

ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS AND PERFORMANCE OF LEARNING INSTITUTIONS

AN EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM KENYA

Felix Kipchumba Sambu 

Phd Student, Department of Accounting and Finance,
School of Business and Economics, Moi University, Kenya
felixsambu25@gmail.com, sambu25@yahoo.com

Ngene Patrick Kihara

MBM Student, Department of Accounting and Finance,
School of Business and Economics, Moi University, Kenya

Abstract

The purpose of the study was to establish the impact of entrepreneurial characteristics on performance of learning institutions. The study was carried out in the North Rift region, Kenya; targeting entrepreneurs or founders of the learning institutions and in their absence, the managers. Questionnaires were used as the main data collection instrument. The study adopted explanatory research design so as to reveal insights into the nature of decision making process by the entrepreneurs or the managers. Data was analyzed using both descriptive (frequencies, mean and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (Pearson Moments of correlations and multiple regressions) using SPSS. Entrepreneurial leadership skills had a positive influence on performance of learning institutions. Moreover, entrepreneurs' determination has positive influence on performance. However, increasing opportunity recognition will reduce performance of learning institutions. Based on the findings, study concludes that entrepreneur characteristics determine the performance of learning institutions. The study recommends that entrepreneurs in education sector need specific education background and adequate experience as they focus on providing quality education to their clients. Findings will help the potential entrepreneurs and in the formulation of government policy.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial leadership skill, entrepreneurs' determination, opportunity recognition, performance

INTRODUCTION

The last decade has seen the emerging of learning institutions as a potential business opportunity. Many entrepreneurs with varied characteristics and reasons that drive them to start and manage enterprises have emerged to invest in this sector. Performance of these institutions depends on the managerial style set forth by the entrepreneur. It is therefore important to understand the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and the performance of the organization. Entrepreneurial characteristics include technological innovativeness, risk taking and pursuing of opportunities proactively (Miller, 1983).

Different entrepreneurs have different characteristics that lead them to invest in this sector. The concept of entrepreneurship has been interpreted and defined differently by many scholars from multiple disciplines in the social science. An entrepreneur is one who takes a goal directed action for the fulfilment of a need. That is, the need to obtain or attain something, to experiment, to accomplish, or to escape the authority of others (Hisrich *et al.*, 2008).

Risk was connected to the concept of entrepreneurship in the 17th century when the entrepreneur entered into contractual arrangement with the government to perform a service or to supply stipulated product for a price that might result in profits or losses. In the 18th century, the entrepreneur was differentiated from the capital provider and in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the entrepreneur was identified with an individual who united ownership of capital with the capacity for organizing the other factors of production. In the middle of the 20th century, the notion of an entrepreneur as innovator was established. In recent times, the concept of entrepreneurship has been refined and broadened to include criteria such as risk taking, innovation and creation of wealth with the consideration of principles and terms from business, managerial and personal perspective (Hisrich *et al.*, 2008). The entrepreneurial process is influenced by the personality of the entrepreneur and environmental forces which trigger events that stimulate growth and creates a new enterprise.

There are two major areas of interests in the study of the personality of the entrepreneur. These include concerns about the entrepreneur's perceived social disposition and issues relating to the entrepreneur's psychological based characters (Ottih, 2000). Considerable research has been dedicated to the task of identifying the characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. The personal characteristics that make for successful entrepreneurship includes, among others, achievement, motivation, determination, risk taking, leadership, opportunity taking innovativeness, independence, and optimism (Ottih, 2000). Other characteristics include entrepreneurial spirit (that is the ability to find and evaluate business opportunities, gather the necessary resources and implement action plans to take advantage of the opportunities), decision making, time management and negotiating. Entrepreneurs who are high on the

personality character of openness to experience are predisposed to be original, to be open to a wide range of stimuli, to be daring and to take risks. Entrepreneurs who have high level of self-esteem feel competent and capable of handling stress and uncertainty and those who have a high need for achievement have strong desire to perform challenging tasks and meet high personality standards of excellence (Jones *et al.*, 2000).

