

1 Social Networks and Entrepreneurship Orientation among 2 Students in Nigerian Universities: A Study of Social Network 3 Size and Risk Disposition

4 Ameh, Abu Amodu¹ and Udu Aka Ama²

5 ¹ Kogi State University Anyangba, Kogi State

6 *Received: 14 December 2015 Accepted: 31 December 2015 Published: 15 January 2016*

7

8 **Abstract**

9 The study analyzed social networks and entrepreneurial orientation with particular reference
10 to Network of African Student Entrepreneurs in Nigerian Universities. The objective was to
11 explain the influence of social networks size on risk disposition among student entrepreneurs.
12 extant literature based on the objective was reviewed. The theoretical underpinning is the
13 sociological theory of entrepreneurship particularly the postulations of Frank Young 1971. The
14 study adopted correlation descriptive method. ANOVA was used to analyze the data. A
15 significant relationship was found to be existing between social networks size and risk
16 disposition among student entrepreneurs. The implication of the result got is that if the
17 students in Nigerian Universities fail to key into the revolution epitomized by the Network of
18 African Student Entrepreneurs, then they run the risk of being bereft of entrepreneurial ideas.

19

20 **Index terms**— social networks, entrepreneurship orientation, nigerian universities, risk disposition, african
21 student.

22 **1 Introduction**

23 Given the need to build a sustainable economy, entrepreneurship has become recognized as one of the major catalysts
24 for economic growth and development. This scenario is even underscored by the growing level of unemployment
25 in Nigeria.

26 However, the capacity of government to create an enabling environment for enterprises to share information
27 for resource mobilization and encouraging the formation of informal contacts is a major paradigm for economic
28 transformation. This is even underscored by the fact that networks operate in different economic, social or
29 cultural contexts. The success or otherwise of an enterprise depends on the entrepreneurial heightened ability
30 and acute awareness for recognizing business opportunities (David and Nigama 2011). A social network is a
31 social structure made up of nodes (individuals or organizations) which are linked by one or more specific types
32 of relationship or interdependence such as value, ideas, financial exchange, trade friendship, kinship, social role
33 as well as affection or action relationship (Haas, 2009) It is therefore important to focus on how entrepreneurs
34 galvanize relationships to obtain information and resources to run profitable business outfits. Entrepreneurship
35 research shows that social networks among other things affect opportunity recognition ??Singh, 2000) as cited
36 in Klyver and Schott ??2011). Social networks create a platform to galvanize external information as a source
37 of enhancement for entrepreneurship. That is why Bastian and Tucci (2013) believe that external knowledge
38 supports organizational learning and innovation capabilities, which include skills, experience and organizational
39 structures that are important for change. Social networks are a fundamental necessity for business growth
40 because entrepreneurs interact with other people and by that benefit from access to knowledge, skills and other
41 resources. Greve (1995) in Zafar et al (2012) averred that when entrepreneurs star their business have a vague
42 idea about how to organize the establishment process, therefore they need the help of the organization who is

43 already existing. These contacts may help to validate business opportunities and provide information about the
44 wide firm environment ??Hill et al, 1991 ??Hill et al, , 1997)) in ??astian and Tucci (2013). It can also follow
45 that entrepreneurial intentions and decisions could be tied to social networks.

