Female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Thailand
– Differences and similarities in motivation
Summary

Date: 2008-06-16
Course: EFO705, Master Thesis in Business Administration
Authors: Anna Johnsson    Sirikanya Kongsinsuwan
          830218    810919
          Tfn: 0732-004788 Tfn: 0735-844652
Supervisor: Tommy Torsne

Title: Female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Thailand – differences and similarities in motivation.

Problem: Female entrepreneur is an interesting topic in the entrepreneurship field of study since there are a few numbers of researches that show that female-owned businesses are gradually becoming an important factor to contribute growth in the global economy. The study of ‘how’ to start business and ‘how’ to keep the business successful and sustainable in global business world is the focus in most of the research. Still, what motivates an entrepreneur to start business is one interesting topic for further and deeper study in the field of entrepreneurship and especially female entrepreneurship. In addition to the motivation of becoming an entrepreneur, other factors that could have possibility in influencing the motivation as well as similarities and differences on motivation when comparing in nationalities are interesting to focus on in the study.

Aim: To describe the motivational factors for entrepreneurs, with focus on female entrepreneurs, and compare these factors with female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Thailand.

Method: Relevant literature review and conceptual framework were selected from entrepreneurship field, including male and female entrepreneurs, motivation and entrepreneurial motivation. Interview, both personal interview and e-mail interview, and questionnaire were used in data collection for the empirical data part. With application of literature review, conceptual framework, and empirical data, the analysis and conclusion parts are concluded and lead to the answer of the research question.

Result: Swedish and Thai female entrepreneurs are similar in motivation of starting the business in term of pull factors, such as need for independence, want to be one’s own boss, need for autonomy, and want for self-achievement. While we have no evidence that education background and career experience had an influence on the motivation of an entrepreneur to start the business, we did find however, that family background showed a result with some weight in influencing motivation from a majority of the respondents in the study.
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1. Introduction

In this section the readers find a description of the problem background and get an introduction to what this thesis will be discussing. This section is divided into background, problem discussion, research question, purpose and the restrictions of the thesis.

1.1. Background

Female entrepreneur is an interesting topic for researchers and students in the entrepreneurship field of study. From the entrepreneurial discourse, we found that the definitions and descriptions of the ‘entrepreneur’ are mostly referring to male more than female. Later on, the gender perspective has come into perception and gained more attention in the area. Moreover, we found that a few number of research shows that female-owned businesses are gradually becoming an important factor for the global economy. Verheul, Stel and Thurik (2006, p.151) pointed out that “Increasingly, female entrepreneurs are considered important for economic development.” Internationally, one in ten women is self-employed, and it is estimated that women own and manage up to one third of all businesses in developed countries (McClelland et al. 2005, p.84). One evidence to support this can be found in Langowitz and Morgan (2003, p.102) who claims that “Women-founded and owned firms represent an increasing percentage of businesses and business revenues in the United States. In 2000, 38% of businesses in the United States were owned by women (Center for Women’s Business Research, 2001).” McClelland et al. (2005, p.85) have further mentioned that ‘In addition, it is evident that the entrepreneurial activity of these female entrepreneurs is making a distinct difference in their communities and economies, in both the developed and developing countries.’ In other words, female entrepreneur is taking part as minor aspect in entrepreneurial literature and discourse, while in global economy female entrepreneur is becoming an important factor to contribute growth in global business.

1.2. Problem discussion

In area of entrepreneur and entrepreneurship, there are many different factors to consider for a study. For example, the root of entrepreneur: whether they are born or made, corporate entrepreneur, barriers or success of entrepreneur, innovation or imitation, policy-making, etc. And if we narrow down the perspective to see the differences of male and female entrepreneurs, the areas of study are even more varied. However, we are inspired by one factor in order to deliver a deeper inspection of the study of the female entrepreneur and that factor is the motivation. While some studies are focused on how to start the business and how to keep them successful and sustainable in the global business world, we would like to focus our paper on ‘why’ the entrepreneurs start their businesses. We are keen to see what motivates them to start up their own businesses, will there be any differences comparing nationalities on
motivation, and if there are other factors that have an impact on their motivations.

