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# ABSTRACT

Succession planning is critical to the long-term viability of the family-owned enterprise. Most family-owned businesses fail to survive the transition to the next generation, leading to the death of several family-owned businesses in Nigeria. Consequentially, the resultant effect is a nationwide decline in the small and medium enterprise (SME) sector. This study explores the effect of succession planning on family business survival in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.Family system theory and Leadership model succession theory were used to explain the effect of succession planning on family business survival in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. The use of questionnaires was employed to collect primary data from the respondents. The study used simple random sampling to select the questionnaire respondents. Descriptive analysis and multiple regression analysis were used to analyse the data. Findings revealed that Mentorship has a significant effect on family businesses’ survival, Gender has a significant effect on family business survival, training has a significant influence on family business survival, and entrepreneurship orientation significantly influences family business survival. Based on the findings, the study recommends that Owners of family businesses adopt a strong mentorship culture to prepare successors for leading the business in the future. It suggested that Entrepreneurial orientation should be encouraged amongst family-owned businesses; this will ensure the business's survival in the event of the founder's demise. It also recommended that gender bias should not be a criterion for choosing a successor in businesses as it does not determine the survival of family businesses. Furthermore, the study proposed that adequate training programs should be put in place for the development of employees and family members; this will positively influence the survival of the family business

**KEYWORDS:** Succession Planning, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Mentorship, Business Survival, Family Business

# CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background to the Study

When venture entrepreneurs become aged or are no longer as energetic as they once were, they must look for knowledgeable and trustworthy people to help with business management. "Succession planning" can be regarded as the approach employed in looking for a capable successor to carry on business operations. Family businesses have evolved into one of the essential concerns in international entrepreneurship discussions over time. Succession planning is very pertinent to the viability of an enterprise. Transition is something that all successful businesses must deal with. It is required when the business owner retires, dies, or resigns (Bernard, 2013; Saan*et al.,* 2013).

In Africa, family-owned enterprises have a considerable influence and emerging markets, contributing to job creation, innovation, social inclusion, economic progress, and improvement (Ofobruku *et al.,* 2015). Family-owned enterprises were a national and worldwide economic milestone, holding 80-98 percent of national firms Utami *et al.,* (2015). However, succession appears to be the primary concern for scholars and specialists in the family business field, and the incidence of effective generational succession emphasizes the need to comprehend the subject matter (Alayo*et al.,* 2016). According to surveys,13% of family companies survive to pass on to the next generation, leaving less than a third sustainable (Ofobruku & Nwakoby, 2015). Furthermore, Cho*et al.,* (2018) noted that several firms, such as the well-known Wal-Mart and Michelin, were established as family businesses and still maintain the same business model.

Today, some of Nigeria's largest corporations emerged from family-owned businesses; they have weathered the storms of a changing business environment thanks to sound succession planning. Okeke (2021) mentioned the "Ibru Organization founded in 1956 by Olorogun Michael Ibru as LAIBRU, as well as the Folawiyo Group founded in 1957 with ₤120 allowances by Alhaji Yinka Folawiyo. Other notable family-owned businesses include Dantata, Ibeto Group Nasco, Dangote Group, Odogwu group of companies, Innoson Motors, Chisco Transport, and Cutix Industries, to name a few. The level of training received by trainees will be of immense benefit upon the owner's demise, and this is the debate that the research aims to stimulate (Aderemi & Awotona, 2019; Ifekwem, 2018; Okeke, 2021). Nigerian family businesses have faced several challenges. On the other hand, some become moribund or are acquired by competitors due to poor successional planning (Harveston*et al.,* 1997; Maalu, 2016).

Family business founders can enhance their chances of sustainability by engineering a unique administrative system that is not subject to gender biases (Ifekwem, 2018). In an investigation conducted by Martin (2013) in the United Kingdom,businesses owned by families revealed that females do not have adequate access to training, certifications, and connections due to successors as opposed to their male counterparts. Successors, in some cases, may be selected based on their skills and abilities to adapt to globalization trends. Despite this research, few qualitative investigations have been carried out to determine the influence of succession planning on organizational survival,especially in underdeveloped nations such as Nigeria, notably in Kwara state. Nevertheless, researchers maintain a connection between family-run enterprises' succession planningand their sustainability(Okeke, 2021).

## 1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Many family businesses have collapsed as a result of bad succession strategies, and others may be on the verge of failing (Bernard, 2013; Saan*et al.,* 2013). Several Nigerian family businesses appear to suffer from "founders' syndrome," with few having a transition strategy. When a family member assumes responsibility based primarily on inheritance and heritage rather than skills and competence, it can lead to several managerial issues. Weak succession planning practices, such as inadequate mentoring, lack of training, support and nepotism, gender or age bias, and ineffective communication, all contribute to these organizations' failure (Okeke, 2021).Despite the acknowledged significance of succession difficulties in family-run enterprises, there is limited information onthe impactofthe owner’s gender in succession planning. One of the key objectives this investigation aims to achieve is to broaden our understanding by investigating similarities and variations in succession planning procedures across male and female-headed family businesses in Ilorin, Kwara state. The growing number of female-owned businesses worldwide drives the need for such research. Despite developing effective strategies to address the shortcomings of family businesses' survival and sustainability rates, family businesses continue to face all of these challenges. As a result, the primary aim of the investigation is to assesshow succession planning influences the survival of selected family businesses in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

## 1.3 Objectives of the Study

The overall objective is to examine the impact of succession planning on family business survival: a case of selected businesses in Ilorin Kwara State, Nigeria.

The specific objectives are to:

i. examine how mentorship influences family business survival.

ii. assess how gender affects family business survival.

iii. ascertain how training impacts family business survival, and

iv. examine how entrepreneurial orientation influences family business survival.

## 1.4 Research Questions

These questions were raised in response to the research’s objectives:

i. does mentorship influence family business survival?

ii. how does gender affect family business survival?

iii. what is the effect of training on family business survival?

iv. how does entrepreneurial orientation impact family businesses' survival?

## 1.5 Hypotheses

The following null hypothesis was constructed to assist and guide this inquiry.

**Ho1**: Mentorship has no significant influence on family businesses' survival

**Ho2**: Gender has no significant influence on family business survival

**Ho3:** Training has no significant influence on family business survival

**Ho4:** Entrepreneurial orientation has no significant influence on family business survival

## 1.6 Significance of the Study

This study will provide information to family business owners and the general public on how to build policies and structures that aid in the implementation of succession plans and identify areas of improvement that impede the successful functioning of their enterprises after their resignation or demise. In terms of academics, this study will surely be a source of knowledge for students in Economics, Business management, other fields, and tertiary institution educators. In addition, it will undoubtedly convey knowledge by motivating academics to debate the relevance of succession planning and the survival of family enterprises.

## 1.7 Scope of the Study

This investigation aimed to look intothe effect of succession planning on the survival of the family business. The variable scopes are mentoring, gender, training, and entrepreneurial orientation. The geographical scope of this study is Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

The unit scope covers the employees and owners of some selected family businesses in Ilorin Kwara, Nigeria

## 1.8 Operationalisation of Research Variables

Effect of Succession Planning on Family Business Survival was operationalized into a mathematical equation as follows:

Y=f(X)…………………. 1.1

Where:

Y= survival of the family business (Dependent variable)

X= succession planning (Independent variable)

The variables of succession planning include mentorship, gender, training, and entrepreneurial orientation.

Succession planning (X) = X1, X2, X3, X4 …Xn……… 1.2

The above can be represented as follow:

X1 = Mentorship

X2 – Gender

X3 = Training and

X4 = Entrepreneurial orientation

Also, based on the X (succession planning) construct, we can present Y (survival of family business) thus;

Y = Y1 …Yn…………………… …….1.3

Y =Survival of Family Business

# CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1 Conceptual Framework

This section contains a literature review on family businesses, succession planning, mentorship, and other concepts that are relevant to the topic. This chapter also describes the theoretical framework developed to serve as a roadmap for carrying out this study, enabling the researcher to achieve the study's objectives and respond to the primary and secondary research questions.

### 2.1.1 Concept of Family Business

Family businesses are companies where family members who are related to the company through familial ties, nuptial connection or being adopted have a high degree of influence over business decisions (low, mid, high management), which to a great extent affects the productivity of the enterprise, its profitability and sustainability (De Massis*et al*., 2014). Businesses operated by a family possess four characteristics, according to Agbim (2019):

1. they are under one family's control;
2. they give non-family members employment;
3. A separate board of directors governs them.
4. The family firm employs a certain number of family members.

Operators with familial ties to the family enterprise influence its objectives and effectiveness in meeting them(Agbim, 2019).

It is impossible to overstate the significance of family businesses. Family businesses contribute to global wealth creation and economic and social development (Panjwani*et al*., 2008). Family businesses are estimated to employ a substantial amount of workers in the United States relative to other nations (Bettinelli*et al.,* 2017). In their investigation, Pieper et al., (2013) detailed the significance of family-run enterprises, which includes; fostering economic prosperity in their host countries, high employment rate, and an increase in community-oriented development. In addition, the inherent synergies between the owner and management allow family businesses to perform better than any other business organisation (Motwani *et al.,* 2006).

### 2.1.2 Succession Planning

Rothwell (2010) described succession planning as an approach for choosing and preparing the appropriate candidate for important organisational roles. According to some accounts, management positions guarantee that people advance in seniority and offer the most incredible flexibility for lateral management moves. Furthermore, it is anticipated that management skills will expand and become more generalized rather than focusing solely on departmental goals. Mathur (2011) describes succession planning as the approach that identifies and advances organizational personnel. These people could step into important leadership roles within the organization. The presence of knowledgeable and skilled labourers who are ready to assume these roles as they open up is increased by succession planning. In other words, this is a process by which an organization ensures that workers are hired and trained to fill each important position within the company.

