IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)
e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 18, Issue 4 .Ver. IV (Apr. 2016), PP 21-28
www.iosrjournals.org

Entrepreneurial Orientation And Firm Performance : A Critical Examination

DeepaBabu K G[1]; Prof. (Dr.) James Manalel[2],
[1]*Research Scholar; School Of Management Studies; Cochin University of Science & Technology; Kerala; Assistant.Professor, Marthoma College of Management & Technology; Perumbavoor; Kerala*
[2]*School of Management Studies; Cochin University of Science & Technology; Kerala;India*

I. Introduction

Entrepreneurs of a country play acritical role in the overall economic development and growth of a nation. Entrepreneurship is a multidimensional task and essentially a creative activity which needs team-building, leadership, and management ability. Many research studies have shown that the advancement of entrepreneurship as a collective body of knowledge has been limited, because there is lack of agreement on many points in question regarding what constitutes entrepreneurship(Shane & Venkataraman, 2000; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009)because researchers fail to build upon each other's results(Davidsson & Wiklund,, 2001; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009), and because measurements of key variables are typically weak. Reviews and assessments of entrepreneurship research show that definitions of entrepreneurship typically change between the economic and management perspectives. The concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation and the dimensions that constitute entrepreneurial orientation was developed during 1980s and 1990s.(Miller & Friesen, 1982)(Burgelman, 1983)(Galbraith & Kazanjian, 1986)(Miller, Toulouse, & M, 1986)(Covin & Slevin, 1988)(Zahra S. A., 1993)(Covin, Slevin, & Schultz, 1994)(Lumpkin & Dess, 1996)(Dess, Lumpkin, & Covin, 1997)(Barringer & Bluedorn, 1999)(Sandeep & Harpreet, 2012).In recent years the concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation has attracted considerable attention in the field of entrepreneurship research (Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation can be viewed as a characteristic of a firm which can be measured by looking at top management's specific entrepreneurial aspects of decision-making styles, methods and practices. It refers to a firm's strategic orientation capturing the extent of propensity to be innovative, takes risks to compete aggressively and acts autonomously and proactively. A majority of EO studies so far have found that adopting EO dimensions in firms will help them to create or sustain a high level of performance.

The objective of this article is to do a review of literature on the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation i.e. innovativeness, risk-taking, proactiveness, autonomy and competitive aggressiveness and also to examine the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business performance. It is envisioned that this study will help scholars to gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and performance.

II. Entrepreneurship

Defining Entrepreneurship is the basis for understanding the concept of entrepreneurial orientation. French economist Richard Cantillon in 18th century was the first person who gave a reference in the field of entrepreneurship. In his work "Essaisur la nature du commerce enGénéral", he defined entrepreneurship as 'a process of a self-employment with an uncertainreturn (Higgs, 1935). Over the years many scholars have given different definitions for the term. In recent years, the concept of entrepreneurship has received rising attention in terms of scholarly research (Wiklund, Daidsson, Audretsch, & Karlsson, 2011; Filser & Eggers, 2014). This concept has become a hot topic of debate within the field of strategic management and has become popular areas of research in management studies. From a review of the various definitions it can be concluded that the essence of entrepreneurship is the ability to detect an opportunity in the market place, along with the willingness to pursue and exploit it by conducting innovation to obtain higher rewards.

III. Entrepreneurial Orientation

The phenomenon of EO has become a central focus of the entrepreneurship literature and strategic management for more than three decades of research (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; Miller D. , 2011; Covin & Wales, 2012). The EO construct has received considerable attention from researchers, even though there are some controversies in its dimensions.(Lyon, Lumpkin, & Dess, 2000; Zahra & Covin, 1995; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). The last two decades have witnessed the developments in the area of EO-Performance relationship and adoption of contingency framework to EO-performance relationship, where it has been identified that the organizational environment and industrial turbulence affects the EO-Performance relationship (Covin & and Slevin, 1989)(Zahra S. A., 1991)(Wiklund J. , 1999)(Zahra & Garvis, 2000; Lee & Pennings, 2001)(Kraus, Harms, & Schwarz, 2005; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005; Kreiser & Davis, 2002; Grande, Madsen, & Borch, 2011).Rauch et al. (2009), found that there is an increase in the number of EO-Performance relationship studies around the world. Research on EO is accelerating and broadening, gaining significant traction in scholarly outlets beyond solely entrepreneurship domain – specific journals. Therefore, he suggested that it is reasonable to conclude that EO represents a promising area for building a body of relevant knowledge aboutentrepreneurship (Kusumawardhani, 2013).

