

# STRATEGIC ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE IN NIGERIA BANKING INDUSTRY

Olufemi OGUNKOYA

Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Nigeria

Email: ogunkoyaoa@yahoo.com

## *Abstract*

*The study examines the effect of strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage: a study of Nigeria Banking Industry. The study objectively investigates the association between strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage in Nigeria. The study employed a survey research design. Analysis was based on primary data generated through a well structured strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage scale and was administered to one hundred and twenty-nine respondents. Responses to research statements were scaled and converted to quantitative data via code manual developed for the study to enable segmentation of the data responses into dependent and independent variables based on strategic entrepreneurship and associated competitive advantage variables. Regression models were specified, estimated and evaluated. The result showed that strategic entrepreneurship has significant positive individual and combined effect on competitive advantage. The study concluded that strategic entrepreneurship is a very important tool for improving competitive advantage by being creative and offering what the competitors are not willing and able to offer. And therefore, recommended that the more researches are carried out on how to best satisfy the customer the more they get customer loyalty which brings growth to the industry and adds to the goodwill of the firm.*

*Keywords: •strategic entrepreneurship, innovation, competitive advantage, & creativity, resource based view*

## **1. Introduction**

Once entrepreneurship and strategic management are used in research, growth and wealth creation comes into play (Hitt & Ireland, 2000; Amit & Zott, 2001; Ireland, Hitt, Camp & Sexton, 2001, 2002; Morris, 1998; Priem & Butler, 2001; Hitt, Ireland). Indeed, the essences of entrepreneurship's are growth and wealth expansion (Certo, Covin, Daily & Dalton, 2001; Covin, Ireland, & Kuratko 2003). Additionally, entrepreneurship progressively is seen as an obligation to the creation of wealth in rising, developing and developed countries as an outcome of individual firms' action (Zahra, Ireland, Gutierrez & Hitt, 2000; Peng, 2001). Likewise, understanding the motives for distinction in wealth creation among firms' in various economies is concerned by strategic entrepreneurship (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997; Farjoun, 2002).

Wealth creation and firm growth are interrelated. Generally, growth presence will help creation of wealth to firm through improving economies of scale in addition

to competitive advantage. These results give further resources and helps in attaining competitive advantage. Additionally, improved wealth makes it attainable for individual firms to allocate resources to improve more growth. This can be particularly common among new venture firms—firms that regularly produce wealth in the course of rapid growth. This paper assumes the value of firm growth whereas examining competitive advantage as the finish product of the effective use of strategic entrepreneurship.

Strategic entrepreneurship as stated in this study was not presumed nor argued that they are one with entrepreneurship however that has been subdivided. In reality, both entrepreneurship and strategic management researches have conferred outstanding and valuable addition to competitive advantage. However, the same as alternative researches, it was deemed that two disciplines are mutually supportive. Meyer and Heppard (2000), as an example, noted the indivisible between the strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage, making it complicated to know one field's research findings while not at the same time studying the results reported in the other. Barney and Arikan (2001) opined that there is a close, although not absolutely specific link between theories of competitive advantage and theories of creativity and entrepreneurship. Understanding the connection between entrepreneurship and strategic management gives positive prospects for researchers exploring how organisations capitalize on wealth. Although wealth creation is concerned by both entrepreneurship and strategic management, their focus differs slightly.

Strategic Entrepreneurship comprises two disciplines, those of Entrepreneurship and Strategic Management. The previous has got to do with actions for and behaviours conducive to identifying and utilizing profitable opportunities in the environment (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). The previous include set of actions designed to accomplish competitive advantage and attain results over average by intelligent and fact-based selection among alternatives resulting in such advantage. In other words, Strategic Entrepreneurship can be defined as a procedure that shows decision-making and managerial efforts for identifying the most effective opportunities which are most profitable and then for utilizing them through strategic actions. Therefore, organisations develop organisational mechanism which are obliges by strategic entrepreneurship to improves their entrepreneurial activity in the course of new strategic action patterns without the accomplishment of the current competitive platform being rejected. The concept of Strategic Entrepreneurship brings about the combination of entrepreneurship and strategic management as a result of it's at the intersection on those two disciplines that sustainable competitive advantage can be achieved. The development of the Strategic Entrepreneurship construct is very important for variety of fundamental reasons.

