

The Role of Management in Developing and Improving the Growth of Startups

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

Startups are some of the engines of innovation and job creation in the global economy. It is these young, high-growth ventures that spur technological development, disrupt incumbent businesses, and create large employment opportunities. The risk of failure in entrepreneurship is hugely high: Almost 90% of startups fail within five years of operation, and the greater majority of these (namely, 70%) fail between the second and the fifth years of operation [1].

Even if there are many factors contributing to startup failure, emerging research points to management-related issues as the principal reason for many failures. Specifically, 23% of startups failed due to poor team dynamics or human resource issues; 14% due to inadequate marketing strategy and poor strategic management; and 16% due to cash flow problems caused by financial mismanagement [2]. The study has also revealed a significant 20-40% rate of replacement of founders by professional managers during crucial growth stages, thereby stressing the importance of management capacity for the survival of a startup.

An original research opportunity can be posed at the intersection of management effectiveness and startup growth trajectories. Classical theories and frameworks of management are conceptualized mostly with established organizations operating in more or less stable environments. However, startups operate in rather uncertain environments marked by extreme resource scarcity and rapid change-these characteristics possibly need quite different approaches to management. How management practices, structures, and capabilities matter to the development and growth of startups remains insufficiently addressed in the literature.

The economic significance of startups accentuates this research lacuna. Besides their contribution to innovation and job creation, profitable startups offer heavy returns to their investors and regional economic upliftment; they serve as a rallying point for the transformation of their broader industry. Any knowledge about the management factors that set apart successful startups from failed ones could really go a long way into increasing the survival rates of startups and, thus, strengthening their positive economic impact.

The complexity of management in startups arises from several characteristics' peculiar to these organizations. First, an early-stage startup usually begins with founders who have strong technical or product knowledge but with little or no management experience. Second, resource constraints are so pressing that the organization requires an exceptional level of efficiency and prioritization. Third, they must ensure a balance between strategic planning and the need to adapt rapidly or even pivot. Fourth, the organizations change dramatically over time, so that from an operations standpoint their management techniques must keep evolving. Fifth, there are difficulties in measuring and staging improvement with traditional business metrics.

This research proposal presents a comprehensive exploration into how management practices, capabilities, and structures influence the development and growth of startup companies. Studying the role of management at different stages of a startup life cycle, analyzing the interrelationship between management effectiveness and outcome performance, and developing frameworks suitable for application in a startup setting are how this study will theoretically and practically contribute to entrepreneurship and management literature.

2. Study Problem

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

Within this overarching problem exists a set of interrelated sub-problems whose systematic investigation is worthy:

2.1 Management Capability Gap

Many startups are typically founded by technically skilled people, with fresh ideas for commercializing them, or people with industry know-how and experience [3]. However, many of the founders lack formal management training and experience. This lack of managerial competence poses a problem as the enterprise expands beyond the founder's personal capacity to manage every facet of the business. Studies have found that venture capitalists replace 20-40% of founders with managers, presumably experienced, during major growth phases, thereby saying that the management ability of initial founders is insufficient for actual organization scaling [4]. The problem arises in just what management skills matter most at different stages, and how can founders develop these skills most effectively?

2.2 Resource Constraint Management

Startups operate under extreme constraints of financing, human capital, and time. These constraints are fundamentally different from those existing in established organizations, set and with stable revenue streams and established operational infrastructure. Research reveals that 82% of business failures are due to poor cash flow management, while somehow 34% of startups run out of cash as the primary cause of failure [5]. The challenge is hiring management capability and determining how it can be used to best optimize limited resources, extend runway operationally, and do more with less—a capability very different from resource management traditionally employed by established firms.

2.3. Strategic Agility versus Organizational Structure

Startups find themselves in this paradox: while they need strategic planning along with organizational structure to coordinate activities and scale up operations, they must be exceptionally flexible to pivot at a moment's notice depending on market feedback. 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

Beyond certain limits, management requirements change drastically with the growth of the startups. The early stage calls for hand-in-hand operational leadership where founders are executing most activities themselves. As the company grows, there has to be a transition towards

strategic oversight, delegation, and empowering others. Research shows that 50-70% of all executives fail within the first 18 months of taking a new role, and the cost for the companies reaches up to 400% of the executives concerned' annual salary [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

Traditional business metrics and management frameworks may poorly describe the distinct value drivers and growth dynamics 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].

