



Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies (ISSN: 2315-5086) Vol. 2(3) pp. 189-198, March, 2013
Available online <http://garj.org/garjmbs/index.htm>
Copyright © 2013 Global Advanced Research Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Culture; is it relevant in the antecedence of entrepreneurial values? Evidence from Zanzibar

Ernest Abaho¹, Issa Seif Salim², Richard Akisimire³

¹Makerere University Business School, Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Business Administration.

²University of Dares Salaam Business School.

³Makerere University Business School, MUBS Mbarara Study Centre.

Accepted 15 March 2013

This study set out to explore the role of culture in the development of entrepreneurial values. It was conducted in Zanzibar, Tanzania. 205 SMEs owners and owner managers were surveyed. Results revealed a strong relationship between culture and entrepreneurial values. Recommendations are made to entrepreneurship scholarship to examine the particular entrepreneurial areas that strongly relate to culture as well as conducting a comparative study with other countries. At community level, there is need to establish areas that strongly influence entrepreneurial values and use them to reinforce the entrepreneurial tendencies of the people of Zanzibar so as to strengthen their values for more sustainable and quality entrepreneurial activities.

Keywords: Culture dimensions, entrepreneurial values, Zanzibar.

INTRODUCTION

The role of entrepreneurship in the economic welfare of societies has bravely been recognized (Urve, and Loomets, 2006) particularly in business startups as well as their subsequent growth and success (Wamara, 2000). Such a drive has been as a result of more developed entrepreneurial values in modern societies (Kirkley, 2010). Despite their importance, the antecedence of entrepreneurial values is still a contentious issue in entrepreneurship research. In this regard, some scholars have attributed these values to ones socialization process such as the Social Learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and Attribution theory (Kelley and Michela, 1980)

Most of these theories appear to bend towards the role

of culture in modeling human character. For example according to Msabila and Ndinguru (2005) culture affects the adoption, adaptation and adjustment of perception of business opportunities through influencing change readiness amongst individuals and their value prepositions through religious values, personal networks and social marginality. This is well supported by Wasserman (2008) who established that one's business values are based on the nature of socialization and upbringing process. This is especially learned through interaction (Bandura, 1977) with successful people and gaining inspiration.

Entrepreneurial values such as entrepreneurial self-efficacy have been linked to culture by a number of scholars. For example, ones socialization and educational processes (Kibanja and Munene, 2009).

Culture also affects gender roles in entrepreneurship. Because of this, it has emerged that women owned SMEs have less chances of growth due to their gender specific limitations (Olomi, 2009; Rosa, Carter, and Hamilton,

2009). Gender being an important aspect of culture especially on its cultural roles, women are reported to work for fewer hours and may have different preferences for the goals of their businesses and differences in success considerations driven by their marital roles (Fairlie and Robb, 2008).

It is also reported that women exclusion from economic activities in the past was a culture that hampered their entrepreneurial self efficacy and low levels of self esteem (Baron and Markman, 2003). This might explain performance differences between women-owned and men-owned firms despite the similar entrepreneurial values that may prevail .

Mika (2003) highlights factors such as education level and age as grounds for difference in entrepreneurial values. However, Mair (2002) in a study of 121 middle managers in a large European financial services firm and their effect on changes in economic performance, customer satisfaction, and subordinate satisfaction established that female middle managers and managers holding lower-level educational degrees were significantly better in achieving profit growth than their male counterparts. These females could have succeeded because of their gender but rather the cultural environment in which they were brought up.

Culture has been reported to have an influence on socioeconomic transformation (Pizarro,2009) and been used to explain the differences in development stages amongst different societies (Noseleit,2008). Culture among other elements is made up of values. These values are assumed to influence individual values in a given society and this shapes people's personal value systems as well as how these people envision life (Noseleit, 2008; Hofstede, 1980).

Hoselitz (1960) explains that the supply of entrepreneurship is governed by cultural factors and spark-plugs of entrepreneurial and economic development in many countries. Studies in entrepreneurship have identified variations in cultural dimensions as part of the explanation for development differences between the developed and developing economies (Pizarro,2009) even within developed societies variations in cultural differences have been reported to influence differences in development levels (Linton, 1945).

While cultural and personal values are an important aspect of socioeconomic progress, it is reported that one of the fundamentals of socioeconomic progress in a knowledge economy are entrepreneurial values (Olufunso, 2010). In facing the trends of globalisation and socioeconomic shifts, entrepreneurial values are believed to play a vital role in facilitating national competitiveness (Keat, Selvarajab, Meyer,2011), technology diffusion (GEM,2005), acceleration of nations' resource productivity (Volkman et al, 2009) through innovation.

Entrepreneurial values have also been reported to play an important role in fostering socioeconomic transformation through value addition (Lengyel, 2003) hence providing an avenue to adjust from peasant to an innovation driven economy (GEM, 2005; Noseleit,2008)

As part of the strategies to achieve the UN 2000/2015 millennium development goals (MDGs) especially the first goal of eradicating extreme hunger and poverty, the development of entrepreneurial values as part of sociocultural transformation has been emphasised (Akpomi,2009).

