Creativity as a Predictor of Entrepreneurship Orientation among Indigenous Entrepreneurs in South-South Nigeria

Dapper, Edwin M. (Ph.D), Ezenwuba Paul C. (Ph.D) & Agbele George. (Ph.D)
Department of Business Administration
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University
Igbariam, Anambra State
dapper.edwin@gmail.com, Paulymex2012@gmail.com
georgeashams@gmail.com

Abstract
This paper focused on creativity as a predictor of entrepreneurship orientation among indigenous entrepreneurs in South-South Nigeria. The research design for this study is the survey research design. The population of the study covered 240 indigenous entrepreneurs selected across the six states of south-south region of Nigeria. The researcher however used the Taro Yamene method to determine the sample size; hence 183 indigenous entrepreneurs were selected from the population. The data used in this study was generated from two major sources namely; primary sources and secondary sources. The major instrument for data collection was a five point likert scale questionnaire titled creativity and entrepreneurship orientation questionnaire (C and EOQ). A reliability index of 0.95 (95%) was obtained which shows that the instrument of the study is highly reliable. The statistical tool used for data analysis in this study is t-test using the 20.0 version of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) and the following results were obtained for hypotheses one, two and three respectively (0.05>0.001, 0.05>0.000 and 0.013<0.05).The study concludes that the entrepreneurship orientation of indigenous entrepreneurs in south-south Nigeria can be understudied through a cursory and closer study of their creativity. Sequel to this conclusion, this paper recommends that government agencies both at the federal and state and all other entrepreneurship stakeholders should help in the development of the skills of the indigenes especially during early education stages. This will help government effectively map the creative capacities of her indigenes with the intent of providing entrepreneurship development programmes that are consistent with their creative capabilities.

Introduction

There is a growing concern among scholars and practitioners alike on the driving force of entrepreneurs' behavior. While it may not be out of place to posit that the study of entrepreneurship has created a whole and wide body of knowledge through its theories, principles and methodologies, understanding while some persons are entrepreneurial while others do not give considerable attention remains an area of knowledge that is yet to receive sufficient scholarly attention. This study therefore will help feel a needful knowledge space in the broader study and understanding of entrepreneurship

The south-south region of Nigeria is known for its endowed natural mineral resources which has made it possible for what may arguably pass as cheap money to be available to its government and citizens. While many argue that this situation has created a chaotic and dampened entrepreneurial orientation among its citizens, others posit that it is the failure of leadership from the national to state level as manifest in misappropriation and misapplication of the mineral resources revenue. While this paper holds a distinct opinion from this

contemporary discourse, its focus is to use the manifest creative abilities of the people to predict the entrepreneurial orientation in them

Objectives of the Study

This paper is aimed at achieving the following specific objectives;

i. Examine if expected creativity does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs risk taking orientation

ii. Examine if responsiveness of entrepreneurs does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs' proactiveness

iii. Examine if contributory creativity of entrepreneurs does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs' innovativeness

Hypotheses

H_{O1}: Expected creativity does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs risk taking orientation

H_{O2}: Responsiveness of entrepreneurs does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs' proactiveness

H_{O3}: Contributory creativity of entrepreneurs does not have significant predictive effects on entrepreneurs' innovativeness

Review of Literatures

Employees' Creativity

Creativity has been examined through multiple perspectives: person, process, product, and press (Runco, 2004). For this reason, understanding creativity within an organizational context requires acknowledging the complexity of the construct. From a person perspective, creativity is viewed as a quality of individual talents and traits (Hennessey and Amabile, 2010) while a process perspective views it as a process with different stages through which ideas are generated. Research that examines creativity from a press (situational influences on creativity) perspective examines situational and environmental influences: cultural, organizational and familial that influence creative person and/or creative process (Hunter, Bedell, and Mumford, 2007). creativity as a product, commonly defined as *novel (original, new) ideas about the processes, services, and products that have a potential to be valuable (useful, appropriate) to an organization either in the short- or long term* (Amabile and Pillemer, 2012). Wang and Netemeyer (2004) adapted this definition to the service delivery context and defined creative sales behaviours as "the amount of new ideas generated and novel behaviours exhibited by a salesperson when performing his or her job activities". Implicit in this definition is the notion of usefulness because if new ideas are generated and/or novel behaviours performed, it is because they are considered beneficial in solving sales problems. It is important to clarify the "novelty" and "usefulness" aspects of creativity as some authors suggested that it is challenging to judge ideas based on such criteria. Indeed, what is original in one field has already been discovered in another field (George, 2007). For instance, methods that have been established in a design firm to develop new products can be very new to the service delivery process in a banking industry. In their earlier review of the creativity literature, Shalley and colleagues (2004) noted that ideas are considered novel if they are unique in relation to other ideas currently available in an organization. Thus, for an idea to be considered creative, it does not necessarily have to be new in a specific context, but novel for an organization. The question of "useful for whom?" has also been raised by researchers. Ideas are considered useful if they have the potential for direct or indirect value to an organization, in either the short or long term. Furthermore, in addressing these matters, creativity scholars agree that novelty and value of a creative product is a domain-specific and subjective judgment. Amabile and Pillemer (2012)

