International Journal of Development and Sustainability
Online ISSN: 2168-8662 – www.isdsnet.com/ijds
Volume 2 Number 4 (2013): Pages 2337-2353
ISDS Article ID: IJDS13052101

ISDS JOURNALS

Special Issue: Development and Sustainability in Africa – Part 3

Do auto artisans practice entrepreneurial orientation? Empirical evidence from the Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana

Moses Ahomka Yeboah *

School of Applied Science and Arts, Cape Coast Polytechnic, Ghana

Abstract

Entrepreneurial orientation has been suggested as an attribute of high performing firms (including auto artisan firms). In line with this assertion, this study examines the extent to which auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis demonstrate entrepreneurial orientation in practicing their profession. Data was obtained through a self-administered questionnaire to 114 auto artisans. The dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation were classified to be low and high if the scale was 0-2.9 and 3-5 respectively. The results indicate high entrepreneurial orientation by the auto artisans with autonomy and risk-taking as the highest and least practiced dimensions correspondingly. This study recommended that improvement on the needed infrastructures amongst others would make the auto artisans achieve higher entrepreneurial orientation and subsequently improved business performance.

Keywords: Entrepreneurial orientation; auto artisans

Cite this paper as: Yeboah, M.A. (2013), "Do auto artisans practice entrepreneurial orientation? Empirical evidence from the Cape Coast Metropolis, Ghana", *International Journal of Development and Sustainability,* Vol. 2 No. 4, pp. 2337-2353.

* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* kofiahomka2@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

The business world today has become fiercely competitive and as such, it has become imperative for business enterprises to identify and sustain their competitive advantage to stay afloat. In view of this, Bygrave et al. (2004) recognized entrepreneurship as a vital component of the economic systems with substantial contribution to national economic growth. Entrepreneurship has become an increasingly popular subject in management research. Essentially, entrepreneurship refers to responding to identified business opportunities and creating new businesses. Entrepreneurial orientation refers to processes and practices leading to creation of new businesses. Entrepreneurial orientation has been found to have significant effects on firms' growth and performance. Entrepreneurs identify and take advantage of business opportunities to create enterprises for money making.

The auto artisans in Ghana are predominantly found in the informal urban centres which make industry-specific information about this sector scarcely obtainable. In the view of Amakye (2007), the auto artisan sector has received rising consideration in the economic advancement discourse of Ghana since the middle of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s. It has, in effect, been the objective of several policy programmes and actions by some governmental and non-governmental institutions and organisations. The focus on this sector at the intellectual and policy levels has arisen out of the understanding that, the sector has not only continued from making Ghana, a novel country, but also a gateway to African. In furtherance of the above, a formal technical training centre project for the artisanal engineering sector in Ghana was launched. This project was put in place purposely to upgrade the technical and managerial capacity of auto artisans located across Ghana. A study by Frimpong (2009) revealed that the majority of auto artisans in Ghana have difficulties working on modern vehicles with high computerized systems.The auto artisan segment in the Cape Coast Metropolis has seen very little adaptation to modern engineering practices and technology applications to keep pace with ever-changing global trends. This sector also has lagged behind in retraining and retooling its artisans. As a result, the artisans have found it challenging to repair the new automobile models.

The importance of entrepreneurial orientation as a determinant of a firm’s success and growth has increased tremendously in the last decade. There is a considerable variation in the size of reported degree of entrepreneurial orientation among small enterprises. Essentially, scholars have a limited understanding about why entrepreneurial oriented firms are more successful in one country than in another (Shane, 1992). Reynolds et al. (2004) argued that research studies on entrepreneurial orientation are mostly carried out in the developed countries and seldom are such studies undertaken in developing countries, particularly Africa. Academics have studied entrepreneurial activities and its consequences on firm performance but, the variables influencing these entrepreneurial activities are across-the-board and therefore exploring gaps in the entrepreneurial orientation research is an important task for scholars. This research therefore seeks to examine the extent to which auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis demonstrate entrepreneurial orientation.The paper is separated into five subdivisions. Part one introduces the study, followed by a discussion of the literature in the second part. The third and forth parts explains the methodology and results respectively. The paper ends with conclusion, recommendation and suggestions for future research.

