



Entrepreneurial ecosystems and performance of women entrepreneurs in Development Exchange Centre (DEC) Bauchi office - Nigeria

ADUBASIM Ernest Ikechukwu¹, WUANOR Gande James², BABALLE Saqiqa Usman³ and EKE Roseline Ekwutoziam⁴

^{1,3&4}*Department of Business Administration and Management, School of Business Studies, The Federal Polytechnic, Bauchi - Nigeria.*

²*Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Management Sciences, Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi*

Email: aiernest@fptb.edu.ng

Abstract

This study focused on Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Performance of Women Entrepreneurs under Development Exchange Centre (DEC) Bauchi state. The study used a cross sectional research design. The population of the study is five hundred selected women entrepreneurs registered with DEC. The sample size of the study is two hundred and seventeen (217). After data cleaning, only 198 responses were finally used for the analysis. Descriptive statistics and Spearman's rank correlation were used for analysis and hypothesis testing respectively. The empirical results reveal that there is a positive significant relationship between Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Performance. The study concluded that Entrepreneurial Ecosystems has a positive and significant relationship with innovativeness and task accomplishment as measures of performance. Therefore, the study recommends that there is need to improve and synchronise both formal and informal institutions to make the entrepreneurial ecosystem supportive for entry, survival and growth of women entrepreneurs. Recognition and reward should be made and given respectively to those that merit them especially to female staff members as these would go a long way to motivate them and ultimately boost performance.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial ecosystem, innovativeness, performance, task accomplishment.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship is perceived as one of the trending topics the world over. The field of entrepreneurship has achieved new heights since the last decade of the 20th century (Isenberg, 2016). The acknowledgement of the worth of entrepreneurship dates back to the work of Schumpeter (1934), in which he labelled entrepreneurs as “agents of creative destruction” and emphasized their important role in economic growth. Since 1934, this field has been widely researched and policymakers have been on a journey to organize the suitable policies to encourage SMEs growth given their

local conditions. Researchers, practitioners and policymakers have broadly agreed on the variety of social, economic and developmental benefits from entrepreneurship, and developed a broad consensus that entrepreneurship is important and it matters (Acs et al., 2014; Blanchflower, 2000; Grimaldi et al., 2011; Parker, 2009; Terjesen & Wang, 2013). On this note, many governments and development agencies have allocated substantial amounts of financial resources and training to the entrepreneurs. These initiatives have been targeted at increasing the volume of entrepreneurial activity in



different regions on the basis of the argument that all kinds of entrepreneurship will generate economic activity.

Initial research on entrepreneurship dwelled mainly on the personality traits of successful entrepreneurs (Lene, Colette, Helene & Geir, 2018), with the aim of finding the set of individual characteristics needed to be a successful entrepreneur. This aspect of entrepreneurship is still the focus of much research, however, developments in the field shifted the focus to firm-specific factors: the skills of the employees, the geographical location of the firm and management practices. The most recent perspective views entrepreneurship as interactive and interdependent (Motoyama and Knowlton, 2017). This modern systematic view of entrepreneurship has been termed the entrepreneurial ecosystem by (Isenberg, 2016). The entrepreneurial ecosystem has been defined as an interactive relationship between entrepreneurs, institutional framework and physical conditions for providing a thriving environment for businesses. The entrepreneurial ecosystem is a complex set of elements aimed at making the environment conducive for entry, survival and growth of entrepreneurship in a region.

According to Adim, Tamunomiebi, Akintokunbo, and Adubasim, (2018), nigerian women entrepreneurs operate in an unfavourable business environment, characterized by various challenges ranging from infrastructural deficiency, low access and high cost of finance, weak institutions and many barriers to formal economic participation. Despite the crucial role of women entrepreneurs in the economic development of their families and countries, it is however discovered that women entrepreneurs have low business performance when compared to their male counterparts; women are largely

concentrated in the informal, micro, low growth and profit areas where competition is intense.

According to Adubasim, Adim and Ibekwe (2018), performance can be judged in many different ways, each of this perceptive can be argued to be unique. Worthy of note is the concern that performance like other management concern does not enjoy universality of the definition. In general, performance is based upon the idea that organization is the combination of productive assets, human, physical and capital for the sole aim of achieving a shared purpose. How is performance measured is another key question. There are several indices to measure employee performance but the ones that stand out are growth, competitive advantage as well as innovation.

