

SPRINGBOARD Journal

No. 1, Volume 6, 2014



جامعة الحكمة، إلورين - نيجيريا

AL-HIKMAH UNIVERSITY
ILORIN, KWARA STATE-NIGERIA

Editorial Board

1. Editor-in-Chief Prof I.B. Bello-Imam, Department of Political Science and Conflict Resolution, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria
- II. Managing Editor Mr. Hamzah Abdurraheem, Department of Languages (English), Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria
- III. Member Dr Qasim Badmaasi, Department of Languages (Arabic), Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria
- IV. Member Dr. A.O.Y. Raji, Department of History and International Relations, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria
- V. Member Dr. L.F. Oladimeji Department of Islamic Studies, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria

Members of the Editorial Advisory Board

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Prof. (Mrs) N.Y.S. Ijaiya, Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria | 6. Prof. Festus Egwakhide, Department of Economics, University of Ibadan, Nigeria |
| 2. Prof. Abdul-Baki Shuaib, Department of Arabic Studies, Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto, Nigeria | 7. Prof. A.O. Sanda, Faculty of Social Sciences, Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria |
| 3. Dr. Bello D. Badah, Department of English Language, Usman Dan Fodio University, Sokoto, Nigeria | 8. Prof. H.O Danmole, Department of History and International Studies, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria. |
| 4. Prof. Muazu Alhaji Nguru, Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, University of Maiduguri, Nigeria | 9. Prof. J.D.Y. Peel, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London, United Kingdom |
| 5. Prof. Aminu Mamodu, Faculty of Education, Ambrose Alli University, Ekpoma, Nigeria | 10. Prof. Pita Ogada Agbese, Department of Political Science, The University of Northern Iowa, U.S.A. |

Contents

List of Contributors	iv
Editorial	vi

Articles in English

1. A Diachronic Survey of the Development of English Language from 43AD to 1000AD: Some Salient Linguistic Changes	1
2. Role of Cognition and Demography in the Response of Children to Advertisements: A Study of Pupils of Four Nigerian Primary Schools	23
3. Developing Marketing Strategies for the Growth and Survival of Private Schools in Ilorin Metropolis	37
4. Assessment of Pre and Post Effects Liberalization Policy of Nigerian Telecommunication Industry	52
5. Towards the Sociology of Entrepreneurship: Exploring some Relevant Approaches	64
6. Fostering Social Entrepreneurship to Achieve Sustainable National Development	83
7. Capital Adequacy and Banks Performance: An Empirical Investigation of the Nigerian Deposit Money Banks	98
8. Overview of Feminism from Global Perspective	111
9. Optimising the Gains of Rural Based Media in Nigeria	124
10. An Ecocritical Analysis of Ogaga Ifowodo's <i>The Oil Lamp</i>	141
11. A Metaphorical Analysis of President Umaru Musa Yar'Adua's Inaugural Speech	152
12. Fiqhu Âdâbu Salâti'l-Jumi'ah: A Comparative Study of the Etiquettes of the Jumu'ah Prayer	165
13. Styles and Methods of Tafsir of Ibn Kathir and Al-Mawdudi: A Comparative Study ...	188
Articles in Arabic	
14. Instructional Materials in the Service of Arabic Language and Literature: Plastic Board as a Case Study	205
15. Effects of Marriage Contract in Islamic Law: The Practices among Nigerian Muslims	217

List of Contributors

1. ABDURRAHEEM, A.A. is a lecturer in the Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
2. ADEDOYIN, Salami Issac (Ph.D) is a Chief Lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin, Nigeria.
3. ADENIGBA, Sikiru Atanda is a lecturer in the Department of Islamic Studies, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
4. ADIGUN, Saidat, M. is a lecturer in the Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
5. AJILORE, Kolade (Ph.D) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Mass Communication, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remon, Ogun State, Nigeria.
6. AKANNI, L.F is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
7. ALAO, Oluwafisayo, O. is a lecturer in the Department of Mass Communication, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria.
8. ALIYU, Saeedat B. lectures in the Department of Languages and Literary Studies, Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria.
9. ALIYU-IBRAHIM, Foluke R. (Ph.D) (Mrs) is a lecturer in the Department of English, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
10. AREMU, Moriam Adeyemi lectures in the Department of Business Administration, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
11. AREMU, Mukaila Ayanda (Ph.D) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
12. ATOLAGBE, Adedapo Adetiba (Ph.D) lectures in the Department of Educational Management, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
13. AYUBA, Abdur-Rasheed Olayiwola lectures in the Department of Languages, (English Unit), Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
14. AZEEZ, O.R. is a Lecturer in the Department of Islamic Studies, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
15. BRIMAH, A.N is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
16. HARUNA, Muhammad Baba Sausi is a lecturer in the Department of Islamic Studies, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.
17. IBRAHIM, Ishaq Olayiwola (Ph.D) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Arabic, Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State, Nigeria.
18. ISSAH, Mashood is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
19. JAMES, Aransiola Ishola is a lecturer in the Department of Business Administration, Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin, Nigeria.
20. JOSEPH, Oluyemi, A. is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
21. OJEDIRAN, Oludolapo (Ph.D) is a lecturer in the Performing Arts Department, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
22. OLANIPEKUN, W.D. is of the Department of Management and Accounting, Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso, Nigeria.
23. OLATUNJI, AbdulGaniy is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.
24. OLOYIN-ABDULHAKEEM, Bashirat O. lectures in the Department of Accounting and Finance, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.
25. SANMI, Mubaraq (Ph.D) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Accounting and Finance, Kwara State University, Malete, Nigeria.
26. SHITTU, Jelili Alaba (Ph.D) lectures in the Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria.
27. SULEMAN, Hassan is a lecturer in the Department of Languages, Kaduna Polytechnic, Kaduna, Nigeria.
28. TSEBEE, Asor Kenneth lectures in the Department of Mass Communication, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Towards the Sociology of Entrepreneurship: Exploring Some Relevant Approaches

by

Olatunji, Abdulganiy; Issah, Moshood and Joseph, Oluyemi A.