The education sector in Kenya has grown very fast over the last decade and many entrepreneurs have taken advantage of this situation to invest in this sector. The existing and projected supply of public education is insufficient to meet the increasing demand for education and training at all levels. While the government recognizes that basic education should be a priority for funding, it is generally evident that public resources are inadequate to guarantee adequate access and coverage of education demand by the target population. Private investors (entrepreneurs) are therefore called to fill in this gap.

An entrepreneur should consistently be taking risks, be innovative and be proactive. Past literature shows a direct relationship between entrepreneurial characterization and firm performance (Keh, *et al.*, 2007; Lee, and Penning, 2001; Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Zahra and Covin, 1995). However, the debate remains within the area of entrepreneurial characteristics research (Covin, *et al.*, 2006). Lumpkin and Dess (1996) have drawn attention to the complexity of entrepreneurial characteristics on performance relationship and suggest that the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and performance is context specific. In other words, the degree of the relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and firm performance is influenced by external environment as well as internal organizational processes. Cooper (1998) states that there is a relationship between the founder of the business and its performance. The last few years have seen an upsurge of private learning institutions and although research into performance has been on going, the emergence of these institutions is relatively a new area that warrants further research. Previous studies on successful business ventures have focused on other industries, like manufacturing, tourism, among others, more than the education industry. Therefore this study sought to determine how entrepreneurial characteristics affect the performance of learning institutions.

H₀₁: Entrepreneur determination has no effect on the performance of learning institutions.

H₀₂: Entrepreneur leadership skills have no effect on performance of learning institutions.

H₀₃: Entrepreneur opportunity recognition has no effect on performance of learning institutions.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The paper was informed by upper echelon theory. The characteristics of the entrepreneur is a resource and their influence on resource management originates from “upper echelon” theory. This theory states that an organization and everything that goes on inside is a reflection of its top management (Hambrick & Mason, 1984). This theory links observable characteristics such as top management age, tenure, functional track and other career experiences, formal education and management team heterogeneity to the nature of managerial processes and organizational outcomes. As corporate entrepreneurship can be induced as a top-down strategy, it is imperative to take top management team characteristics into account. Upper echelon theory suggests that entrepreneur characteristics will make decisions that are consistent with their cognitive base (Hambric and Mason, 1984) or entrepreneur (Finkelstein and Hambric, 1996), which consists of two elements: psychological characteristics (including values, cognitive models, and other personality factors) and observable experiences. A fundamental principle of upper echelons theory is that observable experiences (i.e., demographic measures) are systematically related to the psychological and cognitive elements of executive orientation hence organization innovation performance. Upper echelons research employs the use of observable demographic characteristics as proxy measures of executive orientation.

Penrose, (1959), states that entrepreneurship involves identifying opportunities within the economic system, developing and bringing a vision to life. This vision may be an innovative idea, an opportunity or a better way of doing something. The end result of this process is the creation of a new venture, the expansion of an existing one carried out under conditions of risks and considerable uncertainty (Meyer *et. al.*, 1976). Therefore, entrepreneurship involves recognition of the considerable risks and uncertainties. Rasheed (2002) suggested that the following are some of the relevant entrepreneurial characteristics: leadership, determination, risk taking and motivation, energy, commitment and persistence.

EMPIRICAL REVIEW

Central to entrepreneurship is the founding individual and research in entrepreneurship is focused on the entrepreneur. Past studies sought to determine what characteristics distinguished entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs, and examine the influence of these characteristics on business organization formation rates (Tonge, 2001). Such factors as the need for achievement (McClelland, 1965), risk taking propensity (Brockhaus, 1980), opportunity seeking, innovation, commitment, determination and leadership have been identified and examined as characteristics associated with entrepreneurial behaviour.

William (2009) noted that if all the requisite entrepreneurial and managerial skill which is the product of entrepreneurial characteristics is acquired either by the entrepreneurs themselves or by the management, they could translate these skills into entrepreneurial performance. Therefore, there is positive relationship between entrepreneurial characteristics and entrepreneurial development. The personal characteristics of the owner-manager have been under increasing interest. Some attempts have been made to explain business success or failure in terms of personality traits of the entrepreneur (Glancey, *et al* 1998). Nooteboom (1994) highlighted that one of the most important characteristics of the small business is its diversity. The sources that produce diversity lie in the variance of the backgrounds, motives and goals of the entrepreneurs.