The concept of taking a systematic view of entrepreneurship is relatively new and underdeveloped, and scholars have stressed the need to empirically test the effect of individual and interdependent components of the entrepreneurial ecosystem on the level of entrepreneurship in a region (Alvedalen and Boschma, 2017; Spigel and Harrison, 2018). The research in this field is providing useful insights for improvements in academic (Cavallo et al., 2018; Stam, 2015), as well policy (Acs et al., 2014; Foster et al., 2013; Isenberg, 2010; Stangler and Bell-Masterson, 2015; Taich et al., 2016) understandings of this concept. The objective behind the use of the entrepreneurial ecosystems approach has been to create resilient economies which are self-regulating and self-sustaining through entrepreneurial activities.

Entrepreneurial ecosystem has established itself as the most recent trend in the research area of entrepreneurship (Brown and Mason, 2017; Isenberg and Onyemah, 2016; Martin, 2015; Stam, 2018).

Research on entrepreneurial ecosystems has increased substantially in recent years. In an international conference held in Washington, organized by the International Business Innovation Association was based on the theme of building thriving entrepreneurial ecosystem. The participants agreed on creating collaborative strategies to create encouraging entrepreneurial ecosystems and emphasized the need for further research in this direction. This paper sought to examine the relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and the performance of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state. This study would provide answers to the following research questions:

- i. What is the relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and innovativeness of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state?
- ii. What is the relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and task accomplishment of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Theory of Regulatory Capture

The theory of Regulatory Capture (Laffont & Tirole, 1991) is employed to understand some of the politico-economic processes which shape governmental interventions and how this can influence the objectives of an entire policy initiative towards development of an entrepreneurial ecosystem.

There exist two interpretations of Regulatory Capture, taking the broader definition explained by Ernesto Dal Bo is the “process through which special interests affect states interventions in any of its forms, which can include areas as diverse as the setting of taxes, the choice of foreign or monetary policy, or the legislation affecting R&D” (Dal Bo 2006, pg203).

This theory explains a major challenge that a programme targeted at developing an entrepreneurial ecosystem may face in the hands of political stakeholders as they jostle to capture as more values for their constituency or even in some cases for their own benefits. Dal Bo (2006), also pointed out that well established firms can also position themselves or through proxies to capture excessive benefits to the detriment of the entire program. This is sometimes possible because these firms may have private or expert information that is beyond the reach of smaller firms and start-ups or their political representatives to obtain thereby conferring undue advantage for them to influence the policy direction, this can lead to failure of the program or policy. This theory was adopted as it supports the view of the authors who sought to look at entrepreneurship from the environmental view point as supposed to the behavioural traits as viewed by several other research.

Concept of Entrepreneurial Ecosystem

It is only in the last decade or so that the entrepreneurial ecosystems approach has emerged and received significant attention of academics and policy makers around the world. The entrepreneurial ecosystems approach has been mostly regarded as a novel way of looking at development, yet it is not only consistent with the traditional economic development approaches through entrepreneurship rather in some aspects it complements them. There is no consensus on how to define an entrepreneurial ecosystem, therefore, this approach has usually been explained by dividing it into two parts. Firstly, entrepreneurial ecosystem refers to entrepreneurship which is considered as a process through which people identify and select business opportunities to pursue their business creation dreams (Shane, 2009; Stam, 2015). Entrepreneurs exploit opportunities by taking risks and allocating



resources to get benefit by creating and selling innovative goods and services (Isenberg, 2010).

Innovation is used in terms of either invention or radical improvement in the existing solutions or modification in the existing products, but it definitely adds value to society (Lester and Piore, 2004). More recently, the focus on the quality of entrepreneurship has narrowed down entrepreneurship to high growth firms only (Mason and Brown, 2014; Stam, 2015). There are few reservations about this narrowed focus being too exclusive, but the recent literature on entrepreneurial ecosystems has specifically focused on this aspect, so self-employment is no longer used as an indicator of entrepreneurial activity (Henrekson and Sanandaji, 2014; Shane, 2009; Stam et al., 2011).