Abstract

Entrepreneurship has been one of the fundamental human activities from time immemorial; the age-long practice of entrepreneurial activities in human societies is evident in ancient history of Jews, Arabs, English and African societies. Due to the importance of entrepreneurial activities in human's life, different scholars in several social sciences and managerial disciplines have looked into the subject from their own disciplinary point of view. Most of these disciplines have only seen the concept from their own immediate academic background with little or no emphasis on the socio-cultural milieu in which entrepreneurship takes place. In an attempt to fill this gap, this paper, exploring various approaches, intends to bring out the importance of socio-cultural factors in entrepreneurship activities. It is observed through different approaches examined in the paper that sociological factors have significant influence on entrepreneurship activities generally. The paper concludes on the premise that sociological factors are important variables to be considered in entrepreneurial studies and in the formulation and implementation of entrepreneurial policies in Nigeria.

Keywords: Approaches, Disciplines, Entrepreneurship, Factors, Policies, Study

Introduction

Entrepreneurship is an important activity in human life because without it, it will be difficult to fulfill the basic conditions of living such as food, shelter and clothing. Human being is created in such a way that if he must eat, he must work for what to eat and hence the indispensability of entrepreneurial activities. The age-long practice of entrepreneurship in human life is evident in the history of many ancient societies such as Jews, Arabs, English and African societies. If closely observed, one would realize that the history of all hitherto existing societies contains a history of entrepreneurship (Olatunji, 2012, 2013, Olatunji and Lawal, 2014). Although, the study of entrepreneurship does not begin formally until the 18th century, the term was introduced into economic theory with the works of Richard Cantillon

and Adam Smith in 18th and early 19th centuries but was ignored theoretically until the late 19th and early 20th centuries and was first accorded prominence by Say (1816). It was variously translated into English as 'merchant', 'undertaker', 'adventurer' or 'employer' (International Encyclopaedia of Economics cited in Adunola, 2009).

Because of the importance of entrepreneurial activities in human social living, different scholars in the social science and managerial disciplines have looked into the discourse using different theoretical approaches. For instance, in Economics, entrepreneurs are seen as agent of economic development in the field of management, entrepreneurs are studied based on their managerial functions in establishing and management of business ventures. In Psychology, entrepreneurs are seen as individuals with specific distinct personality features that distinguish them from the general population. In Sociology however, the focus of the entrepreneurship does not really lie in the functions or the definitions of the entrepreneur, rather, the focus of is on the socio-cultural background of the entrepreneur and how such background influences entrepreneurship activities. It could be deduced from the above that entrepreneurship is a confluence of various factors in which each of the factors are as important as the other in the general making of an entrepreneur.

Although socio-cultural factors play immense role in entrepreneurship, it's economic and managerial importance has received more academic prominence and the sociological aspects of entrepreneurship have received less consideration (Olatunji, 2012). (This is regarded as one of the gaps this paper attempts to cover). In the sociological studies of entrepreneurship, several approaches have been devised to explain the inseparable relationship between socio-cultural variables and entrepreneurship. Although, all of these approaches might not be sufficiently explored in a paper of this stature, but a summary clue of each of the approaches will be explored in order to show the relationship and influences of socio-cultural factors on entrepreneurial activities. In other words, the focus of this paper is to explore different sociological or sociological-related approaches to the study of entrepreneurship and how each of the approach gives an insight into the relevance of social factors in entrepreneurship. At this juncture, there is the need to apprise the reader of the fact that, the approaches examined in this paper are considered sociological approaches because the approaches in a way or the other are reiterating the relevance of social factors in entrepreneurial activities. More so, it is important to note that though, the approaches might be overlapping in some instances but the authors have decided to highlight them separately due to some technical differences that exist among them.

Conceptual Clarification

In order to make this chapter more understandable, there is the need to make conceptual clarification of the meaning of entrepreneur and entrepreneurship.

Who is an Entrepreneur and What is Entrepreneurship?

There has not been a generally accepted definition of the terms entrepreneur and entrepreneurship. There have only been variants of definitions depending on the field and the area and angle at which individual researcher sees it (Bamiduro, 1999; Wale-Awe, 2010). The definition used by individuals is influenced by various factors such as individual discipline, the intent, or what one hopes to accomplish. That is why Peter Kilby compared entrepreneurship to the imaginary animal, 'the Heffalump'. The animal according to Kilby (1971:1)

... is a large and important animal which has been hunted by many individuals using various ingenious trapping devices; all who claim to have caught sight of it report that it is enormous, but they disagree on its particularities. Not having explored his current habitat with sufficient care, some hunters have used as bait, their own favorite dishes and have then tried to persuade people that what they caught was a Heffalump. However, very few are convinced, and the search goes on...

Entrepreneur is derived from the French verb "entrepender" which means 'to undertake', 'to attempt', 'to try in hand', 'to contract for', or 'to adventure', 'to try', 'to risk' (Abimbola, 2007; Sarkin-Daji, 2009). According to Bygrave and Hofer (1991), the simplest definition of entrepreneurship is an individual that organizes, operates, and takes on the risks of a business venture. The definition of entrepreneurship from as far back as the eighteenth century sees it as an economic term used to describe the process of bearing the risk of buying at certain prices and selling at uncertain prices (Morris & Lewis, 1991). Sarkin-Daji (2009) defines an entrepreneur as an individual who is willing to and has ability to seek investment opportunities in an environment and be able to establish and run a business outfit successfully based on identified opportunities.

