

# AN ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF CULTURAL DIMENSIONS ON ENTREPRENEURIAL MARKETING PERFORMANCE IN SELECTED SMALL BUSINESS OUTFITS IN DELTA STATE.

By

**OLANNYE, Ajulu Peter**

Department of Business Administration and Marketing, Delta State University, Asaba Campus.

&

**ONIANWA, Hilda Isioma**

Department of Business Administration and Marketing Delta State University, Asaba Campus

## *Abstract*

*Conventional marketing appears not to be effective for small business entrepreneurship competitiveness. Entrepreneurial marketing performance is dependent on so many factors with culture which seems to be the most silent. This study examines the dimensions of culture on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The geographic areas for this study were Oshimili South, Uvwie, and Ethiope East local government areas in Delta State, with total population of 760 SMEs. The sample objects comprised 262 small business entrepreneurship outfits that were selected through stratified random sampling method. The research instrument for data collection was a 30- item modified structured questionnaire on a five point likert scale. Data obtained were analyzed using correlation and multiple regression as analytical tools. The findings revealed that low power distance, low uncertainty avoidance, collectivism and masculinity dimensions of culture exhibited positive effect on small business entrepreneurial performance, while individualism has no statistical effect on entrepreneurial performance. It is concluded that cultural dimensions have significant impact on entrepreneurial marketing performance, in the context of cultural setting in the business environment. The study recommends that entrepreneurs should minimize inequality in their venture, have positive attitude towards uncertainty and environmental changes, and achievement motivation.*

*Keywords: Cultural Dimension, Masculinity/femininity, Entrepreneurial Marketing Performance.*

## **Introduction**

The nature of today's business world makes it seem mandatory to consider culture as one imperative factor which could influence the success of businesses and organizations. Improper understanding of cultural interplay is capable of ruining business deals, hurt sales, or harms the corporate image of any organization. The impetus of entrepreneurial marketing in a country mostly lies within the individuals in that society and on the degree of internal and external stimuli with regards to the spirit of enterprise. Based on this, the key question surfaces, what actually triggers entrepreneurial marketing? Regardless

of the divers triggers of entrepreneurship, the relation of culture and entrepreneurial marketing activities is vital because the innate culture in a nation invariable has a link with how people think and behave therefore, one can easily infer that culture seems to shape the entrepreneurship practices. It may either hinder or stimulate.

Conventional marketing practices appear not to be effective for entrepreneurial firm competitiveness. Entrepreneurial marketing (EM) refers to the interface between marketing and entrepreneurial orientations of Small and Medium Enterprises. This underlines an awareness of the importance of

entrepreneurship and innovation to marketing, and marketing for successful entrepreneurship. The emphasis is adapting form of marketing that are suitable for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and recognizing the important role of entrepreneurs in any marketing activities (Stokes, 2000). Entrepreneurial marketing (EM) is proactive identification and exploitation of opportunities for acquiring and retaining profitable customers through innovative approaches to risk management, resource leveraging and value creation." (Morris, Schindehutte, and LaForge, 2002). Morris et al. (2002) develop seven underlying dimensions of EM: Proactiveness, calculated risk taking, innovativeness, opportunity focus, resource leveraging, customer intensity, and value creation.

The use of cultural dimensions as framework in entrepreneurial discourse has been proposed in a variety of studies and in different contexts for example cultural dimension has been used to understudy role conflict and ambiguity, entrepreneurial intentions, entrepreneurial starts ups, entrepreneurial orientation, risk taking, innovation etc. however, none of these previous studies have shown how cultural dimensions affect positively or negatively the entrepreneurial marketing performance. Again, many of these studies were conducted in western world with only very few in Africa and non in Nigeria to the best of our knowledge. Despite the theoretical and practical limitations of previous studies, they have contributed to better understanding of culture - entrepreneurship relationship. However, these studies are rather prescriptive without getting to a very clear/strong description of how entrepreneurship is culturally constructed. Therefore this research strives to broaden our understanding of how cultural dimensions can be adopted to analyze the behavior of entrepreneurs in Nigeria with respect to their performance.

The constructs of cultural dimensions such as power distance, uncertainty

avoidance, masculinity/femininity and individualism/collectivism as put forward by Hofstede (2001) would be examined in relation to entrepreneurial marketing performance.

The major objective of this study is to examine the impact of cultural dimensions on entrepreneurial marketing performance in Small and Medium Scale enterprises. The specific objectives are to: find out the impact of power distance on entrepreneurial marketing performance, ascertain the impact of uncertainty avoidance on entrepreneurial marketing performance, examine the impact of individualism/collectivism on entrepreneurial marketing performance and determine the impact of masculinity/femininity on entrepreneurial performance.