46 The

47 2 Problem Statement

48 Entrepreneurs are quite often faced with the challenge of obtaining necessary information for the acquisition
49 of credit for the finance of their businesses, as well as possessing the needed managerial and technical skills
50 and experience required to ensure success in their businesses. This is as a result of information asymmetry or
51 outright lack of it among students in Nigerian Universities, which gives rise to lack of access to useful sources
52 of funds for business. Social networks in Nigerian universities exist and operate in different locations and this
53 diversity should have been a source of diverse information and resources for entrepreneurs. However, the mode
54 of and nature of their operation given the difference in location and diversity may constitute an encumbrance to
55 information sharing, which is a drawback to entrepreneurship orientation. Absence of sizable and dense networks
56 in Nigerian Universities could prevent entrepreneurs from securing the most suitable sources of information and
57 finance, as could be occasioned by lack of informal contacts, which could have provided support for members.
58 This consequently could preclude the establishment of mutual trust and absence of mutual trust is a major barrier
59 to funding. Similarly absence of membership support and independence in Nigerian universities could mar the
60 acquisition of entrepreneurship orientation by shortening the patronage by members and low level of self-efficacy
61 and innovation respectively. Against the back drop of the information asymmetry, paucity of finance, ineffective
62 mobilization as well as problems associated with the acquisition of entrepreneurship orientation it becomes
63 worthwhile to examine social networks and entrepreneurship orientation with particular focus on network size
64 and risk disposition of entrepreneurs. For this purpose entrepreneurship orientation is dependent on the nature
65 and dynamics of social networks.

66 3 III.

67 4 Conceptual Review

68 Social networks have become essential for entrepreneurship and have also become a major paradigm for the
69 mobilization of resources and the building of trust that is needed in business. They are also a major source of
70 motivation, direction and increased access to new opportunities.

71 A social network is a social structure made up of nodes (individuals or organizations) which are linked by
72 one or more specific types of relationship or interdependence such as values, ideas, financial exchange, trade
73 friendship, kinship, social role as well as affection or action relationship (Haas, 2009). This suffices that people
74 of homophilous attributes come together to pursue a common agenda. A social network helps in building trust
75 among the members of the network. This in turn makes it possible for actors to cooperate and expect reciprocation
76 (Rousseau et al, 1998, Dakhli and de Clerg, 2004) as cited in Doh and Zolnik (2011). The trust that has been built
77 will enable the actors to respect the assumed commitment amongst themselves in a particular network. Network
78 interactions can engender entrepreneurship intentions among the actors. Entrepreneurship social networks help
79 to extend opportunities to one another, share information that could lead to creative and proactive thinking
80 which could ultimately lead to the development of self-worth that engenders further creativity. Entrepreneurship
81 research shows that social networks among other things affect opportunity recognition ??Singh, 2000) as cited
82 in Klyver and Schott (2011). Network interactions help in building entrepreneurship intentions because as they
83 interact and brainstorm, new idea recognition will begin to develop into new entrepreneurship opportunities.
84 Entrepreneurship orientation refers to the extent to which an individual or team has the propensity for the
85 initiation of new ideas, mobilize resources, take risk and take overall responsibility for actions taken. Simply
86 put by Schillo (2011), it is the extent to which a firm is entrepreneurial. Entrepreneurship orientation can be
87 decomposed into risk disposition (risk taking), pro-activeness, innovativeness, competitive aggressiveness and
88 autonomy. Risk taking according to Stewart et al (1998) in Fairoz et al (2010) is the extent to which a firm
89 is willing to make large and risky resource commitments. Schillo (2011) refers to the risks individuals take by
90 working for themselves rather than being employed. Pro-activeness describes the characteristic of entrepreneurial
91 actions to anticipate future opportunities both in terms of products or technologies and in terms of markets and
92 consumer demand (Schillo, 2011). A proactive entrepreneur is an individual who is focused on the future and
93 anticipates things before they happen. Innovativeness is the propensity of the firm to engage in new ideas and
94 create processes that may result in new

95 5 Global Journal of Management and Business Research

96 Volume XVI Issue II Version I Year () A products, services or technological processes ??Wiklund, 1999) in Fairoz
97 (2010).It relates to the types of products and services a company has introduced to the market (Schillo, 2011).

98 Competitive aggressiveness reflects the intensity of a firm's efforts to outperform industry rivals, characterized
99 by a combative posture and a forceful response to competitor actions ??Fairoz et al, 2010). It refers to
100 the company's way of engaging its competitors distinguishing between companies that shy away from direct

101 competition with other companies and those that aggressively pursue their competitors' target markets (Schillo,
102 2011) Autonomy is defined as independent action by an individual or team aimed at bringing forth a business
103 concept or vision and carrying it through to completion. ??Fairoz, 2010) For the purpose of this paper a social
104 network can be viewed as a set of students, people, groups and organizations who come together to form ties for
105 the purpose of maximizing some form of social impact or profits of stakeholders.

