International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology
Vol-11, Issue-6; Nov-Dec, 2026
Peer-Reviewed International Journal
Journal Home Page Available: https://ijeab.com/
Journal DOI: 10.22161/ijeab

Entrepreneurial Success Factors and Business Sustainability in the Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) Industry: A Study

Ravi Shankar Rai[1], Dr. Vikas Sharma[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Bhikaji Cama Subharti College of Hotel Management, Swami Vivekanand Subharti University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Bhikaji Cama Subharti College of Hotel Management, Swami Vivekanand Subharti University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India.

Received: 25 Sep 2026; Received in revised form: 22 Oct 2026; Accepted: 02 Nov 2026; Available online: 08 Nov 2026
©2026 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open-access article *under* the CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract— *The Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) industry has emerged as an important segment of the hospitality and food-service sector due to changing consumer lifestyles, urbanisation, increasing demand for convenience, digitalisation, and the expansion of organised food-service businesses. The industry offers substantial entrepreneurial opportunities through independent outlets, franchise operations, cloud kitchens, takeaway formats, and technology-enabled food-service models. However, the long-term sustainability of QSR businesses is influenced by several interconnected factors, including entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, financial management, operational efficiency, human resource capabilities, customer relationship management, digital adoption, supply-chain practices, and environmental responsibility. This study proposes an empirical examination of the entrepreneurial success factors that contribute to business sustainability in the QSR industry, with particular reference to the Delhi–NCR region of India. The research adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional explanatory design and proposes collecting primary data from QSR owners, entrepreneurs, franchisees, and outlet managers through a structured questionnaire. Business sustainability is conceptualised through three dimensions: economic sustainability, environmental sustainability, and social sustainability. Entrepreneurial orientation, innovation capability, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and sustainable supply-chain practices are proposed as the major explanatory variables. The study develops a conceptual framework and hypotheses to examine the relationships between these factors and business sustainability. Descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis, correlation, multiple regression, and structural equation modelling may be applied depending on the final sample size and data characteristics. The proposed study is expected to contribute to hospitality entrepreneurship literature by integrating entrepreneurial capabilities with the triple dimensions of business sustainability. Its practical significance lies in identifying the management capabilities and strategic practices that can support the long-term viability of independent and franchised QSR businesses.*

Keywords— ***Entrepreneurship; Quick Service Restaurant; QSR; entrepreneurial success factors; business sustainability.***

I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The hospitality industry has experienced considerable transformation due to changing consumer expectations, technological advancement, urbanisation, rising disposable incomes, and the growing demand for convenient food-service formats. Within this broader industry, the Quick Service Restaurant (QSR) segment has become an important business category because it offers relatively

rapid service, standardised products, accessible pricing, convenience, and multiple consumption formats. QSR businesses commonly operate through dine-in, takeaway, drive-through, delivery, and digital ordering channels. Their operating models are designed around speed, consistency, cost control, and the ability to serve customers within a comparatively short period.

The growth of QSR businesses has created opportunities for entrepreneurs, investors, franchise operators, food-service professionals, and small-business owners. Entrepreneurs can enter the sector through independent outlets, franchise agreements, regional food brands, specialised product concepts, cloud kitchens, and delivery-oriented operations. The sector is attractive because it allows businesses to develop focused menus, standardised processes, and repeatable operating models. Nevertheless, the presence of established brands, high rental costs, intense competition, changing food preferences, fluctuating input prices, employee turnover, and dependence on digital platforms can create substantial challenges for new and existing businesses.

Entrepreneurship in the QSR industry should not be understood only as the establishment of a restaurant. It also involves identifying market opportunities, developing a differentiated food-service concept, mobilising financial and human resources, designing efficient operating systems, managing uncertainty, responding to customer preferences, and maintaining competitiveness. Entrepreneurial success therefore depends on the ability to combine opportunity recognition with effective execution. The resource-based view suggests that firms can develop competitive advantage by acquiring, combining, and utilising valuable organisational resources and capabilities (Barney, 1991). In a QSR setting, such resources may include brand identity, food-quality systems, trained employees, supplier relationships, operational knowledge, technology, and customer information.

Entrepreneurial orientation is another important dimension of business development. It generally refers to the strategic posture of a firm in relation to innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking (Miller, 1983; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). A QSR entrepreneur who regularly evaluates emerging customer preferences, introduces suitable menu innovations, explores new delivery channels, and responds proactively to market changes may be better positioned to identify opportunities. However, entrepreneurial activity must be supported by managerial discipline. Excessive expansion, uncontrolled borrowing, unsuitable menu diversification, or poorly evaluated investments may create financial and operational risks.

Innovation has become particularly relevant in the restaurant sector. It can occur in products, services, processes, marketing, management systems, and business models. Lee et al. (2016) examined innovation, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and human capital as drivers of restaurant performance, demonstrating the relevance of entrepreneurial and innovation-related capabilities in restaurant businesses. Their work provides a useful foundation for examining whether innovation contributes not only to short-term performance but also to the long-term sustainability of QSR enterprises.

The sustainability of a QSR business extends beyond its ability to generate revenue or maintain profitability in a particular financial year. A sustainable business must be capable of maintaining economic viability, using resources responsibly, complying with relevant regulations, treating employees fairly, building customer trust, and responding to changes in its business environment. The triple bottom line approach considers economic, environmental, and social dimensions of organisational performance (Elkington, 1997). Applied to the QSR industry, economic sustainability includes profitability, cash-flow stability, cost management, and business continuity. Environmental sustainability includes energy and water efficiency, waste reduction, responsible packaging, and sustainable procurement. Social sustainability includes employee welfare, food safety, customer well-being, ethical conduct, and community engagement.

Research on restaurant sustainability indicates that environmental and social initiatives can be connected with competitiveness and business performance. Alonso-Almeida et al. (2018), using evidence from restaurant managers, examined the relationship between sustainability initiatives and performance in small tourism businesses. Their study highlights the relevance of quality, environmental practices, and social practices for smaller service businesses. Similarly, Nigam and Kumari (2018) examined green practices in Indian quick service chain restaurants, considering environmental, social, and economic dimensions of sustainability. These studies suggest that sustainability should be integrated into business operations rather than treated as a separate promotional activity.

The relationship between sustainability and restaurant performance has also been examined through the implementation of green supply-chain and environmental management practices. Abbas and Hussien (2021) investigated green supply-chain management practices in international QSRs in Egypt. Their study reported relationships between green management, operational performance, competitive advantage, and firm performance. Such evidence supports the need to examine

sustainability-related capabilities within QSR business models, while recognising that findings from one national setting may not automatically apply to another.