Mohd (2005) noted that entrepreneurial characteristics can influence the type of firm that will be created as well as how it will be managed. Thus, it is important to understand these entrepreneurial characteristics. Several studies have listed the personality characteristics needed to develop entrepreneurship as to include among others; need for achievement and motivation, determination, leadership, risk taking etc. Blackman (2003) asserted that individual's characteristics are attributed to his achievements which also have direct effect on the entrepreneurial firm performance

Entrepreneur Determination and Firm Performance

Determination is one of the important entrepreneur characteristics that inspire an entrepreneur. The entrepreneur should have substantial skill, strong character and determination, as well as willingness to invest the time and effort needed to overcome the challenges and the difficulties that may arise. Hisrich and Peters (2002) noted that an entrepreneur is one who brings all kinds of resources into combinations that make their value greater than before. The entrepreneur must possess the characteristics needed for withstanding the challenges that come along during the entrepreneurial process. It makes an entrepreneur able to overcome incredible obstacles and also compensate enormously for other weaknesses. Almost without any exception, entrepreneurs live under extreme, constant pressure (when they start their business, for them to stay alive, and for them to grow). A new business requires top priority of entrepreneur's time, emotion, patience, and loyalty.

The level of entrepreneur's determination can be measured in several ways: through a willingness to invest a substantial portion of his or her net worth in the venture, through a willingness to take a cut in pay because he or she will own a major piece of venture, and through the other big sacrifices in lifestyle and family circumstances. Determination usually

demands personal sacrifice. Entrepreneurs who successfully build new business seek to overcome hurdles, solve problems, and complete the job. They are disciplined, tenacious, and persistent. They are able to commit and recommit quickly. They love to win and love to compete at anything. However, if tasks are unsolvable, an entrepreneur will be the first person to give up, in comparison to others. While entrepreneurs are extremely persistent, they are also realistic in recognizing what they can and cannot do. They know where they can get help to solve a very difficult but necessary task (Delimunthe, 2009). Entrepreneurs must be capable of exploring

Entrepreneur Leadership and Firm Performance

Leadership refers to people's perception of their ability to exercise control over the environment (Rotter, 1966). People with this character believe that their own behaviours determine outcomes in life, whereas other people believe that outcomes are determined by external factors. Previous studies found leadership to be associated with (1) academic achievement (Findley and Cooper, 1983); (2) coping with organizational changes (Judge *et al.*, 1999; and (3) job motivation, job performance, and career success (Spector, 1982). Given that previous studies have established associations between leadership and performance-related outcomes, it would be reasonable to expect a similar link between this character and the performance of entrepreneur-led firms. An entrepreneur is a leader who combines the resources available to create and market new goods or services (Sullivan and Sheffrin, 2003).

Researchers have recognized the role of organizational leaders as pivotal in the study of entrepreneurship, since business founders are responsible for the creation of goods and services and the leveraging of opportunities (Chandler and Hanks, 1994). The leader is concerned with inventing a product or service, establishing a market niche, attracting new customers, and manufacturing and marketing the product (Flamholtz, 1986). Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005) exhibited that entrepreneurs higher on understanding their own feelings and that of their subordinates are more likely to achieve business outcomes and be considered as effective leaders by their employees and direct manager. Accordingly, leadership has emerged as one of the most important elements of any business, large or small. During these challenging times, when the rules of business seem to be constantly changing, people increasingly look to their leaders for authentic direction and guidance. Especially for a new business venture, the founder or entrepreneur establishes the vision and rules of operation and charts the course of direction for the new company. Creating and sustaining a successful new business venture demands not only vision and financial capital, but also leading others to transform that vision and financial capital into a successful reality.

