performance of the SME sector.

More so, hypothesis two for this study was tested with the aid of Regression, that competitive aggressiveness does not influence the organisational innovativeness of MEs. The model summary shows the interaction between competitive aggressiveness and organisational innovativeness with an (R) value of 0.892. This shows a positive interaction between competitive aggressiveness and organisational innovativeness. The result further reveals R Square value of 0.795; it means that competitive aggressiveness accounts for about 79.5% contribution of organisational innovativeness of medium enterprises in South-west Nigeria. Therefore, the null hypothesis two was rejected, implying that competitive aggressiveness significantly influences the organisational' innovativeness of MEs in South-West Nigeria. The findings confirm the findings of the study of Egwakhe et al. (2021) assertion that competitive aggressiveness enhances performance.

Finally, hypothesis three for this study was tested with the aid of Regression, that the combined impact of creativity and competitive aggressiveness does not influence the organisational innovativeness. The table displays the results of the combined interactive effect of creativity and competitive aggressiveness on the organisational innovativeness, with an (R) value of 0.804. This shows a positive interaction between creativity and competitive aggressiveness on organisational innovativeness. The result also displays an R Square value of 0.647; it means that creativity and competitive aggressiveness collectively account for about 64.7% of organisational innovativeness of medium enterprises. This provides substantial evidence against the null hypothesis three; hence, the null hypothesis three was rejected, implying that creativity and competitive aggressiveness collectively has a significant impact on organisational innovativeness of MEs in South-West, Nigeria. The finding is consistent with the study of Egwakhe et al. (2021); Ivan et al. (2018); who assert that creativity and innovation affect the performance of enterprises.

## **5.0. Conclusion**

This study investigates the impact of entrepreneurial characteristics on the organisational performance of Medium Enterprises. The findings revealed that creativity impacted organisational innovativeness of MEs. The finding further reveals that the competitive aggressiveness of MEs influences the organisational innovativeness of MEs. This study concluded that the entrepreneurial characteristics dimension, specifically creativity and competitive aggressiveness has the unique capacity to enhance organisational innovativeness and improving organisational performance of MEs. The study also emphasizes the need for MEs owners/managers in paying utmost attention by continuously engaging and reassessing their innovation strategies to improve the creation of new products and services. And also develop possible strategies that can be implemented to support MEs competitiveness in the global market.

Organisational effectiveness can be predicted to be influenced by internal characteristics such as the creativity and aggression in the face of competition displayed by the company's owners and managers. Therefore, to improve the performance of medium enterprises, creativity and competitive aggressiveness are indispensable characteristics of owners/managers in a competitive business environment.

### **5.1. Research Contribution**

The key value-added of this study is filling a gap in the existing literature on entrepreneurial characteristics and organisational innovativeness, specifically on medium enterprises. Further, the study aids in discovering how managers and owners of MEs may prioritize creativity and competitive aggressiveness to improve organisational innovativeness and overall performance of medium enterprises.

### **5.2. Research Implications**

As well as theoretical ramifications, this research also has the following research implications: This research will be helpful for business owners and managers of MEs to understand how creativity and competitive aggressiveness techniques can improve organisational innovativeness. The study will help MEs owners and managers know and identify benefits of creativity and competitive



aggressiveness to organizational innovativeness, and, equally create awareness among all the stakeholders in the MEs sector on the collective importance of creativity and competitive aggressiveness to organisational performance.

### 5.3. Research Limitations and Future Research

The study met its objectives, but there were some inherent methodological constraints. Because the managers were contacted through a survey, which records their opinions on the study variables and strategies, it is only possible to evaluate how these strategies were implemented within the organisation through this instrument. Because of this, the outcomes obtained cannot be taken as final.

Regarding future research, these findings can be used to pinpoint any research gaps for potential future studies. Also, it is essential to incorporate specific moderators, such as market orientation and technological capability to further evaluate how these variables moderate the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and organisational innovativeness.