As they prepare the company and its employees for the future, management is prompted by the succession planning process to define and address talent management strategies (McCauley & Wakefield, 2006). Additionally, it promotes staff continuity and longevity. Additionally, it is made to allow key individuals' long-term development, replacement, and strategic applicationto guarantee an organisation's continued successful productivity. Therefore, organizations typically implement a people process to ensure that their employees are appropriately valued, cared for, and developed. According to Rothwell (2010), succession planning and management should support strategic planning and thinking and serve as a crucial starting point of departure for management and workforce development initiatives. This is accomplished by selecting and training the appropriate candidates for the positions.

Transferring management and control within a business is the simplest way to sum up succession. It simply means an exit from the management; it does not imply a complete exit from ownership. Although applicable at all levels, the most significant challenge exists at the highest level. However, as a continuous process, succession planning will help the firms to ensure successors are being prepared by being given tasks and undergoing training that will improve their effectiveness in the event they later take over management of the organisation (Vedpuriswar, 2001).

### 2.1.4 Gender

Age, educational level, and gender are the three family business characteristics most frequently discussed in the literature. Demographic, achieved, teachable, and situational characteristics were the focus of the investigation by Degrysee *et al.,* (2015) and Khurrum *et al.,* (2008). Age and gender are among the demographic characteristics. Achieved characteristics include educational attainment, work history, as well as other aspects. The urge for accomplishment, control, and leadership are all learnable attributes. Health, spouse, family, the existence of children, and other circumstances are examples of situational qualities. Many SMEs, for example, is run by family members. This will have an impact on their succession planning and execution decisions. Succession refers to transferring a business and its management from one person to another (Ganu & Boateng, 2013).Transferring leadership is critical for the enterprise's productivity (Scholes*et al*., 2008). After the owner dies, it is not necessarily required to address succession difficulties and other issues impacting the firm. The owner decides whether to transfer ownership in the SME sector mostly because most enterprise owners see the companies as intricately connected extensions of their personalities and desires.

### 2.1.3 Entrepreneurial Orientation

High levels of education significantly impact succession because successors can raise the enterprise's productivity (Ahrens *et al.,* 2015: Jones *et al.,* 2018). Entrepreneurial Orientation is pertinent for the organisation's sustainability as it prepares the replacement candidate for taking over as soon as the founder is gone. It may involve leadership training, entrepreneurship education and technical expertise (Wahjono *et al.,* 2014). The successor's knowledge and abilities are the foundational competencies for implementing innovative initiatives which can drive a firm’s profitability (Alshanty & Emeagwali, 2019).A good succession plan is dependent on the processes of information internalization and social interaction. The successor's active participation in running the business is a crucial factor. This improves the successor’s comprehension of the business and societal norms (Duh, 2014). Training a successor before assuming leadership in a family-run enterprise is more or less emphasized in every research study conducted worldwide. Only the form or even the performance location affects opinions on educational methods. They all agreed, however, that only a capable successor can guarantee the survival of a family business.

### 2.1.5 Training and Development

Employees undergo training to ensure their effectiveness in their given tasks and make them efficient in future positions. The goal of training is to make the successor's skills stronger. Practical successor training provides the successors with the required managerial abilities, business acumen, and personality traits to run a business successfully (Ghee*et al*., 2015). The advantage of training successors is that it improves their decision-making and problem-solving abilities. In addition, it equips workers to deal with stress, tension, and frustration. Through training, one advances in achieving personal objectives and finds job satisfaction. However, employees willingly resign from their workplace when they retire or leave to seek better opportunities or unwillingly when their appointment is terminated. Therefore, there are regular vacuums in leadership, and organisations struggle to fill these vacancies(Ugwu*et al.,* 2017).

### 2.1.6 Mentorship

This involves the deliberate transfer of information from an expert who possesses a certain level of expertise in a field to an inexperienced person called a mentee who is interested in becoming knowledgeable in that field (Arogundade, 2011). Noe*et al.,* (2002) defined a mentor as someone who commands respect due to their age, experience, expertise, or position in a higher-ranking position. A mentor is a person who supports the development of another person on both a personal and professional level by imparting wisdom and knowledge they have gained over time (Arogundade, 2011). The process of improving others and providing by imparting upon them the necessary knowledge and know-how to succeed in a field is known as mentoring. According to Okurame (2008), mentoring encompasses the practices frequently planned and endorsed by leadership to help employees grow in order to improve the company's competitiveness. When discussing family businesses, employees may be close friends, the owner's or manager's children, or even someone from outside who will take over the company's management. Young and Colby (2006).

Through a mentoring process, inexperienced and experienced people are brought together to help the former develop their knowledge, skills, and sense of self, while the latter gains knowledge and expertise from the former. According to Allen (2007),the method of semi- structuring mentoring is in which an individual of a body of individuals imparts leadership and expertise to an inexperienced individual with the aim of improving their personal life and career. Therefore,it is concluded that mentorship is the willful transfer ofinformation, expertise, and abilities from an expert (the mentor) to a novice or less skilled than the mentor (mentee). Mentors seek to pass on the expertise they have accumulated over the years to their mentees, ensuring their legacy will continue (Kumar &Blake-Beard, 2012). The success of family-runenterprises depends on the transfer of skills and expertise from predecessors to successors. This fills the learning gaps that come from engaging only in formal education (Burns, 2014). Furthermore, the foundation laid by the predecessors through acquired knowledge enables the successors to guarantee that they have the leadership acumen and expertise to steer the company to better productivity and sustainability (Chirico, 2008).

### 2.1.7 Importance of Succession planning

No matter how certain the company's future appears, succession planning is a relevant component of conducting the affairs of an enterprise. One of the most crucial issues for business owners to pay attention to is succession planning which,according to previous works, is the most significant activity carried out by the predecessor, which will benefit the successor of the enterprise (Motwani *et al*., 2006; Pardo-del-Val, 2009). Suh *et al*., (2008) claim that succession planning ensures the adequate preparation of the management and successor for the company’s future. A cycle of anticipated growth and objectives is thus created by matching employees' talents to current needs and preparing them for future responsibilities. When new leadership positions become available, a good succession plan identifies which employees are prepared for them so that another employee is prepared to fill the void when one leaves or is promoted to the next level. Managing anenterprise's leadership transition can be challenging. Planning for succession can reduce the risk for businesses (Garman & Glawe, 2004:Barnett& Davis, 2008).

## 2.2 Theoretical framework

Kurt Lewin famously proclaimed in 1945, suggesting that a good theory plays a crucial role in directing successful practice. Because theory helps connect observed phenomena and create conceptual frameworks that encourage understanding, it is an effective tool for guiding knowledge development (Sutton & Staw, 1995). Additionally, it helps to establish links between the current research and earlier studies, utilizing our collective knowledge to reveal various options for an effectual response (Lindblom & Cohen, 1979; Moore, 1962; Weiss, 1977).

### 2.2.1 Family Systems Theory

Understanding how the family and business systems interact and overlap is essential.Family Systems Theory expands on the idea that families are groupings of persons that engage in dyadic relationships by including behaviour into relationship systems. As a result, families are more than just a collection of individuals; through their interactions and business dealings within the family, these individuals forge distinctive systems or group attributes beyond the sum of the individual attributes. These particular interactions might distinguish family businesses from other types of businesses(Stafford*et al*., 1999). The theory postulates that the family unit will try to preserve an emotional balance and a consistent mode of operation. Both rational and emotive responses to development occur within the family system. Changingthose results from either a development-oriented system or external circumstances can disrupt the balance and its regulatory systems.

Understanding business is also aided by systems theory. The theory analyses how members influence each other and the entire organization (Kepner, 1983). The theory has been immensely beneficial to scholars in comprehending the importance of culture in societal organisations, which in turn supports social enterprises (Whitley, 1999). These social business systems may be crucial to the family system since they provide them with the lee-way to choose where they intend to settle down (Kuratko, 2009). Noe *et al.,*(2002) created a successful business model that concentrated on the entrepreneur's role and how it corresponds to the enterprise’s productivity.They maintain that a company's successis determined by its employees' abilities and factors like organizational vision and employee empowerment. It is evident that this strategy has produced little understanding. Entrepreneurs launch businesses to support their lifestyles (Davis-Brown & Salamon, 1987; Winter*et al.,* 2004). Even though profitability is vital to enterprise owners, they deserve to have more control over how they spend their time by engaging more in social interactions rather than solely the company’s activities.

### 2.2.2 Leadership Model Succession Theory

Leadership Succession Planning According to theory, the organisation, should sustain redundancy in its leadership structures to ensure it prepares for the event when managers step down by naming a replacement, preparing a suitable candidate who has been mentored and avoiding power struggles by ensuring a timely change in the administration (Ibrahim*et al.,* 2001). Businesses use this theory to retain control over the organisational direction and business strategies by promoting from within an existing leadership structure. Successful businesses may outlive their founders. Corporations, non-profits, and cooperatives have histories linked yet different from the individuals who founded them. Succession refers to the procedure undertaken to ensure the continued existence of the enterprise once its current leaders are no longer with the organisation. As a result, numerous management philosophies vary due to the enterprise’s leadership styles (Bjuggren & Sund, 2001).

**2.3 Empirical review**

The following studies are reviewed as they relate to the current study:

* **Mentorship Influence**

McIlongo and Strydom (2021) investigated the usefulness of mentoring in female workers in civil service to advance their careers. Mentoring was stressed as a way of professional growth for women in the South African civil service.Data was gathered using a sample size of 200 women working in the civil service throughout South Africa's provinces. The data was analysed using descriptive statistics.The findings showed that mentorship is valued as a development tool by female public sector employees; however, career advancement is not always influenced by the mentor's gender. The research's single focus on the career aspect was a drawback because the tendency toward an entrepreneurial orientation could have been explored.

Eesley and Wang (2017) evaluated an entrepreneurship course wherebymentees were irregularly partnered with an entrepreneurially oriented individual and a non-entrepreneurial individual for mentorship. This was demonstrated via the use of a longitudinal. The outcome indicated that randomly allocating to an entrepreneurial-orientedtutorgreatly affects the career disposition of mentees, especially amongst mentees with no prior entrepreneurial background. Furthermore, it was proven that a mentor influences a person's desire to work with a firm in its developing stage, with the research's fault being the removal of the family impact. Wangand Shibayama (2022) conducted a relatable study in which they attempted to observe mentorship as a means of helping people acquire and develop their creative abilities. It was further understudied by looking at the relationship between mentor innovativeness and mentees innovativeness as a result of the mentor’s autonomy and explorations. Findings show that the mentorship took a significant period of time to create an obvious effect on the mentee. However, the mentor's innovativeness does not impact the mentee's innovativeness. However, the perspective resulting from the demographics factor was not considered.