2. Literature review

Barringer and Ireland (2006) traced the origin of the word "entrepreneurs" as a French word used in describing people who take up risk such as starting their own business ventures. According to Bygrave and Hofer (1991) and Cunningham and Lischeron (1991), no single accepted definition exists of the concept of entrepreneurship in the research literature, nor does there exist any unitary definition of this concept. In fact, the concept has been used to refer to a wide range of activities, such as creation, founding, adapting, and managing an entrepreneurial venture. Since entrepreneurship takes many forms, it is not surprising that a consensus has not been reached on the definition of entrepreneurship (Cunningham and Lischeron, 1991).

According to the classic writings of Schumpeter (1934), the entrepreneurial function played a central role in economic development. The theoretical background is diverse, spanning economics, strategy research, organisation studies, psychology and sociology, among other disciplines. Schumpeter further described entrepreneurship in terms of introducing new combinations of products, processes, organizations and distribution channels when facing the needs of markets. Schumpeter regards entrepreneurship essentially as a process of creative destruction, where the entrepreneur has a disequilibrating role in the economic system.

Contrary to Schumpeter's view, Hayek (1948) emphasises even more strongly the entrepreneur's ability unintentionally to constitute social order through tacit-knowledge-based but necessarily myopic acts. Kirzner (1973) emphasises the opportunities that arise as a result of the incompleteness of market information, and depicts entrepreneurship fundamentally as an arbitrage activity. Thus, entrepreneurship in the Kirznerian and Hayekian sense drives markets toward equilibrium as entrepreneurs recognise unnoticed profit opportunities and make use of them.

Again et al. (2005) opined that entrepreneurial orientation serves as a conduit for entrepreneurial decisions and actions. Thus, organizations with entrepreneurial orientation inclination are often noted to have a sustained competitive advantage. The entrepreneurial orientation construct is derived from the early work of Miller and Friesen (1978), which initially identified eleven strategy making process dimensions. In an afterward study, Miller (1983) provided the first operationalization of the entrepreneurial orientation construct, which was measured by three dimensions; innovation, risk-taking and proactiveness. Dess and Lumpkin (1996) propounded autonomy and competitive aggressiveness as two additions to the three entrepreneurial constructs originally theorised by Miller (1983). The subsequent paragraphs will discuss each of the entrepreneurial orientation dimensions in detail.

3. Innovation

In today's business world, innovation has turn into one of the vital features for businesses since competition for customers and resources has become fiercely intense, and currently innovation has extended its facets to all areas of business operations. Innovation has become the focal dimension of entrepreneurial orientation since Schumpeter' (1883-1950) emphasis on the concept. The past theoretical effort to establish a connection between entrepreneur and innovation came from economics. Mill (1848: 1909) asserted that entrepreneurship was a vital component to stimulate economic growth and concluded that people require

special skills to practice entrepreneurship. Marshall (1890:1920) posted four factors of production namely; land, labor, capital and organization. Marshal concluded that organization coordinates the other three factors and also serves as the driving engine behind entrepreneurship. Consequently, Marshall says, by being innovative, entrepreneurs create novel products or improve the plan of producing an old commodity.

Drucker (1985, p.32) defines innovation as "the specific tool of entrepreneurs". Drucker reiterated that the entrepreneurs through their innovations create new wealth by opening businesses, creating jobs and ultimately contributing to economic growth. Innovation is a multifaceted construct and is studied from several perspectives at diverse levels of analysis by scholars of different academic disciplines. At the organizational level, researchers have commonly defined innovation as the development (generation) and/or use (adoption) of new ideas or behaviors (Damanpour and Wischnevsky, 2006; Walker 2008). Additionally, Lumpkin and Dess (2001: 431) defined entrepreneurial innovation as the "willingness to support creatively and experimentation in introducing new products/services, and novelty, technological leadership and R&D in developing new processes".

In the view of Verona (1999), innovation entails the acquiring, spreading and using new knowledge. Organization's commitment to learning is able to increase firm's ability to be innovative (Calantone et al., 2002), which is because of its creating and developing knowledge, ability to recognize and predict opportunities. This is why the organization that has commitment to learning is more capable of innovation as compared to its rivals (Damanpour, 1991). Entrepreneurial innovations enable organizations to develop new products and services. And also, equip them with new management procedure and technologies aimed at instilling efficiency throughout the entire organization.

Covin and Miles (1990) argued that innovation is an integral component of entrepreneurship. They explained innovation is an organization's willingness to encourage and support new ideas, and practices. Also, creativity plays a central role in the quest of organizations striving to become innovative, creative thinking depends largely on the personality characteristics of employees such as self-discipline, risk-taking disposition and tolerance for uncertainties. However, the ultimate responsibility rest with the entrepreneur to create a congenial work environment to inspire creative ideas and practices at the work place. Wiklund (1999) portrayed entrepreneurial innovation as the introduction of newness in all facets of the organization. Small and medium enterprises owners are frequently unable to identify the most important factors impacting on their growth.