Despite this clear evidence of management's critical function, however, the systematic investigation of how management practices actually affect startup growth remains largely scattered among several disciplines. This research question addresses a fundamental gap in our understanding of entrepreneurial management and bears immediate practical relevance for enhancing startup success rates.

3. Importance of Study

This research is multidimensionally and unilaterally significant to theory, practical application, economics, and stakeholders:

3.1 Theoretical Importance

This research advances management and entrepreneurship theory in vital respects. It bridges what have been traditionally seen as two independent domains: entrepreneurship research and strategic management literature. Entrepreneurship studies basically focus on opportunity recognition,

venture creation, and innovation, whereas strategic management concentrates on organizational capabilities, competitive advantage, and optimization of performance [12]. In a nutshell, this research seeks to align these two vantage points towards understandings of management in entrepreneurial contexts.

The study goes at length in extending existing theoretical models, particularly in applying RBV and Dynamic Capabilities Theory to startup settings. According to RBV, a firm achieves competitive advantage from resources that are valuable, rare, inimitable, and organized (VRIO), whereas Dynamic Capabilities Theory deals with the firm's ability to sense opportunities, seize them, and adapt operations accordingly [13]. Mainly, these frameworks were developed in the context of established firms. Startups have some peculiar features-these include limited resources, extreme uncertainty, and accelerated growth-that might require a different orientation of these theories. This research will examine the validity of these theories as they apply to entrepreneurial contexts and, if necessary, extend them.

Third, the study furthers organizational theory by examining the evolution of management structures and practices under high-uncertainty, resource-constrained environments. Traditional organizational theory assumes relative stability and an established set of processes. The understanding of how management operates effectively in startup conditions must enable organizational theory to develop concepts related to adaptation, emergence, and organizational becoming rather than static concepts of organizational being.

3.2 Practical Importance

The study provides actionable insights that can benefit several groups of practitioners:

For Founders and Management Teams: The study will identify evidence-based management practices that correlate with startup success. This way, entrepreneurs could make adjustments to their practices on the basis of empirical evidence rather than lecture-based suggestions, personal recommendations, or mere convincing. These methods will address issues such as the growth stage at which teams should shift from operational to strategic leadership, optimal organizational design, key capabilities to build, and how to gauge the effectiveness of management.

For Investors and Venture Capitalists: The study will develop the frameworks that help one evaluate the management team capabilities during a due diligence process. Investors often say that the important thing is "betting on the jockey," and this must be explained through a systematic way of assessing the quality of management. The outcomes will also help investors guide the key portfolio companies through coaching, mentoring, and providing strategic direction.

2. Useful for accelerators and incubators: Organizations that are working with such groups may utilize this information to design more efficient curricula and support programs. With this knowledge of which management capabilities actually matter in successful enterprises, training interventions can be directly targeted. Accelerators will be able to narrow down their generic management advice further to concrete, stage-specific, and context-appropriate management development.

3. For consultants and advisors: The professional service providers working with startups will be able to pick from a wider range of frameworks for diagnosing management problems and recommending interventions. The study offers evidence-based tools for assessing management maturity and identifying developmental priorities.

3.3 Economic Importance

Startup companies are engines for economic growth, innovation, and employment. However, the high level of failure means considerable wastage of resources like financial capital, human talent, and opportunity costs. 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. Albeit the recent high-growth startups have 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 agencies that design programs to support startups, provide for tax interruptions for them, or develop the ecosystem can benefit from understanding which sorts of management interventions bring the greatest return to public investment.

3.5 Importance of the Knowledge Gap

The present literature reveals some critical gaps which this study attempts to address:

Little Empirical Research on Startup Management: Despite a vast number of case studies and practitioner books, rigorous empirical research on management practices in startups remains constrained in quantity. Most management recommendations are anecdotal or based on wisdom passed down from practitioners without an underpinning in rigorous studies [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:

Investigate and analyze the role of management in the development and growth of startup companies, including identification of management practices, capabilities, and structures that critically contribute to startup success and sustainability.