#### **Statement of the problem**

Culture has been recognized in various management theories and models as a factor that affect positively or negatively the performance of business but in practice, most entrepreneurs appear not to consider the cultural factors in their business environment and how they play out, hence the reason for poor performance in most entrepreneurial outfits. What appears apparent to researchers about conventional marketing practices is that they are seldom available to appropriate for entrepreneurial firm competitiveness. Again in most research studies, culture was treated as a sub variable rather than a main variable that is as a context in which business performance should be explained. There have been a lot of studies on the factors that militate against the performance of small and medium scale enterprise (SMEs) some studies came up with findings like inadequate access to finance, poor infrastructure, lack of managerial skill etc but little or no attention is given to culture whereas, culture is a fundamental issue in today's business.

### **Research Hypotheses**

This study is anchored on the following research hypotheses:

H<sub>01</sub> Power distance has no significant relationship with entrepreneurial marketing performance.

H<sub>02</sub> Uncertainty avoidance has no significant relationship with entrepreneurial marketing performance.

H<sub>03</sub> Individualism/collectivism has no significant relationship with entrepreneurial marketing performance.

H<sub>04</sub> Masculinity/Feminity has no significant relationship with entrepreneurial marketing performance

### **Conceptual Review**

#### **Concept of Cultural Dimension**

Culture is a collective programming of the mind that distinguishes members of one group from another (Hofstede, 1980). Hofstede came up with four basic cultural dimensions: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/feminity. Power distance is a “measure of the interpersonal power or influence between B (the boss) and S (the subordinate) as perceived by the less powerful of the two, S (the subordinate)” (Hofstede, 1980). In high power distance cultures there is an unequal distribution of power, strong hierarchies and control mechanisms are present, there is less communication among organizational levels, and an emphasis is placed on subordinates being deferential and obedient to those in positions of power. Uncertainty avoidance measures the ability of a society to deal with the inherent ambiguities and complexities of life. Cultures that are high in uncertainty avoidance rely heavily on written rules and regulations, embrace formal structures as a way of coping with uncertainty, and have very little tolerance for ambiguity or

change. Individualism describes the relationship that exists between the individual and the collectivity in a culture. Societies high in individualism value freedom and autonomy, view results as coming from individual (and not group) achievements, and place the interests of the individual over the interests of the group. Masculinity is primarily concerned with the level of aggression and assertiveness present in a culture. Highly masculine cultures place a high emphasis on assertive and ostentatious behavior, material goods and prestige are highly sought after, individuals tend to exhibit a high need for achievement, and organizations are more willing to engage in industrial conflict.

#### **Entrepreneurial Marketing Performance.**

A stream of research describes Entrepreneurial Marketing as the Marketing orientation of SMEs. It involves a focus on establishing a balance between marketing and entrepreneurial orientations of SMEs. Highly performing entrepreneurs are important to the development of society because they contribute to the creation of employment opportunities, and to the advancement of economic growth (Wei-Wen, 2009). Firm performance is a focal, complex and multidimensional phenomenon in business studies and it is used to refer to the firm's success in the market, which may have different outcomes. Performance can be characterized as the entrepreneurial ability to create acceptable outcomes and actions. The concept of performance is often used to refer to a firm's financial outcome (Islam, Khan, Obaidullah and Alam, 2011). Entrepreneurial marketing performance has been defined in various dimensions by different scholars. In most studies in Nigeria, entrepreneurial marketing performance was defined as surviving the first two or three years that the venture was in business (Owoseni and Akanbi,

2010). In Paige and Littrell (2002), entrepreneurial marketing performance was defined by both intrinsic criteria (including, freedom and independence, controlling a person's own future, and being one's own boss) and extrinsic outcomes (including, increased financial returns, personal income, and wealth). Masuo, Fong, Yanagida and Cabal (2001) found that entrepreneurial marketing performance is commonly defined in terms of economic or financial measures which include return on assets, sales, profits, employees and survival rates; and non pecuniary measures, such as customer satisfaction, personal development and personal achievement.

Sun (2004) believed that entrepreneurial marketing performance as a concept has evolved through the past, and these days, institutions such as banks and venture capitalists use financial facts as a measure of performance. For some researchers, performance can be measured by: profitability (Devine, 2002), Proactiveness, calculated risk taking, innovativeness, opportunity focus, resource leveraging, customer intensity, and value creation. Survival (Devine, 2002; Duchesneau and Gartner, 2007), growth in employees (Chandler and Hanks, 2002; Covin and Covin, 2000), and sales growth (Smith et al., 2001). Aldrich and Martinez (2001); and Devine (2002) noted that there is a close relationship between performance and survival.