The definition of entrepreneurial ecosystems by Stam (2015) is most widely used in academic research because it comprehensively covers this approach. According to Stam (2015), the entrepreneurial ecosystem is a set of interdependent actors and factors coordinated in such a way that they enable productive entrepreneurship.

The entrepreneurial ecosystem is thus about the environment in which entrepreneurship takes place, the role of individual and interdependent factors that enable or constrain the entrepreneurial activity. The complex set of elements of the entrepreneurial ecosystem help in nurturing entrepreneurship in a region. The entrepreneurial ecosystems approach emphasizes social context in terms of its role in making entrepreneurship encouraging or discouraging. Innovative aspirations and achievements of individual entrepreneurs depend on how ingrained entrepreneurial culture is in the society. Entrepreneurs are the focal point of an

entrepreneurial ecosystem which accentuates the context to be conducive for entry, survival and growth of entrepreneurship. In the entrepreneurial ecosystem, entrepreneurs are considered as leaders and the other supporting stakeholders, such as the government are considered as the feeders (Feld, 2012).

Performance of Women Entrepreneurs

Women entrepreneurs are vital to the economic development, poverty and unemployment reduction of a nation. They have roles to play in the social, economic, and political life of any nation. Farr-Wharton and Brunetto, 2009 in Adim, Tamunomiebi, Akintokunbo, and Adubasim, (2018) defined women entrepreneurs as: “women who use their knowledge and resources to develop or create new business opportunities, who are actively involved in managing their businesses, and own at least 50 per cent of the business and have been in operation for longer than a year”. Anwa and Rashid (2013) further extended this definition to explicitly include home-based female entrepreneurs “Female entrepreneurs are defined as those who use their knowledge and resources to develop or create new business opportunities – whether this be informally in a home environment without formally registering their business or formally via business registration, hiring office premises, etc. - who are actively involved in managing their businesses, are responsible in some way for the day-to-day running of the business, and have been in operation for longer than a year.

Mayoux (2004) noted that women entrepreneurs are simply women that participate in total entrepreneurial activities, who take the risks involved in combining resources together in a unique way so as to take advantages of the opportunity identified in their immediate environment through production of goods and services. Most of them are involved in



Micro Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (MSMES) which contribute more than 97% of all enterprises, 60% of the nation's GDP and a 97% of the total share of the employment (Ndubusi, 2004). The spectrum of women in entrepreneurship often ranges from home based businesses (HBB) to micro, small and medium (MSEs) (ILO, 1998). Okafor et.al (2010) opined that women possess dual characteristic (For instance they are firstly women and secondly entrepreneurs). Therefore, women entrepreneurs possess characteristics which include adaptability (Killby, 1968), innovativeness/ creativity (Schumpeter, 1934, Drucker, 1985), strength and internal locus of control (Annenkova, 2001), ability to think and reason fast and endure (Mayoux, 2001), managerial skill, accountability and credit risk.

Women in traditional African economy form the primary producers especially in agriculture, food processing including both the preservation and storage of products and that of marketing and trading surpluses of vital household items. Women are also involved in activities such as weaving, spinning and several hand crafts (Kpelai, 2009). According to Adim, Tamunomiebi, Akintokunbo, and Adubasim, (2018), women are at the heart of economic development and economic growth as they control most of the non-monetary economy (subsistence agriculture, bearing children, domestic labour and so on) and play an important role in the monetary economy as well as trading, wage, labour employment among others. UNESCO (2002) stated that women form high percentage of the population and they have come a long way in businesses, politics, education, sport and other profession.

Measures of Performance

Innovativeness as a Measure of Performance

Innovativeness of entrepreneurs is measured by the propensity by which they innovate their business (Miller & Friesen, 1982); their willingness to try new ways which are different from the existing; the enthusiasm to adopt new ideas or new methods to their business operation; and the eagerness to implement the innovation strategy in their business (Khandwalla, 1987). Innovativeness reflects a firm's tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation and creative processes (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996) that may result in new products, services, or technological processes and which may take the organization to a new paradigm of success (Swieczek and Ha, 2003). It also implies seeking creative, extraordinary or strange solutions to problems and needs. Innovativeness represents a basic willingness to depart from existing technologies or practices and venture beyond the current state-of-the-art (Covin, 2006). An innovative strategic posture can be linked to firm performance as it increases the chances that a firm will realize first mover advantage, stay ahead of their competitors, gain a competitive advantage and capitalize on emerging market opportunities that lead to improved financial results (Kreiser & Davis, 2010).