Specific Objectives:

Objective 1: Identifying Key Management Practices

This objective sets forth the discoveries and categorization of the key management practices that successful startups follow during different stages of growth—from ideation through validation to efficiency and scaling. This entails documenting the specific management activities, processes, and approaches employed by high-performing startups and contrasting such practices with those employed by ventures that were struggling or failed. The intent is to analyze how management practices change as startups grow mature and which practices become truly critical at various stages of development.

Objective 2: Study the Management-Performance Relationship

To study the relationship between management capabilities and measurement of performance of startups in terms of survival rate, growth in revenues, profit, customer acquisition, and valuation. The purpose here is to determine which management characteristics (team experience, strategic planning methods, organizational structures) are associated with actual performance results. For conducting analysis, however, a matrix of performance metrics and qualitative assessments of management effectiveness will be used.

Objective 3: Evaluate Management Frame Works' Applicability

Assessing the value and applicability of management frameworks in the startup context involves testing traditional management theories against startup realities and modern approaches for their suitability in entrepreneurial settings. The ultimate aim is to determine what theoretical frameworks appear most apt in explaining management in startup success.

Objective 4: Examine Critical Management Transitions

Analyzing key management transition points set in growth in start-ups, with emphasis on the shift from founder-led to professionally managed organizations. This objective seeks to explore the challenges, timing, and success factors in the transitions of management: when to bring in experienced executives, how leadership teams should be structured, and what their responsibilities and skills may be at different growth stages. With this knowledge, the transition phases might cause fewer deaths due to the difficulties of scaling.

Objective 5: The Study of Resource Management Strategies

The objective aims to study how resource management strategies impact the sustainability of start-ups. Since resource constraints are defining characteristics of a start-up, this objective explores how effective management can stretch limited financial capital, human resources, and time. For this, the analysis studies cash flow management, burn rate, hiring decisions, and prioritization frameworks that help start-ups lengthen their runway and achieve more with less.

Objective 6: Create a Framework for Startup Management Competency

To formulate a comprehensive framework of management competencies for startup success. This objective transforms empirical observations into an actionable framework identifying those core management capabilities that apply across contexts and those stage-specific competencies that come to the foreground in particular growth phases. The framework will categorize capabilities

between "must-have" ones that are strictly necessary because without them the company cannot survive and "nice-to-have" ones that improve performance.

Objective 7: To Assess Moderating Contextual Factors

To assess varying degrees of moderation exerted by external factors upon management efficacy such as industry sector, geographic location, cultural context, and funding sources. Management practices that do well in one setting do not necessarily translate into another. This objective determines how these contextual factors affect management approaches, thereby enabling more nuanced recommendations tailored to a given situation.

Objective 8: Prepare Evidence-Based Recommendations

The second objective is to provide evidence-based recommendations for startup ecosystem stakeholders, such as founders, investors, accelerators, educators, and policymakers. Basically, the research findings are going to be translated into practical guidelines, evaluation frameworks, curriculum design principles, and policy recommendations ready to be implemented to integrate startup ecosystems better while increasing their success rate.

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 start-up'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: How do different organizational designs (flat or hierarchical, functional or cross-functional) affect startup agility and scalability?

RQ9: How do management systems like Lean Startup, Agile, and traditional strategic management affect startup success?

RQ10: How do various external contextual factors (industry, geography, funding source, market conditions) influence the relation between management and startup results?

RQ11: What managerial competences should be key toward which founders should work to successfully manage growing ventures?

RQ12: How do successful startups deal with the paradox of strategic planning and adaptive flexibility?

6. Hypotheses of the Study

Having laid down the theoretical underpinnings and performed the preliminary literature reviews, the study presents its hypotheses as thus:

H1: Management Team Experience and Startup Survival

Startups under management teams that bring entrepreneurial experience or relevant industry-related experience witness survival rates significantly higher than those under first-time founders with no domain experience.

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

Start-ups operating with cross-functional, team-based organizations display better adaptability and quicker decision-making than do those using traditional hierarchical structures.