Furthermore, Ofobruku and Nwakoby (2015) used the Abuja construction industry to research the effects of mentoring on workers' performance in family businesses. The study employed qualitative and quantitative research techniques. Using the Pearson correlation coefficient statistics technique, responses from 367 construction workers were analysed. According to the findings, mentorship positively influenced employee performance, although career assistance had a bigger positive impact than psychological support. The study demonstrated that the level of mentorship programs implemented within the organization affects employee performance. Performance-wise, improve through professional assistance. The investigation discovered that there is a strong connection between mentorships and employee performance. It further recommends that enterprises attain better competitiveness by creating mentorship programmes to improve employee effectiveness.

The career and psychosocial mentoring roles in the career development of the current female superintendents in Alabama were examined in a study by Promisee-Bynum (2010). Female and assistant superintendents comprised the study's sample population (N=28). According to the ANOVA results, all career and psychosocial mentoring roles are statistically related. However, the effects of mentorship across both genders on the career and psychosocial mentoring functions were not statistically related, according to a one-way ANOVA for gender. Since the research's focus on career continuity was short-sighted, the results imply that the career and psychosocial mentoring functions significantly impact women superintendents' careers in Alabama.

* **Family Businesses Survival**

Alves and Gama (2020) examined the connection between the effectiveness of family businesses (FB) and family influence as determined by power, experience, and culture (F-PEC). Performance was assessed both financially and non-financially. 169 Portuguese family firms responded to a questionnaire, which they used to engage the quantitative method. They used multiple linear regression models. Their discovery indicated there exists a negative relationship between experience and financial performance and a strong connection between familial moralsand non-financial accomplishments. The findings highlight how crucial the company and family goals are to align, while the study's gap undermined the demographic influence.

In order to research family business survival, Katare*et al.,* (2021) gathered internet surveydata from 463 SMEs in the US. The survey data include information on the characteristics of the business, financial health, current management ofchallenges, and an enterprise managed bya family. The outcome of the investigation indicated that the causes of loss of revenuemay not always be related to theduration of the recovery process. Second, businesses that lacked adequate capital were more likely to experience severe income losses, take longer to recover, and be less resilient. Perceived success, growth potential, and perceived profitability were combined to create a scale for resilience. Third, although the pandemic necessitated changes to business models, not all adaptive business strategies had successful commercial results. Stamm and Lubinski (2020) examined the empirical underpinnings and univocal interpretation of the family firm survival rate. They do more research on the literature related to firm demography, a fascinating subject in mortality and ageing, and they find connections to family business studies. Finally, they proposed revising the way survival rates were thought of within a larger firm demographic research framework.

* **Entrepreneurial Orientation**

The works of Martins*et al.,* (2022) on the development and testing of a model considered how entrepreneurship educationalinitiatives affected individual entrepreneurial orientation (IEO) and the function of IEO using the Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB). One thousand seven hundred twenty-three undergraduate students from Colombia and Ecuador were included in the study. The non-parametric statistical test employed (Wilcoxon signed-rank test and Sign-Test)indicated there exists a strong connection between entrepreneurship educationalinitiativesand IEO. Additionally, the theoretical model was validated using structural equation modelling, and the relationships between IEO, TBP, and EI were tested.

Dominant Logic (DL) and its effects on the connection between EO and firm performance were studied by (Ferreras-Méndez*et al*., 2022). A sample comprising 149 newly formed manufacturing enterprises showed that dominant logicis strongly connected with entrepreneurship. According to the data, newly formed enterprises should encourage dominant logic and implement suitable tactics to maximise EO's impact on performance. However, the lack of consideration for the influence of training undermined the research. The results have significant theoretical and applied implications for entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial behaviour, but they omitted the transition of the impact of the entrepreneurial orientation's parameters.Furthermore, Campos*et al.,* (2012) developed a new Family Business Efficacy (FBE) concept, which measures the effectiveness of the family as a group. The study examinedthe impact of family business efficacy on family businesses in Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom. The research identifies FBE elementscorresponding to family members' perceptions of their ability to work together to attain the family enterprise's sustainability objective. The study contributed to the conceptualization of family business efficacy as the foundation for measuring and evaluating the impact of family business efficacy on the performance of an enterprise. However, the qualitative measurement of the instruments would have followed the parameters but was absent.

In a study on continuity of entrepreneurial orientation, Karaevli and Yurtoglu (2021) looked into how family ownership heterogeneity impactshow business groups are internalised at various stages of changes in the marketplace. By speculating and discovering that internationalisation suffers when authority is transferred from the founder to succeeding generations. The study's flaw was that the demographic factors were ignored. Burt*et al.,* (2021) researched to ascertain the following:

1. Describe the meaning of a company being embedded in a family using social network analysis;
2. To make known a novel business from the application, not family but similar to a family.

* **Demographic Factors**

The impact of municipalities' socioeconomic and demographic traits on the Brazilian motorcycle fleet was investigated by (Oliveira *et al.,* 2021). Geographically weighted regression and econometric methods were used. Both methods showed that the car fleet and per capita income positively impacted the motorcycle fleet. Most of the motorcycle fleet was concerted in urban areas and municipalities with high per capita incomes, but due to the study's limitations, Rahman et al., (2021) chose to explore the underlying connectionsbetween motorcycle riders and ride-hailing firms and their socioeconomic and demography. A total of 1003 respondents' responses make up the sample size. Sixteen questions are posed, revealing the respondents' various socioeconomic and demographic traits as they relate to their decision between the two most common ride-hailing firms in Bangladesh: cars and motorcycles.

According to the results, some sociodemographic groups favour motorcycles over cars when looking for rides. The outcome also demonstrates that gender, family size, revenue, level of education, and smartphone use tend to promote ride-hailing preference for both motorcycles and motorcars. However, the study was undermined by the knowledge left out due to such business training. Semple and Fountas (2022) offered a combined analyticssystem to examine the behavioural and demographic features that affect community preference for pedestrianization. Public perceptions of pedestrianization were examined using survey data from Edinburgh, UK, in 2020. descriptive statistics to assess the respondents' perceptions. Initial findings indicated that locals generally support most pedestrianization-related issues. Generally, several independent analyses and modelling techniques point to common factors influencing opinion, such as patterns of behaviour relating to the mode of transportation and frequency of trips. At the same time, disability significantly impacted preference. The impact of training constrained the study.

* **Training Influence**

Pillette*et al.,* (2021) conducted an experiment in which 6 experimenters (3 women) trained 5 women and 5 men (a total of 60 participants) to execute right-hand as opposed to left-hand MI-BCI tasks in order to determine whether the gender of the experimenters affected the training outcomes for MI-BCI users, including performances and user-experience. They also looked at how the gender of the experimenters and subjects affected the training results, specifically how well the MI-BCI performed and how the users felt. Results: On the progression of the test, a significant connection between experimenters and participants' sex was discovered. It was discovered that there was a strong connection between participant stress and experimenter sex on average performances. It was determined that contingent on the sex and tension of the participants, the sex of the experimenters could impact MI-BCI performances.

Wanga*et al.,* (2019) investigated the knowledge and willingness of family business successors to engage in sustainable innovation in relation to the mediating role of the owner’sconsent. A study was conducted with 128 senior executives from family-runenterprises in Taiwan. The study concluded that business successors greatly influence sustainable innovation is determined by leader approval. According to the study, leaders' readinesshandover authorityto the protégé is critical to the protégé’s dispositionto improve the productivity of the enterprise.

# CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

## 3.1 Introduction

This section covers the procedures adopted in conducting the research under the following headings: research design,population,sampling techniques, the instrument and methodof data collection, analysis, validity, and reliability.

## 3.2 Research Design

Kothari (2011) stated that the research design is the systematic processfor which data is collected and analysed so that it is relevant to the objectives of the investigation and is cost-effective. It is a strategy for gathering data for a study that lays out the overall framework.For this study, a cross-sectional descriptive survey will be used as the research design. This study's design was chosen because it relies on primary data to gather information. It concentrates on systematically and precisely measuring the variables. The design employed for this investigation was geared towards assessing the impact of succession planning on family business survival in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

## 3.3 Population of the study

A population is all the units or elements that make up a set or universe (Abbott &McKinney, 2013). This study's population comprises all Cooperate Affairs Commission (CAC) members in Ilorin, Kwara State. The estimated population at the Kwara state ministry of commerce and industry was utilized to arrive at a sample size for the study population.

## 3.4 Sampling Technique and Sample Size

The respondent was chosen using a multi-sampling technique. Purposive sampling was used to select five (5) markets in the city of Ilorin, while simple random sampling was used to select 358 respondents.As a result, the sample size for this study was 358 respondents, as determined by the formula proposed by (Slovin, 1963).

Where:  
n = Total population   
N = Sample size  
α=0.05

## 3.5 Instrument of Data Collection and Administration

The researcher created a structured questionnaire (see appendix 1) for respondents to fill out. They had to check (  ) the boxes provided. The questionnaire employed was categorised into two separate parts; the first asked participants for bio-data information, and the second tested the research hypothesis.

