

Organizational Adaptability and Business Growth of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises in Port Harcourt, Rivers State

Okwurume, Clarence Nkasirim

Department of Management

Faculty of Administration and Management

Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworukwo, Port Harcourt

Abstract: This research delved into exploring the nexus between organizational adaptability and the business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. The study encompassed a population of 152 enterprises within the Port Harcourt local government area. Utilizing a comprehensive approach, the research engaged with the owners of all 152 SMEs, yielding a response rate of 134. The primary objectives included evaluating the resilience of SMEs in confronting challenges, assessing their business growth trajectories, and analyzing the impact of adaptability on SMEs' growth dynamics. The findings revealed robust and statistically significant correlation coefficients, notably 0.817 and 0.747, respectively, indicating the strong relationships between vulnerability and business expansion, and adaptive capacity and business expansion. Additionally, albeit with comparatively lower coefficients, the correlations between vulnerability and market share (0.272) and adaptive capacity and market share (0.173) remained significant. Moreover, the study elucidated the pivotal role of organizational structure in mediating the relationship between organizational adaptability and the business growth of SMEs. In light of these findings, the research underscores the importance for entrepreneurs to meticulously assess their business environments, discerning potential avenues for success while navigating potential pitfalls, such as studying competitors and market trends. This recommendation seeks to equip entrepreneurs with the strategic foresight necessary to thrive amidst evolving market dynamics, ultimately fostering the sustained growth and resilience of SMEs in Port Harcourt and beyond.

Keywords: Adaptability, Business growth, Entrepreneurship, Organizational resilience Vulnerability.

© 2024. Okwurume, Clarence Nkasirim. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 Unported License <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0>, permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

Growth, whether financial, economic, or numerical, is crucial as it serves as a gauge for assessing the standard of living of a specific group of people. Business growth plays a vital role in enabling a country to accommodate its burgeoning population without compromising their standard of living. Economic growth, often measured by an increase in a country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP), correlates strongly with the level of business activities within a nation. Successful

organizational growth hinges upon the effective utilization of resources such as capital, labor, and knowledge, which are transformed into marketable products and services (Nelson *et al.*, 1982).

However, despite its significance, it's noteworthy that no universally accepted measure exists for quantifying business growth (Birley & Westhead, 1990). This absence poses challenges in formulating a comprehensive theory of business growth and raises concerns regarding how growth can be conceptualized and operationalized. Research within organization theory and strategy has highlighted inconsistencies in identifying the objective factors contributing to organizational/business growth (Birley & Westhead, 1990; Davidson, 1991). These inconsistencies may stem from variations in sample characteristics, as different types of firms, such as new ventures versus Fortune 500 companies or manufacturing versus service firms, may exhibit diverse growth indicators.

For instance, Elsen Hardt and Schoon Hoven (1990) found mixed results regarding the relationship between growth and top management team sizes in their analysis of startup firms from high-tech industries, while Willard *et al.* (2000) supported such a relationship. Similarly, Hamilton and Shergi (1992) identified a positive and significant relationship between growth and related diversification in a general sample of firms. These disparities underscore the need for a unified measure of organizational/business growth.

In pursuit of a unified indicator, researchers have explored determinants of firm growth across various disciplines such as strategy, psychology, and economics (Davidson & Wiklund, 2000; Patzeit & Shepherd, 2007). However, the literature review reveals divergent views. For instance, economic research emphasizes the relationship between growth and firm size (Audretsch *et al.*, 2004), while strategic studies focus on the interplay between the environment, business strategy, and growth (McDougall *et al.*, 1992), and psychology examines entrepreneurial behavior (Begley & Boyd, 1987). Without a consensus on how to uniformly measure firm growth, this paper adopts the strategic perspective, considering the relationship between the environment, business strategy, and growth, underpinned by organizational resilience.

Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this paper include:

- i. To examine the relationship between adaptive capacity and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.
- ii. To evaluate the magnitude of the relationship between vulnerability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.
- iii. To ascertain how organizational structure moderates, the relationship between organizational adaptability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.

Research Questions

This research is guided by the following questions:

- i. What is the nature of the relationship between adaptive capacity and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises?

- ii. What is the extent of the relationship between vulnerability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises?
- iii. Does any relationship exist between organizational adaptability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises?

Research Hypotheses

To address the research questions, the following hypotheses are formulated:

H01: There is no significant relationship between adaptive capacity and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.

H02: There is no significant relationship between vulnerability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.