106 **6 a) Empirical review**

107 Entrepreneurship is a major driver of any economy because it injects innovation and economic growth into
108 the economy. In this circumstance, social networks can be one of the key elements for individuals to identify
109 new means ends relationships (commercial opportunities) that result from environment change to discover and
110 exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (Doh and Zolnik, 2011). A good social network is considered as a helpful
111 resource for companies (Zafar et al, 2012). Stuart and Sorenson (2007) carried out a study on strategic networks
112 and entrepreneurial ventures in the United States of America using qualitative research method. The study
113 revealed that even though literature remains unclear concerning the role of founders and key employee networks,
114 versus the networks of firms, most entrepreneurs and young ventures are strategic in their formation of relations.
115 They recommended that there is need to improve the understanding of how networks form and ascriptive group
116 membership and processes of competitive exclusion shape access to network based resources.

117 A study on social networks and marketing cooperation in entrepreneurial clusters; an international comparative
118 study was carried out by Felzensztein and Gimmon (2009) in Scotland and Chile. Data for their study was
119 collected by mail survey and follow-up process. The results revealed that social networking is important in
120 facilitating inter-firm cooperation in marketing activities and that informal meetings and weak ties are useful for
121 sharing marketing information among managing directors. They recommended future research to focus on the
122 influence of social networks on the creation and internationalization of new ventures among cluster-based firms.

123 A study was conducted by Fairoz, Hibrobumi and Tanaka (2010) on entrepreneurial orientation and small and
124 medium scale enterprises of Hambantota district in Sri Lanka, using qualitative and quantitative techniques.
125 The study revealed a significant relationship between proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking with overall
126 entrepreneurial orientation with marked share growth. They recommended that government and nongovernment
127 sector should focus on promoting the level of entrepreneurial orientation by directing research and development
128 activities providing financial resource, training package and consultancy services.

129 Klyver and Schott (2011) conducted a study on how social networks structure shapes entrepreneurial intention
130 in Denmark using survey method and regression analysis. The study found that only bridging social networks
131 represented by low dense network, business size and entrepreneurial network play an important role in shaping
132 individuals' entrepreneurial intentions. They recommended that the policy makers aiming at stimulating
133 entrepreneurial activities should promote networking.

134 A study on the influence of social capital on entrepreneurial opportunity recognition behaviour was carried
135 out by Jawahar and Nigama (2011) in India using survey and regression analysis. The study revealed that the
136 structural dimension of social capital is the most important in influencing knowledge acquisition behaviour of
137 opportunity recognition. They recommended that it is imperative to recognize, evaluate and exploit opportunities
138 from a lot of decision choices.

139 Zafar, Yasin and Ijaz (2012) carried out a study on social networking as a source for developing entrepreneurial
140 intentions among entrepreneurs in Pakistan using survey and critical analysis procedure. The study revealed
141 that social networking helps the entrepreneurs in developing entrepreneurial intention. They recommended that
142 universities should create network nexus through old students (Alumni) that might develop into business.

143 Kacperczyk (2012) carried out a study on social influence and entrepreneurship; the effect of university peers on
144 entrepreneurial entry in United States of America using survey method and logistic regression models. The study
145 revealed that among individuals exposed to similar organizational influence, those exposed to entrepreneurial
146 university peers are more likely to transit to entrepreneurship. Konrad (2013) conducted a study on cultural
147 entrepreneurship. The impact of social networking on succession in Germany using survey and regression analysis.
148 The study revealed that founders as well as managers can overcome numerous barriers through their engagement
149 and activity in social networks, and thereby exercise to a significant degree a positive influence on establishing
150 their enterprise. He recommended a more detailed analysis of the barriers and the beneficial potential especially
151 for the very complex arts and culture sectors of different countries.