## 3.6 Validation and Reliability of the instrument

The effectiveness and accuracy of the instrument used were based on the purpose for which it was designed,thus demonstrating how accurate the research result is and is referred to as validity. The instrument precisely measured what it was intended to measure. This study used a face validity approach, in which the project supervisor reviewed the questionnaire and made necessary changes for approval. This investigation employed content validity to test the instrument's validity. The extent to which an instrument's items represent the content and behaviour specified by the theoretical concept being tested is called content validity. The researchers' project supervisor validated the instrument. The reliability test demonstrated how the research instrument consistently measured what it was designed to measure (Otokiti, 2010). When assessing the instrument's reliability, Cronbach's alpha used was construed as a coefficient alpha ranging from 0 to 1 (Olorunleke& Akinyele, 2014). According to Sekaran and Bougie (2014), "Cronbach's reliability coefficients less than 0.6 are not acceptable, reliabilities in 0.7 ranges are satisfactory, and those coefficients greater than 0.8 are perfect." (See Table 3.1)

Table 3. 1: Reliability Analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **No. of Items** | **Cronbach Alpha Reliability** |
| Mentorship Scale | 20 | 0.82 |
| Family business survival scale | 11 | 0.85 |
| Entrepreneurial training scale | 11 | 0.81 |
| Entrepreneurial orientation scale | 10 | 0.83 |
| Gender scale | 13 | 0.84 |

## 3.7 Methods of Data Analysis

Cooper and Schindler (2014) stated that the procedure of analysing data is carried out to ensure data accuracy and conversion from raw to classified forms suitable for analysis. Following data collection, data analysis must be completed by choosing a data analysis strategy to derive meaning from the collected data, and the final results are presented in tables, graphs, and pie charts. The data collected in this study was quantitative because of the nature of the data. As a result, the quantitative analysis included both descriptive and inferential statistics.See table below

Table 3. 2: Objectives and Method of Data Analysis

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Objective** | **Method of Data Analysis** |
| i | Examine how mentorship influences family business survival. | (OLS) Ordinary least square method of estimation |
| ii | Assess how gender affects family business survival. | (OLS) Ordinary least square method of estimation |
| iii | Ascertain how training impacts family business survival and | (OLS) Ordinary least square method of estimation |
| iv | Examine how entrepreneurial orientation influences family business survival. | (OLS) Ordinary least square method of estimation |

# CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

## 4.0 Introduction

This sectioncomprisesthe interpretation of gathered data, analysed using appropriate statistical and qualitative analytical tools, highlighting the study's findings. Information was stimulated from the existing business owners in the selected markets in Ilorin Metropolis. The tendencies of businesses were obtained from provided data from CAC registered in Ilorin, Kwara State. The formulated hypotheses/ research objectives were used as a guide in arranging the tables and discussing the finding.

## 4.1 Data Presentation

The research’s statistics are given in tables that include pertinent information such as the number of survey formsdisseminated and recovered from participants.A total of four hundred (400) Questionnaires were given at the five marketplaces of Ilorin Metropolis. Three hundred fifty-eight questionnaires were recovered and found eligible for processing, yielding a 90.67 percent response rate(see table 4.1). A total of five locations were selected, and family businesses that had conducted business in the market were selected. The selected locations were (Oja-Tuntun, Geri Alimi, Mount Olive Market, Pillar mega stores, Taiwo oke, and Asa dam business areas). Table 4.1 indicates the tabulated socio-demographics of the research participants.

Table 4. 1:Distribution and retrieval of Questionnaires

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **S/N** | **Study Location** | **Total Distributed** | **Number retrieved** | **% Total retrieved** |
| 1 | Oja-Tuntun | 80 | 75 | 93.75 |
| 2 | Geri Alimi | 80 | 77 | 96.25% |
| 3 | Mount Olive Market | 80 | 68 | 85% |
| 4 | Pillar Market | 80 | 70 | 87.5% |
| 5 | Asa dam Market | 80 | 68 | 85% |
| **Total** | | **400** | **358** | **89.5%** |

Source: Field Survey (2022)

## 4.2Respondents' Demographic Profile

Table 4.1 is a distribution of the demographic features of the respondents. It shows the respondent's age. Marital Status, Number of Dependents, Educational Qualification, Highest Professional Qualification, Employment Status, and Mentorship while runninga family-related business in the Ilorin metropolis.

### 4.2.1 Gender Distribution

Gender distribution showed that 48% of the participants were male, and 52% were female. This indicated a fair distribution among the respondents (see Table 4.2). This shows that respondents are fairly distributed according to gender,suggestingthe absence of gender bias.

Table 4. 2: Gender Distribution

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Male  Female  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 170 | 47.5 | 47.5 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.2 Age Distribution

Furthermore, the breakdown of the age distribution revealed that young people below 38 years (62%) are more among the respondents (employees and owners of some selected family businesses) while 43% of the respondents are aged between 18-27 years, 19% aged 38-47years, 24% aged 38-47years, and 5% are aged 48-57 years while 10% are aged 58years and above (see Table 4.3).

Table 4. 3: Age Distribution

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 18-27  28-37  38-47  48-57  58 years& above  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 154 | 43.0 | 43.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 62.0 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 85.8 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 90.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.3Marital Status Distribution

According to their marital status, the distribution of the respondents revealed that 57% are single, 38% are married, and 5% indicated others. This implies that most respondents are single (see table 4.4).

Table 4. 4: Marital Status Distribution

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Single  Married  Others  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 205 | 57.3 | 57.3 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 95.3 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.4 Number of Dependents

Table 4.5 revealed that about 14% of the respondents have no dependents. A large portion of the respondent, another 38% have 13 dependents, 29% have 4-6 dependents, and 19% reported having dependents equal to or above 10. This indicates that most of the employees and owners of some selected family businesses reported high dependents. This re-emphasizes the practice of community living in Nigeria and sometimes encourages succession challenges.

Table 4. 5: Number of Dependents

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No of dependents  None  1 – 3  4 – 6  10 and above  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 52.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.5Highest Educational Qualification

Table 4.6 illustrates the educational qualification of the respondents, with about 29% holding a post-graduate degree, 38% holding a Bachelor's degree, 29% holding HND and 5% holding OND. This implies that family business owners have the required education for the business.

Table 4. 6: Highest Educational Qualification

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OND  HND  BSc.  MBA  MSc  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 18 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 33.5 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 71.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

The respondents’ professional qualification frequency distribution revealed that 57% possess no professional certification while 43% hold at least one professional certificate (see table 4.7). This indicates that most of the employees and owners of some selected family businesses placed minimal value on professional certification.

Table 4. 7: Professional Qualifications posed by the respondent

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| None  NIM  ACCA  ICAN  Others (please specify)  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 205 | 57.3 | 57.3 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 71.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 76.3 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 95.3 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.6 Job Status

On job status, the majority, 76% of the respondents are trained staff of the organization holding a permanent job while 24% are currently on contract employmentwhile others relive of appointment in contractual.; this is presented intable 4.8

Table 4. 8: Job Status

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Permanent  Contract  Total | Frequencies | % | Cumulative % |
| 273 | 76.3 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Source: Fieldwork (2022)

### 4.2.7Mentorship

Most respondents indicated that they have a mentor (95%), while few indicated no mentor (29%); this is presented in Table 4.9.

Table 4. 9: Respondent and Mentorship

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes  No  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 341 | 95.3 | 95.3 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4. 10: Ethnicity of mentor

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yoruba  Ibo  Hausa  Ijaw  Idoma  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 222 | 62.0 | 62.0 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 85.8 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 90.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 95.3 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

On the ethnicity of the mentor, 62% of the respondents indicated that their mentor is from the Yoruba ethnic group, 24% indicated Igbo, 5% indicated Hausa, 5% indicated Ijaw, and 5% indicated Idoma (see Table 4.10). This revealed that most of the respondents’ mentors are Yoruba.

Table 4. 11: Mentorship and understanding of work objectives by respondents.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  **Total** | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| **358** | **100.0** |  |

Table 4.11 above illustrates that 43% of the participants strongly subscribe to the contribution of their mentor in understanding the work objective, while 48% agreed. However, 5% disagreed, while 5% were undefined. This implies that most of the respondents received support from their mentors to accomplish the work objectives required in their new position.

### 4.2.8 Mentorship Influence

Respondents were asked to score their overall impression of the elements of mentorship influence on a five-point Likert scale. The outcomes are concisely stated in Table 4.12.

Table 4. 12: Mentorship and strategies forachieving short- and long-term objectives

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| Valid | Disagreed | 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| Agreed | 205 | 57.3 | 62.0 |
| Strongly Agreed | 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.12 reveals that 38% of participants strongly approved that their mentor recommended particular techniques to attain short and long-term professional goals, while 57% agreed. However, 5% disagreed.

Table 4. 13: Mentor provided performance feedback about challenging assignments

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 222 | 62.0 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.13 indicates that 24% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors provided ongoing performance feedback about challenging assignments, while 62% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 14: Mentorship help develop a professional reputation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 222 | 62.0 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.14indicated that 24% of the participants strongly agreed that their mentors helped them develop a professional reputation, while 62% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 15: Mentor discussed career paths

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 22 | 62.0 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 14 shows that 29% of the respondents strongly agreed that they discussed career paths with their mentors, while 62% agreed. However, 5% disagreed, and another 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 16: Mentorship advances mutual association.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| **68** | **19.0** | **19.0** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 33.2 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 15 shows that 29% of the respondents strongly subscribe that their mentors supported their advancement in the organization through mutual association, while 38% agreed. However, 19% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4. 17: Mentorship held power and influence within the organization

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 28.5 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.17reveals that 24% of participants strongly believe that their mentors gave insights regarding administrators in positions of power and influence inside the firm, while 48% agreed. However, 19% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4. 18: Mentorship encourages seminars and workshops for competence

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.18 shows that 38% of the respondents strongly agreed that their mentors encouraged them to pursue courses, seminars, and workshops to improve their administrative skills, while 48% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 19: Preparation for positions of greater responsibility

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 52.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.19indicates that 48% of the participants strongly agreed that their mentors helped prepare them for more significant responsibility positions by providing leadership experiences, while 48% agreed. However, 5% disagreed.

Table 4. 20: Mentor displayed a positive attitude which provided a model worthy of emulation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.20indicates that 29% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors demonstrated a good attitude that served as a model for people to follow, while 57% agreed. Nevertheless, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.21: Your mentor provided support and encouragement as you assumedthe responsibility and developed competence

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 66.8 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.21reveals that 33% of respondents strongly believe that their mentors gave support and encouragement as they took on responsibilities and built competence, and 57% agreed. However, 10% disagreed with the assertion.

