

appropriate strategies that would provide information found to be relevant to the issues that are of paramount importance. However, Ibidun and Ogundele (2013) believed that understanding the nature of the business environment, which can be classified into three namely dynamic (continuous changes), stable (relative changes), and unstable (frequent changes), would further help in repositioning the organisation through appropriate strategies while Ogundele (2005) added that the perception of the organisations about the nature of the business environment to a large extent depends on their size and industry in which it operates. The implication of this is that what constitutes a dynamic, stable or unstable business environment is contingent upon size and industry and that all business organisations can never be faced with the same nature of the business environment (dynamic, stable or unstable) as each would derive its peculiarity based on size and sector of the economy it belongs to.

2.2 Business Organisational Survival

Business survival is described as a business organisation's operation; ongoing concern sometimes refers to as manage to stay in business (Akindele et al., 2012). In an attempt to respond to the activities that will enable organisation to operate ongoing - concern, organisations are frequently in the process of structuring and restructuring to keep abreast with these activities, which do come in the form of complexities to include leadership styles, changes, uncertainty, conflict, culture, technology, structure, competitive market, profitability and workplace motivation (Adeoye, 2012). In view of these complexities as challenges, organisation needs to strategically plan and develop the most appropriate and adaptive structure that will enable it to utilise and maximise its resources and ultimately achieve organisational objectives (Mullins, 2002 and Akindele et al., 2012).

2.3 Business Organisational Growth

According to Laosebikan et al. (2013), organisational growth means different things to different organisations because many parameters a company may use to measure its growth. This is so because the ultimate goal of most organisations is profitability. Most organisations

will measure their development in terms of net profit, revenue, and other financial data. Additional criteria for assessing organisational growth are the volume of sales, number of employees, physical expansion, product line success, or increased market share (Lipton and Mark, 2003). In the views of Roberts and John (2004), organisational growth will be gauged by how well a firm does relative to the goals it has set for itself. In the same vein, Coffman et al. (2002) in Oginni (2010) were of the opinion that the intention and desire to keep the business to operate ongoing concern calls for growth of the organisation; otherwise, such organisations will cease to exist. Aluko et al (1999), however, added another dimension to what organisational development is all about by saying that it is something for which most organisations strive, regardless of their size.

2.4 Factors that affect enterprise performance

Funding: Funds is one of the essential parts in managing SMEs. The effective and efficient utilisation of fund bring into a manifestation of other determinant factors. According to Ogunjuiba, Ohuche and Adenuga (2014); finance contributes to the tune of 25% SMEs success among the determinant factors. Uduak (2009) in Banabo and Koroye (2011) shed more light on these by revealing that through lending activities, financial inject funds into the economy which if it is effectively utilised will improve the standard of living, enhance enterprises performance and invariably add value to the bottom line of the economic development.

Education: Education can be in two forms-formal or informal. The knowledge of both can be blended together to give customer satisfaction in the firm. The effectiveness of introduction of management education by Richardson (1940) cited in Wanger, (2010) a programme in real estate management taught at Oxford University in the UK in the mid 13,00s and in the USA has become an eye opener for many universities academics and other institutions worldwide to adopt same. The government must intensify efforts to ensure the introduction of entrepreneurship as a compulsory course at all educational system levels and put every necessary thing in place for effective functioning of Technical and vocational schools in the state where pupil can be trained with various skills.

Technology: Technology takes an inevitable part as regards to enterprises performance in the stiff competitive environment. Technology changes in a dynamic manner with the potentiality of impacting negatively on the firm's competitive position. Looking from SME performance, it can be reasonably gathered that the emergence of technology and it uses such as digital camera in lieu of pinhole camera, computer instead of manual typewriter and other presence of new modern technology have changed the face of enterprises activities. However, Oghojafor (2010) shows that technology possesses both opportunities and hazards, hence, there is need for proper and careful monitoring of the environment to pick out the various technology that will best enhance individual SME performance and firm who failed to accentuate these will gradually lose out and invariably can lead to it extinction. The finding shows that performance of enterprises can be improved by using new technology; it saves cost and ensures enterprises success. This is consistent to the literature in Jasra, et al (2010).