H03: Organizational structure does not significantly moderate the relationship between organizational adaptability and business growth of small and medium-scale enterprises.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Concept of Organizational Adaptability

Adaptability is an essential trait for organizations to navigate external shocks effectively. In the realm of social sciences, the concept of adaptability remains relatively new, lacking a universally agreed-upon definition (Simmie & Martin, 2009). Organizational adaptability becomes particularly pertinent when individuals and organizations respond to changes. Individual actors and firms play crucial roles in economic and social development by generating human and social capital, fostering innovation and productivity, and creating opportunities (Burriard & Bhamra, 2011). The adaptability of organizations hinges on their ability to withstand various disruptions, as they continuously strive to remain competitive and viable within uncertain environments.

For individuals, adaptability encompasses qualities such as flexibility, high motivation, perseverance, and optimism. In the context of entrepreneurship, adaptability emerges as a pivotal factor in sustaining a business venture successfully (Devries & Shields, 2005).

Organizational Resilience

The concept of organizational resilience arises from the growing imperative to manage uncertainty in modern complex societies and economies. Organizational resilience encompasses various meanings, including the ability to prevent negative consequences, mitigate worsening impacts, and engage in recovery following disruptive events (Westrum, 2006). Effective risk management entails investing in capabilities that enhance resilience (Walter *et al.*, 2006). Natural disasters and other threats have underscored the importance of organizational resilience in contemporary management discourse (Bahora *et al.*, 2003; Ntuen, 2006; Runyan, 2006).

Organizational resilience is not merely a standalone system but often considered as an outcome that complements existing corporate strategies and management systems. It enables organizations to proactively respond to changes, disruptions, and risks, positioning themselves for advantage in the aftermath of crises. A tailored approach to organizational resilience acknowledges the complexities of different corporate environments, regulatory frameworks, stakeholder expectations, and organizational obligations.

Dimensions of Organizational Adaptability

In this study, adaptive capacity and vulnerability serve as key dimensions of organizational resilience. Viewing resilience as a process rather than a piecemeal response underscores the need for awareness in managing risks comprehensively (Dalziell & Mcmanus, 2001). Adaptive capacity refers to an enterprise's ability to alter its strategies, operations, management systems, governance structures, and decision-making processes to withstand perturbations and disruptions (Starr et al., 2004). It involves adapting to changes and responding to disturbances, recognizing the interrelationships among various determinants such as managerial abilities and psychological stress reduction among workers (Smit & Wandel, 2006).

Measures of Business Growth

Entrepreneurship's relevance to economic development is widely recognized, with education and training playing pivotal roles in cultivating future entrepreneurs and enhancing the capabilities of existing ones (Henry *et al.*, 2003). The success of entrepreneurs stems from a combination of individual qualities and business characteristics (Ayala Calvo *et al.*, 2010). Cognitive and social behavioral factors also contribute significantly to entrepreneurial achievement (Aldrich & Martine, 2001).

Business Expansion

Business expansion presents both opportunities and challenges for successful enterprises. It entails increased financial fortunes and necessitates effective leadership to manage the growth trajectory. As organizations expand, decentralization may occur, leading to internal politics and dissension over strategic goals. Additionally, market share expansion demands new strategies to compete with larger competitors.

Market Share

Market share, defined as the percentage of sales within a particular industry, influences profitability and competitiveness. While a larger market share can lead to cost efficiencies through bulk purchasing, it may also incur higher advertising expenses. Managers often adjust operations and marketing strategies based on market share dynamics.

Organizational Structure

Organizational structure encompasses the formal system of task and reporting relationships that motivate employees to achieve organizational goals. It provides top management with

administrative mechanisms to influence strategic actors at various levels within the organization (Burgelman, 1983).

METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a cross-sectional design to investigate the dynamics within small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The target population comprised 152 SMEs operating in the region. Due to the manageable size of the population, the research opted to include all 152 SMEs as its sample size. Subsequently, 152 questionnaires were distributed among business owners within these enterprises. However, only 134 completed questionnaires were returned, forming the basis of analysis for the study.

Given the descriptive nature of the research objectives, descriptive statistics were employed to analyze individual variables. Mean rating scores were calculated to assess the levels of various factors pertinent to the study. Furthermore, to draw inferential conclusions, the Spearman Rank correlation statistical tool was utilized. This approach allowed the research to explore potential relationships between different variables within the SME context. Throughout the analysis, the significance of results was assessed at the alpha (α) level of 0.05, adhering to standard statistical conventions. Consequently, all findings were interpreted in line with established guidelines to ensure the validity and reliability of the conclusions drawn from the data.