Based on the assertions above, we can say that the following are entrepreneurial performance indicators: sales growth, employee growth, profit growth, survival, and return on investment, market share, level of creativity and innovation. As Simons (2000), opined that performance indicators should assist entrepreneurs in tracking the implementation of business strategy by comparing actual results against strategic goals and objectives. He further argued that performance measurement can play a critical

role as means of facilitating innovation and to adapt to changing business conditions.

### **Power Distance and Entrepreneurial Marketing Performance**

Power distance describes the degree to which less powerful members in the society expect and accepts that power is being distributed equally or unequally (Hofstede 1980). Power distance is a general measure of the degree of interpersonal influence that those who hold power in a social structure can exert over those who lack power. Power Distance measurement in societies/ cultures could either be high or low. In low power distance society, people do not perceive a large difference in power between lower and higher ranking members. In low power distance societies, individual, managers and people at the top of organizations and society attempt to minimize inequality between classes, emphasizing the ideal of equal rights for all members of the society even if it is not perfectly achieved. In high power distance societies tend to exert much influence over the behavior of subordinates who tend to be submissive rather than independent. Organizations tend to be highly centralized with a clear-cut separation between white and blue collar workers, characterized by relatively large wage differentials between the groups. There is little opportunity for low-level employees to move up in organizational hierarchies.

Power distance in relation to entrepreneurial marketing performance: Low power distance cultures/societies are likely to generate a higher level of entrepreneurial activity simply because more people will assume the role of entrepreneurs (Russell, 2004). In high power distance organizations, less-powerful subordinates tend to be "submissive" and primarily concerned with preserving their position within a rigid hierarchy. Such individuals are not likely candidates to leave their organizations to become risk-taking entrepreneurs, further reducing the potential supply of entrepreneurs

(Abazi and Safari 2009). The general consequence of low power distance on entrepreneurial marketing is relatively easy access to entrepreneurial resources, greater entrepreneurial opportunities, more entrepreneurial initiatives leading to creativity and innovativeness. High power distance makes access to resources and entrepreneurial opportunities restricted hence fewer entrepreneurs emerge (Gruyter, 2014).

### **Uncertainty Avoidance and Entrepreneurial Performance**

Uncertainty avoidance is the extent to which people feel threatened by uncertainty and ambiguity and try to avoid them (Hofstede, 1988). Uncertainty avoidance (UA) is a measure that indicates a group's level of anxiety regarding future events. It evaluates the degree of tolerance within a culture/society for the ambiguity that is inherent in a continuously unfolding future (Abazi and Safari 2009).

In countries/societies characterized by a high degree of UA, social relations tend to be relatively formal, rules and procedures are heavily relied on to standardize the behavior of group members. Individual levels of ambition are relatively low and there is a tendency to prefer group rather than individual decision-making processes. Conflict and competition among group members is considered disruptive, creating dissension and uncertainty; therefore, it tends to be avoided rather than confronted. There is a strong resistance to change in high UA societies accompanied by a low tolerance for risk-taking behavior. In contrast, low UA societies tend to produce less formal organizations with fewer written rules and procedures. Competition and conflict among organizational members is more accepted, they are viewed as positive processes in many contexts, leading to innovation and improvement. Risk-taking behavior is more

acceptable and resistance to change is not as great in low UA as in high UA countries/societies.

The implication of Uncertainty Avoidance to entrepreneurial marketing performance is that High uncertainty avoidance entrepreneurs will tend to have a relatively low tolerance for ambiguity and an aversion to risk-taking. Such individuals will be less likely to seek out proactive identification and exploitation of opportunities and innovative ventures. Opportunities that will involve change and innovation may be shunned or overlooked. Low uncertainty avoiding entrepreneurs possesses entrepreneurial marketing traits as high tolerance for ambiguity and a perception to see changes in the environment as opportunities instead of threats, they believe in taking risk to become successful and practitioners are giving credibility for marketing messages.

### **Individualism/Collectivism and Entrepreneurial Performance**

Individualism is the tendency of people to look after themselves and their immediate family only and want to differentiate themselves from groups, while, Collectivism is the tendency of people to belong to groups who look after them in exchange for loyalty (House, 2004). In individualistic societies, personal values and goals are the prime determinant of behavior and self-identity. Individual autonomy is more important in individualistic societies and staying a member of a group is not as highly prized. Conversely, in collectivist societies, group values and goals predominate and individual desires are considered to be subservient to or derived from group values. Identity is derived primarily from group membership rather than individual characteristics (Hofstede, 1980).