Infrastructure: infrastructure such as: power, good road network, steady water supply, effective communication system and market are referred to as flavour on the performance of SME. The absence of the facilities mentioned above in the lives of SMEs act as a catalyst for low performance, which invariably results in winding up if necessary step is not taken on time. The problem of erratic power supply alone has caused havoc in the performance of SME such as: reduction in quality of product, decline in production, inflation, low labor turnover, and unemployment to mention but a few.

Government Policies: Government creates rules and sometimes changes the rules which can affect the way enterprises operate. The government policy formulation system is capable of promoting innovation and new enterprises start-up. As part of government policy to boost the performance of SME, policy must be established to strengthen the financial support mechanisms of the Enterprises from the financial institution.

Raw Materials: This is the input that the firm works with to produce output. The absent or the low supply of these raw materials increase cost of production. Manufacturers Association of

Nigeria (Ibrahim, 2011) observed that inadequate supplies of raw materials cause stagnation, low quality of products, and poor performance, among others. This shows that adequate supplies of raw materials ensure the good performance of the Enterprises.

Entrepreneur Competencies: Awe (2012) viewed an entrepreneur as a person who organises and manages a commercial undertaking with the ultimate purpose of profit-making as a return on investment. Entrepreneur can be described as an innovating man, path-breaker and a pacesetter of economic and industrial growth. Their capabilities in terms of systematic ways of handling the available resources with the right knowledge of what it takes to make Enterprises to perform indicate his competency. Therefore, entrepreneur from SMES perspective can be described as a person breaking away from the traditional base of his economic activity and catching on to a relatively new line of enterprises, service or manufacturing. Hence, an entrepreneur's hallmark has been the ability to identify, exploit, and make a success of opportunities.

2.4 Relationship between environmental factors, Business survival and Growth

Oginni (2012) believed that analysis of business environment is the examination and appraisal of the opportunities and threats provided by the environment and the potential strengths and weaknesses the business possesses. Carrasco (2007) in Oginni (2012) however, opined that opportunities and threats are associated with a business's external environment while strengths and weaknesses are associated with the business's internal environment. Consequently, external analysis examines opportunities and threats that exist in the environment while internal analysis examines strengths and weaknesses within the business with a view of using these to combat the external forces. However, both opportunities and threats exist independently of the firm. To Oginni (2012), the internal environment is always manipulated in response to the dictate of the external environment in an attempt to meet organisational objectives. Ghazali et al (2010) views supported this belief. Ibidunn, et al (2013) analysed the critical internal and external factors that affect Malaysia's strategic planning. The internal and external factors examined in their

study included strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Their study showed that firm's strengths are related to their financial resources and the weaknesses are related to the firms' management. The study further revealed that the external factors that become opportunities to the firms are support and encouragement from the government. Threats are the bureaucratic procedures that firms have to face to get plan approval and certificate of fitness.

Pulendran et al (2000) in their related work on business environment observed that the external environment in which organisations operate is complex and constantly changing and found that a significant characteristic of the external environment and business organisation is competition. This was supported by the views of Asika, (2001) that organisations that recognise the presence and intensity of competition have a greater tendency to seek out information about customers for evaluation and to use such information to their advantage, thus enabling competition to drive business organisations to look for their customers to understand better ways to meet their needs, wants, and thereby enhances organisational performance (Azhar, 2008).

According to Alexander (2000), the dynamic and rapidly changing environment in which most organisations compete had made business environment (political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, e.t.c.) to have significant impact on organisational survival and performance (effectiveness, efficiency, increase in sales, achievement of corporate goals e.t.c.) thus, organisations should pay more attentions to their environment by conducting and embarking on periodic scanning. In a related work by Adeoye (2012), it was stated that in the manufacturing industry, environmental changes are continuously exerting new pressures on company performance and to respond to these changes, some companies within the apparel industry have formulated and implemented strategies to reorganise and reform the way products are manufactured and distributed to final consumers, thus, the impact of environmental factors on business performance towards profit objective is found to have an increasingly stronger interrelationship which require a more sophisticated business strategies.

Ogundele and Opeifa (2004) summed it up in their related work on environment and entrepreneurship by saying that external environment and their factors helps visualise the analysis of business survival and growth in an attempt to enhance understanding of how environmental factors work together with the variables of business survival and growth to determine the future of business organisation.