Task Accomplishment as a Measure of Performance

Task accomplishment is a measure of an employee's productivity and involves their contribution to overall organizational productivity and effectiveness, it refers to actions that are part of the formal reward system and addresses the prescription as indicated in the descriptions of the role (Williams and Karau, 1991). It shows the level or the extent an employee achieves a given target. In general, task accomplishment comprises of activities that translates the organizations policies, missions and resources into tangible and intangible goods produced by the



organization and to enable efficient operation of the organization (Motowidlo et al., 1997). Thus, task accomplishment covers the fulfilment of the requirements that are part of the agreement between the employee and the organisation. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) pointed out that task accomplishment is the effectiveness and efficiency with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization's technical core and assist in moulding the psychological state of the organization (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993). They further suggested that in accomplishing a given task there are two aspects to it, which are interpersonal facilitation and job dedication. Interpersonal facilitation includes cooperative and helpful acts that help the effectiveness of co-employee. While job dedication includes self-disciplined and motivation to support organizational objectives and goals (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996).

Entrepreneurial Ecosystem and Performance

The Kauffman Foundation has recently started a programme to understand and explain the measurement and performance of entrepreneurial ecosystems (Stangler and Bell-Masterson, 2015). Thus, entrepreneurial ecosystems can be regarded as a contemporary issue, yet there is still a long way to go in developing our understanding as different aspects of this concept are unfolding through research in different contexts and time periods. The concept of the entrepreneurial ecosystem is based on the theories of organisational ecology, institutional theory, regional economics and a systems approach. It emphasises self-organizing and self-regularizing mechanisms for competitive market policies. The combination of formal institutions (government regulations and taxation system), informal institutions (corruption perception) and

physical conditions (access to finance, supportive infrastructure, a stable political environment, a skilled labour force and a formal economy) are expected to create an entrepreneurial ecosystem where the entry, survival and growth of firms will be at its highest rate. The institutional framework and physical conditions will determine the health of the entrepreneurial ecosystem, and how supportive or constraining it is. A supportive entrepreneurial ecosystem is expected to promote business activity and self-regulate the market by screening out the poor performing firms, whilst also attracting those which challenge the status quo with differentiated and innovative products. Since most businesses start from either a small or medium scale, a high rate of SMEs formation has been used in the literature as an indicator of entrepreneurial activity. Thus, the role of the entrepreneurial ecosystem has been to ensure high rates of entry and survival of SMEs with growth potential. In supportive entrepreneurial ecosystems, the survival and growth of SMEs is given more importance in comparison to the entry rate. The high rate of survival and growth of SMEs in the USA and Europe has been accredited to their institutional support, facilitative physical conditions and low entry costs. On the other hand, the entrepreneurial ecosystems of developing countries have been blamed for a high exit rate of firms in their markets because the institutions here are seen to be relatively inefficient.

As, SMEs contribute significantly to economic growth, productivity and innovation (Memili et al., 2015; Schlogl, 2004); therefore, policymakers should emphasize the provision of a supportive environment for better economic performance. Moreover, it has been argued that if the encouragement and facilitation of SMEs is continued, the long-term economic objectives including skilled



human resources, alleviating poverty, dispersing economic activity to deprived regions, the involvement of minorities in economic activity and the utilization of untapped entrepreneurial potential, can all be achieved (Beck, 2007; Bouri et al., 2011; Kuntchev et al., 2012; OECD, 2005). Thus, SMEs can play a momentous role in the economic turnaround of any developing economy. The lower capital needs and labour-intensive nature of SMEs give them unprecedented importance in the solutions to the economic problems of developing countries (Rodrik, 2014; Stephens et al., 2013). Moreover, unskilled and semi-skilled labour is often the target of the SMEs because of their usually low tech and labour-intensive production processes. Moreover, it is believed that the sheer number, size and operational nature of SMEs give them an added advantage to spur endogenous growth and accelerate the economic development of developing countries. Their vital role in promoting domestic firm performance in existing and new industrial sectors to create a resilient economy in the contemporary competitive world is inarguable. However, apart from due recognition of their contributions, the challenges this sector faces should not be underestimated too, particularly when the widespread phenomenon of market globalization is giving added advantages to large firms due to their resource base.