Other developing countries have also developed policies to foster community entrepreneurial values as part of the strategies to graduate from developing to developed economies. For example, countries like Malaysia have ratified policies towards developing an entrepreneurial culture because it was established that these values are a critical avenue to the creation of a robust and change oriented economy (Malysian Plan, 2006-2010)

It is also important to note that while some cultures support the development of entrepreneurial values such as those characterised by individualism and long-term orientedness (Hofstede, 1980), other cultural values impede development of an entrepreneurial society. For example (Weber, 1905) argues that Catholicism as a culture impedes development (because of its conformist norms) compared to Protestantism which is characterised by the spirit of capitalism (an economic system where entrepreneurial culture is glorified) and protestant ethic (where the mental attitude towards business in the society is favorable). Recently, it has been reported that in South Africa, most people have negative attitudes towards entrepreneurial values (Nasser et al 2003; GEM, 2003; Kongolo, 2010) and this has reduced social dynamism and affected global competitiveness of the affected countries.

Entrepreneurial values are a complex phenomenon comprising of risk propensity through tolerance for ambiguity (Chisholm and Hugh, 1911; Linton,1945; Hisrich et al ,2005; Gibb,2007), information seeking behaviors (Bates, 2002;), pro-activeness and innovativeness (Blichfeldt,2009), need for achievement (McClelland, 1961), self efficacy (Rotter, 1966), perseverance (Alsaaty, 2007), persuasiveness (Busenits and Lou, 1996) goals orientedness, strategic orientation (Hofstede, 1980)and cosmopolitaness (Ranuji, 2006).

Although seminal scholars like Schumpeter have argued that entrepreneurial values are healthy phenomenon for socioeconomic transformation, they have remained silent about why some societies have more entrepreneurial values than others.

The question therefore is; does culture affect entrepreneurial values? If yes, what are the main dimensions of culture that contribute in the shaping of

these entrepreneurial values? It therefore becomes important to investigate how different values, beliefs, assumptions, norms are aligned to entrepreneurial values.

Statement of the problem

Without an empirical insight into culture, the explanation about differences in entrepreneurial values intentions across countries will remain inadequately addressed. This is because of the broader array of ethnical backgrounds from which a number of people attribute their entrepreneurial values. GEM studies (2004/2008/2010) indicate that the major variations in entrepreneurial activity are attributed to cultural differences. Alas, there has been a low level of research activity (at least in the sub-Saharan Africa) to empirically test for culture as antecedent to entrepreneurial values. Hence the motivation behind this study.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to establish the extent to which culture influences entrepreneurial values.

Significance of the study

Considering the limited entrepreneurship research activity in the area of culture, this study contributes to the literature about culture and entrepreneurship at least in a developing country context.

For policy suggestions, the study can be used to explain and given opportunity, guide the SME development policy makers on how to undertake better strategies of improving the economy(ies) through inculcating a culture of entrepreneurialism in modern societies so as to be able to create and develop sustainable growth oriented SMEs.

To the practitioners, this study helps in understanding the role of culture in developing entrepreneurship (intrapreneurship) among their human resources for improved performance. This can be through the promotion and adoption of cultural dimensions that promote the spirit of capitalism and entrepreneurial proclivity amongst their staff and other relevant stakeholders.

Literature and Theoretical review

Understanding Culture in a global perspective

There has so far not been a standard globally agreed definition of culture. Several authors have attempted to come up with various definitions based on their experiences, environments as well as their own

perceptions. Classical scholars such as Tylor (1871) posit that culture is a multifaceted concept which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of a given society.

Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) describe culture in three basic dimensions; excellence of taste in the fine arts and humanities, an integrated pattern of human knowledge through social learning and a set of shared attitudes, values, goals, and practices that characterise an institution, organisation or group. Recently, culture has been defined as a common set of beliefs and values shared by a social group in form of symbols, norms, laws, values, rituals, myths and behaviors that can influence peoples' thinking and actions (Bucurean et al, 2011).

Other conceptualisation lenses of defining culture are applied using beliefs, (general proposals regarding the functioning of a group) values (principles or qualities people believe in because they think are important), collective norms (specific rules of conduct applicable to all the members of a group), myths (idealistic stories based on true events and because they represent an explanatory function), and taboos (Bucurean et al, 2011; Lahti, 2003 and Hosftede, 1980). Therefore, through culture, people and groups define themselves, conform to society's shared values, and contribute to society transformation (Eagleton, 2000). Thus, culture includes many societal aspects such as language, customs, values, norms, ethnicity, rules, tools, technologies, products and institutions (Frow, 1995; Iriye, 1990).

Lederach (1995) views culture as the way of life in a given society. The author cites culture as comprised of elements like beliefs, values, norms and it arises out of a configuration of learned behavior and results of behavior whose elements are shared and transmitted to and by the members of a particular society. Williams, (1985) explains how culture is learnt through music, literature, painting, sculpture, theatre and film. This perhaps explains the role of cultural heritage centers and museums and the justification for their role in maintaining societies' historical evolution.

What is not clear though is whether culture is societal or biological. For example in Leslie (1949), it is argued that human genetics create cultural forms common to people everywhere. Genetic mutations and anomalies, then, give rise to the behavioral and cultural differences encountered across and among human groups (Maschner, 1996). These differences potentially include language, food and clothing preferences as well as sexual attitudes (Wald, 1993). However, Ajzen and Fishbein, (1980) and Ajzen (1991) in their theory of learned behavior have an opposing view and their argument is that humans learn to behave in a given way not because of their biological heritage but their social orientation. This theory is premised on the fact that human beings have the ability to make judgment on what is right and wrong so a decision

to behave in a certain way. It therefore cannot be a universal fact about humanity that every one owes their existence to the union between their father and mother forming the basis for the family, the social unit of society (Wald, *ibid*). Out of this, it can be generalized that culture is the way of life and the guiding principles to that life in a given society.