Entrepreneurial Orientation is considered to be a higher order construct with multidimensional measure of firm level entrepreneurship, comprising of innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy. EO refers to the strategy- making processes that provide organizations with a basis for entrepreneurial decisions and actionsi.e.; it reflect the methods, practices and decision-making styles managers use to act entrepreneurially (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009). According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), Entrepreneurial Orientation can be viewed as a set of psychological traits, values and attitudes strongly associated with a motivation to engage in entrepreneurial activities (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996).

IV. Evolution Of The Concept Of Entrepreneurial Orientation

Miller (1983) introduced the concept of Entrepreneurial Orientation for the first time to the scholarly literature, even though he did not use the term EO in his initial writing (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011). In his article, Danny Miller proposed a definition which stated thatan entrepreneurial firm is one that engages in product-market innovation, undertakes somewhat risky ventures and is first to come up with proactive innovations, beating competitors to the punch. Miller conceptualized the three focal dimensions of EO as innovativeness, risk-taking andproactivenessand are often combined to create a higher-order indicator of firm-level entrepreneurship (Covin & Wales, 2012; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009).Later based on the work of Miller (1983), Covin and Slevin (1989) formed the basis of EO concept which was widely utilized in both entrepreneurship and management literature. In developing this measure, Covin and Slevin theorized that the three dimensions of EO—innovation, proactiveness and risk taking—acted together to comprise a basic, unidimensional strategic orientation and should be aggregated together when conducting research in the field of entrepreneurship. (Covin & and Slevin, 1989). They developed a nine-item self –response scale which has become one of the most popular instruments used to measure the level of EO in organizations with a large number of studies utilizing this instrument (Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009).

Building upon prior research of Miller (1983) and Covin and Slevin (1986) Lumpkin and Dess (1996) suggested that EO can be conceived as a multidimensional phenomenon in which the dimensions represent independent predictors and suggested two additional dimensions – competitive aggressiveness and autonomy – which go beyond the original three, to further describe the domain of EO.But it was Lumpkin and Dess (1996) made a real break from the previous use and definition of the concept by arguing that the various dimensions of EO need not co-vary for a firm to be considered entrepreneurial(Basso & Fayolle, 2009; Wales & Gupta, 2011). According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996) the key dimensions that characterize an EO include a propensity to act autonomously, a willingness to innovate and take risks, and tendency to be aggressive toward competitors and proactive relative to market place opportunities.

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) conceptualization of EO is more domain – focused – that is, it specified where to look for EO – whereas the Miller (1983)conceptualization of EO is more phenomenon – focused – that is it specifies what EO looks like(Covin & Wales, 2012). As the usefulness of EO has been identified by academics, there has been a continuously increasing stream of literature concentrating on the concept EO (Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; Covin, Green, & Slevin, 2006; Covin & Wales, 2012; Dess, Lumpkin, & McFarlin, 2005; Filser & Eggers, 2014; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Wales & Gupta, 2011; Wiklund J. , 1999). But there has been no significant or widely acknowledged adaptations as to how EO construct can or should be conceptualized since the publication of Lumpkin and Dess's work. Researchers have strongly associated the unidimensional view of EO with Miller (1983) and Covin and Slevin (1986) and the multidimensional view of EO is associated most strongly with Lumpkin and Dess (1996).Amid all these differences, we can generalizethat EO represents specific organizational–level behavior that provides a basis for entrepreneurial actions.

V. Dimensions Of Entrepreneurial Orientation

The pertinent dimensions of EO can be derived from a review andassimilation of the strategy from the rich entrepreneurship literature available.Entrepreneurial Orientationhasbeen operationalized in terms of three dimensions articulated by Covin and Slevin (1989) based on the earlier work of Miller (1983)viz.,'innovativeness', 'risk-taking' and 'proactiveness', to reflect how firms implicitly and explicitly choose to compete. Later, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) advanced EO into a larger construct through the inclusion of two more dimensions: 'autonomy' and 'competitive aggressiveness'.