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 that use the correct measures will identify problems early in time and channel their resources accordingly.

H8: Leadership Styles and Team Performance.

Transformational leadership styles (afflicted with vision, inspiration, and empowerment) match more closely with the startup teams' performance than those that are transactional.

Rationale: Creative energy, initiative, and adaptability should flow from team members for the transformation of startups. Transformational leadership nurtures those attributes better.

H9: Contextual Moderation

The strength of the link between management practices and startup performance is moderated by various contextual elements such as industry sector, geographic location, funding sources, and market conditions.

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 particular 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 the 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 all the 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, or customer acquisition cost, and LTV, which is customer lifetime value, stand as a pair of fundamental evaluative metrics for unit economics. It has been found that successful SaaS startups somehow maintain an LTV to CAC ratio greater than 3:1. MRR relates to monthly recurring revenue and hence denotes an element of revenue predictability for subscription businesses. The burn rate, in tandem with the runway, remains crucial in cash management, where top startups maintain 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 still 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. Comparative studies on US and non-US startups find that strategy formalization is of importance only if one operates in an institutional context in which errors can be costly and resources hard to mobilize. On the other hand, research on emerging market startups brings forth certain challenges, like scarce talent pools, less support from institutions, and different cultural norms affecting management practices.

Funding source research focuses on how management approaches differ with venture capital funding against those with bootstrapping or corporate venture capital. The pressure to grow fast in VC-backed ventures could sometimes force aggressive management approaches, whereas the bootstrappers will be looking at capital efficiency. The corporate-backed ones will be provided with resources but may have some strategic restrictions due to their parent companies.

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 looks into how management strategies allow startups to find, acquire, build, and put to use 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. It tests whether startup firms with strong dynamic capabilities perform above those with strong operational capabilities but weak dynamics, thereby setting the entrepreneurial context for the theory.

8.3 Lean Startup Methodology

Introduced by Eric Ries in 2011, the Lean Startup approach took off in parallel with Lean Manufacturing, Customer Development (Blank, 2013), Agile software development, and Design Thinking movements [24] This approach focuses on build-measure-learn cycles, minimum viable products (MVPs), validated learning, and pivoting on the basis of customer validation.

Core principles include: (1) Entrepreneurs may be everywhere, with entrepreneurship management being a form of management that goes beyond traditional startups; (2) Entrepreneurship is management: a startup is an institution, an institution requires a management framework. (3) Recovery learning: Startups exist to learn how to build a sustainable business. (4) Build-Measure-Learn: Generate an idea, build a product, measure customer response, and learn if the startup should pivot or persevere. (5) Innovation accounting: A method of measuring progress, setting milestones, and prioritizing work.

These methodologies provide practical frameworks to manage uncertainty and systematically test assumptions around the business model. Critics underscore some limitations and say the methodology puts too much weight on customer feedback versus visionary innovation, therefore having iteration takes precedence over breakthrough opportunities, and its applicability outside the sphere of software startups is poorly defined.

This research studies the efficacy of Lean Startup methodology in different settings and the wider relation of this methodology to management practices. It explores whether startup organizations that conform to the Lean Startup principles are better placed to perform well and to what extent this growth methodology is paired with management frameworks of a different sort.

8.4 Entrepreneurial Management Theory

Entrepreneurial Management, in its conception by, among others, Stevenson and Jarillo, distinguishes the management in the entrepreneurial one from the established organizational context [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). To master these transitions and remain on an upward growth curve, advances in management capabilities must accompany process changes.

The current study investigates whether management effectiveness in startups depends on their lifecycle stage, and what management capabilities become more critical at different stages. How transition points are challenged and how success factors weigh in on the tipping of management evolution during startup growth are studied.

9. Methodology and Research Methods

9.1 Research Philosophy and Approach

In perfect keeping with practical problem-solving, this research opts for the pragmatic philosophical stance, rejecting the dominance of any heel of methodological tradition. 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

The present study follows a mixed-methods sequential explanatory research design in its two phases:

Phase 1: Quantitative Survey Research

Phase 1: Survey

The first phase concerns survey research of a massive scale to investigate how management practices might be related to issues that affect startup performance. This phase serves to test hypotheses, make out patterns, and establish correlations between variables across as large a sample as possible.