Table 4. 22: Established trust level which encouraged the productive organization

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| 239 | 66.8 | 85.8 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.22indicates that 14% of the participants strongly agreed that theredeveloped a degree of trust that permitted them to discuss honest concerns, fears, and ambivalence that distracted them from efficiently organizing work, while 67% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4. 23: Informal Mentorship exchanges on work and non-work experiences

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.23 demonstrates that 28% of respondents strongly agreed that their mentors were persons with whom they could have casual discussions regarding their job and non-work experiences. However, 19% disagreed with the assertion, while 52% agreed.

Table 4. 24: Exhibited positive values which provided a model worthy of respect

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.24 indicates that 43% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors demonstrated positive characteristics that served as an example to be emulated,while 52% agreed. However, 5% disagreed with the assertion.

Table 4. 25: Mentorship serves as a sounding board for self-exploration

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 23.7 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 66.8 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.25indicates that 33% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors served as their sounding board for self-exploration, while 43% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4. 26: Mentorship helped mould leadership style

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.26indicates that 38% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors helped mould their leadership style, while 48% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 27: Mentor accepted and supported personal Concerns

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 239 | 66.8 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.27 indicates that 24% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors accepted and supported them as they attempted to resolve personal concerns, while 67% agreed. However, 10% disagreed.

Table 4. 28: Mentor promote positive self-image of emerging administrator

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.28indicates that 43% of the participants strongly believed that their mentors promoted a positive self-image as an emerging administrator, while 53% agreed. However, 5% disagreed.

Table 4. 29: Mentor served as a confident without risking exposure to others

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 23.7 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.29indicates that 19% of the participants strongly agreed that their mentors acted as a confidant with whom they could discuss their questions and worries without fear of being exposed to others in the organisation,while 57% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4. 30: Established independent environment

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.30indicates that 24% of the participants strongly agreed that their mentors established a climate that encouraged independence, while 57% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

### 4.2.9 Family Business Survival

Table 4. 31: Family has an influence on business

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 47.8 |
| 187 | 52.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.31indicates that 52% of the participants strongly agreed that their family influences their business, while 34% agreed. However, 14% disagreed.

Table 4. 32: Family members share similar values

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 19.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.32indicates that 38% of the participants strongly agreed that their family members share similar values, while 43% agreed. However, 14% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 33: Family members support the family business

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.33reveals that 38% of respondents strongly feel that their family members support the family company in conversations with friends, workers, and other family members,while 57% agreed. However, 5% disagreed.

Table 4. 34: Family members are committed to the family firm.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.34 shows that 43% of respondents strongly believe their family members feel loyal to the family business, while 53% agreed. However, 5% disagreed.

Table 4. 35: Family members are proud of the family business

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.35 shows that 38% of the respondents strongly agreed that their Family members are delighted to inform others that they work for the family firm. While 48% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 5% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 36: Long-term participation in the family business is profitable.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 66.8 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.36indicates that 33% of participants strongly believe there is much to be gained by engaging in the family company long-term, while 52 percent agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 37: Family members agreed on the family business's goals, plans, and policies.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 19.0 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.37 shows that 23% of the respondents strongly agreed that their Family members agreed on family company objectives, strategies, and policies, while 57% agreed. However14% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 38: Deciding to be involved with the family business has had a positive influence on my life

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 19.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | --62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.38 indicates that 38% of the participants strongly agreed that their decision to be involved in the family business positively influences their life, while 43% agreed. However, 14% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 39: Supporting family decisions about the family business's future

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 14.2 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 19.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.39 reveals that 38% of respondents strongly agreed with their family's decision about the future of the family company, while 43% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undecided.

Table 4. 40: Your family has an impact on your company.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 19.0 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 52.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

According to Table 4.40, 48% of participants strongly agreed that their family influences their business, while 34% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, and 14% disagreed.

### 4.2.10 Trans-generational Succession

Table 4. 41: The company's owners' current generation (or generations) (1st,2nd,etc.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Second Generation  Fourth Generation  Fifth Generation  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 66.8 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.41 shows that 48% of the respondents indicated that the fourthgeneration currently owns the company, while 33% indicated the fifth generation and 19% indicated the second generation. This suggests that most respondents asserted that their company is transgenerational, having succeeded over two generations.

Table 4. 42: Present generation managing the Company

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Generation  Second Generation  Third Generation  Fourth Generation  Fifth Generation  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 102 | 28.5 | 28.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 38.0 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 42.7 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

In business management, 29% of the respondents indicated that the first generation currently manages the company, 10% indicated the second generation, 5% indicated the third generation, 34% indicated the fourth generation, and 24% indicated the fifthgeneration (see Table 4.42).

Table 4. 43: Active generation on governing board

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| First Generation  Second Generation  Third Generation  Fourth Generation  Fifth Generation  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 33.2 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 42.7 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

On the participation in the governing board of the business, 19% of the respondents indicated that first-generation is active in the governing board, 14% indicated the second generation, 10% indicated the third generation, 34% indicated fourth-generation while 24% indicated fifth-generation (see Table 4.43).

Table 4. 44: Stay Independent

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 28.5 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 42.7 |
| 103 | 28.8 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.44indicates that 29% of the participants strongly agreed that the business is still independent, while 29% agreed. However, 19% strongly disagreed, 14% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4. 45: Reduce Debt

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 43.0 |
| 204 | 57.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.45 shows that 57% of the respondents strongly agreed there is a reduction in the business's debt, while 38% agreed and 5% were undefined.

Table 4. 46: Ensure the company's long-term viability.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 38.3 |
| 221 | 61.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.46 shows that 62% of the respondents strongly agreed that the business's long-term survival is assured, while 34% agreed and 5% are undefined.

Table 4.47: Balance family concerns and business interests

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 154 | 43.0 | 43.0 |
| 204 | 57.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.47 shows that 57% of the respondents strongly agreed that there are balanced family concerns and business interests, while 43% agreed.

Table 4.48: Prepare and Train a Successor

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.48 shows that 38% of the respondents strongly agreed that there is preparation and training of a successor for the business, while 57% agreed, but 5% disagreedwith this submission.

Table 4.49: Increase private or family wealth

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 222 | 62.0 | 66.8 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.49 shows that 33% of the respondents strongly agreed there is an increase in private and family wealth, while 62% agreed, but 5% were undefined.

Table 4.50: Increase the market value of the business

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.50 shows that 43% of the respondents strongly agreed there is an increase in the business's market value of the business while53% agreed, but 5% were undefined.

Table 4.51: Maintain the founder's position in the firm after retirement.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 57.3 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.51 shows that 43% of the respondents strongly agreed that they keep the founder involved in the firm when he retires, while 53% agreed, but 5% were undefined.

Table 4.52: Promote business growth

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 14.2 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 52.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.52 shows that 48% of the respondents strongly agreed that they promote business growth, while 38% agreed. However, 5% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

### 4. 2.11 Entrepreneurship Training

Table 4.53: Engage in assembly talks and share entrepreneurship experience

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 171 | 47.8 | 47.8 |
| 187 | 52.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.53 shows that 52% of the respondents strongly agreed that they engage in assembly talks or personal sharing of entrepreneurship experience while on the job, and 48% agreed.

Table 4.54: Lecture on entrepreneurial skills is engaged by family intermittently

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| 187 | 52.2 | 71.2 |
| 103 | 28.8 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.54 shows that 29% of the respondents strongly agreed that lecture lesson on entrepreneurial skill is engaged by our family intermittentl**y,** while 52% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.55: External visits to the museum, companies to understand enterprise and innovation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 23.7 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.55 shows that 24% of the respondents strongly agreed to engage in an external visit to a museum and company to understand enterprise and innovation, while 53% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4.56: Attachment and internship to a family company

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 23.7 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.56 shows that 19% of the respondents strongly agreed to attachment and internship in their family company, while 57% agreed. However, 19% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.57: Lessons on product or prototype development

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Valid %** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 204 | 57.0 | 57.0 | 66.5 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 33.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.57 shows that 33% of the respondents strongly agreedon product or prototype development lessons, while 57% agreed. However, 5% disagreed, and 5% were undefined

Table 4.58: Worked in groups for business ideas development

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.58 shows that 38% of the respondents strongly agreed that they worked in groups to develop business ideas, while 53 and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.59: Presented reports about the progress of my projects

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 52.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.59 shows that 48% of the respondents strongly agreed that they presented reports about the progress of my project, while 48% agreed, but 5% disagreed.

Table 4.60: Learned from mentors’ experience

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 52.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.60 shows that 48% of the respondents strongly agreed that they learn from their mentor’s experience, while 43% agreed. However, 5% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.61: Received guidance and feedback from mentors

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 52.2 |
| 171 | 47.8 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.61 shows that 48% of the respondents strongly agreed that they received guidance and feedback from their mentor/facilitator, while 48% agreed and 5% disagreed.

Table 4.62: Presentation of entrepreneurship idea to family organization

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 47.8 |
| 187 | 52.2 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.62 shows that 52% of the respondents strongly agreed that they presented their idea at entrepreneurship-related events and competitors in our family organisation, while 34% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

### 4. 2.12 Entrepreneurship Orientation

Table 4.63: Management actively adapts to new ways of doing things by key rivals.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 57.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.63 shows that 44% of the respondents strongly agreed that the Management actively adapts to new ways of doing things introduced by major rivals, while 43% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.64: Try new ways of doing things and seek novel solutions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 119 | 33.2 | 33.2 |
| 239 | 66.8 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.64According to the findings, 67% of respondents strongly agreed that they are eager to attempt new methods of doing things and seek unique, novel solutions while agreeing slightly to the infusion of new ideas.

Table 4.65: Encourage individuals to think and act in innovative and creative ways.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 47.5 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.65 shows that 53% of the respondents strongly agreed that theyencourage individuals to think and act in innovative and creative ways. While 43% agreed and 5% disagreed.