3.0 Theoretical Review

3.1 Legitimacy Theory

This theory supports the notion that company alters their reporting policies to show that their operations are consistent with the social priorities and expectations of the society (Deegan & Gordon 1996 as cited in Al-Hadi, 2019). Legitimacy theory also establishes an incentive for corporate environment reporting, stemming from the existence of a general social contract between companies and society (Cai, Cui, & Jo, 2016). According to Junru (2013), the argument that the increased environmental disclosures and reporting witnessed resulted from pressures from stakeholders was founded on the legitimacy theory over the years. Companies use the legitimacy perspective to disclose voluntarily environmental information which shows that they are conforming to the expectations and values of the society within which they operate (Al-Hadi, 2019) By communicating environmental information the company makes itself look legitimate in the public pressure on the business (Dang, 2018), they need to legitimise their existence to society. Legitimacy theory, therefore, posits that by providing sufficient social and environmental disclosures, the entity hopes to improve its overall public image and ultimately justify its continued existence (Elijido-Ten, 2004).

Under this theory, CSED (communication medium) can be used as a tool by the companies to communicate information about their operations and activities (practices) to meet the society expectations to maintain its license to operate in the society (Dutta & Nezlobin, 2017). According to Fuadah, et al., (2019), Legitimacy theory relates to the level and types of corporate social disclosure in the annual report which directly relates to management's perceptions of the concerns of the community. This theory typically suggests that firms use declarations to manage their image with a legitimacy crisis

when an adverse change exists in the enterprise's public perception. The legitimacy theory believes that the management provides information to make the company look good in the eyes of stakeholders, but this information may be suitable for making sound investment decisions (Huang, Duan, & Zhu, 2017). Legitimacy theory, on the other hand, emphasises why corporations disclose environmental information to the society (Dang, 2018).

3.2 Stakeholders Theory

The stakeholder theory's fundamental proposition is that the outcome of the efficient management of the company and stakeholders relationship determinants the firm's success. (Jha, & Cox, 2015). In this case, the stakeholders are identified by the organisation of concern by a perceived strategic need to manage particular relationships to achieve their aims (Kang, & Shin, 2016). A basis for stakeholder theory is that companies are so large and their impact on society so persuasive that they should discharge on accountability to many more sectors of society than solely to shareholders. Not only are shareholders affected by companies, but they affect enterprises in the same way (Dang, 2018). There are two branches of stakeholder theory: a normative (ethical) branch of stakeholder theory and managerial branch of stakeholder theory (Jha, & Cox, 2015). The policy perspective of stakeholder theory equally treats all the stakeholders of the company and does not take into account the power of each stakeholder (Deegan & Jeffrey 2006 as cited in Jha, & Cox, 2015). The normative perspective of stakeholder theory asks the managers to work for the benefits of all the stakeholders (Deegan & Unerman, 2006).

As far as, the managerial perspective of stakeholder theory is concerned, it takes into account the interests of a limited number of interested parties, who have significant power to influence the organisation. The power of the company depends on the nature of (critical) resources held by the stakeholders (Jha, & Cox, 2015). The theory supports the idea that the behaviour of various stakeholder groups is what encourages management match corporate needs with their surroundings (Lin, & Dong, 2018). The managerial branch of stakeholder theory provides a framework in which to analyse CSED in an organisation centred way. The success of

appropriately managing stakeholders through the discharge of accountability using CSED is arguably some form of organisational legitimacy (Salvi, et al., 2018).

3.3 Positive Accounting Theory

This theory proposes and explains why firms make voluntary social disclosures. Based on the original work of Nguyen, & Tran, (2019), the positive accounting theory have directly sought to establish evidence for the political cost hypothesis as an explanation for firms social disclosures. The theory is based on the propositions that managers, shareholders, and regulators/politicians are rational and attempt to maximise their value, which is directly related to their compensation and, hence, their wealth (Nguyen, et al., 2017). In their study, Nguyen, & Tran, (2019) argued that, positive accounting theory is an expression of neo-classical economic theory. Fundamental to it is a belief in rational choice theory, that is, material self-interest usually referred to as opportunistic behaviour as the basis for all economic activities. Therefore, in positive accounting theory, self-interest (opportunistic behaviour) is the reason for the choice of accounting methods and techniques as well as policy decisions. Nguyen, & Tran, (2019) argued that the objective of positive accounting theory is to describe, explain and predict accounting practice of managers. So it will be clear which firms publish certain information like corporate disclosure. The positive accounting approach says nothing about which reporting method should be used as a positive theory based on empirical information and is not normative.

