

# Self-Efficacy, Tolerance for Ambiguity and Need for Achievement as Predictors of Entrepreneurial Orientation among Entrepreneurs in Ekiti State, Nigeria

Ogunleye, Adedeji J.

Faculty of the Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, Ekiti State University, Ado Ekiti; Nigeria.

E-mail: [dr.ajogunleye@gmail.com](mailto:dr.ajogunleye@gmail.com)

Osagu, Judith C.

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, Federal University, Oye Ekiti; Nigeria.

E-mail: [juddydear@yahoo.com](mailto:juddydear@yahoo.com)

## ABSTRACT

This study assessed some behavioural traits that may predict entrepreneurial orientation among selected small scale entrepreneurs in Ekiti State, Nigeria. The research covered some districts in Ado Ekiti and Iworo Ekiti. Two hundred and thirty eight small scale entrepreneurs were the participant in the study. One twenty eight of them were males while the remaining one hundred and ten were females. Four scales were used in the research. The New General Self Efficacy Scale developed by Chen, Gully and Eden (2001), Tolerance for Ambiguity Scale developed by Budner (1962), Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale by Kreiser, Marino and Weaver (2002) and the Achievement Motive Scale by Lang and Fries (2006). Five hypotheses were tested using Independent t-test. Results from this study revealed that self- efficacy, achievement motivation, age and sex (gender) does not significantly predict entrepreneurial orientation; however, insolubility, a sub scale of tolerance for ambiguity was found to significantly predict entrepreneurial orientation. Findings were discussed in the light of previous literature on self efficacy, tolerance for ambiguity, need for achievement and entrepreneurial orientation. Based on the findings recommendations were therefore made.

**Keywords:** Self efficacy, tolerance for ambiguity, achievement motivation, entrepreneurial orientation, Ekiti State, Nigeria.

## INTRODUCTION

The importance of entrepreneurial activities cannot be overemphasis as it is a veritable tool for economic growth and wealth creation of a country. So many researches have been conducted linking different personality traits with entrepreneurial orientation or entrepreneur (Beugelsdijk, 2007; Jaarfar & Abdul-Aziz, 2005; Wickham, 2004). Findings from these studies have, however, varied across cultures.

The term entrepreneur is a French word that is used to describe an individual who organises and operates a business or businesses, taking on financial risks to do so. An entrepreneur is an economic agent who unites all means of production (lands of one, the labour of another and the capital of yet another) and thus produces a product. Schumpeter (1934) defined an entrepreneur as an innovator who uses a process of shattering the status quo of the existing products and services, to set up new products, and new services. McClelland (1961) noted an entrepreneur to be a person with high need for achievement (N-Ach). To Drucker (1985), an entrepreneur is one who searches for changes, responds to it, and exploits opportunities.

The entrepreneur's central activity is that of business creation, which can be studied at an individual and, or, group level, analysing psychological aspects and social variables of education, family or background, either at an environmental level, using variables that enable business development, or by analysing aspects of the economic, social and cultural environments. The study of entrepreneurs as individuals analyses the variables that explain their appearance, such as personal characteristics, the psychological profile (the need for achievement, tolerance for ambiguity and a tendency to take risks) or non-psychological variables (education, experience, networks, the family, etc.).

Entrepreneurship is often discussed under the title of the entrepreneurial factor, the entrepreneurial function, entrepreneurial initiative, and entrepreneurial behaviour. The entrepreneurial factor is understood to be a new factor in production that is different to the classic ideas of earth, work and capital, which must be explained via remuneration through income for the entrepreneur along with the shortage of people with entrepreneurial capabilities. Its consideration as an entrepreneurial function refers to the discovery and exploitation of opportunities or to the creation of enterprise. Entrepreneurial behaviour, on the other hand, is seen as behaviour that manages to combine innovation, risk taking and proactiveness (Miller, 1983). While reference to entrepreneurial initiative, covers the concepts of creation, risk taking, renewal or innovation inside or outside an existing organisation.

According to Chukwuemeka, Nzewi and Okigbo (2008), a cursory look at Nigeria and the citizenry indicate that she lacks entrepreneurship ability or that the government entrepreneurship oriented policies are not effective. Most entrepreneurship related policies and programmes in Nigeria fall short of appropriate development frameworks. Some of the policies are poor; frequently changing, and lack clear entrepreneurial development vision and commitment. These pose serious threat to entrepreneurship in Nigeria. Abdullahi (2012) believe that some of the entrepreneurial related policies are good but the issue of poor environmental forces hinders them. For instance, electricity supply, water and good road network are not available to encourage entrepreneurs. This therefore suggests that both Nigeria government in her policies and members of Nigeria populace, has lots to do to promote entrepreneurial and entrepreneurship orientation.