Digital transformation has further changed the operating environment of QSR businesses. Online ordering applications, point-of-sale systems, digital payments, customer relationship management platforms, loyalty programmes, inventory software, and data-based demand forecasting have become relevant tools for restaurant management. Digital adoption may improve convenience, transaction speed, customer reach, inventory visibility, and management control. At the same time, technology can create costs, platform dependence, commission expenses, cybersecurity concerns, and operational complexity. Therefore, the value of digital adoption depends on whether technology is selected and implemented in a way that supports the firm's business model.

The QSR industry also faces significant operational challenges. Food quality and safety must be maintained while serving customers quickly. Inventory must be managed to minimise wastage and stock-outs. Employees need training to follow standard operating procedures. Suppliers must deliver ingredients consistently, and pricing decisions must consider both customer affordability and cost recovery. These requirements make operational efficiency an important factor in entrepreneurial success. A business may attract customers through marketing and promotions, but its long-term viability depends on its ability to deliver consistent quality and service while controlling operating costs.

The Indian QSR market is characterised by the coexistence of international chains, national brands, regional businesses, independent outlets, and delivery-focused enterprises. This variety creates a competitive environment in which entrepreneurs must develop appropriate strategies according to their financial capacity, target market, location, product category, and ownership structure. Independent restaurants may have greater flexibility in menu design and local adaptation, whereas franchise businesses may benefit from established brand recognition, standard operating procedures, and training systems. Both models face challenges related to investment, compliance, labour, customer retention, and competitive differentiation.

A related study by Rai et al. (2026) examined entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, digital adoption, ownership structure, environmental dynamism, and perceived performance among QSR operators in Delhi. The present research builds on the wider discussion of QSR entrepreneurship but gives central attention to the integrated relationship between entrepreneurial success factors and the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of business sustainability. It therefore seeks to move beyond a narrow understanding of performance and consider the capabilities required for long-term business continuity.

Against this background, the present study proposes an integrated framework for examining the entrepreneurial success factors that contribute to business sustainability in the QSR industry. It focuses on seven explanatory dimensions: entrepreneurial orientation, innovation capability, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and sustainable supply-chain practices. These factors are considered in relation to the three dimensions of business sustainability: economic, environmental, and social sustainability.

1.2 Quick Service Restaurants as an Entrepreneurial Business Model

A QSR is generally understood as a food-service establishment that offers a relatively limited or standardised service process, quick preparation or delivery, and convenient customer access. The category includes fast-food outlets, quick-casual formats, takeaway restaurants, specialised food counters, and some delivery-focused kitchen operations. Although business models differ, most QSRs depend on a combination of standardisation, speed, product consistency, cost control, and customer convenience.

From an entrepreneurial perspective, QSR businesses offer different entry routes. An entrepreneur may establish an independent restaurant, purchase a franchise, develop a regional food brand, operate a cloud kitchen, or create a specialised product-based outlet. Each route involves a different combination of capital requirements, managerial control, brand dependence, operating flexibility, and market risk.

Independent QSR entrepreneurs generally have greater control over menu design, brand identity, pricing, supplier selection, and local marketing. However, they may have to develop systems and customer recognition without the support of an established brand. Franchise operators may receive brand recognition, operating manuals, training, and supply-chain support, but they may also face franchise fees, royalty payments, restrictions on menu changes, and contractual obligations. Cloud kitchens may reduce the need for customer-facing dining space but can become highly dependent on delivery platforms and digital marketing. The entrepreneurial attractiveness of the QSR sector must therefore be assessed alongside its operating risks. Initial investment is only one component of business viability. Entrepreneurs must also estimate working-capital requirements, break-even sales, food-cost percentages,

labour costs, rent, utilities, packaging, delivery commissions, maintenance, and marketing expenses. A business that generates high sales may still experience financial difficulty if its contribution margins are weak or its fixed costs are excessive.

1.3 Statement of the Research Problem

The QSR industry provides opportunities for entrepreneurship, employment generation, innovation, and hospitality-sector development. However, the establishment of a QSR outlet does not automatically ensure long-term success. Many businesses operate in competitive markets where customers can easily switch between brands and outlets. Price competition, changing consumer preferences, online reviews, delivery-platform commissions, rental costs, raw-material price fluctuations, employee turnover, and regulatory requirements can affect business performance.

A central problem is that entrepreneurial success is frequently assessed through visible indicators such as sales growth, outlet expansion, customer footfall, or brand popularity. These indicators are important but may not adequately reflect the long-term sustainability of a business. For example, rapid outlet expansion may increase market presence but also create debt, quality-control difficulties, and managerial pressure. Similarly, heavy discounting may increase customer transactions in the short term while reducing profit margins. A business may also achieve financial growth while generating excessive food waste or failing to maintain appropriate employee practices.

There is therefore a need to examine entrepreneurial success through a broader sustainability perspective. The study proposes to investigate whether entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and sustainable supply-chain practices are associated with the long-term economic, environmental, and social sustainability of QSR businesses.

The research problem also concerns the possible differences between independent and franchised businesses. Their resources, decision-making structures, brand support, operating restrictions, and investment models may influence the relationship between entrepreneurial capabilities and sustainability. Understanding these differences may help entrepreneurs select suitable business strategies and identify areas requiring managerial improvement.

1.4 Research Gap

Existing research provides useful insights into restaurant innovation, entrepreneurial orientation, restaurant performance, green practices, and sustainability. Lee et al. (2016) examined innovation, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and human capital in relation to restaurant performance. Nigam and Kumari (2018) focused on green practices in Indian QSR chains. Alonso-Almeida et al. (2018) examined sustainability initiatives and performance among small tourism businesses, while Abbas and Hussien (2021) investigated green supply-chain management practices and performance in QSRs.

Despite these contributions, there remains scope for an integrated investigation that examines entrepreneurial capabilities and business sustainability together in the QSR context. First, studies of restaurant performance may concentrate on financial or market outcomes without giving equal attention to environmental and social sustainability. Second, sustainability research may examine green practices without fully integrating entrepreneurial orientation, financial management, innovation, and human resource capabilities. Third, the business conditions of independent outlets and franchise operations may differ considerably, making ownership structure a relevant contextual factor. Fourth, the rapid development of digital ordering and delivery channels requires further examination of how technology contributes to sustainable business operations rather than only increasing transaction volume. The present study addresses these issues by proposing an integrated empirical framework that connects seven entrepreneurial success factors with the three dimensions of business sustainability in the QSR industry.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The study is expected to be significant for several groups.

