UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management (UKRJEBM)
Homepage: https://ukrpublisher.com/ukrjebm/
Email: submit.ukrpublisher@gmail.com
Volume 1, Issue 10, 2025 ISSN: 3049-429X (Online)

Corporate Entrepreneurship and Organizational Performance in Selected Telecommunication Firms in Rivers State

Wege Lenu Goodluck[1], Biobele Richards Briggs[2], Nuel-Mark, Goody[3]

[1,2] Department of Business Administration and Management Kenule Beeson Saro-wiwa Polytechnic Bori
[3] Department of Entrepreneurship, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt

***Corresponding Author**: Wege Lenu Goodluck

DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17937010*

Article History
Original Research Article
Received: 15-11-2025
Accepted: 28-11-2025
Published: 15-12-2025

Citation: Wege Lenu Goodluck, Biobele Richards Briggs, Nuel-Mark, Goody. (2025). Corporate Entrepreneurship and Organizational Performance in Selected Telecommunication Firms in Rivers State. UKR Journal of Economics, Business and Management (UKRJEBM), Volume 1(10), 60-69.

Abstract

This paper evaluated the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State. Innovation, risk taking and proactiveness were used as proxies for corporate entrepreneurship while efficiency, effectiveness and goal attainment were used to measure organizational performance in this study. Using survey research design a population of 200 employees of telecommunication firms in Port Harcourt and a sample size of 133 was derived from the population using Taro Yamane's formula. Well-structured questionnaires were designed and used to obtain responses from the respondents on the research questions. 90 out of the 133 distributed questionnaires were correctly completed and used for the analysis for the study. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient on SPSS at ***0.05*** *was applied to test the hypotheses.* ***.*** *From the study it was revealed that key dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship; innovation, risk-taking, and proactiveness positively correlate with organizational performance. These findings suggested that telecommunication firms in Rivers State that embrace innovative practices and are willing to take calculated risks, and act proactively in their business strategies tend to perform better. Hence, telecommunication firms should encourage and support innovative thinking and practices at all organizational levels.*

Keywords*: Corporate, Entrepreneurship, Organization, Performance, Telecommunication*

INTRODUCTION

Various academic scholars and practitioners have extensively debated the concept of organizational performance, considering factors such as industry, managerial viewpoints, financial and non-financial indicators, and employee-related activities. According to Foss and Klein (2020), the historical evolution of performance in entrepreneurship centers on identifying, exploring, managing, and owning unique opportunities. This view is closely related to how an individual takes action towards opportunities and their resultant achievements. Wadhwani (2016) posited that entrepreneurship involves innovation and creativity, both for individuals and businesses. However, corporate entrepreneurial opportunities are often overlooked when entrepreneurship is viewed solely from an individualistic angle. Therefore, corporate entrepreneurs are not only economic actors but also the "brains" of the corporation, the "fundamental intrapreneurs," and the "creatives" of the corporate sector. As a result, the characteristics of entrepreneurs in a firm are directly related to the company's capacity to create or find opportunities, make use of those opportunities, manage the organisation, and evaluate its level of success. Karimi and Walter (2016) asserted that rapid growth may be maintained via the connection between organisational culture and the interdependence and relatedness of corporate entrepreneurship and organisational performance. This relationship can facilitate the continuous productivity and rapid organisational development.

Corporate entrepreneurship is the practice of encouraging employees of an organization to think like entrepreneurs even while they are part of a more conventional firm structure. Wahyudi et al. (2021) and Kreiser et al. (2021) defined corporate entrepreneurship as the process of creating new enterprises inside an existing company through the use of innovation or operational redesign to enhance profits and beat competitors. Parker (2011) defined the practice of corporate entrepreneurship as the act of creating new businesses or seizing opportunities outside of an organization to increase organizational success. In the highly competitive global market of today, having an entrepreneurial attitude is becoming more vital for many organizations that have been around for a long time (Kelley, 2011). Given the current need for new businesses and innovative ideas, it is possible for businesses to experience revitalization through the implementation of corporate entrepreneurship (Karacaoglu et al., 2013). According to Kuratko et al. (2015), corporate entrepreneurship results in economic development and the generation of wealth in a firm. This phenomenon occurs throughout the life cycle of an organization. Additionally, the study of Catherine et al. (2020) posited that firm with entrepreneurial potential have the tendency to overtake their competitors in the long run.