To prevail over these challenges, small businesses really need entrepreneurs to transfer their knowledge into very successful practices throughout continuous innovation at every level of the business venture. (OECD LEED Programme, 2009). Also, Mosey, Clare and Woodcock (2002) put forward that owners of SME need to create an innovative organizational structure which is very receptive to ideas from all employees. They opined that such a system facilitates the development of new products and services.

4. Proactiveness

Proactiveness is an organizational system which is both ongoing and driven by top management. Proactiveness has long been recognized by several authors as a fundamental element of entrepreneurial

orientation (Miller, 1983; Covin and Slevin, 1989; Dess and Lumpkin, 1996; Rauch et al., 2004). For instance, Dess and Lumpkin (1996) described proactiveness as an aspect of entrepreneurial orientation which enables an organization to have a forward-looking perspective. Again, Baron (1998) suggested proactiveness is an aggressive posturing by firms relative to their competitors. Baron (1998) concluded that such posturing makes the firm a leader rather than a follower at the market place. Business firms with proactive inclinations normally enjoy fist mover advantage and subsequently build and sustain their market share (Miller, 1983; Covin and Slevin, 1989; Dess and Lumpkin, 1996). Furthermore, Rauch et al. (2004) claimed that proactive firms are characterized by frequent introduction of new products and service ahead of competitors.

Although innovativeness relates to a firm's orientation toward creating innovative responses, proactiveness is related to anticipating and acting on future wants and needs in the market, which would enable a firm to gain first-mover advantage vis-a-vis the competition (Dess and Lumpkin, 1996). And also, proactiveness makes firms lead in the introduction of new products and services as well as modern management practices relative to other firms in the industry (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2001). Compared to innovativeness that focuses on creating novel combinations of product and administrative dimensions, proactiveness focuses more on a firm's initiative. Krueger (1993) theorised that proactive organizations shape their environments by actively seeking and exploiting opportunities. A proactive firm seizes new opportunities through (a) scanning the environment to seek opportunities (Venkatraman, 1989) and (b) taking pre-emptive action in response to perceived opportunity (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996).

Essentially, proactive firms introduce new products, technologies, administrative techniques to shape their environment and not react to it (Miller and Friesen, 1983). On the functional side, proactiveness helps firms to proactively seek information and resources to meet anticipated demand (Francis and Collins-Dodd, 2000). Singh et al. (1999) argued that the technological improvements necessary to meet changes in products and processes could threaten the existing competencies of a firm. However, proactiveness could help firms to seek out new ways to address technological challenges.

Venkatraman (1989) was of the view that proactiveness is the process of predicting and taken action on future demands of people by seeking new business opportunities and in accordance with organizational learning theory (Huber, 1991), proactiveness enhances learning capability to acquire, disseminate, unlearn and integrate market information. Proactiveness facilitates recognizing explicit customer needs, which could help to develop an appropriate marketing mix (Zahra and Covin, 1995) and the ability to outperform competitors in churning out novel products, services and management practices to the market (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). In the view of Weerawardena (2003), proactivity is crucial to entrepreneurial orientation because it suggests forward-looking actions.

The proactive firm often takes precautionary measures before environmental changes impact directly or indirectly on the organization. Along this line, Miller (1983) and Covin and Slevin (1989) have argued that the proactive tendency of a firm propels them to be ahead of their competitors, intends of new product development and management systems. Also, Dess and Lumpkin (2005) characterized proactive firms as organizations always on the lookout for business opportunities. Finally, in owning and/or managing a business, success is repeatedly determined by how business owners/managers think things through. Often a

person is seems surprisingly lucky in business, but this luck can be attributed to the foresight and vision that is the trait of good proactiveness.

5. Risk-taking

Risk-taking is an important part of entrepreneurship. Successful entrepreneurs are those who take calculated risk. The description of entrepreneurs as risk-takers is widely accepted by scholars in entrepreneurship. Some of these scholars equate the idea of entrepreneurship with the risk taking propensity of individuals (Cantillon, 1734, McClelland, 1965, Hisrich 1986; Hisrich and Peters, 1992; Shane, 1994). Cantillon (1734) defined entrepreneurs as persons who engage in exchanges for profit and also makes business decisions in the face of uncertainty. Cantillon concluded that risk-taking is the principal factor that separated entrepreneurs from hired employees. Hisrich (1986) and Hisrich and Peters (1992), simply described risk taking has as a fundamental element of the entrepreneur and entrepreneurship. Every business owner/manager assumes risks in their discharge of business related activities. For instance, Covin and Slevin (1989) and Lumpkin and Dess (1996), considered risk taking as the likelihood of loss and also an inherent characteristic of every business desiring to become entrepreneurially oriented.

