

Social Networks and Entrepreneurship Orientation among Students in Nigerian Universities: A Study of Social Network Density and Proactiveness.

Okafor, Lawrence Chima*, Ameh, Abu Amodu Phd**

*Department of Business Management, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

**Department of Business Administration, Kogi State University, Anyigba

Abstract: *The study examined social networks and entrepreneurship orientation with particular reference to the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) in Nigerian Universities. The objective was to determine whether a relationship exists between social networks density and pro-activeness among student entrepreneurs. Extant literature based on the objective was reviewed. The study adopted descriptive method and used percentages, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also used to analyze the data. The theoretical underpinning is the sociological theory of entrepreneurship particularly the postulations of Frank Young in 1971. The findings revealed that a significant relationship exists between social networks density and pro-activeness among student entrepreneurs in Nigerian universities. If the students in Nigerian Universities fail to key into the revolution epitomized by the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE), then they run the risk of being bereft of entrepreneurial ideas. It was concluded that social networks have become a major paradigm for entrepreneurial performance in the contemporary business setting. This is because interactions in such networks have come to provide opportunities for resource mobilization and innovation because of the synergy they confer on the actors. Consequently, it is recommended amongst others that the management of Nigerian Universities should accord the appropriate logistic support to facilitate the work of the social network and that academic recognition should be accorded the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs(NASE) so that they can develop enthusiasm and commitment to its programmes.*

Keywords: *Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurship Orientation, Pro-Activeness.Social Networks, Social Network Density*

I. INTRODUCTION

The need to build a sustainable economy, and develop entrepreneurship has become imperative and recognized as one of the major catalysts for economic growth and development. This scenario is particularly so given the growing level of unemployment in Nigeria. Meanwhile, the capacity of government to create an enabling environment for enterprises to share information for resource mobilization and encouraging the formation of informal contacts is a major paradigm for economic transformation. This is even underscored by the fact that networks operate in different economic, social or cultural contexts. The success or otherwise of an enterprise depends on the entrepreneurial heightened ability and acute awareness for recognizing business opportunities (David and Nigama 2011). A social network is a social structure made up of nodes (individuals or organizations) which are linked by one or more specific types of relationship or interdependence such as value, ideas, financial exchange, trade friendship, kinship, social role as well as affection or action relationship (Haas, 2009)

It is therefore important to focus on how entrepreneurs galvanize relationships to obtain information and resources to run profitable business outfits. Entrepreneurship research shows that social networks among other things affect opportunity recognition (Singh, 2000) as cited in Klyver and Schott (2011). Social networks create a platform to galvanize external information as a source of enhancement for entrepreneurship. That is why Bastian and Tucci (2013) believe that external knowledge supports organizational learning and innovation capabilities, which include skills, experience and organizational structures that are important for change. Social networks are a fundamental necessity for business growth because entrepreneurs interact with other people and by that benefit from access to knowledge, skills and other resources. These contacts may help to validate business opportunities and provide information about the wide firm environment (Hill et al, 1991, 1997) in Bastian and Tucci (2013). It can also follow that entrepreneurial intentions and decisions could be tied to social networks.

The Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) which has its headquarters in Kaduna State University, is the National Universities Commission (NUC) recognized organization for student 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 Africa and the diaspora. Kaduna State University was chosen as Africa secretariat for the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) in far away South end-at-sea campus of the University of Essex, United Kingdom, in June 2010. This was held under the auspices of the Entrepreneurship Partnership for Africa (EPA)- a British Council sponsored project and the National Universities Commission (NUC). The Kaduna State University was mandated to set up a website and coordinate the activities of the Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) across Africa. The Network allows peer groups to share information, network and interact on business activities on a well structured interactive platform. The Network of African Student Entrepreneurs (NASE) also provides mentoring and support for young African Entrepreneurs in all universities and graduates across the globe, taking one city, one region, one nation at a time.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