1.3. Research question

The research question is therefore as follows:

*Do the motivational factors differ between female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Thailand?*

1.4. Aim

To describe motivational factors for entrepreneurs, with focus on female entrepreneurs, and compare these factors with female entrepreneurs in Sweden and Thailand.

1.5. Target group

Researchers and students in the field of female entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial motivation.

1.6. Restrictions

The first area we will not mention in this paper is culture. We found that culture would most likely be a too large area to inspect and, with the time limit, we chose to avoid this area instead of touching on it without being able to cover all of the important aspects from this area as well as being unable to provide a full picture of the culture in entrepreneurship.

Law, regulation and government policies in each country are also important issues that impact on the motivation to start a business. However, due to the distance between a country like Thailand and the location in which we are located, we are unable to search for enough data and information to support this. Therefore, instead of having weak data on such important issues, we chose not to present these topics in the paper.

We also left the start-up process untouched in this paper. Since we are focusing on the motivation of becoming an entrepreneur only, therefore the process of starting the business or the entry mode the entrepreneurs choose for their businesses are not included here.

Moreover, we have chosen not to make a big issue of the gender factor even though we touch upon it when describing the female entrepreneur.
2. Method

In this second chapter, the reader finds a description of the method used when writing this thesis. It is divided into sections such as research approach, how it was done, validity and reliability and also any problems encountered with the chosen method.

2.1. Research approach

When writing a thesis, there are a number of different methods to choose from. Literature review, case study, experiment and observation are only a few examples of the different methods available. In choosing a method, the writer have several factors to consider, such as time, cost, availability, etc. (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2001)

For this thesis, we have chosen to conduct interviews and review the current literature in our subject area. We identified literature that we thought relevant for our chosen topic and with this we gathered, read and configured our theory for our thesis. (Forsberg & Wengström, 2003)

There are a number of different ways to conduct interviews. Our choice was to do three different types of interviews. For the interview of the Thai female entrepreneurs, we chose e-mail interviews. There are many advantages with e-mail interviews, such as it removes the space constraint and budget constraints what exists in other types of interviews. An e-mail interview also simplifies validation. Of course, e-mail interviews also has its negative sides, such as the need for being good at expressing oneself in a written form and also the lack of guarantees that the respondent will answer all the questions. (Ryen, 2004)

With the Swedish female entrepreneurs, we chose to conduct personal interviews since we had the time and the respondents were forthcoming (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2001). To make things easier for the respondents, we chose to e-mail them our questions in advance so they would feel they had the chance to prepare their answers.

We also chose to have a questionnaire sent to all of our respondents since we felt the answers from the personal interviews and e-mail interviews might not be easily compared. It also gave us an opportunity to see if the respondents answered differently when given a questionnaire than in the interview. Just as mentioned, the reason for making a questionnaire was due to a need to make sure that we could easily compare the answers given by the entrepreneurs from the two countries. We were fully aware that questionnaires are usually used as a measuring device with the help of mathematical equations. This was not our intention with our questionnaire which is why we have not used mathematical equations when presenting the material collected from the questionnaire.
As written above, interviews can be done in a variety of ways. For instance, they can be either unstructured, structured, or any combination of the two. They can be either qualitative or quantitative. A structured interview means that the questions are the same for every respondent. We decided to have a structured interview where our questions for the 10 female entrepreneurs were all the same. Only difference was that the questions were translated to Swedish for the personal interviews. The questions asked in both interviews and the questionnaire was constructed with our research question in mind and with the help of previous research. (Forsberg & Wengström, 2003)

When choosing to conduct e-mail interviews and personal interviews, we also had in mind that through this we would allow the respondents to convey their thoughts in their own words which means we chose a more qualitative than quantitative interviews. (Forsberg & Wengström, 2003) We are aware that in gathering information directly from the respondent they may color the information in order to make themselves appear more appealing but, we consider this to be unlikely in this case since it has to do with motivation and not promoting their companies.