Baird and Thomas (1985) identified risk taking as venturing into the unknown, committing a relatively large portion of assets and borrowing heavily. Risk-Taking is the willingness to break away from the tried-and-true path and venture into unknown territory (Venkatraman, 1989). To encourage employees to create novel combinations, risk-taking is most useful if it is woven into the fabric of an organization. And Nystrom (1990) opined organisations are likely to be innovative when risk-taking is promoted in an organization. Rauch et al. (2004) in their studies concluded that risk taking entails making audacious decisions and subsequently taking actions in the face of uncertainty in the environments. To them, risk taking is committing substantial resources of the organization into ventures which the outcome cannot be readily known. Risk taking is another dimension of entrepreneurship, and is a very important property of entrepreneurship (Antoncic and Hisrich, 2003). Finally, according to Gilley, Walters and Olson (2002), risk-taking propensity promotes and exhibits behaviours that lead to process enhancements, new products or services, and innovative practices in an organisation.

6. Autonomy

Autonomy is a significant element of entrepreneurial orientation. Schumpeter (1934) observed that entrepreneurial business owners or managers run their business on their personal vision. This implies that business owners strive to uphold and value their decision making powers and will resist any attempt to receive instructions from others. A study by Miller (1983) confirms the forgoing argument by indicating that most entrepreneurial firms had the most autonomous leaders. Again, Burgelman (1983) and Mintzberg (1973) opined that organizational leaders often engage in autonomous actions in running the organization.

Hart (1992) confirms these claims by suggesting that entrepreneurial leaders take independent actions creating new ventures.

Lumpkin and Dess (1996) defined autonomy as the desire by business owners to make decisions and also continue with actions independently devoid of organizational impediments. Business organizations that champion autonomy as a means of achieving entrepreneurial orientation creates an encouraging work climate to enable employees function creatively without unnecessary management interferences.

Lee and Peterson (2000) described autonomy as the independent spirit and freedom necessary to create new ventures. For these reasons, autonomy is thought to be an essential element of the entrepreneurial orientation construct. According to them, entrepreneurs must create a business culture that promotes independent acting and also enables opportunity seeking avenues at the work place.

7. Competitive aggressiveness

Stinchcombe (1965) suggested that young firms are particularly susceptible to the liability of newness and therefore, must take steps to establish legitimacy and power relative to suppliers, customers, and other competitors. And according to Lumpkin and Dess (1996), competitive aggressiveness also reflects a will to be unconventional rather than rely on traditional methods of competing. Furthermore, they argued that for a firm to have a truly entrepreneurial orientation, theses firms are likely to also demonstrate a significant degree of competitive aggressiveness. That is, it recognizes the presence of rivalry and seeks to act to maintain or improve its relative position. Examples of this and other forms of competitive aggressiveness available to new entrants include adopting unconventional tactics to challenge industry leaders (Cooper and Dunkelberg,1986), analyzing and targeting a competitor's weaknesses (Macmillan and Jones, 1984) and focusing on high value-added products while carefully monitoring discretionary expenses (Cooper and Dunkelberg,1986). Chene Hambrick (1995) described competitive aggressiveness as being an organization's trend in responding aggressively to competitor’s actions and looking forward to gaining competitive advantage. Similarly, Lumpkin and Dess (2001) characterised competitive aggressiveness as threat responses the entrepreneurs engage in.

8. Methodology

This study employed descriptive statistics. Data for the study was obtained through self-administered questionnaire.

8.1. Population

The study area for this research was Siwdu, a suburb in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Siwdu is the main hub of auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis. Siwdu is a hub of auto artisans in the Region. A complete list of registered auto artisans in Siwdu was unavailable and so a headcount was conducted primarily on auto

artisans who have secured permanent place of business and had apprentices and/or employees. The following statistics were obtained; population size is 297 auto artisans. Out of this number, 98 do not own a place due to congestion and had to perch with those who that had permanent place of business but, 26 did not have either employees or apprentices. The sampling size was 174 auto artisans after subtracting the number of those auto artisans without either employees or apprentices and also those with no business venue. This was because one of the performance indicators was to find out the auto artisan's ability to create jobs.