Phase 2: Qualitative Case Study Research

The second phase implements a multi-case study methodology to search for mechanisms, contextualize quantitative findings, and offer rich understanding of management practices in successful and unsuccessful startups. Case studies bring depth and explanation to the patterns arising from a quantitative approach.

The sequential design lets quantitative results inform the qualitative investigation, while qualitative observations aid in the interpretation of quantitative patterns. This approach clearly addresses breadth (many cases examined quantitatively) and depth (few cases examined qualitatively).

9.3 Population and Sampling

Research Population:

The study population consists of technology-based startups aged 1-7 years that operate in many sectors including software, hardware, biotech, fintech, and e-commerce, with at least one full-time employee. To study management practices specific to lifecycle stages, the population includes startups operating at different lifecycle stages, such as validation, efficiency, and scaling.

Geographic Scope:

The study would include startups from different geographic regions including North America, Europe, Asia, and emerging markets. This range ensures that contextual factors shall be taken into account while the focus remains on technology startups facing similar basic challenges.

Sampling for Quantitative Phase:

Sample Size: A minimum of 350 startups will be chosen to ensure adequate statistical power in various multiple regression analyses and subgroup comparisons. Power analysis ($\alpha=0.05$, $\beta=0.20$, medium effect size) indicates that the sample size can detect significant relationships.

Sampling Method: Stratified random sampling will be conducted with stratification arising from:

- Lifecycle stage (validation, efficiency, scaling)
- Industry sector (software, hardware, biotech, fintech, e-commerce)
- Geographic region (developed vs. emerging markets)
- Funding status (bootstrapped, angel-funded, VC-backed)

Sample Selection: Startups will be identified using several sources such as startup databases (Crunchbase, AngelList), accelerator/incubator alumni networks, industry associations, and venture capital portfolio companies. Random selection within strata will ensure representativeness.

Qualitative Phase Sampling:

Sample Size: 24-30 in-depth case studies will be selected through purposive sampling that ensures diversity across:

- Performance outcomes (successful vs. struggling)
- Lifecycle stages
- Industry sectors
- Geographic 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:

Quantitative Data-Gathering:

Online Structured Survey:

The major quantitative data instrument will be a fully-fledged online survey uploaded on a professional survey platform. The survey will then be disseminated through a number of channels: by means of e-mail invitations sent to identified startups, through strategic partnerships with accelerators/incubators, through industry associations, and through social media directed at relevant groups.

Themes Covered in the Survey:

- Characteristics of management teams (experience, education, former roles)
- Management practices (planning, allocation of resources, decision making)
- Organizational overview and processes
- Performance metrics include survival, revenue growth, funding raised, and headcount.
- Contextual factors refer to industry, geography, and funding sources.

Survey Design: Insofar as they exist, validated scales will be used in the survey, paying particular attention to the development of scales that capture the relevancies of constructs specific to startups. The types of questions will vary and could be Likert-scale items, multiple choice, and possibly a few limited open-ended questions. Survey length will be optimized to about 20-25 minutes so as to balance the completion rates with comprehensiveness.

Secondary Quantitative Data:

Additional data collection will be sourced via public channels including:

- Startup databases (Crunchbase, PitchBook) for data on funding, valuation, and growth
- LinkedIn for management team backgrounds
- Company websites for product information and positioning

Qualitative Data Collection:

Semi-structured Interviews:

Primary qualitative data will be collated through in-depth interviews with founders, management team members, and key employees of the case study startups.

Interview Protocol:

- Duration: 60 to 90 minutes per interview
- Number: 2 to 4 interviews per case study company
- Format: Video call or face to face, recorded with consent
- Structure: Semi-structured using an interview guide, but with flexibility for exploration

Interview Topics:

- Management evolution history and critical decisions
- Resource management strategies and challenges
- Leadership transition experiences
- Performance measurement practices
- Critical incidents and turning points
- Lessons learned and advice for other startups

Document Analysis:

Qualitative data will be supplemented by:

- Business plans and strategy documents
- Minutes of board meetings and investor update documents
- Internal management reports and dashboards
- Organizational charts and role descriptions
- Results of employee surveys and culture assessments

Observational Data:

Where possible, limited ethnographic observations of management meetings and planning sessions will provide additional insight into management practices as they occur

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.