In Nigeria, various studies have explored the role of corporate entrepreneurship in different sectors. Oladimeji et al. (2019) found that CE characteristics account for 56% of the variation in profitability among service firms, with corporate venturing, imaginative risk-taking, and proactiveness significantly correlating with performance. Abosede et al. (2018) investigated the impact of CE on Nigerian banks' overall performance, identifying entrepreneurial innovation, proactiveness, risk-taking, strategic renewal, and corporate venturing as positively and substantially influencing performance. Innovation, in particular, was highlighted as the most crucial factor for Nigerian banks' international success. Eze (2018) examined CE's impact on manufacturing firms' growth, revealing a substantial correlation between innovation, initiative, risk-taking, strategic renewal, and corporate venturing with non-financial performance. Despite these findings, there remains a notable knowledge gap regarding the precise relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and performance in the telecommunication sector in developing economies like Nigeria.

Specifically, the Nigerian telecommunications industry in Rivers State faces challenges from new technologies, intense market competition, government regulations, and evolving customer preferences. Corporate entrepreneurship offers a potential solution by promoting an environment that incentivizes risk-taking, strategic rethinking, and innovation within established firms. However, there is a distinct lack of understanding regarding how CE influences organizational efficiency in this specific context. Addressing these knowledge gaps is critical for managers and policymakers to make informed decisions.

Hypotheses

H_{01}: There is no significant relationship between innovation and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

H_{02}: There is no significant relationship between risk taking and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

H_{03}: There is no significant relationship between proactiveness and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

LITERATURE REVIEW

CONCEPT OF CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP

According to Asogwa (2016), the art of entrepreneurship involves of seeing a need in the market, putting together a group of people to fulfill that need, and following that need through to its conclusion. It is not uncommon for an entrepreneur to be in command of a commercial venture, directing the production components, which include the human resources, financial resources, and other resources that are required to capitalise on a business opportunity. In this capacity, the entrepreneur is responsible for coordinating the formation of a firm as well as its growth. However, because of the lack of lacked the necessary "soft skills," most individuals have started businesses that eventually failed. These "soft skills" include the ability to effectively communicate with a varying audience, the capacity to engage with team members to achieve high performance, and the capability to solve problems through value-creating solutions.

According to Roth (2014), entrepreneurs must be able and willing to assume the risks associated with the process of conceiving, planning, and overseeing a commercial endeavor in order to be successful in turning a profit. Idam (2014) clarify that entrepreneurship comprise the actions required to establish or manage a business. Additionally, he argued that entrepreneurship is just the act of starting a new company. The spirit of entrepreneurship is vital to all economic endeavors. The level of competitiveness and the capacity to support long-term growth in any sector are both influenced by entrepreneurial attitude.

Corporate entrepreneurship is the act of creating and developing new business opportunities inside an existing organisation (Kuratko, 2017). Morris et al. (2008) state that there are two primary forms of corporate entrepreneurship: strategic entrepreneurship and corporate venturing. According to Morris et al. (2008), corporate venturing is all about starting new firms inside existing organisation, but strategic entrepreneurship is about resurrecting old activities that make a company stronger at competing and taking risks.

Innovation

Innovation enables businesses to create new value, which is beneficial to all stakeholders including the organisation, suppliers, and customers. Yunis et al. (2018) suggested that the incorporation of new ideas into businesses has the potential to boost their productivity, development, and business success. Additionally, Bigliardi (2013), asserted that innovation has the potential to provide businesses a momentary competitive edge in the market, which may result in greater sales and organisational development. Organisations that use creative strategies do better than their counterparts who are less imaginative (Nybakk & Jenssen, 2012). Innovative practises have a considerable influence on the efficiency of a firm since they have an effect on every phase of the production process (Bartolacci et al., 2015),.

Organizational innovation, according to Berkhout et al. (2010), is the process of embracing novel perspectives on a company's operations, external relationships, and corporate structure. In the words of Atalay et al. (2013), companies seek to innovate to lower administrative, supply, and transaction costs, improve employee satisfaction, and gain access to non-tradable assets. Kuratko et al. (2015) found that companies that were successful in process, product, and organizational innovation also had higher levels of overall sales and exports. This is because organizational innovation is more likely to lead to increased workplace satisfaction (Simao et al., 2016).