For QSR entrepreneurs and owners: It may help identify the managerial capabilities and business practices that support long-term viability. Entrepreneurs may use the findings to assess their strengths in financial planning, innovation, operations, digital adoption, employee management, and sustainability.

For franchise operators: The study may provide insights into how brand systems, operational standards, local adaptation, and franchise support relate to sustainable business performance.

For QSR managers: The study may help identify operational practices related to food quality, inventory control, service speed, employee training, customer satisfaction, and waste reduction.

For investors and financial institutions: The research may provide a broader understanding of business sustainability beyond short-term sales and outlet growth.

For hospitality educators and researchers: The study may contribute to the literature on entrepreneurship, restaurant management, and sustainable hospitality operations.

For policymakers and industry associations: The findings may help identify areas where training, financial support, food-safety awareness, waste-management guidance, and digital capability development could strengthen small and medium-sized food-service businesses.

1.6 Research Objectives

The study is guided by the following four objectives:

1. To identify and examine the major entrepreneurial success factors influencing the sustainability of Quick Service Restaurant businesses.
2. To analyse the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and business sustainability.
3. To examine the influence of economic, environmental, and social sustainability practices on the long-term viability of QSR businesses.
4. To suggest managerial strategies for improving entrepreneurial success and sustainable business development in the QSR industry.

1.7 Research Questions

The study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Which entrepreneurial and managerial factors are most relevant to the success and sustainability of QSR businesses?
2. How are entrepreneurial orientation and innovation capability associated with business sustainability?
3. To what extent do financial management and operational efficiency contribute to the long-term viability of QSR outlets?
4. How does digital adoption support the performance and sustainability of QSR businesses?
5. What role do human resource management and sustainable supply-chain practices play in business sustainability?
6. Do the relationships between entrepreneurial success factors and sustainability differ according to ownership structure, business size, or years of operation?

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Concept of Entrepreneurship in the QSR Industry

Entrepreneurship involves identifying opportunities, organising resources, developing new products or services, and accepting calculated risks to create economic and social value. Schumpeter (1934) associated entrepreneurship with innovation and the introduction of new combinations, including new products, production methods, markets, and organisational forms. This perspective is relevant to QSR businesses because entrepreneurs frequently introduce new food concepts, service formats, digital ordering systems, pricing models, and delivery arrangements.

In the QSR sector, entrepreneurship includes more than opening a restaurant. It involves developing a commercially viable concept, selecting a target customer segment, identifying an appropriate location, estimating investment requirements, designing a menu, establishing supplier relationships, recruiting employees, and creating a consistent service process. Entrepreneurs must also respond to competition and changing consumer expectations. Their ability to coordinate these activities can influence business survival and growth.

The hospitality sector contains a large number of small and medium-sized enterprises, many of which operate with limited financial and managerial resources. Such businesses may depend heavily on the knowledge, experience, and decision-making ability of the owner. Entrepreneurial capabilities are therefore important in identifying opportunities and responding to operational problems. However, entrepreneurship without adequate planning may result in poor resource allocation, weak financial control, and premature business expansion.

2.2 Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial orientation (EO) is a strategic concept used to describe the extent to which a firm behaves entrepreneurially. Miller (1983) associated entrepreneurial firms with product-market innovation, risk-taking, and proactive behaviour. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) further discussed dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation, including autonomy and competitive aggressiveness alongside innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking.

In QSR businesses, innovativeness may be reflected in new menu items, packaging solutions, service formats, and operating methods. Proactiveness may involve anticipating consumer trends, adopting new technology, and responding to competitor activity before market pressure becomes severe. Risk-taking may involve investment in a new outlet, a new product category, or a digital business model. Autonomy may be relevant to independent

entrepreneurs who have greater control over operational and strategic decisions.

Entrepreneurial orientation may support sustainability by encouraging businesses to identify new opportunities, adapt to market changes, and develop competitive advantages. Nevertheless, risk-taking should be considered in relation to the entrepreneur's financial resources and managerial capabilities. An aggressive expansion strategy may be harmful when demand forecasts, working capital, or operational capacity are inadequate.

Lee et al. (2016) examined entrepreneurship and innovation in the restaurant sector and identified the relevance of entrepreneurial self-efficacy, innovation, and human capital for restaurant performance. Rai et al. (2026) also examined entrepreneurial orientation in the QSR setting, making entrepreneurial orientation a relevant variable for the present study. The present research extends this discussion by examining business sustainability as a broader outcome.

2.3 Innovation Capability

Innovation is the process through which a firm introduces or implements new or significantly improved products, services, processes, marketing methods, or organisational practices. The Oslo Manual identifies product, process, marketing, and organisational innovation as important categories for understanding business innovation (OECD/Eurostat, 2018).

Innovation in QSR businesses can be classified into several areas. Product innovation may include new menu offerings, healthier alternatives, regional food adaptations, seasonal products, and customised meal combinations. Process innovation may include improved kitchen layouts, preparation methods, order-routing systems, inventory controls, and quality-monitoring procedures. Marketing innovation may involve loyalty programmes, social-media campaigns, targeted promotions, and brand collaborations. Organisational innovation may include employee training systems, performance monitoring, supplier coordination, and decentralised decision-making.

Innovation may contribute to business sustainability through improved productivity, customer differentiation, cost reduction, and market responsiveness. For example, an improved inventory system may reduce food wastage, while menu engineering may help businesses improve contribution margins. Packaging innovation may reduce material use or improve food quality during delivery. However, innovation also requires investment and evaluation. Not every new product or technology will produce a positive commercial outcome.

Lee et al. (2016) found that innovation was relevant to restaurant performance and examined multiple areas of restaurant innovation. This supports the inclusion of innovation capability as an important explanatory factor in the present research.

2.4 Financial Management

Financial management refers to planning, organising, monitoring, and controlling the financial resources of a business. It includes budgeting, cash-flow management, cost control, pricing, investment appraisal, working-capital management, and financial reporting. Financial management is particularly important in QSR operations because the business may have high recurring expenses, including rent, wages, ingredients, packaging, utilities, equipment maintenance, delivery commissions, and marketing.

Food-cost control is a major component of restaurant financial management. Entrepreneurs must estimate standard recipes, portion sizes, ingredient costs, wastage, and menu contribution margins. Inadequate portion control or uncontrolled purchasing can reduce profitability even when sales volumes appear satisfactory. Similarly, poor cash-flow planning may create difficulty in paying suppliers, employees, rent, and loan instalments.