Öztekin (2015), among other scholars, dismissed the positive accounting arguments on the grounds of the theoretical framework's underlying assumptions. As they suggested, positive theories are not about what (social) reporting should be, but rather about what it is on the face of it. On the basis of explaining why firms are making social disclosures, positive accounting explanations are less easily dismissed. Casual observations, for example reveals that positive accounting explanations rely on empirical evidence largely identical to that used in support of other explanations (most notably, legitimacy theory) of social disclosure, explanations which, incidentally Poddi, et al.

(2016) seem to find more acceptable. As these scholars note, a number of empirical studies have shown strong associations between disclosure and firm size, and between disclosure and type of industry. In fact, the size disclosure relationship appears empirically the most robust. Such results are claimed in support of legitimacy theory, as well as in favour of positive accounting theory (Rosa, Liberatore, Mazzi, & Terzani, 2018).

4.0 Empirical Review

Aziz and Yasin (2010) conducted research to assess how Market Orientation (MO) and External Environment (EE) will influence performance among SMEs in the Agro-Food Sector in Malaysia. MO involves customer competitor orientation, inter-functional coordination, and information while EE include market technology turbulence and competitive intensity are all the factors that influenced business performance. Questionnaire was issued to the managers of the selected food and beverage manufacturers' directory, which serves as the sources of data used for the study, and regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses of the study. On the MO, the result indicates that customer-competition orientation and information dissemination were positively related to business performance while inter-functional coordination is not related significantly to business performance. In the same line, the result of external technology turbulence and competitive intensity does not moderate the relationship between MO and business performance.

Similarly, Philip (2011) carried out research in order to investigate the factors affecting Business Success of Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Bangladesh. The researcher makes use of product and services, external environment, management and know-how, resources and finance, a way of doing business and cooperation, and SMEs characteristics as the factors that affect the business success of SMEs. Questionnaire was used to collect data, and it was analysed by through SPSS software that gives relevant analysis in terms of reliability analysis, frequency analysis, regression analysis, one-way ANOVA and T- test. The result of the study shows that the most variable that affect business success of SMEs were management know-how, products and services, the way of doing business, and external environment, and

there has significant relationship with business success of SMEs. But resources and finance and SMEs characteristics do not have a significant relationship with the business success of SMEs.

Shehu et al. (2013) carried out a study to investigate the Mediating Effect between Some Determinants of SMEs Performance in Nigeria. The research uses Owner/manager knowledge, competitive intensity, complexity of marketing, technical competence, firm size, and advisory services as the factors that influence or affects SMEs performance in Nigeria. The study make use of structure questionnaire survey that consist a sample of two hundred and seventy-eight manufacturing SMEs operating or functioning in Kano State, Nigeria,

and a total of one hundred and ninety-eight questionnaire were filled correctly and return which represent 71% of the response rate, and also a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to test the hypotheses under study. The result of the study indicates a positive and strong relationship between advisory services, complexity of marketing decision, owner/manager knowledge and SMEs performance, and the result shows that there is no positive relationship between firm size, technical competence services, and SMEs performance. The study result also shows that advisory services mediate the relationship between owner-manager knowledge and marketing decision complexity.

Anga (2014) investigate the Determinants of Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs) in Nigeria. Survey questionnaire was used to collect data from two hundred and thirty sample of SMEs under study, and the data collected was analysed by SPSS and also logistic regression analysis was employed to measure the determinants of SMEs whereby internal and external factors which involve risk taking, communication/business skills, ability to make decision, management skills, finance, government policies, corruption, marketing information communication technology, and infrastructure all influence performance of SMEs. The result shows that risk-taking, communication/business skills, ability to make a decision has no significant effect on the performance of SMEs. Finance, government policy, market of the product shows an adverse impact on the performance of SMEs. While corruption, information communication technology (ICT) shows a positive relationship

with SMEs' performance, and the last result indicates that infrastructure affects the performance of SMEs in Nigeria.

5.0 Conclusion

Small scale businesses are indispensable catalyst and an important contributor to the economic growth in every nation due to their vast irreplaceable prospect in the economy. Small businesses serve as a laboratory for the development and innovation of new ideas and offerings before market commercialisation to prevent the production of goods and services that do not meet consumer expectation. This unique nature of small scale business makes the personalisation and modification of products meet consumer preference easy. Hence, small business operators must develop and adopt scientific and rational business management strategies to aid and increase their understanding of both their business and their environment. Sound knowledge of the dynamic business environment will facilitate the planning and predictions on the most significant factors that affect business survival.