However, without undermining the chances of success of SMEs, it is also a bitter reality that many of the new firms fail during the process of entry, establishment and sometimes expansion. The non-exhaustive list of the reasons for failure includes: financing constraints, liquidity problems, inexperienced entrepreneurs or the wrong selection of the market, for instance. However, the ecosystem perspective points to the constraining entrepreneurial ecosystem, based on inefficient institutional

framework and physical conditions, as a reason for the high rate of failure of firms (Feld, 2012). It is argued that the constraining entrepreneurial ecosystem of developing countries does not allow entrepreneurial activity to increase beyond a certain level. Entrepreneurs are not free to ensure self-regulation or self-sustainability; rather their actions are tightly controlled by the regulators. So the question is what should governments in developing countries do to promote SMEs? The general answer is that they should ensure the provision of an environment conducive for the entry, survival and growth of SMEs. The indigenous entrepreneurial ecosystem should be gradually improved using a bottom-up approach, with the role of governments as facilitators rather than strictly controlling the entrepreneurial activity. However, governments should also allow market forces to operate to ensure the screening of underperforming firms, rather than intervening to save the poor performers. Moreover, the recent research suggests that, although there are notable contributions from small and new firms, only high growth firms started by ambitious entrepreneurs are contributing significantly to the economic development of a region (Audretsch and Belitski, 2017; Cavallo et al., 2018; Isenberg and Onyemah, 2016; Mason and Brown, 2014; Spigel and Harrison, 2018; Stam, 2015; Wong et al., 2005). The earlier belief that all types of entrepreneurship (productive, unproductive, destructive) contribute in creating economic activity has been rejected by contemporary empirical findings. It has now been argued that the benefits of entrepreneurship can be realised in a society only if the economic benefits of productive entrepreneurship supersede the unproductive entrepreneurship, and this is possible only when the institutions are performing their role efficiently and effectively, and

supportive physical conditions are provided to the entrepreneurs.

Thus, recognizing the contributions of ambitious entrepreneurs and the role of institutions and physical conditions in the performance of the private business sector, governments in developed countries have changed their policy direction. The most recent policy shift has been to move from pushing for increasing the number of entrepreneurs (quantity) to improving the quality of entrepreneurship in a region by increasing the number of high growth firm (Acs et al., 2018; Stam, 2007). Thus, only high growth SMEs are the centre of policy related attention with respect to the development of entrepreneurial ecosystem in developed economies.

It is on the grounds of these agreements that the following hypothesis were drawn:

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem

and innovativeness of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.

Ho₂: There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and task accomplishment of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.

3. Methodology

The study adopted the cross-sectional survey method in the generating the data for the study. The population comprised of women entrepreneur registered with Development Exchange Centre, DEC in Bauchi state totalling to five hundred (500). The sample size was obtained using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size for a given population. The table placed the sample size at two hundred and seventeen (217). Descriptive statistics and Spearman's rank correlation were used for data analysis and hypotheses testing with the aid of the SPSS Package version 23.

Table 1. Reliability Statistics for the Instruments

S/No	Dimensions/Measures of the study variable	Number of items	Number of cases	Cronbach's Alpha
1	Entrepreneurial Ecosystem	4	198	0.873
2	Innovativeness	4	198	0.862
3	Task Accomplishment	4	198	0.769

Source: field survey, 2021

4. Data Analysis and Results

Bivariate Analysis

The test of hypothesis cover hypotheses Ho₁ and Ho₂ which were bivariate and all stated in the null form. We have relied on

the Spearman Rank (*rho*) statistic to undertake the analysis. The 0.05 significance level is adopted as criterion for the probability of either accepting the null hypotheses at ($p > 0.05$) or rejecting the null hypotheses at ($p < 0.05$).

Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationship between Entrepreneurial Ecosystem and Performance

			Entrepreneurial Ecosystem	Innovativeness	Task Accomplishment
Spearman's rho	Entrepreneurial Ecosystem	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.845**	.788**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Innovativeness	Correlation Coefficient	.845**	1.000	.578**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	198	198	198
	Task Accomplishment	Correlation Coefficient	.788**	.578**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	198	198	198

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: SPSS output, version 23

The table above illustrates the test for the two postulated bivariate hypothetical statements.

H01: *There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and innovativeness of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.*

The correlation coefficient 0.845 shows that there is a strong and positive relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and innovativeness. The p value $0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that the relationship is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and innovativeness of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.

H02: *There is no significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem*

and task accomplishment of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.

The correlation coefficient 0.788 shows that there is a strong and positive relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and task accomplishment. The p value $0.000 < 0.05$ indicates that the relationship is significant. Therefore, the null hypothesis is hereby rejected and the alternate upheld. Thus, there is a significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and task accomplishment of women entrepreneurs in Bauchi state.

5. Discussion of Findings

The findings revealed a strong and positive significant relationship between entrepreneurial ecosystem and performance using the Spearman's rank order correlation tool and at a 95% confidence interval. The findings of this study confirmed that entrepreneurial

ecosystem had a significant positive relationship with performance of women entrepreneurs (innovativeness and task accomplishment). This finding is justifying the position of Acs et al. (2014) and Guzman and Stern, (2015) who focused on linking outcomes, such as the number of high growth firms or firm survival, with inputs such as economic structures or particular support policies. Qualitative approaches such as (Spigel, 2015) have employed in-depth interviews with entrepreneurs to examine the processes through which ecosystems develop, evolve, and provide resources and support to entrepreneurs. Qualitative approaches are more amenable for examining the complex connections between an entrepreneur and their regional economic social and economic environment because publicly available data cannot easily examine the social relations that make up ecosystems.

Malecki (2011) placed an emphasis at the significance of global connections among distinctive entrepreneurial ecosystem, because the potential to integrate worldwide understanding is considered crucial for companies to grow to be successful of their domestic entrepreneurial ecosystem. According to Mason and brown (2014) firms are perceived to have the impression to attract skilled employees to the region, upgrade managerial talents of local firms, work as a supply for spin off firms (Neck et al. 2004), and provide enterprise opportunities for local enterprises to get right of entry to global markets.

Similarly, Mason and Brown (2014) and Mack and Mayer (2015) corroborates our finding as they opined that scholars have claimed that the factors of Entrepreneurial atmosphere will shift in significance and of their connections as they evolve. This kind of dynamic entrepreneurial ecosystem framework desires to make specific which factors and family members depend

wherein degree, and the way they influence every other over the years. The ecosystem framework presented as a system or network that includes many interrelated components with no clear relationships.

However, Motoyama and Watkins, (2014) criticized the entrepreneurial ecosystem literature. The argued that the literature have addressed the factors of the differences without giving right attention to the connections among them, and treating all components as equally important. The entrepreneurial ecosystem literature has not yet delivered an exhaustive system approach that could reveal insight, for example, on the pivotal inquiry because some entrepreneurial ecosystem can make crucial associations while other entrepreneurial ecosystem neglect to do so (Ter Wal, 2016).

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

The entrepreneurial ecosystem approach has emerged to be a supportive environment for the members of an ecosystem to take entrepreneurial activities to a new level. Every ecosystem has different members with different characteristics. As a result, creating a successful entrepreneurial ecosystem demands a deep understanding of the culture and features of an environment. This is one the main duties of policy makers or organizational leaders, to pay attention to these dissimilarities, because if the women entrepreneurs don't receive support from the members of the environment, developing an entrepreneurial ecosystem that would accommodate these women entrepreneurs will ultimately fail. Since entrepreneurship is one of the main factors in economic development, we need to continuously improve its effectiveness by identifying different criteria and measures. Hence this study concludes that entrepreneurial ecosystem significantly relates with the

performance of women entrepreneurs. Specifically, the study concluded that entrepreneurial ecosystem significantly relates to the level of task accomplished as well as the innovativeness of these women entrepreneurs.