This methodology enabled a comprehensive examination of the SME landscape in Port Harcourt, facilitating insights into the factors influencing their operations and performance. By employing both descriptive and inferential statistics, the study was able to provide a nuanced understanding of the dynamics at play within this crucial sector of the economy.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results from the analyses presented in this paper are rooted in the investigation of five hypotheses outlined at its inception, all of which were designed to align with the research objectives. This study aimed to deepen our comprehension of resilience within small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) situated in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, and its impact on their growth trajectory. The data collected were primarily derived from responses provided by entrepreneurs, focusing on their awareness of vulnerabilities and the proactive measures they undertake to mitigate potential setbacks. Vulnerability and adaptive capacity were utilized as metrics to gauge organizational resilience. Additionally, the study examined the extent to which entrepreneurs in Port Harcourt grasp the significance of resilience in fostering organizational growth, measured through key variables such as market share and business expansion.

Mean scores were employed to evaluate the responses, with a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Thus, scores were expected to fluctuate between these two extremes, with higher scores indicating stronger agreement or acceptance, and lower scores signaling disagreement or doubt. A mean rating score of 3 served as the threshold for decision-making, indicating moderate agreement.

Vulnerability of SMEs was a focal point of the investigation. Through a series of questions, entrepreneurs were prompted to assess the susceptibility of their organizations to crises or disasters, as summarized in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Summary of Responses on Vulnerability

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Our Organization has a laid down plan in dealing with emergency/crisis or business continuity plan	134	1.00	5.00	2.3657	1.05873
My Organization is proactively positioned to shift from business as usual (BAU) stance to respond to crisis	134	1.00	5.00	2.3358	1.01821
We are favourably disposed in relying in the capability and capacity of external resources to provide resources in an emergency.	134	1.00	5.00	2.2388	.93535
My Organization has clearly defined priorities for what is important during and after crisis	134	1.00	5.00	3.6119	1.25003
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Source: SPSS ver. 20 Window Output, 2024

Table 1 provides a comprehensive summary of the four instruments utilized to measure vulnerability in the study. Among these instruments, the highest mean rating score of 3.612 indicates that entrepreneurs generally concur that their organizations possess clearly defined priorities for what is important during and after a crisis. Conversely, the lowest mean rating score of 2.239 suggests that entrepreneurs express a degree of uncertainty regarding their reliance on the capability and capacity of external resources to provide assistance during an emergency.

The mean rating scores collectively suggest that all but one of the instruments fall below the mid-point of 3, indicating varying degrees of agreement among entrepreneurs with the statements posed by the instruments. Notably, the grand mean rating score for entrepreneurs' responses on organizational vulnerability is calculated at 2.638, underscoring a generally low level of perceived vulnerability within small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) as evaluated through these instruments.

Further investigation will be conducted to ascertain the extent to which this observed low level of organizational vulnerability influences organizational growth trajectories, thereby shedding light on the implications of vulnerability management for SMEs' development and resilience in the face of crises.

Adaptive Capacity of SMEs

When assessing adaptive capacity, researchers concentrate on examining the strategies employed by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to navigate and endure perturbations and disruptions within their organizational structures. The responses of entrepreneurs to such challenges are outlined in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of Responses on Adaptive Capacity

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
In our organization, square pegs are put in square holes i.e. those qualified to make hard decisions make it, regardless of seniority.	134	1.00	5.00	3.8881	1.33580
Our Organization is not oblivious of the happenings in our internal and as well as external and responds accordingly	134	1.00	5.00	3.5373	1.24850
Our Organization is concerned about the adequacy of information and knowledge needed by employees to enable them respond to unexpected problems.	134	1.00	5.00	3.0821	.98903
My Organization encourages employees with challenging task, and capacity development through their job.	134	1.00	5.00	3.3582	1.36223
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Source: SPSS ver. 20 Window Output, 2024.

Table 2 presents a comprehensive summary of the four instruments employed to measure adaptive capacity within the scope of this study. It delineates various aspects of adaptive capacity as perceived by entrepreneurs. Among these dimensions, the highest mean rating score of 3.888 was observed in response to the statement indicating that in their organizations, square pegs are put in square holes, signifying that those qualified to make difficult decisions do so, irrespective of seniority. Conversely, the lowest mean rating score of 3.082 was attributed to entrepreneurs asserting that their organizations exhibit concerns regarding the adequacy of information and knowledge available to employees, which is essential for effectively responding to unforeseen challenges.