The growth of economies and businesses efficiency is influence by strategic entrepreneurship and also facilitates competitive advantage through diffusion processes, usage practices and the success of commercial. In addition, entrepreneurship has a direct on growth and competitiveness. The relationship between strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage has hastened research concern in entrepreneurship development, and particularly, for over a decade, huge research interest has been attracted through the concept of strategic entrepreneurship. Various researchers in business field have argued the possibility

that entrepreneurship development contributes to competitive advantage via the competencies it helps to develop within the organisation (Timil & Bartus, 2006; Morgan and Sanchez 2008; Amue, 2013).

Previous research has revealed that there has been a fall in market share engaged by a variety of firms in Nigeria, as a result of inadequate utilization or misallocation of their organisations' resources, lack of implementation of precise policies, strategies and actions designed to attain competitive height among firms are not in place. Study and explanation of strategic entrepreneurship, innovation and competitive advantage is a persistent theme studied by academics, consultants and practitioners. The internalization of economy, dynamic nature of the environment, greater competitive firms, the need for continuous innovation, product customization and growing use of strategic forces firms to face challenges of improving their competitive advantage. These difficulties are greater for small firm using strategic entrepreneurship because their economy of scale and their resources are less than those of large firms. This research examines the link between strategic entrepreneurship and competitive advantage (Teece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997). Base on these reasons this research is been carried out to identify the effect of strategic entrepreneurship on competitive advantage of selected banks in Nigeria.

This paper sought to clarify the validity of this research by testing this hypothesis:

**H<sub>0</sub>:** strategic entrepreneurship has no significant effect on competitive advantage.

This research will enlighten the organization, and most importantly the potential readers, and will make sincere fellow scholars understand the impact of supply chain management in an organization distribution cycle. The significance of this study is also to see to the inadequacy in the distribution channel and how it affects new product adoption process, and to explore effective remedial ways.

Furthermore, another importance of the study is to know how consumers are able to adopt a new product. At the end, this research would be useful to guide the organization as well as other researcher.

The study will be subdivided into four sections in which the first section dealt with the introduction. Section two of this study elaborated on the literature review. Section three dealt with the research methodology and analysis. Section four focused on the summary, conclusion, recommendation and finally the references used for the study.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1 Strategic Entrepreneurship**

The arguments relating strategic entrepreneurship build on four main assertions regarding the nature of strategic entrepreneurship. First, as its name suggests, strategic entrepreneurship is the melding of the strategy and entrepreneurship domains. Firms pursuing strategic entrepreneurship engage in both the opportunity-seeking activities needed by entrepreneurship and the advantage-seeking activities needed by strategy (Covin et al., 2003). The argument is that either entrepreneurship or strategy, the desire of firms to create wealth on a continual basis cannot rely exclusively on the activities they are associated with. The reason for this is that actions taken to implement a chosen strategy enable a firm to

extract value from existing domains. As such, these actions provide wealth creation with in the short run.

However, profitable niches change, shift, and disappear quickly in today's economy (Ireland & Hitt, 1999). Thus, a firm focused only on taking actions to implement a particular strategy might become the most effective producer within a declining market space. Activities related with entrepreneurship, on the other hand, identify new niches and ways to serve them. Without being able to successfully use a chosen strategy—one that creates a competitive advantage—a firm will soon face imitator competitors whose offerings will erode its profits. Thus, the actions related with strategy and with entrepreneurship are each necessary, but not individually sufficient, to promote sustained wealth creation.

Moreover, these two elements must work in concert with one another. The union of strategy and entrepreneurship is one of the foundational notions of strategic entrepreneurship.

Strategic entrepreneurship also involves finding a balance between opportunity-seeking and advantage-seeking activities (Covin et al., 2003). Opportunity seeking involves sorting through potential opportunities to identify areas of future activity for the firm. The overall success of opportunity-seeking efforts depends on how the firm absorbs and integrates new and existing knowledge. More specifically, opportunity seeking is inherently a learning process, wherein a firm gathers knowledge from outside its borders to supplement its own knowledge stocks (Chesbrough, 2003). Outside sources include other firms that are acquired, alliance partners, and promising start-ups that the firm supports through corporate venture funds (Ireland & Webb, 2007). Building a diverse knowledge base enables a firm to expand its competitive repertoire. An expanded repertoire is essential for success during periods of disruption and unpredictability, because executives cannot know in advance the responses their firms will need to enact.