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

III. CONCEPT OF SOCIAL NETWORK

A network could be stated as a specific set of linkages among a defined set of actors (Sirec and Bradac, 2009). This set of actors could be a set of people who have common interests that come together on a common basis to pursue those interests. They also believe that actors in a social network can be persons, groups, and collectives of organizations. On the basis of this characterization therefore, a social network could be defined on the basis of the individual or organization. A personal network is defined as the management of relationships or alliances that the individual has with others in their society (Dubini and Aldrich, 1991; Aldrich and Zimmer, 1986) as cited in Sirec and bradac (2009). Whereas an organizational network according to Groen (2005), is a voluntary arrangement between two or more firms that involves durable exchange, and sharing or co-development of new products and technologies. According to Ogunnaike and Kehinde (2013), social networks are nodes of individuals, groups, organizations, and related systems that tie on one or more types of interdependence: these include shared values, visions and ideas, social contacts, kinship, conflict, financial exchanges, trade, joint membership in organizations and group participation in events, among numerous other aspects of human relationship. This suffices that people of homophilous attributes come together to pursue a common agenda. In business, a social network could take different forms depending on what it is set up to achieve. Credence is lent to this assertion by Groen (2005) who said that “ in business practice, networks may have different forms, including strategic alliances, joint ventures, licensing arrangements, subcontracting, joint R & D, and joint marketing services.

NEED/PURPOSE OF SOCIAL NETWORK

A social network helps in building trust among the members of the network. This in turn makes it possible for actors to cooperate and expect reciprocation (Rousseau et al, 1998, Dakhli and de Clerg, 2004) as cited in Doh and Zolnik (2011). The trust that has been built will enable the actors to respect the assumed commitment amongst themselves in a particular network. Network interactions can initiate entrepreneurship orientation among the actors. Entrepreneurship social networks help to extend opportunities to one another, share information that could lead to creative and proactive thinking which could ultimately lead to the development of self-worth that engenders further creativity. Entrepreneurship research shows that social

networks among other things affect opportunity recognition (Singh, 2000) as cited in Klyver and Schott (2011). Network interactions help in building entrepreneurship intentions because as they interact and brainstorm, new idea recognition will begin to develop into new entrepreneurship opportunities.

Levels of social network

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

The Link between Social Network Density and Pro-activeness.

Social networks are a huge source of information and new ideas because of the multiplicity of interactions that characterize them. And it is from such interactions that proactive thinking emanates because of the collaborative nature of those interactions. However the proactive disposition within the network is a product of the number of direct relations between the entrepreneurs within the network (i.e. network density). In addition, as Sirec and Bradac (2009) asserted, the degree of networking pro-activity is related to the entrepreneur and partly to other actors involved in a particular network. But the proactive disposition of an entrepreneur is also tied to the strength of the network because a strong network facilitates the building of synergy between and amongst entrepreneurs. Once the network interactions are dense or strong, then trust begins to build up and trust promotes pro-activeness among entrepreneurs. This is corroborated by Doh and Zolnik (2011) that trust enhances idea generation by facilitating interactions between individuals within organizations and between organizations. Stakeholders with strong ties are more likely to influence one another, and thus creating strong ties among diverse stakeholders can enhance mutual learning and the sharing of resources and advice (Crona and Bodin, 2006; Newman and Dale, 2004, 2007). However within the context of resource management, weak ties can make a network more resilient and adaptive to environmental change (Prel and Reed, 2009). This is because they believe that diverse and new ideas have been shown to travel best through weak ties. .

IV. ENTREPRENEURSHIP ORIENTATION

Entrepreneurship orientation refers to the extent to which an individual or team has the propensity for the initiation of new ideas, mobilize resources, take risk and take overall responsibility for actions taken. Simply put by Schillo (2011), it is the extent to which a firm is entrepreneurial. Entrepreneurship orientation can be decomposed into risk disposition (risk taking), pro-activeness, innovativeness, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy. Risk taking according to Stewart et al (1998) in Fairoz et al (2010) is the extent to which a firm is willing to make large and risky resource commitments. Pro-activeness describes the characteristic of entrepreneurial actions to anticipate future opportunities both in terms of products or technologies and in terms of markets and consumer demand (Schillo, 2011). A proactive entrepreneur is an individual who is focused on the future and anticipates things before they happen.