Evidently, all the instruments utilized in the study yielded mean rating scores above the midpoint of 3. This suggests a favorable perception among entrepreneurs regarding the adaptive capacity within their organizations. Notably, the grand mean rating score for entrepreneurs' responses on

adaptive capacity stands at 3.466. This overall score underscores a prevalent perception of high adaptive capacity among entrepreneurs participating in the study.

It is noteworthy that while these findings highlight a positive outlook on adaptive capacity, the study is poised to delve deeper into the implications of such high levels of adaptive capacity on organizational growth. Subsequent analysis aims to elucidate the extent to which this perceived adaptive capacity translates into tangible outcomes for organizational development and resilience.

By incorporating diverse perspectives and employing robust measurement instruments, this study endeavors to contribute nuanced insights into the dynamics of adaptive capacity within entrepreneurial contexts, thereby facilitating a deeper understanding of its implications for organizational success and sustainability.

Business Expansion by SMEs

Business expansion often heralds a rise in financial prosperity, but it also presents a myriad of challenges. Entrepreneurial responses to these challenges shed light on the managerial strategies that Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) employ to navigate growth while staying true to their initial objectives. Table 3, presented below, provides a comprehensive overview of these strategies and their effectiveness.

Table 3: Responses on Business Expansion

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
We have direct sales link with customers	134	1.00	5.00	3.4328	1.01454
We are in more than one geographical place.	134	1.00	5.00	2.9701	1.28578
We produce our products/service ourselves without external interference.	134	1.00	5.00	2.9478	1.15893
We have different lines of products / services.	134	1.00	5.00	3.1940	.99228
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Source: SPSS ver. 20 Window Output, 2024

Table 3 presents a comprehensive summary of the four instruments utilized to measure business expansion within the study. Notably, the data reveals a spectrum of responses from entrepreneurs. The highest mean rating score, standing at 3.433, signifies a consensus among entrepreneurs regarding the presence of direct sales links with customers. Conversely, the lowest mean rating score, at 2.948, reflects entrepreneurs' assertion of producing their products or services internally without external involvement.

Interestingly, the mean rating scores for all instruments cluster closely around the midpoint of 3, suggesting a nuanced perspective among entrepreneurs regarding various facets of business expansion. Specifically, the grand mean rating score for entrepreneurs' responses on business

expansion stands at 3.136. This figure indicates that the level of business expansion among SMEs in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, is notably elevated, slightly exceeding an average rating.

Subsequent analysis within the study aims to elucidate the relationship between this observed high level of business expansion and the concept of organizational resilience. Through examining this relationship, the study seeks to provide insights into the factors contributing to the robustness and growth of SMEs within the region.

Moreover, it is pertinent to maintain the citations for proper attribution of sources and to adhere to academic standards.

Measuring Market Share

Market share is considered an indicator for business competitiveness. Table 4 encapsulates the multifaceted strategies employed by SMEs to bolster their market share and fortify their competitive positions within dynamic business landscapes.

Table 4: Responses on Market Share

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
My organization plans for the future in terms of new markets/products	134	1.00	5.00	3.4179	1.32244
Helping customers/customer satisfaction is very important to us.	134	1.00	5.00	2.1418	1.04164
Our organization focuses on acquiring new customers with new needs to be met.	134	1.00	5.00	2.8134	1.33303
My organization encourages competition and sales incentive.	134	1.00	5.00	2.6418	1.14644
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Source: SPSS ver. 20 Window Output, 2024

Table 4 presents a comprehensive overview of the instruments employed to measure market share within the context of this study. Notably, the highest mean rating score recorded is 3.418, indicating consensus among entrepreneurs regarding their organizations' proactive stance towards future planning, particularly concerning new markets and products. Conversely, the lowest mean rating score is 2.142, reflecting entrepreneurs' assertion that prioritizing customer assistance and ensuring satisfaction are not perceived as highly significant.

The mean rating scores across the instruments reveal a consistent trend, with all but one falling below the established threshold. Specifically, the grand mean rating score, calculated at 2.754, underscores the prevalent notion among entrepreneurs that the market share of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, is relatively low. However, this score hovers just below the average rating, indicating a nuanced perception of market performance within the region.

Relationship Between Organizational Adaptability and Business Growth

Having delved extensively into the individual levels of the variables of organizational resilience and entrepreneurial growth, research now seeks to establish whether a significant relationship exists between the two math variables and their respective dimensions.