### References

1. ASAD, M., SHABBIR, M. S., SALMAN, R., HAIDER, S. H., & AHMAD, I. (2018). Do entrepreneurial orientation and size of enterprise influence the performance of micro and small enterprises? A study on mediating role of innovation. *Management Science Letters*, 8(10), 1015-1026. doi:10.5267/j.msl.2018.7.008
2. ANNA, M. T., HANNAH K. A. DE-LEON, CRISPIN B. GAYA, ALAN JOYCE DD CATLE, AND LIZELLE C. RODRIGUEZ ORACION. (2021). "Preferred Essential Entrepreneurial Skills of Employees in the Hospitality Industry." *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science* 7(3):1–10. doi: <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijaems>.
3. AYEPA, N. A., ROSEMOND, B., & MAVIS, S. B. M., (2019). "Effects of Innovativeness and Firm Resources on the Growth of Small Enterprises in the Ga South Municipality in Ghana." *Ghana Journal of Development Studies* 16(1):1. doi: 10.4314/gjds.v16i1.1.
4. AYODEJI, B. I. (2016). Innovations and innovation capability in palm kernel processing industry in southwestern Nigeria. *International Journal of Innovation*

- Science*, 9(1), 102-114,
5. DOMI, S., REMZI, K., JOAN L. C., & GENTJAN M., (2019). “Effects of Innovativeness and Innovation Behavior on Tourism Smes Performance: The Case of Albania.” *Economics and Sociology* 12(3):67–85. doi: 10.14254/2071-789X.2019/12-3/5.
  6. EGWAKHE, J. A., AKOMA, L. O., EGBUTA, O. U., & AKINLABI, B. H. (2021). Small and medium enterprises innovation and sales volume in selected manufacturing SMEs in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR)*, 9(4), 127–136. <https://doi.org/doi.org/10.20431/2349-0349.0904011>
  7. INDRIASTUTI, H., (2019). Entrepreneurial Innovativeness, Relational Capabilities, and Value Co-Creation to Enhance Marketing Performance.” *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews* 7(3):181–88. doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.7328.
  8. IVAN, J., MILICA A., & ĐORĐE N. (2018). Entrepreneurial personality traits and smes profitability in transition economy.13(1):89–104. doi: 10.5937/sjm13-13087.
  9. KAISER, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39,31–36.
  10. KREJCIE, R. V. & MORGAN, D. W., (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, [e-journal] 30(3), 607-610.
  11. LIANG, C., (2019). How entrepreneur personality affects agrirural entrepreneurial alertness.” *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation* 15(1):147–70. doi: 10.7341/20191516
  12. Liu, H. C., Ip, C. Y., & Liang, C. (2018). A new runway for journalists: On the intentions of journalists to start social enterprises. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation*, 14(2), 83-100.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.
  13. MARINA D., JASMINKA L., DAVID S., & JADRANKA, Š., (2018). Intellectual capital, organisational climate, innovation culture, and SME performance: Evidence from Croatia", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, [doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-04-2018-0117](https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-04-2018-0117)

14. MSME SURVEY, (2021). PwC and MSMEs Survey 2020 (Issue June 2020).
15. NWITE, O (2016) Entrepreneurship education in Nigerian tertiary institutions: A remedy to graduates unemployment. *British Journal of Education* 4(5), 16-28
16. OLUBIYI, T. O., EGWAKHE, A.J. AMOS, B., & AJAYI, A.A., (2019). Entrepreneurial orientation and firm profitability: Evidence from Lagos State Nigeria. *Journal of Business and Management* 21(6), 42–54. doi: 10.9790/487X-2106024254.
17. RASHID, S., & RATTEN, V. (2020). Entrepreneurial ecosystems during COVID-19 : The survival of small businesses using dynamic capabilities. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WJEMSD-09-2020-0110>
18. RUKUNDO, S.F., CYEZE, M. E. & EMMANUEL, F. (2016). The role of context in shaping students entrepreneurial intention. *American Research Journal of Humanity and Social Science*. 4(1), 1 – 18.
19. SANTOS, A., MUSTAFA, M., & CHERN, G. T., (2016). The big five personality traits and burnout among Malaysian HR professionals. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 8(1), 2–20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-09-2014-0106>
20. SCHUMPETER, J. A. (1949). *Business cycles*. New York, McGraw-Hill
21. SCHUMANN, P. (1994). *Innovate! Straight path to quality, customer delight, and competitive advantage*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
22. TEECE, D. & PISANO, G. (1994). The dynamic capabilities of firms: an introduction. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 3, 537–556.
23. WARDHANA, F. K., & ARIA B. P., (2021). Identify the big five personality traits to escalate business motivation in food technology industry Literature Review Entrepreneurship Motivation on Startup and Human Resources in Startup.” 6(8):532–41.