The relationship between individualism and entrepreneurial marketing performance is that in individualistic societies, the ownership of individual resources is paramount hence; business resources such as

financial profits are reinvested in the business for its growth (Ogbor, 2012). Individualistic entrepreneurs are driven by personal need for achievement, self esteem, self actualization and self obligation. Collectivism in relation to entrepreneurial marketing performance; in a collectivist marketing entrepreneurial setting, customer intimacy is valued, the concept of value co-creation is paramount and resource leveraging. It has been argued that collectivism helps entrepreneurship because collectivistic societies provide more social support and resources (Gruyter, 2014). For example, families in collectivistic societies tend to be more helpful in providing the needed resources for one's entrepreneurial endeavors and the needed social security in the event that things do not work out.

#### **Masculinity/Feminity and Entrepreneurial Performance**

Masculinity measures the extent to which male characteristics dominate the society and stresses achievement, competition and resolution of conflict through violence. Feminine societies stress solidarity, emotional displays, relationships among people and resolution of conflicts by compromise (House, Hanges, Javidan and Dorfman 2002). In masculine societies, individuals tend to set high performance standards and act forcefully to achieve these standards. Achievement motivation is high within these societies and markers of achievement such as earnings, formal recognition and advancement are relatively more important than work climate and relationship issues. Independent rather than group decision making is preferred. In feminine societies, nurturance issues are more prominent. A desirable work environment is defined in terms of high quality social relationships, friendly organizational climates and employment security. Achievement motivation is relatively weak and organizational effectiveness is defined in terms of social climate and the quality of human contact. Group decision-making is preferred over individual initiatives (Hofstede, 2001).

Masculinity/Feminity relation to entrepreneurial marketing performance would seem to be through the assertiveness and high need for achievement characteristic of "masculine" cultures (Abzari and Safari, 2009). McClelland (1961) found a strong correlation between need for achievement and the level of entrepreneurial activity within a society. In masculine societies, the material success achieved through successful entrepreneurial ventures is valued and entrepreneurs who attain such success are recognized and esteemed. Conversely, in relatively feminine cultures, achievement motivation in the material sense is relatively weak and success is defined in terms of pleasant human relationships. Consequently, it is presumed that more individuals will be attracted to entrepreneurship as a means of achieving material benefits and social position in masculine cultures/societies while there will be less interest in entrepreneurial activities in feminine cultures. Finally, masculine culture instills competitive spirit in entrepreneurs, innovativeness, calculated risk taking, thereby gaining competitive advantage in the industry where they operate, but feminity instills spirit of collective bargaining and negotiation that creates a friendly atmosphere for entrepreneurial activities to thrive.

#### **Theoretical Framework**

##### **Hoselitz's Culture-Entrepreneurship Theory**

This study draws on the Hoselitz Culture/Entrepreneurship theory. This theory is considered relevant for this study because it views entrepreneurship from a cultural perspective emphasizing that entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial performance is governed by cultural factors and culturally minority groups are the spark –ups of entrepreneurial and economic development. He further opined that in many countries, entrepreneurs have emerged from a particular socioeconomic class or group which means that such cultures are

supportive of entrepreneurial activities thus, in such culture, individuals have natural inclination towards becoming entrepreneurs and they have special trait that drives performance. For example the Igbos from across the Niger are considered as culturally marginal group and from this group, a lot of entrepreneurs have emerged whose entrepreneurial activities have favorable impact on the economy of Nigeria. Again women generally are now being considered as well performing entrepreneurs because of cultural barrier and glass ceiling. Hoselitz cultural theory can be viewed from the following cultural angle:

Hypothesis of marginal men: Hoselitz in his theory formulated the hypothesis of marginal men. He opined that marginal men are important reservoir of entrepreneurial development because of their ambiguous position from a cultural or social statement makes them particularly suited to make creative adjustments in situations of change and in the course of this adjustment process, they develop genuine innovations in social behavior. Secondly managerial and leadership ability: individuals who possess extraordinary managerial and leadership skills bring entrepreneurial talents in the society. Lastly, contribution of specific social classes: The theory reveals that entrepreneurial talents are found in persons/groups having particular socio- economic back ground and this background drives them into entrepreneurship and also makes them performs better than others in their entrepreneurial venture.