Hofstede (1980) explains that culture creates certain behaviors in different societies and uses a dimensional approach to explain it. According to him, culture can be categorized in five dimensions;

Power Distance (PD)-the extent to which the less powerful members of a society expect and accept that power is distributed unequally where high PD indicates that inequalities of power and wealth exist within the society and that the less powerful members of the society accept this situation and low PD means equity in social opportunities.

Individualism (IV). Here, everyone is expected to look after him/herself as part of one family. High IV societies indicate that individual rights are supreme and in Low IV societies, people consider the general interest and disregard individual priorities.

Masculinity (MS). This focuses on the extent to which values like competitiveness and aggressiveness are used for economic gains. High MS means that the society values assertiveness and aggressiveness. Low MS means that there are more feminism tendencies such as empathy and courtesy relationships.

Uncertainty Avoidance (UA). This focuses on the level of tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity within the society. A High UA indicates that the society has a low tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. Such societies are rule-oriented and usually employ a lot of controls in order to reduce the amount of uncertainty. A low UA indicates the country has less concern about ambiguity and uncertainty and has more tolerance for a diversity of opinions. This is reflected in a society that is less rule-oriented, more readily accepts change, and takes more and greater risks.

Long-Term Orientation (LTO). The main focus here is on the degree to which the society embraces, or does not embrace strategic views about phenomena. In this case, High LTO indicates that the society prescribes to the values of long-term commitments while low LTO indicates that the society does not reinforce the concept of a long-term thinking in their work.

Although Hofstede's work is somewhat dated and has rightly been criticized on a number of grounds (see McSweeney, 2002) the dimensions have been useful in understanding that members of various societies are likely to behave in different ways in a given situation. Hence as a matter of fact, this study adopts Hofstede's culture dimensions because they have been widely used in various areas such as psychology (Triandis, 2004, Triandis, Dunnette and Hough, 1994) interpersonal relations (Tamas, 2007), entrepreneurial attitudes

(Fitzsimmons, Douglas, 2005), assessing entrepreneurial activity (Zhao, Rauch and Frese, 2011), entrepreneurial activity (Noseleit, 2008) as well a number of other studies.

The concept of Entrepreneurship

There has been a wide debate on what the general definition of entrepreneurship is. For this, several scholars have come up with various definitions based on different premises. Academic veterans like Say in (Chisholm and Hugh, 1911) coined the word entrepreneur as one who undertakes an enterprise, shifts economic resources out of lower and into higher productivity and greater yield. Fogel (2001) explains entrepreneurship as a life skill that drives someone to start up a new business influenced at an individual level and general environment.

Fogel (2001) in his study about the meaning of social entrepreneurship indicates that the term entrepreneur originated from French economics as early as the 17th and 18th centuries. In French, it means someone who undertakes a significant project or activity. More specifically, it came to be used to identify the adventurous individuals who stimulated economic progress by finding new and better ways of doing things. In this sense, "things" may refer to business. This submission has components of innovativeness. Fogel does not require entrepreneurs to cause change, but sees them as exploiting the opportunities that change (in technology, consumer preferences, and social norms) creates. He stresses that entrepreneurs always search for change, respond to it, and exploit it as an opportunity.

Fletcher (2004) explains entrepreneurship in an international perspective and views entrepreneurs as individuals with innovative skills who go out into the international market negotiating competitive threats and bringing about economic change and development through the combination of new technologies, practices and ways of thinking.

In a social perspective, Santos (2009) defines entrepreneurship as a complimentary economic activity based on value creation and addressing the most pressing needs of the society. In Hisrich et al (2005) an entrepreneur is seen in the perspective of a business, managerial, and personal factors hence viewing entrepreneurship as the process of creating something new with value by devoting the necessary time and effort, assuming the accompanying financial, psychic, and social risks in addition to receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction and independence.

An amalgamation of the above definitions of entrepreneurship and what entrepreneurs do indicates that in common, entrepreneurship involves at least starting up a business (Chisholm and Hugh, 1911; Fogel, 2001) through identification of business opportunities and innovatively responding to those opportunities (Fletcher,

2004) and value addition (Santos, 2009) to address the needs of society.

Entrepreneurial values

There has been a lot of debate as to whether any one operating a business is an entrepreneur or not. In this case, a lot of scholars have argued in favor of the fact that business individuals vary in their degree of entrepreneurialism. Going by the definition (Santos, 2009; Fletcher, 2004), starting a business qualifies one to claim a quality of entrepreneurship. However, the extent of entrepreneurship is not clear. Such vagueness can be cleared by considering the entrepreneurial values that are exhibited by business owners. Entrepreneurial values are multidimensional. For example, from the sociological point of view, values refer to norms, traditions, conventions, ideologies and promises (Kroeber and Kluckhohn, 1952; Bandura, 1977). On the other hand, the economic point of view values have connection with basic concepts such as benefit, change and price therefore reflecting preferences, motives, needs and attitudes of an individual's psychology (Demirer et al, 2010). The question arises as to why an entrepreneur has a different way of thinking from other human beings and traditional business people. Answers to this may be that they have the motivation, passion, perceptions and emotions strongly associated with economic values. This means that there are several ways of considering entrepreneurial values because some may be based on motivational factors, trait, and sociological conditioning (Rauch and Frese, 2000).

Demirer et al, (2010) in a study among Turkish undergraduate students' considers the main entrepreneurial values as need for achievement, propensity to take risk, tolerance to ambiguity self confidence (supported by Gartner et al., 1994) and innovativeness as fundamental to successful entrepreneurs. Kibanja and Munene, (2009) stress that self confidence and negotiation skills are key values that strengthen one's abilities in acquiring business financial resources particularly bank loans.

