

The Role of Management in Developing and Improving the Growth of Startups Companies in Saudi Arabia

Prepared by:
Yahya Alghamdi

Supervised by:
Dr. Al-Faisal Abdul Hamid
Dr. Fayez Jarad

Academic Year: 2025

Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Study Problem
3. Importance of Study
4. Objectives of the Study
5. Study Questions
6. Hypotheses of the Study
7. Previous Studies
8. Theoretical Foundations of the Study
9. Methodology and Research Methods
10. Study Tools
11. Study Limitations
12. References

1.Introduction

New businesses are the workforce of innovation and job creation in the global economy. Young, high growth companies lead innovation, disrupt existing marketplace activities, and provide significant employment opportunities. The possibility of failure in the case of entrepreneurship is substantial, in the sense that, about 90% of new investments fail after five years, with most within the second and the fifth years of their existence [1].

Even though many reasons contribute to businesses failing, new research suggests that poor management is the major culprit for failure. According to the research, 23% of failed businesses suffered due to team dynamics and human resources issues; 14%, from poor marketing strategy and strategic management; 16% did not make it through due to financial mismanagement issues with cash flow [2]. This study has also revealed a rather significant fact about startups a 20-40% replacement rate of founders at key growth stages by professional managers. This seems to indicate that at least in the early days of a new organization, the choice of management capacity might well be a good predictor of a company's success.

It lies in the blending of factors determining management efficiency with startups growth trajectories, where an original research opportunity awaits. Classic management theories and frameworks are drawn largely for established organizations and under more or less stable conditions. However, startups operate in a seriously uncertain environment characterized by extremely scarce resources and fast paced change, something that possibly necessitates quite different management approaches. How managements shape the startup capacities of growth and developmental processes in physiological terms are heretofore inadequately addressed in the published literature.

No studies about the economic importance of new startups are highlighted the research gap. Profits they bring in contribute to job creation and innovation, generate income for investors, and generate economies for many more around the region, thus philosophically fundamentally changing the industry. Knowledge about the managerial salience indicated the difference between successful and failed startups surely can increase the survival rates of startups and thus increase their positive economic contribution.

In the context of startups, peculiar characteristics of the young organizations make management extremely hard. The very first point I would like to mention is early stage companies with no experienced management except a strong technical or product team, comprising the founders. The scarcity of resources demands a higher degree of effectiveness and prioritizing from young companies. The need for control over strategic planning and fast adaptation or even the pivoting of strategy is a challenge at the same time. Furthermore, the mechanical structure of these organizations may undergo dramatic changes over time, so that the only salient characteristic of their operation is eternal growth. A nice and a substantially poor sixth reason is that forward-thinking startups suffer from the difficulty of measurement and staging for improvement through traditional business metrics.

Examining the management practices, skills, and structures that influence the development and growth of a startup company is the core objective of this research proposal. In that way, the study

aims to contribute both theoretically and practically to the entrepreneurship and management literature by exploring the role of management in various stages of a startup life cycle, examining the correlation between management effectiveness and outcome performance, and developing models applicable to a startup setting.

2. Study Problem

Central to the research problem is this: How do management practices, capabilities, and structures influence the startup companies' development and growth trajectories?

To this overarching problem fall a sequence of interrelated sub problems, the investigation of which is both systematic and publishable:

2.1 Management Capability Gap

Startups frequently tend to rise from either technically able individuals coming up with feasible flow for a commercial model or industry specific know how and experience hands [3]. But when the firm grows, and concerns stretch beyond the avoidable capacity of the founders, it is the scenario. Various studies place the percentage at which venture capitalists fire founders for managers at 20-40%, and thus the implicit conclusion is that the management capabilities of the initial founders are not enough for the company's real scaling [4]. The crux of the matter is exactly which management skills are more crucial for different stages and how can founders aptly and effectively develop these management skills?

2.2 Resource Constraint Management

Startups operate in a graveyard of finance, people, and time. These constraints have undergone a complete transformation in comparison to those faced by the government of old institutions, with rapidly growing revenue and an established operational setup. Research will also show that 82% of business failures are the result of poor cash flow management, while 34% of startups succumb specifically to cash related issues [5]. Recruitment Managerial Ability is the challenge and how this can be used to effect maximum utilization of resources, extend operational runways, and do more with less a capacity very different from the resource optimizing approaches adopted by established firms.

2.3. Strategic Agility versus Organizational Structure

Startups come in a kind of paradox in which they need strategic planning and the organizational structure for coordination of the various activities while scaling up the works, but they must be super flexible to be able to take sharp turns, based on the feedback from the market, at any point in time. Research indicates that 74% of high-growth startups have collapsed due to scaling up prematurely, showing management's inherent inability to strike a balance between structure and agility. On the contrary, complete informality can cast the organization into chaos and inefficiency. Understanding how management sets up the right structure while preserving flexibility is hence one of the challenges [6].

2.4 Leadership Transition and Organizational Evolution

Management needs move far past certain limits in startup growth stages. Early stages call for side by side functional leadership, with founders doing most activities for themselves. However, as the company grows, there is a requirement to shift toward advisory oversight delegation being highly empowering. According to research statistics, 50-70% of top leaders are bound to fail within the first 18 months in a new position and this costs up to 400% of their salaries for them and their companies [7]. It is then a matter of identifying the critical transition points and understanding how the required managerial capability shifts so that strategies can be put in place for a successful leadership transition.

2.5 Performance Measurement and Management Effectiveness

High level performance measures and management tools often do not provide a complete understanding of the specific value drivers and growth avenues of startups. Metrics such as profitability, return on investment, or market share would be illogical or misleading in the case of early-stage ventures. The question is which indicators of performance address the real sustenance of management toward effectiveness in a startup; how it shall use these performance metrics for decision making; and how multiple stakeholder interests (founders, employees, investors, customers) can be reconciled given that they might point in different directions [8].

2.6 Contextual Significance

The nature of the problem is contextually notable in that management-related variables are found to account for the bulk of startup failures:

- 34% are failed mainly due to poor product market fit (strategic management failure).
- 23% failed because of team problems (human resource management) [9]
- 22% failed primarily due to poor marketing (strategic execution).
- 18% fail because of issues related to pricing and cost concerns (financial management) [10].
- 16% face cash flow problems (operational management).
- 14% failed due to poor marketing (management of customer acquisition) [11].

Nevertheless, despite the evidence on the centrality of management, a systematic investigation on the specific ways that entrepreneurial management effectively influences start up growth is far from being fully addressed and is merely presently dispersed across multiple literature selves on this notion: this research question would be shedding some light on an inherent gap in the general understanding of entrepreneurial management, of which there exist immediate business applications to boost the chances of success for startups.