8.2. Sample and Sampling Procedure

The population of the auto artisans was stratified into four groups based on their job specialisation; auto mechanics, auto wielders, auto electricians and auto sprayers. The simple random sampling technique was employed; in particular, the lottery method was utilized to select the auto artisans from each stratum in order to arrive at the sample size. The number of auto artisans selected from each stratum was dependent on the stratums' population size. The sample size in each stratum used for the study is displayed in Table 1. Using the formula developed by Krejcie and Morgan (1970), a sample size of 118 auto artisans was obtained. Once the sample size for the general population was obtained, the sample size for each stratum was obtained by using the formula:

$$n_1 = \frac{n\ x\ N^1}{N}$$

where; n_1 = Sample size, N = general population and N_1 = stratum (population).

Table 1. Sampled Auto Artisans for the Study

Type of auto artisan	Sampling frame	Sample size
Mechanics	63	43
Welders	52	35
Electricians	32	22
Sprayers	26	18
Total	173	118

Source: Field data

8.3. Measures

The data were collected through the use of self-administered questionnaire. The entrepreneurial orientation were categorised into five dimensions; innovativeness, proactiveness, risk-taking, competitive aggressiveness and autonomy as propounded by Dess and Lumpkin (1965). In all, 22 items were developed based on Covin and Slevin (1989), and review of related literature. These dimensions were measured on an

Agreement Scale of 1 to 5 with 1 indicating Weak Agreement while 5 indicates Strong Agreement. The results in Table 2 depict that the Cronbach's coefficient alpha (α) for each of the entrepreneurial orientation dimensions were higher than 0.70. This indicates that the mean coefficients of the dimensions are reliable and useful for this research, because according to Fraenkel and Wallen (2000), a useful rule of thumb is that reliability should be at least 0.70.

Table 2. Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients

Constructs	Cronbach's Alpha
Innovativeness	.803
Proactiveness	.741
Risk-taking	.717
Autonomy	.701
Competitiveness aggressiveness	.702

Source: Field data

8.4. Analysis of data

A total of 118 questionnaires were administered but, 114 were collected back; representing 96.61% response rate. Data collected from the survey design were analysed quantitatively. The data obtained were analysed using the computer software; Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS 17.0 version). Regarding the extent to which the auto artisans at Siwdu demonstrate entrepreneurial orientation, the dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation had their mean put on scale of 0-5. They were classified to be low and high entrepreneurial orientation if the scale was 0-2.9 and 3-5 respectively.

9. Results and Discussions

9.1. Profile of Respondents

The demographic analysis reveals that all the auto artisans were males (100%). The majority of the auto artisans, a total of 97.4% prefer to own and manage their business whilst only few (2.6%) will employ managers. With regard to age, 77.2% representing the majority were between 25 and 44 years and 15.8% fell between the ages of 45 and 54. There are 56.1 % of the auto artisans from JHS/Middle School, 9.9% were

from Commercial/Vocational/Technical education, 13.3% had Senior High School. And also, 2.6% had received Post Secondary Diploma but, 1.8% of the auto artisans had never been to school.

Majority of the auto artisans (57%) had owned and managed their business for more than 10 years. 36% of them had operated their business for the past 7 to 10 years. Those auto artisans that had been associated with their business for 3 to 6 years account for 7%. A few 7% had owned and/or managed their business for the last 3 to 6 years. In addition, 88.6% did not have any work experience before joining the auto artisan profession. Only 11.4% had worked before as operating staff in their previous employment. All the auto artisans (100%) had fewer than four employees, whilst, 95.5% had apprentice fewer than five people and only 3.5% of them had apprentices between six and nine people. This shows that the auto artisans prefer working with apprentices to working with employees.

9.2. Auto Artisans' Entrepreneurial Orientation

The findings indicate that the auto artisans have a high practice of innovativeness ($\overline{X}$ = 3.77; Table 3). Majority of the auto artisans ($\overline{X}$ = 3.98; 99.1%) strongly agreed that they unceasingly encourage their employees/apprentices to think creatively. Additionally, majority (96.5%; $\overline{X}$ = 3.97) of the auto artisans engage in and support new ideas from their employees/apprentices. This could mean that auto artisans create an encouraging work environment to enable their employees/apprentices think and explore creatively in performing assigned tasks.