Entrepreneurship is the ability to create something (usually a business entity) from practically nothing, 'it is initiating, building and watching an enterprise rather than watching one' (Okpara, 2005:25). Nwangwu (2007) opined that entrepreneurship is a process of bringing together the factors of production, which include land, labour and capital so as to provide a product or service for public consumption. According to Okpara (2005), entrepreneurship is the knack for sensing opportunities where others see chaos, contradiction and confusion; it is

the ability to build a founding team to complement one's own skill and talent. It is the know-how to find, marshal and control economic/business resources. What could be inferred from the definitions of entrepreneur above is that entrepreneurs are individuals who initiated a business entity and assume the risks and benefits of the business venture. They are individuals who believe that they are the master of their own fate, the driver of their own ship. Though, these definitions sees entrepreneurs as founders of a business organization but entrepreneurs include not just the original founders of business firms but also second-generation operators of family owned firms, franchisees, and owner managers who have bought out the founders of existing firms (Longenecker, Moore and Petty, 2003).

Entrepreneurship play immense roles in the general socio-economic and political well-being of many nations in the world today, this is because of its role as an engine of economic and social development (Ijaiya, Muhammed and Chika, 2010); in the exploration and utilization of natural resources (Sarkin-Daji, 2009; Salihu, 2009); in the generation of employment opportunities for the mass population (Igbinedion and Akpeti, 2010; Olatunji, 2013); in reduction of poverty rates in the society (Abimbola, 2007; Agu, 2010; Ijaiya et.al., 2010) and in strengthening democratic institutions in the society (Olatunji, 2011). However, it is important to note that entrepreneurship activities are carried out by entrepreneurs in the society and because such entrepreneurs are social being with socio-cultural background, the highest possibility is that their behaviours and performance will be generally influenced by their socio-cultural conditions. In other words, it is important to put interest in the study of these important factors and because the socio-cultural factors are many, numerous sociological approaches has been developed to explain the obvious link between social factors and entrepreneurship activities. In this respect, the next segment of this paper is used to briefly explore some of these approaches.

Approaches to the Study of Entrepreneurship: An Overview

According to Chu, cited in Adunola (2009), ideological approaches in the study of entrepreneurship are fundamentally categorized into four mainstreams namely: management, economics, sociological and psychological. While the first two perspectives are given more prominence, only recently that academic discussion on the last two perspectives begin to occupy centre stage in entrepreneurship discussion. In order to complement these recent efforts, the focus of this write up dwelled on the sociological perspectives. In other words, ideological approaches that would be considered in this paper would revolve majorly around the background of the sociological studies.

The focus of sociological perspective in the study of entrepreneurship is to look into the relevance of social factors concerning entrepreneurial action. This is because socio-cultural factors have a substantial influence in creating entrepreneurs as well as entrepreneurship (Katz, 1991). For example, social and cultural factors that place a high value on innovation, risk taking and independence are more likely to produce entrepreneurial events than a system with contrasting values (Islam, 2000; Mueller and Thomas, 2000). In this approach, social factors are seen as an important determinant of social action including entrepreneurship, premised on the conception that; right from the definition of entrepreneurship, the characteristics of entrepreneur, the emergence and continuity of entrepreneurship all points to the fact that the study of entrepreneurship cannot be completed without considering the socio-cultural dynamics through which entrepreneurship occur. In this paper, attempt is made to review several relevant approaches explaining the influence of socio-cultural factors on entrepreneurship. Some of such approaches are briefly explained below.

Socio-Cultural Approach

In this approach, culture is seen as an important determinant of any social action. The basic conception of this perspective is that culture is an important determinant of any human behaviour because it influences the motives, values, and beliefs of individuals (Olatunji, 2009; Olatunji and Lawal, 2014). More so, it is believed within the framework of this approach that human behaviour are functions of a specific socio-cultural system (Hofstede, 2001) in which cultural institutions affect individual behaviours. In essence, social actions (by entrepreneurs) are meaningful human behaviours, which cannot be separated from the social and cultural contexts (Bloodgood and Sapienza, 1995; Robinson and Sexton, 1994). Specifically, the influence of culture on entrepreneurial activities of different societies has been a subject of discussion since the beginning of the 20th century. Max Weber is one of the foremost sociologists that discovered that cultural factors and social values play important roles in shaping and influencing entrepreneurial action. Weber in the Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism explained the decisive role of religion in the development of modern capitalism in which entrepreneurship is the driving force.

Reynolds (1991) defines entrepreneurship as the creation of new organizations, which is context-dependent. According to Abimbola, (2007), the source of entrepreneurship action lies in the in the cultural value system of the society. Shapero (1981) concluded that culture was an explanatory variable for

entrepreneurial activity or the lack of it. He also noted that some cultures value entrepreneurship more than others and hence the reason for variability in the supply of entrepreneurs in different cultures. Davidsson and Wiklund (1995) concluded that a diverse set of cultural values is responsible for differences among regions in the rates of entrepreneurial start-ups and continuity. Thus, this approach views the entrepreneurial world as channeled through a well-integrated society and culture in which the value system becomes the crucial determinant of an individual's actions. Becker (1993) suggested that some societies, because of their non-entrepreneurial culture, welcome outsiders to perform entrepreneurial functions. In effect, some groups with entrepreneurial values do become the predominant entrepreneurs of host societies. Numerous empirical studies report some cultures as being more represented than others in the small business sector. Among them, Lasry (1982) noted the percentage of entrepreneurs among Sephardi immigrants in Montreal as being significantly higher (38 percent) than among immigrants in general. Similarly, Sayigh (1962), found Christians and Jews to be the prominent entrepreneurs in Lebanon. By and large, what could be inferred from the socio-cultural approach is that human being is a socio-cultural being and cultural beliefs, cultural values and practices have a profound effects on the shaping and making of the entrepreneur as well as the rate of entrepreneurial development of a society.