3. Importance of Study

The research has also generated far-reaching implications to theory, practical application, economics, and stakeholders:

3.1 Theoretical Importance

Very important is the management. But at present interest in entrepreneurship research and strategy management is the cause of connection. Entrepreneurship studies generally center on Opportunity discovery, venture ship, and innovation, while the strategic management research is targeting organizational resources, competitive requests, and performance demographic agreements [12]. The primary goal of these research models is to bridge the two perspectives in understanding management in entrepreneurial settings.

As mentioned earlier, the study makes a significant contribution to an extended understanding of theories in the context of a startup. In translating and utilizing the Resource Based View (RBV) and Dynamic Capabilities Theory to startup settings, RBV postulates firms' resources that prospect for competitive advantage should pass the VRIO test, that is, be valuable, rare, inimitable, and organized. However, in the light of Dynamic Capabilities, the perspective deals with enabling firms to sense the opportunities for change, to seize them, and to adapt their operating environment [13]. These constructs were mainly developed in a mature firm context. A startup, on the other hand, is likely to present an entirely unique set of circumstances, encompassing limited resources, a high degree of uncertainty, and accelerated growth, which may warrant some adjustment in perspective within the context of these theories. This research will attempt to ascertain the applicability of these theories to an entrepreneurial context and to propose necessary modifications.

Additionally, corporate theory expands beyond the time series to the evolution of management arrangements and practices under a context of high uncertainty and resource scarcity. When corporate theory weighs stability and a set of processes, it implies a feature of incapability as reflected in emergent processes of company building. However, it is clearly indicated that the establishment of the big picture of management effectiveness must help corporate theory to derive a germinable typology of those processes that are blanketed under concepts of adaptation, emergence, and organizational becoming, as opposed to more stable concepts of static organizational being.

3.2 Practical Importance

The study is ripe for driving value to several constituencies:

For the Architects and Management Teams: The thrust is to navigate through evidence-based management practices that are correlated with the attainment of success in startups. This, thereby, enables start up managers to enhance their business practices according to empirically proven ways, not fuzzy hints based on practical issues, personal opinions, and polished subjects. Discussed are, inter alia, issues under the research of strategic leadership vis a vis growth phase, design of the organization, the core capabilities necessary to build, and the methods of objectively measuring the effectiveness of management. The study will develop frameworks to help investors understand

which capabilities are exhibited by management teams during due diligence. Investors often say that "we are betting on the jockey." However, this must be put into practice by devising a systematic framework for evaluating the management quality. The study findings will enable investors to coach, mentor, and provide strategic direction to the major portfolio companies.

2. It cannot be supposed to be of any value to startup accelerators and incubators. With such data, quite desirable curriculum equipment and training seminar design can be allowed for. Indeed, it would be an effective intervention for training purposes should knowing exactly what management capabilities are important established on the successful companies' evidence. Accelerators could develop from generic management guidance into stage specific and context sensitive guidelines for management development.

3. The professional service providers catering to startups can choose among various diagnostic frameworks for management problems and recommended interventions. Put simply, the study provides some scientific tools to assess management maturity and pinpoint developmental priorities.

3.3 Economic Importance

Startup companies are economic drivers of growth, innovation, and employment. Nonetheless, the high failure rate signifies gross wastage of financial, human, and opportunity resources. Research indicates that even slightly better survival rates in startups would return great economic gains.

The scale of the problem: In the United States alone, some 600,000 new businesses are started every year. An improvement of 5% in management practice to increase survival from 50% to 55% of five years would mean 30,000 more businesses surviving down the path of cascading implications for employment, tax revenue, and dynamism into the economy [14]. The impact aside multiplies greatly globally.

The inverse is when startups that do not survive get mismanaged. Beyond mere survival, efficient management enables the rapid growth of startups on the other side. Although the recent high growth startups have been scaled, they are found to provide a disproportionate economic value. Knowing the management factors that enable successful scaling may create immense positive influence of entrepreneurial activity. Being successful, the startups become an even stronger platform for innovation and entrepreneurship and develop ecosystem effects that multiply their initial economic contribution.

3.4- Stakeholder-Specific Importance

This research benefits various groups of stakeholders differently:

Workers: Management practices in an organization improve culture, reduce stress, provide opportunities to grow professionally, and increase job security. Studies on what constitutes

effective management have direct implications for the working conditions of startup employees who often take less pay in exchange for growth opportunities.

Clients: That is where the startup creates great value for its products and services via good management. During the growth phase, the startup needs quality service, along with the need to innovate on an ongoing basis. In the hands of ill management, the product quality has suffered, and the services were not as expected, and upsetting customers, sometimes even closing the company.

Communities and Regions: The successful startup contributes to the development of the regional economy and employment opportunities and innovation ecosystem. Management studies enable strengthening the local entrepreneurial communities by improving the chances of startup success.

Educational Institutions: Universities, in conjunction with business schools, should propagate these research findings into the entrepreneurship curriculum so that students are trained in entrepreneurial management based on evidence rather than anecdotes.

Policymakers: Government programs designed to assist startups, grant them tax breaks or develop the ecosystem are encouraged to examine which management interventions yield the highest public returns.

3.5 Importance of the Knowledge Gap

The present literature mentions several critically important research questions which this study aims to address:

Little Empirical Research on Startup Management: Despite the vast number of case studies and practitioner books, the field of empirical research on management practices in startups is under-represented in scholarly research. Most management recommendations for high growth ventures are based on hearsay and anecdotal evidence gleaned from years of practice and observation, without any strong empirical foundation. [15].

Limited Understanding of the Evolution of Management: The dynamics of how management capabilities should evolve as startups move through lifecycle stages from ideation through validation, efficiency, and scaling remain a matter of speculation and assumption [16]. Most research study startups at single instances in time rather than as the evolution of management.

Insufficient Startup-Specific Frameworks: Management frameworks designed for established organizations might not translate well into a startup realm. Startups require management frameworks designed specifically for extreme uncertainty, lack of barriers, and rapid change.

Deficient Performance Metric Study: A wealth of literature describes the financial metrics available for established firms, while for startups, the available performance indicators and their relationship to management practices remain poorly explored. It is perhaps through the understanding of which KPIs are most important for startups at different stages that management on decision making could be improved considerably.

4. Objectives of the Study

Research strives to realize a major objective which will be furthered by eight specific objectives.