Table 5: Result of Spearman correlation coefficient of vulnerability and business expansion

Correlations			Vulnerability	Business Expansion
Spearman's rho	Vulnerability	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.817**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	134	134
	Business Expansion	Correlation Coefficient	.817**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	134	134

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

Source: SPSS ver. 20.0 Window Output, 2024ow

The analysis reveals a robust correlation between vulnerability and business expansion, as evidenced by a coefficient of 0.817 with a p-value of 0.000. This coefficient signifies a strong positive linear relationship between the two variables, indicating that as vulnerability increases, so does business expansion. Moreover, the p-value being less than the predetermined significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$) warrants the rejection of the null hypothesis. Consequently, we confidently conclude that there exists a statistically significant correlation between vulnerability and business expansion.

Table 6: Result of Spearman correlation coefficient of vulnerability and market share

Correlations			Vulnerability	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Vulnerability	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.272**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	134	134
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.272**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	134	134

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

Source: SPSS ver. 20.0 Window Output, 2024

The analysis reveals a notable correlation between vulnerability and market share, with a coefficient of 0.272 and a p-value of 0.000. This indicates a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. The directionality of the correlation is consistent; as vulnerability increases, so does market share. Moreover, the p-value of 0.000, being considerably lower than the predetermined significance level of 0.05, leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

Consequently, it can be inferred that there exists a statistically significant correlation between vulnerability and market share (Smith, 2020).

Table 7: Result of Spearman correlation coefficient of adaptive capacity and business expansion

			Correlations	
			Adaptive Capacity	Business Expansion
Spearman's rho	Adaptive Capacity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.747**
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
		N	134	134
	Business Expansion	Correlation Coefficient	.747**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
		N	134	134

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

Source: SPSS ver. 20.0 Window Output, 2024

Adaptive capacity is correlated with business expansion giving a coefficient of 0.747, and a p-value of 0.000, which shows that there is a strong positive linear relationship between the two variables. Direction is same (i.e. as one increases, so does the other), also, since the p-value (= 0.000) is less than the level of significance, α (= 0.05), we therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant correlation between the two variables: adaptive capacity and business expansion

Table 8: Result of Spearman correlation coefficient of adaptive capacity and market share

			Correlations	
			Adaptive Capacity	Market Share
Spearman's rho	Adaptive Capacity	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.173*
		Sig. (2-tailed)		.045
		N	134	134
	Market Share	Correlation Coefficient	.173*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.045	
		N	134	134

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

Source: SPSS ver. 20.0 Window Output, 2024

Adaptive capacity is correlated with market share giving a coefficient of 0.173, and a value of 0.045, which shows that there is a weak positive linear relationship between the two variables. Direction is same (i.e. as one increases, so does the other), also, since the p-value (= 0.001) is less than the level of significance, α (= 0.05), we therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is significant correlation between the two variables: adaptive capacity and market share

Table 9: Entrepreneurs’ Response on Structure

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
My Organization strongly advocates that things be done through formal processes and procedures.	134	1.00	5.00	3.0000	1.48678
My Organization encourages flexibility and decision making is decentralized.	134	1.00	5.00	2.6791	1.19900
Our strategic and structural make-up encourages autonomy	134	1.00	5.00	2.8806	1.36577
My Organization adapts freely to changing environmental situations without dwelling on the past.	134	1.00	5.00	2.7463	1.23048
Valid N (listwise)	134				

Source: SPSS ver. 20 Window Output, 2024

Table 9 presents a comprehensive overview of the four instruments utilized to measure organizational structure within the scope of this study. Notably, the table reveals a spectrum of responses, with the highest mean rating score reaching exactly 3.0. This score indicates a consensus among entrepreneurs that their respective organizations strongly advocate for the implementation of formal processes and procedures. Conversely, the lowest mean rating score, standing at 2.679, reflects entrepreneurs' perception that their organizations encourage flexibility and decentralize decision-making.

Analyzing the mean rating scores across all instruments, it becomes apparent that all but one fall below the mid-point of 3. This suggests a tendency towards a lower level of perceived structural adherence within the organizations under study. In fact, the grand mean rating score for entrepreneurs' responses on structural aspects stands at 2.827. This value underscores a prevailing sentiment of limited appreciation for structural frameworks within these organizations.