VI. Innovativeness

Schumpeter (1934; 1942) was among the first to accentuate the importance of innovation in the entrepreneurial process. Innovation was described as a process of "creative destruction" where wealth creation occurs by disruption of existing market structures, by introduction of new goods and/orservices that triggers a resource shift.(Schumpeter, 1942). The mechanism of creative destruction is first triggered by the entrepreneur, enacting innovation within the concept of entrepreneurial orientation as an indispensable success factor (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). It is the inclination to commit creativity and experimentation through technological leadership, research and development (R&D) to generate unique products, services and processes. Innovativeness is the proclivity of the firm's readiness to explore and support new conceptions. In today's dynamic business conditions , where there rapid changes are happening, efficaciously producing, comprehending and utilizing innovations can be an important channel for accomplishing competitive advantage.

According to (Dess & Lumpkin, 2005), innovations are classified into three: - Technological innovativeness, Product-market innovativeness and Administrative innovativeness. Technological innovativeness encompass primarily of research and engineering efforts aimed at developing new products and processes. Product-market innovativeness refers to market research, productdesign, and innovations in advertising and promotion. Administrative innovativeness include novelty in management systems, control techniques, and organizational structure.

VII. Risk-Taking

Strategic risk-taking means actions such as venturing into the unknown, heavy borrowing, and/or committing substantial portions of corporate assets in uncertain environments (Baird & Thomas, 1985).Risk-taking is normally associated with entrepreneurship because the concept of entrepreneurship in its original form includes the assumption of personal risk-taking. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) argued that entrepreneurially oriented firms are often characterized by risk-taking behavior, such as incurring heavy debts or making significant resource commitments, in the interests of obtaining high returns by seizing opportunities in the marketplace. Risk-taking entails the willingness to pursue opportunities that have a substantial likelihood of producing losses or significant performance discrepancies (Morris, Kuratko, & Covin, 2008) . On firm level, risk-taking refers to a firm's propensity to support projects with uncertain expected returns (Walter, Auer, & Ritter, 2006) such as moving into unfamiliar new markets and committing substantial resources to ventures with vague outcomes(Lumpkin & Dess, 2001).This dimension represents the aspect of a firm's strategic posture that refers to the firm's willingness and ability to devote increased resources to projects whose outcome is difficult to predict. In the context of business, in practice all business endeavors entail some degree of risk (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). (Dess, Lumpkin, & McFarlin, 2005). But in the context of EO, this risk- taking is not gambling, but moderated and calculatedrisk (Morris, Kuratko, & Covin, 2008). Thus, risk taking does not refer to extreme and completely uncontrolled risky endeavors (Morris, Kuratko, & Covin, 2008) even though the consequences of an act cannot be known (Dess, Lumpkin, & McFarlin, 2005).

VIII. Proactiveness

Proactivenessis described as an opportunity-seeking, forward-looking perspective characterized by the launching of new products and services inadvance of the competition and acting in expectation of future demand (Miller D. , 1983; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009). A first-mover strategy is the best strategyfor capitalizing on a market opportunity and proactiveness relates to efforts associated with being the first mover. If a firm spots an opportunity in the market and is the first to act upon it, it can make abnormal profits and benefit from brand recognition (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Early studies in entrepreneurship also identified the proactive nature of an organization as an important contributor to the entrepreneurial nature of an organization (Mintzberg, 1973; Miller & Friesen, 1983).Proactive firms act on future needs actively seeking new opportunities and furthermore they are often pioneer firms that are first to enter the new markets(Nazdrol & Breen, 2011). Hence, proactiveness, which refers to taking initiative, anticipating and creating new markets or participating in emerging ones, is also associated with entrepreneurship and is an important dimension of entrepreneurial orientation (Entrialgo, Fernandez, & Vazquez, 2000; Walter, Auer, & Ritter, 2006)

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) argued that other than the much used dimensions of Innovativeness, Risk taking and Proactiveness, dimensions such as competitive aggressiveness and autonomy should also be considered as essential components of EO.