### Research Methods

The cross sectional survey research design was employed. The population of this study, comprised of small and medium scale enterprise in three local governments in Delta State; uvwie, Oshimili South and Ethiope East which came to a total of 760 (source: Delta State industrial directory, 2006), the stratified random sampling technique was used and a workable sample size of 262 was gotten. The research instrument was a 30-item validated modified structured questionnaire adapted

from Yoo et al (2011); Yildiz, (2014); Zhao, (2010). Which respond formant is on five point Likert scale. Data obtained were analyzed using correlation and regression

Cultural dimensions was measured using four constructs( Power distance {high and low}, uncertainty avoidance{high and low}, individualism/collectivism, and masculinity/femininity) the four dimensions of culture were measure was measured using 24 items,6 item for each construct then entrepreneurial marketing performance was measured using 6 items. The scale was further validated using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) which examined the interrelated measures among power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism and masculinity/femininity. As shown in table 1, all factor loading exhibited favorable values above 7.0 for each item that measured a particular construct which implies that all items used to measure a particular construct are appropriate. For the reliability check, a test-retest method was used to estimate the internal consistency. Favorable reliable scores were obtained from all items since all coefficient values were above 0.6 thus exceeding the minimum bench mark of Cronbach's coefficient Alpha value recommended by Malthotra (2004).

### Results and Findings

This section presents the results of data gathered from the field survey. Data collected were analyzed using correlation and multiple regression analytical tools, hypotheses were further tested and meanings were given to the findings

#### Table 1: Results of Exploratory Factor Analysis and Reliability of Scales

Scale items	Power Distance (PD)	Uncertainty Avoidance (UA)	Individualism/Collectivism (IC)	Masculinity/Feminity (MF)	Entrepreneurial Performance (EP)	Cronbach Alpha
PD1	0.71					
PD2	0.77					
PD3	0.70					
PD4	0.72					
PD5	0.70					
PD6	0.79					0.80
UA1		0.70				
UA2		0.70				
UA3		0.78				
UA4		0.75				
UA5		0.79				
UA6		0.70				0.82
IC1			0.79			
IC2			0.71			
IC3			0.72			
IC4			0.77			
IC5			0.71			
IC6			0.70			0.84
MF1				0.75		
MF2				0.71		
MF3				0.70		
MF4				0.74		
MF5				0.72		
MF6				0.71		0.81
EM1					0.70	

**Table 2: Correlation matrix among the Variables of Cultural Dimension and Entrepreneurial Marketing Performance.**

	1	2	3	4	5
<b>1. Power Distance</b>	1				
<b>2. Uncertainty Avoidance</b>	.533**	1			
<b>3. Individualism/ Collectivism</b>	.467**	.203**	1		
<b>4. Masculinity/ feminity</b>	.632**	.450**	.305**	1	
<b>5. Entrepreneurial Marketing Performance</b>	.669**	.435**	.544**	.704**	1

\*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 (2tailed)

The correlation analysis in table 2 showed that power distance exhibited positive correlation with entrepreneurial marketing performance ( $r = .669^{**}$   $P < .01$ ). Uncertainty avoidance was also positively correlated with entrepreneurial marketing performance ( $r = .435^{**}$   $P < .01$ ). Individualism/Collectivism exhibited positive correlation with entrepreneurial marketing

performance ( $r = .544^{**}$   $P < .01$ ). Masculinity/feminity exhibited positive correlation with entrepreneurial marketing performance.

**Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis of Dimensions of Culture and Entrepreneurial Performance**

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	16.121	3.857		4.180	.001
High PD	-.018	.045	-.145	-.403	.697
Low PD	.044	.043	.370	1.027	.034
High UA	-.047	.340	-3.382	-	.045
Low UA				1.163	
Individualism	.049	.049	1.398	1.212	.023
Collectivism	-.025	.043	-.206	-.595	.041
Masculinity	.027	.039	2.240	3.696	.015
Feminity	.071	.033	.599	2.139	.050
	-.069	.036	-.535	1.912	.081

Dependent variable: Entrepreneurial marketing performance

In table 3, results from the regression analysis showed that high power distance exhibited a negative effect on entrepreneurial performance having Beta value ( $\beta = -.145$ ). Low power distance revealed a positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance with Beta value ( $\beta = .370$ ). Low uncertainty avoidance exhibited a positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance having Beta value ( $\beta = 1.398$ ). High uncertainty avoidance revealed a negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance with

Beta value ( $\beta = -3.382$ ). Collectivism exhibited a positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance ( $\beta = 2.240$ ) while individualism exhibited a negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance ( $\beta = -.206$ ). Beta coefficient of ( $\beta = .599$ ) for masculinity and ( $\beta = -.535$ ) for feminity which implies that masculinity has a positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance while feminity has negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.544 <sup>a</sup>	.296	.183	1.425

- a. Dependent variable: entrepreneurial marketing performance Individualism, Collectivism, Masculinity and femininity.
- b. Predictors: (constant), High PD, Low PD, High UA, Low UA, **Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis of Dimensions of Culture and Entrepreneurial Performance**