152 **7 b) Levels of Social Network**

153 Nahapiet and Ghosal (1997) as cited in Tsal and Ghosal (1998) identified three dimensions or levels of social
154 networks. These are structural, relational, and cognitive. They theoretically justified how attributes of each
155 of these dimensions facilitate the combination and exchange of resources within firms. According to this view
156 the structural dimension includes social interaction. The location of an actor's contact in a social structure of
157 interactions provides certain advantages for the actor. The relational dimension on the other hand refers to
158 assets that are rooted in these relationships, such as trust and trustworthiness. Trust can act as a governance
159 mechanism for embedded relationships (Uzzi 1996) as cited in Tsal (1998). Trust is an attribute of a relationship,
160 but trustworthiness is an attribute of an individual actor involved in the relationship (Barney and Hansen, 1994)

11 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

161 as cited in Tsal and Ghosal (1998). The cognitive dimension is embodied in attributes like a shared code or a
162 shared paradigm that facilitates a common understanding of collective goals and proper ways of acting in a social
163 system.

164 **8 c) Entrepreneurship orientation**

165 Entrepreneurship orientation refers to the extent to which a firm is entrepreneurial (Schillo, 2011). Lumpkin
166 and Dess (1996) as cited in Putri (2009) refer to a firm's entrepreneurial orientation as its propensity to act
167 autonomously, innovate, take risk, and act proactively when confronted with market opportunities. Schillo
168 (2011) refers entrepreneurial orientation as having five components. These are: Risk taking-this refers to the
169 risks individuals take by working for themselves rather than being employed. It is the extent to which a firm is
170 willing to make large and risky resource commitment ??Stewart, et al, 1998; ??ovin and Slevin, 1991) in Fairoz,
171 Hirobumi, and Tanaka 2010). Pro-activeness-describes the characteristic of entrepreneurial actions to anticipate
172 future opportunities, both in terms of products or technologies and in terms of market and consumer demands.
173 It refers to the extent to which a firm is a leader or follower and is associated with aggressive posturing relative
174 to competitors (Davis, et al, 1991) in Fairoz, et al (2010). Innovativenessrelates to the types of products and
175 services a company has introduced to the market. Competitiveness-refers to the company's way of engaging with
176 its competitors, distinguishing between companies that shy away from direct competition with other companies
177 and those that aggressively pursue their competitor's target markets. Autonomy-refers to the independent action
178 of an individual or a team in bringing forth an idea or a vision and carrying it through to completion (Lumpkin
179 and Dess, 1996) as cited in Schillo (2011) without being held back by overly stringent organizational constraints.

180 **9 d) Strategies for inculcating entrepreneurship in Nigerian 181 Universities**

182 One of the greatest challenges facing entrepreneurship is the strategies for inculcating the expected entrepreneurial
183 skills to students. But given the economic realities of our economy, there must be a strategy to ensure that
184 entrepreneurship culture is imbibed in Nigeria. According to Mansor and Othman (2011) since each higher
185 institution is having its own activities and programmes on entrepreneurship education, the best and effective
186 programmes need to be identified and created to ensure that all institutions are given fair opportunities to
187 prepare the best methods on entrepreneurship education. But the way entrepreneurship in Nigerian universities
188 is run currently leaves much to be desired, as it has failed to go beyond classroom theory. In the words of
189 Mansor and Othman (2011), concepts learned in the classroom have minimal real world significance. Education
190 and knowledge cannot be delivered solely from text books and lectures; it must include practical, hands-on
191 experience that challenges the students especially in entrepreneurial studies (Asmah, and Ariffin, 2009) in Mansor
192 and Othman (2011). The lecture method as is presently done in Nigerian universities will hardly achieve the
193 aims of entrepreneurship education. According to Jimoh-Kadiri (2012) lecture method is inappropriate when the
194 objective is to transfer skills and change attitude. Daly (2001) in Jimoh-Kadiri (2012) suggested four methods
195 namely seminars, visitation, intern challenge and practice firm. Jimoh-Kadiri (2012) believes that strategies could
196 also be teacher-oriented, studentoriented, assignment-oriented and games and simulation. It is important that
197 any strategy for inculcating entrepreneurship education should be practice-based so that graduates of Nigerian
198 universities can have the opportunity of aligning the theory with the practical world experience

199 **10 e) Challenges and Barriers to Network of African Student 200 Entrepreneurs (NASE)**

201 Top management support-the level of support currently enjoyed by NASE in Nigerian universities is at a low
202 ebb. For this body to succeed in its laudable mission, the top management of the universities must be favorably
203 disposed to providing financial and material support for the prosecution of its programmes.