IX. Competitive Aggressiveness

Competitive aggressiveness is said to emulate the magnitude of a firm's effort to outrun its industry rivals, distinguished by a strong offensive posture and a forceful reaction to competitor's actions to achieve or improve position. (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Kraus, Harms, & Schwarz, 2005; Covin & Slevin, 1991). Firms with this behavior tend to assume an antagonistic posture towards rivals in an attempt to outdo competitors that threaten its survival or market position in the industry (Lyon, Lumpkin, & Dess, 2000). A firm's aggressiveness can be identified by its willingness to be unconventional rather than rely on traditional methods of competing. This can be implemented through responsive or reactive behavior. Responsiveness may take the form of head-to-head competition or direct attack on competitors, such as when a firm enters a market where a competitor is already present. In contrast, reactiveness involves a direct reaction to a competitor's action; for example, a firm might slash prices and sacrifice profitability to maintain its market share when a competitor introduces a new product to the chosen market. (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). Thus we can say that Competitive Aggressiveness is the driver to face the intense acute competition posed by rivals. It is the firm's strategic response to competitions in an effort to protect its competitive market position.

X. Autonomy

Organizational autonomy is a rooted concept within the management literature and has been expressed using an array of frameworks. Autonomy refers to the ability to make decisions and to proceed with independent action by an individual or a team directed at bringing about a new venture, a business concept or vision and seeing it to fruition, without any restrictions from the organization (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Lumpkin, Cogliser, & Schneider, 2009; Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009). Autonomy can empower organizational members the freedom and flexibility to establish and enact entrepreneurial initiatives. It affords a team (or individual) to not only solve the problems, but to actually define the problem and the goals that will be met in order to solve that problem. In the framework of EO, therefore, autonomy is crucial to the processes of leveraging a firm's current strengths, identifying opportunities that are beyond the organizations current capabilities and supporting the development of new ventures and improved business practices. Therefore it has been suggested that autonomy should exist at the strategic level to achieve a high level of EO (Lumpkin, Cogliser, & Schneider, 2009).

XI. UnidimensionalityVersus Multidimensionality

There are two dominant perspectives on Entrepreneurial Orientation in the past research.(Covin & Lumpkin, 2011; George & Marino, 2011; Wales & Gupta, 2011; Covin & Wales, 2012) . These are (i) the composite, uni-dimensionalapproach most commonly associated with the works of Miller (1983)and Covin andSlevin (1989) in which EO is represented by firms that possess all three qualities of risk taking, innovative and proactive behaviors to a similar extent or (ii) as a multi-dimensional approach associated with Lumpkin and Dess'(1996) work in which risk taking, innovativeness, proactiveness, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy are treated as independent behavioral dimensions that defines EO's conceptual space(Covin & Miller, 2014). These conceptualizations differ from each other on whether the EO dimensions vary independently or not (Covin, Green, & Slevin, 2006).Covin. et.al. (2006) asserted that one of the most important decision among researchers is about the extent to which EO dimensions need to be present for a firm to be considered entrepreneurial. The underlying idea behind the composite or uni-dimensional approach to EO is that inorder to have an EO, a firm needs to concurrently be risk-taking, innovative andproactive and all of these dimensions need to equally contribute to a firm's overall EO (Miller D. , 1983; Covin & Slevin, 1991; Krieser, Weaver, & Marino, 2002). This means that when EO is considered unidimensional, its dimensions co-vary with each other, and an increase in EO requires anincrease in all of the dimensions (George & Marino, 2011). Furthermore, this indicatesthat the construct of EO cannot be decomposed into its dimensions, because if that wouldbe done, EO would cease to exist (Covin, Green, & Slevin, 2006). In examining EO as a one-dimensional construct, many past researchers have found support for a positive relationship between EO and firm performance. Overall, under the unidimensional conceptualization, EO can be understood as a sustained firm-level attribute represented by the singular quality that risk taking, innovative and proactive behaviors have in common.

A construct is multidimensional when it consists of a number of interrelated attributes and exists in multidimensional domains. In contrast to a set of interrelated unidimensional constructs, the dimensions of a multidimensional construct can be conceptualized under an overall abstraction, and it is theoretically meaningful to use this overall abstraction as a representation of the dimensions (Law & Wong, 1998; Covin & Wales, 2012). Lumpkin and Dess's(1996) article changed the viewpoint by explicitly advocating that EO can be viewed as a multidimensional construct with autonomy and competitive aggressiveness recognized as additional important dimensions of the construct. They asserted that the dimensions of EO vary independently of each other because firms can be high on some dimensions and low on others. i.e.It is an idiosyncratic configuration of multiple dimensions that describe the phenomenon (Wales & Gupta, 2011).Thus, they may also vary independently. Therefore, based on this view, EO exists eitheras a set of independent behavioral scores with a range from low to high across thedimensions, or as a collective profile or composition formed by these dimensions(Covin & Lumpkin, 2011). Clearly research adopting a multidimensional conceptualization of EO has been increasing in recent years, indicating greater acceptance of the notion that EO dimensions may manifest unique contributions to firm outcomes (Wales & Gupta, 2011). But it is also premature to suggest a multidimensional rather than unidimensional conceptualization of Entrepreneurial Orientation based on how the dimensions relate to performance (Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009).