Table 10: Result of Partial correlation coefficient between organizational adaptability and business growth controlling for the influence of structure

Control variables			Organizational Adaptability	Business Growth	Organizational Structure
-none-	Organizational Adaptability	Correlation	1.000	.774	.590
		Significant (2-tailed) d	0	.000 132	.000 132
	Business Growth	Correlation	.774	1.000	.572
		Significant (2-tailed) d	.000 132	0	.000 132
	Organizational Structure	Correlation	.590	.572	1.000
		Significant (2-tailed) d	.045 132	.000 134	0
Organizational Structure	Organizational Adaptability	Correlation	1.000	.659	
		Significant (2-tailed) d	0	.000 131	
	Business Growth	Correlation	.659	1.000	
		Significant (2-tailed) d	.000 131	0	

a. Cells contain zero-order (Pearson) correlation

The analysis conducted reveals significant insights into the relationship between organizational adaptability, business growth, and organizational structure within small and medium-scale enterprises (SMEs) in Port Harcourt, Rivers State. Initially, the zero-order correlation between organizational adaptability and business growth exhibited a substantial and statistically significant correlation coefficient of 0.744 (p -value < 0.05), indicating a strong association between the two variables without considering organizational culture as a mediating factor.

Upon further examination using partial correlation while controlling for organizational culture, the relationship remains robust with a coefficient of 0.659 and maintains its statistical significance (p -value = 0.000, < 0.05). This finding underscores the inherent connection between organizational adaptability and business growth, even when considering the influence of organizational culture.

However, it is noteworthy that organizational structure plays a crucial mediating role in this relationship. Both organizational adaptability and business growth exhibit significant positive correlations with structure as evidenced by zero-order correlation coefficients of 0.590 and 0.572, respectively. When the effect of organizational structure is removed, the correlation between organizational adaptability and business growth reduces to 0.659, maintaining statistical significance at $\alpha = 0.05$. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that organizational structure indeed mediates the relationship between organizational adaptability and business growth in SMEs in Port Harcourt, Rivers State

Organizational Resilience and Entrepreneurial Growth

Upon revisiting the scatter plot depicted in Fig. 1, which illustrates the relationship between Organizational Resilience and Entrepreneurial Growth, a deeper analysis emerges. Considering the correlation coefficient of 0.659, while controlling for the influence of structure, it becomes apparent that the adjusted R^2 value is 0.434281. This adjusted R^2 value signifies that Organizational Resilience effectively explains approximately 43.43% of the variances observed in organizational growth, after considering the moderating effect of structure.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research has revealed, based on its key findings, that while there exists a low level of vulnerability, there is a high adaptive capacity within the organization, indicating a significant degree of organizational adaptability. Similarly, the research indicates a high level of business expansion paired with a low market share, reflecting substantial business growth. Despite the diversity in rating scores, all hypotheses remained significant at the 0.5 confidence level. However, it is apparent that organizational adaptability alone, as represented by vulnerability and adaptive capacity, may not solely account for major changes in business growth. Other unaccounted factors could potentially lead to erroneous conclusions. This study addresses this issue by investigating the influence of organizational structure, which was found to be significant in explaining its moderating effect on the relationship between organizational adaptability and business growth. Based on the conclusion, the study recommends that, small and medium scale enterprises should:

- i. Promote inquisitiveness, foster a culture of inquiry regarding information and knowledge. Proactive engagement in seeking knowledge is crucial, as organizations demonstrating such behavior are better positioned to initiate changes aimed at performance improvement.
- ii. Encourage innovation and activity, to create conditions conducive to innovation and proactive activity. By fostering an environment that encourages creativity and innovation, businesses can adapt more readily to market changes and seize growth opportunities.
- iii. Implement crisis preparedness strategies, proactively prepare for potential crises by developing robust crisis management strategies. Having contingency plans in place enables organizations to effectively navigate through challenging situations and mitigate potential damages to their operations.
- iv. Promote situational awareness among employees to actively monitor and report on internal and external situations relevant to the organization. By fostering a culture of vigilance and accountability, employees can help identify potential issues early on, allowing for timely interventions to maintain organizational performance and address emerging challenges.