Innovativeness is the propensity of the firm to engage in new ideas and create processes that may result in new products, services or technological processes (Wiklund, 1999) in Fairoz (2010). It relates to the types of products and services a company has introduced to the market (Schillo, 2011). Competitive aggressiveness reflects the intensity of a firm's efforts to outperform industry rivals, characterized by a combative posture and a forceful response to competitor actions (Fairoz et al, 2010). It refers to the company's way of engaging its competitors distinguishing between companies that shy away from direct competition with other companies and those that aggressively pursue their competitors' target markets (Schillo, 2011) Autonomy is defined as independent action by an individual or team aimed at bringing forth a business concept or vision and carrying it through to completion. (Fairoz, 2010) For the purpose of this paper a social network can be viewed as a set of students, people, groups and organizations of homophilous attributes that come together to form ties for the purpose of maximizing some form of social impact or profits of stakeholders.

V. EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Entrepreneurship is a major driver of any economy because it injects innovation and economic growth into the economy. In this circumstance, social networks can be one of the key elements for individuals to identify new means ends relationships (commercial opportunities) that result from environment change to discover and exploit entrepreneurial opportunities (Doh and Zolnik, 2011). A good social network is considered as a helpful resource for companies (Zafar et al, 2012).

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

A study was conducted by Fairoz, Hibrobumi and Tanaka (2010) on entrepreneurial orientation and small and medium scale enterprises of Hambantota district in Sri Lanka, using qualitative and quantitative techniques. The study revealed a significant relationship between proactiveness, innovativeness, risk-taking with overall entrepreneurial orientation with marked share growth. They recommended that government and non-government sector should focus on promoting the level of entrepreneurial orientation by directing research and development activities providing financial resource, training package and consultancy services. Klyver and Schott (2011) conducted a study on how social networks structure shapes entrepreneurial intention in Denmark using survey method and regression analysis. The study found that only bridging social networks represented by low dense network, business size and entrepreneurial network play an important role in shaping individuals' entrepreneurial intentions. They recommended that the policy makers aiming at stimulating entrepreneurial activities should promote networking.

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

Zafar, Yasin and Ijaz (2012) carried out a study on social networking as a source for developing entrepreneurial intentions among entrepreneurs in Pakistan using survey and critical analysis procedure. The study revealed that social networking helps the entrepreneurs in developing entrepreneurial intention. They recommended that universities should create network nexus through old students (Alumni) that might develop into business. Kacperczyk (2012) carried out a study on social influence and entrepreneurship; the effect of university peers on entrepreneurial entry in United States of America using survey method and logistic regression models. The study revealed that among individuals exposed to similar organizational influence, those exposed to entrepreneurial university peers are more likely to transit to entrepreneurship.

VI. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social networks as an interactive platform for information sharing and networking must be viewed with a holistic 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 no 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 desirability- message from society, culture, friends, situations, peers and mentors as well as perceptions of feasibility including support from mentors and partners. Udu and Udu (2008) further averred that the need to work harder and measure up will bring in creativity, innovation, vision and plain hard work. They opined also 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.

VII. METHODOLOGY

Questionnaires were designed as instruments for data collection 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. Simple percentages were used to analyze the data. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was in addition 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.

ANALYSIS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES AND RESULTS

Table 1. The Relationship between Social Network size and Risk Disposition

S/n	Questions	No. of Respondents				
		SA=5	A=4	D=3	SD=2	U=1
1.	The closeness of the ties greatly promotes pro-activeness	59(62.28%)	35(37.23%)	1(1.06%)	-	-
2.	They are many ties that are possibly available in a closer manner and consequently enhances pro-activeness	49(52.13%)	44(46.81%)	-	-	1(1.06%)
3.	The closeness of the ties naturally promotes trust and pro-activeness among members	55(58.51%)	(41.50%)	-	-	-
4.	The strength of ties in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness	48(51.06%)	45(47.87%)	1(1.06%)	-	-
5.	Low turnover in the membership of the network promotes strong ties and pro-activeness in the network	37(39.36%)	47(50%)	6(6.38%)	4(4.25%)	-

SOURCE: FIELD SURVEY, APRIL, 2016

From the table above, results in question 1 showed that majority of the respondents, which is 59 representing 62.28% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that the closeness of ties among members in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness . 35 of the respondents representing 37.23% of the total respondents for the study agreed that the closeness of the ties among members in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness. None of the respondents disagreed that closeness of the ties naturally promotes pro-activeness or was undecided about the fact that closeness of ties among members of a network enhances pro-activeness. From the above majority view it can be affirmed that there is a strong relationship between closeness of ties in network and pro-activeness.