Table 4.66: People in the organisation have a strong propensity for a high-risk project

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 57.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.66 shows that 43% of the respondents strongly agreed that the People in the organisation have a significant proclivity toward high-risk activities. Project while 38% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.67: Bold, wide-ranging acts are necessary to achieve our organization's objective

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 62.0 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.67 indicates that 38% of the participants strongly agreed that their drastic must be undertaken to ensure the firm’s objectives are met, while 53% agreed, but 10% are undefined.

Table 4.68: Organization adopts a wait-and-see posture in making costly decisions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 28.5 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 71.2 |
| 103 | 28.8 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.68indicates that 29% of the participantsfirmly believed that when there is ambiguity,the business usually takes a wait-and-see tacticin order to minimize hasty judgments. 43% agreed, 19% disagreed, and 10% undefined.

Table 4.69: In the last three years, our company has launched several new product and service lines.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 187 | 52.2 | 61.7 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.69indicates that 38% of the participantsfirmly believed that in the previousyears (3), their firm hadsold a wide range of goods and services, while 52% agreed, but 10% were undefined.

Table 4.70: In the past 3years, changes in products and service lines have been mostly of a minor nature

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 19.0 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 61.7 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.70indicates that 38% of the participants strongly agreed that Changes in product and service lines have been relatively minimal in the last three years, while 42% agreed. However, 10% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.71: The firm supports the efforts of individuals or teams that work autonomously

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Valid %** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 204 | 57.0 | 57.0 | 61.7 |
| 137 | 38.3 | 38.3 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.71 indicates that 38% of the participantsfirmly believedthat their company supports the efforts of individuals or teams who operate independently,while 57% agreed and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.72: In general, my firm's employees feel that the best outcomes emerge when individuals or teams choose which business possibilities to pursue on their own.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Valid %** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 170 | 47.5 | 47.5 | 57.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.72 shows that 43 % strongly agreed that the positive outcomes were recorded when employees, either as a group or as individuals, chose what opportunities to exploit, while 47.5 % agreed. However, 4.7% disagreed, and 4.7% were undecided.

### 4.2.13 Gender

Table 4.73: There is gender discrimination inthe workplace

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 68 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 47.5 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 61.7 |
| 69 | 19.3 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.73indicates that 19.0% of the participantsfirmlybelieved that they feel there is gender discrimination at their workplace, while 19% agreed. However, 19% strongly disagreed, 28% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4.74: You lost an opportunity because of your gender

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 136 | 38.0 | 47.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 57.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 76.0 |
| 86 | 24.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.74indicates that 24% of the participantsfirmlybelieved that they had lost opportunities because of their gender, while 19% agreed. However, 10% strongly disagreed, 38% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.75: You work harder at your job because of your gender

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | Frequency | % | Cumulative % |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 38.0 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 42.7 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 66.5 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.75indicates that 34% of the participantsfirmlybelieved that they feel they must become performers better at their job because of their gender, while 24% agreed. However, 10% strongly disagreed, 29% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.76: Men are superior to women in the workplace

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 188 | 52.5 | 52.5 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 71.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 81.0 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 95.3 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.76indicates that 5% of the participantsfirmly believed that they think that men are superior to women in the workplace, while 14% agreed. However, 53% strongly disagreed, 19% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.77: Women inthe workplace receive fewer opportunities than men

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 18 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 28.8 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 52.5 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 71.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.77indicates that 29% of the participants firmly believed that they think that women at their workplace receive fewer opportunities than men, while 19% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 28% disagreed, and 23% were undefined.

Table 4.78: Women should fill a top position inthe workplace

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 19.0 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 23.7 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 42.7 |
| 205 | 57.3 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.78indicates that 29% of the participantsfirmly believed that they think that women at their workplace receive fewer opportunities than men, while 19% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 28% disagreed, and 23% were undefined.

Table 4.79: Women take desperate measures to get a promotion?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 69 | 19.3 | 19.3 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 38.3 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 52.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 81.0 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.79indicates that 19% of the participantsfirmly believedthey ever had to take desperate measures to get a promotion, while 29% agreed. However, 19% strongly disagreed, 19% disagreed, and 24% were undefined.

Table 4.80: Have you ever taken desperate measures to get recognition?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 52 | 14.5 | 14.5 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 43.0 |
| 51 | 14.2 | 57.3 |
| 68 | 19.0 | 76.3 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.80 indicates that 24% of the participantsfirmly believedthey ever had to take desperate measures to get recognition, while 19% agreed. However, 15% strongly disagreed, 29% disagreed, and 14% were undefined.

Table 4.81: Men get promoted more than women in your workplace

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 28.5 |
| 34 | 9.5 | 38.0 |
| 102 | 28.5 | 66.5 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.81indicates that 33% of the participantsfirmly believedthat men get promoted more than women in their workplace, while 29% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 24% disagreed, and 10% were undefined.

Table 4.82: Men and women get paid the same amount of money for the same job inthe workplace

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 51 | 14.2 | 14.2 |
| 153 | 42.7 | 57.0 |
| 154 | 43.0 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.82 indicates that 43% of participantsfirmly believedthat both genders are appropriately remunerated for doing the same job at their company, while 43% agreed, but 14% were undefined.

Table 4.83: Men and women should be treated as equal

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Valid %** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 85 | 23.7 | 23.7 | 33.2 |
| 239 | 66.8 | 66.8 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.83indicates that 67% of the participantsfirmly believedthat men and women should be treated equally, while 24% agreed, but 10% were undefined.

Table 4.84: You receive the respect you deserve from a colleague

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Strongly Disagreed  Disagreed  Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Cumulative %** |
| 17 | 4.7 | 4.7 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 9.5 |
| 17 | 4.7 | 14.2 |
| 119 | 33.2 | 47.5 |
| 188 | 52.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.84 indicates that 53% of the participantsfirmly believedthat they receive the respect they deserve from their colleagues while 33% agreed. However, 5% strongly disagreed, 5% disagreed, and 5% were undefined.

Table 4.85: Manager encourages at work

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Undefined  Agreed  Strongly Agreed  Total | **Frequency** | **%** | **Valid %** | **Cumulative %** |
| 34 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 |
| 204 | 57.0 | 57.0 | 66.5 |
| 120 | 33.5 | 33.5 | 100.0 |
| 358 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

Table 4.85indicates that 33% of the participantsfirmly believedthat the manager encourages me at work, while 57% agreed and 10% were undefined

## 4.3Hypotheses Testing

### 4.3.1 Test of Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis was developed in response to the research question and objective.

**Research Objective 1**: Examine how mentorship influences family business survival

* **Research Question 1**: Does mentorship influence family business survival?

**Research Hypothesis One**

H01 - Mentorship has no significant influence on family businesses’ survival

Ha1 - Mentorship has a significant influence on family businesses’ survival

Multiple regression was adopted for the testing of Hypothesis One

Table 4.86:Model Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| 1 | .239a | .057 | .054 | .53866 |
| *a. Predictors: (Constant), MI* | | | | |

The model summary table (table 4.86) demonstrates the level of variance in the dependent variable (the survival of family businesses),which the independent variable (Mentorship) illustrates. Similarly, the R square demonstrates a coefficient determination R square (R2) of about 0.057 if expressed by a percentagewas 5.7%. This infers that the family businesses’ survival measures predict a 5.7% variation of mentorship. The adjusted R square of 0.054 (5.4%) showed variability of the independent variable (Mentorship);meanwhile, the standard error is .53866. Therefore, Mentorship explains 5.4% of family businesses’ survival variations.

The findings are verified by ANOVA (F test) results (see table 4.87),illustrating that the model or none of the parameters were equal to Zero.

Table 4.87: ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| 1 | Regression | 6.259 | 1 | 6.259 | 21.570 | .000b |
| Residual | 103.294 | 356 | .290 |  |  |
| Total | 109.553 | 357 |  |  |  |
| 1. *Dependent Variable: FBb. Predictors: (Constant), MI* | | | | | | |

According to the ANOVA table (see table 4.87), the F value is 21.570 at a.000b significance level. The inference is that mentoring has a substantial impact on the survival of family businesses. in the study areas

**Decision:** Reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, Mentorship significantly affects family businesses’ survival in the study areas.

Table 4.88: Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.281 | .196 |  | 16.767 | .000 |
| MI | .221 | .048 | .239 | 4.644 | .000 |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FB* | | | | | | |

The coefficient table (table 4.88) represents the basic model, demonstrating how the factors are included in the model's prediction of the dependent variable. The significance threshold was set at 0.05 for a two-sided test, with the absolute value of the test statistics (t) greater than or equal to the critical value of 1.96. The model found that Mentorship had a statistically significant influence in predicting family businesses’ survival with high beta values (*beta* = .239) with a t-value (4.644) higher than 0.196, significance level (where p< 0.05). This means that the need for family business owners to engage the mentorship explains family businesses’ survival in the location. This implies that for each unit increase in Mentorship, there are up to .239-unit increases in family businesses’ survival.

**Decision:** A significance level of less than 0.01 suggests statistical confidence greater than 99%. This suggests that mentorship impactsthe survival of the family business. Therefore, the null hypothesis (H03) was dismissed, but the alternative hypothesis (Ha3) states that mentoring significantly influences the survival of family companies in the research locations.

### 4.3.2 Test of Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis was developed in response to the study question and research objective.,

* **Research Objective 2: Assess how gender affects family business survival.**

**Research Question 2:** How does gender affect family business survival?

**Research Hypothesis Two**

H02 - Gender has no significant influence on family business survival

Ha2 - Gender has a significant influence on family business survival

A multiple regression model was used to test Hypothesis Two in order to:

1. identify whether or not there is a relationship,
2. examine the degree of the relationship between the independent variable (that is, Gender) and the dependent variable (family businesses’ survival);
3. access the predictor importance of the variables
4. analyse the significant effect of the variables under study.