References

- Acs, Z. J. (1996). Small Firms and Economic Growth, in Port Harcourt. Admiral (ed.), *Small Business in Modern Economy, Devries Lectures in Economics*. Oxford, U.K: Blackwell Publishers.
- Adger, W.N. (2000). Social and ecological resilience: are they related? *Progress in Human Geography*, 24, 347-364.
- Aghion, P., Harris, C., Howitt, P. & Vickers, J. (2001). Competition, limitation and growth with step-by-step innovation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 68, 467-492.
- Aldrick, N.E. & Martinez, M.A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 41-56.
- Alesch, D.J. & Holly, J. N. (1998). Small business failure, survival and recovery: Lessons from the January 1994, Northridge earth quake. HEHRP Conference and Workshop on Research on North ridge, California Earth Quake of January 7, 1994.
- Alesch, D.J. et al. (2001). Organization's at risk: What happens when small business and not for profit encounter natural disasters? Public Entity Risk Institute, Fairfax.
- Audretsch, D.B., Klomp, L., Santarelli, E. & Thurik, A.R. (2004). Gibrat's law: Are the services different? *Review of Industrial Organization*, 24, 301-324.
- Ayala, Calvo, J. C. & Manzano Garcia, C. (2010). Established business owners' success: Influencing factors. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15(03), 263.
- Bahora, A.S., Collins, T.C., Davis, S.C., Goknur, S.C., Kearns, J.C., Lieu, T.N., Nguyen, T.P., Horopito, B.M., & Pata, S.D. (2003). Integrated peer-to-peer applications for advanced emergency response system part 1: Concept of operations.
- Bandura, A, (1977a). Self-efficacy, toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A, (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Baron, R.A. & Markman, C.D. (2000). Beyond social capital: how social skills can enhance entrepreneurs' success. *Academy of Management Executive*, 14, 106-127.
- Bhamra, R., Dani, S. & Burnard, K. (2011). Resilience: The concept, a literature review and future directions. *International Journal of Production Research*, online first.
- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1990). Growth and performance contrasts between 'types' of small firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 2, 535-557.

- Buckle, P., Mars, G. & Smale, S. (2002). New approaches to assessing vulnerability and resilience. *Australia Journal of Emergency Management*, 15(2), 8-15.
- Burgelman, R.A. (1983). Corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management: Insights from a process study. *Management Sciences*, 29(12), 1349-1396.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Change, S. & Falit-Baiamante, A. (2002). Disaster vulnerability of businesses in the 2001. *Nisqually Earthquake, Environmental Hazards*, 4, 59-71.
- Coutu, D.L. (2002). How Resilience Works. *Harvard Business Review*, 80(3), 46-55.
- Covin, J. C. & Slevin, D. P. (1991). A conceptual model of entrepreneurship as firm behaviour. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(1), 17-25.
- Dalziel, E. P. & Mcmanus, S.T. (2004). Resilience, vulnerability and adaptive capacity; implications for system performance. *International Forum for Engineering Decision Making (IFED)*, Switzerland (December).
- Davidson, P. (1991). Continued entrepreneurship: ability, need, and opportunity as determinants of small firm growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6, 405-429.
- Davidson, P. & Wiklund, J. (2000). Conceptual and empirical challenges in the study of firm growth.
- Delmar, F. (1996). Entrepreneurial behaviour and business performance. *Stockholm School of Economics*, Stockholm.
- Devries & Shield (1985). Historical analysis of climate-society interaction in Kates, R.W.; Ausubel, J.H., and Berberian, M. (eds.), *Climate Impact Assessment*. New York: Wiley.
- Eisnerhardt, K.M. & Schoonhoven, P. (1990). Organizational growth: linking team, strategy, environment, and growth among U.S semiconductor ventures, 1978-1988. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35(3), 504-529.
- Evans, D.S. (1987). The relationship between firm growth, size and age: estimates for 100 manufacturing industries. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 35(4), 567-581.
- Fussler, H. (2005). Vulnerability in climate change: A comprehensive conceptual framework e-scholarship repository, University of California <http://respositories.edubog/ucias/breslauer/6>.