Successful entrepreneurs are leaders capable of installing vision and managing in the long term. They are self-starters, experienced, have intimate knowledge of the technology and the market place in which they will compete and sound general managerial skills (Grant, 1992). Successful entrepreneurs have a well-developed capacity to exert influence without formal power and are adept at conflict resolution.

Entrepreneur Opportunity Recognition and Firm Performance

An entrepreneur is good at spotting opportunities where no one else sees them (Thompson, 1999; Boyett, 1997; Burns, 2005). Thompson (1999), phrases it as “know where” instead of “know how” which basically means that they know where to look for business opportunities. A good example is Sir Richard Branson and his Virgin Group. He spots good opportunities and the Virgin Group consists of different products and services, spanning from the airline industry to beverages, cinemas, etc.

Schumpeter (1942) defined the entrepreneur as an individual able to: reform or revolutionize the pattern of production by exploiting an invention or, more generally, an untried technological possibility for producing a new commodity or producing an old one in a new way, by revolutionizing an industry and so on. This definition underscores an important characteristic of the entrepreneur – innovation. In fact, entrepreneurs are generally characterized as individuals who are full of creative and innovative ideas and are also able to merge these ideas with the resources available in order to generate additional value. Hence, innovation carries the invention (the discovery) further “with the commercial realization of value of the invention or the receipt of an economic return” (Feldman, 2004, p. 3). Innovation and entrepreneurs are companion terms and studies show that entrepreneurs are more creative, imaginative and innovative than non-entrepreneurs (Thomas & Mueller, 2000; Gürol & Atsan, 2006; Koh, 1996); and that innovation can also separate entrepreneurs from managers (Steward *et al*, 2003).

Successful entrepreneurs seek the opportunity to utilize the money, the resources, and the other factors. Some of these latter items have a place and time in the entrepreneurial process; they are not a source and driver for the venture. Entrepreneurs are constantly thinking of new ideas for businesses. This is done by watching trends and spotting patterns in the business world. Entrepreneurs realize that good ideas are many, but good opportunities are few and far between. Latest studies have helped and a great deal is now known about the criteria, the patterns, and the requirements that differentiate the good idea from the good opportunity. Entrepreneurs rely heavily on their previous experiences to come up with opportunities. The opportunity taker thinks of opportunity first and cash last. Some highly successful entrepreneurs

still venture into new businesses because they are obsessed with what they believe is the next breakthrough opportunity (Timmons and Spinelli, 2007).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Explanatory research design deepens the researchers' perception and gives a clearer insight because it is direct and not indirect and abstract in its approach. The researcher can obtain a real record of personal experiences which can reveal the subjects motivations that drive one to action along with the forces that direct to adoption of certain patterns of behaviour. The target population were 200 learning institutions within the Eldoret Municipality, Kitale Municipality and Kapsabet Municipality, Kenya. A census study was used. This implied the use of all the targeted institutions, thus the study population for this study was 200. This study used both primary and secondary sources of data. Questionnaires were used to collect data.

Measurement of Variables

Performance of the learning institutions was measured using the log of mean enrolment of the student for 2 years period (2010 – 2011). Determination skills were measured through proxies of pressure, time keeping, passion, loyalty, discipline, persistence, commitment, among other proxies. The proxies were on a 5 point likert scale with of which 5=very well, 4= well, 3= somewhat, 2= very little and 1= not at all. The next independent variable of entrepreneur leadership skills was measured through proxies of team building, leadership style, ability to guide, years of experience, decision making abilities, among others. The 5 point likert (5=More effective, 4= effective, 3=less effective, 2=Neutral and 1= ineffective) was used. The third variable of entrepreneur opportunity recognition also had a 5 point likert scale of which 5=very well, 4= well, 3= somewhat, 2= very little and 1= not at all. Entrepreneur risk tolerance had several proxies, preference for high risk projects, to maximize the chances of a given opportunity, among others on a likert scale of 5=More effective, 4= effective, 3=less effective, 2=Neutral and 1= ineffective. Entrepreneur motivation proxies included the need to be own boss, the use of past experience, provision of employment to others, closenes to family, among others, were also on a 5 point likert scale of 5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neutral, 2=disagree and 1 strongly disagree.