Main Objective:

It is the endeavor to investigate how prevailing management practices, capabilities, and organizational structures influence the emergence, growth, and survival of startups so that the influencing factors crucial for leading to the success of start-ups could be figured out.

Sub-Objectives:

1. To search for and bring to the fore the management practices that successful startups maintain over various growth stages.
2. To test the association between managerial capabilities and startup performance indicators (survival, revenue growth, profitability, customer acquisition, valuation).
3. To assess the actuality of the so-called management frameworks when it comes to startups.
4. To review and understand some of the main critical management transition periods, most particularly the transition from founder led startups to professionally managed organizations.
5. To analyze types and kinds of resource management strategies (financial, human, and time) and how these strategies support matters of startup sustainability, particularly in their runway extension.
6. To propound a layered framework of prime management competencies essential for startup victory.
7. To evaluate how contextual factors (industry, geography, culture, funding sources, market conditions) impact the managerial effect on startup performance.
8. To formulate evidence-based recommendations to entrepreneurs, investors, support organizations, educators, and policy makers for augmenting success in entrepreneurship.

5. Study Questions

The primary and secondary research questions are as under:

Primary Research Question

How do management practices, capabilities, and organizational structures develop, grow, or sustain startup companies?

Secondary Research Questions

RQ1: Which management practices are considered critical in differentiating successful startups from failing ventures, and how do they vary across the lifecycle stages?

RQ2: How does the composition, experience, and expertise of the management team correlate with the performance outcomes (survival rates, revenue growth, and valuation) of startups?

RQ3: Which management capabilities matter most during the go between the early stage and scaling phases?

RQ4: How do resource management strategies (financial, human, and temporal) impact the extension of a startup's runway and its operational efficiency?

RQ5: What is the interaction between startup performance and the formalization of strategic planning, and how does it vary by growth stage?

RQ6: How do transitions in leadership (founder team professional management) impact organizational performance and culture?

RQ7: What are the most valid performance metrics and KPIs that measure management effectiveness in a startup context?

RQ8: What do flat and hierarchical organizational designs bring agility and scalability to startups?

RQ9: How do Lean Startup and Agile management systems along with more conventional strategic management systems affect the success of startups?

6. Hypotheses of the Study

After having been through this lens of theoretical approach, it should present the hypotheses accordingly because of it being new to one of the resaying requirements:

H1: Management Team Experience and Startup Survival

Founders with proven entrepreneurial or industry know how perform much more successfully than individuals who are noobs in the industry.

Rationale: Priorly, it has been argued how experienced managers possess some levels of tacit knowledge, networks, and pattern recognition skills, and appropriate decision making under uncertainty.

H2: Strategic Planning and Performance

Startup performance is positively correlated with moderate formalization of strategic planning, whereas it is negatively correlated with very high formalization or total informality.

Rationale: The hypothesis puts forward a notion of an inversely proportional relatedness. Too much planning can marginalize agility and overconsumption of precious resources, whereas a total absence only promotes utter chaos in the organization.

H3: Resource Management and Runway Extension

Startups applying great systematic resource management (cash flow monitoring, burn rate optimization, and strategic prioritization) attain extended operational runways and high capital efficiency than those without systematic management.

Rationale: 82% of business failures result from cash flow issues; hence, in theory, effective resourcing should greatly affect survival.

H4: Management Transition Timing

H4a: Introduction of professional management early (before product market fit) negatively correlates with performance because of premature bureaucratization.

H4b: Late professionalization of management (after scaling) negatively correlates with performance due to organizational chaos and founder limitations.

Rationale: The two hypotheses are complementary and imply that there is an optimum moment for a change in management.

H5: Organizational Structure and Agility

Cross functional, team-based Startups show more adaptability and quicker decision making as compared to Startups using traditional hierarchical forms.

Rationale: Cross functional structures reduce information silos, speed up communication, and allow decision making at the team level.

H6: Dynamic Capabilities and Growth

Startups that effectively develop dynamic capabilities (sensing opportunities, seizing opportunities, transforming operations) achieve higher growth rates than those with strong operational capabilities but weak dynamic capabilities.

Rationale: Dynamic Capabilities Theory suggests that in volatile environments, the ability to adapt and reconfigure resources matters more than current resource positions.

H7: Performance Measurement and Management Effectiveness

Startups that actively track and use the suitable KPIs report better performance outcomes than those operating on pure intuition or choosing inappropriate indicators.

Rationale: Management theory promotes decision making based on evidence. Startups utilizing the right metrics would recognize the problems timely and, not unexpectedly, pile up their resources.

H8: Leadership Styles and Team Performance.

Like transformational, transactional leadership is one of the well-defined, fundamental organizational leadership distinguished into various factors relevant to the task or obligation, such that the person leads the team with a constructive style.

Rationale: Members shall channel creative energy, take their initiatives, and adapt to functions well for startup transformation. Such modus of leadership nurtures these attributes more efficiently.

H9: Contextual Moderation

Some contextual variables including the industry sector, geographic location, funding sources, and market conditions can moderate the relationship between management practices and firm performance.

Rationale: Management effectiveness is highly dependent on the context. So, what seems to be a good practical method for software startups may not be so good for biotech ventures.

7. Previous Studies

This section reviews literature according to major research streams:

7.1 Startup Success Factors and Failure

Research on startup success factors reveals that multiple determinants lead to venture outcomes. According to CB Insights analysis of startup failures, 42% fail due to lack of market need, 29% run out of cash, 23% don't have the right team, and 19% are outright competed out [17]. Even the definitions manifest the importance management has in strategic, financial, human resource, and competitive considerations.

Studies examining startup failure rates are always grim: approximately 90% of startups fail and 10% within their first year, while 70% fall between the second and fifth years [18]. According to Failory, 74% of high growth startups fail from premature scaling, indicating probably that senior management is challenged by aligning growth ambitions with organizational capability, while 82% of businesses fail through poor management of cash flows [19].

Team dynamics emerge as a critical factor for success. Studies show that 23% of startup failures arise because of team issues, such as conflicts among founders, gaps in skills, and poor hiring decisions. In VC investment decision-making studies, the quality of the team is consistently identified as the top criterion. Yet the empirical research measuring the link between certain characteristics of teams and performance outcomes remains scarce.

7.2 Management Practices in Startups

Some specific research on management practices provides a few important insights; first, growth management is important for sustainability, scaling, and the ability to adapt. Startups that fail to manage growth effectively soon drain their resources and capital. Managing growth effectively means managing it well through planning, good financial decisions, and profitable decisions.