Social-Psychological Perspective

In the study of factors influencing entrepreneurial behavior, the two fundamental approaches observed are the micro and macro approaches. The macro explanation seeks to explain the influence of the general socio-cultural system on the making and molding of individual personalities, the micro school on the other hand seeks to analyze the important roles of individual personalities in shaping and making of the whole system. In this regard, while the socio-cultural perspective focus on the influence of the overall cultural system on the entrepreneurship, the micro view attempt to examine the influence of personality factors on the emergence, maintenance and continuity of entrepreneurship. In essence, psychological or personality theories of entrepreneurship wants to look into the factors responsible for the emergence and continuity of entrepreneurial personalities in business realm and how enormous supply of such personalities could lead to entrepreneurship development of a society. Researchers in this field believe that certain perceptions and beliefs among entrepreneurs transcend cultures According to this approach, personality characteristics and not cultural influences make people to become entrepreneurs.

Social psychology is a branch of sociology, a discipline that has its focus of inquiry on the behaving individual within a social context analyzing behavioral processes with a view to generalize from individual to group and to social movement. This approach on entrepreneurship seeks to look into the less obvious link between the social and psychological conditions of entrepreneurial behavior. According to these scholars, entrepreneurial activities are mental in nature and as a result entrepreneurs are not just anyhow persons, they are set of people with certain distinguished personality type which did not only inhibit entrepreneurship but more importantly enhance its continuity. In other words, the social psychological approach wants to look into the personality characteristics of entrepreneurs such as internal locus of control; innovativeness, risk-taking orientation, achievement orientation and other behavioral characteristics of entrepreneurs as it go a long way in influencing entrepreneurial actions and inactions. It is conceived within the premise of this approach that certain individuals are pulled to entrepreneurship because of some psychological predispositions in their personality.

These traits according to these theorists are often inborn characteristics and it is generally believed within this approach that individuals that possess these characteristic traits are born-entrepreneurs. In many other literatures on entrepreneurship, this perspective is often referred to as 'traits theory'. The trait approach to entrepreneurship is the evaluation and examination of entrepreneurial action based on the mental and psychological characteristics of individual entrepreneurs. Based on this principle, individuals are the units of analysis and individuals with identifiable entrepreneurial characteristics will have a higher propensity to function in entrepreneurial realms (Lachman, 1980). With the belief in traits as a determining factor in this approach, entrepreneurs are seen as exceptional persons capable of forming a rewarding venture, they are often extraordinary achievers. More so, this approach is of the view that certain psychological traits enable entrepreneurs to achieve entrepreneurial goals. Practically, this approach could be used to explain the influence of trait factors in the making of the entrepreneurial personalities such as Bill Gates (CEO of Microsoft Computers), Soichiro Honda, (founder of Honda Motor Company. Mark Zuckerberg (Founder and owner of Facebook). Aliko Dangote (Founder of Dangote Group of Companies).

In conclusion, the trait theory to entrepreneurship study has been one of the classical works in entrepreneurship theorizing and it has proved very useful in the understanding of the influence of personality factors in the making of the entrepreneur. However, this approach could be faulted on the basis that, it only

considers the outcome while grossly neglecting the process which leads to the outcome. Put in another way, the trait perspective is faulted on the premise that it grossly neglected the social processes which makes the realization of the personality traits possible.

Anthropological Perspective

Anthropology is a branch of Sociology which is generally classified into physical and cultural anthropology (Harris, 1995). In essence, these two branches of anthropology could be used as relevant ideological approach to explain some fundamentals of entrepreneurship dynamics. Anthropologists generally classified culture into two broad categories: material and non-material culture. Material culture relates to overt or explicit aspect of culture which consist of the objects which people in a particular society have learned to make and use to satisfy their needs in that society (Olatunji, 2009; Olatunji and Lawal, 2014). The non-material aspects of culture consist of knowledge, philosophy, morals, motivation, language, attitudes, values, etc. shared and in a society. They are sometimes referred to as covert or implicit aspects of culture because they are not visible or tangible but are manifested through the behaviour of a people (Otiye and Ogionwo, 2003; Olatunji, 2009). Basically, the cultural anthropological approach to entrepreneurship focus more on the non-material aspects of culture and it tends to focus on the importance of culture and its un-rivaled impact not only in determining the social structure but more specifically in influencing human behaviour generally.

Technically, the anthropological approach is partially an extension of the socio-cultural because the focus is still more on 'culture', however, this approach has been assigned a separate sub-heading in this paper because its explanations on the impact of culture on entrepreneurship is somewhat extensive than the first approach. It is conceived within the purview of this approach that the decision to engage in entrepreneurship, the degree of entrepreneurial activity and its outcome all depend on opportunity structure and cultural characteristics of not only the individual but also that of the entire cultural system of a particular society. This approach also study the impact of entrepreneurship development as it influence cultural change in the society. Furthermore, this approach sees entrepreneurship basically as a cultural element which influences cultural dimension of a society and which retrospectively influences the behaviour of individual entrepreneur. Barth (1963) viewed the entrepreneur as an individual whose activity has an impact on a community, causing social changes therein.