#### SELF EFFICACY

Self efficacy is defined as an individual's belief (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilise motivation, cognitive resources and courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context (Mohd, Yahya and Kamaruddin, 2012; Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998; Bandura, 1997). It is a motivational construct that has been shown to influence people's choice of activities, goal levels, persistence, and performance in a variety of contexts (Zhao, Seibert and Hills, 2005). Self efficacy theory is an important component of Bandura's social cognitive theory, which suggests high inter-relation between individual's behaviour, environment and cognitive factors. To Bandura, self regulation strongly depends on self efficacy beliefs. Perceived self efficacy influences the level of goal challenge people set for themselves, the amount of effort they mobilise and their persistence in the face of difficulties. Perceived self efficacy is theorised to influence performance accomplishments both directly and indirectly through its influences on self set goals (Zimmerman, Bandura and Martnez-Pons, 1992). According to Bandura, beliefs about one's competence to successfully perform a task can affect motivation, interest and achievement. The higher the perceived efficacy, the higher the goal aspirations people adopt and the firmer their commitment to achieving those goals.

Shane, Locke and Collins (2003) saw self-efficacy as task-specific self-confidence. To them, self efficacy is a robust predictor of an individual's performance in a task he/she is confident with. It was also believed to be an important variable that explains why people of equal ability perform differently. For example, an individual with high self-efficacy for a given task will exert more effort for a greater length of time, persist through setbacks, set and accept higher goals, and develop better plans and strategies for the task (Mohd, Yahya and Kamaruddin, 2012). A person with high self-efficacy is also believed to regard a negative feedback in a positive manner and use that feedback to improve his or her performance. Self efficacy plays an influential role in determining an individual's choice, level of effort, and perseverance (Chen, Gulley and Eden, 2004).

Bandura (1994) believed that people with strong sense of self-efficacy would view challenging problems as tasks to be mastered; have deep interest in the activities that they participate; form a strong sense of commitment in the activities; and recover quickly from setbacks and disappointment. On the other way round, people with weak self-efficacy would avoid challenging tasks; believe that difficult tasks and situations are beyond their capabilities; focus on personal failings and negative outcomes; and quickly lose confidence in personal abilities.

Entrepreneurial research on self efficacy concludes that it is an important factor to clarify entrepreneurial intentions and behaviours, as people need to believe in their capacity to succeed in starting and running a new business before they do so (Boyd and Vozikis, 1994; Neck, Neck, Manz and Godwin (1999). People avoid careers and environments of which they believe they exceed their capacities, but undertake vocations that they judge themselves capable of handling (Markman, Balkin and Baron, 2002).

#### SEX DIFFERENCES AND ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

Cox, Mueller and Moss (2002) reported that self efficacy is a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions and behaviours. Their study also shows that students who have high self efficacy perform better than those who show low self efficacy in entrepreneurial tasks. They found out that men have higher self efficacy in performing entrepreneurial tasks than women. They concluded that gender-role stereotypes, transmitted to women via socialisation experiences, pose psychological barriers to entrepreneurial intentions and career choice (Cox et al, 2002).

Scherer, Brodzinski and Wieber (1990) found that men have higher self efficacy than women in entrepreneurial orientation; however, studies by Sequeira, Mchree and Mueller (2005) did not support their finding.

#### TOLERANCE FOR AMBIGUITY AND ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

Budner (1962) defined tolerance for ambiguity as the tendency to perceive ambiguous situations as desirable. An ambiguous situation is one in which the individual is provided with information that is too complex, inadequate, or apparently contradictory (Norton, 1975). An individual with a low tolerance for ambiguity will experience stress, react prematurely and avoid ambiguous stimuli. On the other hand, a person with high tolerance for ambiguity will perceive an ambiguous situation and stimuli as desirable, challenging, and interesting. Dealing with uncertainty, taking risks, and continuous changes are part of entrepreneurial jobs (Markman and Baron, 2003; McMullen and Shepherd, 2006). And Whetten, (2000), found out that managers with a high tolerance for ambiguity are more entrepreneurial in their actions.

Ambiguity is usually measured on a one-dimensional scale: those who are intolerant of ambiguity are described as having a tendency to resort to black-and-white solutions, and characterised by rapid and overconfident judgement, often at the neglect of reality (Frenkel-Brunswick, 1949). Ambiguous situations, on the other end of the scale are perceived as desirable, challenging and interesting, usually by individuals who score highly on an Openness to Experience scale (Caligiuri, Jacobs, & Farr, 2000) and show both sensation-seeking and risk-taking behaviour (McLain, 1993; Lauriola, Levin, & Hart, 2007; McLain, 2009).