204 Lack of investment culture among the studentsthe students generally feel it is not worthwhile to be fully
205 committed to this organization since membership does not contribute to their graduation from the university, as
206 the programme is not credit rated.

207 Novelty character dilemma-the challenge of misconception of social networks as epitomized by NASE as an
208 individualistic effort rather than a collectivistic one because of lack of awareness about its prospects and relevance
209 to the immediate environment should be surmounted. Other barriers include the creation and maintenance of
210 atmosphere of trust and reciprocity with respect to the sharing of information and business opportunities.

211 The above challenges notwithstanding, NASE has come to stay as it has global acceptability for valuable
212 service to the immediate environment.

213 IV.

214 **11 Theoretical Framework**

215 Social networks as an interactive platform for information sharing and networking must be viewed with a holistic
216 perspective so as to leverage on the benefits that they deliver to members. Because organizations and their

members are changing and complex, numbers of their attributes should be studied together and as a matter of degree, not as neither/or phenomena-a multivariate approach to a changing world of greys, rather than blacks and whites ??Pugh and Hickson, 2007). This suggests that there is one reason why an organization is established and run but on the basis of many influences. What determines the nature and form that an organization takes is its size and degree of dependence on other existing organizations. This suffices that an organization must interact on a synergistic basis for business promotion. The theory that provides the basis for this study is the Frank Young's sociological theory of entrepreneurship propounded in 1971. The Young's theory is based on the following assumptions, that a group is seen to be experiencing low status recognition, denial of access to important social networks and possesses a greater range of institutional resources than other groups in society at the same system level, negative displacement-losing job for instance, transition from college or the university to career, positive pull-examples made by parents, friends and mentors and activated by situations that positively affect the individual, perceptions of desirabilitymessage from society, culture, friends, situations, peers and mentors as well as perceptions of feasibility including support from mentors and partners. ??du and Udu (2015) further averred that the need to work harder and measure up will bring in creativity, innovation, vision and plain hard work. ??du and Udu (2015) opine that Frank Young concerned himself with inter group relations as the main causes of entrepreneurial behaviour. According to Young (1971) instead of individuals, one must find clusters which may qualify themselves as entrepreneurial groups, as the groups with higher differentiation, and have the higher capacity to react. Young defined reactivity or solidarity as the degree to which the members of the group create, maintain and project a coherent definition of their situation. And differentiation Young defined as the diversity, as opposed to coherence, of the social meanings maintained by the group. When a group has a higher degree of institutional and occupational diversity relative to its acceptance, it intends to intensify its internal communication which gives rise to a unified definition of the situation (Deshpande, 1982) in Pawar (2013). Young maintains that entrepreneurial activity is generated by the particular family backgrounds, experiences, as a member of a certain kind of groups and as a reflection of general cultural values.

The inter group relations as emphasized by the Frank young's theory, which is characteristic of social networks provides an appropriate platform for information and idea sharing, which ultimately bolsters entrepreneurship orientation. Inter group relations is also a major paradigm for resource mobilization and the building of mutual trust that is needed in business. Therefore the theory is considered appropriate for the present study.

245 V.

246 **12 Methodology**

247 Questionnaires were designed using the five point Likert's scale ranging from strongly agree=5, agree=4, disagree=3 strongly disagree=2 and undecided=1. A sample of 94 students was arrived at from a population of 123 students using the Taro Yamane formular. The samples were randomly selected. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used in analyzing the data with a level of significance of 5%. When it is compared with the probability value obtained from the ANOVA result, it is such that if the probability value falls below 0.05, it implies that there is a strong relationship between the identified variables of the study. Likewise using the rule of thumb of 2, an F-stat value that is greater than 2 suggests a significant relationship, but if it falls below 2, it implies there is no significant relationship between the variables of the study.