Generally, cultural anthropologists examine the influence of various socio-cultural variables such as family, education, ethnic background, language; age etc as it could bear a significant influence on the decision of an individual to engage in entrepreneurship. For instance, Barth (1963) explains that as there exist a marked difference in behaviour of people of different ethnic background, then the ethnic group persists as a significant unit that could influence action. Thus, ethnic differences can produce attitude differences (Baskerville, 2003) as well as behavioral differences (Abimbola, 2007).

The physical anthropologists focus on the material aspect of culture which consist of the objects which people in a particular society have learned to make and use to satisfy their needs in that society and such materials are often visible and physical and are referred to as 'artifacts' (Olatunji, 2009). Physical anthropologists are of the views that, the physical environment in which an individual or an ethnic group find themselves will to a very large extent influence their decision not only to engage in entrepreneurial action but more importantly would determine the type of entrepreneurship activities (occupation) they engage in. For instance, people of the forest areas are often hunters and farmers, while people that live in the riverside are often fishers and the people of the desert are often animal rearers.

Thus, the basic assumption of this approach is that cultural elements (material and non-material) influences entrepreneurial behaviour and entrepreneurship development could influences cultural development in form of economic growth and social change (Olatunji and Lawal, 2014). In conclusion, the anthropological approach is often ignored in the examination of entrepreneurial studies but if critically examined, one would realized that entrepreneurial actions are influenced by numerous diverse factors which would be discovered by considering the anthropological approach to the study of entrepreneurship.

The Displacement Approach

Social factors are not only numerous but more importantly dynamic. The dynamism of social factors brings about the recognition of this approach as an important social determinant of entrepreneurship. This approach could also be referred to as Pull/Push approach because of its fundamental belief that what influence people to engage in entrepreneurship are as a result of social factors which could be desirably appealing (pull) or undesirably (pushing) the individual to entrepreneurship. These factors however are inter-dependent, inter-related and dynamic in nature in such a way that both the pull and push factors work together

to influence entrepreneurial dynamics. More often than not, most other approaches tend to focus more on the factors that determine continuity and success of entrepreneurial action with less focus on the initiative factors. The displacement school however, is of the view that the basic and most important factor that makes people to turn to entrepreneurship is displacement or negative life occurrences experienced by the individual in his or her previous occupation or his or her socio-economic situations. Displacement in this perspective is seen as a consequence of social relationship and the reaction towards such displacement will also be determined by social factors. With this understanding, displacement is seen as one of the decisive social factors that condition people to become an entrepreneur. It is assumed that an individual will not engage in entrepreneurship unless they are prevented from engaging in other non-entrepreneurial economic activities, or because they are displaced from their initial economic position. Entrepreneurship results as the best alternative for such displaced individual or group of individuals. Young cited in Abimbola (2007) found that entrepreneurship occurs when a person or group has a low status, and has been in a way or the other denied access to mainstream society.

Shapero and Sokol (1982) present a model of the larger-scale precursors to starting a business. In their model, the usual inducement to forming a business is 'displacement'. For example, unemployment, termination of employment appointment; leaving school or the armed services, getting divorce, moving to another country etc. According to Shapero and Sokol, the first question asked after a displacement is whether it is desirable to start a business or not. Shapero (1981) generalized that most entrepreneurs are displaced persons who have been dislodged from their familiar niche. Shapero and Sokol (1981) found that refugees are more likely to start new ventures in their host societies than they would in their countries of origin. This suggests that in times of transition, individuals may become entrepreneurs, although entrepreneurship was not originally their intended goal.

Everett Hagen is one of the basic proponents of this perspective. According to Hagen (1962:86), the basic cause of entrepreneurial action "is the perception on the part of the members of some social group that their purpose and values in life are not respected by groups in the society whom they respect and whose esteem they value". He also noted that great traders are often aliens - Chinese, Indians, persons from the Near East, Jews, etc. He explained their entrepreneurial activity in terms of a subdominant group seeking to overcome social grievance via achievement in the economic realm. In each case, Hagen believed that the marginal

group had a sense of separateness from the rest of the host society (Hagen, 1962 cited in Abimbola, 2007:93).

According to Hagen, loss of status can occur in one of the four ways- i) the group may be displaced by force; ii) it may have its valued symbols denigrated; iii) it may drift into a situation of status inconsistency and iv) it may not be accepted in a new society, and the outcomes or reactions of the loss of status are retreatism, ritualism, innovation, reformism and rebellion. Among these reactions retreatism is important for entrepreneurship. Because retreatism is characterized by psychological repression of the trauma associated with the status loss. The suppressed rages resulting from the loss of status ultimately lead to situation whereby the later generations are socialized having this surprised rage in mind. For this reason the son's becoming innovators is increased and entrepreneurship becomes a feasible outlet for such tendencies (Islam, 1989). In a nutshell, this approach to the examination of entrepreneurship could be used to explain how negative social life experience could induce some people to become entrepreneurs. Although, this approach is useful in explaining the relevance of negative life experiences as a factor that trigger entrepreneurial startup, but it could be faulted on several grounds such that its explanations on negative life experiences as an important determinant of entrepreneurship is parochial in the sense that, entrepreneurial startup could be influenced by varying other factors such as availability of conducive business environment, availability of business capital, family background and so on. This shortcoming notwithstanding, this perspective has given an insight into one of the relevant factor that triggers entrepreneurial action.

Entrepreneurship Event Formation (EEF) Approach

The EEF approach was expounded by Shapero and Sokol (1982) and its basic assumption is that it seeks an explanation of how group membership and different socio-cultural factors available in an individual's environment affect his/her choice of entrepreneurial path. It also seeks to answer the fundamental questions like what makes an individual venture into entrepreneurship despite the numerous economic alternatives available. According to Shapero and Sokol (1982:33), "seldom can we find a case where starting a new company was the only possible alternative; no psychological framework suggests that there is a particular need or drive for company formation even though company formation may be linked to more generalized needs for achievement".