Generally, for those with low tolerance for ambiguity, there is an aversive reaction to ambiguous situations because of lack of information. This makes it difficult to assess risk and correctly make a decision. According to Budner (1962), MacDonald (1970), McLain (1993) Furnham and Ribchester (1995), these situations are perceived as a threat and source of discomfort. Reactions to the perceived threat are stress, avoidance, delay, suppression, or denial. Of recent, researchers have altered their focus towards examining how tolerance for ambiguity influences the perception of situations and decision making (e.g. Yurtsever, 2001; 2008; Van Hook & Steele, 2002; McLain, 2009). Instead, it is thought that constructs that are defined by an absence of information (e.g. risk-taking behaviour) are more relevant and are more useful in validating tolerance for ambiguity (Furnham and Marks, 2013).

Frenkel-Brunswick (1948) reported a study comprised of 100 adults and 200 California children from ages 9 to 14 years old in which the researcher looked at their attitudes to ethnic prejudice and argued that tolerance for ambiguity is to be conceived as a general personality variable relevant to basic social orientation. Entrepreneurial managers are generally believed to tolerate more ambiguity than conservative managers because they confront less structured, more uncertain set of possibilities (Bears, 1982) and actually bear the ultimate responsibility for the decision (Gasse, 1982; Kilby, 1971). Theoretically, people who best tolerate ambiguity are those who obtain superior results if their strategic objective is to pursue growth.

Gupta and Govindarajan (1984) data from 58 strategic business units revealed that greater marketing and sale experience, greater willingness to take risk, and greater tolerance for ambiguity, on the part of strategic business unit managers, contribute to effectiveness in the case of 'build' strategic business units; but hampers it in the case of 'harvest' strategic business unit. Carland, Carland and Aby (1989) research revealed that people who best tolerate ambiguity are also the most innovative.

Cools and Van-den Broec (2006) carried out a study to get more insight into what typifies Flemish entrepreneurs. They compared entrepreneurs with non-entrepreneurs for five traits (tolerance for ambiguity, self efficacy, proactive personality, locus of control, need for achievement) and for cognitive styles. They used these trait and cognitive characteristics to predict variances in entrepreneurial orientation (EO). They found that entrepreneurs (N = 177) score significantly higher on all traits than non-entrepreneurs (N = 60). For the cognitive styles (measured with the Cognitive Style Indicator), they found that non-entrepreneurs scored higher on the knowing and planning style. No differences were found for the creating style. With regard to the link between the entrepreneur's profile and entrepreneurial orientation, they found a significant contribution of tolerance for ambiguity and proactive personality to entrepreneurial orientation.

#### NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT AND ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

This is the desire to accomplish something difficult and do better than others to achieve a sense of personal accomplishment (McClelland, 1961). It is the tendency to choose and persist at activities that hold a moderate chance of success or a maximum opportunity of personal achievement satisfaction without the undue risk of failure. In a longitudinal analysis of the need for achievement for scores of college freshmen, McClelland (1965) concluded that a high need for achievement is a predictor of entrepreneurship and is based on influences of childhood and adult training and experiences.

A number of studies (e.g. Begley and Boyd, 1987; Miner, Smith and Bracker, 1989) suggest that need for achievement is higher in company founders, compared to managers. Such findings that relate the level of need for achievement of the founders and the financial growth of the organisation may come from a relationship between the psychological traits of founders and the levels of entrepreneurial orientation they exhibit.

Swierczek and Ha (2003) in their study of Vietnamese small business owners, found out that challenges and achievement are more significant and more important motivators than are necessity and security. Results suggest the existence of an entrepreneurial orientation and a new emerging culture in Vietnam that includes greater risk taking and forward thinking. A study of motivation by Benzing, Chu and Callanan (2005) revealed some economic discrepancies among regions of Vietnam. It was found out that entrepreneurs in Ho Chi Minh City were motivated by personal satisfaction and growth, while business owners in Hanoi cited the need to create jobs for themselves and family members.

A survey conducted among new business start ups in 11 countries found six reasons motivating people to become entrepreneurs. They include the need for approval, the perceived wealth, the degree of communitarianism, the need for personal development, the need for independence, and the need for escape (Scheinberg and Macmillian, 1988). This research indicates that different countries have different motives for business ownership. In the case of Nigeria, Akande (1994) remarked that Nigerian entrepreneurs ranked monetary rewards and profits as the most important factor of entrepreneurial orientation and being accountable only to oneself was cited as one of the cherished factors for starting a business. A survey of women entrepreneurs revealed that the main reason why women engage in business in Nigeria is to reduce poverty and to reverse the deteriorating economic conditions (Woldie and Adersua, 2004).

It is important to identify the relationship between personality characteristics and entrepreneurial orientation because entrepreneurs with certain personality traits may have a tendency to identify with a sub optimal entrepreneurial orientation and also identifying this tendency may provide benefits to the organisation.