255 **13 Global Journal of Management and Business Research**

256 Volume XVI Issue II Version I Year () From the table above table, results in question 1 showed that majority of the respondents, which is 61 representing 61.89% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that there is a strong relationship between network size and disposition toward risk taking. 31 of the respondents representing 32.98% of the total respondents for the study also agreed that there is an existing relationship between network size and the disposition of entrepreneurs toward taking risk. 1 of the respondents representing 1.06% of the total respondents for the study however disagreed that there exists a relationship between network size and the disposition of entrepreneurs toward taking risk, 1 respondent representing 1.06% was undecided about whether there is a relationship between network size and risk disposition. From the above majority view it can be affirmed that there is a strong relationship between network size and the disposition toward taking risk in entrepreneurship.A

266 From question 2 above, 56 respondents representing 59.57% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that a high number of ties in a network affects risk disposition positively. 35 respondents representing 37.23% of the total respondents for the study agreed that a high number of ties in a network positively affects risk disposition amongst entrepreneurs. 3 respondents representing 3.19% of the respondents for the study however disagreed, and that a high number of ties in a network does not necessarily encourage risk disposition toward taking risk. From this majority view, it can be affirmed that a high number of ties in a network will affect risk disposition positively.

273 From question 3 above, 59 respondents representing 62.77% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that members with large networks have better access to information than those with smaller networks and will consequently be disposed to risk taking. 34 respondents representing 36.17% of the total respondents for the study agreed that members with large networks will have better access to information than those with smaller

17 CONCLUSION

277 networks and will be consequently be favourably disposed to risk taking. 1respondent representing 1.06% of the
278 total respondents for the study however disagreed, that members with large networks will not necessarily have
279 better access to information than those with smaller networks. From this majority view it can be affirmed that
280 members with large networks will have better access to information than those with smaller networks.

281 From question 4 in the above table, 43 respondents representing 45.74% of the total respondents for the
282 study strongly agree that contacts with entrepreneurs outside the network will enhance disposition toward risk
283 taking, while 45 respondents representing 47.87% of the total respondents of the study agreed that contacts with
284 entrepreneurs outside the network will enhance disposition toward risk taking. 4 respondents representing 4.26%
285 of the total respondents for the study however disagreed that contacts with entrepreneurs outside will enhance
286 risk disposition. 2 respondents representing 2.13% of the total respondents for the study also had a strong
287 disagreement with the fact that contacts with entrepreneurs outside the network will enhance the disposition of
288 the entrepreneur toward taking risk. From this majority view it can be affirmed that contact with entrepreneurs
289 outside the network will enhance risk disposition.

290 From the question 5 in the table above, 47 respondents representing 50% of the total respondents for the study
291 strongly agreed that contact with members of other networks will enhance the disposition toward risk taking.
292 44 respondents representing 46.81% of the total respondents for the study agreed that contact with members
293 of other networks will enhance risk disposition of entrepreneurs toward risk taking. 3 respondents representing
294 3.19% of the total population for the study disagreed that contact with members of other networks will necessarily
295 enhance risk disposition of entrepreneurs. None of the respondents strongly disagreed nor was undecided about
296 the propriety of contacts with members of other networks enhancing the disposition toward risk taking. From
297 this majority view it can be affirmed that contact with members of other networks will enhance risk disposition.
298 The Probability value of 0.008 obtained falls below 0.05, i.e. $0.008 < 0.05$. This implies that there is a significant
299 relationship between social network size and risk operation. Likewise, its F-stat value of 3.49 is greater than 2 i.e.
300 $3.49 > 2$, it also implies that there is a significant relationship between social network size and risk disposition.

301 14 VII.