According to Abimbola (2007), the process of change in an individual's life is directed by vectors. Vectors are forces that influence the movement of an individual towards a given direction at a given time. Most members of a collectivity are held down in a particular path by the sum of vectors in their lives. These vectors could be loss of job, family situations, peer influence and several push and pull factors in an individual's life and even some covert forces most often determine behavioral direction of individuals in a social situation. For an example, an unemployed graduate may consider venturing into business if his socio-cultural background is favorable to establishing a business venture. That is, if for example, if he has a family history that is supportive of business or grew up in a business environment or has received a formal or an informal training in business. Such individual will venture into business if he calculates his social capital advantage which would serve as vectors for his decision to enter into business.

In sum, this approach to the study of entrepreneurship focused on the fact that entrepreneurship is caused by different varying factors as against the proposition of many other perspectives. This approach uses a comparative analysis method to look into the relevance and influences of various (social, psychological and socio-structural) factors in determining entrepreneurial startups, maintenance and continuity. This approach is premised on the fact that entrepreneurship is a consequence of different sociological, psychological and economic factors. This approach is different from the earlier discussed perspectives because, it perceived entrepreneurship as been triggered by multiple social factors. More so, this perspective assumed that what motivate people to engage in entrepreneurship ventures could be as a result of any of the observed factors or could be a combination of one, two or three of these factors. The uniqueness of this approach lies in the fact that the factors that influence entrepreneurship are multiple and dynamic social factors and that these social factors are numerous and contextual.

Social Capital Approach

Social Capital is a theoretical approach which has gained prominence in many social science and educational disciplines since the past twenty years (Woolcock 1998; Borgatti and Foster 2003). Its popularity is due to its consideration of the value of relationship network as a prominent factor that influences social behaviour (Haynes, 2009). Conceptually, social capital is a form of capital that an individual enjoys due to his/her level of relationships between individual or among individuals in the social system. According to Adler and Kwom (2002), the reason for an exponential growth in the utilization of social capital approach in explaining various

causes of human behaviour is because social capital lens can reveal features and causes of social behaviour that otherwise would have hitherto remain invisible with the use of other theoretical lenses.

According to Putnam (2000), social capital refers to the collective value of all 'social networks' and the social influences that arise from these networks. Coleman (1988:34) defined social capital functionally as "a variety of entities with two elements in common: they consist of some aspects of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of actors within the structure". This means that, social capital is anything generated by networks of relationships, reciprocity, trust, and social norms which facilitates individual or collective action. In Coleman's (1998) conception, social capital is a neutral resource that facilitates any manner of action.

Prominent among the scholars that initiated this theory include the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. Robert D. Putnam is another prominent academic figure that writes on the influence of social capital in determining social behaviour. It is important to note that 'the level of relationship' is important in this theoretical framework because the intensity of relationship (most often) will determine the quality and prospect of the capital to the individual and would also determine the extent to which social capital would influence the incidence of behaviour. In this perspective, it is right to say, the closer the tie, the more the possibility of causing or influencing behaviour.

Inferring from the foregoing, social capital as a theoretical approach could be used to analyze the influence of relationship network in conditioning entrepreneurship generally. In a study conducted by Alwis and Senathiraja (2003) among entrepreneurs in Sri-Lanka, social capital factors such as ethnic solidarity was found to be having a significant influence on the behaviour of entrepreneurs in the study area. Similarly, Singer (1972) study of entrepreneurs of Madras found out that the joint family organization as a form of social capital plays a positive role in promoting industrial entrepreneurship in the area (Singer, 1972). The findings of Singer (1972) suggested that social capital is an important influencing factor for the entrepreneurs he studied because it provides financial, physical and social security which make entrepreneurial activities not only possible but also successful.

Also, Borland (1994) found out that social capital is the most significant factor that is commonly associated with business students who declared entrepreneurial intentions. In a study conducted by Shivanni et.al (2010) on Indian entrepreneurs, Shivanni found out that the moral and financial support received by the entrepreneurs from their family was valuable for them and it played a significant

role in enabling them to carry out their entrepreneurial activities. Roomi's (2009), study of female entrepreneurs in Pakistan shows that lack of access to appropriate social capital by female entrepreneurs in Pakistan gives a major setback to the performance of female entrepreneurs in the study area. It was also discovered through the study that the majority of successful female entrepreneurs are those who have access to enormous social capital (those who have received high support from their extended families). In the Nigeria context, Abimbola's (2007) study of Nigerian entrepreneurs also shows that social capital is an important socio-cultural factors influencing entrepreneurial event.

In conclusion, it could be deduced from the discussions thus far that entrepreneurship is a social phenomenon, a mental activity and a phenomenon that has to do with social structure of the society. In a nutshell, entrepreneurship though is an economic phenomenon but it is largely influenced by numerous social factors and these factors are important determinants of entrepreneurship. To this extent, there is the need to give these sociological/psychological and environmental factors prominence in entrepreneurship discussion generally. In this regard, this work has attempted to present some background sociological and psychological approaches explaining different variables observed to have influence on entrepreneurship generally and the decision to involve in entrepreneurship specifically.

Summary, Conclusion and Recommendations

From the various theoretical approaches analyzed above, it would be realized that though each of the approaches present viable explanation on the relevance of non-economic factors in entrepreneurial undertakings. However, it should be noted that most of these approaches are not only complementary but they are inter-related to a large extent. For instance, the personality theories cannot be well understood except one considers the social context in which the personality develops. An example of this is visible in number of works such as Mueller and Thomas (2001). Mueller and Thomas (2001) found that as cultural distance increased, internal locus of control, risk taking and energy levels decreased. This is a pointer to the fact that socio-cultural factors play immense role in the dynamic working of the trait approach. Addressing the relevance of culture in analyses of entrepreneurial behaviour, Alwis, et.al (2003) observe that it is the system of values, beliefs and artifacts that determine entrepreneurial mind-set and serve as guidance to his personal behaviour and this mind-set is the result of his past experimental learning from socio cultural environment.