From question 2 above, 49 respondents representing 52.13% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that there are many ties that are possibly available in a closer manner and consequently promotes pro-activeness. 44 respondents representing 46.81% of the total respondents for the study agreed that there are many ties that are possibly available in a closer manner and consequently enhance pro-activeness amongst entrepreneurs. None of the respondents for the study however disagreed, that there are many ties that are possibly available in a network and consequently enhances pro-activeness. However 1 respondent representing 1.06% of the total respondents for the study was undecided about the fact that many ties are possibly available in a closer manner and consequently enhances pro-activeness. From this majority view, it can be affirmed that there are many ties that are available in a closer manner and will enhance pro-activeness. From question 3 above, 55 respondents representing 58.51% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that closeness of the ties naturally promotes trust and pro-activeness among members. 39 respondents representing 41.50% of

the total respondents for the study agreed that closeness of the ties naturally promotes trust and pro-activeness among members. None of the respondents disagreed or was undecided about the fact that the closeness of ties will promote trust and pro-activeness among members, From this majority view it can be affirmed that closeness of ties among members of a network promotes trust and pro-activeness members.

From question 4 in the above table, 48 respondents representing 51.06% of the total respondents for the study strongly agree that the strength of ties in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness, while 45 respondents representing 47.87% of the total respondents of the study agreed that the strength of ties in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness among amongst members. 1 respondent representing 1.06% of the total respondents for the study however disagreed that the strength of ties among members of a network will enhance pro-activeness. From this majority view it can be affirmed that the strength of ties in a network greatly enhances pro-activeness in entrepreneurship.

From the question 5 in the table above, 37 respondents representing 39.36% of the total respondents for the study strongly agreed that low turnover in the membership of a network promotes strong ties and pro-activeness in the network. 47 respondents representing 50% of the total respondents for the study agreed that low turnover in the membership of a network promotes strong ties and pro-activeness among members. 6 respondents representing 6.38% of the total population for the study disagreed with the assertion that low turnover in the membership of a network promotes strong ties and pro-activeness in the network. 2 respondents representing 4.25% strongly disagreed that low turnover in the membership of a network will promote strong ties and pro-activeness. From this majority view it can be affirmed that low turnover in the membership of a network will promote strong ties and pro-activeness in entrepreneurship.

TO TEST THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NETWORK DENSITY AND PRO-ACTIVENESS

Test for Equality of Means Between Series

Date: 02/12/16 Time: 15:32

Sample: 1 94

Included observations: 94

Method	df	Value	Probability
Anova F-statistic	(4, 464)	6.379772	0.0001

Analysis of Variance

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Sq.	Mean Sq.
Between	4	8.821799	2.205450
Within	464	160.4021	0.345694
Total	468	169.2239	0.361589

Category Statistics

Variable	Count	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Err. of Mean
Q6	94	4.627660	0.486021	0.050129
Q7	94	4.500000	0.617835	0.063725
Q8	94	4.595745	0.493379	0.050888
Q9	94	4.500000	0.523635	0.054009
Q10	93	4.236559	0.771755	0.080027
All	469	4.492537	0.601323	0.027767

The interpretations for the ANOVA results obtained above at the 5% level of significance i.e. 0.05. When it is compared with the Probability value of 0.008 obtained falls below 0.05, i.e. 0.0001 < 0.05. This implies that there is a significant relationship between network density and pro-activeness. Likewise, its F-stat value of 6.38 is greater than 2 i.e. 6.38 > 2, it also implies that there is a significant relationship between network density and pro-activeness.