Table 4. 89: Model Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| 1 | .136a | .019 | .016 | .54956 |
| *a. Predictors: (Constant), GEN* | | | | |

Table 4.89 demonstrates how much the dependent variable (family business survival) varianceinfluences the independent variable (Gender). Thus, the R square demonstrates a low coefficient determination R square (R2) of around 0.019 when represented as a percentage of 1.9%. This implies that the metrics of family business survival predict 1.9% gender variation. The adjusted R-square of 0.016 (1.6%) indicated variability of the independent variable (Gender), whereas the standard error of the estimate is .54956 (error term). Showing that gender accounts for 1.6% of the difference in family business survival.

Table 4. 90: ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| 1 | Regression | 2.036 | 1 | 2.036 | 6.742 | .010b |
| Residual | 107.517 | 356 | .302 |  |  |
| Total | 109.553 | 357 |  |  |  |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FBPredictors: (Constant), GEN* | | | | | | |

According to the ANOVA table (see table 4.90), the F value at a 1% significance level is 6.742. The consequence is that gender has a negligible impact on family business survival in the research locations.

**Decision:** Reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, gender significantly affects family business survival in the study areas.

Table 4. 91: Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| 1 | (Constant) | 3.693 | .190 |  | 19.456 | .000 |
| GEN | .138 | .053 | .136 | 2.597 | .010 |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FB* | | | | | | |

The coefficient table (table 4.91) displays the statistically significant contribution represented in the basic model, demonstrating the amount to which model variables contributed to the prediction of the dependent variable. For a two-sided test, the significance threshold was set at 0.05, with the absolute value of the test statistics (t) larger than or equal to the critical value of 1.96. Gender exhibited statistical significance in family business survival, according to the model, with significant beta values (beta =.136) and a t value (2.597) more than 1.96, sig..000 p.05). Indicating that for each unit increase in Gender, there are up to .136-unit increases in family business survival. This suggests that the requirement for a family business to engage Gender explains the location'sfamily business survival.

**Decision:** A significance level of less than 0.01 suggests statistical confidence greater than 99%. This suggests that the existence of gender affects the longevity of family businesses. As a result, the null hypothesis (Ho2) was rejected, but the alternative hypothesis (Ha2) states that gender substantially impacts family business survival in the research locations.

### 4.3.3 Test of Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis was developed in response to the third research question and research a,

**Research Objective 3:** Ascertain the influence of training on family business survival.

* **Research Question 3:** What is the impact of training on family business survival?

**Research Hypothesis Three**

H03- Training has no significant influence on family business survival

Ha3 - Training has a significant influence on family business survival

Multiple regression was used to test Hypothesis Three in order to:

1. If there exists any relationship
2. Assess the degree of the relationship between the independent variable (that is, Gender) and the dependent variable (family businesses’ survival);
3. Examine the predictor importance of the variables
4. Investigate the significant effect of the variables under study.

Table 4. 92: Model Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| 1 | .505a | .255 | .253 | .47874 |
| *a. Predictors: (Constant), ET* | | | | |

Table 4.92 demonstrates how much the dependent variable (family business survival) varies with respect to the independent variable (Training). In this situation, the R square demonstrates a low coefficient determination R-square (R2) of around 0.255 when stated as a percentage of 25.5 percent. This implies that family business survival metrics predict a 25.5 percent variance in Training. The adjusted R-square of 0.253 (25.3 percent) indicated the variation of the independent variable (Training), whereas the standard error of the estimate is.47874, indicating the error term. This implies that training accounts for 25.3 percent of the variation in family business survival.The findings are corroborated by ANOVA (F test) results (see table 4.93)given below

Table 4. 93: ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | Regression | 27.961 | 1 | 27.961 | 121.997 | .000b |
| Residual | 81.592 | 356 | .229 |  |  |
| Total | 109.553 | 357 |  |  |  |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FBb. Predictors: (Constant), ET* | | | | | | |

The ANOVA table (table 4.93) shows that the F value is 121.997 at a .000b significance level. Showing that Training has a low significant effect on family business survival in the study areas

**Decision:** Reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the training significantly affects family business survival in the study areas.

Table 4. 94: Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| 1 | (Constant) | 1.295 | .262 |  | 4.935 | .000 |
| ET | .688 | .062 | .505 | 11.045 | .000 |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FB* | | | | | | |

The coefficient table (table 4.94) represents the basic model, demonstrating the amount to which factors are included in the model's prediction of the dependent variable. The model found that training has statistical significance in family business survival, with high beta values (beta =.505) and a t-value (11.045) more than 1.96, sig..000 p.05) This suggests that the requirement for a family business to engage in training explains how a family business may survive in the location. This means that for every unit increase in Training, family business survival rises by up to.505 units. For a two-sided test, the significance threshold was set at 0.05, with the absolute value of the test statistics (t) larger than or equal to the critical value of 1.96.

**Decision:** A significance level of less than 0.01 reflects statistical confidence of greater than 99%. This suggests that the existence of training impacts the survival of family businesses.

### 4.3.4 Test of Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis was formulated based on the research question and research objective,

**Research Objective 4**: Examine how entrepreneurial orientation influences family business survival

**Research Question 4:** How do entrepreneurial orientation impact family business survival?

**Research Hypothesis four**

H02 - Entrepreneurship orientation has no significant influence on family business survival

Ha2 Entrepreneurship orientation has a significant influence on family business survival

Multiple regression was used to test Hypothesis four in order to:

1. Ascertain whether or not there is a relationship,
2. Assess the degree of the relationship between the independent variable (that is, Gender) and the dependent variable (family businesses’ survival);
3. determine the predictor importance of the variables
4. investigate the significant effect of the variables under study.

Table 4. 95: Model Summary

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | **R** | **R Square** | **Adjusted R Square** | **Std. Error of the Estimate** |
| 1 | .264a | .070 | .067 | .53505 |
| a. *Predictors: (Constant), EO* | | | | |

Table 4.95 summarizes the model and illustrates how much of the dependent variable (family business survival) varies with respect to the independent variable (Entrepreneurship orientation). Similarly, the R square demonstrates a low coefficient determination R square (R2) of about.070 when represented as a percentage of 7. This impliesthat family business survival metrics indicate a 7% variance in entrepreneurial attitude.The corrected R square of.067 (6.7 percent) indicated that the independent variable (Entrepreneurship orientation) was variable, while the standard error of the estimate suggests a number of 53505 representing the error term. This means that Entrepreneurship orientation accounts for 6.7 percent of the difference in family business survival.Given below is the analysis of Variance ANOVA (F test). See table 4.96.

Table 4. 96: ANOVA

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Sum of Squares** | **df** | **Mean Square** | **F** | **Sig.** |
| 1 | Regression | 7.636 | 1 | 7.636 | 26.674 | .000b |
| Residual | 101.917 | 356 | .286 |  |  |
| Total | 109.553 | 357 |  |  |  |
| *a. Dependent Variable: FBb. Predictors: (Constant), EO* | | | | | | |

The ANOVA table (see table 4.96) shows that the F value is 26.674 at a .000b significance level. Showing that Entrepreneurship orientation has a low significant effect on family business survival in the study areas.

**Decision:** Reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, the Entrepreneurship orientation significantly affects family business survival in the study areas.

Table 4. 97: Coefficients

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model** | | **Unstandardized Coefficients** | | **Standardized Coefficients** | **t** | **Sig.** |
| **B** | **Std. Error** | **Beta** |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.982 | .234 |  | 12.751 | .000 |
| EO | .282 | .055 | .264 | 5.165 | .000 |

*a. Dependent Variable: FB*

The coefficient table (table 4.97) represents the basic model, demonstrating the amount to which factors are included in the model's prediction of the dependent variable. The model found that Entrepreneurial Orientation has statistical significance in family business survival, with high beta values (beta =.264) and a t-value (5.165) above 1.96 sig000 p.05) indicating that Entrepreneurial orientation greatly influences family business in the area under investigation. Showing for every unit increase in Entrepreneurship orientation, itrecords a 505-unit increase in family business survival.

**Decision:** A significance level of less than 0.01 suggests statistical confidence greater than 99%. This shows that Entrepreneurship impacts family businesses' longevity. Therefore, the null hypothesis (Ho3) was dismissed, but the alternative hypothesis (Ha3) states that entrepreneurial orientation substantially influences family business survival in the research locations.

# CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## 5.1 Summary of the Study

In Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria, this study looked into the impact of succession planning on family business survival. While many previous types of research on this topic have used one or two factors mediating succession planning and family-owned enterprise survival, this study examined other predictors such as mentorship influence, gender influence, training influence, and entrepreneurial orientation influence on family-owned business survival. The model developed in this study has several important research implications.

## 5.2 Findings

This study found that most of the employees and owners of some selected family-owned businesses are young, below 38 years (65%), with fairly distributed genders (that is, absence of dominant gender). However, gender-driven challenges and perceptions were found to be strong. In addition, the prevalence of large families with high dependents was confirmed. While training through mentorship, internship and attachment were common among FOBs. In addition, the hypothesis's results showed that mentorship influence significantly impacted family-owned businesses in Ilorin, Kwara State. The descriptive analysis showed that 95% of the respondents said they had a mentor who gave them broad support and encouragement as they took on the responsibility and developed competence. Additionally, their mentors showed a positive attitude that served as role models worth following.

According to the current literature, parents' preferences and wishes affect succession criteria and, ultimately, the survival of the family-owned business. According to the literature, male successors are still preferred to female successors worldwide. Primogeniture is still a problem, even in nations where female leadership and gender equality are highly valued. According to this study, gender greatly impacts whether family-owned businesses in Ilorin, Kwara State, survive. According to the available literature, there exists a bias in choosing male successors over female successors in today’s business world; parental partialities and desiresdeterminewho inherits the enterprise and, ultimately, the survival of the family-owned business (Otten-Pappas, 2013). Primogeniture persists that there exists a similar occurrence in the developed world. This study discovered that gender significantly impacts the survival of family-runenterprises in Ilorin, Kwara State.

Family-runenterprises are an important part of any country's socio-economic environment and a source of national income. Its importance and economic impact are well recognized, with an estimated 80 – 90 percent of global GDP (GDP) contributed annually (Fatoki, 2014). Understanding the entrepreneurial orientation in FOB can thus improve firm performance. According to Mahmood and Hanafi (2013), entrepreneurs with a strong entrepreneurial orientation outperform those with a weak entrepreneurial orientation. The study discovered that entrepreneurship orientation significantly impacts FOB survival in Ilorin, Kwara State. This finding lends credence to the notion that entrepreneurial orientation is a necessary transgenerational strategy for family business survival.