Risk Taking

According to Smejkal and Raise (2006), risk can be defined in a number of ways, such as the likelihood of failure or loss, the uncertainty of potential outcomes, the difference between expected and actual outcomes, the likelihood of any outcome that deviates from the expected one, an event in which the quantitative magnitude of a particular occurrence is subject to a particular distribution of probabilities, the risk of negative variation from the target (also known as net risk), the possibility of loss or profit (also known as speculative risk), the uncertainty resulting from the volatility of asset values (also known as investment risk), the average value of the loss function, or the possibility of a particular threat emerging from a particular system. Kim and Vonorts (2014) found that when new businesses encountered operational, financial, and technical difficulties, they actively sought help from others through networking activities. The study also discovered a strong link between financial and technical risk and networking. Two-thirds of respondents ranked market risk as the greatest threat to their company's survival out of all the issues that threaten the market. This risk is caused by a number of factors, including fierce competition, low product demand, the introduction of novel designs, and a small clientele. Moderate risk-taking is linked to higher degrees of global scope development than either low or high risk-taking. A moderate approach to risk-taking is beneficial, claim Dai et al. (2014).

Proactiveness

According to Frank et al. (2010), any business strategy that aims to be sustainable must include proactive measures. proactiveness can be viewed as a way for businesses to make decisions and as a way to apply other facets of commercial practices and entrepreneurial skill. Perez-Luno et al. (2011) asserted that companies that try to innovate their goods and services stand a better chance of long-term success. Businesses will have a better chance of success in their endeavors if they actively look for opportunities that identify market trends and act upon them. Johannes (2009) posited that these companies are able to establish a strong position that is difficult for their rivals to overcome and monopolize a sizeable section of the market. This is because they have a monopoly on the most valuable resources in the industry and are intimately familiar with the most fundamental challenges it faces. The ability to foresee and prepare for possible threats, the capacity to adapt, the capacity to look ahead, and the capacity to take the initiative are some of the traits of proactive people or organisations (Rosemond et al., 2012).

ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Different viewpoints exist regarding the definition and application of organizational performance as an output metric, and these viewpoints were some of the first to focus on the phenomenon. When talking about growth, size, profitability, and viability, accounting professionals frequently associate it with numerical appearance. The success of the organization is determined by the extent to which its departments work together, even if the company is just a collection of departments. Kaplan and Norton (2001) provided four performance metrics that they say they created from their point of view.

Despite the fact that this method is resilient, there are a variety of perspectives on it, including those of academics such as Simon (2000) on control systems, William (2010) along causal-chains, Armstrong (2016) and Robins (2007) on size, growth, finance, attitudes, and behaviours, and others (Adeoye et al., 2019). However, there is a catch: (i) firms tend to have a variety of sizes and methods of evaluation, and (ii) performance assessments may be subjective and even unconnected to one another. These perspectives are typically valid and dependable, but there is a catch. For the purpose of this research, the performance of the organisation was evaluated based on the productivity within a certain time period or year.

Goal Attainment

One of the things that one hopes to achieve in the future is the realization of an idea that they have committed to as a goal. Dunlop and Lee (2004) defined goals as the things that an individual, group, or organization hopes to accomplish by a specific date. An intended outcome can be further decomposed into more specific goals, objectives, or a future situation that will result in the desired change. Everyone agrees that this is an excellent attempt to successfully accomplish the stated goals, which will ultimately lead to the desired change. The accomplishment of goals is made much simpler when they are formulated in a manner that is more rational. As a consequence of this, goals may become more specific, quantitative, reachable, realistic, and time-bound (Kacmar et al., 2009). For instance, a short-term target is one that may be completed within the next twenty-four hours at the very most, an intermediate goal over the next three to six months at the very most, and a long-term objective within the next year or more than that. According to Cote and Miners (2006), goals continue to be significant since they provide problems and include a degree of complexity.

Efficiency

According to Ogboso and Amah (2016), the essence of efficiency is the ability to accomplish one's goals with a minimal expenditure of resources and a minimal amount of waste generation. Methods that make an effort to cut down on waste, money, and time are included in its scope. Because both time and speed are vital resources for any business, it is essential to make the most of the former and limit the latter within the organisation. The method in which a firm handles this duty is a reflection of the amount of efficiency and production that the organisation has. Studies of time and motion have mostly concentrated on speed and time ever since Taylor's introduction of scientific management, which led to the development of effective management and management practices. They assist you in distinguishing yourself from the other rivals. It is not enough to just adhere to sound corporate governance procedures in order to achieve excellence in performance. Additionally, it is not a statistic that can be used to determine whether or not anything is successful; nonetheless, it may make things worse if you make a mistake (for example, having an audit committee that is ineffective or CEOs who are not really independent). Can the organisation effectively dispatch businesses (including through committees in and between meetings) and follow up on decisions? Can the organisation handle crises and identify emerging issues? Can the organisation identify and focus on key issues and risks facing the organisation, rather than just a long list of them? These are some of the questions that pertain to the efficiency of the organisation.