- Gagne, M. & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 331-362.
- Gulati, R. (2009). *Reorganize for resilience: Putting customers at the centre of your business*. Boston, Massachusetts: Harvard Business Press.
- Holland, D. V. & Shepherd, D.A. (2011). Deciding to persist: adversity, values, and entrepreneurs' decision policies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 1-28.
- Holling, C.S. (1986). The resilience of terrestrial ecosystems; Local surprise and global change. In: Clark, W.C., and Munn, R.E. (eds.). *Sustainable Development of the Biosphere*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. Chap. 10, 292-317.
- Holling, C.S. (1995). What Barriers? What Bridges? In: *Barriers and Bridges to the Renewal of Ecosystems and Institutions*. Gunderson, L., Holing, C.S., and Light S.S. (eds.). Columbia University Press, New York.
- Home, J. F. (1997). A New Direction: The Coming Age of Organizational Resilience. *Business Forum*, 22(2/3), 24-28.
- Hubbard, D.W. (2009). *The Failure of Risk Management: Why It's Broken and How to Fix It*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Ireland, R. D. & Hilt, M. A. (1999). Achieving and maintaining strategic competitiveness in the 21st century: The role of strategic leadership. *Academy of Management Executive*, 19, 63-77.
- Klein, R.J.T, Nicholls, R. J. & Thomalla, F. (2003). Resilience to natural hazards: how useful is this concept. *Environmental Hazards*, 5, 35-45.
- Lau, C. & Busenitz, L.W. (2001). Growth intentions of entrepreneurs in a transitional economy: the people's republic of China. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(1), 5-20.
- Lounsbury, M. & Glynn, M.A. (2001). Cultural entrepreneurship stories, legitimacy and the acquisition of resources. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 545-564.
- Macarath & McMillan (2000). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 132-152.
- Mallak, L. (1998). Putting organizational resilience to work. *Industrial Management*, 40(6), 8-13.
- McDougall, P.P., Robinson, R.B. & DeNisi, A.S. (1992). Modeling new venture performance: an analysis of new venture strategy, industry structure and venture origin. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7, 267-289.

- Mitchell, J.R. & Shepherd, D.A. (2010). To thine own self be true: Images of self, images of opportunity, and entrepreneurial action. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 25(1), 138-154.
- Ntuen, C.A., Balogun, O., Boyle, E. & Turner, A. (2006). Supporting command and control training functions in the emergency management domain using cognitive systems engineering. *Ergonomics*, 49(12-13), 1415-1436.
- Orser, B. (1997). *Understanding the influence of intention, managerial capacity and gender on small firm growth*. PhD. Thesis, Bradford University School of Management.
- Paton, D. (1999). Disaster business continuity: promoting staff capability. *Disaster Preventing and Management*, 8(2), 127-133.
- Pimm, S. L. (1984). The complexity and stability of ecosystems. *Nature*, 307(26), 321-326.
- Rioli, L. & Savicki, V. (2003). Cooperation, Reliability of socio-technical systems and allocation of functions. *International Journal Hum-Computer Studies*, 52, 357-379.
- Ruyan, R.C. (2006). Small Business in the Face of Crisis Identifying Barriers to Recovery from a Natural Disaster. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 14(1), 12-26.
- Schoon, M. (2005). A short historical overview of the concepts of resilience, vulnerability, and adaptation, workshop in political theory and policy analysis. Indiana University Working Paper W05-4. Available at: <http://www.indiana.edu/~iupolsci/gradcv/schoon/historicalcritique.pdf>.
- Seaman, A. L. & Williams, J. (2005). The perils of the plan. *CMA Management*, 79(1), 14-16.
- Schein, E.H. (1999). *The Corporate Culture Survival Guide: Sense and Nonsense about Culture*. San Francisco, C.A: Jossey-Bass. 9.
- Sheffi, Y. (2006). Waiting for the next “big one. *Boston Globe*, February 19, 91.
- Smit, Brand Wandel, J. (2006). Adaption, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 282-292.
- Starr, R., Newfrock, J. & Delurey, M. (2004). Enterprise resilience: managing risk in the networked economy. *Strategy + Business*, 30, 1-10. <http://www.beh.com>.
- Teece, D., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*.
- Villaghin De Leon, J.C. (2006). Vulnerability: A conceptual and methodological review. United Nations University Institute for Environmental and Human Security (UNU- EHS) Source 4.

- Webb, C., Tierney, K. & Dahlhamer, J. (2003). Predicting long-term business recovery from disaster: a comparison of the Loma Prieta earthquake and hurricane Andrew. *Environmental Hazards*, 45-58.
- Welg, N. (1994). Section 1, Interdependence and response planning. *Wellington Engineering Lifetimes Group*, New Zealand.
- Watts, M. J. & Bolhe, H .G. (1993). The space of vulnerability. *The Causal Factor in Hunger and Famine Progress in Human Geography*, 1, 43-67.
- Westrum, R. (2006). A Typology of Resilience Situations. In, Hollinagel, E., Woods, D.; and Leveson, N, (eds.) (2006). *Resilience Engineering: Concepts and Precepts*. Ashgate Publishing Limited, Aldershot, England.
- Willard, G.E., Kruger, O. A. & Feeser, H. R. (2002). In order to grow, must the founder go: A comparison between founder and non-founder managed high growth manufacturing firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7(3), 181-194.
- Wisner, B. (2005). Remarks made at United Nations University - Institute for Environment and Human Security UNU-EHS. *Vulnerability Workshop*, Kobe Japan.