Similarly, in the theory of withdrawal of status respect, Everett Hagen's argument is that certain social changes are cause of psychological changes in a group or in an individual of the society. He believes that the initial condition leading to eventual-entrepreneurial behavior is the loss of status by a group of collectivity (Islam, 2000). This relationship is also evident in the work of McClelland. McClelland (1961) identified need for achievement as an important psychological variable influencing entrepreneurial behavior, despite the power of the psyche, McClelland also acknowledged the relevance of social factors in the making of personality when he observes that number of factors, which determine achievement orientation include environment, child-rearing practice and parent-child relationship. Rotter (1966) also made similar observation in his work on internal locus of control of the entrepreneur. Rotter's (1966) defines two categories of locus of control: one attributes cause to the individual actor while the other attributes cause to entity external to the individual, i.e. the socio-cultural environment.

In addition to this, it should also be noted that some of the approaches are not only inter and intra-related, they are also interwoven as it would be observed that some approaches might be explaining similar factors under different theoretical approaches. For example, some of the ideas pushed by the physical anthropological approach are also emphasized through the environmental and socio-structural perspective. This fact notwithstanding, if properly observed, one would realize the technical difference in them. Similarly, the basic argument of the displacement theory is similar to the argument pushed by the push/pull perspective. However, the researcher has decided to bring all these theories to focus in order to give detailed theoretical explanations to explain the relationships between socio-cultural elements and entrepreneurship dynamics in the society. By and large, the theoretical approaches as highlighted above shows that no single individual perspective or factor could account for the development of entrepreneurship. Rather, entrepreneurial behaviour is a combination of these factors in a dependent order. This means that, the interplay of socio-cultural factors, social-psychological factors as well as socio-structural factors are combined and responsible for the making of an entrepreneur. Conclusively, it could be deduced from the above that socio-cultural factors play immense roles in entrepreneurship generally. In other words, it is important to note the relevance of sociological factors in determining entrepreneurial event, entrepreneurial performance and survival. In this regard, there is the need to always consider this fact in the formulation and implementation of entrepreneurial policies and in the general curriculum of entrepreneurship studies in the country generally.

References:

- Abimbola, O.H, (2007) "Socio-Cultural Factors in Entrepreneurial Event Formation: A study of Nigerian entrepreneurs". (A Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Sociology Covenant University)
- Adler, P. and Kwom, S.W. (2002) *Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept*, *Academy of Management Review* 27(1) 17-40
- Adunola, A. (2009) *Entrepreneurship Development and Employment Creation in Ilorin Metropolis* (A M.Sc. Research Dissertation submitted to the Department of Sociology, University of Ilorin. Ilorin, (Nigeria).
- Agu, R.O. (2010) *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Concepts, Theories and Concepts* (Vol. 1) Onisha: Kawuris and Manilas Publishers Ltd. Anambra Nigeria
- Alwis, W.P.G. and Senathiraja, R (2003) "The Impact of Socio - Cultural Background of the Entrepreneur on Management and Business Practices of selected Small and Medium Scale Businesses in Sri Lanka". A paper presented at 9th International Conference on Sri Lanka Studies. Held at Matara, Sri Lanka from 28th to 30th November 2003
- Bamiduro, J.A. (1999) "Small-Scale Industries under the Structural Adjustment Programme" In Saliu, H.A. (ed.) *Issues in Contemporary Political Economy of Nigeria*. Ilorin: Haytee Books.
- Barth, F. (1963) "The Role of the Entrepreneur and Social Change in Northern Norway" *American Journal of Small Business* (Winter): 25-30.
- Baskerville, R.F. (2003) "Hofstede Never Studied Culture." *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 28(1):1-14.
- Becker, G.S. (1993) *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bloodgood, J.M., Sapienza, H.J (1995) *The Dynamics of New Business Start-Ups: Person, Context, and Process*. Greenwich: JAI Press INC,
- Borgatti, S.P., and Foster, P.B. (2003) "The Network Paradigm in Organizational Research: A Review and Typology" *Journal of Management* 29(6) 991-1013.
- Borlind, M. (1994) "Social Capital as a Network Theory" *Connections* 11(2):19-30.
- Bygrave, W.D. & Hofer, C.W. (1991) "Theorizing about Entrepreneurship" *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice* 16(2): 13-22
- Coleman, J.S. (1988) "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital" *American Journal of Sociology* 9(4) pp95 120
- Davidsson, P. and Wilkund, J. (1995) "Values, Beliefs and Regional Variations in New Firm Formation Rates" *Journal of Economic Psychology* 18: 179-199
- Hagen, E.E. (1962) *On the Theory of Social Change: How Economic Growth Begins*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