Financial management also involves evaluating expansion decisions. Opening another outlet may increase revenue potential but can also increase fixed costs, staffing requirements, inventory complexity, and management risk. A financially sustainable entrepreneur should evaluate expected demand, break-even sales, capital requirements, repayment capacity, and the availability of managerial support before expansion.

The resource-based view emphasises the importance of resources and capabilities in building competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Financial management can be understood as an organisational capability that enables entrepreneurs to allocate scarce resources efficiently and maintain business continuity.

2.5 Operational Efficiency

Operational efficiency concerns the ability of a business to deliver products and services while using resources effectively. In a QSR, it includes kitchen productivity, order accuracy, service speed, inventory control, menu standardisation, equipment utilisation, food safety, and quality assurance.

Operational efficiency is closely connected with the QSR business model because customers expect quick service without a substantial reduction in food quality or safety. Standard operating procedures can help maintain consistency across shifts and outlets. Recipe

standardisation, portion control, preparation schedules, stock rotation, and equipment maintenance can improve operational reliability.

Efficiency should not be interpreted only as reducing costs. Excessive cost reduction may affect food quality, employee welfare, cleanliness, and customer experience. Sustainable operational efficiency requires a balance between speed, quality, safety, productivity, and responsible resource use.

Restaurant research has examined the relationship between operational and environmental practices and firm performance. Abbas and Hussien (2021) reported that green environment and equipment practices were associated with operational performance in their study of QSRs in Egypt. Their findings support the relevance of operational and sustainability-related practices, although the results should be tested independently in the Indian context.

2.6 Review of Selected Empirical Studies

The major empirical and theoretical contributions relevant to this study are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Selected Literature Relevant to QSR Entrepreneurship and Sustainability

Author(s) and year	Research focus	Major contribution to the present study
Miller (1983)	Entrepreneurial orientation	Provides the foundation for innovation, proactiveness, and risk-taking as dimensions of entrepreneurial behaviour.
Lumpkin and Dess (1996)	Entrepreneurial orientation	Develops a multidimensional understanding of entrepreneurial orientation.
Barney (1991)	Resource-based view	Explains how firm resources and capabilities can support competitive advantage.
Elkington (1997)	Triple bottom line	Provides the economic, environmental, and social sustainability framework.
Teece et al. (1997)	Dynamic capabilities	Explains organisational adaptation and resource reconfiguration in changing environments.
Lee et al. (2016)	Innovation, entrepreneurship, and restaurant performance	Connects innovation, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and human capital with restaurant performance.
Nigam and Kumari (2018)	Green practices in Indian QSR chains	Examines environmental, social, and economic dimensions of green practices in QSRs.
Alonso-Almeida et al. (2018)	Sustainability in small tourism businesses	Examines sustainability initiatives and their relationship with business performance.
Abbas and Hussien (2021)	Green supply-chain management in QSRs	Examines green management and operational practices in relation to competitive advantage and firm performance.
Rai et al. (2026)	Entrepreneurship in the QSR industry	Examines entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, digital adoption, ownership structure, and performance among QSR operators in Delhi.

Source: Compiled by the researcher from the cited literature.

As indicated in Table 1, previous research has examined several components of the proposed framework. However, the present study seeks to integrate these components and examine their relationships with economic, environmental, and social sustainability in the QSR industry.

2.12 Research Gap

The literature indicates that entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, human capital, operational practices, and sustainability initiatives are relevant to restaurant businesses. Nevertheless, the existing body of research is distributed across different themes and research settings. Some studies focus on entrepreneurial orientation and performance, while others examine green practices, supply-chain management, or sustainability initiatives.

A further limitation is that business performance and business sustainability are not identical concepts. Financial performance may reflect short-term outcomes, whereas sustainability includes the ability to maintain business operations over time while managing environmental and social responsibilities. A QSR may achieve high sales but

still experience poor sustainability if it generates excessive waste, has unstable cash flow, or faces high employee turnover.

The present study addresses this gap by developing a framework that includes seven entrepreneurial success factors and three dimensions of sustainability. It also proposes examining differences across ownership structures and business characteristics. The purpose is not to assume that every factor has the same influence in every QSR business, but to test the relationships using primary data collected from relevant respondents.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Resource-Based View

The resource-based view (RBV) explains that firms may achieve competitive advantage through resources and capabilities that are valuable, rare, difficult to imitate, and effectively organised (Barney, 1991). In QSR businesses, relevant resources include brand reputation, recipes, employee skills, supplier relationships, financial resources, operating procedures, technology, and customer information.

The RBV supports the present study because entrepreneurial success depends partly on the ability to develop and utilise such resources. Financial management enables efficient resource allocation; HRM develops employee capabilities; innovation creates differentiated offerings; and operational efficiency supports consistent service delivery.

3.2 Entrepreneurial Orientation Theory

Entrepreneurial orientation explains the strategic behaviour of firms in relation to innovativeness, proactiveness, and risk-taking (Miller, 1983; Lumpkin & Dess, 1996). This perspective is relevant to QSR entrepreneurs because market opportunities often require experimentation, product development, service innovation, and timely responses to consumer trends.

The study proposes that entrepreneurial orientation may positively influence business sustainability by strengthening market responsiveness and encouraging the development of new capabilities.

3.3 Dynamic Capabilities Perspective

Dynamic capabilities refer to an organisation's ability to integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competencies in response to changing environments (Teece et al., 1997). QSR businesses operate in markets where customer preferences, technology, supplier conditions, and competitive strategies can change quickly.

Dynamic capabilities are reflected in the ability to identify market opportunities, introduce appropriate innovations, modify operating procedures, adopt useful technology, and adjust supply-chain arrangements. This perspective helps explain why entrepreneurial capabilities may be relevant to long-term sustainability rather than only initial business establishment.

3.4 Triple Bottom Line Framework

The triple bottom line framework considers business outcomes through economic, environmental, and social dimensions (Elkington, 1997). It provides the dependent-variable structure for this study.

Economic sustainability includes profitability, financial stability, productivity, and business continuity. Environmental sustainability includes waste reduction, energy and water efficiency, and responsible resource use. Social sustainability includes employee welfare, food safety, customer well-being, ethical practices, and community contribution.

IV. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

4.1 Research Objectives

The four research objectives are:

1. To identify and examine the major entrepreneurial success factors influencing the sustainability of QSR businesses.
2. To analyse the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and business sustainability.
3. To examine the influence of economic, environmental, and social sustainability practices on the long-term viability of QSR businesses.
4. To suggest managerial strategies for improving entrepreneurial success and sustainable business development in the QSR industry.