Krueger (2007) in the review of the attribution theory emphasises cognitive ability while Boyd and Vozikis, (1994) cite entrepreneurial orientation as a holistic value because it helps in the direction and guiding of the actions of the entrepreneur toward the development and implementation of the business concept. This value comes as a result of environmental forces, where people become entrepreneurs either out of their intentions while others are forced by external pressure. Related findings were made by Rosa, Kodithuwakku, and Balunywa, (2006) while examining the drivers of business start up in Uganda. Hence, no single trait or characteristic defines the entrepreneur, nor does it allow one to predict entrepreneurial behavior.

Entrepreneurial orientation is therefore a framework of traits that separates the potential entrepreneur from those who are not predisposed or motivated to engage in new venture formation.

According to Bandura (1977) the most important entrepreneurial values for business success are self efficacy and goal orientedness. This is because they serve as an important link between intention and action. Goals also impact performance and behavior in a directive function because they help turn attention and effort toward activities which are relevant to the goal and ignore activities which are irrelevant. Proponents of this such as Rauch and Frese, (2000) emphasize the value of goal orientedness and self efficacy as stronger amongst committed individuals. Hence, committed individuals attach importance on the outcome (how important is it to succeed) and how likely their success is in their own estimation (self-efficacy) because it builds a mental map towards success and blocks pessimistic tendencies. Such values are usually impacted by experience in a given business or task. That is why somebody can have high self-efficacy regarding one task but it may be low when it comes to another task. Recently, Abaho (2013) in a study about entrepreneurial values of University students in Uganda established an entrepreneurial values framework to comprise of visionarism, self-efficacy, economic frugality, leadership orientation, high levels of networking behavior, information seeking and cosmopolitanism.

The main observation from this is that different individuals require different entrepreneurial values for different purposes. This may depend on the environment in which they live, the main activities they do as well as their nature of interaction with their businesses and in other spheres of life.

Culture and entrepreneurial values

Societies vary in the levels of entrepreneurial values and therefore it becomes important to establish the causes for such differences. Scholars such as Fitzsimmons and Douglas, (2005), Zhao, Rauch and Frese, (2000), Mueller and Thomas, (2000) as well as Wong, (2011) have explained variations of entrepreneurial values across societies and culture has always been flagged as one of the antecedents to such variations.

Culture, as the underlying system of values atypical to a specific group or society shapes the development of certain personality traits and motivates individuals in a society to engage in behaviors that may not be evident in other societies (Mueller and Thomas, 2000). Hofstede (1980) shares the same view and further suggests that culture as the collective programming of the mind directs the behavior of people towards entrepreneurialism; the degree of entrepreneurial values will keep changing from society to society because of cultural dynamics caused by differences in value systems, beliefs, taboos and other

important cultural elements. This is because cultural differences in people cause disparity in cognition, emotion, and motivation towards life (Triandis, 2004) and people's self efficacy (Basu and Virick, 2008).

Licht and Siegel (2005) while examining the social dimension of entrepreneurship found that the level and modes of entrepreneurial activity are affected by the surrounding culture hence concluding that entrepreneurs may rely on social networks that facilitate reputational bonding as a means for resource mobilization and sharing. It is made clear that the cultural environment and practice makes its members perceive the social role of the entrepreneur differently because entrepreneurial behavior responds to a set of cues from the social environment. Therefore, a social system that places a high value on innovation, risk-taking, and independence plus other entrepreneurial values is more likely to produce entrepreneurial events than a system with contrasting values (Msabila and Ndunguru, 2005). As part of society and social learning agents, role models play an important role because of the socialization learning process (Kumar, 2009).

Zhao, Rauch and Frese (2011) in a study about cross-country differences in entrepreneurial activity examined the role of national cultural practice on economic wealth and observed that culture can support or impede entrepreneurial behavior at the individual level implying that a culture which supports entrepreneurship produces more people with entrepreneurial potential and, as a consequence, more entrepreneurial activity. The same study found out that culture as a whole is significantly related to early-stage entrepreneurial activities, but not to established entrepreneurial activities.

While examining whether entrepreneurial values vary across cultures, Mueller and Thomas (2000) in a study using Hofstede dimensions of culture to predict entrepreneurial values established that some cultures are more conducive for entrepreneurship than others. For example, in individualistic cultures it was found that there was an increased likelihood of an internal locus of control orientation. There was also support for the hypothesis that internal locus of control combined with innovativeness were more likely in individualistic, low uncertainty avoidance cultures than in collectivistic, high uncertainty avoidance cultures. This means that culture may condition potential for entrepreneurship, generating differences across different societies. However, the study only considered internal locus of control and innovativeness as major entrepreneurial values and yet there is a host of other values such as risk propensity that carry valuable meaning in entrepreneurial success.

Bucurean, Costin and Marcu (2011) in a study based on 50 Romanian entrepreneurs about whether entrepreneurial culture related to human behavior found out that strong culture influences one's attitude towards changes, risk taking, creativity and innovation. What was not mentioned in the study though was how strong and in

what logic such culture influences these entrepreneurial values.

Fitzsimmons and Douglas, (2005) in their cross-cultural study of potential entrepreneurs in India, China, Thailand and Australia examined the role of the entrepreneur in business success. Their findings revealed that significant correlations exist between entrepreneurial behaviour and one's nationality (national culture) because it influences the motives, values and beliefs of individuals. It was concluded that entrepreneurial behaviour across nations is dependent on more than cultural values and beliefs, and that other factors must also be taken into account such as the economic situation. Whereas the study revealed that culture transforms to firm success, the individuals total business experience was significant in explaining variance in risk tolerance (for example older people were found to be more risk averse across all nations in the study whilst self-efficacy and the human capital variables were not significant in explaining variance in any of the entrepreneurial attributes in India.