VIII. DISCUSSION

The objective of the paper was to examine the relationship between network density and pro-activeness amongst entrepreneurs. The results revealed that there is a strong relationship between social network density and pro-activeness in the management of business. This is because of the fact that the dense the network, the diverse the ties and the more the synergy in terms of information access, resource mobilisation and innovation. This tallies or rhymes with the proposition of Martinez and Aldrich (2011), that diverse ties increase self efficacy and innovation. They also believed that at the organizational creation stage, most entrepreneurial teams are homogenous whereas team diversity is associated with better outcomes. This is because, having found themselves among actors of homophiles attributes, they will borrow a leaf from the experience of those running business successfully and think pro-actively and prepare in advance i.e. articulate alternative strategies in event of any eventuality. That is why Prell and Reed (2009) posited that “ stakeholders who are similar to one another are better able to communicate tacit, complex information, as there tends to be higher mutual understanding between such actors”. In addition, new ideas that are products of interactions occasioned by trust can produce a strong basis for proactive thinking, in the sense that rather than being a follower the entrepreneur leads his competitors. The frequent interactions encouraged by trust will enable the entrepreneur to exploit confidential information to the disadvantage of competitors. This consequently enables the entrepreneur to have an edge over his competitors.

IX. CONCLUSION

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

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

From the above analysis and conclusion, the following recommendations are made.

The management of Nigerian universities should accord NASE the appropriate recognition by providing logistic support and infrastructure facilities so that it can expand its activities. 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 programmes. The alumni association should be encouraged to key into the programmes of NASE in form of partnering with the students for the purpose of promoting the activities of NASE. Every higher institution in Nigeria should key into the laudable programmes of this body as it helps in empowering students for post student life.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abou-Mghali .A & Almual, A. (2012): Impact of Entrepreneurial Networks in the Success of Business on-going Stage in Jordanian Manufacturing Companies. American Academic and Scholarly Research Journal 4(2), pp01-09.URL: <http://www.ccsenet.org/jsd>.
- [2] Awadh, A.M & Saad, A.M (2013). Impact of Organizational Culture and Employee Performance. International Review of Management and Business Research 2(1), pp1-8. URL: <http://www.irnbrjournal.com>.
- [3] Bastian, B. L. &Tucci, C. L. (2013): The Role of Advice Sources for Entrepreneurship and Innovation. 35th DRUID Celebration Conference 2013, Barcelona, Spain, June 17-19. DOI: jelcodesM13033
- [4] Bolton, D.L. and Lane, N. (2012): Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation; Development a Measurement Instrument. Education and Training 54 (2) pp219-233. URL: <http://www.eric.ed.gov/?id=eja61536>
- [5] Borgbatti, S.P & Forster P.C (2003):The Network Paradigm in Organizational Research; A Review and Typology Journal of Management 29(6), pp991-1013. DOI : 10.1016/50149-2063-03-00087-4
- [6] Christina, P & Reed, K L (2009): Stakeholder Analysis and Social Network Analysis in Natural Resource Management. Society and Natural Resources 22, pp501-518. DOI: 10.1080/08941920802199202.
- [7] Crona, B & Bodin, O. (2006): What you know is who you know; communication patterns among resource users as a prerequisite for co-management. Ecology and Society 11(2), pp1-9 URL: www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol11/iss2/art7
- [8] Doh, S. & Zolnik (2011). Social Capital and Entrepreneurship; An Exploratory Analysis. African Journal of Business Management 5(12), pp4961-4975 DOI: 10.5897/AJBM11.095.
- [9] Elmar, D.K (2013): Cultural Entrepreneurship; the Impact of Social Networking on Success. Creativity and innovation Management, Journal 22(3), pp307-319 URL: <http://www.ioatwork.com/role-social-networking-cultural-entrepreneur>.