## **2.2 Perspective of Entrepreneurship**

Entrepreneurship is a process of creating something new with value by devoting necessary time and effort, assuming the accompanying financial, psychic, social risks, receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction and independence (Robert Hisrich, 2002). Hence, Strategic Entrepreneurship can be regarded as the process of adopting a plan or strategy in the creation of something new so as to avoid unnecessary risk or loss in order to achieve the objective of receiving rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction. In recognizing the importance of the evolution of entrepreneurship into the twenty first century, Kuratko (2009) developed an integrated definition that acknowledged the vital factors necessary for this phenomenon. Entrepreneurship is a dynamic process of vision, change and creation. It requires an application of energy and passion towards the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions.

## **2.3 Competitive Advantage**

Competitive advantage is seen as a benefit that is gained by the organisation over its competitors by offering its customers greater value, which could either, be through lower prices or by providing additional distinct benefits and services that justify similar or sometimes higher prices (Ehmke, 2011). Competitive advantage is achieved by a distinctive strategy that sets the organisation apart from its rivals (Hough et al., 2008).

Competitive advantage is the advantage that an organisation has over its competitors which is gained by offering customers great value products, which is achieved by either provision of lower prices or providing much greater benefits and services that justify higher prices (International School of Management, 2012). Competitive advantage in an organisation is seen as the availability of core competencies which are the capabilities or the skills that an organisation puts effort into and excels in while maintaining its target of the overall mission (Divandri and Yousefi, 2011).

Competitive advantage gives a firm an edge over its rivals and an ability to generate greater value for the firm and its stakeholders. Therefore to ensure survival in a highly competitive environment such as Nigeria, An strategic-based organisation have to learn to weather the storms of competition and beat today's ferocious market forces and volatility by providing quality products, distinct product features and well packaged value adding products that satisfy customer need at affordable prices with effective promotional strategy via its possession of strategic networks. Every firm possesses certain unique capabilities and competences that distinguish it from other firms and these features, such as strategic in this case, greatly influence its performance in the market and determine to what extent a firm survives the pressure from global market competition; and this cannot be achieved except the right competitive strategy is developed and implemented appropriately.

#### **2.4 Creation of Competitive Advantage**


Michael Porter promoted the idea that the industry structure and the organisational positioning are the basis for the models of competitive advantage. Porter's five forces diagram provides the idea of Porter's theory for competitive advantage. Competitive strategy need to grow out of a sophisticated understating of the rules of completion that in turn determine the attractiveness of the industry. "The ultimate aim of competitive strategy is to cope with and, ideally, to change those rules of the firm's behaviour" (Porter, 2008). The five forces as developed by Porter determine the profitability of the industry and that some industries will be more attractive compared to others (figure 1).

#### **2.5 Emergence of Competitive Advantage**

In an organisation the competitive advantage emerges from both internal and external sources within its operating environment. The internal environment is when the organisation creates innovative capabilities and skills which would be encouraged by the pressures in the market environment (Grant, 2012). He further suggests that the external sources which are important in the emergence of organisational competitive advantage include:

- New technology developments
- New or changing customer needs
- The emergence of new industry segment
- Availability and changing of input costs

Bhatt & Grover, 2005; Chen & Tsou, 2007 have framed the discussion in terms of strategic capabilities, and argue that managing strategic is a capability that can create uniqueness and provide organisations a competitive advantage. Competitive advantage would be meaningful if it has the attributes that add a significant value to the operations of an organisation.



**Figure 1. Porter's 5 Forces - Elements of Industry Structure**

Source: Adapted from Porter, 2008.