Reliability Results

Table 1 indicates the results of analysis of pilot study test results found to be sufficient as composite reliability. Coefficients (Cronbach's Alpha) of all variables were above 0.8 as recommended by Mugenda (2003).

Table 1. Reliability Results

	Cronbach's alpha	Number of items
Entrepreneur determination skills	0.821	10
Entrepreneur leadership skills	0.733	10
Entrepreneur opportunity recognition	0.944	10

Data Analysis Approach

Data was analysed using both descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive methods such as frequencies mean and standard deviation were used. Inferential statistics include Pearson correlations and multiple regressions analysis. Multiple Regressions was used because of its ability to use multiple independent variables to estimate their effect on a single dependent variable. This would predict a single dependent variable from any number of independent variables entered into regression equations. The study thus used the technique to examine the effect of entrepreneur characteristics on firm performance..

The regression model which assumes linearity, normality, constant and independence was

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \beta_4 X_4 + \beta_5 X_5 + \varepsilon$$

Y = The dependent variable (Firm Performance)

β_0 = Constant

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3,$ - will be the regression coefficients in Y by each variable of X

X_1 = Entrepreneur Determination

X_2 = Entrepreneur Leadership Skills

X_3 = Entrepreneur Opportunity Seeking Skills

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Results from table 2 revealed that mean enrollments for private primary schools was 251.54, while mean enrollment for private secondary was 182.05. Private colleges (for the four semester in two years) had a mean enrollment of 489.14. This implies that private colleges recorded the highest number of students' enrollment for the two years (2010, 2011).

Table 2. Mean Enrolment

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Private Primary School	251.5397	50.27426
Private Secondary School	182.0541	205.0645
Private College	489.1429	143.6386

Descriptive Statistics

This study also used descriptive statistics to describe and to understand the basic features of the data that are used in this study, because it is provided simple summaries about the sample and the measures. Using this tool one will be able to know the mean and standard deviation of each variable. . Entrepreneurial determination skills recorded an overall mean of 4.36. The overall mean for entrepreneurial leadership skills was recorded to be 4.36 rating all the above items as “effective”. Findings also showed that Results from table 3 shows that entrepreneur determinations skill was correlated with the performance of private learning institutions as evident of (Pearson correlation of 0.252 significant at 0.01). This implies that entrepreneur determinations skills and leadership skills had positive linear relation on performance of learning institutions.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Performance	Determination skills	Leadership Skills	Opportunity Recognition
Performance (log of enrolment level)			1			
Entrepreneur Determination Skills	4.443	0.42234	.252**	1		
Entrepreneur Leadership Skills	4.3637	0.46115	.322**	.481**	1	
Entrepreneur Opportunity Recognition	3.6806	0.60041	-0.055	0.154*	.280**	1

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Regression Weights

The table below shows the unstandardized regression weights also called structural (path) coefficients, their standard errors (SE), critical ratios (C.R), and their p values. The regression weight, also called a path coefficient, p coefficient or a beta weight is similar to a b or beta coefficient in ordinary linear regression and is similarly calculated. It also estimates the strength of the relationship between a predictor and a criterion variable, by predicting the amount of change in the dependent variable for each one unit change in the independent variable. The table shows that all the regression coefficients for the model are significantly different from zero beyond the 0.01 and 0.05 level, as indicated by the column labeled p. A positive coefficient means that the predicted value of the dependent variable increases when the value of the independent variable increases. The path that is critical in testing the alternative hypothesis for objective one (that entrepreneur determination has a positive effect on the performance of

learning institution) is the one that runs from performance to determination. Since its path coefficient is significant and positive it means performance is likely to be determined with determination. Thus, the null hypothesis that entrepreneur determination has negative relation with performance was rejected and the alternative set by the study accepted. The path coefficient in the model from performance to determination is .592, which is a sample estimate of the population parameter. This indicates that when performance increases by one unit on its scale, entrepreneur determination likely improves by 59.2%.