- [10] Emirbayer, M & Godwin J. (1994): Network Analysis Culture and the Problem of Agency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99(6), pp1411-1454
URL: [http://www.zotero.org/scottbot/items/item key/CHDZEZUN](http://www.zotero.org/scottbot/items/item%20key/CHDZEZUN)
- [11] Fairoz, F.M, Hirobumi, T. and Tanaka, Y. (2010): Entrepreneurial Orientation and Business Performance of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises of Hambantota District, Sri Lanka. *Asian Social Science* 6 (3) pp34-46.
URL: [http://www.mgt.ruh.ac.lk/staff-index.php?page=5 user=mafasiya](http://www.mgt.ruh.ac.lk/staff-index.php?page=5%20user=mafasiya)
- [12] Felzensztein C. & Gimmon, E. (2009): Social Network and Marketing Cooperation in Entrepreneurial Clusters: An International Comparative Study. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship* pp01- 11.
DOI: 1007/510843-009-0041-2
- [13] Felzensztein, C. & Gimmon, E. (2007): The Influence of Culture and size upon inter-Firm Marketing Cooperation: A Case Study of the Salmon Farming Industry. *Mark Intell Plann*, 25(4), pp377-393.DOI: 10. 1108/02634500710
- [14] Greve, A. & Salaff, J. W. (2003): Social Networks and Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and P, Practice*, 28(1), pp1-22. Retrieved from www.homes.chass-utoronto.ca/~greve/Greve-Salaff
- [15] Groen, A. J. (2005): Knowledge Intensive Entrepreneurship in Networks; towards a multi-level/multi dimensional approach. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 13 (1), pp69-88.
URL: www.insme.org/files/1810.
- [16] Haas, M. (2009): Social Network Theory and Analysis; A Preliminary Exploration. Centre for Health Economics, Research and Evaluation, Faculty of Business, University of Technology, Sydney.URL: <https://www.rrtq.com/fra/publications/social-network-theory-and-analysis-a-preliminary-exploration.asp>.
- [17] Hooi, P. (2002): The Role of Networking Alliances in Information Acquisition and Its Implications for New Product performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(6), pp727-744.
DOI: 1016/S0883-9026(03)00026-0
- [18] Jawahar, D.P and Nigama K. (2011): Influence of Social Capital on Entrepreneurial Opportunity Recognition Behaviour. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, 5(1), pp351-368.URL: <http://econ.upm.edu.my/ijem/vol5no2/bab10.pdf>
- [19] Jimoh-Kadiri, S.O. (2012): Assessment of Strategies for Effective Teaching of Entrepreneurship by Business Education Teachers in Tertiary Institutions in South-South, Nigeria. An Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Department of Vocational Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka.
URL: naulibrary.org/dglibrary/admin/book-directory/thesis/11049.pdf
- [20] Kacperczyk J.A (2012): Social Influence and Entrepreneurship; The Effect of University Peers on Entrepreneurial Entry. *Organization Science Articles in Advance* pp01-20.
URL: olenka.scripts.mit.edu/docs/orsc.1120.0773.pdf
- [21] Kilby, P. (2009): Hunting the Heffalump. *Social Science Research Network*.
URL: www.ssrn.com (26/8/2014).
- [22] Klyver, K. & Schott, T. (2011): How Social Network Structure Shapes Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research* 1(1), pp03-19.
URL: ent.ut.ac.ir/jger/images/usersfiles/1/file/pdf/kim%20kliver%201.pdf
- [23] Kontinen, T. & Ojala, A. (2011): International Opportunity Recognition Among Small and Medium Sized Family Firms. *Journal of Small Business Management* 49(3), pp490-514.
URL:<http://users.jyu.fi/~aroyalala/documents/international%20oppourtunity%20recognition%20small%20and%20medium-sized%20family%20firms.pdf>.
- [24] Lechner, O.,Dowling, M. &Welpel, I. (2005): Firm Networks and Firm Development; tHe Role of relational Mix. *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol 20.
DOI: 1016/S0883-9026(03)00026-0
- [25] Martinez, M. A. &Aldrich, H. E. (2011): Networking Strategies for Entrepreneurs; Balancing Cohesion and Diversity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 17(1), pp7-38.
DOI: 10.1108/13552551111107499
- [26] Newman, L & Dale, A (2004): Network Structure Diversity and Pro-active Resilience Building; A Response to Tompkins and Adger. *Ecology and Society* 10(1), 991-10
URL: www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss1/ressp2
- [27] Newman, L & Dale, A (2007): Homophily and Agency; Creating Effective Sustainable Development Networks. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 9(1) pp79-90
DOI: 10.1007/S10668-005-9004-5
- [28] O'Donnell, A. O., Gilmore, A., Cummins, D. &Carson, D. (2001): The Network Construct in Entrepreneurship Research; A Review and Critique. *Management Decision*, 39(9), pp749-760.
DOI: 10.1108/EUM000000006220
- [29] Ogunnaike, O. O. & Kehinde, O. J. (2013): Social Networking and Business Performance: The Case of Selected Entrepreneurs in Ota, Nigeria. *Journal of Business Administration and Management Sciences Research*, 2(5) pp116-122
URL: <http://www.apexjournal.org/ JBAMSR>.
- [30] Pawar, P. (2013): Social Sciences Perspectives on Entrepreneurship. *Developing Country Studies*, 3 (9) pp35-38.
URL: www.slideshare.net/AlexanderDecker/social-sciences-perspectives-on-entrepreneurship-27916101
- [31] Putri, N (2009): Literature on Entrepreneurial Orientation. *Economics and Innovation Management*. www.google.com/nikenputri
URL: economics-innovations-info.blogspot.com/2009/06/literature-on-entrepreneurial.html.
- [32] Schillo, S. (2011): Entrepreneurial Orientation and Company Performance; Can the Academic Literaturer guide Managers? *Technology Innovation Management Review*, pp1-6
URL: www.telfer.uottawa.ca/en/directory/professors/schillo-sandra
- [33] Scott, J. (2014): What is Social Network Analysis [www.bloomsbury Academic.com](http://www.bloomsbury.com) (27/4/2014).
URL: www.bloomsbury.com/uk/what-is-social-network-analysis-9781849668170/.
- [34] Seibert S. E, Kraimer, M.L & Liden, R.C (2001): A Social Capital Theory of Career Success. *Academy of Management Journal* pp01-46.
URL:<http://www.research.gate.net/profile/maria-kraimer/publication/228831713-A-social-capital-theory-of-career-success/links/09e4150d4a1ca10ebf000000>
- [35] Sirec, K. and Bradac, B. (2009): How Does Networking Impact the SMEs Growth. *Organizacija* 42(2),pp59-66. DOI: 102478/v10051-009-0003-4