After considering the array of empirical and theoretical perspectives, it was hypothesized that;

H1: Culture has a positive influence on entrepreneurial values.

H1a: The higher the level of individualism, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

H1b: The higher the level of power distance, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

H1c: The lower the level of Uncertainty Avoidance, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

H1d: The higher the level of masculinity, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

H1e: The higher the level of long-term orientedness, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

Measurement of study variables

The independent variable (culture) was measured by Hofstede (1980) cultural dimensions namely; Individualism, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity and Long-term orientation.

Dependant variable (entrepreneurial values) was measured by Self efficacy, need for achievement, risk tolerance, innovativeness (and creativeness) and information seeking behavior.

Research design

This study adopted a cross-sectional correlational design. It also adopted the objectivist research philosophy.

Study population, sampling procedure and sample size

The study consisted of SMEs owners and owner

Table 1. Reliability Statistics

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
Entrepreneurial Values	.773	32
Cultural Dimensions	.815	51

Table 2. One-Sample Statistics

Variable components	N	Mean	SD	p
NArch	205	4.4033	.33168	.000
Risk	205	3.5108	.74567	.000
Crea. and Innov	205	4.6654	.41138	.000
ISB	205	2.8634	.65225	.000
Self Efficacy	205	4.4585	.35390	.000
PD	205	4.8315	.26971	.000
IV	205	4.4524	.31309	.000
MS	205	4.5522	.23149	.000
UA	205	4.6697	.38841	.000
LO	205	4.3986	.23199	.000

Table 3. Correlations and hypothesis testing

	EVs	PD	IV	MS	UA	LO	
Corr	EVs	1.000	.077	.050	.254	.238	.280
p	EVs	.	.135	.237	.000	.000	.000

EVs=Entrepreneurial Values, PD=Power distance, IV=Individualism, MS=Masculinity, UA=Uncertainty avoidance, LO=Long-term orientedness

managers. The purpose of selecting this population was to examine the antecedence of their entrepreneurial inspiration since it is argued that not everyone in business is entrepreneurial or was inspired by entrepreneurial intentions. Hence the selection of this population helps to understand the extent to which culture drives people to business as well as whether even after starting business, their momentum of entrepreneurship remains upscale. 205 questionnaires were collected.

DATA ANALYSIS

Statistical Package for Social Scientists was used in the analysis of data. Variable statistics were used to establish the levels of the variables, correlations to test for the hypothesis and regression to establish the extent to which the cultural dimensions were predicating entrepreneurial values.

RESULTS

Reliability tests were made and it was established that the study tool was consistent and reliable within the recommended statistical range.

Results revealed that people of Zanzibar have high levels of entrepreneurial values especially need for achievement, creativity and innovativeness and self efficacy. However, their risk orientation is much lower and the lowest is their information seeking behavior. As for the cultural dimensions, it is observed that there was a significantly high score above the mean for all the dimensions. In this case, it is seen that Zanzibaris have high tendencies of individualism, there is a high level of differences between the haves and have-nots as indicated in power distance, there are more gender based discrepancies in terms of roles and perceived superiority where men are believed and taken as more superior to women and are more active in economic activities.

High levels of uncertainty avoidance were established meaning that in terms of entrepreneurial values, these people prefer to play safe by avoiding risky business engagements. Results provide evidence that people in Zanzibar have a long-term orientation in business and life at large as supported by high levels of long-term orientedness significantly above average.

Hypothesis testing

H1a: The higher the level of individualism, the higher

Table 4. Regression Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adj. R Sq.	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.354 ^a	.125	.103	.30025

Table 5. General stats

Variables		Freq	%
Gender	Male	149	72.7
	Female	56	27.3
Religion	SDA	2	1.0
	Moslem	195	95.1
	Catholic	3	1.5
	Others	5	2.4
Do you work in teams?	Yes	89	43.4
	No	116	56.1
Marital status	Married	126	61.5
	Single	68	33.2
	Divorced	9	4.4
	Widow	1	.5
	Other	1	.5
Highest level of education	PLE	93	45.4
	O-Level	72	35.1
	H/School	10	4.9
	Diploma	24	11.7
	Degree	6	2.9
Age	18-27	76	37.1
	28-37	90	43.9
	38-47	24	11.7
	48-57	11	5.4
	58+	4	2.0
	Total		205

the level of entrepreneurial values.

Results: The hypothesis was rejected because of insufficient evidence to make a significant cause ($r=.05, p>.05$).

H1b: The higher the level of power distance, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

Results: the hypothesis was rejected due to its insignificance ($r=.077, p>.05$).

H1c: The lower the level of Uncertainty Avoidance, the high the level of entrepreneurial values.

Results: The hypothesis was rejected because the level of UA was high and this led to significantly higher levels of entrepreneurial values ($r=.238, p<.001$).

H1d: The higher the level of masculinity, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

Results: Hypothesis was not rejected ($r=.254, p>.001$).

H1e: The higher the level of long-term orientedness, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values.

Results: Hypothesis was not rejected ($r=.280, p>.001$).

a. Predictors: (Constant), LO, MS, IV, PD, UA

According to the study findings, culture is a significant

predictor of entrepreneurial values. It explains up to 35% of the change in people of Zanzibar’s entrepreneurial values. There is however need to further study other factors that antecede these values apart from the cultural environment.