When choosing our respondents, we used our own personal networks and the Technology Park in Västerås. This was mainly due to convenience and time constraints.

2.2. Research process

When writing the theory for our thesis, we searched for literature dealing with the entrepreneur, the female entrepreneur, motivation and the motivation for the entrepreneur. In order to be more efficient, we then chose to divide the literature we found and write about different parts of the theory. We have, after writing separately, added it all to one document and together read through it to make sure we have no mistakes in the text and also to make sure all the text follows a clear thread throughout the thesis.

In gathering our literature, we have used words such as entrepreneurs, female entrepreneurs, motivation, entrepreneurial motivation, etc. We used these words in different search engines such as ABI/inform, school library, libris.se, Västerås Stadsbibliotek, Google Scholar, Elin, etc. From the result, we chose the articles, books, etc. that we found most relevant with our question in mind.

For the empirical part of this thesis, we have conducted 3 forms of interviews, with 5 Swedish female entrepreneurs and 5 Thai female entrepreneurs. We sent a questionnaire to all 10 entrepreneurs.

With the Swedish female entrepreneurs (SFE), we booked meetings and conducted personal interviews. A few days before the interview, we sent an e-mail to the respondent with our questions, that we had translated into Swedish, and our questionnaire. During the interview, one of us asked the questions and wrote the answers down on paper. The interviews were
conducted in Swedish and the result was later translated to English before adding it to the thesis.

With the Thai female entrepreneurs (TFE), we chose to conduct e-mail interviews by sending the TFE an e-mail containing the questions, in English, and the questionnaire. The replies were then, if in Thai, translated before adding them to the thesis.

When adding the results from the interviews to the thesis, we also wrote a short description of who we interviewed and their companies.

For the duration of the thesis writing process, we have kept in touch with each other in our thesis group in order to maintain control over the thesis and its development.

2.3. Validity and Reliability

Two concepts to always have in the back of your mind when writing a thesis or conducting research of any form are validity and reliability. (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2001)

Validity means that the research process focuses on its purpose and does not deviate. In other words, that the thesis covers what is in the research question and purpose (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2001; Forsberg & Wengström, 2003). We have kept this in mind when writing our thesis and constantly made sure that what we write about is necessary in order to answer our research question.

With reliability Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul (2001) and Forsberg & Wengström (2003) mean that the research should give results that would not change if someone else conducts the same research. Of course, time is a factor in this since one cannot expect to get the same results if the research is copied at a much later point in time since certain facts tend to alter with time (Ryen, 2004). For this thesis, the reliability is relatively high. We would expect that should anyone else conduct an interview with our respondents, using our questions, at another time, the answers should still be the same.

2.4. Method problems

One negative aspect in our method was that we chose to interview only 5 females from each country. Had we interview more, we could have seen a clearer picture of the differences and similarities.

We are also aware that using a different method in collecting an empirical data could have a possibility to lead to different results. However, since we decided to choose the interview as a method for this thesis, we faced the problem to collect the data of Thai female entrepreneurs by face-to-face interview. Still, we chose to use e-mail interview instead of phone interview for Thai female entrepreneurs. The reasons of not using phone interview in this thesis are due to the time differences (5 hours differences), unable to record
the conversation and the expense for phone interview to 5 entrepreneurs could be costly.

2.4.1. **Source criticism**

When writing a thesis you have to look at your sources with critical eyes and try to see if they are current, which means that the facts are accounted close to the time it showed up e.g. if someone writes a journal everyday then the journal is current but if that someone sits down years later to write what he did then it is not current. You also have to look for tendency which means that the one writing has some interest in the question e.g. a leader would want to written of as a good leader even though he was not. The last two factors you have to consider are dependency, e.g. if two different sources are using the same source for their information, and authenticity, e.g. how authentic a web page is which is difficult to evaluate. (Eriksson & Wiedersheim-Paul, 2001)

When it comes to the current factor, we have some sources that are from the 1980’s, some from 1990’s but most are from 21st century which means they are current. The ones from 1980’s could be questionable but we don’t think the motivations change that much over time.