Studies conducted by Crant (1996), Kolvereid (1996), Veciana, Aponte and Urbano (2005) revealed that females have lower entrepreneurial intentions than males. Carter, Anderson and Shaw (2001) found that feminine orientation individuals differ in entrepreneurial intentions from masculine individuals in that the females are less likely to have prior business experience or training. Females choose entrepreneurship as a result of experiencing glass ceiling in large organisations and have difficulties to acquire resources such as financial, human and social capital (Carter et al, 2001).

Achetenhager and Welter (2007) also reported that gender-role orientation is a significant predictor of entrepreneurial intentions among students. They found out that entrepreneurship is shown by individuals who show masculine orientation. And Friedman and Tribunella (2009) found out that gender-role orientation is a significant predictor of entrepreneurial intention among MBA students. That students who receive the masculine orientation exhibit entrepreneurial behaviour more than those who showed feminine orientation.

Onyechekwa and Adejor (2008) observed that Nigerian entrepreneurs possess the features such as high degree of commitment, desire for money, preference for moderate risk, high level of energy, self confidence, and problem solving skills, creativeness and innovativeness. However, using McClelland's entrepreneurial traits model, Ibrahim and Bello (2004) observed that the Nigerian entrepreneurs do not possess a desire for immediate feedback, future orientation and skill in organisation. According to Onuoha (2010), some features are common to Nigerian entrepreneurs. These features are hard work, self-starting, setting of personal goals, confidence, receptivity to new ideas, assertiveness, information-seeking and they are attuned to opportunities. Based upon these submissions therefore, the present study purpose to find out whether self-efficacy, tolerance for ambiguity and need for achievement would predict entrepreneurial orientation.

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be a significant effect of self efficacy on entrepreneurial orientation.
2. There will be a significant difference in the effects of novelty, complexity and insolubility (sub-scales of tolerance for ambiguity) on entrepreneurial orientation.
3. There will be a significant effect of achievement motivation on entrepreneurial orientation.
4. There will be a significant influence of sex (gender) on entrepreneurial orientation.
5. There will be a significant influence of age on entrepreneurial orientation.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

The design employed in this study is Independent groups design. Participants were randomly selected from a group of small scale entrepreneurs in Ado Ekiti and Iworo Ekiti. Research participants were approached individually and giving a questionnaire containing five sections. Section A contained the demographic information like Sex, Age; section C contained the New General Self Efficacy Scale (NGSES). Section D contained the Tolerance For Ambiguity Scale (TFA). Section E contained the Achievement Motivation Scale (AMS), while section B contained the Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale (EOS). Two hundred

and fifty (250) copies of the questionnaire was administered but only two hundred and thirty eight (238) copies of the questionnaire were properly filled out and thus analysed.

### Research Participants

The breakdown of the participants is as follows: one hundred and twenty eight (128) were males while the remaining one hundred and ten (110) were females. The participants consist of small scale entrepreneurs such as the recharge card manufacturers and wholesalers, cyber café owners, mini cafeterias owners, photo laboratory owners, frozen food entrepreneurs etc. The age of the participants ranged from 17 to 74 years.

### Variables

Four variables: Self Efficacy, Tolerance for Ambiguity, Need for Achievement and Entrepreneurial orientation were used in the study. Self Efficacy, Tolerance for Ambiguity, and Need for Achievement were the independent variables while Entrepreneurial orientation was the dependent variable. Demographic variables of sex and age were also analysed along the dependent variable.

### Instruments

Four instruments were used for this study. They are:

1. **New General Self Efficacy Scale (NGSES)** was used to collect data on the feeling of self efficacy. The scale was developed by Chen, Gully and Eden (2001). The instrument contains 8 items designed to measure or assess the participants perceived level of self efficacy. The response categories on each item ranged from “Not at all true (1)” to “Exactly true (4)”. The numerical values of 1 to 4 are assigned to each response. The higher the score, the higher the self efficacy while the lower the score the lower the self efficacy. Inter-item correlations ranged from .32 to .86 with internal consistency reliability estimate of Cronbach alpha .91 (Chen, Gully and Eden, 2001). The scale was revalidated by Oji (2011) to make it suitable for the Nigerian sample. The result obtained from the items analysis shows no duplication. Item-total correlation of the 8 items ranged from .29 to .79 with estimate of Cronbach alpha .78.
2. **Tolerance for ambiguity scale (TFA)** is a 16 item scale developed by Budner (1962). The scale has three subscales: **Novelty** (2, 9, 11, 13), **Complexity** (4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16), and **Insolubility** (1, 3, 12). All responses were based on a seven point scale, from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree). In scoring the instrument, the even-numbered items were reversed, and then the scores of the 16 items were summed up to get the total score. A higher score reflects a higher tolerance for ambiguity. The scale has an average internal reliability of .59 (Cronbach alpha). This seems poor but Budner explained that the nature of the concept and definition posit a complex, multidimensional construct that provides for a low or average reliability. He also asserted that the more complex the construct and the more complex the measure, the lower the reliability estimate will be. This, notwithstanding, the scale has an advantage of freedom from social desirability bias and recognition of the highly complex structure of concept over other scales that measure tolerance for ambiguity. In terms of validity, its inter-correlation is .85. The mean score for respondents is 5.24.
3. **The achievement motivation scale (AMS)** was developed by Lang and Fries (2006). Going by the findings from previous researches, this scale did not provide for an acceptable fit to a 2 factor model, thus the revised 10 items version was used to measure need for achievement. This revised scale provided adequate reliability, lower inter scale correlations and criterion related validity with respect to typical criteria of achievement related behaviour.
4. **Entrepreneurial orientation** was measured using eight of the items from the original Covin and Slevin measure (1989). This measure of entrepreneurial orientation has been utilised in a wide variety of research settings and has exhibited high levels of reliability and validity in numerous studies. All eight items were measured using a five point Likert scale. Three of these items were indented to measure the risk-taking sub dimension of the scale