## 5.3 Conclusion

The importance of SMEs to the economy is widely acknowledged, particularly in developing countries, and Nigeria is no exception. However, due toa well-plannedleadership transition, SMEs fail or close after Nigeria's founder's death or retirement. Investigate the influence of succession planning on the survival of family-runenterprises: A look at some of the businesses in Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria. In practice, family business refers to the semi-complex connection between family members, non-family units, and the business, which is thought to form a distinct set of characteristics that explains performance differences between family and non-family-run enterprises. Because family members are usually devoted, innovative, responsible, and committed to the family enterprise, familial participation often strengthens the business. Such loyalty can reduce power struggles in the workplace, foster excellent communication, cooperation, and trust, and foster understanding. Furthermore, the family business's strengths are the entrepreneurial spirit and efficient actions. Mentorship, gender, training, and entrepreneurship were discovered to strongly impact family-runenterprises’ survival in Kwara State, Nigeria.

**5.4 Recommendations**

The investigation discovered that it is pertinent to state that mentorship has a significant influence on family-owned businesses (FOB); thus, to build a developmental relationship with the next-generation members, FOB management or incumbents should mentor identified employees or members of the family early because this would foster their affective and normative commitment and encourage them to continue engaging in the family firms. Furthermore, such mentorship's emotional and cognitive experiences can lead to positive development and interactions in mentoring relationships, shaping the careers of next-generation members.

More generally, training and development aid FOB in fostering innovation, upholding the company culture, and maintaining competitiveness in a fast-paced business environment. According to this study, training greatly impacts whether such businesses survive across generations in Kwara State. Therefore, the management of FOB should implement a continuous training program based on the internal and external needs of the company, with qualified trainers, well-defined objectives, and a design that emphasizes competence development, behavioural modification, and performance improvement. This study suggested that a training program should emphasize a large number of employees and market needs, development of technical and soft skills, and entrepreneurial spirit among the employees and members of the family.This study also suggests that mentorship and vestibule training/simulators be prioritized, particularly when effectiveness, employee motivation, and minimizing training time were the most crucial factors. When training costs need to be cut while employee motivation needs to be raised, on-the-job training would be a great alternative.

The importance of entrepreneurship orientation (EO) is highlighted as a crucial survival strategy for family businesses. Family firms must develop an entrepreneurial orientation to survive over the long term. The founder's background significantly impacts EO in family-runenterprisesin which the founder makes the majority of the decisions. Nevertheless,the owner’s entrepreneurial force wanes in long-standing family businesses, so other forces sustain entrepreneurship orientationin those companies. Similarly, family members' openness to transformationdetermines the enterprise’s sustainability, ensuring they adapt to the contemporary business climate, meet clients’ needs, and exploit opportunities in the market.

Additionally, these businesses' reputations as family businesses may support EO. In order to maintain their market position, most members of family-run businessescarefully protect the reputation that has been built up for their company. Members of family firms are adamant about creating a highly reputable family-run enterprise brand that distinguishes the company from rival corporations. Consequently, to foster discontinuous innovation, the management of family-owned businesses should encourage entrepreneurship among employees and family members. This would encourage developing and implementing innovative management approaches emphasising strategic actions, industry, organizational, technological, and people contexts
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# APPENDIX I

**SECTION A: BIO-DATA**

***INSTRUCTION:*** *Read the questions carefully and tick (* ✓ *) as appropriate the correct answers as they relate to the questions.*

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age:18-27 years ( ) 28-37 years ( ) 38-47 years ( ) 48-57 years ( ) 58 years & above ( )
3. Marital status:Single( ) Married ( ) Divorced ( ) Separated ( ) Others (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4.Number of Dependents: None ( ) 1 – 3 ( ) 4 – 6 ( ) 10 and above ( )

5.Highest Educational Qualification:ND ( ) HND ( ) BSc. ( ) MBA ( ) MSc.

()

6.Highest professional Background: None ( ) NIM ( )NIMA ( )ACCA( ) ICAN ( ) NIPR ( ) CIBN ( ) Others (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

7.What is your job status? Permanent( ) Contract( )

8. Have you ever had a mentor? Yes( ) No( )

9. What is /was the gender of your mentor(s)?Male( ) Female( )

10.What is/was the ethnicity of your mentor? Yoruba( ) Ibo( ) Hausa( ) Ijaw( ) Idoma( )

**SECTION B:** Kindly indicate by ticking (✔) *as appropriate* whether you “Strongly Agreed (SA),” “Agreed (A),” “Undecided (U),”or “Disagreed (D),” or “Strongly Disagreed (SD).”

**Mentorship influence**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD |
| 1 | Your mentor helped you understand how to accomplish the work objectives of a new position. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Your mentor suggested specific strategies on how to achieve short and long-range career objectives |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Your mentor provided you with ongoing performance feedback about challenging assignments |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Your mentor helped you develop a professional reputation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Your mentor discussed career paths with you |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Your mentor supported your advancement in the organization through mutual association. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Your mentor shared insights about administrators who held power and influence within the organization. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Your mentor encouraged you to take courses, seminars, and workshops to develop your competence in administration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Your mentor helped prepare you for positions of greater responsibility by providing leadership experiences. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Your mentor displayed a positive attitude which provided a model worthy of emulation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Your mentor provided support and encouragement as you assumed responsibility and developed competence. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | Your mentor established a trust level which encouraged you to talk openly about anxieties, fears and ambivalence that distracted from the productive organizational work |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | Your mentor was a person with whom you could enjoy informal exchanges about work and non-work experiences |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | Your mentor exhibited positive values which provided a model worthy of respect |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Your mentor served as your sounding board for self-exploration |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 | Your mentor helped mould your leadership style |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 | Your mentor accepted and supported you as you attempted to resolve personal Concerns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 | Your mentor promoted in you a positive self-image as an emerging administrator |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19 | Your mentor served as a confident with whom you could share doubts and concerns without risking exposure to others in the organization |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20 | Your mentor established a climate which encouraged independence |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Family Business Survival**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD | |
| 1 | My family has influence on my business |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 2 | My family members share similar values |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 3 | My family and business share similar values |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 4 | Family members support the family business in discussions with friends, employees,and other family members |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 5 | Family members feel loyalty to the family business |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 6 | Family members are proud to tell others that they are part of the family business |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 7 | There is so much to begainedbyparticipatingin thefamilybusinessonalong-termbasis |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 8 | Familymembersagreedwiththefamilybusinessgoals, plans and policies |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 9 | Decidingtobeinvolvedwiththefamilybusinesshas a positiveinfluenceonmylife |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 10 | Isupportmyfamily’sdecisionsregardingthefutureofthefamilybusiness |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 11 | Yourfamilyhasinfluenceonyourbusiness. |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| **Trans-generational Succession** | | | | | | | |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD | |
| 1 | The generation (or generations) that currently owns the company (1st,2nd, 3rd etc.) |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 2 | The generation (or generations) that, at the moment, manage (s) theCompany |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 3 | The generation (or generations) that, at the moment, is (are) active on  governance board |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 4 | Stayindependent |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 5 | Reducedebt |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 6 | Assurethelong-termsurvivalofthebusiness |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 7 | Balancefamilyconcernsandbusiness interests |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 8 | Prepareandtrainasuccessor |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 9 | Increaseprivateorfamilywealth |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 10 | Increasethemarketvalueofthebusiness |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 11 | Maintainaroleforthefounderin thebusinessafterretirement |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| 12 | Promotebusinessgrowth |  |  |  |  |  |  | |

**Entrepreneurship Training**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD |
| 1 | I engage in assembly talks or personal sharing of entrepreneurship experience while on the job |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Lecture lesson on entrepreneurial is engaged by our family intermittently |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | I engage in external visit (museum, company visit) to understand enterprise and innovation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Attachment and internship to my family company |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Lessons on product or prototype development |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Worked in groups for business ideas development |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Presented reports about the progress of my projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Learned from my mentor about their experience |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Received guidance and feedback from my mentors/facilitators |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Presented your idea at entrepreneurship-related events and competitors in our family organization |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Presented your idea at entrepreneurship-0 related events and competitions outside our organization |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Entrepreneurship Orientation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD |
| 1 | Management actively responds to main competitors’ new ways of doing things |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | I am willing to try new ways of doing things and seek unusual, novel solutions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | We encourage people to think and behave in original and novel ways |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | The people in my organization have a strong propensity for high-risk project |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Our people believe, owing to the nature of the environment, that bold, wide-ranging acts are necessary to achieve our organization objective |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | When there is uncertainty, our organization typically adopts a wait and see posture in order to minimize the probability of making costly decisions |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Inthepast3years,ourorganizationhasmarketedawidevarietyofnew linesofproductsand/orservices. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | In the past 3years,changesinour productand/or service lineshavebeen mostlyofaminornature.(Reversecoded). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | The firm supports the efforts of individuals or teams that work autonomously. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Ingeneral,thepeople ofmyfirmbelieve that thebest results occurwhen individuals orteamsdecideforthemselves whatbusiness opportunitiesto pursue. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Gender:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | Question | SA | A | U | D | S | SD |
| 1 | Do you feel there is gender discrimination at your workplace |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Have you ever lost an opportunity because of "our gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Do you feel like you have to work harder at your job because of your gender? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Do you think that men are superior to women in the workplace? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Do you think that women at your workplace receive fewer opportunities than men? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Do you think a woman would be able to fill a top position at your workplace? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Have you ever had to take desperate measures to get a promotion? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | Have you ever had to take desperate measures to get recognition? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | Do you believe men get promoted more than women at your workplace |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | Do both men and women get paid the same amount of money for the same job at your workplace? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | Do you feel men and women should be treated as equal |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 | I receive the respect I deserve from my colleague |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | The manager encourages me at work |  |  |  |  |  |  |