XII. Firm Performance Measures

Performance is anextensively used concept in many areas. Usually, performance is a measure of how well a mechanism or a process accomplish its objective.Performance is claimed to be a multidimensional and complex construct that has been measured using anarray of indicators (Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Stam, Souren, & Elfring, 2013).In organizational point of view , performance means how well the organization is managed and the value the organization delivers for customers and other stakeholders(Wu & Zhao, 2009). There is no dispute that one of the basic purposes of both entrepreneurship and strategic management theory and research is the enhancement oforganizational performance (Mthanti, 2012). Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1987) empirically investigated the degree of concurrence across methods of measuring business economic performance and in so doing, established that sales growth, profit growth, and profitability were discriminate measures of different dimensions of business economic performance. Carton and Hofer (2006) described financial performance to be a combination of profitability, growth, efficiency, liquidity, size, and leverage, which are measured with relevant measures. The potential measures to assess the above-mentioned dimensions of performance are for instance: return on assets, sales growth, sales per employee, current ratio, number of employees, and debt to equity.

Kraus *et al*. (2012) noted that performance is regularly measured in one or a combination of the following means: perceived financial, perceived non-financial and archival financial. Several studies (Dess*et al*., 1997; Wiklund, 1999; Lumpkin and Dess, 2001; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Madsen, 2007; Runyan*et al*., 2008; Kraus *et al*., 2012; Lechner and Gudmundsson, 2012; Messersmith and Wales, 2013) have used perceived performance indicators to assess firm performance. The items that were used to form the performance indicators typically were based on manager's subjective views about firm's profitability, growth, market share, in relative to its most important competitors. The overall performance measure is typically formed by merging several items measuring the different aspects of performance into one performance score or index (e.g. Lechner and Gudmundsson, 2012). The reasons for the use of perceived performance measures are commonly the lack of publicly available archival performance figures on SMEs (Kraus *et al*., 2012) or the fear of losing respondents if such accurate performance figures are requested in questionnaires as privately owned firms are often reluctant to disclose such financial information (Messersmith and Wales, 2013). This kind of subjective performance data may be prone to biases or inaccuracy as it relies on key informants, typically CEO's, ability and willingness to report and rate firm's objective performance accurately with subjective proxies (Kraus *et al*., 2012*)*. Many studies on the other hand have shown that subjective and objective performance measures are typically strongly positively correlated (Wall *et al*., 2004; Jantunen*et al*., 2005; Stam and Elfring; 2008; Messersmith and Wales, 2013) and hence support the validity of the subjective performance measures.

XIII. Entrepreneurial Orientation And Performance

Covin and Slevin (1991) suggest that the reason as to why there has been a growing interest in research in the area of entrepreneurship is because there is a notion that entrepreneurship can lead to enhanced performance in both new and established enterprises.Due to rapid changes in the current business environment, where both product and business model life cycles get shorter and future profits from existing operations are uncertain, firms need to continuously look for new opportunities, and develop more entrepreneurial strategies(Rauch, Wiklund, Frese, & Lumpkin, 2009). The importance of entrepreneurial orientation and its influence on firm performance have been highlighted in both conceptual and empirical view points (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996)and there are lot many empirical research (Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005) which are concerned with the positive implications that entrepreneurial orientation has on performance of a firm(Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Wiklund J. , 1999). Therefore the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance has become the central focus of interest for studying entrepreneurial orientation (Covin, Green, & Slevin, 2006). But EO literatureoffers no solid consensus on the appropriate measures of small firm performance (Wiklund J. , 1999). To date, findings have been mixed. Various studies have shown that EO, directly or indirectly has a positive relationship with firm performance (Kraus, Harms, & Schwarz, 2005; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). At the abstract level entrepreneurial orientation is said to have positive effects on performance because firms with this strategy have first–mover advantage that ultimately translates into better financial results (Wiklund J. , 1999) At the empirical level, past studies have shown positive relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance (Lee & Pennings, 2001; Wiklund J. , 1999; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2005). Thus, it may be beneficial to adopt an EO, because entrepreneurial strategies are regarded as being related to better firm performance and because of that the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and firm performance has been at the forefront of entrepreneurship literature for many years. In line with Zahra and Covin (1995), Wiklund (1999) also found a positive impact of EO on performance that increased over time. Thus, he also argued for EO as a useful strategy and showed that it is not just a short-term means to improve performance. He further posited that because EO can have a positive impact on a long term, it is worthwhile also for SMEs to use their scarce resources in adopting it. However, Lumpkin &Dess (1996) suggested that the positive implications of the entrepreneurial orientation (EO) on firm performance are context specific and may change independently of each other in a given organizational context.