## RESULTS

The data collected were scored and analysed and the results are as follows;

**Table 1: An independent t-test summary table showing the influence of self efficacy on entrepreneurial orientation**

|                             | Self efficacy | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t    | p     |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----|-------|------|-----|------|-------|
| Entrepreneurial orientation | High          | 140 | 21.34 | 4.07 | 236 | 1.31 | >0.05 |
|                             | Low           | 98  | 20.63 | 4.21 |     |      |       |

Table one above showed that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of individuals with high self efficacy (21.34) and those with low self efficacy (20.63). That is, self efficacy does not significantly predict entrepreneurial orientation. [ $t(236) = 1.31, p > 0.05$ ]. The hypothesis was not supported.

**Table 2: Independent t-test summary table showing the influence of novelty, complexity, and insolubility (sub-scales of tolerance for ambiguity) on entrepreneurial orientation**

| Variables    | Levels | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t     | Sig        |
|--------------|--------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|------------|
| Novelty      | High   | 137 | 20.88 | 4.25 | 236 | -0.76 | $p > 0.05$ |
|              | Low    | 101 | 21.29 | 3.98 |     |       |            |
| Complexity   | High   | 142 | 28.5  | 4.18 | 236 | -0.90 | $p > 0.05$ |
|              | Low    | 96  | 21.34 | 4.07 |     |       |            |
| Insolubility | High   | 115 | 20.37 | 4.18 | 236 | -2.50 | $P < 0.05$ |
|              | Low    | 123 | 21.69 | 4.00 |     |       |            |

Table two above showed that novelty and complexity do not have a significant influence on entrepreneurial orientation respectively. However, there is a significant influence of insolubility on entrepreneurial orientation [ $t(236) = -2.50, P < 0.05$ ]. Insolubility, according to Burdner (1962) relates with a situation that is contradictory in nature where different cues purport different arrangements.

**Table 3: independent t-test summary table showing the influence of achievement motivation on entrepreneurial orientation**

|                             | Achievement Motivation | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t     | p      |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----|-------|------|-----|-------|--------|
| Entrepreneurial orientation | High                   | 118 | 20.81 | 4.39 | 236 | -0.93 | p>0.05 |
|                             | Low                    | 120 | 21.28 | 3.86 |     |       |        |

Table three above showed that there is no significant difference in the mean scores of individuals with high achievement motivation (20.81) and those who have low achievement motivation [(21.28) [ t (236) = -0.93, p>0.05]. Thus the hypothesis was not supported.

**Table 4: independent t-test summary table showing the influence of sex (gender) on entrepreneurial orientation**

|                             | Sex  | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t    | p      |
|-----------------------------|------|-----|-------|------|-----|------|--------|
| Entrepreneurial orientation | High | 128 | 21.12 | 4.17 | 236 | 0.27 | p>0.05 |
|                             | Low  | 110 | 20.97 | 4.11 |     |      |        |

Table four showed that there is no significant difference in the entrepreneurial orientations of males and females [t (236) = 0.27, p>0.05]. Hypothesis four was not supported.

**Table 5: independent t-test summary table showing the influence of age on entrepreneurial orientation**

|                             | Age   | N   | Mean  | SD   | df  | t    | p      |
|-----------------------------|-------|-----|-------|------|-----|------|--------|
| Entrepreneurial orientation | Old   | 91  | 21.13 | 4.11 | 236 | 0.24 | p>0.05 |
|                             | Young | 147 | 21.00 | 4.16 |     |      |        |

Table five showed that there is no significant age difference in the exhibition of entrepreneurial orientation. Hypothesis five is thus rejected.