We have not noticed any tendency in our interviews nor any in our sources though we cannot rule it out since anyone writing has something invested in it and therefore could be a little partial or have previous ideas.

The dependency in the interviews is difficult to check but we do not think they are dependent. Not do we think there is too much dependency in the literature that we have used to, we have noticed that many writing about entrepreneurs mention Schumpeter, etc.

When it comes to authenticity of webpages, we feel that this has not been a problem for us since we have kept our usage of webpages to a minimum and only used it for finding information about the companies we have spoken to during our interviews.
3. Previous research

In this chapter the reader gets to take part in the previous research in the visited area. The sections deals with such matters as a short description of the entrepreneur, male and female entrepreneurs, industry distinguished to female type, motivation and motivation in the context of becoming an entrepreneur. At the end of the chapter the reader will find a summary of the theory in a conceptual framework/model that will be used in the analysis later on.

3.1. The entrepreneur

Entrepreneur comes from the French word ‘entreprendre’ and entrepreneurship was first used in economic theory by Richard Cantillon in the 18th century. The term entrepreneurship has been used in an economic aspect in the terms of production, profit, equilibrium, capitalism, risk or uncertainty ever since then. Until the 20th century, Joseph A. Schumpeter, who was claimed as the main figure in the literature of entrepreneurship, has introduced the new modern concept of entrepreneurship in innovation perspective. Swedberg (2000, p. 15) used the definition of Schumpeter to define entrepreneurship as “the making of a ‘new combination’ of already existing materials and forces; that entrepreneurship consists of making innovations, as opposed to inventions; and that no one is an entrepreneur for ever, only when he or she is actually doing the innovative activity”. Schumpeter (1911) further described the main types of entrepreneurial behavior to (1) the introduction of a new good; (2) the introduction of a new method of production; (3) the opening of a new market; (4) the conquest of a new source of supply of raw material; and (5) the creation of a new organization of an industry. To give a clearer view of the definition, Schumpeter (1911, p.58) explained that it is the carrying out of new combinations that we call ‘enterprise’; the individuals whose function it is to carry them out are the ones we call ‘entrepreneur’. One interesting perspective of entrepreneur from Schumpeter (1911, p.62) is that “carrying out of a new combination” is a special function, and the privilege of a type of people who are much less numerous than all those who have the objective possibility of doing it. Therefore, entrepreneurs are a special type, and their behavior a special problem, the motive power of a greater number of significant phenomena. In other words, Schumpeter (1911) is saying that the entrepreneur is a very special person in terms of decision, ability, and innovation. Swedberg (2000, p.17) went further that “Schumpeter now made clear that the entrepreneur does not have to be a single person but can equally well be an organization.”

Edith Penrose (1995, p.31), the author of ‘The Theory of the Growth of the Firm’, also proposed a definition of the entrepreneur as follows; the term ‘entrepreneur’ is used in a function sense to refer to individuals or groups within the firm providing entrepreneurial services, whatever their position or occupational classification may be. Penrose (1995) went on to explain that
‘entrepreneurial services’ are contributions to the operation of a firm that leads to the introduction and acceptance of new ideas regarding such matters as location, products, changes in technology, acquisition of managerial personnel, the raising of capital etc. Likewise, entrepreneurial services in Penrose’s meaning can refer to entrepreneurship in a general meaning.

Another interesting definition of the entrepreneur came from Burns (2005, p.9) who defined it as “Entrepreneurs use innovation to exploit or create change and opportunity for the purpose of making profit. They do this by shifting economic resources from an area of lower productivity into an area of higher productivity and greater yield, accepting a high degree of risk and uncertainty in doing so.” We found this definition have combined several perspectives from theorists in the entrepreneurship area; innovation from Schumpeter, change and opportunity from Kirzner, profit from Von Mises, resources, productivity and yield from Say, and risk and uncertainty from Knight. Mill (cited in Collins, Hanges & Locke 2004, p.99) suggested that risk bearing was the major feature that separated entrepreneurs from managers.