Multiple Regression Analysis:

The hypotheses will be tested using multiple regression models that relate management practices as independent variables to startup performance as dependent variables, while controlling for contextual factors; hierarchical regression will be used to determine the relative importance of different categories of management practices.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM):

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) will be applied to test theoretical models involving complex relationships with multiple mediators and moderators regarding how management capabilities affect performance through intermediate mechanisms.

Cluster Analysis:

Employ clustering techniques to segregate firms into distinct management practices profiles. Such exploratory analysis may reveal management approaches that are not recognized beforehand.

Comparative Analysis:

Compare management practices across the various subgroups (successful versus unsuccessful startups, various lifecycle stages, different industries) through t-tests, ANOVA, chi-square tests.

Qualitative Analysis:

Qualitative data will be analyzed through NVivo software with the aid of systematic coding and thematic analysis:

First-Cycle Coding:

The initial coding procedure will utilize both deductive codes derived from the theoretical frameworks and inductive codes emerging from the data. Coding categories will reference management practices, challenges, transitions, and outcomes.

Second-Cycle Coding:

Pattern coding will seek to identify themes, relationships, and explanations, while axial coding will interlink categories.

Within-Case Analysis:

An individual analysis of every under-considered case will be conducted to understand the unique management trajectory through the pinpointing of critical events, decisions, and patterns.

Cross-Case Comparisons:

Four kinds of patterns translated to instances will be observed to assess overt central themes, contrasting approaches, and contextual factors affecting management effectiveness. These comprise case-ordered matrices, time-ordered displays, and conceptual frameworks.

Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings:

Final analysis will stitch together both kinds of data for triangulation, convergence, and complementarity purposes. Qualitative findings will provide an explanation for the quantitative patterns, and quantitative patterns will further state qualitative themes that hold true on a more general level.

9.6 Validity and Reliability

Quantitative Validity and Reliability:

Construct Validity: Measures for constructions will be reviewed against the literature for validated scales, and the survey instrument will go through an expert panel review and undergo pilot testing with a small startup sample.

Internal Validity: Account for confounders and interpose adequate statistical techniques to check for alternative explanations to established relationships.

External Validity: Employ stratified random sampling techniques to ensure representativeness of the sample, report the sample characteristics clearly, and discuss restricted generalizability.

Reliability: Scale reliability is assessed through Cronbach's alpha (≥ 0.7), test-retest reliability methods are applied using a subset of respondents, and inter-item correlations are examined.

Qualitative Validity and Trustworthiness:

Credibility: Use triangulation (multiple sources of data), employ member checking with interviewees, practice prolonged engagement, and maintain researcher reflexivity.

Transferability: Presentation of rich, thick description of cases and contexts so that readers can assess whether transferability applies to their situations.

Dependability: Detailed audit trail of rationales behind data collection and analysis decisions, consistent employment of interview protocols, and documented analytical procedures are to be maintained.

Confirmability: Include thick quotations to ground interpretations in data, recognize researcher perspectives and possible biases, and actively seek evidence that disconfirms research findings.

10. Study Tools

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

10.1 Data Collection Methods

Online Survey Platform:

Professional survey software (e.g., Qualtrics or SurveyMonkey) that permits useful features such as complex question logic, randomization, data validation, and data export. The platform selection will be based on user experience, mobile compatibility, and integration capabilities.

Semi-Structured Interview Guide:

A comprehensive interview guide will focus on the major research domains and provide space to investigate other related aspects. This guide will undergo pilot testing and be subsequently refined after receiving feedback from the initial interviews.

Document Analysis Protocol:

A framework for systematically reviewing and extracting relevant information from startup documents with respect to business plans, financial reports, or strategic materials.

Audio/Video Recording Equipment:

Top-quality devices used to record interviews with the participants' permission, thereby assisting in the transcription and analysis.