The critical ratios are simply the path coefficients divided by their corresponding standard errors. For example, $.592/.252= 2.3492$. A critical ratio is therefore a t value that is used to test the null hypothesis that path coefficient is not significantly different from zero. At 95% confidence interval, a critical ratio that is greater than 1.96 means that the path coefficient is significantly different from zero. However, since AMOS outputs the p values also, the CRs are simply redundant. The standardized regression weights (which are shown in the path diagram) are all measured in standard deviation units and are therefore not dependent on the units of measurement of the variables. The advantage of the standard partial regression coefficients then is that their magnitudes can be compared directly to show the relative standardized strengths of the effects of several independent variables on the same dependent variable. From the model it can be seen that performance is best indicated by risk taking, motivation, determination and leadership skills and negatively by the opportunity seeking behaviour.

R square for performance was .37, R square measures how much variability in the dependent variable as accounted for by the predictors. This means that performance of the schools can be explained by the five factors under consideration when combined. The remaining unexplained variation in performance could partly be attributed to other factors not specified in the model and partly to the error term (error) in the model.

Table 4. Regression Weights

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
performance	<---	Determination	.592	.252	2.353	.019	
performance	<---	Leadership	.558	.235	2.371	.018	
performance	<---	Opportunity	-.923	.183	-5.049	***	

The study findings from Table 4 reported that R squared (coefficient of determination) for learning institutions recoded values of 0.374 that is 37.4% amount of variation in the learning performance that is accounted for by variation in the predictor variables (determination skills, leadership skills, opportunity recognition, risk tolerance and entrepreneur motivation). The

closer this is to 1 the better, because if R^2 adjusted is 1 then the regression model is accounting for all the variation in the outcome variable. This implies that learning performance of secondary is highly predicted by the independent variables.

ANOVA (f test) was used to test the goodness of fit. From Table 4, F ratio was recorded to be 17.571 with a p value of 0.000, implying that f ratio is statistically significant. If F ratio is statistically significant it implies that the null hypothesis $H_0: b = 0$ is rejected. Hence we infer that the models are fit in predicting the performance of learning institutions. The residual mean square is a measure of how poorly or how well the regression line fits the actual data points. A large residual mean square indicates poor fit. If residual mean square is large, the value of F would be low and F ratio may become non-significant.

Hypothesis 1 postulates that entrepreneur determination has no effect on the performance of learning institution. From Table 4, entrepreneur determination skills recorded $\beta_1 = 0.591$, the parameter was significant as reported by its p value (0.024) which is less than 0.05 (level of significance), hence we reject null hypothesis and conclude that entrepreneurial determination had a positive effect on the performance of learning institutions. This implies that increasing entrepreneurial determination skills with one unit will increase performance of the learning institutions with 0.591.

Hypothesis 2 postulates that entrepreneurial leadership has no effect on performance of learning institutions. Study results shows that entrepreneurial leadership skills scored coefficient estimates of $\beta_2 = 0.558$ with p value of 0.028, since the p value is less than 0.05 we shall reject the null hypothesis that entrepreneurial leadership has no positive effect on performance of learning institutions and infer that entrepreneurial leadership has a positive effect on performance of learning institutions. This implies that increasing entrepreneurial leadership skill with one unit will increase performance of learning institution with 0.558 units. Previous studies found leadership to be associated with (1) academic achievement (Findley and Cooper, 1983); (2) coping with organizational changes (Judge *et al.*, 1999; and (3) job motivation, job performance, and career success (Spector, 1982). These results relate with leader motive profile theory where McClelland suggests that, regardless of variations in economic development, entrepreneurs with leadership skills will almost always find ways to maximize economic goal. Further, he asserts that entrepreneurs with high leadership skills have high achievement and are capable of installing vision and managing long term goals. They are self-starters, experienced, have knowledge of the technology and the market place in which they will compete and sound general managerial skills (Grant, 1992). Successful entrepreneurs have a well-developed capacity to exert influence without formal power and are adept at conflict resolution.