### 3. Theoretical Framework

#### 3.1 Resource Based View

The Resource-Based View (RBV) was put forward by Wernerfelt (1984) based on the earlier work of Penrose (1959). The RBV stresses the importance of internal idiosyncratic resources in explaining the differences in success levels amongst firms when competing in the same industry (Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991). Resource-based is defined as the resources and capabilities possessed by competing firms that may differ, and these differences may be long lasting (Rumelt, 1984; Wernerfelt, 1984; Barney, 1991). The RBV is the first stream in the field of strategic management that has significantly grounded the understanding of the variations of success levels in firms. However, the literature suggests that not all resources contribute equally to a firm's success (Barney, 1991; Petraf, 1993; Adner & Zemsky, 2006; Moliterno & Wiersema, 2007). The resources that contribute to a firm's success are valuable, rare, inimitable, non-substitutable, appropriable, and specialized capabilities that bestow the firm's competitive advantage. These resources are intangible in nature and include staff knowhow, organisational culture and reputation. These resources are called strategic assets (Itami & Roehl, 1987; Hall, 1992; Amit & Shoemaker, 1993; Barney, 2001; Ray et al., 2004; Newbert, 2007).

The RBV has gained importance in the field of strategic management. Specifically, during the 1990s, the RBV gained much attention in explaining why some firms outperformed others (Barney, 1991; Ray et al., 2004). Within the RBV, capabilities are referred to as being the most important contributor to a firm's success (Charan, 1991; Day, 1994; Grant, 1996; Teece et al., 1997; McEvily & Chakravarthy, 2002; Grant, 2002; Teece, 2007; Moliterno & Wiersema, 2007), and are ultimately reflected in managers and staff know-how (Grant, 2002).

The resource based view (RBV) is a management tool used to evaluate the resources available in the firm. In essence, the resource-based view is based on the idea that the effective and efficient application of all useful resources that the organisation can gather helps determine its competitive advantage. It seeks to explain the internal sources of a firm's sustained competitive advantage. Its innermost proposition is that if a firm is to attain a state of sustainable competitive advantage it must obtain and control valuable, rare, inimitable, and non-substitutable (VRIN) resources and capabilities, plus have the firm in the place that can absorb and apply them. The resource based view as a foundation for the competitive advantage of a firm is rooted primarily in the application of a bunch of valuable tangible or intangible resources at the organisation's disposal. A resource based view of the firm argued that the success of a firm in its product market was a result of its advantages in the factor market (or resources) gave a practical approach to the resource-based view, by calling them the 'core competence of the corporation'. They also clarified that to add value to the firm, resources must be inimitable.

Barney identified four characteristics of resources that would be required to generate sustainable competitive advantage to firms - resources must be valuable, rare, inimitable and non-substitutable (**VRIN**).

#### **4. Research Objective**

The study aims to objectively investigate the impact of strategic entrepreneurship on competitive advantage.

##### **4.1 Methodology of Research**

The research design used for this research was survey research design. It was employed in an attempt to gather data and to investigate answers to research questions from respondents and for test of hypothesis. However, this method of research design was adopted to describe the effect of strategic entrepreneurship on competitive advantage with respect to the focus area of study. This is because the study area (Nigeria Bank) is one of the most creative, innovative and competitive industry in Nigeria.

The target population of the study would consist of selected respondents representing from the Nigeria banking sector with not less than 5yrs working experience. And the selected banks include Wema Bank Plc, Guarantee Trust Bank, FCMB and Zenith Bank Plc situated in Ijebu North-East, Ogun State. The population of the study was drawn from twenty one thousand, two hundred and eighty two (21,282) employees (table 1).

**Table 1****The target population**

<b>Banks</b>	<b>No of Employees</b>
FCMB	9,062
Guaranty Trust Bank Plc	2,901
Wema Bank Plc	1,440
Zenith Bank Plc	7,879
Total	21,282

*Source: NSE Fact Book (2013)*

The population was evenly distributed among staffs from Wema Bank Plc, Guarantee Trust Bank, FCMB and Zenith Bank Plc that are deemed qualified and also consisting of males, females, different age brackets, working experience and qualifications of the respondents under the study.