Popularized by Eric Ries in 2011, the approach builds on quick cycles of validated learning and experimentation, customer feedback [20]. The research has also shown that startups following Lean principles will achieve product market fit faster and utilize their resources better. On the contrary, potential drawbacks to this regular approach may include an excess of iterations, perhaps even at the cost of solid strategic thinking.

Strategic management research concerning startups is still sparse but increasing. The study on worldwide startups revealed that most of a startup's performance can be explained by the extent to which it has a coherent strategy (i.e., coherency between market scope, competitive positioning, organizational design, and culture). This points to the fact that strategy matters but in ways unique to startups from established firm strategic management.

7.3 Leadership and Management Transitions

Leadership transition research identifies some key issues. Studies indicate failure for 2/3 of startups as founders did not receive enough leadership development. As startups transition from being founder led to distributed leadership, management needs change drastically. Research indicates 50-70% of executives fail in their new role within 18 months.

There is research into founder transition, which tells us that venture capitalists tend to replace 20-40% of founders during crucial growth stages; yet founder led companies performed 3.1x better than non-founder led companies in a 15 year period, thereby indicating that perhaps replacing founders is not the answer [21]. It may be more about how the founder adapts rather than just replacing him.

On the leadership styles, transformational leadership appears more important than transactional leadership. Startups need creativity, initiative, and adaptability, attributes best fostered through inspirational, empowering leadership.

7.4 Theoretical Foundations Applied to Startups

Various theoretical frameworks serve as institutional support to startup management research. First documented by Wernerfelt and Barney, the Resource Based View declares that competitive advantage arises from resources which are valuable, rare, inimitable, and organized (VRIO). If we transpose this theory into startups, RBV would explain accounts of startups purportedly deprived of tangible resources that managed to succeed because of the effective leverage of intangible assets, including the know-how of the founders, brand image, and intellectual property.

According to Teece, Pisano, and Shuen, Dynamic Capabilities Theory is concerned with organizational capacities to sense opportunities, seize them by having resources in the right configuration for the situation in question, and changing operations in the process. This framework becomes more relevant to startups that function in high uncertainty environments wherein adjacencies for continuous adaptation remain present. Research on applying Dynamic Capabilities Theory to startups suggests that pivoting, rapid learning, and resource reconfiguration matter more than initial resource endowments.

The Lean Startup uses principles from a variety of other theories, including Lean Manufacturing, Customer Development, Agile Methodologies, and Design Thinking. It is apparent from the research that it has been rapidly adopted globally in startup ecosystems, yet empirical work testing its effectiveness in different contexts remains scarce. The core principles emphasize the hypothesis driven experiments, minimum viable products (MVPs), and validated learning.

7.5 Performance Measurement in Startups

Startup performance analysis recognizes a few keys, critical KPIs. CAC and LTV (customer acquisition cost and lifetime value, respectively) are pivotal to evaluating unit economics. It has been observed, on average, that successful SaaS startups maintain an LTV to CAC ratio of at least 3-1. MRR and therefore predictability of revenue for a subscription business are thus joined at the hip. The burn rate, in reference to runway, is also very much a matter for cash management, with top startups to have approximately 18-24 months of runway [22].

The literature recognizes different methods of valuation, among which are the Berkus Method (assigns value to five success factors: idea, prototype, management team, strategic relationships, sales), the Scorecard Valuation Method (which compares benchmark companies along several factors), and other forms of market related approaches. Valuation wise, however, there exists a large degree of uncertainty, with little agreement upon which approach proves best, especially when it comes to those ventures without revenues.

Churn rate research is particularly relevant to subscription businesses, with recommendations putting monthly churn below 2% for SaaS companies. With startups heavily focused on a product-led growth strategy, metrics for time to value and feature adoption rates, along with stickiness calculated through DAU/MAU ratios, are getting more research attention.

7.6 Contextual Factors and Management Effectiveness

Research examining contextual factors influencing effectiveness of management identifies deciders. Industry sector research highlights that management approaches that work for software startups may not work for biotech, hardware, or retail ventures. Each industry under development faces and defines its own challenges, including long or short development cycles, capital needs, a peculiar regulatory environment, local competitive dynamics, etc.

Geographic context study shows the approach to startup management varies substantially across regions. Research on startups across geographies has suggested that only in settings where mistakes are costly and resources are not easily mobilized does strategy formalization matter significantly. Emerging market research, on the other hand, focuses on the challenges of small talent pools, unsupported institutions, and various cultural norms that have an impact on management practices.

Research into funding sources is concerned with divergences in management approaches between firms under VC and those practicing bootstrapping or external corporate venturing. With the pressure to grow quickly for the VC backed firms, aggressive management approaches would sometimes be seen, while bootstrappers regard capital efficiency. For the firm funded with corporate capital, substantial resources are generally available but there may be strategic constraints owing to the parent company.

Together, these investigations illustrate how management practices, team characteristics, strategic options, and contextual factors nurture start-up results. Conversely, all studies show significant differences in theories of construction, methodologies applied, and stages highlighted. Most studies

seem to concur that effective management intervention in resource ownership and leadership transition is key to the success of a given novel business, placing these isolated or against a minuscule industrial or regional background nearly always. The cleavage indicates the research gap that has alluded to the immediate need for an integrative framework put on empirical testing to simultaneously investigate management practices, capabilities, structures, and contextual moderators across multiple growth stages, looking across the stages at how management operations influence startup development, growth, and sustainability.

8. Theoretical Foundations of the Study

This research applies several accepted theoretical frameworks adapted to startup contexts:

8.1 Resource-Based View (RBV)

An entity can attain sustainable competitive advantage only through resources that are valuable, rare, costly to imitate, and suitably organized (VRIO). Instead of focusing on positioning within the external market, the RBV believes that internal capabilities and resources are the sources of competitive advantage.

Applied to startups, RBV tries to explain why some ventures succeed while having few resources to their disposal. In other words, successful startups frequently rely on certain intangible resources, such as the founders know how, powerful organizational culture, proprietary information, strategic relations, and brand names. These resources meet the VRIO criteria: They are valuable (allowing competitive positioning), rare (not held by many), inimitable (hard for competitors to copy), and organized (managed correctly through systems of management).

Yet startups differ from established firms in critical ways that call for the RBV adaptation. Startups have fewer resources, operate in a higher uncertainty environment, and hence face rapid changes in their resource requirements. This research investigates how management strategies allow startups to find, acquire, build, and used VRIO resources under serious constraints. It analyzes whether the concepts of resource heterogeneity and immobility also apply equally well in startup situations where resources remain fluid and fast changing.