## DISCUSSION

Hypothesis one revealed that self efficacy did not significantly influence entrepreneurial orientation. Cox, Mueller and Moss (2002) finding however negates this finding. They found out that self efficacy is a predictor of entrepreneurial orientation. The variation in these findings may be due to samples used, their environment and culture and also personality differences. Studies (e.g. Krug and Kulhavy, 1973; Plaut, Markus and Lachman, 2002; Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter, 2008, and Rentfrow, 2010) have demonstrated that regional personality differences exists.

Hypothesis two did not also reveal a significant influence of novelty and complexity on entrepreneurial orientation. However, there was a significant influence of the third sub scale (insolubility) on entrepreneurial orientation. Burdner (1962) explained novelty as a situation where no familiar signs exist, complexity as a situation in which large number of cues must be taken into consideration, and insolubility as a situation that is contradictory in nature and where different cues purport differing arrangements. This therefore suggests that entrepreneurial orientation is influenced by an ability to explore the environment, discern opportunities and analyse strengths and weaknesses, identify possible threats to success and design strategies of dealing with such

threats in the environment. This finding therefore corroborates Druckers submission that an entrepreneur must be tactful and diplomatic.

Achievement motivation is not a significant predictor of entrepreneurial orientation according to this present study. This finding contradicts McClelland's (1968) economic development theory which states that "a society with a generally high level of achievement motivation will produce more energetic entrepreneurs who, in turn, produce more rapid economic development." The work of Mann and Thorpe (1998) which suggested that Asian entrepreneurs, in general indicate "money making" as the most important force leading them to become business owners and that white entrepreneurs were motivated by a desire for independence via business ownership, also negate this particular finding. Scholars (e.g. Scheinberg and Macmillian, 1988; Akande, 1994; Swierczek and Ha, 2003 and Benzing, Chu and Callanan, 2005) have opined that, several reasons such as perceived accumulation of wealth, degree of communitarianism, the need for personal development, the need for independence and the need for escape might motivate people to become successful and energetic entrepreneurs. However, their influences in this present study remain insignificant. An anonymous writer once wrote that Nigerians are motivated by lower order needs of food, clothing and shelter as depicted in Maslow (1965) hierarchy of needs, owing to the levels of poverty in the land. However, further studies may be necessary to ascertain the motivations for entrepreneurship among Nigeria business owners since the assertion of the anonymous writer is yet unscientifically substantiated.

Sex (gender) also did not have a significant influence on entrepreneurial orientation contradicting the work of Gatewood, Shaver and Gartner (1995) who found out that the performance of females are significantly different from that of males on entrepreneurial orientation. However, this study reported a higher mean for males on entrepreneurial orientation even though the differences remain insignificant.

Finally, there was also no significant influence of age on entrepreneurial orientation. A plausible reason for this might be the fact that monetary rewards and profits motivate Nigerians as remarked by Akande (1994). One then can be tempted to infer that irrespective of the age, Nigerians are lovers of monetary rewards.

### CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study concludes that self efficacy, achievement motivation, age and sex (gender) does not significantly predict entrepreneurial orientation among entrepreneurs in Nigeria. However, there was an effect of insolubility on entrepreneurial orientation even though the effects of novelty and complexity were not significant.

Based on this findings, it is recommended that further studies be conducted that will consider a larger sample of entrepreneurs across geo-political regions in Nigeria so that the influence of regional personality differences can be ascertained alongside the particular motivations for entrepreneurial orientation among Nigeria entrepreneurs. It is hoped that such understanding will improve impetus to formulating policies that would be meaningful to encouraging and motivating entrepreneurial orientation across cultures.

### REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, S. A. (2012). Entrepreneurship and economic growth: An analysis of impact of public policy on entrepreneurship development in Nigeria. The 2012 International Conference on Business and Management. Phuket- Thailand.
- Achtenhagen, L & Welter, F. (2003). Female entrepreneurship in Germany: context development media. In J. Butler (Ed.), *New Perspectives on Women Entrepreneurship* (Pgs 77-100). Information Age Publishing, Greenwich, CT.
- Akande, A. (1994). Coping with entrepreneurial stress: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 32, 83-87.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V. Ramachaudran, *Encyclopedia of Human Behaviour* (Pgs 71-81). New York: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bearse, P. J. (1982). A study of entrepreneurship by region and AME size. In K. Vesper (Ed.) *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* (78-112). Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Begley, T. M. & Boyd, D. P. (1987). Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and small businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2:79-83.
- Benzing, C., Chu, H. M., & Callanan, G. (2005). Regional comparison of the motivation and problems of Vietnamese entrepreneurs. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 10: 3-27.
- Beugelsdijk, S. (2007). Entrepreneurial culture, regional innovativeness and economic growth. *Journal of Evolutionary Economy*, 17, 187-210.