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	T	Sig
	B	Std. Error			
(Constant)	52.648	10.911		4.825	.000
Power distance	.180	.176	.190	1.025	.031
Uncertainty Avoidance	.196	.176	.206	1.117	.027
Individualism/collectivism	.248	.165	.274	1.506	.014
Masculinity/femininity	.198	.177	.206	1.115	0.12

Dependent variable: entrepreneurial marketing performance

**Table 6: Model summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.464 <sup>a</sup>	.215	.189	1.629

- a. Dependent variable: entrepreneurial marketing performance
- b. Predictors: (constant), Power distance, Uncertainty Avoidance Individualism/Collectivism and Masculinity/femininity.
- indicates that low power distance has positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The result from test of hypothesis one (H<sub>1</sub>) further confirms that there is a statistically significant relationship between power distance and entrepreneurial marketing performance. This is supported by the findings of (Hayton et al 2002) where they revealed that entrepreneurship thrives in low power distance societies. The result also follows Dwyer, Masak and Hsu (2005) position where a positive relationship was established between low power distance and innovation. Yildiz, (2014), opined that equality of power (low power distance) in organizations increases corporate entrepreneurship. The implication of this finding is that, low power distance entrepreneurs encourages

**Discussion**

The study focused on the impact of cultural dimensions on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The correlation analysis involving all the indicators of cultural dimension reported positive correlation in table 2, which indicates that they are good measures of cultural dimension. From table 3, the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = -.145$ ) for high power distance indicated that high power distance has negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance while the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = .370$ ) for low power distance

initiatives in their venture and thus leading to innovation and creativity, evenly distribution of resources and survival because only creative and innovative entrepreneurs can withstand competition and survive for more than five years.

From table 3, the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = 1.398$ ) for low uncertainty avoidance indicated that low uncertainty avoidance has positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance while the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = -3.382$ ) for high uncertainty avoidance indicates that high uncertainty avoidance has negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The result from test of hypothesis two ( $H_2$ ) further confirms that there is a significant relationship between uncertainty avoidance and entrepreneurial marketing performance. This finding is consistent with the opinion of Mueller and Thomas, (2000); Wennekers et al., (2007) asserted that uncertainty avoidance entrepreneurs have high tolerance for ambiguity which implies long term planning, environmental scanning and the prediction of future developments. This finding is also supported by the findings of Abzari and Safari (2009), that uncertainty avoidance directly addresses the uncertainty associated with entrepreneurship by reducing business risk, increasing the quality of products and services and leads to new product developments and business growth.

The implication of this finding is that uncertainty avoidance entrepreneurs are very proactive and they are always willing to accept the change inherent in the environment of business.

From table, the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = 2.240$ ) for collectivism indicated that collectivism has positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance while the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = -.206$ ) for individualism indicates that individualism has negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The result from test of hypothesis three ( $H_3$ ) further confirms that there is a significant relationship between

individualism/collectivism and entrepreneurial marketing performance. This finding is consistent with the finding of Gruyter, (2014) opined that collectivist society provides more social support and resources to support ones entrepreneurial pursuit and also the needed social security in the event that things go wrong.

This finding contradicts prior findings in the literature review by (Ogbor, 2012; Hayton et al., 2002; Morris et al., 2005; and House et al., 2002). That collectivism negatively favors entrepreneurship. It will be important to note that Nigeria is a collectivist society and there are a good number of entrepreneurs whose activities directly have positive effect on the economy for example, the Igbo people are known and applauded for their contribution to the nation's growth and development through their entrepreneurial activities. These people are culturally tuned to entrepreneurship because of their culturally marginalized background and these socioeconomic groups are highly collectivist in nature that families and relative provide the needed resources for member's entrepreneurial endeavor and once a member starts performing well, there is a trickledown effect since that entrepreneur starts grooming a person from the family or community to start up his or her own business.

From table 3, the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = .599$ ) for masculinity indicated that masculinity has positive effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance while the  $\beta$  value ( $\beta = -.535$ ) for femininity indicates that femininity has negative effect on entrepreneurial marketing performance. The result from test of hypothesis four ( $H_4$ ) further confirms that there is a significant relationship between masculinity/femininity and entrepreneurial marketing performance. This finding is supported by the findings of Hayton et al, (2002), in their study; they revealed a significant relationship between need for achievement and masculinity index they opined that masculinity leads to greater focus

on entrepreneurship as a source of achievement and wealth. Yildiz, (2014), further opined that to survive in business, entrepreneurs need an aggressive and strategic behavior which is accordance with masculine values.