8.2 Dynamic Capabilities Theory

Dynamic Capabilities Theory, developed by Teece, Pisano, and Shuen in 1997 and developed further by later writers, focuses on organizational capabilities to sense opportunities and threats, seize opportunities by mobilizing and reconfiguring resources, and transform operations to sustain competitive advantage in shifting environments [23].

The theory proposes that there are three main capabilities: (1) Sensing - scanning, searching, and exploring opportunities across technologies and markets; (2) Seizing - mobilizing resources to seize

an opportunity and create value; and (3) Transforming - a continuous process of renewal through asset recombination and reconfiguration as well as changes to organizational structures.

The framework is particularly pertinent to startups operating in highly volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments. Startups arguably do not have much in terms of operational or resource based capabilities and hence must leverage their dynamic capabilities for their survival and growth. That is, sensing market needs accurately, seizing opportunities swiftly under severe resource constraints, and continuous transformation as they scale.

This research examines how management practices develop dynamic capabilities in startups. This study addresses the Entrepreneurial Context through the level of performance shown by new enterprises in the presence of strong dynamic capabilities compared to those possessing operational capabilities that are weak by comparing the two approaches.

8.3 Lean Startup Methodology

The Lean Startup methodology that was introduced by Eric Ries has been rising in parallel and in parallel with a bigger Lean Enterprise, Customer Development (Blank, 2013), Agile software development, and Design Thinking movements [24] This orientation showcases the build measure learn cycle, MVPs and validated learnings, which are builders of customer-validated pivots.

Core principles are: (1) Entrepreneurs can be found everywhere with the theory behind entrepreneurship management belonging to a way of management that goes beyond just traditional startups; (2) Entrepreneurship is management: startup being an institution, an institution requires a management process. (3) Validated learning: Startups exist to learn how to build a sustainable business. (4) Let's Build It and Measure It: Come up with an idea, construct a product, test it against customer reaction, and see whether it is opportune to turn or keep going. (5) Innovation accounting: A method to account for everything done, establish milestones, and prioritize.

These techniques give you clear frames to steer through uncertainty and to methodically verify their design/model hypothesis. On the other hand, some critics suggest this technique also relies heavily on customer feedback as against visionary innovation for continuous iteration which the authors of the study maintain is favored over breakthrough opportunities, clearly delineating its unsuitability beyond software startups.

This research explores the effectiveness of Lean Startup methodology in varying scenarios and the broader relationship of this methodology with management practices. The investigation also explores how effectively startup organizations adhering to the principles of Lean Startup find themselves doing well and the extent to which such entrepreneurial growth techniques are interwoven with any of the other management frameworks.

8.4 Entrepreneurial Management Theory

According to Stevenson and Jarillo, the idea behind the entrepreneurial sciences is to isolate entrepreneurial from non-entrepreneurial management approaches [25]. The entrepreneurial management stresses opportunity driven, rather than resource-driven, approaches and considers

resource constraints more as a challenge to be overcome by creative ability rather than as a limitation.

Features considered include: (1) Strategic orientation toward opportunity recognition and exploitation; (2) Commitment to opportunities despite scarce resources; (3) Control of resources through access and influence, rather than through ownership; (4) Management structure emphasizing flat hierarchies and network coordination; (5) Reward philosophy that relates to the creation of value and potential for growth

The theory suggests entrepreneurial organizations demand a different set of management approaches than administrative organizations. Whereas administrative management is concerned with the efficient utilization of resources within predetermined structures, entrepreneurial management is concerned with the mobilization of resources toward the pursuit of opportunities despite constraints.

This study investigates whether entrepreneurial management practices are more conducive to startups than traditional management approaches and how such practices should evolve as the startup matures toward an established organization.

8.5 Organizational Lifecycle Theory

Organizational Life Cycle Theory proposes that organizations move predictably through different stages, each stage having its own challenges or problems, structure, and management needs. As widely reported, the stages are genesis or inception, validation or survival, growth or efficiency, expansion or scaling, and maturity or renewal.

Applied to startups, the lifecycles theory presumes management activities practiced at a given stage shall be inappropriate during others. At the early stages, management is very hands on operational and very flat with hardly any processes, mostly informal. At growth stages, one starts requiring systems, specialization by roles, and formalization of processes. At scaling stages, strategic leadership and hydraulic delegation and professional management structures become pertinent.

These points of transition, or often termed "crises," emerge when management techniques no longer suffice. The Greiner model identifies crises of leadership (from founder to professional management), autonomy (need to delegate), control (need to coordinate), and red tape (need for flexibility). Further boosting management skills are also essential to sustain these transitions and keep riding up the growth chart.

The study probes whether the effectiveness of managerial practices in a new venture is determined by the stage in the venture life cycle and which management capabilities have become essential skills at various stages in ventures. This study investigates how this importance of change at transition points that set eminence in the scale of management evolution during the startup maturity.

9. Methodology and Research Methods

9.1 Research Philosophy and Approach

This research is practically founded upon a pragmatic philosophy that eschews obedience to any tradition of methodological methods. The pragmatist sees some research questions as best answered using different methods, thus making room for the research to employ mixed methods wherever deemed appropriate.

Research works abductively going back and forth between theory and empirical observations. Whereas there will be deductive hypothesis testing of relationships proposed by existing theories, the inductive element incorporates the possibility that unexpected patterns and relationships may emerge. It is, therefore, especially appropriate to study entrepreneurship research, where theoretical frameworks are continuing to evolve.

9.2 Research Design

It is mixed method research, which generally follows a sequential explanatory design methodology. This method first conducted an elicitation-driven survey followed by two case studies.

Phase 1: Quantitative Survey

This phase will encompass quantitative large scale surveys studying the relationship between management practices and key dimensions of startup performance. The main objective is to test the study hypotheses, detect patterns, and further discover statistically significant relationships among the constructs in several different case studies.

Phase 2: Qualitative Case Study Research

In phase two, multi group case studies will be used to dig out hidden mechanisms and validate the quantitative results. They would, therefore, augment the extents they wanted to report further to explain exactly why all the other management practices worked and merely suggested in the ratings.

A design-oriented method will permit quantitative findings to guide the sampling and focus of a qualitative investigation, whereas the qualitative insights, in turn, will aid in the interpretation and/or sharpening of quantitative constructs. This method thus is said to really merge breadth (widely cast quantitative net) with depth (intense qualitative digging) of research into a more complete picture of the research question.