Effectiveness

There is no universally accepted definition of the concept of organisational effectiveness (Amah, 2014). It's possible that the issue is being caused by the fact that there are an excessive number of criteria or definitions available for the concept. The degree to which an organisation is successful in accomplishing its own goals or the policy objectives of the organisation is often defined by the organization's level of effectiveness (Zheng, 2010). Effectiveness is essential for organisational performance, indicating how well an organisation achieves its goals. Richard et al. (2009) described effectiveness as realizing goals through strategic planning and execution, assessing outputs against stakeholder expectations. From a strategic management viewpoint, effectiveness results from aligning resources with opportunities and strengths (Kaplan & Norton, 2004). The Balanced Scorecard integrates both financial and non-financial metrics to evaluate organisational progress toward its mission. Effective organisations also prioritize long-term sustainability and adaptability, as highlighted by Cameron (2010). They must respond to environmental changes and meet stakeholder needs. In public and non-profit sectors, effectiveness is measured by service delivery and social impact, indicating that this measure is context-specific, influenced by an organisation's purpose and stakeholder expectations (Boyne, 2002)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CORPORATE ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE

Extant literature has identified several key variables influencing entrepreneurial intentions and organisational performance in different settings. Mustafa et al. (2016) highlighted that students' innovativeness and proactiveness significantly impact their entrepreneurial potential, with organisational culture in university setting promoting student-led initiatives. Peng et al. (2015) challenged traditional views, asserting that faster innovation enhances organisational performance, while Loon (2016) confirmed that corporate culture significantly drives students toward entrepreneurship.

Joo (2018) explored innovativeness and progressiveness within organisational culture, finding a positive correlation with the performance of non-financial firms, and noted that risk-taking did not adversely affect performance. Cho and Lee (2018) echoed this, linking creative progressiveness to improved performance without significant influence from risk-taking.

In high-tech industries, internal corporate entrepreneurship and risk-taking are vital for success. Antoncic and Prodan (2008), along with Zahra and Covin (2011), indicated that investing in new products and technologies boosts profitability. Bojica and Fuentes (2011) confirmed the positive impact of corporate entrepreneurship on organisational performance, particularly in innovation-led firms. Zahra (1993) underscored that active corporate entrepreneurship participation promotes growth.

Wang (2008), Lumpkin et al. (2009), and Rauch et al. (2009) defined risk-taking as engaging in bold ventures amid uncertainty, while Zahra and Garvis (2000) described organisational risk-taking as support for innovation, enabling firms to capitalize on market opportunities. They equated progress with an organisation's capacity to introduce new products effectively and adapt its knowledge base for strategic targeting of emerging market segments.

Clark (2010) posited that innovative firms often push towards technological advancements and research investment, enhancing overall organisational performance. Zahra and Garvis (2000) argued that innovation creates valuable assets, processes, and systems fulfilling customer needs and establishing competitive advantages. Continuous innovation contributes to organisational growth and operational efficiency, vital for entrepreneurial sustainability. Huse et al. (2005) identified three innovation dimensions: product/service improvement, new production technologies, and creative management systems. Proactivity reflects an organisation's readiness to exploit market opportunities and lead in innovation, with proactive entrepreneurship significantly enhancing performance, as demonstrated by Zahra and Garvis (2000). This suggests that initiating proactive changes could be crucial for elevating organisational effectiveness.

THEORICAL FRAMEWORK

Process Theory

Process theory, as proposed by McMullen (2015) posits that the evolution of phenomena is best understood through the sequential interactions of events and activities. Interest in process theory has surged among entrepreneurship researchers, particularly concerning complex, context-rich, and dynamic phenomena (Gartner, 2010; Moroz & Hindle, 2010). Stevenson and Jarillo (1990) emphasize that entrepreneurs continuously seek new opportunities, regardless of available resources. Process theory has been significantly utilized in management and organization studies (Langley, 1999; Langley et al., 2013; Hjorth et al., 2015), highlighting that the occurrence of a presenter (X) alone cannot produce a result—rather, a probabilistic combination of multiple phenomena is necessary (Mohr, 1982). This theory elucidates observed phenomena, positing that entrepreneurship can be viewed as a process initiated by an entrepreneurial event, which involves generating and maturing a new idea, concept, service, product, or activity. Individuals or organizations take on the role of executing this event. Furthermore, Stevenson, Roberts, and Grousbeck (1989) suggest that an entrepreneurial spirit is defined by values such as risk-taking and innovative thinking in pursuit of opportunities.