The study adopted a simple random sampling technique in the selection of sample respondents. The respondents would be distributed into different strata (i.e. lower, middle and top level). However, the respondents would be selected based on their work experience, position and educational background.

$$\text{Sample Size} = (0.5 \times (1+0.5)) / ((0.05/1.96)^2)$$

$$\text{Sample Size} = 0.25 / ((0.002551\dots)^2)$$

$$\text{Sample Size} = 0.25 / 0.00065077\dots$$

$$\text{Sample Size} = 384.16\dots$$

$$\text{True Sample} = 384.16\dots \times 21282 / 384.16\dots + 21282-1$$

$$\text{True Sample} = 8175693.12 / 21665.16$$

$$\text{True Sample} = 129.3659239$$

The sample size of this study was 129 and would cut across the four selected banks in Ogun State, Nigeria. Staffs of one hundred and twenty-nine (129) were administered as the sample size of this research study.

In order to attain adequate, appropriate and reliable information, the research work adopted only primary source of data. The primary source of data included questionnaires, personal interviews, and discussions with key respondents or staff of the selected banks. The primary data is important because it provides the researcher with detailed data which were actual situations or responses arising out of the field study. Furthermore, the questionnaire was divided into two Parts – A and B. Part A included basic information on the demographic characteristics of the respondents, while Part B focused on the questions relating to research topic under study.

The primary data is expected to meet the expectation of the study, as it would be evaluated and validated by expert in the field of research. Therefore, the instrument is subjected to editing, evaluation and measurement against the research variables in order to ensure their completeness, consistency, accuracy and relevance.

#### **4.2 Research Question**

Therefore, the research questions obtained from the research objectives is does strategic entrepreneurship have significant positive impact on competitive advantage?



## 5. Results and Discussion

The study would adopt a simple percentage method with a frequency distribution table in order to present and interpret the outcome of each questionnaire as clearly as possible and a Regression method of analysis for the interpretation of the research hypotheses. Furthermore, SPSS software would be used in the analysis of primary data gathered through the administration of questionnaires. This is to enable the processed data and output to be presented into tables, for qualitative explanations and analyses of the research variables (table 2).

**Table 2**

**Demographic Data of Respondents**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>				
	57.0%	43.0%				
<b>Age of Respondents</b>	<b>25-35 years</b>	<b>36-45 years</b>	<b>46-55 years</b>	<b>56 years &amp; above</b>		
	54.8%	35.7%	9.0%	0.5%		
<b>Education</b>	<b>NCE/OND</b>	<b>HND/BSC</b>	<b>PGD/M.Sc</b>	<b>Ph.D</b>		
	10.9%	51.2%	34.4%	3.2%		
<b>Position</b>	<b>CEO</b>	<b>Top Manager</b>	<b>Middle Manager</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Others</b>	
	0.5%	15.8%	35.7%	47.5%	0.5%	
<b>Working Experience</b>	<b>1-4 years</b>	<b>5-10 years</b>	<b>11-15 years</b>	<b>16-20 years</b>	<b>Above 20 years</b>	
	31.2%	48.9%	14.5%	2.7%	2.7%	
<b>No of Employees</b>	<b>51-100</b>	<b>101-200</b>	<b>201-300</b>	<b>301-400</b>	<b>401-500</b>	<b>Above 500</b>
	2.7%	26.7%	2.7%	1.4%	4.1%	62.4%

Source: Author Survey, 2017.

### Hypothesis Testing

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** Strategic entrepreneurship has no significant impact on competitive advantage in Nigeria (table 3). In this section it was observed that the value of R = 0.977 and the coefficient of determination (Rsquare) of 0.955. This suggests the notion that Competitive Advantage is influenced by 95.5% of strategic entrepreneurship while the rest (100% - 95.5% = 4.5%) is explained by other causes.

**Table 3**

**Model Summary**

<b>Model Summary<sup>b</sup></b>					
<b>Model</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R Square</b>	<b>Adjusted R Square</b>	<b>Std. Error of the Estimate</b>	<b>Durbin-Watson</b>
1	.977 <sup>a</sup>	.955	.955	.21234946	1.874
a. Predictors: (constant) SE...					
b. Dependent Variable: CAD					

Source: Author Survey, 2017.

The durbin-watson figure 1.874 is close to the value of 2.0. Therefore, there is no problem of serial correlation in the model. Hence the model is good and can be used for prediction. There is no auto-correlation since the residuals are not serially correlated (table 4).