The implication of this finding is that entrepreneurs who possess the masculine cultural trait always strive for achievement, they like to take responsibility, they set moderate challenging and attainable goals and they desire regular feedback on their performance and these are basic attributes that drives performance in entrepreneurship.

Based on the data analyzed, the following conclusions were made. That culture has significant effect on entrepreneurship. This study concludes that low power distance leads to performance entrepreneurial venture because in such ventures, entrepreneurs attempts to minimize inequality by having simpler or flatter structures where everybody can participate, egalitarian ideas and initiatives are encouraged and these are the necessary ingredient for innovation, creativity and survival because of easy access to resources and more opportunities.

Uncertainty avoidance affects entrepreneurship positively because based on the study findings; low uncertainty avoidant entrepreneurs are people who have the faculty to deal with ambiguity, they are very proactive and in the event of change, they are always ready to accept because change is perceived as an opportunity instead of threat. The development and implementation of innovative products and processes is inherent in uncertainty and risk and only entrepreneurs who are proactive can survive.

From the study findings, collectivism favors entrepreneurial performance. In prior studies by (Ogbor, 2012; Hayton et al., 2002; Morris et al., 2005; and House et al., 2002),

collectivism was negatively related to entrepreneurship but this study findings revealed a different dimension. Collectivist entrepreneurs have collective orientation, social group identity, group decision making and group encouragement. Collectivism favors entrepreneurship because it fosters commitment and sacrifice amongst employees and provides a protective environment that minimizes uncertainty associated with business.

Masculinity positively affects entrepreneurial performance. The masculinity cultural index places emphasis on the desire to take responsibilities, engage in healthy business competitions will in turn lead to more creative and innovative ideas, accomplishment and performance measurement, these are necessary attributes that drives entrepreneurial performance.

### **Recommendations**

Culture can support or impede entrepreneurial marketing performance. This study therefore recommends that since culture is the foundation of any entrepreneurial endeavor it should not be overlooked. Entrepreneurs should pay attention to the cultural make up or their business. By cultural make up we mean, firstly the cultural characteristics of the entrepreneur secondly, the cultural factors inherent in the business environment and lastly how both cultural make up can be harnessed to the good of the business.

This study also recommends that in order for entrepreneurs to perform better in their venture, they should imbibe the spirit of achievement motivation. Achievement motivation is the most important factor that contributes to growth rates and it is also related to high tolerance for ambiguity and the willingness to take risk. Again initiatives, access to resources and the ability to exploit

opportunities have been tied to entrepreneurial performance; entrepreneurs should therefore minimize inequality in their venture to as to be able to tap into all resources available for exploit.

#### References

- Abzari, M., & Safari, A. (2009). The role of culture on entrepreneurship development. *Journal of international management*, 7(1), 1 - 24. Retrieved from <https://numerons.files.wordpress.com/2012/04/23the-role-of-culture-on-entrepreneurship-development.pdf> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]=
- Aldrich H.E., & Martinez M.A. (2001). Many are called, but few are chosen: An evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship. *Journal Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 25(4), 451-485. Retrieved from <http://www.irbrp.com/static/documents/September/2009/29.Brian.pdf> [Accessed on: 10/04/2015]
- Chandler, G.N., & Hanks, S. (2002). Founder competence: The environment and venture performance. *Journal Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(1)77-79. Retrieved from <http://huntsman.usu.edu/files/uploads/CV-Resume/Hanks,%20Steve.pdf> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Covin, J.G., & Covin, T.J. (2000). Competitive aggressiveness, environmental context, and small firm performance. *Journal Entrepreneurship theory and Practice*, 14(4), 35 - 50. <http://kisi.deu.edu.tr/ethem.duygulu/covin%20ve%20slevin.pdf> [Accessed on: 2/14/2015]
- Delta State Industrial Directory (2006). Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
- Devine, P. (2002). The institutional context of entrepreneurial activity. In Adaman, Fand Devine, P. (Eds.), *Economy and society: Money, capitalism and transition*. Montreal: Black Rose Books. <https://books.google.com.ng>
- Duchesneau, D.A., & Gartner, W.B. (2007). A profile of new venture success and failure in an emerging industry. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(5) 297-312. Retrieved from <http://isb.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/28/1/6> [Accessed on: 08/08/2015]
- Dwyer, S., Mesak, H., & Hsu, M. (2005). An exploratory examination of the influence of national culture on cross-national product diffusion. *Journal of International Marketing*, 127. <http://www.aabri.com/manuscripts/11806.pdf> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Gruyter, D. (2014). Intercultural dimension of entrepreneurship. *Journal of intercultural management*, 6, (2), 35-47. Retrieved from [www.degruyter.com/view/j/.../joim-2014-0010.xml](http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/.../joim-2014-0010.xml) [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Hayton, J.C., George, G., & Zahra, S.A. (2002). National culture and entrepreneurship: A review of behavioral research. *Journal Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(4), 33 - 53. Retrieved from <http://www.ljemail.org/reference/References.aspx?ReferenceID=1379100> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Hoselitz, B. F. (1951). The early history of entrepreneurial theory: Explorations in *Entrepreneurial History*, 3(4), 193-220
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede's model in context. *International Association for cross-cultural psychology*, 2(8), 3-26 <http://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1014&context=orpc> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- House, R., Javidan, M., Hanges, P., & Dorfman, P. (2002). Understanding cultures and implicit leadership theories across the globe: An introduction to project GLOBE. *Journal of world business*, 37(1), 3-10. Retrieved from [http://www.thunderbird.edu/wwwfiles/sites/globe/pdf/jwb\\_globe\\_intro.pdf](http://www.thunderbird.edu/wwwfiles/sites/globe/pdf/jwb_globe_intro.pdf) [Accessed on: 02/01/2016]
- Islam, M.A., Khan, M.A., Obaidullah, A.Z.M., & Alam, M.S. (2011). Effect of