The entrepreneurial value creation theory

Mishra and Zachary (2014) presented a theory detailing the entrepreneurial journey, which begins with opportunity recognition, progresses through developing entrepreneurial competence, and ends with realizing entrepreneurial rewards. The entrepreneur, as a crucial component of this process, must cultivate a spirit and tools for entrepreneurship. Key steps involve identifying external opportunities, assessing available resources, acquiring additional resources if necessary, creating sustainable value, and retaining generated profits. They propose a two-stage framework for value creation and appropriation, elucidating the intricacies of entrepreneurial activities.

In the first stage, an entrepreneur with clear intentions utilizes existing resources to recognize external cues and enhances their entrepreneurial competence to advance to the second stage. Many initial attempts may fail, but successful ventures focus on establishing dynamic capabilities for sustained growth and profitability. Entrepreneurs seeking to expand their businesses may seek external resources like venture capital or form strategic partnerships. However, investors face adverse selection challenges when predicting firm quality and entrepreneurial capabilities. Entrepreneurs can leverage signaling through incentives to attract higher-value investment offers.

The overarching goal is to develop a business model that incorporates dynamic capabilities while reorganizing entrepreneurial skills to create long-term value. Mishra (2015) notes that interactions among subprocesses in the second stage ensure ongoing value creation and appropriate rewards for entrepreneurial efforts. This theoretical framework offers insights into how entrepreneurs can navigate the complex landscape of opportunity recognition, resource acquisition, and value appropriation within the entrepreneurial process.

Empirical review

Nobakht et al. (2020) conducted research on Iranian manufacturing companies in order to investigate the ways in which innovation, new business venturing, and strategic renewal—three characteristics of corporate entrepreneurship—affect the performance of the organisation. The findings indicate that there is a significant positive link between entrepreneurial activity and the achievement of both financial and non-financial success in businesses. Their regression analysis confirmed that innovation and strategic renewal particularly had the strongest effects.

Similarly, Idris and Ahmad (2021) explored the impact of corporate entrepreneurship on the performance of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Malaysia. They found that proactiveness and risk-taking significantly influenced firm performance, especially in dynamic and uncertain environments. The study suggested that firms embracing these CE characteristics were more adaptable, competitive, and profitable. This supports the idea that CE serves as a mechanism for driving superior outcomes, especially in emerging markets.

In Nigerian, Chukwu and Nnabuife (2020) examined how corporate entrepreneurship influences the performance of selected telecommunication firms. Their results showed a strong positive correlation between CE practices (like intrapreneurship and product innovation) and organizational performance indicators such as market share, customer satisfaction, and profitability. The authors emphasized the need for firms to institutionalize entrepreneurial culture to sustain growth and competitive advantage.

Altaf and Khalil (2023) focused on the banking sector in Pakistan, exploring how internal corporate venturing and organizational support influence both financial and employee performance. The results indicated that internal support for entrepreneurship, such as flexible structures and innovation funding, positively correlated with both employee productivity and overall firm performance. This highlights the mediating role of organizational structure and resources in enhancing the CE-performance link.

Amadi and Onuoha (2022) investigated the role of corporate entrepreneurship in driving organizational performance among Nigerian manufacturing firms. Using a survey of 150 senior managers, the study found that innovation and strategic renewal had statistically significant effects on productivity, sales growth, and market expansion. The authors concluded that corporate entrepreneurship was not only a catalyst for growth but also a survival strategy in Nigeria's volatile economic climate.

Likewise, Obiekwe and Emeh (2019) analyzed the relationship between CE and performance in oil and gas companies operating in Port Harcourt. Their findings showed that intrapreneurship and risk-taking were essential for increasing operational efficiency and stakeholder satisfaction. The study recommended that organizations continuously foster innovation and risk management capabilities to thrive in the competitive energy sector.

In another study, Eze and Nwaeke (2021) evaluated corporate entrepreneurship practices among indigenous firms in Nigeria. They found that companies that encouraged autonomy, proactive behavior, and internal innovation teams performed better in terms of revenue growth, brand value, and customer loyalty. Their findings align with earlier literature supporting the view that entrepreneurial orientation enhances business resilience and strategic agility.