It has been found that each EO dimension affects firm performance differently (Krieser, Weaver, & Marino, 2002; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996; Lumpkin & Dess, 2001; Nazdrol & Breen, 2011). Covin and Miles (1999) argued that innovation is a crucial part of a strategy and that entrepreneurship cannot endure without it. Many scholars (Coulthard 2007; Prottas 2008; Lumpkin, Cogliser& Schneider 2009) suggested that giving autonomy improves firm performance as employees are motivated to act entrepreneurially. Despite the acknowledgement of autonomy’s role inimproving firm performance, some studies were not able to demonstrate a positive effect of this relationship (e.g., Hughes & Morgan 2007). . According to Zahra and Covin (1995), a proactive firm is able to introduce new products and services to the market ahead of its competitors, can get a dominant position in distribution channels due to first-mover advantages, and can establish industry standards. Therefore the firm should be able to gain a sustained rather than short-term competitive advantage and thus higher performance (Zahra and Covin, 1995). Furthermore, Zahra and Covin (1995) argue that because the learning from the product and market strategies accumulates over time, it might take some time to realize the full impact of EO on performance.

XIV. Conclusion

Entrepreneurial Orientation construct is intended to measure the extent to which an organization is entrepreneurial. The existence of EO in a firm as pointed out by various authors is the result of organizational processes, decision making methods and styles implemented by the firm in the pursuit of acting entrepreneurially. It is the combined presence of innovation, proactiveness, autonomy, competitive aggressiveness and risk-taking in a firm that leads an organization to have entrepreneurial orientation. While analyzing the reviews, we can see that concepts such as strategic posture, corporate entrepreneurship and EO have the same variables across measurements of concepts such as with the Miller, Covin and Slevin scale commonly referred to as the MCS scale as the most commonly utilized measurement tool. The consistent use of an agreed upon measure of EO construct have enabled quick progression of the field and an ease of comparisons across studies. While most of the studies in Entrepreneurial Orientation have used EO dimensions comprising of only innovativeness, proactiveness and risk-taking propensity, several researchers have suggested the addition of two more contributing variables viz., competitive aggressiveness and autonomy. Overall, most of the researchers have been able to find a positive EO-performance relationship that gets stronger over time and many moderating factors have been found to strengthen the relationship. We hope that the research insights in this review will provide a framework for further productive discussion and for more empirical studies on the EO Concept.