- entrepreneur and firm characteristics on the business success of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6 (3)289-299. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814038774> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- McClelland, D.C. (1960). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- Ogbor, J.O (2012). The African entrepreneur: Cultural discourses and cultural practices. *Trend Journal of management and social sciences*, 4(1),12-31
- Owoseni, O.O., & Akanbi, P.A. (2010). Entrepreneurial intentions: A theoretical framework. *Journal of Management and Corporate Governance*, 7(1)1-15. Retrieved from <http://www.cenresinpub.org/entreinten.pdf>. [Accessed on: 05/08/2015]
- Paige, R.C., & Littrell, M. A. (2002). Craft retailers criteria for success and associated business strategies. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 40(4), 314- 331. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/jsbm.2002.40.issue4> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Russell, D.R.(2004). *The impact of national culture on the emergence of entrepreneurship*. Penn State – Harrisburg.
- Shane S., Venkataraman S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1),217–226. Retrieved from [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-540-48543-8\\_8#page.](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-540-48543-8_8#page.) [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Simons, R. (2000). *Performance Measurement & Control Systems for Implementing Strategy*. New Jersey, NJ; Prentice Hall Inc.
- Smith, N.R., Bracker, J.S., & Miner, J.B. (2001) Correlates of firm and entrepreneur success in technologically innovative companies. In Churchil, N. C., Kirchoff, B.J., Krasner , O.J and Vesper, K. (Eds.), *Frontiers of entrepreneurship research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Sun, T. (2004). Knowledge required to achieving entrepreneurial success. Unpublished D.M., University of Phoenix, United States, Arizona.
- Wei-Wen, W. (2009). A competency-based model for the Success of an Entrepreneurial start up. *WSEAS Transactions on Business and Economics*, 6(6), 279-291. Retrieved from <http://www.wseas.us/e-library/transactions/economics/2009/32-323.pdf> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Wennekers, S., Thurik, R., Van Stel, A., & Noorderhaven, N. (2007). Uncertainty avoidance and the rate of business ownership across 21 OECD countries, *Journal of Evolutionary economics*, 17(2), 133-160. Retrieved from <http://www.ondernemerschap.nl/pdf-ez/H200705.pdf> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Yildiz, M.L. (2014). The effects of organizational culture on corporate entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(5), 35-44 [http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol\\_5\\_No\\_5\\_1\\_April\\_2014/4.pdf](http://ijbssnet.com/journals/Vol_5_No_5_1_April_2014/4.pdf) [Accessed on: 02/08/2015]
- Yoo, B., Donthu, N., & Lenartowicz, T. (2011). Measuring Hofstede's five dimensions of cultural values at the individual level: Development and validation of CVSCALE. *Journal of International Consumer Marketing*, 23(3), 193-210. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233129941\\_Measuring\\_Hofstede%27s\\_Five\\_Dimensions\\_of\\_Cultural\\_Values\\_at\\_the\\_Individual\\_Level\\_Development\\_and\\_Validation\\_of\\_CVSCALE](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233129941_Measuring_Hofstede%27s_Five_Dimensions_of_Cultural_Values_at_the_Individual_Level_Development_and_Validation_of_CVSCALE) [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]
- Zhao, x., Li, H., and Rauch, A.(2012). Cross-country Differences in Entrepreneurial Activity: The Role of Cultural Practices and National Wealth. *Frontiers of business research in China*, 6(4) 447-474. <https://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/business-school/Public/ZHAO.> [Accessed on: 02/04/2015]