suggest that to assess novelty and usefulness of a creative product, one should be an external observer with a domain-relevant experience and should use his/her own subjective judgments of creativity. One cannot expect to avoid subjectivity in assessing novelty and usefulness of ideas because researchers assign attributes of people, processes, and places as contributors to creative products and acts.

Types of Creativity

Unsworth (2001) identified four types of creativity, which are categorized along two dimensions: (i) driver for engagement in creative activity (internal/external) and (ii) type of problem (closed/ open). External driver for engagement in creative activity can be a situation or a specific job that requires an individual to be creative, whereas internal driver can be one's inner desire to be creative. Open problem in organizational setting is characterized by employees discovering problems themselves, whereas a closed problem is one formulated and presented to employees. Unsworth's model (2001) represents four major categories: expected, proactive, responsive, and contributory types of creativity, but these dimensions represent a continua rather than defined categories. Expected creativity in organizational settings reflects situations/jobs that by definition require creative solutions to self-discovered problems and entail employee discretion in the choice of problems. Total Quality Management practices are an example of expected creativity. Responsive creativity is driven by external conditions and closed problems - a person has the least choices over problem. Jobs that by definition require creativity for solving stakeholders' presented problems fall under this category. For instance, the work of designers, architects, and R&D scientists require creative solutions for specific offered problems. As mentioned above, Unsworth's types of creativity are context-specific even for the same type of job. For instance, a web designer could work on a customer-specific problem, but in another context will proactively discover problems him/herself and suggest improvements. Contributory creativity is an internally driven (self-determined) response to a formulated problem. It involves voluntary behaviours such as when employees from one department voluntarily help to solve a specific problem in another department. Finally, proactive creativity occurs when individuals are internally driven to search for problems and generate solutions. For instance, in customer contact jobs employees can be internally driven to engage in a creative process to solve self-discovered or stakeholder-presented problems.

Although it is possible for creativity to be required in customer contact jobs in some organizations, it is usually not specified in the job description and therefore it constitutes a discretionary behaviour or an output of an internal drive (Martinaityte and Sacramento, 2013). Customer contact employees constantly deal with challenges their customers face and therefore are motivated to discover problems (open problem) which then need novel solutions. In addition to discovering problems, customer contact employees can also be invited to respond to a framed/proposed problem by their managers or customers. For instance, employees may be asked to suggest ideas for reducing operational costs in their unit. In such a case, employees would be dealing with closed problems. Based on Unsworth's (2001) taxonomy, this research focuses on proactive and contributory types of creativity, which are internally driven responses to either self-discovered and/or proposed problems. While the extant creativity research has focused predominantly on externally-driven creativity, driven by job requirements or situational demands (Hirst et al., 2009) recent research examines creativity in jobs where creativity may not be a requirement such as sales and customer service (Gong et al., 2009).

Entrepreneurial Orientation

EO has been considered a valid concept in the field of entrepreneurship, because it is an efficient tool for acquiring evidence of entrepreneurial actions and decision-making across multiple organizational and geographic contexts (Kemelgor, 2002). EO as a driving force

behind entrepreneurial activities has become a central theme of the discipline of entrepreneurship (Wales, Monsen and McKelvie, 2011).On a general level, EO demonstrates a firm's organizational processes, methods, and styles that it uses to act. Thus, the process of entrepreneurship is emphasized over the actors behind it, which puts entrepreneurship in a management framework. Despite of the large amount of studies examining EO, there are still various debates about it, the forces driving it, its appearance and about the connection between EO and performance (Miller, 2011).

Dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation

As stated in the previous section, Covin and Slevin's (1988) three-dimensional definition of EO is adopted and it is treated as a multi-dimensional construct. Thus, this subsection presents those dimensions of innovativeness, risk-taking and proactiveness in more detail after which it discusses the multi-dimensionality of EO.