Table 3. Level of Innovativeness

Innovativeness variables	Mean*
This enterprise encourages employees to think and behave in original and novel ways.	3.98
This enterprise has the tendency to engage in and support new ideas, novelty, experimentation and creative processes.	3.97
This enterprise emphasise on utilizing new technology.	3.89
Changes in this enterprise' products or service lines have been quite slow.	3.72
This enterprise searches purposely for the sources of innovation.	3.71
This enterprise emphasizes on research and development	3.65
This enterprise encourages new ideas from any workers regardless Of his/her position	3.45
Overall Mean	**3.77**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field data.

The study revealed high practice of proactiveness with a mean of 3.91 (Table 4). The entire auto artisans ($\overline{X}$ = 3.91; 100%) act in anticipation of future needs and also 99.1% of them with a mean of 4.23 had an

intensive drive towards their business goals. Additionally, 99.1% of the auto artisan's recognised explicit customer needs in advance.

Table 4. Level of Proactiveness

Proactiveness variables	Mean*
This enterprise acts in anticipation of future needs.	4.25
This enterprise has an intensive drive towards its goals.	4.23
This enterprise facilitates recognizing explicit customer needs.	4.11
This enterprise initiates actions to which competitors then respond	3.63
This enterprise has an aggressive posturing relative to competitors.	3.62
This enterprise is not the first to introduce new products or services.	3.61
Overall Mean	**3.91**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field data

The implication of this result is that the auto artisans at Siwdu will stop at nothing in achieving the very purpose for which they decided to run the auto artisan venture. Although the auto artisans scored high level of proactiveness, 86% of them agreed they were not the first to introduce new products or services. This could imply that the auto artisans at Siwdu do not initiate any novelty with respect to the auto artisan profession but, rather borrow or copy technological additions from their colleagues elsewhere.

Table 5. Level of Risk-taking

Risk-taking variables	Mean*
This enterprise has a strong and aggressive attitude on taking decisions.	3.97
This enterprise practices "wait and see" position to minimize risk.	3.82
This enterprise does not have strong preference for high-risk projects.	3.58
This enterprise does not respond to unrelated opportunities.	3.05
This enterprise always invests in untested technologies.	2.19
Overall Mean	**3.32**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field data.

With respect to auto artisan risk-taking propensity, the study revealed a high practice ($\overline{X}$ =3.32; Table 5). The majority of auto artisans (93.9%) agreed that a strong and aggressive attitude on taking decisions

contributed highly to their overall risk-taking propensity. A substantial number of the auto artisans (94.7%) admitted that they have adopted a "wait and see" posture towards deciding on situations that are not recurring in nature. The inference from this result is that the auto artisans only take bold and aggressive decisions on situation that are repetitive.

Table 6. Level of Autonomy

Autonomy variables	Mean*
The manager or owner of this enterprise maintains strong central authority.	4.35
The manager or owner of this enterprise has the ability and will to be self-directed in the pursuit of opportunities	4.12
This enterprise grants little freedom for both individual and team work.	4.00
This enterprise allows bypassing procedures to get workers committed in implementing new ideas	3.87
Overall Mean	**4.09**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field data.

The auto artisan's responses on their autonomy practices were scored high ($\overline{X}$ = 3 and above; Table 6). Majority of the auto artisans (99.1%) agreed maintaining strong central authority was the key contributor to their overall practice of autonomy. Additionally, 99.1% of them had strong preference to be self-directed in the pursuit of opportunities. This result implies that the auto artisans at Siwdu run their ventures independently devoid of external influences.

With respect to auto artisans' competitive aggressiveness, the study revealed a high practice of competitive aggressiveness ($\overline{X}$ = 3.97, Table 7). Particularly, majority of the auto artisans (100%) had strong agreement that they were susceptible to the "liability of newness".

Table 7. Level of Competitive aggressiveness

Competitive aggressiveness variables	Mean*
This enterprise is susceptible to the "liability of newness".	4.15
This enterprise typically adopts a bold, aggressive posture to maximise the probability of exploiting potential opportunities.	4.03
This enterprise has a tendency to be ahead of others in introducing novel ideas or products.	3.89
This enterprise is willing to be unconventional rather than rely on traditional methods of competing.	3.46
Overall Mean	**3.89**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field data, 2011.

This implies that each of the auto artisans gets agitated if he perceives any of his colleagues to be more technologically abreast with the auto artisan profession than he does. Again, 98.2% of the auto artisans had the tendency to be ahead of others in introducing novel ideas or products/services, while 84.2% of them preferred unconventional rather than rely on traditional methods of competing. This outcome brings to light the fierce competition among the auto artisans and the intensity of their efforts to outperform each other.