9.3 Population and Sampling

We focused our study on tech-based startups operating for a period between 1 and 7 years. A venture was included if it comprised one full-time employee. These entities were involved in the fields of software, hardware, biotech, fintech, and e-commerce and fell during varied lifecycle stages, like validation, efficiency, and scaling. This allowed us to capture the variability in the management practices of each growth trajectory.

Geographical Context:

The study coverage stretches far and wide across technology startups located in Saudi Arabia. This wide location lets the researchers afford the context while remaining focused on the startups facing almost identical technological and entrepreneurial challenges.

Sampling for Quantitative Phase:

A minimum of 350 cases (startups) is required for multiple regression and subgroup comparisons, given that this number gives the samples good enough statistical power. This sample size was a limit mostly due to the determination of the medium effect size ($\alpha < 0.05$ and $\beta < 0.20$) that would otherwise be erroneously detected in the analysis.

- Strata will be established for stratified sampling according to:
- Lifecycle stages (validation, efficiency, scaling)
- Industry sector (software, hardware, biotech, fintech, e-commerce)
- Country (developed and developing countries)
- Finance status (bootstrapped, angel-funded, VC-backed)

Qualitative study sampling plan

For the qualitative project, 24–30 in-depth case studies will be chosen through purposive sampling. Cases need to be guided by these parameters for:

- Performance outcomes (successful vs. struggling startups)
- Lifecycle stages
- Industry sectors
- Geographical contexts.

9.3 Cases Identification Criteria:

Cases will be identified under theoretical sampling principles for maximum variation to enable identification of patterns and theory building. Successful cases offer insight into actual good practices in management; struggling cases bring forth problems and management pitfalls.

9.4 Method of Data-Gathering:

The research will make its way on the collaborative methodology route, utilizing mostly quantitative data made available through structured questionnaires via a professional platform on the web.

So, the survey work is craft thinking about numerous issues concerning startup management teams in terms of their experiences, educations, previous roles, as well as working environments illustrated in their roles in setting project goals, resource allocation, and decision-making practices by various institutions. Its further tests for more critical organizational data, survival rates, revenues, funding raised, and hiring. The research intends to concurrently classify and measure locations and other contextually derived characteristics including industry, location within the country, and a list of funding sources. To ensure validity, the survey will employ validated scales whenever possible, and questions will take forms of Likert scales and multiple choices, as based on an ideal completion time of about 20-25 minutes. Concurrently, an additional source of quantitative public data, among others, will be derived from data on funding and valuation-such as Crunchbase and PitchBook and on backgrounds of management LinkedIn and from the websites of the companies themselves on product offerings and positioning and so forth. In qualitative perspectives, the in depth semi structured interviews would be lined up with founders, managers, key employees line up from approximately 60 to 90 minutes, via video or face to face scenarios, that will look into the trajectory of several issues related to management evolution, resource strategies, leadership transitions, measurement of performance including critical incidents-providing an in depth perspective in understanding the dynamics inside a startup. Furthermore, qualitative data would be expanded through the analysis of internal documents like business plans, board meetings, management reports, organization charts, and surveys eliciting information related to internal processes, culture, and decision making mechanisms inside the startups.

9.5 Data Analysis Methods

Quantitative Analysis:

Provided statistical treatments shall be undertaken through SPSS and R statistical software, involving the application of several analytical techniques:

Descriptive Statistics:

Means, standard deviations, frequency distributions of all variables shall be computed so as to obtain understanding of how the sample is characterized and of variable range.

Correlation Analysis:

Bivariate relationships between management variables and performance outcomes shall be analyzed by Pearson correlation coefficients. This preliminary exploration aims to identify probable relations to be examined further.

This task goes about using a sophisticated array of mixed methods in characterizing management practices varying the organizational environments. Right now, it is trying to see whether hierarchical regressions can help to understand one instance of how many startup and effort outcome-dependent variables can be somewhat eliminated. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) will also enable the understanding of complex relationships involving mediators and moderators, explaining how different management-related capabilities can impact performance indirectly.

How concerning the presence of separate profiles, since the cluster analysis aims to explore the latent structure of management practices amongst the firms and thereby possibly find that there exists a group, with its own set of previously unsuspected approaches. Subsequent data analysis will take place through the use of the so-called NVivo software. This begins in the first cycle of coding in order to generate both deductive and inductive codes associated with management practices, challenges, and outcomes. The next circle of coding, which includes pattern coding and axial coding, will reveal emerging themes and link the categories, and a within-case analysis will help understand the processes exhibited by certain cases by identifying major milestone events and decision-making processes. A cross case comparison will be conducted to identify the global patterns with reflection on contrasting practices on the basis of case-ordered matrices and time-ordered displays. The last phase is to integrate the qualitative and quantitative findings for triangulation, enabling the qualitative insights to give meaning to the quantitative patterns, and vice versa, in yielding a well rounded overall understanding of how management practices affect the overall performance of a startup across various contexts.

9.6 Validity and Reliability

Reliability and validity are important to any study, and this study indeed assures both quantitative and qualitative validity and reliability. Quantitative validity, for instance, includes construct validity, verified by literature review, expert review, and pilot study; internal validity, i.e., by handling confounding variables and incorporating appropriate statistical techniques; and external validity, assessed by stratified random sampling, detailed sample characterization, and acknowledgement of inability for generalization. Reliability measures, for one, require evaluation of the consistency of the scale using Cronbach's alpha (≥ 0.7); this is done under a test-retest methodology, including a smaller subset of all the respondents. Additionally, item-to-item correlation will be calculated using SPSS. Qualitative validity and trustworthiness are supported by credibility practices such as triangulation, member checking, prolonged engagement, and reflexivity; transferability through rich contextual descriptions; dependability by means of extensive audit trails, reliable protocols, and an honest presentation of the analysis; and confirmability through quotation selection that accurately describes the phenomenon. The researcher should choose empty entries which he can find and present as a way to support or oppose his own biases, looking for contradictory data.

10. Study Tools

This study will utilize the following methods for data collection and analysis:

10.1 Data Collection Methods

The research would follow a multiple data collection approach taking various methods to ensure an ample bunch of reliable data. An online survey platform, with professional survey software such as Qualtrics or SurveyMonkey, would create the space for the construction and dissemination of questionnaires while playing with multiple advanced features including complex question logic, randomization, and data validation before easily exporting data. Featured criteria for platform selection include user experience simplicities, mobile compatibility, and integration opportunities, and these were to further guarantee respondent ambassadors, quality data, and informational pathways. On the other hand, semi structured interviews coupled with a detailed interview schedule focus on the core domains for coverage in the research and would, based obviously on flexibility, extend to cover associated areas. An initial round of controlled feedback will test its reliability during pilot management. The document analysis part of the study will embrace specific structured methodological conduct for examining and taking bite sizes off the noble enterprise's documents; such bite size appetizers are intended to squeeze out valuable information upon which data would resurface. This further serves the cause of rigor and focus. To facilitate these, high-quality recording glasses will be on hand to record on-tape interviews and carry out transcription if the participants are kind enough to give their consent to accommodate this for further study. Taken as a whole, this would permit the data multiplication toward deepening the final execution of the formal treatment of the perspective.