In conclusion, it is imperative to realise that performance goals and targets, set in production and low costs for the SME can only be achieved when SMEs are provided with good SME friendly policies, conducive operating environment, improvements in infrastructure, peace and security; and have the right type of personnel, that have cooperative attitudes and spirit, good teamwork, high morals, high motivation, high-performance goals, have the desire to achieve the company's goals and objectives and are served with good communication.

6.0 REFERENCES

1. Adeoye, A. O. (2012). Impact of External Business Environment on Organizational Performance on Food and Beverage Industry in Nigeria. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 6 (2), pp. 56-65.
2. Akindele, R. I., Oginni, B. O. and Omoyele, S. O. (2012). Survival of Private Universities in Nigeria: Issues, Challenges and Prospects. *International Journal of Innovative Research in Management*, 1 (2), pp. 30-43.
3. Azhar, K. (2008). *Strategic Management and Business Policy*, Tata, New Delhi: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
4. Ciano, J. (2011). *Principle of Business Survival in a Difficult Environment*. Presentation to NIC Entrepreneur Club Workshop (November, 2011).
5. Ibidunni, O. S. and Ogundele, O. J. K. (2013). Competition in Marketing, Survival Yardstick for Small and Medium Enterprises in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (1), pp. 231-240.
6. Oginni, B.O & Faseyiku, I.O. (2012). *Fundamentals of Human Capital Management: A process approach*, Mankore Print Ltd, Somolu - Lagos.
7. Oginni, B.O. (2012). *The turbulent Business Environment in Nigeria*, Somolu - Lagos Shecom Press Ltd.
8. Jednak, S.; Kragulj, D. (2015) Achieving Sustainable Development and Knowledge-Based Economy in Serbia. *Manag. J. Sustain. Bus. Manag. Solut. Emerg. Econ.* 2015,20,1-12.
9. Rezny, L.; Buchanan White, J.; Maresova, P. (2019) The knowledge economy: Key to sustainable development? *Struct. Chang. Econ. Dyn.* 2019, 51, 291-300.
10. Sinakou, E.; Boeve-de Pauw, J.; Van Petegem, P. (2019) Exploring the concept of sustainable development within education for sustainable development: Implications for ESD research and practice. *Environ. Dev. Sustain.* 2019, 21,1-10.
11. Dima, A.M.; Begu, L.; Vasilescu, M.D.; Maasen, M.A. (2018) The Relationship between the Knowledge Economy and Global Competitiveness in the European Union. *Sustainability* 2018,10,1706.
12. Vallerie, D. Peterson, R. Entrepreneurship and economic growth: Evidence from emerging and developed countries. *Entrep. Reg. Dev.* 2009, 21, 459-480. [CrossRef]
13. Busu, M.; Trica, C.L. (2019) (2019) Sustainability of Circular Economy Indicators and Their Impact on Economic Growth of the European Union. *Sustainability* 2019,11, 5481.
14. Kisel'akova, D.; Sira, E.; Sofrankova, B. The ease of doing business index in

- selected countries. *J. Manag. Bus. Res. Pract.* 2019, 11, 8-14.
15. Ocak, M.; Findik, D. (2019) The Impact of Intangible Assets and Sub-Components of Intangible Assets on Sustainable Growth and Firm Value: Evidence from Turkish Listed Firms. *Sustainability* 2019, 11, 5359.
 16. Mikalauskiene, A.; Atkociuniene, Z. (2019) Knowledge Management Impact on Sustainable Development. *Monten. J. Econ.* 2019,15,149-160.
 17. Li, Y.; Song, Y.; Wang, J.; Li, C. (2019) Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Sharing, and Innovation Performance: Evidence from the Chinese Construction Industry. *Sustainability* 2019,11, 2713.
 18. Cherulinam, Francis (2012), *Business Environment: Text and Cases*, Himalaya Publishing House, Mumbai. 21st Revised Edition, 2012.
 19. Hans V. Basil (2016). Role of Role and Responsibilities of Managerial Economists: Empowering Business through Methodology and Strategy. *Nitte Management Review*, 10(2), December 2016, pp. 27-43

© GSJ