Innovativeness: According to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), Schumpeter (1942) was one of the first to highlight the role of innovation in the entrepreneurial process. Schumpeter (1942) describes a process of "creative destruction", where wealth creation occurs through disruption of existing market structures due to introduction of new goods and/or services that cause resources to move away from existing firms to new ones thus allowing the growth of the new firms. Lumpkin and Dess (1996) argue that the process of creative destruction is initiated by an entrepreneur, which makes innovation an important success factor within EO. Furthermore, this link between entrepreneurship and innovativeness is supported by the results of Shane, Kolvereid and Westhead (1991), who found that innovation is among the key motives to start a business.

Lumpkin and Dess (1996), state that innovativeness reflects a firm's tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation, and creative processes that may result in new products, services, or technological processes. Innovativeness refers to willingness to move forward from existing technologies or practices and explore beyond the current borders and shows that a firm is putting effort into introducing new products to the market. Thus, innovativeness is vital for maintaining a firm's viability because it is the source of ideas that lead to improvements and new products and thus helps in sustaining a thriving firm (Lumpkin, Brigham, and Moss, 2010).

Innovativeness is also of high importance because as the markets nowadays change in a rapid pace, maintaining competitive advantage is crucial. Innovativeness can be a key to this, because it can be a source of significant progress and growth for a firm. Dess and Lumpkin (2005) states that innovativeness plays a key role in the construct of EO, its importance in this study becomes even greater. This is due to the fact that, innovativeness is a culturally bound concept, which suggests that its levels and impacts across cultural barriers may differ.

Risk-taking: Risk-taking entails the willingness to pursue opportunities that have a substantial likelihood of producing losses or significant performance discrepancies (Morris, Kuratko and Covin, 2008). Risk-taking is normally associated with entrepreneurship because the concept of entrepreneurship in its original form includes the assumption of personal risk-taking (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). On firm level, risk-taking refers to the tendency to support projects with uncertain expected returns (Walter, Auer and Ritter, 2006).Firms with an EO often engage in risky activities, such as high leveraging and large resource commitments in the desire of gaining high returns by pursuing opportunities in the market. Finally, personal risk is related to a person, normally an executive, who decides to favor a certain strategic course of action.

The risk here stems from the influence the executive has on the direction of the company, which can in case of failure also lead to personal consequences. (Dess and Lumpkin, 2005)

Proactiveness: Liebermann and Montgomery (1988) state, that first-mover strategy is the best strategy for capitalizing on a market opportunity. If a firm spots an opportunity in the market and is the first to act upon it, it can make abnormal profits and benefit from brand recognition. Thus, proactiveness, which refers to taking initiative, anticipating and carrying out new opportunities, and creating new markets or participating in emerging ones, is also associated with entrepreneurship, and is an important dimension of EO (Walter, Auer and Ritter, 2006). According to Smith, Ferries and Grimm (2001), proactiveness is significant for EO because of its forward-looking perspective. A proactive firm is able to identify possible emerging problems and find solutions for them. Due to this, proactiveness can be key for competitive advantage, because competitors need to respond to the successful initiatives of the pioneer. The pioneer may also succeed in locking in customers due to high switching costs. Venkatraman (1989) proposes that proactiveness refers to processes aimed at foreseeing and acting on future needs by searching for new opportunities which may relate to present operations or differ from them. Thus proactiveness can refer to the introduction of completely new products and brands before competitors, and also to eliminating those operations which have turned or are turning unprofitable.

Materials and Methods

The research design for this study is the survey research design. The choice of survey design is appropriate since the population under study is finite. The population of the study covered 240 indigenous entrepreneurs selected across the six states of south-south region of Nigeria. The researcher however used the Taro Yamene method to determine the sample size; hence 183 indigenous entrepreneurs were selected from the population. The data used in this study was generated from two major sources namely; primary sources and secondary sources. The primary sources include; questionnaire and oral interview, while the secondary sources are journals, articles, internet, textbooks, and the records and publications of the banks. The major instrument for data collection was a five point likert scale questionnaire titled creativity and entrepreneurship orientation questionnaire (C and EOQ). Face to face approach was adopted in administering the questionnaires, hence; the researcher gave the questionnaire to the respondents physically and retrieved the filled copies of the questionnaire using the same approach. The questionnaire was subjected to face and content validation and its consistency tested using Spearman rank correlation coefficient (r). A reliability index of 0.95 (95%) was obtained which shows that the instrument of the study is highly reliable. The statistical tool used for data analysis in this study is t-test using the 20.0 version of statistical package for social sciences (SPSS). The formular for t-test is given as;

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

Where,

$\bar{x}_1$ = Mean of first set of values, $\bar{x}_2$ = Mean of second set of values, S_1 = Standard deviation of first set of values, S_2 = Standard deviation of second set of values, n_1 = Total number of values in first set and n_2 = Total number of values in second set.