302 15 Discussion

303 The objective of the paper was to examine the relationship between network size and the disposition toward risk
304 taking by entrepreneurs. The results revealed that there is a strong relationship between network size and the
305 disposition of entrepreneurs toward taking risk in business. This is because of the fact that the bigger the size of
306 the network, the diverse the ties and the more the synergy in terms of information access, resource mobilisation
307 and innovation. According to Martinez and Aldrich (2011), diverse ties increase self efficacy and innovation. They
308 also believed that at the organizational creation stage, most entrepreneurial teams are homogenous whereas team
309 diversity is associated with better outcomes. A high number of ties will also confer diversity on the network
310 which lends credence to the position of the scholars above. Members of large networks are also of the likelihood
311 of getting a wider information base than those of smaller networks because of the myriad of interactions that are
312 available. Contacts with entrepreneurs outside of the network will also enhance risk disposition because of the
313 opportunity to tap from the experience of the entrepreneurs who are already running well established businesses
314 and also for resource mobilisation. This is in line with the position of Greve and Salaff ??2003), that establishing
315 a business requires different contacts and resources in different phases. This helps them to build confidence and
316 better Objective: To Test the Relationship between Social Network Size and Risk Disposition ability in business
317 creation. This is in line with work of Zafar et al (2012), whose study revealed that social networking helps in
318 developing entrepreneurial intentions. Contacts of members of one network with members of other networks will
319 also enhance risk disposition because of the experiences they will share, the diversity of information they will
320 access and the promotion of synergy. This is in line with work of Kacperezyk (2012), whose study revealed that
321 among individuals exposed to similar organizational influence, those exposed to entrepreneurial university peers
322 are more likely to transit to entrepreneurship.

323 16 VIII.

324 17 Conclusion

325 Social networks have become recognized as a major paradigm for entrepreneurial performance in the contemporary
326 business setting. This is because interactions in such networks have come to provide opportunities for resource
327 mobilization and innovation because of the synergy that they confer on actors. The study carried out an analysis
328 of general empirical studies on social networks with a view to explaining the relationship between network size and
329 risk disposition amongst entrepreneurs with particular focus on the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs
330 (NASE), and came to the realization that social networks should be encouraged as they serve as a rallying point,
331 for innovation, resource mobilization and information sharing.

332 18 IX.

333 19 Recommendations

334 From the above analysis and conclusion, the following recommendations suffice.

335 The management of Nigerian universities should accord NASE the appropriate recognition by providing logistic support.

337 The programmes of NASE should be accorded academic recognition by giving it credit units so that students will be encouraged to develop enthusiasm and commitment in its programme.

339 The alumni association should be encouraged to key into the programme of NASE in form of partnership.

340 Every higher institution in Nigeria should key into the laudable programmes of this body as it helps in empowering students for post student life. ^{1 2 3}

II.

Year

()

Network of African Student Entreprene

(NASE) which has its headquarters in Kaduna State University, is the National Universities Commission (NUC)

entrepreneurship in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. The Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) is a non-profit organization for students and recent graduates of tertiary institutions that seek to create support for graduates and student entrepreneurs across

recognized organization

[Note: A for Africa (EPA)a]

Figure 1:

1

S/nQuestions

- 1 Network size affects the risk disposition to a great extent.
- 2 A high number of ties in a network affects risk disposition positively.
- 3 Members with large networks have better access to information and resources than those with smaller networks and favourably disposed to risk taking.
- 4 Contacts with entrepreneurs outside the network enhances risk disposition.
- 5 Contacts with members of other networks enhance disposition toward risk taking.

	No of Respondents			
SA=5	A=4	D=3	SD=U=1	
61(64.89%)	1(32.98%)	1(1.06%)	-	1(1.06%)
56(59.57%)	35(37.23%)	3(3.19%)	-	-
59(62.77%)	34(36.17%)	1(1.06%)	-	-
43(45.74%)	45(47.87%)	4(4.25%)	2(2.13%)	
47(50%)	44(46.81%)	3(3.19)	-	-

Figure 2: Table 1 :

341

¹© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1

²© 2016 Global Journals Inc. (US)

³Social Networks and Entrepreneurship Orientation among Students in Nigerian Universities: A Study of Social Network Size and Risk Disposition

19 RECOMMENDATIONS

342 [Lane et al.] , Ogunbiyi Lane , Ogui , Enugu-Nigeria .