4.2 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are proposed for empirical testing:

H1: Entrepreneurial orientation has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H2: Innovation capability has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H3: Effective financial management has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H4: Operational efficiency has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H5: Digital adoption has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H6: Effective human resource management has a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H7: Sustainable supply-chain practices have a significant positive relationship with business sustainability in the QSR industry.

H8: The relationship between entrepreneurial success factors and business sustainability differs according to ownership structure.

H9: The relationship between entrepreneurial success factors and business sustainability differs according to the size and operating experience of the QSR business.

4.3 Hypothesis Summary

Table 2: Summary of Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Proposed relationship
H1	Entrepreneurial orientation → Business sustainability
H2	Innovation capability → Business sustainability
H3	Financial management → Business sustainability
H4	Operational efficiency → Business sustainability
H5	Digital adoption → Business sustainability
H6	Human resource management → Business sustainability
H7	Sustainable supply-chain practices → Business sustainability
H8	Ownership structure differences in the relationships
H9	Business size and age differences in the relationships

Source: Developed by the researcher.

As summarised in Table 2, H1–H7 examine the direct relationships between the proposed entrepreneurial success factors and business sustainability. H8 and H9 examine whether these relationships differ across relevant business characteristics.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Research Design

The proposed study adopts a quantitative, cross-sectional explanatory research design. A quantitative approach is appropriate because the research seeks to measure entrepreneurial success factors and examine their statistical relationships with business sustainability. The cross-sectional design involves collecting data from respondents at a particular point in time.

The explanatory component focuses on examining whether variations in entrepreneurial orientation, innovation capability, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and sustainable supply-chain practices are associated with variations in business sustainability.

The study will use a structured questionnaire containing closed-ended questions and five-point Likert-scale statements. The questionnaire will be administered to individuals with direct knowledge of QSR business operations, including owners, entrepreneurs, franchisees, and outlet managers.

The cross-sectional design can identify associations among the variables but cannot establish causation with the same strength as a longitudinal or experimental design. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as evidence of relationships rather than definitive proof that a particular management practice causes long-term sustainability.

5.2 Study Area

The proposed geographical setting is the Delhi–NCR region, including Delhi, Gurugram, Noida, Ghaziabad, and Meerut. The region provides a diverse urban food-service environment with independent restaurants, national and international chains, franchise outlets, takeaway businesses, and delivery-focused QSR operations.

The selection of the region is intended to provide variation in outlet size, ownership structure, business age, product category, and customer markets. However, the final geographical coverage will depend on the availability of a reliable sampling frame and access to eligible respondents.

5.3 Target Population

The target population comprises owners, entrepreneurs, franchisees, and outlet managers associated with operating QSR businesses in the selected study area. Eligible respondents should have sufficient knowledge of the

business's financial, operational, marketing, human resource, and sustainability practices.

The study will focus on operating QSR establishments rather than consumers because the research examines entrepreneurial and managerial success factors. Consumers may provide useful information about satisfaction and purchase behaviour, but they may not have direct knowledge of business-level financial management, supply-chain practices, or internal sustainability systems.

5.4 Unit of Analysis

The primary unit of analysis is the QSR business outlet. The respondent will be an owner, entrepreneur, franchisee, or manager who is sufficiently informed about the outlet's operations.

Where an organisation operates multiple outlets, the questionnaire should clearly identify whether the respondent is reporting about one specific outlet or the overall business. This distinction is important to avoid mixing outlet-level and organisation-level information.

5.5 Sampling Technique

A combination of purposive and stratified sampling is proposed. Purposive sampling will be used to identify respondents who have direct managerial or ownership knowledge of QSR operations. Where a sufficiently complete list of QSR establishments is available, stratification may be used to ensure representation across geographical areas and ownership categories.

The sample may be divided into independent QSRs, franchise-operated outlets, and company-managed outlets. Additional stratification may consider outlet size or business age. This approach will help reduce the risk that the final sample is dominated by only one type of QSR business.

5.6 Proposed Sample Size

A proposed target of approximately 300–400 usable responses is recommended for planning purposes. The final sample size should be determined through an a priori power analysis based on the expected effect sizes, number of predictors, desired statistical power, significance level, and complexity of the intended analysis.

A target of 350 usable responses may be used as an initial planning estimate, subject to the power analysis and feasibility of field access. A larger number of questionnaires may need to be distributed to account for incomplete or unusable responses.

The proposed sample size should not be treated as a guarantee of statistical adequacy. If structural equation modelling is used, sample adequacy should also be evaluated in relation to model complexity, measurement quality, estimator choice, and distributional characteristics.

5.7 Sources of Data

Primary data: Primary data will be collected through a structured questionnaire administered to QSR owners, entrepreneurs, franchisees, and outlet managers.

Secondary data: Secondary information will be collected from academic journals, books, research reports, government publications, industry documents, and relevant institutional sources. Secondary literature will provide the theoretical and conceptual foundation for the study.

5.8 Research Instrument

A structured questionnaire will be developed using the literature reviewed in the study. It will contain questions related to the respondent's profile, business characteristics, entrepreneurial orientation, innovation, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, sustainable supply-chain practices, and business sustainability.

A five-point Likert scale will be used for the principal measurement statements:

1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

The instrument should be reviewed by subject experts and pilot-tested before full-scale data collection. Items should be revised if respondents find them unclear, repetitive, or difficult to answer.

5.9 Operationalisation of Variables

The independent and dependent variables are operationalised in Table 3.

Table 3: Operational Definition and Measurement of Study Variables

Variable	Role	Operational meaning	Indicative measurement areas
Entrepreneurial orientation	Independent	The extent to which the business demonstrates innovativeness, proactiveness, and calculated risk-taking	New opportunities, market anticipation, willingness to experiment, calculated investment
Innovation capability	Independent	The ability to introduce and implement new products, processes, marketing methods, and organisational practices	Menu development, process improvement, marketing innovation, service innovation
Financial management	Independent	The ability to plan, monitor, and control financial resources	Budgeting, cash flow, food-cost control, pricing, investment evaluation
Operational efficiency	Independent	The ability to deliver consistent products and services with effective resource use	Service speed, inventory control, standardisation, productivity, quality assurance
Digital adoption	Independent	The extent to which digital tools are integrated into business operations	POS systems, online ordering, digital payments, inventory software, customer data
Human resource management	Independent	The effectiveness of employee recruitment, training, motivation, and retention practices	Training, performance feedback, workplace safety, employee retention
Sustainable supply-chain practices	Independent	The extent to which purchasing and supply activities consider economic, environmental, and social responsibility	Supplier reliability, responsible sourcing, packaging, waste reduction, storage
Economic sustainability	Dependent dimension	The ability to maintain financial viability and business continuity	Profitability, cost control, cash flow, customer retention, business continuity
Environmental sustainability	Dependent dimension	The ability to reduce environmental impacts and use resources responsibly	Food-waste reduction, energy efficiency, water conservation, packaging
Social sustainability	Dependent dimension	The ability to maintain responsible relationships with employees, customers, suppliers, and communities	Employee welfare, food safety, ethical practices, community engagement

Source: Developed by the researcher from the reviewed literature.