Ibrahim and Shariff (2024) in a cross-sectional study involving high-tech firms in the UAE discovered that strategic entrepreneurship practices significantly influenced performance metrics like product quality, market share, and return on investment. Their study also highlighted the moderating role of environmental dynamism, suggesting that CE is more impactful in highly competitive or fast-changing industries.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A descriptive, cross-sectional design was employed to ensure an in-depth understanding of the subject matter, enhancing the information obtained from current literature. The population for this study consisted of 200 employees from Globacom Limited and MTN Nigeria Limited in Port Harcourt. A sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's sampling formula. The resulting sample size was 133. Data collection utilized a structured questionnaire, which underwent critical examination and validation. The questionnaires were properly distribution and retrieved. Data from the completed questionnaires were analyzed using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient on IBM SPSS version 21.0.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

This section is concerned with the verification of hypotheses through the resources gathered from the questionnaire. Formulated hypotheses are tested using Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient and the estimation was facilitated by Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21.0.

The decision rule for accepting or rejecting any of our hypotheses is stated below:

1. Reject the null hypothesis at **5%** level of significance if the significant value (P-value) is less than 0.05.
2. Accept the null hypothesis at **5%** level of significance if the significant value (P-value) is greater than the 0.05.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between innovation and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

Table 1: Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis between innovation and organizational performance

			Innovation	Organizational Performance
Spearman's rho	Innovation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.602**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	90	90
	organizational performance	Correlation Coefficient	.602**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	90	90

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 1 above reveals a Spearman ranking correlation coefficient of 0. 602. This result indicates that there is a strong degree of linear relationship between innovation and organizational performance in telecommunication firms. This is because the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.50 i.e. r=0. 602

Decision On Hypothesis One: Since the significant value (P-value) of 0.000 is less than 0.05, we therefore reject the null hypothesis and accept alternative hypothesis. This implies that there is a significant relationship between innovation and organizational performance in telecommunication firms. In tandem with this, Bigliardi (2013) showed, businesses might see short-term benefits from innovation in the form of a competitive edge, including greater sales and growth. Innovative companies outperform their less creative counterparts, according to the literature (Nybakk & Jenssen, 2012). According to research by Bartolacci et al. (2015), innovative practises have a substantial effect on the efficiency of businesses since they affect every stage of production.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between risk taking and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

Table 2: Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis between Risk Taking and Organizational Performance

Correlations

			Risk Taking	Organizational performance
Spearman's rho	Risk Taking	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.573**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	90	90
	Organizational performance	Correlation Coefficient	.573**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	90	90

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 4.11 above reveals a spearman ranking correlation coefficient of 0. 573. This result indicates that there is a degree of linear relationship between risk taking and organizational performance in telecommunication firms. This is because the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.50 i.e. r=0.573

Decision on Hypothesis Two: Since the significant value (P-value) of 0.000 is less than 0.05, we therefore reject the null hypothesis and accept alternate hypothesis. This implies that there is a significant relationship between risk taking and organizational performance in telecommunication firms. Finding of Dai et al. (2014) concerning risk-taking point to the benefits of a moderate stance, as high levels of risk-taking raise the stakes of international activities while low levels discourage venturing abroad altogether

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant relationship between Proactiveness and Organizational Performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State.

Table 3: Spearman's Rank Correlation Analysis between proactiveness and organizational performance

Correlations

			proactiveness	Organizational performance
Spearman's rho	proactiveness	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.514**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	90	90
	Organizational performance	Correlation Coefficient	.514**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	90	90

***. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Table 3 above reveals a spearman ranking correlation coefficient of 0.514. This result indicates that there is a degree of linear relationship between proactiveness and organizational performance in telecommunication firms. This is because the correlation coefficient is greater than 0.50 i.e. r=0. 514

Decision on Hypothesis Three: Since the significant value (P-value) of 0.000 is less than 0.05, we therefore reject the null hypothesis and accept alternate hypothesis. This implies that there is a significant relationship between proactiveness and organizational performance in telecommunication firms.

Summary of Findings

This study on the relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance in selected telecommunication firms in Rivers State revealed that;

i. Innovation relate with organizational performance in telecommunication firms in Rivers State
ii. Risk-taking relate with organizational performance in telecommunication firms in Rivers State
iii. Proactiveness relate with organizational performance in telecommunication firms in Rivers State

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study revealed that key dimensions of corporate entrepreneurship; innovation, risk-taking, and proactiveness positively correlate with organizational performance. These findings suggest that telecommunication firms in the region that embrace innovative practices, are willing to take calculated risks, and act proactively in their business strategies tend to perform better. This relationship reenacts the importance of promoting a corporate entrepreneurial culture to enhance sustained organizational success. Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made;

1. Telecommunication firms should encourage and support innovative thinking and practices at all organizational levels. This can be achieved by investing in research and development, providing employees with the necessary tools and training, and creating an environment that rewards creativity and new ideas.
2. Firms should develop a framework that allows for calculated risk-taking. This includes establishing clear guidelines for evaluating potential risks and rewards, providing support for employees willing to explore new ventures, and learning from both successes and failures.
3. Organizations should adopt a proactive approach to market trends and changes. This involves regularly conducting market research, staying updated with technological advancements, and being responsive to customer needs and preferences.