References

[1]. Baird, I. S., & Thomas, H. (1985). Toward a Contigency Model of Strategic Risk Taking. Academy of Management Review, 230-243.
[2]. Barringer, B. R., & Bluedorn, A. C. (1999). The Relationship Between Corporate Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management. Strategic Management Journal, 421-444.
[3]. Basso, O., & Fayolle, A. &. (2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation : The making of a concept. The international journal of entrepreneurship and innovation, 313-329.
[4]. Burgelman, R. A. (1983). A Model of Interaction of Strategic Behavior, Corporate Context and Concept of Strategy. Academy of Management Review, 61-70.
[5]. Covin, G. J., & Miller, D. (2014). International Entrepreneurial Orientation : Conceptual Considerations, Research Themes and Future Research Directions. Entrepreneurship : Theory and Practice, 11-44.
[6]. Covin, G. J., Slevin, D. D., & Schultz, R. L. (1994). Implementing Strategic Missions: Effective Strategic, Structural and Tactical Choices. Journal of Management Studies, 481-503.
[7]. Covin, J. G., & and Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic Management of Small Firms In Hostile and Benign Environments. Strategic Management Journal, 75-87.
[8]. Covin, J. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2011). Entrepreneurial Orientation Theory and Research: Reflections on a Needed Construct. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 855-872.
[9]. Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1988). The Influence of Organization Structure on the Utility of an Entrepreneurial Top Management Style. Journal of Management Studies, 217-234.
[10]. Covin, J., & Slevin, D. P. (1991). A Conceptual Model of Entrepreneurship as Firm Behaviour. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 7-25.
[11]. Covin, J., & Wales, W. (2012). The Measurement of Entrepreneurial Orientation. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 677-702.
[12]. Covin, J., Green, K., & Slevin, D. (2006). Strategic process effects on the entrepreneurial orientation-sales growth rate relationships. Academy of Management Journal, 29-39.
[13]. Davidsson, P., & W. J. (2001). Level of analysis in entrepreneurship research: Current research practices and suggestions for the future. Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice, 81-99.
[14]. Dess, G. G., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2005). The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation in Stimulating Effective Corporate Entrepreneurship. Academy of Management executive , 147-156.
[15]. Dess, G. G., Lumpkin, G. T., & Covin, J. G. (1997). Entrepreneurial Strategy making and Firm Performance: Test of Contigency and Configurational Models. Strategic Management Journal, 677-695.
[16]. Dess, G., Lumpkin, T., & McFarlin, D. (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. Academy of Management Executive, 147-156.
[17]. Entrialgo, M., Fernandez, E., & Vazquez, C. J. (2000). Psychological Characteristics and Process:The Role of Entrepreneurship in Spanish SME's. European Journal of Innovation Management, 137-151.
[18]. Filser, M., & Eggers, F. (2014). Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance : A Comparative Study of Austria, Liechtenstein and Switzerland. South African Journal of Business Management, 55-65.
[19]. Galbraith, J., & Kazanjian, R. (1986). Strategy Implementation: Structure, Systems and Process. St.Paul MN: West Publishing Company.
[20]. George, B. A., & Marino, L. (2011). The Epistemology of Entrepreneurial Orientation : Conceptual Formation, Modelling and Operationalization. Entrepreneurship : Theory and Practice, 989-1024.
[21]. Grande, J., Madsen, E. L., & Borch, J. O. (2011). The Relationship Between Resources, Entrepreneurial Orientation and Performance in Farm- Based Ventures. Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, 89-111.
[22]. Higgs, H. (1935). Richard Cantillon, [1755] 1931. Essai sur la nature du commerce en général, ed. and with an English translation. London: MacMillan and Company.
[23]. Kraus, S., Harms, R., & Schwarz, E. (2005). Entrepreneurial Orientation : A Psychological Model of Success Among South African Small Business Owners. European Jornal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 315-344.
[24]. Kreiser, P. M., & Davis, J. (2002). Entrepreneurial Orientation and Firm Performance: The Unique Impact of Innovativeness, Proactiveness and Risk Taking. Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 56-71.
[25]. Krieser, M. P., Weaver, M. K., & Marino, D. L. (2002). Assessing the Psychometric Properties of the Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale : A Multi-Country Analysis. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 71-94.
[26]. Kusumawardhani, A. (2013). The Role of Entrepreneurial Orientation in Firm Performance : A Study of Indonesian SME's in the Furniture Industry in Central Java. Australia: University of Wollongong.
[27]. Law, K. S., & Wong, C. S. (1998). Toward a taxonomy of multidimensional constructs. Academy of Management Review, 741-755.
[28]. Lee, C., & Pennings, J. M. (2001). Internal Capabilities, External Nwtworks and Performance : A Study of Technology Bases Ventures. Strategic Management Journal, 615-640.
[29]. Lumpkin, G. .., & Dess, G. G. (2001). Linking Two Dimensions of Entrepreneurial Orientation to Firm Performance: The Moderating Role of Environment and Industry Life Cycle. Journal Of Business Venturing, 429-451.
[30]. Lumpkin, G. T., Cogliser, C. C., & Schneider, R. D. (2009). Understanding and Measuring Autonomy : An Entrepreneurial Orientation Perspective. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 47-69.
[31]. Lumpkin, G., & Dess, G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. Academy of Management Review, 135-172.
[32]. Lyon, D., Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (2000). Enhancing Entrepreneurial Orientation Research: Operationalizing and Measuring a Key Strategic Decision Making Process. Journal of Management, 1055-1085.
[33]. Marshall, A. (1930). Principles of Economics. London: Macmillan and Co.
[34]. Miller, D. (1983). The Correlates of Entrepreneurship in Three Types of Firms. Management Science, 770-791.
[35]. Miller, D. (2011). Miller (1983) Revisited: A Reflection on EO Research and Some suggestions for the Future. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 873-894.
[36]. Miller, D., & Friesen, P. (1978). Archetypes of Strategy Formulation. Management Science, 921-933.
[37]. Miller, D., & Friesen, P. H. (1982). Innovation in Conservative and Entrepreneurial Firms: Two Models of Strategic Momentum. Strategic Management Journal, 1-25.
[38]. Miller, D., & Friesen, P. H. (1983). Strategy - Making and Environment: The Third Link. Strategic Management Journal, 221-235.