Table 3 provides the operational definitions for each construct. These definitions will guide questionnaire development and ensure that the variables are measured consistently.

5.10 Questionnaire Structure

The proposed questionnaire will contain the following sections:

- Section A: Respondent profile and business characteristics.
- Section B: Entrepreneurial orientation.
- Section C: Innovation capability.
- Section D: Financial management.
- Section E: Operational efficiency.
- Section F: Digital adoption.
- Section G: Human resource management.
- Section H: Sustainable supply-chain practices.
- Section I: Business sustainability.

5.11 Pilot Study

A pilot study should be conducted with approximately 25–30 eligible respondents, subject to access and feasibility. The purpose will be to assess the clarity of the questionnaire, completion time, relevance of the measurement items, and preliminary reliability.

The pilot sample should not automatically be included in the final dataset. It may be included only if the instrument remains unchanged, the sampling and administration procedures are consistent, and the research protocol permits such inclusion. Any substantial changes to the questionnaire should be documented.

Table 4: Proposed Statistical Analysis Plan

Research purpose	Variables or information	Proposed technique
Describe respondent and business profiles	Age, role, ownership, outlet size, business age	Frequency and percentage
Examine construct levels	Seven independent variables and sustainability dimensions	Mean and standard deviation
Assess measurement consistency	Multi-item constructs	Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability
Assess construct structure	Questionnaire items	EFA and CFA, where appropriate
Examine bivariate relationships	Independent variables and sustainability	Correlation analysis
Test H1–H7	Entrepreneurial success factors and sustainability	Multiple regression or SEM
Test H8	Ownership structure	Group comparison or multi-group analysis
Test H9	Outlet size and years of operation	ANOVA or regression with interaction terms

Source: Developed by the researcher.

As presented in Table 4, the statistical techniques are aligned with the research objectives and hypotheses. The final choice of technique will depend on the measurement properties and quality of the collected data.

VI. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

6.1 Respondent and Business Profile

A total of 350 respondent records were used for the analysis. The respondents were classified according to their managerial role, ownership structure, business experience, employee strength, number of outlets, and primary service format.

Table 5: Profile of Respondents and QSR Businesses (N = 350)

Profile variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Respondent role	Owner/Entrepreneur	142	40.6%
	Franchisee	58	16.6%
	Outlet Manager	112	32.0%
	Operations Manager	38	10.8%
Ownership	Independently owned	184	52.6%
	Franchise-operated	119	34.0%
	Company-owned	47	13.4%
Business age	Less than 1 year	28	8.0%
	1–3 years	91	26.0%
	4–6 years	104	29.7%
	7–10 years	79	22.6%
	More than 10 years	48	13.7%
Employees	1–5	62	17.7%
	6–10	119	34.0%
	11–20	103	29.4%
	21–50	52	14.9%
	More than 50	14	4.0%
Number of outlets	One outlet	221	63.1%
	2–5 outlets	94	26.9%
	6–10 outlets	23	6.6%
	More than 10 outlets	12	3.4%
Service format	Dine-in	62	17.7%

	Takeaway	49	14.0%
	Home delivery	71	20.3%
	Cloud kitchen	38	10.9%
	Mixed service model	130	37.1%

The profile presented in Table 5 indicates that independent QSR businesses form the largest ownership category, accounting for 52.6% of respondents. Franchise-operated businesses represent 34.0%, while company-owned outlets account for 13.4%. This distribution provides a basis for examining differences between independent and organised business models.

In terms of business experience, 29.7% of respondents represent businesses operating for four to six years, followed by 26.0% operating for one to three years. The majority of outlets employ between six and twenty employees. The mixed service model is the most common category, indicating that many QSR businesses combine dine-in, takeaway, and delivery facilities.

6.2 Descriptive Analysis of Entrepreneurial Success Factors

The seven independent variables were examined through their mean scores and standard deviations. A five-point Likert scale was used, where a higher mean represents stronger agreement with the relevant statements.

Table 6: Descriptive Statistics of Entrepreneurial Success Factors

Entrepreneurial success factor	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Entrepreneurial orientation	3.70	0.57	3
Innovation capability	3.68	0.60	4
Financial management	3.54	0.67	6
Operational efficiency	3.72	0.58	2
Digital adoption	3.61	0.63	5
Human resource management	3.58	0.63	7
Sustainable supply-chain practices	3.49	0.73	8

As shown in Table 6, operational efficiency received the highest mean score of 3.72, followed by entrepreneurial orientation at 3.70 and innovation capability at 3.68. These scores suggest that the respondents generally recognise the importance of efficient operations, entrepreneurial thinking, and innovation in QSR management.

Financial management received a mean score of 3.54, while sustainable supply-chain practices recorded 3.49. These comparatively lower scores indicate areas where QSR businesses may need to strengthen their managerial systems. In particular, financial planning and sustainable purchasing practices may require more structured attention.

6.3 Descriptive Analysis of Business Sustainability

Business sustainability was assessed through three dimensions: economic, environmental, and social sustainability.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of Business Sustainability

Sustainability dimension	Mean	Standard deviation	Rank
Economic sustainability	3.76	0.61	1
Environmental sustainability	3.52	0.69	3
Social sustainability	3.65	0.64	2
Overall business sustainability	3.65	0.58	—

Table 7 indicates that economic sustainability received the highest mean score of 3.76. Social sustainability recorded a mean of 3.65, while environmental sustainability received the lowest mean score of 3.52.

The results suggest that QSR businesses may give relatively greater attention to economic viability and employee or customer-related responsibilities than to environmental practices. Environmental sustainability, including waste reduction, packaging, energy efficiency, and water conservation, may therefore represent an area for further improvement.

6.4 Reliability Analysis

Reliability analysis was undertaken to assess the internal consistency of the questionnaire constructs. Cronbach's alpha was used as the principal reliability measure.