References

1. Adebayo, J. Y. (2003). Manufacturing Enterprises in Nigeria, Is Finance a constraint to Performance? *Journal of Economic Reform*, 1(3).
2. Ajuwon, O.S., Ikhide, S.I., & Akotey, J.O. (2017). Msmes and Employment Generation in Nigeria. *The Journal of Developing Areas, 51*, 229 - 249.
3. Alasan, S. L., & Yakubu, A. L. (2011). An Empirical Study of Small Scale Financing in Nigeria. *Journal of Unilorin Business School,* 1(1), 87-96.
4. Altaf, M., & Khalil, S. (2023). Corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance: The mediating role of employee engagement in the

banking sector. *International Journal of Business and Society, 24*(1), 101–117.

5. Amadi, T. C., & Onuoha, B. C. (2022). Corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance of selected manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Business Innovation, 9*(1), 45–58.

6. American Marketing Association (2006), *Marketing Terms Dictionary* (online), available at: www.marketing power.com/index

7. Antoncic, B., & Prodan, I. (2008). Alliances, corporate technological entrepreneurship and firm performance: Testing a model on manufacturing firms. *Technovation*, 28(5), 257–265.

8. Asiyah, Atmaja, A. W. T., & Herawati, N. T. (2017). Analysis of the Meaning of Profits According to Street Vendors Along Jalan Ahmad Yani Singaraja. *e-Journal S1 Ak Ganesha University of Education*, 7(1).

9. Bojica, A. M., & Fuentes, M. D. M. F. (2011). Knowledge acquisition and corporate entrepreneurship: Insights from Spanish SMEs in the ICT sector. *Journal of World Business*, 47(3), 397–408.

10. Boyne, G. A. (2002). *Concepts and indicators of local authority performance: An evaluation of the statutory frameworks in England and Wales*. *Public Money & Management*, *22*(2), 17–24.

11. Brassington, F. & Pettitt, S. (2003), Principles of Marketing, 3rd ed., Pearson Education, Harlow

12. Cameron, K. S. (2010). *Measuring organisational effectiveness in institutions of higher education*. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *25*(4), 604–632.

13. Cho, Y., & Lee, J. (2018). Corporate entrepreneurship and performance: The role of organizational culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 87, 12–23.

14. Chosniel, O, Selorm, A.M, & David, K. W.. (2014). Globalisation and competitiveness: challenges of small and medium enterprises (SMEs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(4), 288–289

15. Chukwu, B. I., & Nnabuife, E. K. (2020). Corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance in Nigerian telecommunication sector. *International Journal of Management Studies and Research, 8*(6), 13–24.

16. Clark, D. N. (2010). Innovation management in SMEs: Active innovators in New Zealand. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 23(4), 601–619.

17. Cosson, M. (2003). *The Entrepreneur: An Economic Theory* (2nd ed.). Edward Elgar Publishers.

18. Eze, S. C., & Nwaeke, L. I. (2021). Entrepreneurial orientation and organizational performance in indigenous firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Law Research, 9*(2), 34–47.

19. Gilmore, A., Carson, D. and Grant, K. (2001), "SME Marketing in Practice", *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 19(1), 6-11

20. Huse, M., Neubaum, D. O., & Gabrielsson, J. (2005). Corporate innovation and board of directors: How effective are boards in inspiring innovation? *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 35(4), 79–100.

21. Ibrahim, M., & Shariff, M. N. M. (2024). Strategic entrepreneurship and performance in UAE high-tech firms: Moderating effect of environmental dynamism. *Asian Journal of Business Research, 14*(1), 22–39.

22. Idris, A., & Ahmad, R. (2021). The relationship between corporate entrepreneurship and SME performance in Malaysia. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, 28*(3), 389–406.

23. Joo, S. J. (2018). The effect of organizational culture on firm performance: The mediating role of employee commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 71, 56–64.

24. Kadiri, I.B. (2012). Small and Medium Scale Enterprises and Employment Generation in Nigeria: The Role of Finance.

25. Kaplan, R. S., & Norton, D. P. (2004). *Strategy maps: Converting intangible assets into tangible outcomes*. Harvard Business Press.