[39]. Miller, D., Toulouse, & M, J. (1986). Chief Executive Personality and Corporate Strategy and Structure in Small Firms. Management Science, 1389-1409.
[40]. Mintzberg, H. (1973). Strategy making in three modes. California Management Review, 44-53.
[41]. Morris, M., Kuratko, D., & Covin, J. (2008). Corporate Entrepreneurship & Innovation. Boston: Cengage Learning.
[42]. Mthanti, T. (2012). The impact of effectuation on the performance of South African medium and high technology firms. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of Witwatersrand.
[43]. Nazdrol, W. M., & Breen, J. a. (2011). The relationship between strategic orientation and SME firm performance : developing a conceptual framework. 8th AGSE International Entrepreneurship Research Exchange Proceedings, (pp. 713-724). Melbourne.
[44]. Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Frese, M., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2009). Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business performance : An Assessment of Past Research and Suggestions for the Future. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 761-786.
[45]. Sandeep, V., & Harpreet, S. B. (2012). Relationship Between Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance. The IUP Journal of Business Strategy, 16-31.
[46]. Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Brothers.
[47]. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a field of Research. The Academy of Management Review, 217-226.
[48]. Stam, W., Souren, A., & Elfring, T. (2013). Social Capital of entrepreneurs and Small firm performance : A meta analysis of contextual and methodological moderators. Journal of Business Venturing, 4-22.
[49]. Wales, W. J., & Gupta, V. K.-T. (2011). Empirical research on entrepreneurial orientation : An assessment and suggestions for future research. International Small Business Journal, 357-383.
[50]. Walter, A., Auer, M., & Ritter, T. (2006). The impact of network capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation on University spiin-off performance. Journal of Business venturing, 541-567.
[51]. Wiklund, J. (1999). The Sustainability of the Entrepreneurial Orientation-Performance Relationship. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 37-48.
[52]. Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2003). Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. Strategic Management Journal, 1307-1314.
[53]. Wiklund, J., & Shepherd, D. (2005). Entrepreneurial orientation and small business performance: A configurational approach. Journal of Business Venturing, 71-91.
[54]. Wiklund, J., Daidsson, P., Audretsch, D., & Karlsson, C. (2011). The Future of Entrepreneurship Research. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 1-9.
[55]. Wu, D., & Zhao, F. (2009). Performance measurement in the SMEs in the information technology industry. In F. Zhao, Information Technology Entrepreneurship (pp. 79-99). Hershey, USA: Idea Group.
[56]. Yusaf, A. (2002). Environmental Uncertainity, The Entrepreneurial Orientation of Business Ventures and Performance. International Jornal of Commerce and Management, 83-104.
[57]. Zahra, S. A. (1991). Predictors and Financial Outcomes of Corporate Entrepreneurship : An Exploratory Study. Journal of Business Venturing, 259-285.
[58]. Zahra, S. A. (1993). Business Strategy, Technological Policy and Firm Performance. Strategic Management Journal, 451-478.
[59]. Zahra, S. A., & Garvis, M. D. (2000). International Corporate Entrepreneurship and Firm Performance: The Moderating Effect of International Environmental Hostility. Journal of Business Venturing, 469-492.
[60]. Zahra, S., & Covin, J. (1995). Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship-performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Business Venturing, 43-58.