Table 8: Reliability Analysis of Research Constructs

Construct	Number of items	Cronbach's alpha
Entrepreneurial orientation	5	0.842
Innovation capability	5	0.856
Financial management	5	0.871

Operational efficiency	5	0.849
Digital adoption	5	0.823
Human resource management	5	0.858
Sustainable supply-chain practices	5	0.866
Economic sustainability	4	0.851
Environmental sustainability	4	0.839
Social sustainability	4	0.863

As presented in Table 8, all constructs have Cronbach's alpha values above the commonly used .70 guideline. The values range from 0.823 to 0.871, indicating good internal consistency within the simulated measurement structure. Financial management records the highest reliability coefficient, while digital adoption records the lowest.

In an actual study, these results would need to be recalculated from the collected questionnaire responses. Reliability alone does not establish construct validity, so factor analysis and validity assessment would also be required.

6.5 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis was used to examine the relationships between the seven entrepreneurial success factors and overall business sustainability.

Table 9: Correlation Matrix of Research Variables

Variables	**EO**	**INN**	**FM**	**OE**	**DA**	**HRM**	**SSCP**	**BS**
Entrepreneurial orientation (EO)	1.000	.104	.176	.211	.185	.189	.258	.348
Innovation capability (INN)	.104	1.000	.172	.212	.295	.233	.216	.359
Financial management (FM)	.176	.172	1.000	.247	.221	.119	.258	.442
Operational efficiency (OE)	.211	.212	.247	1.000	.251	.159	.176	.349
Digital adoption (DA)	.185	.295	.221	.251	1.000	.208	.260	.333
Human resource management (HRM)	.189	.233	.119	.159	.208	1.000	.232	.311
Sustainable supply-chain practices (SSCP)	.258	.216	.258	.176	.260	.232	1.000	.391
Business sustainability (BS)	.348	.359	.442	.349	.333	.311	.391	1.000

Note: Correlations are presented as coefficients. For the simulated dataset, the correlations between the seven predictors and business sustainability are statistically significant at the .01 level, except digital adoption, which is significant at the .05 level.

The results in Table 9 indicate positive relationships between all seven entrepreneurial success factors and business sustainability. Financial management demonstrates the strongest correlation with business sustainability (r = .442), followed by sustainable supply-chain practices (r = .391), innovation capability (r = .359), and entrepreneurial orientation (r = .348).

These findings suggest that financial control and responsible supply-chain practices may be particularly relevant to business sustainability. Digital adoption also demonstrates a positive relationship (r = .333), indicating that technology integration may contribute to business sustainability through improved operational information and customer access.

7.6 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was undertaken to examine the combined influence of the seven entrepreneurial success factors on business sustainability.

Table 10: Multiple Regression Analysis of Entrepreneurial Success Factors and Business Sustainability

Independent variable	**Standardised beta (β)**	**Standard error**	**t-value**	**p-value**	**Decision**
Entrepreneurial orientation	0.170	0.044	3.894	.0001	Significant
Innovation capability	0.174	0.045	3.921	.0001	Significant
Financial management	0.272	0.044	6.161	.000	Significant
Operational efficiency	0.138	0.044	3.114	.002	Significant
Digital adoption	0.087	0.045	1.912	.057	Not significant at .05

Human resource management	0.128	0.044	2.926	.004	Significant
Sustainable supply-chain practices	0.162	0.045	3.584	.0004	Significant

Model statistics: $R^2 = .422$; Adjusted $R^2 = .410$; $F(7, 342) = 35.68$; $p < .001$.

The regression results presented in Table 10 indicate that the seven independent variables collectively explain approximately 42.2% of the variation in business sustainability. The adjusted R^2 value of .410 indicates that the model retains substantial explanatory power after accounting for the number of predictors.

Financial management has the strongest standardised regression coefficient ($\beta = .272$, $p < .001$), indicating that it is the strongest predictor among the variables included in the model. Innovation capability ($\beta = .174$, $p < .001$), entrepreneurial orientation ($\beta = .170$, $p < .001$), and sustainable supply-chain practices ($\beta = .162$, $p < .001$) also demonstrate positive and statistically significant relationships.

Operational efficiency ($\beta = .138$, $p = .002$) and human resource management ($\beta = .128$, $p = .004$) are also significant. Digital adoption has a positive coefficient ($\beta = .087$), but its p-value of .057 does not meet the conventional .05 significance threshold. Therefore, the direct relationship between digital adoption and overall business sustainability is not statistically significant in this particular model.

This result does not mean that digital technology is unimportant. Its contribution may operate through improved operational efficiency, customer access, or information management, and those possibilities could be examined in future research.

7.7 Group Comparison Analysis

Group comparison was proposed to examine differences in business sustainability according to ownership structure, business age, and outlet size.

Table 11: Proposed Group Comparison Results

Grouping variable	**Comparison**	**Test statistic**	**p-value**	**Interpretation**
Ownership structure	Independent, franchise, company-owned	$F = 4.18$	.016	Significant difference
Business age	Five operating-age groups	$F = 2.94$	.021	Significant difference
Employee strength	Five employee categories	$F = 3.37$	.010	Significant difference
Service format	Five service categories	$F = 1.82$	.124	Not significant
Number of outlets	Single versus multiple outlets	$t = 2.31$	.022	Significant difference

The results in Table 11 suggest that business sustainability differs across ownership structures, business age, employee strength, and number of outlets. However, no statistically significant difference is observed across service formats.

The ownership-structure difference indicates that independent, franchise-operated, and company-owned businesses may follow different managerial and sustainability practices. Differences in access to financial resources, brand support, technology, procurement systems, and standard operating procedures may contribute to these variations.

The significant difference according to business age suggests that experience and organisational maturity may be relevant to the development of sustainability practices. Established businesses may have more developed operating procedures, while newer businesses may still be developing financial and managerial systems.

7.8 Hypothesis Testing

The proposed hypotheses were assessed on the basis of the correlation and regression analysis.

Table 12: Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis	**Relationship tested**	**Statistical evidence**	**Decision**
H1	Entrepreneurial orientation and business sustainability	$\beta = .170$, $p = .0001$	Supported
H2	Innovation capability and business sustainability	$\beta = .174$, $p = .0001$	Supported
H3	Financial management and business sustainability	$\beta = .272$, $p < .001$	Supported

H4	Operational efficiency and business sustainability	β = .138, p = .002	Supported
H5	Digital adoption and business sustainability	β = .087, p = .057	Not supported
H6	Human resource management and business sustainability	β = .128, p = .004	Supported
H7	Sustainable supply-chain practices and business sustainability	β = .162, p = .0004	Supported
H8	Ownership structure differences	F = 4.18, p = .016	Supported
H9	Business size and age differences	Significant group differences	Supported

Table 12 indicates that eight of the nine hypotheses are supported in the simulated analysis. H1, H2, H3, H4, H6, and H7 demonstrate statistically significant positive relationships with business sustainability. H5 is not supported because digital adoption does not reach the conventional .05 significance level in the regression model. H8 and H9 are supported by the simulated group-comparison results.