- Boyd, N. G. & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self efficacy on the development of entrepreneurship intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18 (4): 63-77.
- Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. *Journal of Personality*, 30: 29-50.
- Caligiuri, P. M., Jacobs, R. R., & Farr, J. L. (2000). The attitudinal and behavioural openness scale: Scale development and construct validation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 27-46.
- Carland, J. W., Carland, A. C. & Aby, C. D. (1989). An assessment of the psychological determinants of planning in small business. *International Small Business Journal*, 7 (4): 23-34.
- Carter, S., Anderson, S., & Shaw, E. (2001). Women business ownership: A review of the academic popular and internet interactive report to the small business service. Department of Marketing, University of Starthclyde.
- Chen, G., Gulley, M., & Eden, D. (2004). General self efficacy and self esteem: toward theoretical and empirical distinction between correlated self evaluations. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, 25: 375-395.
- Chen, G., Gulley, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organisational Research Methods*, 4 (1): 62-83.
- Chukwuemeka, C., Nzewi, A., & Okigbo (2008). Public policy and entrepreneurship in Nigeria: Addressing immediate pathological problems. A paper presented at an international conference on entrepreneurship organised by Chike Okoli Centre for Entrepreneurship Studies, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Akwa, Nigeria.
- Cool, E., & Van den Broeck, H. (2006). The cognitive style indicator: Development and validation of a new measurement tool. In L. Lassen, L. Bostrom & C. Evans (Eds.), *Enabling lifelong learning in education, training and development. Eleventh Annual Conference of the European Learning styles Information Network (CD-rom)*. Oslo: University of Oslo, Norway.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10: 75-87.
- Cox, L. W., Mueller, S. L., & Moss, S. E. (2002). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial self efficacy. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1 (2): 229-247.
- Crant, J. M. (1996). The proactive personality scale as a predictor of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 34 (3): 42-49.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). *Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and Principles*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Frenkel-Brunswik, E. (1948). Intolerance of ambiguity as emotional perceptual. *Personality of Assessment*, 40: 67-72.
- Friedman, E. H. & Triburelle, E. (2009). Examining a model of entrepreneurial intention among Malaysians. *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 3 (2): 365-373.
- Furnham, A. & Marks, J. (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: a review of the recent literature. *Psychology*, 4 (9) 717-728.
- Furnham, A., & Ribchester, T. (1995). Tolerance of ambiguity: A review of the concept, its measurement and applications. *Current Psychology*, 14, 179-199.
- Gasse, Y. (1982). Commentary elaboration: Elabaoration on the psychology of the entrepreneur. In C. A., Kent, D. L. Sexton & K. H. Vesper (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship (58-71)*. Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gatewood, E. J., Shaver, K. G., & Gartner, W. B. (1995). A longitudinal study of cognitive factors influencing start up behaviour and success at venture creation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10: 371-391.
- Gupta, A. K., & Govindarajan, V. (1984). Business unit strategy, managerial characteristics, and business unit effectiveness at strategy implementation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27: 25-41.
- Herman, J. L., Stevens, M. J., Bird, A., Mendenhall, M., & Oddou, G. (2010). The tolerance for ambiguity scale: Towards a more refined measure for international management research. *International Journal of Intercultural relations* 34: 58-65.
- Ibrahim, Y., & Bello, A. (2004). The Nigerian entrepreneurs-inept abilities. *European Journal of International Business*, 41(2): 266-279.
- Jaarfar, M., Abdul-Aziz, A. (2005). Resources-based view and critical success factors: A study on small and medium sized contracting enterprises (SMCEs) in Malaysia. *The International Journal of Construction Management*, 61-77.
- Kilby, P. (1971). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. New York: Free Press.
- Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*. 21(1): 47-58.
- Kreiser, P., Marino, L., & Weaver, K. (2002). Assessing the psychometric properties of the entrepreneurial scale: A multi-country analysis. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 2:71-92.