The study based on the conclusion recommended that:

i. To leverage on the gains of innovativeness, there is need to improve and synchronize both formal and informal institutions for making the entrepreneurial ecosystem supportive for entry, survival and growth of women entrepreneurs.

ii. To improve on the effectiveness as well as efficiency to which task are accomplished, recognition and reward should be made and given respectively to those that merit them especially to female staff members as these would go a long way to motivate them and ultimately boost performance.

References

- Acs, Z.J., Autio, E., Szerb, L., 2014. National Systems of Entrepreneurship: *Measurement Issues and Policy Implications. Research Policy* 43, 476-494.
- Adim, C.V., Tamunomiebi, M.D., Akintokunbo, O.O and Adubasim, I. E (2018). Entrepreneurial innovativeness and performance of women entrepreneurs' in Rivers State, Nigeria. *World Journal of Entrepreneurial Development Studies*, 2(1) 9-23
- Adubasim, I. E. Adim, C. V. & Ibekwe, W. (2018). Knowledge creation as predictor of employee performance in Abubakar Tafawa Balewa University, Bauchi, Bauchi State, Nigeria. *Global Scientific Journal*, 6(8), 231-250
- Akerlof, G. (1970). The Market for Lemons: Qualitative Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 84.
- Alvedalen, J. & Boschma, R. (2017). A Critical Review of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems Research: Towards a Future Research Agenda. *European Planning Studies*, 25(6), 887-903.
- Amit, R., Brander, J., & Zott, C. (1998). Why do venture capital firms exist? Theory and Canadian evidence. *Journal of business Venturing*, 13(6), 441-466.
- Audretsch, D., 2011. Entrepreneurship Policy. In: L.P. Dana (ed.) *World Encyclopaedia of Entrepreneurship*. Edward Elgar, 111-121.
- Beck, T. (2007) Financing Constraints of SMEs in Developing Countries: Evidence, Determinants and Solutions. In: KDI 36th Anniversary International Conference, 2007 Korea. Korea Development Institute, 26-27.
- Blanchflower, D. G. (2000) Self-employment in OECD Countries. *Labour Economics*, 7(5), 471-505.
- Bouri, A., Breij, M., Diop, M., Kempner, R., Klinger, B. & Stevenson, K. (2011) Report on Support to SMEs in Developing Countries through Financial Intermediaries. Dalberg.
- Brown, R. & Mason, C. (2017) Looking Inside the Spiky Bits: A Critical Review and Conceptualisation of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems.



- Small Business Economics*, 49(1), 11-30.
- Cavallo, A., Ghezzi, A. & Balocco, R. (2018) Entrepreneurial ecosystem research: present debates and future directions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1-31.
- Cowling, M., Liu, W. & Zhang, N. (2016) Access to Bank Finance for UK SMEs in the Wake of the Recent Financial Crisis. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 22(6), 903-932.
- Dal Bo, E. (2006). Regulatory capture: a review. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 22(2), 203-225.
- Dierkens, N. (1991). Information asymmetry and equity issues. *Journal of financial and quantitative analysis*, 26(2), 181-199
- Feld, B. 2012. Start-up Communities: Building an Entrepreneurial Ecosystem in your City. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ.
- Foster, G., Shimizu, C., Ciesinski, S., Davila, A., Hassan, S., Jia, N. & Morris, R. (2013) Entrepreneurial Ecosystems around the Globe and Company Growth Dynamics. World Economic Forum.
- Grimaldi, R., Kenney, M., Siegel, D. S. & Wright, M. (2011) 30 years after Bayh-Dole: Reassessing Academic Entrepreneurship. *Research Policy*, 40(8), 1045-1057.
- Healy, P. M., & Palepu, K. G. (2001). Information asymmetry, corporate disclosure, and the capital markets: A review of the empirical disclosure literature. *Journal of accounting and economics*, 31(1), 405-440.
- Henrekson, M. & Sanandaji, T. (2011). The Interaction of Entrepreneurship and Institutions. *Journal of Institutional Economics*, 7(01), 47-75.
- Henrekson, M. & Sanandaji, T. (2014) Small Business Activity does not Measure Entrepreneurship. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(5), 1760-1765.
- Isenberg, D. J. & Onyemah, V. (2016) Fostering Scale up Ecosystems for Regional Economic Growth. *Innovations*, 11(1-2), 60-79.
- Isenberg, D. J. (2016) Applying the Ecosystem Metaphor to Entrepreneurship: Uses and Abuses. *The Antitrust Bulletin*, 61(4), 564-573.
- Isenberg, D.J., 2010. How to start an entrepreneurial revolution. *Harvard Business Review* 88, 41-49.
- Ismael, Y., Yusuf, A. & Davond, M. (2010). A Review paper on Organizational Culture and Performance. Available at www.ijbssnet.Com/Journals/vol.-1-no.3 December - 2010/4.Pdf [24].
- Laffont, J. J. & Tirole, J (2014). The politics of government decision-making: A theory of regulatory capture. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106 (4) 1089-1127
- Lebans, M. & Euske, K. (2006). *A conceptual and operational delineation of performance*, *Business Performance*