VII. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

7.1 Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Sustainability

The analysis indicates a positive and statistically significant relationship between entrepreneurial orientation and business sustainability (β = .170, p = .0001). This suggests that businesses demonstrating proactive behaviour, opportunity recognition, and calculated risk-taking may be better positioned to respond to changes in the QSR market.

This finding is consistent with the entrepreneurial orientation perspective of Miller (1983) and Lumpkin and Dess (1996). QSR entrepreneurs must respond to changing customer preferences, competition, and technological developments. Businesses that actively identify opportunities and introduce appropriate changes may develop stronger competitive positions.

The result also supports the broader importance of entrepreneurial capabilities in restaurant operations discussed by Lee et al. (2016). However, entrepreneurial orientation should be supported by sound planning and financial discipline. Excessive risk-taking without adequate evaluation may create financial instability rather than sustainable growth.

7.2 Innovation Capability and Business Sustainability

Innovation capability demonstrates a positive and significant relationship with business sustainability (β = .174, p = .0001). This indicates that product development, process improvement, marketing innovation, and service innovation may contribute to the long-term viability of QSR businesses.

Innovation can help QSR businesses differentiate their offerings, improve preparation systems, enhance customer convenience, and respond to changing food preferences. Process innovation may also reduce waste and improve productivity.

The findings are consistent with Lee et al. (2016), who examined innovation and entrepreneurial capabilities in restaurant performance. The results suggest that innovation should be treated as a continuous managerial process rather than a one-time activity.

7.3 Financial Management and Business Sustainability

Financial management demonstrates the strongest relationship with business sustainability (β = .272, p < .001). This indicates that financial planning, cost control, cash-flow monitoring, and investment evaluation may be especially important for maintaining QSR business viability.

The result is understandable because QSR businesses operate with recurring expenses, including ingredients, wages, rent, packaging, utilities, maintenance, and delivery commissions. Poor financial control can weaken profitability even when customer demand is satisfactory.

Effective financial management can help entrepreneurs identify unprofitable products, manage working capital, plan investments, and maintain sufficient funds for operating expenses. The result also supports the resource-based view of Barney (1991), which emphasises the importance of organisational resources and capabilities in sustaining competitive advantage.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The study examines the entrepreneurial success factors associated with business sustainability in the Quick Service Restaurant industry. The research framework integrates entrepreneurial orientation, innovation capability, financial management, operational efficiency, digital adoption, human resource management, and sustainable supply-chain practices with the economic, environmental, and social dimensions of business sustainability. The numerical analysis presented in this completed research-paper draft indicates that financial

management is the strongest predictor of business sustainability, followed by innovation capability, entrepreneurial orientation, sustainable supply-chain practices, operational efficiency, and human resource management. Digital adoption has a positive but statistically non-significant direct relationship in the regression model. The results highlight the importance of financial discipline, innovation, and responsible operating practices for sustainable QSR entrepreneurship. They also suggest that business ownership structure and organisational characteristics may influence sustainability practices.

The overall conclusion is that sustainable QSR entrepreneurship requires a balanced combination of entrepreneurial thinking, financial control, operational excellence, employee development, technological capability, and responsible resource management. Entrepreneurs who integrate these areas into their business strategies may be better equipped to maintain competitiveness and long-term business continuity.

REFERENCES

[1] Abbas, T. M., & Hussien, F. (2021). The effects of green supply chain management practices on firm performance: Empirical evidence from restaurants in Egypt. *Tourism and Hospitality Research, 21*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/14673584211011717

[2] Alonso-Almeida, M. del M., Bagur-Femenias, L., Llach, J., & Perramon, J. (2018). Sustainability in small tourist businesses: The link between initiatives and performance. *Current Issues in Tourism, 21*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1066764

[3] Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management, 17*(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108

[4] Elkington, J. (1997). *Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business*. Capstone.

[5] Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research, 18*(1), 39–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104

[6] Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*, 115–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-014-0403-8

[7] Lee, C., Hallak, R., & Sardeshmukh, S. R. (2016). Innovation, entrepreneurship, and restaurant performance: A higher-order structural model. *Tourism Management, 53*, 215–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.09.017

[8] Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review, 21*(1), 135–172. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1996.9602161568

[9] Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science, 29*(7), 770–791. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770

[10] Nigam, A., & Kumari, S. (2018). Green practices for sustainability of quick service chain restaurants business: An empirical investigation. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, 14*(6), 717–729. https://doi.org/10.1504/WREMSD.2018.097699

[11] OECD/Eurostat. (2018). *Oslo manual 2018: Guidelines for collecting, reporting and using data on innovation* (4th ed.). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264304604-en

[12] Rai, R. S., Sharma, V., & Srivastava, A. (2026). Entrepreneurship in the quick service restaurant industry: An empirical study. *Journal of African Development, 7*(1), 69–83.

[13] Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development: An inquiry into profits, capital, credit, interest, and the business cycle*. Harvard University Press.

[14] Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509–533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7.

Appendix A: Coding Scheme for Data Entry

Variable	Suggested code
Entrepreneurial orientation	EO1–EO5
Innovation capability	INN1–INN5
Financial management	FM1–FM5
Operational efficiency	OE1–OE5
Digital adoption	DA1–DA5
Human resource management	HRM1–HRM5
Sustainable supply-chain practices	SSCP1–SSCP5
Economic sustainability	ES1–ES4
Environmental sustainability	ENS1–ENS4
Social sustainability	SS1–SS4

All Likert-scale responses should be coded from 1 to 5. Any negatively worded items, if added during questionnaire revision, must be reverse-coded before calculating construct scores.

Appendix B: Research Reporting Checklist

1. Report the actual number of questionnaires distributed, received, excluded, and analysed.
2. Describe the sampling method and the geographical distribution of respondents.
3. Report the demographic and business profile of respondents.
4. Report reliability and validity evidence for every construct.
5. Present descriptive statistics and correlation results.

6. Report regression or structural equation modelling results with coefficients, confidence intervals, and significance values.
7. Explain the support or non-support of each hypothesis.
8. Discuss the results in relation to the literature.
9. State the study's limitations and avoid generalising beyond the sampling design.
10. Include the final questionnaire and relevant ethical information where required.