Social Networks And Entrepreneurship Orientation Among Students In Nigerian Universities: A Study

- [36] Stuart, E.T& Sorenson, O(2007): Strategic Networks and Entrepreneurial Ventures. Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 1(1), pp211-227
DOI: 10.1002/sej.18
- [37] Teoh, W.M & Chong, S. (2007): Theorizing a Framework of Factors Influencing Performance of Women Entrepreneurship in Malaysia. Journal of Asian Entrepreneurship and Sustainability 3(2) pp01-17.
URL: www.asianentrepreneurshipjournal.com/AJES1112Teoh.pdf
- [38] Tsal, W. and Ghosal, S.(1998): social capital and value creation: the role of intra firm networks. Academy of management journal. Vol 41 (4) pp 464-476
DOI: 10.2307/257085ACAD MANAGE
- [39] Udu, A.A, and Udu, G.O.C. (2008): Entrepreneurship. Rhyce Kerex Publishers, 25 Ogunbiyi Lane, Ogui, Enugu-Nigeria.
- [40] Zafar, M.J; Yasin, G.& Ijaz, M. (2012): Social Networking as a Source for Developing Entrepreneurial Intentions Among Entrepreneurs; A Case of Multan. Asian Economic and Financial Review 2(8) pp1072-1084.
URL: <http://www.aessweb.com/pdf-files/1072-1084.pdf>.
- [41] <http://www.enactussfu.com/about/>.
- [42] <http://www.thebridge.cmu.edu/...in.../about>.

Okafor, Lawrence Chima " Social Networks and Entrepreneurship Orientation among Students in Nigerian Universities: A Study of Social Network Density and Proactiveness " **International Journal of Business and Management Invention (IJBMI)** 6.7 (2017): 33-41