**Table 4**

ANOVA						
ANOVA <sup>b</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
1	Regression	122.273	1	122.273	2711.623	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	5.727	127	.045		
	Total	128.000	128			
a. Predictors: (constant) SE...						
b. Dependent Variable: CAD						

Source: Author Survey, 2017.

In this section it was observed that a probability level of significance value of 0.00. Therefore the probability (0.00) is much smaller than 0.05, then the multiple regression models can be used to predict the competitive advantage of organisation. The regression result of the study’s model suggests that the independent variables strategic entrepreneurship have significant effect on competitive advantage. The test of overall significance of regression implies testing the null hypothesis. The overall significance of regression is tested using Fisher’s statistics. In this study the calculated F\* value of 2711.623 is significant at p<0.05. It is therefore concluded that linear relationship exists between the dependent and independent variable of the model. Based on these findings, the postulation which states that there is no significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables is rejected. The evidence established that the independent explanatory variable strategic entrepreneurship have individual and combine impact on the competitive advantage of Nigeria banks (table 5).

**Table 5**

Coefficients								
Coefficients <sup>a</sup>								
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Significance	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	-6.070E-17	.019		.000	1.000		
	SE	.977	.019	.977	52.073	.000	1.000	1.000
a. Dependent Variable: CAD								

Source: Author Survey, 2017.

In this section it was observed that significant value of strategic entrepreneurship 0.00<0.05, then the appropriate basis for decision making in the

regression analysis can be concluded that strategic entrepreneurship have significant effect on competitive advantage. Thus, increasing the strategic entrepreneurship potential of an organisation can improve competitive advantage.

Based on the coefficient output - collinearity statistics, obtained VIF value of 1 000 meaning that the VIF value obtained is between 1 to 10, it can be concluded that there is no multi-collinearity symptoms.

## 6. Conclusions

Having analyzed data gathered and tested the hypothesis formulated; finding indicates that there is significant relationship between strategic entrepreneurship, innovation and competitive advantage of banks in Nigeria as indicated in the hypothesis. From the findings of the regression analysis, the study found that there was a variation of 92.4 % in competitive advantage due to changes in strategic entrepreneurship, innovation. This is an indication that 92.4% changes in competitive advantage could be accounted for by strategic entrepreneurship, innovation. The study further revealed that there was positive strong relationship between strategic entrepreneurship, innovation and competitive advantage as shown by strong positive correlation coefficient. From the finding on analysis of variance, the study found that the overall model had a significance value of 0.000 which shows that the data is ideal for making a conclusion on the population's parameter as the value of significance (p-value) is less than 5%. The study further revealed that there is significant relationship between strategic entrepreneurship, innovation and competitive advantage of banks in Nigeria. Therefore, it can be inferred that strategic entrepreneurship, innovation is a quintessential and imperative tool for ensuring competitive advantage.

Having analyzed data gathered and tested the hypothesis formulated; finding indicates that there is banks can improve its competitive advantage drastically by investing in innovation. It was also observed that uniqueness and pre-activeness goes a long way in determining the competitive advantage of banks in Nigeria as indicated in the hypothesis. Producing unique product and rendering unique services gives banks the competitive edge over their rivals. The study reveals that there are leading banks in the industry that invest more into R&D department to know more about current trends and how to better serve their customer has better chance of gaining competitive advantage thereby gaining customer loyalty. When banks are innovative minded and offer better product and services to their customers which their competitors are not aware of are prone to have competitive edge than their competitors from the part of their competitors' and to provide a better version of what their competitors' are offering so as to gain more customers' and to retain the loyalty of employees and customers' which supports the findings of Bassey et al (2005) that incorporating innovation in your business can help you save time and money and give you the competitive advantage to grow and adapt your business in the marketplace. From the findings of the regression analysis, the study found that there was a variation of 95.5 % in competitive advantage due to changes in innovation. This is an indication that 95.5 % changes in competitive advantage could be accounted for by innovation. The study further revealed that there was positive strong relationship between competitive advantage and innovation as shown by strong positive correlation coefficient. It was also observed that there was a variation of 92.4 % in competitive advantage due to changes in uniqueness and pro-

activeness. This is an indication that 92.4% changes in competitive advantage could be accounted for uniqueness and pro-activeness. The study further revealed that there is positive relationship between competitive advantage and uniqueness and pro-activeness as shown by the strong positive correlation coefficient. From the finding on analysis of variance, the study found that the overall model had a significance value of 0.000 which shows that the data is ideal for making a conclusion on the population's parameter as the value of significance ( $p$ -value) is less than 5%. Therefore, it can be inferred that uniqueness, pro-activeness and innovation are quintessential and imperative tool for ensuring competitive advantage.