Hisrich (cited in Mueller & Thomas 2001, p.55), in summarizing research on entrepreneurial behavior, notes that the entrepreneur is someone who demonstrates initiative and creative thinking, is able to organize social and economic mechanisms to turn resources and situations to practical account, and accepts risk and failure. Segal, Borgia & Schoenfeld (2005, p.42) stated that being an entrepreneur, one who is self-employed and who starts, organizes, manages, and assumes responsibility for a business, offers a personal challenge that many individuals prefer over being an employee working for someone else. New challenges have come to the field of entrepreneurship to build and make this area more interesting for both study and real life, such as social-psychological, environmental, technological, social, or, of course, gender perspectives.

Understanding the mainstream of study in entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs were assumed to be men. However, women entrepreneurs are new interesting topic to discuss as well as being an alternative of the study in the field of entrepreneurship have brought us more variety for the argument. The next part of this literature review will present the differences between female and male entrepreneurs.

3.2. Female and male entrepreneurs

Female entrepreneurship is an under-researched area with tremendous economic potential and one that requires special attention (Henry, cited in McClelland et al. 2005, p.85). Lavoie (cited in Moore & Buttner 1997, p.13) described the female entrepreneur as the female head of a business who has taken the initiative of launching a new venture, who is accepting the associated risks and the financial, administrative and social responsibilities, and who is effectively in charge of its day-to-day management. The term “othering” is used to encapsulate the process by which a dominant group
defines into existence an inferior group, mobilizing categories, ideas and behaviors about what marks people out as belonging to these categories (Schwalbe et al., cited in Bruni, Gherardi, and Poggio 2004, p.257). By the modernist social studies, entrepreneurial discourse has used the word “othering” to distinguish male and non-male entrepreneur. Moreover, Collins and Moore (cited in Bruni, Gherardi, and Poggio 2004, p.258) stated that “…we may personally feel about the entrepreneur, he emerges as essentially more masculine than feminine, more heroic than cowardly.” In other words, the typical entrepreneur in most thoughts is the male entrepreneur with the characteristics of the masculine and heroic. However, during the period of 1980s, the scientific discourse on female entrepreneurship and women-run organizations began to gain ground (Bruni, Gherardi, and Poggio 2004, p.258).

There are many similarities and some differences – mainly regarding career preference and motivators – existing between male and female entrepreneurs (Brush, Moore & Buttner and Fischer et al., cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.817). Brush (1992, p.6) gave further details that “Research over the past ten years has shown there are similarities between male and female business owners across demographic characteristics, business skills, and some psychological traits (Hagan, Rivchun, & Sexton, 1989). However, differences between male and female business owners have been found in educational and occupational background, motivations for business ownership, business goals, business growth, and approaches to business creation.”

DeMartino & Barbato (2003, p. 819) mentioned a study by Bailyn in which he found that male and female entrepreneurs differ in how they structure their work around their personal life. Where men typically found their goals outside of the home and chose to direct their efforts toward challenges in the marketplace and the wealth creation that accompanies success in that arena. Women, on the other hand, used the autonomy of entrepreneurship to integrate the goals of family and personal interests to the goals of work. (Bailyn, cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.819)

Brush, Fischer et al., Chaganti & Parasuraman, Carter et al., and Verheul (cited in Verheul, Stel & Thurik 2006, p.151) proposed that female and male entrepreneurs differ with respect to their personal and business profile: they start and run businesses in different sectors, develop different products, pursue different goals and structure their businesses in a different fashion. Furthermore, Rosa & Hamilton, Kalleberg & Leicht, and Riding & Swift (cited in Mirchandani 1999, p.230) suggested that structural differences between the businesses which women and men operate are seen to produce the gender differences in their entrepreneurship patterns. Jago & Vroom (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.403) found experimental support in that females selected more participative leadership strategies than males.

In addition, Mirchandani (1999, p.230) stated another approach for the relationship between business structure and the gender of the business owner, women and men are seen to choose the structures and industry focus
within which they work. Example is provided by Goffee & Scase (cited in Mirchandani 1999, p.230) that women set up different types of businesses depending on their orientation towards their businesses and their families.

