

## Review of: "Impact of entrepreneurial orientation on business performance: Analysis of small-medium sized corn enterprises"

Agata Mesjasz-Lech1

1 Częstochowa University of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Although the problem raised in the article is not new, it is still valid. Further research focused on the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and company performance is therefore needed. Unfortunately, there are many ambiguities in the article.

The authors identify five dimensions that can form the basis for measuring entrepreneurial orientation (p. 3), but only list and describe four of them.

The authors used the snowball method as a sampling method. This method is characteristic of a non-representative sample (non-random sampling), so the statement: "The number of samples obtained from the results of snowball sampling includes as many as 47 units of observation (respondents) as a representative sample for this study." (p. 6) I consider to be incorrect.

The research methodology is very poorly described. Table 1 presents the 'Loading factor' category - but it is not explained how its value was estimated. Furthermore, it is not entirely clear how both entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance were measured. It is only from Table 2 in the chapter 'Results and Discussion' that one can learn that the indicated five dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation are described by certain indicators. Similarly, in the case of performance - it is only from Table 3 that one can guess which indicators describe the three listed dimensions of performance. It is not entirely clear how the quantitative indicator scores given by the respondents on the qualitative (ordinal) scale should be interpreted. What does it mean, for example, that ROI was given a score of 2.25 (enough)?

It is completely incomprehensible for what purpose the authors used the Student's t-test (p. 9). What do hypotheses H0 and H1 (p. 10) mean? What is the basis for the conclusion "that entrepreneurial orientation can improve company performance by 32.4%." (p. 10)? The results of which test are presented in Table 4 (p. 10)? What do the variables X1 and Y3 mean? How was the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance examined? How should the conclusion be understood: "The direct effect of entrepreneurial orientation on company performance is 13.9%, while the indirect effect is due to its relationship with the external environment and business strategy of 18.5%."? On the basis of which studies was this statement constructed?

Unfortunately, reading the article raises too many doubts that should be clarified to give the article real scientific value. In



addition, on page 6 reference is made to Table 4.1, while a table with this number does not exist in the text of the article. The same applies to the reference to Table 4.5 (p. 8).