This study has investigated the effect of strategic entrepreneurship on competitive advantage of banks in Nigeria. The results of this study revealed that there is strong relationship between strategic entrepreneurship, innovation and competitive advantage of banks in Nigeria. On the basis of the findings of this study, it can be concluded that strategic entrepreneurship no negative effect on competitive advantage. The study found that uniqueness and pro-activeness is very essential tool for maintaining competitive advantage. And also, innovation is also a very important tool for improving competitive advantage by offering what the competitors are not willing and able to offer. And also by making counter strategy to tackle the competitors in other to achieve competitive edge. It is also postulated that uniqueness, pro-activeness and innovativeness are the best tools for the management of Nigeria banks adopt in order for them to wax stronger in a global financial competitive environment.

The study indicates that the ability of a bank to invest in R&D department goes a long way in determining how competitive a bank can be. The findings insinuates that the more researches are carried out on how to best satisfy the customer the more they get customer loyalty which brings growth to the bank adds to the goodwill of the firm. It was also observed that there is no better way of serving the customers better than giving them something unique that is scarce and cannot be found from their direct competitors. It was also observed that been pro-active makes banks have an edge than their direct rival they tend to react to every opportunity first which is one of the key cog of been an entrepreneur. And you give new product and service to your customers and with new administrative technique you tend to boss the market single-handedly by gaining more customers which when you give are first at doing something that has not been seen before it brings about growth and brand loyalty.

## REFERENCES

- Adeniyi-Kie, A. (2004). ICT Entrepreneurship in Developing Countries and Poverty Alleviation. In *International Symposium on ICT Education and Application in Developing Countries (ICTES2004) Bahir Dar, Amhara Region*.
- Adner, R., & Zemsky, P. (2006). A demand-based perspective on sustainable competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(3), 215-239.
- Amit, R., & Zott, C. (2001). Value creation in e-business. *Strategic management journal*, 22(6-7), 493-520.

- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of management*, 17(1), 99-120.
- Barney, J. B. (2001). Resource-based theories of competitive advantage: A ten-year retrospective on the resource-based view. *Journal of management*, 27(6), 643-650.
- Barney, J. B., & Arian, A. M. (2001). The resource-based view: Origins and implications. *Handbook of strategic management*, 124188.
- Bhatt, G. D., Grover, V., & GROVER, V. (2005). Types of information technology capabilities and their role in competitive advantage: An empirical study. *Journal of management information systems*, 22(2), 253-277.
- Brorström, B. (2002). The world's richest municipality: The importance of institutions for municipal development. *Journal of Economic Issues*, 36(1), 55-78.
- Certo, S. T., Covin, J. G., Daily, C. M., & Dalton, D. R. (2001). Wealth and the effects of founder management among IPO-stage new ventures. *Strategic management journal*, 22(6-7), 641-658.
- Charan, R. (1991). How networks reshape organizations--for results. *Harvard Business Review*, 69(5), 104-115.
- Chen, J. S., & Tsou, H. T. (2007). Information technology adoption for service innovation practices and competitive advantage: The case of financial firms. *Information research: an international electronic journal*, 12(3), n3.
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). The logic of open innovation: managing intellectual property. *California Management Review*, 45(3), 33-58.
- Covin, J. G., Ireland, R. D., & Kuratko, D. F. (2003). The exploration and exploitation functions of corporate venturing. In *Academy of Management meetings*.
- Day, G. S. (1994). The capabilities of market-driven organizations. *the Journal of Marketing*, 37-52.
- Divandri, A., & Yousefi, H. (2011). Balanced Scorecard: A Tool for Measuring Competitive Advantage of Ports with Focus on Container Terminals. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 2(6), 472.
- Farjoun, M. (2002). Towards an organic perspective on strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(7), 561-594.
- Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 17(S2), 109-122.
- Grant, W. B. (2002). An estimate of premature cancer mortality in the US due to inadequate doses of solar ultraviolet-B radiation. *Cancer*, 94(6), 1867-1875.
- Hall, A. (1992). Signal transduction through small GTPases—a tale of two GAPs. *Cell*, 69(3), 389-391.
- Hitt, M. A., & Ireland, R. D. (2000). The intersection of entrepreneurship and strategic management research. *Handbook of entrepreneurship*, 45-63.

- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2001). Strategic entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial strategies for wealth creation. *Strategic management journal*, 22(6-7), 479-491.
- Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., Camp, S. M., & Sexton, D. L. (2002). Strategic entrepreneurship: Integrating entrepreneurial and strategic management perspectives. *Strategic entrepreneurship: Creating a new mindset*, 1-16.
- Ireland, R. D., & Hitt, M. A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13(1), 43-57.
- Ireland, R. D., & Webb, J. W. (2007). A multi-theoretic perspective on trust and power in strategic supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25(2), 482-497.
- Itami, H., & Roehl, T. (1987). Mobilizing intangible assets. *Cambridge (Mass.)*.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2009). The entrepreneurial imperative of the 21 st century. *Business Horizons*, 52(5), 421-428.
- McEvily, S. K., & Chakravarthy, B. (2002). The persistence of knowledge-based advantage: an empirical test for product performance and technological knowledge. *Strategic management journal*, 23(4), 285-305.
- Meyer, G. D., & Heppard, K. A. (2000). Entrepreneurial Strategies. *Entrepreneurship as strategy: Competing on the entrepreneurial edge*, 1.
- Miles, M. P., & Covin, J. G. (2000). Environmental marketing: A source of reputational, competitive, and financial advantage. *Journal of business ethics*, 23(3), 299-311.
- Moliterno, T. P., & Wiersema, M. F. (2007). Firm performance, rent appropriation, and the strategic resource divestment capability. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(11), 1065-1087.
- Moliterno, T. P., & Wiersema, M. F. (2007). Firm performance, rent appropriation, and the strategic resource divestment capability. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(11), 1065-1087.
- Morris, S. C. (1998). *The crucible of creation: the Burgess Shale and the rise of animals*. Peterson's.
- Newbert, S. L. (2007). Empirical research on the resource-based view of the firm: an assessment and suggestions for future research. *Strategic management journal*, 28(2), 121-146.
- Peng, M. W. (2001). The resource-based view and international business. *Journal of management*, 27(6), 803-829.
- Penrose, E. T. (1959). The theory of the growth of the firm. *New York: Sharpe*.
- Peteraf, M. A. (1993). The cornerstones of competitive advantage: A resource-based view. *Strategic management journal*, 14(3), 179-191.
- Porter, M. E. (2008). The five competitive forces that shape strategy. *Harvard business review*, 86(1), 25-40.

- Priem, R. L., & Butler, J. E. (2001). Tautology in the resource-based view and the implications of externally determined resource value: Further comments. *Academy of Management review*, 26(1), 57-66.
- Rangone, A. (1999). A resource-based approach to strategy analysis in small-medium sized enterprises. *Small Business Economics*, 12(3), 233-248.
- Ray, G., Barney, J. B., & Muhanna, W. A. (2004). Capabilities, business processes, and competitive advantage: choosing the dependent variable in empirical tests of the resource-based view. *Strategic management journal*, 25(1), 23-37.
- Rumelt, R. P. (1984). Towards a Strategic Theory of the Firm. Competitive strategic management. *Competitive strategic management*, 556-570.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of management review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic management journal*, 28(13), 1319-1350.
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic management journal*, 509-533.
- Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California management review*, 38(4), 8-29.
- Tushman, M. L., & Romanelli, E. (1985). Organizational evolution: Interactions between external and emergent processes and strategic choice. *Research in organizational behavior*, 8, 171-222.
- Wernerfelt, B. (1984). A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 5(2), 171-180.
- Zahra, S. A., Ireland, R. D., Gutierrez, I., & Hitt, M. A. (2000). Introduction to Special Topic Forum Privatization and Entrepreneurial Transformation: Emerging Issues and a Future Research Agenda. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(3), 509-524.

