

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

Jose Fernandez Serrano<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Universidad de Sevilla

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

In my opinion, there is a significant amount of literature available on the impact of entrepreneurial orientation on company performance (Žur, 2013). Abundant empirical research has demonstrated the positive impact of entrepreneurial orientation components on performance (see, for example, Presutti and Odorici, 2019). However, there is a lack of research on the mediating or moderating role of some socioeconomic variables in the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance, such as "female orientation" (Ince et al., 2023). The analysis of the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance also needs to be further explored in certain sectors (such as agriculture) and in certain groups of countries (such as developing countries). This research focuses on this last group.

In my opinion, the aspects to highlight or improve in the paper are the following.

The introduction should highlight the importance of the research and what new contribution it brings to the discussion or what gap it aims to cover. The authors should try to use the most current bibliography possible. The introduction should focus on the problem of the topic they address (entrepreneurial orientation-growth relationship) and the studies that analyze this relationship in the agricultural sector or in developing countries.

The literature review should be more exhaustive, and authors such as Miller (1983) or Covin and Slevin (1991) should be included, as well as more recent references (Miller, 2011).

Before analyzing the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, the authors should define the concept in more detail. The dimensions need to be analyzed in greater depth, and the authors need to include more literature. In my opinion, the authors do not delimit the term "innovativeness" precisely enough. Innovativeness is the ability or disposition of an organization or individual to create, develop, and implement new ideas or solutions. "Innovativeness is the tendency of firms to participate in and support new ideas that may lead to new technological products, services, or processes" (Hernández-Perlines et al., 2020). It refers to the ability of a company or person to create or introduce new ideas, products, services, or processes that improve people's quality of life, business efficiency, or technological development. It can also describe the skill of being creative and developing innovative solutions to challenges that arise. In my opinion, the authors use an innovation output variable (the result) in the style of Schumpeter.

The methodology needs to be expanded and better explained. The authors need to demonstrate that their results are robust with only 47 observations. The authors state, "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". Why? How many companies are there in total? In other words, what is the population size?

The statistical tool or model is not well-defined, and the authors need to clarify better the methodology they have employed (cross-section is not a methodology). It seems that they use Likert variables and analyze the frequency of their values. But the authors need to clarify how they do it because the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation are latent or fictional variables. It is not clear what the actual and ideal scores represent. In my opinion, with so few observations, any statistical result cannot be conclusive. A qualitative study (such as in-depth interviews) may be more appropriate. Additionally, control variables such as company size or age should be included.

In any case, the main question remains what is the novelty of their analysis. The authors' conclusions should be analyzed based on existing research.

I hope my comments will help improve this analysis.

Hernández-Perlines, F., Ibarra Cisneros, M.A., Ribeiro-Soriano, D., Mogorrón-Guerrero, H., 2020. Innovativeness as a determinant of entrepreneurial orientation: analysis of the hotel sector. *Econ. Res.-Ekon. Istraživanja* 33, 2305–2321. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1696696>

Miller (1983) Revisited: A Reflection on EO Research and Some Suggestions for the Future - Danny Miller, 2011 [WWW Document], n.d. URL <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2011.00457.x> (accessed 4.20.23).

Presutti, M., Odorici, V., 2019. Linking entrepreneurial and market orientation to the SME's performance growth: the moderating role of entrepreneurial experience and networks. *Int. Entrep. Manag. J.* 15, 697–720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0533-4>

Žur, A., 2013. Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance – Challenges for Research and Practice. *Entrep. Bus. Econ. Rev.* 1, 7–27. <https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2013.010202>

Miller D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7), 770–792.

Covin J.G. & Slevin D. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 7–26.