10. Conclusion

This study was to examine the extent to which the auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis practice entrepreneurial orientation. The overall level of entrepreneurial orientation of the auto artisans was high ($\overline{X}$ = 3.79; Table 8).

Table 8. Level of Entrepreneurial Orientation

Entrepreneurial Orientation Dimensions	Mean*
Autonomy	4.09
Proactiveness	3.91
Competitive aggressiveness	3.88
Innovativeness	3.77
Risk-taking	3.32
Overall Mean	**3.79**

**Scale (Mean): 0-2.9 = low and 3-5= high.*
Source: Field Data, 2011

The highest practiced entrepreneurial orientation dimension was autonomy ($\overline{X}$ = 4.09) followed by proactiveness ($\overline{X}$ =3.91) and competitive aggressiveness ($\overline{X}$ = 3.88). Innovativeness recorded ($\overline{X}$ =3.77) whilst, risk-taking was the least practiced dimension ($\overline{X}$ =3.32). The revelation from these results is that the auto artisans in the Cape Coast Metropolis are extremely willing to be self-directed in running their business, desire to be constantly abreast with the future needs of customers and are eager to outstrip each other. They are a bit conservative in taking decisions that they perceive as risky and are also laggards in coming out with novel products/services.

11. Recommendation and suggestions for future research

This study recommended that improvement on the needed infrastructures amongst others would make the auto artisans achieve higher entrepreneurial orientation and consequently improved business performance.

Finally, the entrepreneurial orientation of each of the four specialisations of auto artisans; mechanic, welders, electricians and sprayer was not discussed, and so future research can compare and contrast the entrepreneurial orientation of these groups of auto artisans.

References

Amakye, O. (2007), "Informal sector in Ghana", *The Stateman*, No.1569, p. 4.

Antoncic, B. and Hisrich, R.D. (2003), "Corporate entrepreneurship contingencies and organizational wealth creation", *Journal of Management Development,* Vol. 23, pp. 518-550.

Baird, I. and Thomas, H. (1985), "Toward a contingency model of strategic risk-taking", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 10, pp. 320-343.

Baron, R.A. (1998), "Cognitive mechanisms in entrepreneurship: Why and when *e*ntrepreneurs think differently than other people", *Journal of Business Venturing,* Vol. 13, pp. 275- 294.

Barringer, B.R. and Ireland, R.D. (2006), *Successfully launching new venture* (2nd ed.), Pearson Education, Inc., New Jersey.

Burgelman, R.A. (1983), "Corporate entrepreneurship and strategic management: Insights from a process study", *Management Science,* Vol. 29, pp. 1349-1364.

Bygrave, W. and Hofer, C.W. (1991), "Theorizing about entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 16, pp. 13-22.

Bygrave, W.D., Reynolds, P.D. and Autio, E. (2004), Entrepreneurship monitor, *Executive Report,* Babson College, London.

Calantone, R.J., Cavusgil S.T. and Zhao, Y. (2002), "Learning orientation, firm innovation capability, and firm performance", *Industrial Marketing Management,* Vol. 31, pp. 515 –524.

Cantillon, R. (1755), *Essai sur la nature du commerce en general* (Ed. 3rd), Guillaumin, Paris.

Chen, M.J. and Hambrick, D.C. (1995), "Speed, stealth and selective attacks: How small firms differ", *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 38 No. 2, pp. 452-482.

Cooper, A.C. and Dunkelberg, W.C. (1986), "Entrepreneurship and paths to business owner-ship*", Strategic Management Journal,* Vol. 7, pp. 53-68.

Covin, J.G. and Miles, M.P. (1990), "Corporate entrepreneurship and the pursuit of competitive advantage", *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 47–63.

Covin, J.G. and Slevin, D.P. (1989), "Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments", *Strategic Management Journal,* Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 57-75.

Cunningham, J.B. and Lischeron, J. (1991), Defining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management,* Vol. 29, pp. 45-61.

Damanpour, F. (1991), "Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators", *Academy of Management Journal,* Vol. 34, pp. 555–90.

Damanpour, F. and Wischnevsky, D. (2006), "Research on organizational innovation: Distinguishing innovation-generating from innovation-adopting organizations", *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management*, Vol. 23, pp. 269–91.

Dess, G. and Lumpkin, G. (2005), "The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship", *Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 19 No. 1, pp. 147-156.