10.2 Data Analysis Methods

There is a suite of software tools available nowadays for the handling of research data. National statistics, correlational studies, regression, comparisons all SPSS. R, with more unusual techniques, tackles SEMs and clustering. Excel is known for available quantitative data managing, analyzing, and visualizing at the initial stage of the process. NVivo provides the appropriate setting for coding, theme extraction, and data analysis in qualitative research with MAXQDA for contrasting data. Both Mendeley and Zotero are excellent citations management tools. Together with its major advantage of survey spread, LinkedIn and email marketing platforms ought to be lauded. Tableau is quite the preferred standard for visual outputs. Transcription services such as rev.com and Otter.ai transcribe interviews; they convert the information into a format consistent with the research protocol.

10.3 Measurement Instruments

It is imperative to generate a comprehensive and multilevel instrument for the assessment of various facets of management and startup performance. Among others, the Management Practice Scale will gauge the various management practices ranging from strategizing, resource management, decision-making, performance monitoring, human resources effectiveness, and organizational

structure. This is operationalized as two scales with a total of 34 items. In addition, a Management Capacity scale will evaluate dynamic capabilities and management abilities for such qualities as sensing opportunities, mobilizing resources, transforming organization, leading productively, and strategic thinking. The article thus provides multiple metrics to evaluate startup performance, including survival status, revenue growth, customer acquisition, funding and valuation, employee expansion, market share, milestones achieved in product development, industry sector, geographic location, investor involvement, and competitive intensity. The aim of all these instruments is a detailed description of the management practices, abilities, and key metrics of success for startup firms.

11. Study Limitations

The findings must be interpreted with several limitations in mind.

11.1 Methodological Limitations

Cross-Sectional versus Longitudinal Design:

In its effort to study startups at various lifecycle stages, the primary quantitative phase remains cross-sectional, capturing data at single time points. This narrows the scope of its ability to infer true causal relationships and consequently observe how management is evolving inside the individual startups. Ideally, causal inference could be made stronger with a longitudinal design following the same startups over several years. This, however, remains practically unfeasible because of the time and resource constraints coupled with startup attrition. The study partially tries to compensate for this by using retrospective questions and qualitative case histories.

Self-Report Bias:

Depending on the self-report method of data collection, founders and managers may provide socially desirable responses, overrate their opportunities, or recall past events with bias. One way that helps make up for such downside occurs through triangulation of various types of data sources, objective performance criteria when possible, and crafting survey questions to minimize bias.

Sampling Limitations:

It is difficult to get adequacy in startup samples as failed startups are quite rare and tend to fall into survivorship bias-the focus is never on VCs, making it difficult to access successful startups. Also, geographical and language barriers might limit the international sample. These are offshoots, however, which might be overcome with a multiprong recruitment strategy, high incentives, and sample composition as a point of consideration in all interpretations.

Measurement Challenges:

Because any measurement can present a certain amount of trouble in decision-making in startups, plus when minimization is given to standardized checks, secondly, they have very high performance instability levels, and thirdly, difficulty in attribution all in all make the tool appear unable to capture a lot of business management subtleties.

11.2 Limitations of Scope

Technology Startup Focus:

The main reason for your decision is the exclusion of high growth potential businesses. However, the research only extends to technology startups and does not reflect a generalizable aspect to service oriented or retail businesses or businesses not focused on innovation. But this exclusion is consistent with the practical rules to gain access to technology startups through digital channels and little regard for certain growth potential.

Boundary of the Lifecycle Stage:

Stage boundaries are problematic to define in startup development. There are many dimensions in which startups mature asynchronously, so you might see a business in the growth stage on product development while still developing mature business processes. Stage definitions only become somewhat subjective and will carry through analyses at different stages.

Geographic Scope:

To have better diversity at the international level, practically, some parts of the world (such as North America and Western Europe) could be overrepresented compared to others. Cultural and language factors could probably limit diversity in full geographic scope. The conclusions should, therefore, be arrived at with an awareness of the issue of geographic bias.

Management Practice Comprehensiveness:

Management encompasses vast domains. This study deals with strategic management, resource management, organizational structure, leadership, and performance measurement but cannot cover all management aspects. Marketing management, operations management, and the specifics of financial management receive less attention here. These are potential avenues for future inquiry.

11.3 Contextual Limitations

Temporal Context:

The research conducted in economic and technological contexts, may thus suffer limited tint of temporal generalizability. The economic conditions, technological trends, funding environment, and level of maturity of the startup ecosystem continue to change. Management practices that work in the present may have to be reworked for time contexts. The study shall list the contextual factors that could be a limitation but will not be able to waive off temporal contingency.

Industry Heterogeneity:

Indeed, the multiple industries examined here (software, hardware, biotech, fintech, e-commerce) present internal variation on a grand scale. "Software startups" include SaaS, mobile apps, gaming,

enterprise software, and more each having its distinct traits. Industry categories are merely simplified representations of a complex reality. The within-industry variation should have been considered and kept in mind for the interpretation of the findings.

Complexity of Causality:

Success in a startup emerges from the interacting effect of multiple factors, including management, product-market fit, timing, luck, and external circumstances. The study tries to look at management as a part of success; however, separating the causal impacts of management from those of other parameters is still a major challenge. Statistical controls go a long way, but do not suffice to remove every confound. One must hence interpret findings as showing associations and probable contributors rather than as providing definitive proof of causal claims.

11.4 Practical Limitations

Resource Constraints:

This kind of academic research is constrained in terms of the finances and time so that the sample size, geographic range, as well as data collection methods then get affected. Large samples, case studies extended in time, or longitudinal tracking, might provide stronger data, but resources for these are not available.

Access Limitations:

A somewhat interesting effect could result in the case wherein startups of extreme achievements, and the extreme non-achievement class proved hard to sample from. Failed startups simply say no, or they are closed. On the other hand, to convince into partaking, startups that are highly successful tend to be a tough lot. This might further effect a selection bias toward ventures of medium performance still surviving today.