343 [Pawar ()] , P Pawar . Retrieved from www.slideshare.net/AlexanderDecker/social-sciences-perspectives-on-enterpreneurship-27916101 *Social Sciences Perspectives on Entrepreneurship. Developing Country Studies* 2013. 3 (9) p. .

344 [Tsal and Ghosal ()]: social capital and value creation: the role of intra firm networks'. W Tsal , S Ghosal . 10.2307/257085ACADMANAGE. *Academy of management journal* 1998. 41 (4) p. .

345 [Seibert et al. ()] 'A Social Capital Theory of Career Success'. S E Seibert , M Kraimer , R Liden . <http://www.researchgate.net/profile/maria-kraimer/publication/228831713-A-social-capital-theory-of-career-success/links/09e4150d4a1ca10ebf000000> *Academy of Management Journal* 2001. p. .

346 [Abou-Mghali and Almuala ()] Abou-Mghali , A Almuala . *Impact of Entrepreneurial Networks in the Success of Business on-going Stage in Jordanian Manufacturing Companies*, 2012. 4 p. . (Retrieved from http)

347 [Schillo ()] 'Entrepreneurial Orientation and Company Performance; Can the Academic Literature guide Managers?'. S Schillo . www.telfer.uottawa.ca/en/directory/professors/schillo-sandra *Technology Innovation Management Review* 2011. p. .

348 [Awadh and Saad ()] *Impact of Organizational Culture and Employee Performance*, A Awadh , A Saad . 2013.

349 [Putri ()] *Literature on Entrepreneurial Orientation. Economics and Innovation Management*. www.google.com/nikenputri Retrieved from: economics-innovations-info, N Putri . blogspot.com/2009/06/literature-on-entrepreneurial.html 2009.

350 [Martinez and aldrich ()] 'Networking Strategies for Entrepreneurs; Balancing Cohesion and Diversity'. M A Martinez , H E aldrich . 10.1108/1355255111107499. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 2011. 17 (1) p. .

351 [O'donnell et al. ()] A O O'donnell , A Gilmore , D Cummins , D &carson . 10.1108/EUM0000000006220. *The Network Construct in Entrepreneurship Research; A Review and Critique*, 2001. 39 p. .

352 [P] Retrieved from www.homes.chass-utoronto-ca/~greve/Greve-Salaff, P , Practice . 28 p. .

353 [Haas ()] *Social Network Theory and Analysis; A Preliminary Exploration*, M Haas . 2009. (Centre for Health)

354 [Zafar et al. ()] 'Social Networking as a Source for Developing Entrepreneurial Intentions Among Entrepreneurs; A Case of Multan'. M Zafar , G Yasin , M Ijaz . <http://www.aessweb.com/pdf-files/1072-1084.pdf> *Asian Economic and Financial Review* 2012. 2 (8) p. .

355 [Stuart and Sorenson ()] 'Strategic Networks and Entrepreneurial Ventures'. E Stuart , Sorenson . 10.1002/sej.18. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 2007. 1 (1) p. .

356 [Teoh and Chong ()] 'Theorizing a Framework of Factors Influencing Performance of Women Entrepreneurship in Malaysia'. W Teoh , S Chong . www.asianentrepreneurshipjournal.com/AJES1112Teoh.pdf *Journal of Asian Entrepreneurship and Sustainability* 2007. 3 (2) p. .

357 [Udu et al. ()] A A Udu , G O C Udu , F C Eze . *Entrepreneurship*. Rhyce Kerex Publishers, 2008. p. 25.

358 [Scott ()] *What is Social Network Analysis* www.bloomsbury.com/uk/what-is-social-network-analysis-9781849668170/ 2014. bloomsbury Academic.

359 [370] [371] [372] [373] [374] [375] [376] [377] [378]