Dess, G.G. and Lumpkin, G.T. (1996), Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 21, pp. 135-172.

Drucker, P.F. (1985), "Innovation and entrepreneurship: Practice and Principles", *Systematic Entrepreneurship,* Vol. 21 No. 9.

Fraenkel, J.R. and Wallen, N.E. (2000), *How to design and evaluate research in education* (4th ed.), The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., USA.

Frimpong, E. (2009), "Welcome to Kumasi, the garden city of Africa", Retrieved March 5, 2011, from: http://www.graphicghana.com.

Gilley, K., Walters, B.A. and Olson, B. (2002), "Top management team risk taking propensities and firm performance: Direct and moderating effects*", Journal of Business Strategies*, Vol. 19, pp. 95-114.

Hart, S.L. (1992), "An integrative framework for strategy-making processes", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17, pp. 327-351.

Hayek, F.A. (1948), *Economics and knowledge, reprinted in individualism and economic order*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Hisrich, R.D. and Peters, M.P. (1998), *Entrepreneurship: Starting, developing, and managing a new enterprise,* Irwin, Boston.

Huber, G.P. (1991), "Organizational learning: The contributing processes and the literatures", *Organisation Science,* Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 88-115.

Kirzner, I. M. (1973), *Competition and entrepreneurship*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D.W. (1970), "Determining sample size for research activities", *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 607-610.

Krueger, N. (1993), "The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 5-21.

Lee S. and Peterson, S. (2000), "Culture, entrepreneurial orientation, and global competitiveness", *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 35 No. 4, pp. 401-416.

Lumpkin, G.T. and Dess, G.G. (2001), "Linking two dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation to firm performance: The moderating role of environment and industry life cycle", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16, pp. 429-451.

MacMillan, I.C. and Jones, P.E. (1984), "Designing organizations to compete", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 4, pp. 11-26.

Marshall, A. (1890), *Principles of economics,* Prometheus Books.

McClelland, D.C. (1965), "Achievement motivation can be developed", *Harvard Business Review,* Vol. 43, pp. 6-25.

Mill, J.S. (1848: 1909), *Principles of Political Economy with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy*, Longmans, Green and Co., London.

Miller, D. and Friesen, P. (1978), "Archetypes of strategy formulation", *Management Science*, Vol. 24, pp. 921-933.

Miller, D. and Friesen, P.H. (1983), "Strategy-making and environment: The third link", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 4, pp. 221-235.

Miller, D. (1983), "The Correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms", *Management Science,* Vol. 29, pp. 770-791.

Mintzberg, H. (1973), "Strategy-making in three modes", *California Management Review*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 44-53.

Mosey, S., Clare, J. and Woodcock, D. (2002), "Innovation decision making in British manufacturing SMEs", *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 176-83.

Nystrom, P.C. (1990), "Differences in moral values between corporations", *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol. 9 No. 12, pp. 971-979.

OECD LEED Programme (2009), *On SMEs, Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Paris: OECD.

Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T. and Frese, M. (2005), "Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 12-18.

Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G.T. and Frese, M. (2005), "Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 19 No. 7, pp. 12-18.

Reynolds, P.D., Bygrave, W.D. and Autio, E. (2004), *Global entrepreneurship monitor: Executive Report,* Babson College, Babson Park, Ma.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934), "The theory of economic development", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 58, pp. 358-480.

Shane, S. (1994), "The effect of national culture on the choice between licensing and direct foreign investment", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, pp. 627-642.

Shane, S.A. (1992), "Why do some societies invent more than others?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 7, pp. 29–46.

Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965), Social structure and organizations. In G. James. (Ed.), *Hand-book of organizations,* (pp.142-1 93). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Venkataraman, S. (1989), *Problems of small venture start-up, survival, and growth: A transaction set approac,* Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Walker, R.M. (2008), "An empirical evaluation of innovation types and organizational and environmental characteristics: Towards a configuration approach", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,* Vol. 18 No. 4, pp. 591–615.

Weerawardena, J. (2003), "Exploring the role of market learning capability in competitive strategy", *European Journal of Marketing,* Vol. 37 No. 314, pp. 407-429.

Wiklund, J. (1999), "The sustainability of the entrepreneurial orientation performance relationship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice,* Vol. 24 No. 1, pp. 37 48.

Zahra, S.A. and Covin, J.G. (1995), "Contextual influences on the corporate entrepreneurship performance relationship: A longitudinal analysis", *Journal of Business Venturing,* Vol. 10 No. 3, pp. 43-58.