Hypothesis 3 postulates that entrepreneurial opportunity recognition has no effects on performance of learning institutions. Study findings reports that entrepreneurial opportunity recognition indicated coefficient estimates of $\beta_3 = -0.923$ which was significant in predicating the learning performance of the institutions, as reported by p value of 0.000 which is less than 0.05 hence we reject null hypothesis that entrepreneurial opportunity recognition has no positive effects on performance of learning institutions and conclude that entrepreneurial opportunity recognition has negative effects on performance of learning institutions. This suggests that entrepreneur recognition of more opportunity will reduce the performance of the existing learning institutions. The standard error of the parameters gives us an indication of how much the point estimate is likely to vary from the corresponding population parameter. This contradicts Timmons and Spinelli (2007) who noted that some highly successful entrepreneurs still venture into new businesses because they are obsessed with what they believe is the next breakthrough opportunity. Leader motive profile theory, report that successful entrepreneurs seek the opportunity to utilize the money, the resources, and the other factors. Some of these latter items have a place and time in the entrepreneurial process; they are not a source and driver for the venture. Entrepreneurs are constantly thinking of new ideas for businesses.

Table 5. Regression Results

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-6.714	1.411		-4.757	0.000
Determination skills	0.591	0.26	0.159	2.273	0.024
Leadership Skills	0.558	0.252	0.164	2.217	0.028
Opportunity Recognition	-0.923	0.191	-0.353	-4.833	0.000
R Square	0.374				
Adjusted R2	0.353				
ANOVA(F)	17.571				
Sig.	0.000				

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study definitely can serve as a guide in formulating education Based on the study findings there is significant change in learning of private colleges if the determination skills of an entrepreneur improves. Entrepreneur capability of handling pressure, being passionate, patient, loyal, persistent, tenacious and disciplined are the proxies that determine the entrepreneur determination skill to implement better learning institutions. Entrepreneurial leadership skills affect performance and running of private primary schools and private secondary schools. Some of the entrepreneurial leadership qualities are: being good team

builder, authoritative, having a vision, being good planner, self-starter, having adequate experience, great decision maker, able to share success and encourage others to grow and thrive. Being able to recognize upcoming opportunities reduce performance and running of private primary schools and private secondary schools. Recognizing opportunity because of seeing similar business or because of getting the idea from Magazines/Newspaper/Radio/Television and friends or relatives will reduce efficiency and effectiveness of an entrepreneur to run the institutions. Any entrepreneur who is able to tolerate risk has a high chance of improving learning of an institution for entrepreneurs to obtain the professional and industry know-how they require, they should recruit the right personnel. Entrepreneurial Leadership skill is also important for better performance of institutions, the managerial role of the entrepreneur is thus chiefly indirect. Public and private sector initiatives designed to promote and facilitate entrepreneurship should be adapted to optimally take account of different entrepreneurial types. This study reveals that some entrepreneurs start a business because they are declared redundant and cannot find any gainful employment, and therefore, in order to survive and earn some money for a living they venture into entrepreneurship. This reason for starting a business directly disadvantages the business because in most cases they, (entrepreneurs), do not know anything about how to run a business. If this reason to start business is more widely explored and it is verified to be true, businesses have problems with their establishment because of lack of business skill and prior experience. Governmental support can be arranged in developing entrepreneurial programmes.

REFERENCES

- Blackman, A. J. (2003), *Entrepreneurs: Interrelationships between Their Characteristics, Values, Expectations, Management Practices and SME Performance*, Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Griffith University, Australia.
- Brockhaus RH (1980). *Psychology of the Entrepreneur* in Sexton DL, Kent CA and Vesper KH (Eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Entrepreneurship*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., Vol.2, pp. 39-71.
- Burns, P. (2005). *Corporate Entrepreneurship*. Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Chandler, G., and Hanks, S., (1994). "Market Attractiveness, Resource-Based Capabilities, Venture Strategies and Venture Performance," *Journal of Small Business Management* Vol. 2(1), 27-35
- Cooper, A.C. (1998). Findings on Predictions of Performance from a Large Scale Research Program, Small Enterprise Research. *The Journal of SEAAZ*, Vol., pp 247.
- Covin, JG, Green, KM & Slevin, DP 2006, 'Strategic Process Effects on the Entrepreneurial Orientation-Sales Growth Rate Relationship', *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 57-81
- Feldman, M. (2004), *The Significance of Innovation*, Rotman School of Management University of Toronto.
- Flamholtz, E.G. (1986), *How to Make the Transition from an Entrepreneurship to a Professionally Managed Firm*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA.