Results

The researcher used this section to present and analyze the data used for this study. The statistical techniques used for the analysis are simple percentage (%) and t-test using (SPSS 20.0 version).

SPSS Output for Hypothesis One

```
T-TEST GROUPS=RANKS(5 1)
  /MISSING=ANALYSIS
  /VARIABLES=ECandRT
  /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
```

Group Statistics

	RANKS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
ECandRT	5.00	5	30.4000	6.69328	2.99333
	1.00	5	10.6000	6.42651	2.87402

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
EC and RT	Equal variances assumed	.159	.701	4.771	8	.001	19.80000	4.14970	10.23078	29.36922
	Equal variances not assumed			4.771	7.987	.001	19.80000	4.14970	10.22802	29.37198

The SPSS output shows that the p-value (sig 2-tailed) is 0.001 which is less than the level of significance (0.05), therefore we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and conclude that expected creativity has significant predictive influence on risk taking behavior of entrepreneurs

SPSS Output for Hypothesis Two

```
T-TEST GROUPS=RANKS(5 1)
  /MISSING=ANALYSIS
  /VARIABLES=RCandPr
  /CRITERIA=CI(.95)
```

Group Statistics

	RANKS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
RCandPr	5.00	5	26.0000	2.73861	1.22474
	1.00	5	8.4000	5.17687	2.31517

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
RC and Pr	Equal variances assumed	1.826	.214	6.720	8	.000	17.60000	2.61916	11.56021	23.63979
	Equal variances not assumed			6.720	6.076	.001	17.60000	2.61916	11.21058	23.98942

The p-value (Sig 2-tailed) from the SPSS output above is 0.000 which is less than the level of significance (0.05), therefore we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and conclude that responsiveness has significant predictive effect on the proactiveness of entrepreneurs

SPSS Output for Hypothesis Three

```
T-TEST GROUPS=RANKS(5 1)
  /MISSING=ANALYSIS
  /VARIABLES=CCandI
  /CRITERIA=CI(.95).
```

Group Statistics

	RANKS	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
CCandI	5.00	4	25.0000	3.91578	1.95789
	1.00	4	9.5000	7.93725	3.96863

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
CC and I	Equal variances assumed	4.900	.069	3.503	6	.013	15.50000	4.42531	4.67167	26.32833
	Equal variances not assumed			3.503	4.379	.021	15.50000	4.42531	3.62128	27.37872

It can be seen from the SPSS output above that the p-value (Sig 2-tailed) is 0.013 which is less than the level of significance (0.05), therefore we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and conclude

that contributory creativity has significant predictive effect on the innovativeness of entrepreneurs

Discussion of Findings

In hypothesis one, the result shows that *expected creativity* has significant predictive effect on the risk taking orientation of entrepreneurs as the level of significance was greater than the p-value (i.e 0.05>0.001). The output of hypothesis two proved that the predictive effect of responsiveness on entrepreneur's proactiveness is more very as the p-value obtained showed a result far lesser than others tested. The null hypothesis was therefore rejected in place of the alternative, this is because the level of significance is higher than the p-value (i.e 0.05>0.000). The result of hypothesis three shows that contributory creativity has significant predictive effect on entrepreneur's innovativeness as the alternative hypotheses was accepted in place of the null hypotheses as a result of the p-value been lesser than the level of significance (i.e 0.013<0.05).

Conclusion and Recommendation

Understanding entrepreneurship orientation has been the crux of this paper and bearing in mind the environmental concern in the area of study, this study concludes that the entrepreneurship orientation of indigenous entrepreneurs in south-south Nigeria can be understudied through a cursory and closer study of their creativity. Sequel to this conclusion, this paper recommends that government agencies both at the federal and state and all other entrepreneurship stakeholders should help in the development of the skills of the indigenes especially during early education stages. This will help government effectively map the creative capacities of her indigenes with the intent of providing entrepreneurship development programmes that are consistent with their creative capabilities.

References

Amabile, T. M., and Pillemer, J. (2012).Perspectives on the Social Psychology of Creativity.*The Journal of Creative Behavior, 46*, 3-15.