General statistics

In the table above, it was revealed that majority of the respondents were males (72%) and this may explain why the level of masculinity was high and may also mean that women participation in economic activities in Zanzibar is low. Majority of the respondents (95%) were Muslims and minority Catholics (1.5%). 56% work in entrepreneurial teams as business partners. Such may mean that there is a high level of trust in the society and a spirit of familiness in business.

Very low levels of education were established with majority of the business people (54%) with primary education as their highest level attained and only 2.9% with university education. Such may affect the quality of entrepreneurial activity in terms professionalism, accountability, planning and sustainability. It was also

found out that the most active age in business was 28-37 years of age and the least were those aged above 58 years.

DISCUSSION

This study revealed interesting results. In the first place, it indicates a high level of entrepreneurial values among the people of Zanzibar. Relatedly, it was established that despite what is generally known about the island as well as its business history, people still fear business risk and yet there is a high level of business activity. This could mean that the business community prefers to engage in less risky ventures. This perhaps justifies the high level of trading activity compared to innovative industries such as technology and manufacturing.

One of the reasons fronted for a high level of fear for risk is that because it is an island, people fear to engage in risky businesses especially market risk where they anticipate loss or lack of sustainable demand for their services and products. This is based on the isolation of the island so that people have nowhere else to create markets leading to low levels of novelty in the industrial sector.

A hypothesis was set that individualistic societies have high levels of entrepreneurial values. This was based on the assumption that there is a lot of social competition towards wealth accumulation and every household or family strives on its own without or with less support from the community. Despite the high levels of individualism in Zanzibar, there was no observed significant relationship between this variable and the level of entrepreneurial values. This may suppose that the motive to become entrepreneurial is low or non-existent as argued by Fitzsimmons and Douglas (2005). In some instances, individualism may be due to social clustering without necessarily driving entrepreneurial and material superiority. Such could be the prevailing condition in Zanzibar.

Another hypothesis was set; there is a positive and significant relationship between power distance and entrepreneurial values. According to the results, there was no significant relationship between the said variable hence the hypothesis was rejected. In the perspective of this study, power distance was perceived as the extent to which the less powerful and more powerful people interact and relate. It was revealed that there is a high level of power distance meaning that there is a big difference between the powerful and less powerful. This was observed in terms of wealth and political power.

It actually relates to the high level of individualism as observed earlier. Contrary to these findings, Brown (2003) reports that societies with highly entrepreneurial people exhibit high levels of power distance because they want to

maintain their superior positions in society.

Masculinity and entrepreneurial values. In this study, masculinity was perceived as gender roles. Low levels of masculinity means that there are more tendencies that favor feminism and so there is high regard for women participation in socio-economic activities. It was therefore hypothesized in this study that the higher the level of masculinity, the higher the level of entrepreneurial values. Results revealed a positively significant relationship between the variables; hence the hypothesis was not rejected. Although the concept of masculinity is seen in a negative way to mean that men are mistreating women and the weak in society, it may also mean hard work and aggressiveness towards success (Clare, 2012). In this respect, the people of Zanzibar have a social culture that limits women participation in commercial chores. This would explain why there are more male respondents in this study since the target was those active in business.

Considering the economic history of Zanzibar, it may not come as a surprise to find out that despite their low levels of business risk propensity, the masculinity in pursuing business is high.

The final hypothesis was about long-term orientedness and entrepreneurial values where it was hypothesized that societies with high levels of future orientation have high levels of entrepreneurial values. Results indicated that there is a strong significant and positive relationship between long-term orientedness (hereby regarded as strong future orientation). This means that people in Zanzibar are highly frugal and work hard towards improving the socio-economic future of their society.

In a general perspective, results indicated that culture as a socio-economic catalyst has a significant role to play in the development of entrepreneurial values in Zanzibar. Such findings have been established by other scholars such as Wong (2011).

What is however interesting with the findings of this study is that there is an incongruity in the role played by the different cultural dimensions in the development of entrepreneurial values. For example whereas some dimensions such as individualism and power distance were established to be high. This would make one assume that they catalyse entrepreneurial values because of the need to meet the standards of the superior people in society as a form of competition for prestige and success. In dismay the study established that the weak and poor are not reacting to the success of the rich and educated. Related contrasting findings were earlier supported by Zhao, Rauch and Frese (2011) who argue that in some instances, culture may either cause positive or sometimes negative reinforcement in the development of entrepreneurial values. Therefore, whether the people of Zanzibar are or not entrepreneurial on the account of culture depends on the way they embrace their prevailing socio-economic profiles and how they manipulate such

situations for self and community transformation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It can be deduced that culture has a big role to play in the socio-economic transformation of a society. This is based on the findings of this study where culture explains 32% of variation in entrepreneurial values. It is also based on this study that a conclusion is drawn that it is not always the case that people are inspired to work harder when their neighbors are more successful than them as was reported in other studies such as Rauch and Frese (2000) as well as Hofstede (1980).

Theoretically, this study contributes to the understanding of the role of culture in the development of entrepreneurial values with evidence from a developing country lens. Also previous studies have used a comparative strategy. However, this study takes particular emphasis in understanding a particular country to establish the levels of cultural dimensions singularly and relating them to a particular variable. Future studies should focus on comparing Zanzibar and her peer so as to establish any variations especially in their role in entrepreneurial values.