- Measurement*, Cambridge University Press
- Lester, R. K. & Piore, M. J. (2004) *Innovation, the Missing Dimension*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lumpkin, G.T. & Dess, G.G. (1996). Clarifying the Entrepreneurship Orientation Construct and linking it to Performance. *Academy Of Management Review*, 21(1), 135-172.
- Martin, R. (2015) Rebalancing the Spatial Economy: The Challenge for Regional Theory. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 3(3), 235-272.
- Mason, C., Brown, R., 2014. Entrepreneurial ecosystems and growth oriented entrepreneurship. OECD LEED Programme, Paris.
- Motoyama, Y. & Knowlton, K. (2017) Examining the Connections within the Startup Ecosystem: A Case Study of St. Louis. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 7(1), 1-32.
- OECD (2002). *The Keys for Successful Women Entrepreneurs*. The OECD Bologna Process, December 2002.
- OECD (2005). *SME and Entrepreneurship Outlook*. 2005 ed. Paris: OECD.
- Parker, S. C. (2009). *The Economics of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, P., Davinney, S. & Johnson, G. (2009). *Measuring Organizational Performance: Towards Methodological Best Practices*. *Journal of Management*, 35 (3), 718-804.
- Rodrik, D. (2014). The Past, Present, and Future of Economic Growth. *Challenge*, 57(3), 5-39.
- Schlogl, H. (2004) *Small and Medium Enterprises: Seizing the Potential*. The OECD Observer. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shane, S. (2009). Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy. *Small business economics*, 33(2), 141-149.
- Spigel, B. & Harrison, R. (2018) Toward a Process Theory of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 12(1), 151-168.
- Spigel, B. (2017). The Relational Organization of Entrepreneurial Ecosystems. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 49-72.
- Stam, E., 2014. *The Dutch Entrepreneurial Ecosystem*. Utrecht: Birch Research.
- Stam, E., 2015. *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems and Regional Policy: A Sympathetic Critique*. *European Planning Studies* 23, 1759-1769.
- Stangler, D. & Bell-Masterson, J. (2015) *Measuring an Entrepreneurial Ecosystem*. Kauffman Foundation Research Series on City, Metro, and Regional Entrepreneurship. Kansas City, Missouri: Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.
- Stephens, H. M., Partridge, M. D. & Faggian, A. (2013) *Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth in Lagging Regions*.



- Journal of Regional Science,
53(5), 778-812.
- Taich, C., Piazza, M., Carter, K. &
Wilcox, A. (2016) Measuring
Entrepreneurial Ecosystems.
Ohio: Urban Publications,
Cleveland State University.
- Van de Ven, A.H., Sapienza, H.J.,
Villanueva, J., 2007.
Entrepreneurial pursuits of self-
and collective interests.
*Strategic Entrepreneurship
Journal 1*, 353-370.
- William, W. C. & Lohnes, P. R. (1962)
Multivariate Procedures for the
Behavioural Sciences. New
York: John Wiley & Sons
- Wong, P. K., Ho, Y. P. & Autio, E.
(2005) Entrepreneurship,
Innovation and Economic
Growth: Evidence from GEM
Data. *Small Business
Economics*, 24(3), 335-350.
- World Bank. 2014. Doing Business 2015:
Going Beyond Efficiency.
Washington, DC: World Bank.