Coelho, F., Augusto, M. r., and Lages, L. F. (2011). Contextual factors and the creativity of frontline employees: The mediating effects of role stress and intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Retailing, 87*, 31-45.

Covin, J. G., and Slevin, D. P. (1989).Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments.*Strategic Management Journal* , 75-87

Dess, G.G. and Lumpkin, G.T., (2005). The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship.*Academy of Management Executive*, 19(1), pp. 147–156.

Drucker, P.F. (1985). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers

Fiet, J.O. (2002). *The Systematic Search for Entrepreneurial Discoveries*, Westport, CT: Quorum Books

George, J. M. (2007). Chapter 9: Creativity in organizations. *The Academy of Management Annals, 1*, 439 - 477.

Gong, Y., Huang, J.-C., and Farh, J.-L. (2009). Employee learning orientation, transformational leadership, and employee creativity: The mediating role of employee creative self-efficacy. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*, 765-778.

Hennessey, B. A., and Amabile, T. M. (2010).Creativity.*Annual Review of Psychology, 61*, 569-598.

Hirst, G., van Knippenberg, D., and Zhou, J. (2009). A cross-level perspective on employee creativity: Goal orientation, team learning behavior, and individual creativity. *Academy of Management Journal, 52*, 280-293.

Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., and Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for creativity: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal*, *19*, 69-90.

Kemelgor, B. H., (2002). A comparative analysis of corporate entrepreneurial orientation between selected firms in the Netherlands and the USA.*Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14(1), pp. 67–87

Landström, H., (2005). *Pioneers in entrepreneurship and small business research.*[ebook] New York: Springer. Available through: HELCAT/Aalto University Library,

Lieberman, M. B. and Montgomery, D. B., (1988).First-Mover Advantages.*Strategic Management Journal*, 9(Special Issue), pp. 41–58.Töölö http://lib.hse.fi/FI/ecampus/

Lumpkin, G. T., Brigham, K. H. and Moss, T. W., (2010).*Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 22(3-4), pp. 241–264.

Lumpkin, G., and Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the Entrepreneurial Orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of management review* , 137-172.

Martinaityte, I., and Sacramento, C. A. (2013).When creativity enhances sales effectiveness: The moderating role of leader–member exchange.*Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34*, 974-994.

Miller, D. (2011). Revisited A reflection on EO Research and some Suggestions for the Future. *Entrepreneurship, Theory, and Practice* , 873-894.

Morris, M.H., Kuratko, D.F. and Covin, J.G., (2008). *Corporate Entrepreneurship and Innovation.*2nd ed. Mason, OH, USA: Thomson Higher Education.

Murphy, J.P, Liao, J and Welsch, P.H. (2006). A Conceptual history of entrepreneurial thought, *Journal of Management History*. *12*, 9-24.

Runco, M. A. (2004). Creativity.*Annual Review of Psychology*, *55*, 657-688

Say, J.B. (1803). TraitéD'économiePolitique, ou Simple Exposition de la ManièreDont se Forment, se Distribuent, et se Composent les Richesses, A.A. Renouard, Paris.

Schumpeter, J. A., (1942). *Capitalism, socialism, and democracy.*New York: Harper & Brothers.

Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here? *Journal of Management, 30*, 933-958.

Shane S., (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus.* Cheltenham, U.K.: Edward Elgar

Shane, S.; Kolvereid, L. and Westhead, P. (1991).An exploratory examination of the reasons leading to new firm formation across country and gender.*Journal ofBusiness Venturing, 6*, 431-446

Smith, K., Ferrier, W. and Grimm, C., (2001). King of the hill: Dethroning the industry leader. *Academy of Management Executive*, 15(2), pp. 59–70.

Stevenson, H., and Harmeling, S. (1990). Entrepreneurial Management's Need for a More "Chaotic" Theory", *Journal of Business Venturing*, *5*, 1-14.

Unsworth, K. (2001). Unpacking creativity.*Academy of Management Review, 26*, 289-297

Venkatraman, N., (1989). Strategic orientation of business enterprises: The construct, dimensionality, and measurement. *Management Science*, 35(8), pp. 942–962.

Wales, W., Monsen, E., and McKelvie, A., (2011).The Organizational Pervasiveness of Entrepreneurial Orientation.*Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(5), pp. 895–923.

Walter, A., Auer, M. and Ritter, T., (2006).The impact of network capabilities and entrepreneurial orientation on university spin-off performance.*Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(4), pp. 541–567.