- Gartner, W. (1985). *A conceptual framework for describing the phenomenon of new venture creation*. Academy of Management Review.
- Gartner, W. B. (1990). Some Suggestions for Research on Entrepreneurial characteristics and Characteristics. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol.4(1), 27-37.
- Glancey, K., Greig, M., & Pettigrew, M. (1998). Entrepreneurial Dynamics in Small Business Service Firms. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 4, No. 3: 249 – 268.
- Grant, A. (1992): The development of an entrepreneurial leadership paradigm for enhancing new venture success. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research: 1992*. Babson College, Wellesley.
- Gürol, Y. & Atsan, N. (2006), “Entrepreneurial characteristics among university students. Some Insights for entrepreneurship education and training in Turkey”, *Education and Training*, Vol. 48, No.1.pp86
- Jones GR, George JM, Hill CWL. (2000). *Contemporary Management* (2nd ed.). Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
- Keh HT, Nguyen TTM, Ng HP (2007), ‘The Effects Of Entrepreneurial Orientation And Marketing Information On The Performance Of Smes’, *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 592-611.
- Lee, C., Lee, K. & Pennings, J.M. (2001) Internal capabilities, external linkages, and performance. A study on technology-based ventures. *Strategic Management Journal* vol.22 no.6-7 p.615-640
- Lumpkin, G.T., & Dess, G.G. (1996) Clarifying the entrepreneurial construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol.21 (1), pp.135-172.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965a). Achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 389-392.
- Meyer, H.H., Walker, W.B. and Litwin, G.H. (1961), Motive Patterns and Risk preferences associated with entrepreneurship”, *J. Abnorm. Soc. Psychol.*, Vol.63, pp570-574.
- Meyer, H.H., Walker, W.B. and Litwin, G.H. (1976): “Motive Patterns and Risk Preferences associated with Entrepreneurship”. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 63, 570-574.
- Miller, D. (1983). The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms, *Management Science*, Vol.29, no.7, pp. 770-791.
- Mohd, K. H. 2005. “*Small and Medium-Sized enterprises in Malaysia-Role in Issues*”. Sintok: UUM Press.
- Mugenda, O. M. & Mugenda, A. G., (2003), *Research Methods; Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, Acts Press, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Nooteboom, B. (1994). Innovation and Diffusion in Small Firms: *Theory and Evidence*. *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 6, No. 5: 327 - 347.
- Ottih LO (2000). *Entrepreneurship: Towards Preparedness*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Penrose, E. (1959): *The Theory of Growth of the Firm*, New York: Wiley Press.
- Rasheed, H. S. (2002): “Developing Entrepreneurial Characteristics in Youths: The Preferences associated with Entrepreneurship”. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, Vol.63, pp570-574.
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological monographs: General and applied*, 80, Serial No 609.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942), *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Shane, S. (2000). Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science*. Vol. 11(4): pp448-470.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*. Vol.25(1): pp217
- Steward, W.H., Carland, J.C., Carland, J.W., Watson, W.E. & Sweo, R. (2003), “Entrepreneurial dispositions and goal orientations: a comparative exploration of United States and Russian entrepreneurs”, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp27–46.

Thomas, A.S. & Mueller, S.L. (2000), "A case for comparative entrepreneurship: assessing the relevance of culture", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp256-276.

Timmons, Jeffrey A. & Spinelli Stephen (2007). *New Venture Creation' Entrepreneurship for 21st Century*. International Edition. McGraw Hill.

Tonge, J. (2001): A Review of Small Business Literature, (Part 2): "Birth, Growth and Death of The Small Business", Working Paper Series, Manchester Metropolitan University Business School.

Vesper, K. H. (1980). *New venture strategies*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zahra, S.A. & Covin, J.G. (1995) Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10:43-58.