Socially, this study can be useful because it helps to guide the people of Zanzibar in the areas they need to address in order to make develop their society with more entrepreneurial members especially by trying to utilize some of their strength such as long-term orientedness and high individualistic tendencies which can help to build social competitiveness for future development. In this regard, the people in authority can refer to this study for areas that require attention such as helping those who are not as successful to pick inspiration and role modeling form their successful counterparts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors wish to acknowledge the support received from Zanzibar Overseas Services and BABAs THREE Investment during data collection and analysis of this study. The research assistant Mr. Masoud Ali Musa of ZABACCO is also recognised.

REFERENCES

- Abaho E (2013). *Entrepreneurial curriculum as an antecedent to entrepreneurial values in Uganda: a SEM model*. Global Advanced Research Journal of Management and Business Studies. Vol. 2(2) pp. 085-092.
- Ajzen I (1991). *Theory of planned behavior*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes 50: 179-211.
- Ajzen I, Fishbein M (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice-Hall.
- Akpomi ME (2009). *Achieving millennium development goals (MDGS) through teaching entrepreneurship education in Nigeria higher education institutions*. European Journal of social sciences. 8(1):152 – 159.
- Alsaaty FM (2007). *Entrepreneurs: strategic thinkers in search of opportunities*. Journal of Business Economics Research 5 (2): 65-71.
- Bandura A (1977). *Social Learning theory*. Centre for Small and Medium Sized Enterprises Warwick Business School, UK October 2002
- Baron RA, Markman GD (2003). *Beyond social capital: the role of entrepreneurs' social competence in their financial success*. Journal of Business Venturing 18: 41 – 60.
- Basu A, Virick M (2008). *Assessing entrepreneurial intentions amongst students: a comparative study*. Accepted at the April, 2008, National Collegiate Inventors and Innovators Alliance Conference, Dallas, TX.
- Bates MJ (2002). *After the Dot-Bomb: Getting Web Information Retrieval Right This Time*. First Monday, volume 7, number 7 (July 2002), retrieved from URL: http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue7_7/bates/index.html on 11/03/2013
- Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980. Iriye, A. (1990) *Culture*. The Journal of American History 77.1, pp. 99-107
- Blichfeldt BS (2009). *Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Tourism: The Case of a Danish Caravan Site*. Journal of Tourism and Cultural Heritage, 7(3), 415-431.
- Bucurean M, Mădălina A, Costin M, Marcu F (2011). *Culture -a factor that determines the entrepreneurial behavior*. Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering 2011, Volume 11, Issue 3. 5-14
- Busenitz LW, Lau CM (1996). *A cross-cultural cognitive model of new venture creation*. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice 20(4): 25-39.
- Chisholm H (1911). "Say, Jean Baptiste". *Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th ed.) Cambridge University Press.
- Demirer H, Yüksek O, Hasan M (2010). *The relationship between entrepreneurial traits and universal human values: An application on University Students*. Journal of Academic Researches and Studies Volume 2, 65
- Eagleton T (2000). *The Idea of Culture*, Malden (MA), Blackwell, . p. 36.
- Fairlie RW, Alicia MR (2008). *Gender Differences in Business Performance: Evidence from the Characteristics of Business Owners Survey*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 3718.
- Fitzsimmons JR, Douglas EJ (2005). *Entrepreneurial Attitudes and Entrepreneurial Intentions: A Cross-Cultural Study of Potential Entrepreneurs In India, China, Thailand And Australia*, Babson Kauffman Entrepreneurial Research Conference, Wellesley, MA. June 2005
- Fletcher D (2004). *Enacting Entrepreneurial Values To Achieve Internationalisation: An Interpretive Perspective Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*. Volume 16, Issue 4, pages 289-305.
- Fogel G (2001) *An Analysis of Entrepreneurial Environment and Enterprise Development in Hungary*. Journal of Small Business Management
- Frow J (1995). *Elvis' Fame: the commodity form and the form of the person*. Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature, 7:2, 131-171.
- Gibb AA (2007). *Entrepreneurship: Unique Solutions for Unique Environments. Is it possible to achieve this with the existing paradigm?* International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education. Vol. 5 Senate Hall.
- Global Entrepreneurship Monitor high expectation entrepreneurship 2005 summary report.
- Hisrich RD, Michael PP, Dean AS (2005). *Entrepreneurship*. (6ed.) McGraw-Hill Irwin, New York
- Hofstede G (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hoselitz BF (1960). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth*. Sociological Aspects of Economic Growth, Vol. p. 139-158 Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1497771>
- Keat Y, Selvarajah C, Meyer D (2011). *Inclination towards entrepreneurship among university students: An empirical study of Malaysian University students*. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(4), 206-220.