26. Kareem B. (2018). Impact of Entrepreneurship on Unemployment/ Underemployment Rate in Nigeria: Islamic Perspective. Science Arena Publications Specialty. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*. 4(1), 12–18.

27. Kareem, R. O. (2015). Employment level and economic growth of Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Development Studies*, 8(1), 53- 70.

28. Katua, N. T. (2014). The Role of SMEs in Employment Creation and Economic Growth in Selected Countries. *International Journal of Education and Research,* 2(12)

29. Loon, M. (2016). Organizational culture and the performance of university students in entrepreneurship. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 19(2), 28–45.

30. McDaniel, C., Lamb, C.W. & Hair, J.F. (2006), *Introduction to Marketing*, 8th ed., South Western Publishers, Cincinatti, OH.

31. Mishra, C. S., & Zachary, R. K. (2015). The theory of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship research journal*, *5*(4), 251-268.

32. Mukhtar. A. (2013). The role of entrepreneurship towards employment generation and poverty reduction: a theoretical discourse. A Lecture Presented at First Annual Students' Entrepreneurship Lecture, Organized by the Students' Union Government. vol. 5. Katsina .,. Available from: mustaphamukhtar.blogspot.com/2013/03.

33. Mursy, A. L., & Rosidi. (2013). The Touch of Taste Behind the Meaning of Profit. *Journal of Multiparadigm Accounting,* 4(2), 165-176

34. Mustafa, M., Hernandez, E., Mahon, C., & Chee, L. K. (2016). Entrepreneurial intentions of university students: The role of proactive personality, innovativeness and university support. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 25(2), 45–64.

35. Nobakht, M., Hosseini, M., & Amiri, A. (2020). Investigating the impact of corporate entrepreneurship on organizational performance: A study in Iranian manufacturing companies. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Development, 13*(2), 89–104.

36. Obiekwe, C., & Emeh, I. E. J. (2019). Corporate entrepreneurship and organizational performance in oil and gas firms in Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management, 7*(4), 1–15.

37. Peng, Y., Song, M., & Xiaofeng, X. (2015). Innovation speed and firm performance: Evidence from the Chinese market. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 32(3), 717–744.

38. Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 761–787.

39. Reynolds, P.L. (2002), "The need for a new paradigm for small business marketing – what was wrong with the old one?", *Journal of Research in Marketing & Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 191-205.

40. Richard, P. J., Devinney, T. M., Yip, G. S., & Johnson, G. (2009). *Measuring organisational performance: Towards methodological best practice*. *Journal of Management*, *35*(3), 718–804.

41. Sari, D .P. (2014). What does "advantage" mean for the medical profession? *Multiparadigm Accounting Journal:* JAMAL, 5(1), 130-138.

42. Shettima, M. B, Sharma, N, & Banerji, P. (2020) Impact of small and medium enterprises on employment generation in Kaduna State Nigeria. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 13(22), 2229-2236.

43. Shettima, M. B. (2017). Impact of SMEs on Employment Generation in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science*.;22(09):43–50.

44. Smith, A. (2007). Translating sustainabilities between green niches and socio-technical regimes. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 9(4): 427-450.

45. Suresh, K. (2018). *Best Investment Plans in India and Money Saving Ideas* . Available from: http://www.myinvestmentideas.com

46. Taiwo, M., Ayodeji, A.M., & Yusuf, B.A. (2013). Impact of Small and Medium Enterprises on Economic Growth and Development. *American Journal of Business and Management, 1*, 18-22.

47. Ubaidillah, A., Mulyani, S., & Effendi, D. E. (2013). Meaning Advantages for Foot Traders Lima (Study on Street Traders Five in Bangsri Jepara). *Journal Accounting & Investment*, 14(1), 65-77.

48. Ukwegbu A. C. (2012). Employment generation and expansion: a panacea for security challenges in Nigeria. *Department of Business Administration, University of Lagos*.

49. Wafirotin, K. H., & Marsiwi, D. (2015). Profit Perception According to Street Vendorson Jalan Baru Ponorogo. *Journal Equilibrium,* 13(2), 24-36

50. Wang, C. L. (2008). Entrepreneurial orientation, learning orientation, and firm performance. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 32(4), 635–657.

51. Zahra, S. A. (1993). Environment, corporate entrepreneurship, and financial performance: A taxonomic approach. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(4), 319–340.

52. Zahra, S. A., & Covin, J. G. (2011). Business strategy, technology policy and firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 12(6), 451–478.

53. Zahra, S. A., & Garvis, D. M. (2000). International corporate entrepreneurship and firm performance: The moderating effect of international environmental hostility. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5-6), 469–492.