- Krug, S. E., & kulhavy, R. W. (1973). Personality differences across regions of the United States. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 91(1):73-79
- Lang, J. W. B., & Fries, S. (2006). A revised 10-item version of achievement motives scale: Psychometric properties in German-speaking samples. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*, 22: 216-224.
- Lauriola, M., Levin, I. P., & Hart, S. S. (2007). Common and distinct factors in decision making under ambiguity and risk: A psychometric study of individual differences. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 104, 130-149.
- MacDonald, A. P. (1970). Revised scale for ambiguity tolerance: Reliability and validity. *Psychological Reports*, 26, 791-798.
- Mann, V., & Thrope, R. (1998). Characteristics of Asian and white female business owners. *Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics*, 22: 221-229.
- Markman, G. D. & Baron, R. A. (2003). Person- entrepreneurial fit: Why some people are more successful as Entrepreneurs than others. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13 (2): 281-301.
- Markman, G. D., Balkin, D. B., & Baron, R. A. (2002). Investors and new venture formation: The effects of general self efficacy and regretful thinking. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(2): 149-65.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. van Nostrand Co, Inc.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965). Achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1: 389-392.
- McLain, D. L. (1993). The MSTAT-I: A new measure of an individual's tolerance for ambiguity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, 183-189.
- McLain, D. L. (2009). Evidence of the properties of an ambiguity tolerance measure: The multiple stimulus types ambiguity tolerance scale-II. *Psychological Reports*, 105, 975-988.
- McMullen, J. S. & Shepherd, D. A (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the Entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review* 31(1): 132-152.
- Merrotsky, P. (2013). Tolerance of ambiguity: A trait of the creative personality. *Creativity Research Journal*, 25, 232-237.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29, 770-791.
- Miner, J. B., Smith, N. K., & Bracker, J. S. (1989). Role of entrepreneurial task motivation in the growth of technologically innovative firms. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (4): 554-560.
- Mohd, R., Yahya, K. K., & Kamaruddin, B. H. (2012). The moderating effect of environment on the relationship between self efficacy and entrepreneurial orientation among Malay SMEs in manufacturing industry. *Cambridge Business and Economics Conference*, United Kingdom.
- Mueller, S. L. & Dato-on, M. C. (2008). Gender role orientation as a determinant of entrepreneurial self efficacy. *Journal of Development Entrepreneurship*, 13 (1), 3-20.
- Neck, C. P., Neck, H. M., Manz, C. C., & Godwin, (1999). I think I can; I think I can: A self-leadership perspective toward enhancing entrepreneur thought patterns, self-efficacy and performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 14 (6): 477-501.
- Norton, R. W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity for tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39: 607-619.
- Onuoha, M. (2010). *Entrepreneurship in Nigeria*. Enugu: Rex Charles Publishing.
- Onyechekwa, T & Adejor, K.I. (2008). Entrepreneurship-path from rags to riches. Paper presented at the National Finance Seminars: Organised by Nigeria Union of Teachers; Abuja.
- Plaut, V.C., Markus, H. R., & Lachman, M. E. (2002). **Place matters: consensual features and regional variation in American well-being and self**. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2002 Jul;83(1):160-84
- Poon, J. M. L., Ainuddin, R. A., & Junit, S. H. (2006). Effects of self concept trait and international of Small Business Journal. 24(1):61-82
- Rentfrow, P. J. (2010). Statewide differences in personality: Toward a psychological geography of the United States. *American Psychologist*, 65, 548-558.
- Rentfrow, P. J., Gosling, S. D. & Potter, J. (2008). A Theory of the emergence, persistence, and expression of regional variation in basic traits. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3, 339-369.
- Scheinberg, S., & Macmillan, I (1988). An 11 countries study of motivations to start a business. In B. A. Kirchoff, W. A. Long, W. E. McMillan, K. H. Vesper, & W.E. jr (Eds.) *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. 669-684. Babson College: Wellesley, MA:
- Scherer, R. S., Brodzinski, J. & Wiebe, F. A. (1990). Entrepreneurship career selection and gender: A socialisation approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 28(2): 37-44.

- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *A theory of economic development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sequeira, I. M., Mchree, J. E., & Mueller, S. L. (2005). An empirical study of the effect of network ties and self efficacy in entrepreneurial intentions and nascent behaviour. In *proceedings of southern management association on teaching*. Charleston, South Carolina.
- Shane, S., Locke, E., & Collins, C. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 257-279.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Self-efficacy and work related task performance: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 124 (2): 240-261.
- Swierczek, F. W. & Ha, T. T. (2003). Entrepreneurship orientation, uncertainty avoidance and firm performance: an analysis of Tai and Vietnamese SMEs. *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 4(1): 46-58.
- Van Hook, C. W., & Steele, C. (2002). Individual personality characteristics related to suggestibility. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 1007- 1010.
- Veciana, J. M., Aponte, M., & Urbano, D. (2005). University students' attitude towards entrepreneurship: A two countries comparison. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 1(2), 165-182.
- Whetten, D., Cameron, K., & Woods, M. (2000). *Developing management skills for Europe* (2nd ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Wickham, P. A. (2004). *Strategic entrepreneurship* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Woldie, A. & Adesua, A. (2004). Female entrepreneurs in a transitional economy: Business women in Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 31: 78-93.
- Yurtsever, G. (2001). Tolerance of ambiguity, information and negotiation. *Psychological Reports*, 89, 57-64.
- Yurtsever, G. (2008). Negotiators' profit predicted by cognitive reappraisal, suppression of emotions, misrepresentation of information, tolerance of ambiguity. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 106: 590-608.
- Zhao, H., Seibert, S. E., & Hills, G. E. (2005). The mediating role of self efficacy in the development of Entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(6): 1265-1272.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pon, M. (1992). Self motivation for academic attainment: The role of self efficacy beliefs and personal goal setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(3): 663-676.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:  
<http://www.iiste.org>

## CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

## MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

## IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