- Kelley HH, Michela JL (1980). *Attribution theory and research*. Annual Review of Psychology Vol. 31: 457-501 DOI: 10.1146/annurev.ps.31.020180.002325
- Kibanja GM, Munene J (2009). Finance and performance of small medium size enterprises (SMEs). *Journal of African Business*. Vol 10. No 1.
- Kibanja GM, Munene JC (2009). *A gender analysis of bank loan negotiations in Uganda*. *Journal of African Business*, 10(1), 105–119.
- Kirkley W (2010). Self determination and entrepreneurship: personal values and intrinsic motivators of entrepreneurial behavior. A thesis of doctor of philosophy of Massey University, Oakland, New Zealand
- Kongolo M (2010). *Job creation versus job shedding and the role of SMEs in economic development*. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 4(11), pp. 2288-2295.
- Kroeber AL, Kluckhohn C (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*.
- Krueger NF (2007). *What lies beneath? The experiential essence of entrepreneurial thinking*. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(1), 123–138.
- Lederach JP (1995). *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Access Culture*, Syracuse, NY: Syracuse Univ. Press.
- Lengyel I (2003). *Knowledge Transfer, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, and*
- Leslie WA (1949). *The Science of Culture: A Study of Man and Civilization*. (2nd edition) New York: Grove Press.
- Licht AN, Siegel JI (2005). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship in Mark Casson and Bernard Yeung, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Oxford Univ. Press.
- Linton R (1945a). *The cultural background of personality*, New York: Appleton Century
- Mair J (2002). *Value creation through entrepreneurial activity: A multiple constituency approach*, Research Paper No 468 September, 2002, University of Navarra.
- Maschner HDG (1996). *Darwinian Archaeologies*. (ed.) New York: Plenum
- McClelland DC (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McSweeney B (2002). *Hofstede's model of national cultural differences and their consequences: A triumph of faith—a failure of analysis*. *Human Relations*, 55:89–118.
- Mika P (2003). *Multiple entrepreneurship among successful SMEs in peripheral locations*, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 10 Iss: 4, pp.418 – 425
- Msabila D, Ndunguru M (2005). *Combating sexual harassment in*
- Mueller, S.L. and Thomas A.S. (2000) *Culture and entrepreneurial potential: a nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness*, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 1, 51-75.
- Noseleit, F. (2008) *The Entrepreneurial Culture: Guiding Principles of the Self-Employed*. Jena Economic Research Papers 2008- 034.
- Olomi, D.R (2009) *Influences of entrepreneurial behavior and Business Success*. African entrepreneurship and Small business development, Context and process (ed) 21-32
- Olufunso FO (2010). *Graduate entrepreneurial intentions in South Africa: motivations and obstacles*. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(9), 87-98.
- Pizarro I (2009). *The role of entrepreneurial culture and human capital in innovation* Working paper series, WP BSAD 09.02 Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Spain
- Ranuji CR (2006). *A study on entrepreneurial behavior of dairy farmers*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, India.
- Rauch A, Frese M (2000). *Psychological approaches to entrepreneurial success. A general model and an overview of findings*. In C.L. Cooper and I.T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 101-142). Chichester: Wiley.
- Brown BL (2003). *The Role of CTE in Entrepreneurship*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult Career and Vocational Education
- Columbus OH. *Regional Development in Hungary*. (Ed.) JATE Press, Szeged: 81-95
- Rosa P, Carter S, Hamilton D (1996). *Gender as a Determinant of Small Business Performance: Insights from a British Study* *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 8, Issue 6, p. 463-478.
- Rosa PJ, Kodithuwakku S, Balunywa W (2006). *Entrepreneurial motivation in developing countries: what does "necessity" and "opportunity" entrepreneurship really mean?*, *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research: Vol. 26: Iss. 20*
- Rotter JB (1966). *Generalized expectations for internal versus external control of reinforcement*. *Psychological Monographs*, 80 (1), 1-28
- Rutashobya L.K, Shimba IA, Nilsson K (2009). *Gender, social networks and Entrepreneurial outcomes in Tanzania*. *Journal of African Business*. Vol. 10, Number 1
- Santos MF (2009). *A positive theory to social entrepreneurship*. Faculty and Research Working paper 2009/23/EFE/ISIC, Social Innovation Centre, INSEAD Business School
- Tamas A (2007). *Geert Hofstede's Dimensions of Culture And Edward T. Hall's Time Orientations: An Intercultural Organization Development Tool* compiled by (www.tamas.com) 2007
- Triandis HC, Dunnette M, Hough L (1994). *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (second edition, Vol. 4). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Triandis HC (2004). *The many dimensions of Culture*. *Academic Commentary Academy of Management Executive*, 2004, Vol. 18, No. 1
- Taylor EB (1871). *Primitive Culture* (reissued by Cambridge University Press, 2010. ISBN 9781108017527) *universities: efforts, challenges and opportunities: A Case of Four Universities in Tanzania*. Mzumbe University, Tanzania.
- Urve V, Loomets P (2006). *The Role of Entrepreneurship in Economic Development and Implications for SME Policy in Estonia*. 14th Nordic Conference on Small Business Research, May 11-13, 2006, Stockholm, Sweden
- Volkman C, Wilson KE, Mariotti S, Rabuzzi D, Vyakarnam S, Sepulveda A (2009). *Educating the next wave of entrepreneurs: unlocking entrepreneurial capabilities to meet the global challenges of the 21st Century – a report of the Global Education Initiative*. *World Economic Forum*, pp. 1-184, retrieved on 4th March 2013, [http://www.weforum.org/pdf/GEI/2009/Entrepreneurship Education Report.pdf](http://www.weforum.org/pdf/GEI/2009/Entrepreneurship%20Education%20Report.pdf)
- Wamara MKR (2000). *Analysis of entrepreneurial ability and performance of micro retailers of fresh fruits and vegetables*. MBA Dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam.
- Wasserman N (2008.) *The founder's dilemma*, Harvard business review, February 2008
- Wasserman N (2008). *The Founder's Dilemma*. Harvard Business Review, 86(2), 103-109.
- Williams R (1985). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, revised edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wong MA (2011). *The Evolution of Entrepreneurial Culture: Two Competing Hypotheses*. Paper presented at the 25th Annual United States Association for Small Business and Entrepreneurship (USASBE) Conference, Hilton Head, NC, USA.
- Zhao X, Rauch A, Frese M (2011). *Cross-country Differences in Entrepreneurial Activity: The Role of National Cultural Practice and Economic Wealth* (Unpublished).