10.2 Data Analysis Methods

Statistical Software:

- SPSS: Quantitative analysis platform encompassing descriptive statistics, correlations, regression, and group comparisons.
- R: More advanced analyses such as structural equation modeling, cluster analysis, and other custom treatments.
- Excel: Data organization, first-pass analyses, and visualization.

Qualitative Analysis Software:

- NVivo: Full-spectrum qualitative data analysis from coding, theme identification, visualization of relationships, and integration with mixed methods.
- MAXQDA: Qualitative software alternative and is used for comparative analyses and visualization.

Additional Tools:

- Reference Management: Organizing literature and managing citations through Mendeley or Zotero.
- Survey Distribution: Use LinkedIn, an email marketing platform, and accelerator-network channels for survey distribution.
- Data Visualization: Use Tableau or similar for visually powerful depictions of the findings.
- Transcription Services: Recording professional transcription services (Rev.com, Otter.ai) of interviews

10.3 Measurement Instruments

The research will develop and use several instruments of measurement:

Management Practice Scale:

A very complete scale could be generated able to measure different management practices:

- Formalization of strategic planning (5 items)
- Effective resource management (6 items)
- Decision making process (5 items)
- Performance monitoring and measurement (6 items)
- Team and HR (7 items)

- Organizational structure characteristics (5 items)

Management Capacity:

A scale of dynamic capabilities and management skill measurement:

- Sensing capabilities (ability to recognize opportunities)
- Seizing capabilities (ability to mobilize resources)
- Transforming capabilities (ability to adapt organization)
- Leadership effectiveness
- Strategic thinking and execution

Performance Measures:

Multiple startup performance indicators:

- Survival/failure status
- Revenue growth rate
- Customer acquisitions metrics
- Funding raised and valuation
- Employee growth
- Market share or penetration
- Product development milestones
- Industry sector characteristics
- Geographic location and market conditions
- Sources of funding and investor involvement
- Intensity of competition

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. Some compensation for this limitation arises via triangulation through numerous data sources, whenever possible objective performance metrics, and the crafting of survey questions to minimize bias.

Sampling Limitations:

Getting adequate startup samples presents challenges. Failed startups may be very hard to reach, thereby creating a survivorship bias. On the other hand, successful startups might not have the time to participate in the research. Additionally, international samples might be limited because of language and geographic barriers. These concerns are addressed by using multiple recruitment channels, providing incentives to participate, and incorporating the sample composition as consideration in any interpretations made.

Measurement Challenges:

Because all measures can create a huge difficulty in decision-making in startups, any small amount of standardization, an extreme level of performance volatility, and, thirdly, the difficulty in attribution creates the fact that this tool may not capture actual nuances of entrepreneurial management.

11.2 Limitations of Scope

Technology Startup Focus:

The research mainly focuses on technology startups rather than traditional small businesses. This focus allows for the examination of startups facing similar challenges but limits generalizability to service businesses, retail ventures, or non-innovation-focused small businesses. The decision is based on some practical considerations (technology startup accessibility through digital channels) as well as on some theoretical focus on high-growth potential ventures.

Boundary of the Lifecycle Stage:

While this study looks at various lifecycle stages, defining stage boundary tends to be quite problematic. Startups develop asynchronously along different dimensions—a venture may be very mature in, say, product development but relatively immature when it comes to business processes. Stage definitions shall necessarily carry some degree of subjectivity, which will impact analyses done across stages.

Geographic Scope:

With the hope of including international diversity, in practical terms, some geographies (like North America and Western Europe) might eventually become 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 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:

Such academic research is limited in budget and time; these affect the sample size, geographical range, and methods of data collection. Larger samples, bigger case studies, or longitudinal tracking would bring in more weight, but the resources for those are not available.

Access Limitations:

An interesting effect here could be if highly successful startups and very highly unsuccessful startups are difficult to access. Failed startups could simply refuse or be closed down. On the other hand, highly successful startups are a tough bunch to convince for availability. This could lead to a selection bias toward ventures of moderate performance still operational today.

Disclosure Sensitivity:

Startups might want to keep a distance from sharing explicit details about challenges faced by management, failures, or sensitive metrics for reasons of competition or confidentiality. 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;WGROUPE: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.