Disclosure Sensitivity:

Startups might want to avoid sharing explicit details about the challenges faced by management, failures, or sensitive metrics that are relevant, essential, and more impactful for competitive or confidential reasons. This can turn into a limitation in terms of the depth of data in certain areas. The study circumvents this by way of assuring confidentiality, reporting in aggregated forms, and, where possible, using alternative data sources.

References

- [1] C. Giardino, X. Wang, and P. Abrahamsson, "Why Early-Stage Software Startups Fail: A Behavioral Framework," *Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing*, vol. 182 LNBIP, pp. 27–41, 2014, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-08738-2_3.
- [2] M. Cantamessa, V. Gatteschi, G. Perboli, and M. Rosano, "Startups' Roads to Failure," *Sustainability* 2018, Vol. 10, Page 2346, vol. 10, no. 7, p. 2346, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.3390/SU10072346.
- [3] J. R. Melenchion, E. K. M. Kubo, E. C. Oliva, and E. D. Cohen, "People development in startups," *RAM. Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, vol. 24, no. 2, p. eRAMG230116, 2023, doi: 10.1590/1678-6971/ERAMG230116.EN.
- [4] A. Davila and G. Foster, "Management Control Systems in Early-Stage Startup Companies," *The Accounting Review*, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 907–937, Jul. 2007, doi: 10.2308/ACCR.2007.82.4.907.
- [5] A. Davila, G. Foster, and N. Jia, "Building sustainable high-growth startup companies: Management systems as an accelerator," *Calif Manage Rev*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 79–105, 2010, doi: 10.1525/CMR.2010.52.3.79;SUBPAGE:STRING:ABSTRACT;REQUESTEDJOURNAL:JOURNAL:CMRA;WEBSITE:WEBSITE:SAGE;WGROU:STRING:PUBLICATION.
- [6] J. Ogolla Atieno and Dr. T. A. Senaji, "RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STRATEGIC AGILITY AND ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE," *Africa International Journal of Management Education and Governance (AIJMEG)*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 2518–0827, Oct. 2017, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <http://repository.kemu.ac.ke/handle/123456789/1013>
- [7] R. A. Zaidi, M. M. Khan, R. A. Khan, and B. G. Mujtaba, "Do entrepreneurship ecosystem and managerial skills contribute to startup development?," *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 25–53, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1108/SAJBS-07-2020-0233.
- [8] J. Freeman and J. S. Engel, "Models of Innovation: Startups and Mature Corporations," *Calif Manage Rev*, vol. 50, no. 1, 2007, doi: 10.2307/41166418.
- [9] B. Rismayadi, "Human Resource Management Practices in Startup Companies: Challenges and Opportunities," *Lead Journal of Economy and Administration*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 176–182, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.56403/LEJEA.V2I4.184.
- [10] Alnoor. Bhimani, "Financial management for technology start-ups : how to power growth, track performance and drive innovation," p. 228, 2022, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available:

https://books.google.com/books/about/Financial_Management_for_Technology_Startups.html?hl=ar&id=AjpUEAAAQBAJ

- [11] A. Dr. Rais and K. Abdedaïme, "The Role of Customer Acquisition Strategy in the Growth of Startups," 2024, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <http://localhost:8080/jspui/handle/123456789/11362>
- [12] E. Romanelli, "Environments and Strategies of Organization Start-Up: Effects on Early Survival," *Adm Sci Q*, vol. 34, no. 3, p. 369, Sep. 1989, doi: 10.2307/2393149.
- [13] S. A. Zahra, "The Resource-Based View, Resourcefulness, and Resource Management in Startup Firms: A Proposed Research Agenda," *J Manage*, vol. 47, no. 7, pp. 1841–1860, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1177/01492063211018505;JOURNAL:JOURNAL:JOMA;WGROU:STRING:PUBLIC ATION.
- [14] P. Ester and Jonge, "Accelerators in Silicon Valley," *Accelerators in Silicon Valley*, p. 176, May 2025, doi: 10.5117/9789462987166.
- [15] P. Centobelli, R. Cerchione, and E. Esposito, "Knowledge Management in Startups: Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda," *Sustainability 2017, Vol. 9, Page 361*, vol. 9, no. 3, p. 361, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.3390/SU9030361.
- [16] E. G. Teixeira, G. L. de Moura, L. F. D. Lopes, D. A. B. Marconatto, and A. A. Fischmann, "The influence of dynamic capabilities on startup growth," *RAUSP Management Journal*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 88–108, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1108/RAUSP-08-2019-0176.
- [17] N. Fernando, "Impact of cash management practices on the performance of the small-scale start-ups," 2025, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <http://www.theseus.fi/handle/10024/892146>
- [18] T. R. . Eisenmann, "Why startups fail : a new roadmap for entrepreneurial success," p. 351, 2021, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books/about/Why_Startups_Fail.html?hl=ar&id=iW3vDwAAQBAJ
- [19] G. Cattafi, "The risk of growing too fast in the start-up phase. The case of gazelle enterprises.," 2025, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://tesidottorato.depositolegale.it/handle/20.500.14242/200908>
- [20] R. M. Benzerroug, "Startup management: benefits and limitations of the 'Lean Startup' method and its importance for Algeria's entrepreneurial ecosystem," *أبعاد اقتصادية*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 587–607, Jun. 2024, Accessed: Nov. 14, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/249296>
- [21] I. Peña, "Tecnolatinas 2021: The LAC Startup Ecosystem Comes of Age," *Tecnolatinas 2021: The LAC Startup Ecosystem Comes of Age*, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.18235/0003080.

- [22] Z. Székely, "Three Critical Elements of Start-Up Success," *Driv. Forensic Innovation in the 21st Century: Crossing the Valley of Death*, pp. 113–145, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-56556-4_6.
- [23] A. Davila and G. Foster, "Management Control Systems in Early-Stage Startup Companies," *The Accounting Review*, vol. 82, no. 4, pp. 907–937, Jul. 2007, doi: 10.2308/ACCR.2007.82.4.907.
- [24] D. L. Frederiksen and A. Brem, "How do entrepreneurs think they create value? A scientific reflection of Eric Ries' Lean Startup approach," *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 2016 13:1, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 169–189, Oct. 2016, doi: 10.1007/S11365-016-0411-X.
- [25] R. A. Zaidi, M. M. Khan, R. A. Khan, and B. G. Mujtaba, "Do entrepreneurship ecosystem and managerial skills contribute to startup development?," *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 25–53, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1108/SAJBS-07-2020-0233.