- Harris, M. (1995) *Culture People and Nature: An introduction to Anthropology* New York: Harcourt Base Publishers
- Haynes, P. (2009) "Before Going Any Further With Social Capital: Eight Key Criticisms to Address". *Working Paper Series* Institute of Innovation and Knowledge Management, INGENIO (CSIC-UPV) Valencia
- Hofstede, G (2001) *Cultures Consequences*, 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Igbinedion, S.O. and Akpeti, E.O. (2010) "Unleashing Entrepreneurship for Economic Growth: Challenges and Opportunities" *African Review of Social and Management Sciences* 1(1). Pp 19-29.
- Ijaiya, G.T., Mohammed, L.A.B. and Chika, U.A. (2010) "The Informal Sector and Poverty Reduction in Nigeria: A Framework for Policy Analysis" *Ilorin Journal of Business and Social Sciences* 14 (1&2) 13- 27.
- Islam N. M. (2000) "Theories on Entrepreneurship", in Rahman A.H.M.(ed) *Entrepreneurship*. Bangladesh: University Grand Commission
- Katz, J.A. (1991) "The Institution and Infrastructure of Entrepreneurship" *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(3)
- Kilby, P. (1971) *Hunting the Heffalump* In P. Kilby, (Ed). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Development*. New York: Free Press.
- Lachman, R. (1980) "Toward Measurement of Entrepreneurial Tendencies". *Management International Review*, 20(2), 108-116.
- Lasry, J.C. (1982). *Une diaspora Francophone au Quebec: les Juifs Sepharades*. Questions de Culture, vol. 2, pp. 113-138. Quebec, PQ: Institut de Recherche sur la Culture.
- Longenecker, J.G., Moore, W.C and J. Petty, W. (2003) *Small Business Management: An Entrepreneurial Emphasis*, Ohio: Thomson South-Western
- McClelland, D. (1961) *The Achieving Society*. New Jersey: Van Nostrand
- Morris, M.H. and Lewis, P.S. (1991) "Entrepreneurship as a Significant Factor in Social Quality of Life" *Journal of Business Research*, 23(1):21-36.
- Mueller, S.L. and Thomas, A. S. (2000) "A case for Comparative Entrepreneurship: Assessing the Relevance of Culture". *Journal of International Business Studies* 31(2): 287
- Nwagwu, A. (2007) *Higher Education for Self-Reliance: An Imperative for the Nigeria Economy*. NEAP publications Accessed on 26th May, 2013 from www.google.com
- Okpara, F. (2005) *The Practice of Entrepreneurship*. Enugu: Precision Publishers Limited, Nigeria.

- Olatunji, A. (2009) "Socio-Cultural Factors and Work-Related Attitudes of Employees in the Banking Sector: The Case of Bank Workers in Ilorin, Kwara state". *Lapai Sociological Review* 1(2) pp 212-231
- Olatunji, A. (2011) "Entrepreneurship Development: A Viable Option for Curbing Political Violence and Enhancing Democratic Consolidation in Nigeria" A paper presented at the *Anthropological and Sociological Association of Nigeria (ASAN) Annual Conference held at University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria*. From August 9-11, 2011
- Olatunji, A. (2012) "The Relevance of Guidance and Counseling in Entrepreneurial Empowerment" *Sokoto Journal of Social Sciences* 2(2) pp 65-78
- Olatunji, A. (2013) "The Practice of Human Capital Management among Small Scale Entrepreneurs: An Empirical Overview" *Centre Point Journal (Humanities edition)* 16(1) pp 19-40
- Olatunji, A. and Lawal, E.E and Raji K.O (2014) "Considering Cultural Entrepreneurship for Economic Development in Nigeria" *Advanced Management* Published by the Department of Business Administration, University of Ilorin
- Otite, O and Ogionwo, W. (2003) *An Introduction to Sociological Studies*. Nigeria: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Putnam, R (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* New York: Simon and Schuster
- Reynolds, P. D. (1991) "Sociology and Entrepreneurship: Concepts and Contributions". *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 16, No. 2, 47-67.
- Robinson, P.B. and Sexton, E.A. (1994) "The effect of Education and Experience on Self-Employment Success", *Journal of Business Venturing* 9 (2), 141-156
- Roomi, M. A (2009) *Entrepreneurial Capital, Social Values and Islamic Traditions: Growth of Women-Owned Enterprises in Pakistan*. Retrieved from www.google.com on 28/10/2010
- Rotter, J.B. (1966) "Generalized Expectations for Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement" *Psychological Monographs* 80, 609
- Salihu, M.E. (2009) "Creativity and Entrepreneurship" In Abdulkadir, D.S. (ed.) *Contemporary Approach to Entrepreneurial Development* Published by the Department of Business Administration, Ibrahim Babangida University, Lapai, Niger State
- Sarkin-Daji, B.D. (2009) "Foundations and Framework of Entrepreneurship" In D.S.Abdulkadir, (ed.) *Contemporary Approach to Entrepreneurial Development* Published by the Department of Business Administration. Lapai: Niger State
- Sayigh, Y.A. (1962). *Entrepreneurs of Lebanon* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Shapero, A.C. and Sokol, L., (1981) "The Displaced, Uncomfortable Entrepreneur" *Psychology Today*, 83-88.
- Shivani, P. Senath, R. (2010) "Socio-cultural Factors and Entrepreneurial Activity: A Study of Indian Entrepreneurs" *Global Entrepreneur* 10(01) PP 61-72.
- Shapero, A. C. and Sokol, L., (1982) "The Social Dimensions of Entrepreneurship", in C. Kent, D. Sexton, and K.H. Vesper (eds.) *The Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. 72-90
- Singer, P. (1972) "*Beyond Tradition and Modernity in Madras*" Comparative Studies in Society and History 13(02) PP 160-195.
- Wale-Awe, O. (2010) *Entrepreneurship Development* 5th Edition, Lagos: UBT Print-serve Ventures.
- Woolcock, M. (1998) "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework" *Theory and Society*, 27(2):151-208
- Young, J.E. (1997) "Entrepreneurship Education and Learning for University Students and Practicing Entrepreneurs". In Sexton, D.L. and Simlor, R. W. (eds), *Entrepreneurship*. Chicago: Upstart Publishing