Buttner (cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.818) stated that women are usually more influenced and motivated by family needs whereas men usually have economic motives.

One of the areas to distinguish between male and female entrepreneurs are the industry where both of them are mostly performed their businesses. Scholars have identified traditional and nontraditional industries for female entrepreneurs with several aspects.

3.2.1. **Traditional and nontraditional industries for female entrepreneurs**

It is well documented that businesses of female entrepreneurs tend to be concentrated in certain traditionally female industries such as retail stores, personal services, and educational services, although some recent "modest" progress has been made in women entering nontraditional fields such as manufacturing, finance, and construction (Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.402).

Loscocco & Robinson (cited in Anna et al. 1999, p.281) found that women-owned businesses are concentrated in traditional female-typed fields with lower average business receipts than male-typed fields. They categorize the retail and service industries as female-typed, and the manufacturing, construction, and high technology as male-typed. Further study is showed by Moore & Rickel (cited in Anna et al. 1999, p.282) who examined characteristics of women in traditional and non-traditional managerial roles. Their study found that women having a non-traditional business role had a higher level of achievement, emphasized production more, saw themselves as having characteristics more like managers and men, and saw no self-characteristics which conflicted with those ascribed to male managers, contrary to women in traditional roles. Moreover, Hisrich & Brush (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.402) also observed that most female entrepreneurs avoid innovation in products or services - preferring to compete in the existing markets instead.

Being female in the society to perform on her own business is likely to be disadvantage in some meaning. In some societies, inequality can easily be noticed. Few barriers for female entrepreneurs in the industry will be discussed in the following part.

3.2.2. **Barriers to female entrepreneurs**

One main barrier to female entrepreneur is financial barrier. Access to capital; whether a female entrepreneur apply to an institutional financier (a bank, a finance agency), a friend, a relative or even her spouse, they are likely to come up against the assumption that “women can’t handle money” (Aldrich et al., cited in Bruni, Gherardi & Poggio 2004, p.262).
More studies provided support to this barrier. Financial aspects of venture start-up and management are without a doubt the biggest obstacles for women (Brush, cited in McClelland et al. 2005, p.89). Verheul & Thurik (cited in Verheul, Stel & Thurik 2006, p.161) showed that women may have more problems securing finance through the regular channels because their business profile usually is less favorable for investors than that of men, due to women starting smaller businesses, in services and often working part-time. Several studies suggest that acquiring capital is more difficult for women than for men, and that women have more difficulty in convincing (potential) investors (Schwartz, Hisrich & Brush, Brush, Carter & Cannon, and Carter, cited in Verheul, Stel & Thurik 2006, p.161). Humphreys & McClung (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.403) noted that bankers feel that female entrepreneurs are ineffective in obtaining credit because of a lack of financial and accounting expertise, and a lack of self-confidence. One reason for this problem is mentioned by Buttnner & Rosen (cited in Ahl 2002, p.102) who found that bank loan officers perceived men to be more ‘entrepreneurial’ than women – men were rated higher on leadership, autonomy, risk-taking propensity, readiness for change, and endurance.

Henry & Kennedy (2003, p.207) stated that women tend to rely more on self-generated finance than men during the start-up phase, with bank credit only increasing once the businesses has established itself. This might apply as their solution for the financial problem with the bank.

Another barrier is proposed by Chaganti & Parasuraman (cited in Ahl 2002, p.104) who studied gender differences in performances, goals, strategies, and management practices. They found similar management practices, similar employment growth and return on assets, but women had smaller sales. Women rated both achievement goals and financial goals higher than men, and for strategy there were no differences except that women rated product quality a little higher.

Now moving on to describing motivation.

3.3. Motivation

Motivation is basically the driving force behind behavior. Meaning that theories on motivation deal with beliefs that there is some underlying reason for behavior (Franken, 2002; Hughes et al., 2006; Wagner, 2003). Motivation has thus a strong connection to behavioral theory. There are two types of motivation: approach and avoidant. Approach is in response of a want or need while avoidant is in response of e.g. danger that needs to be avoided. The main focus of behavior and motivation can be found in three words: arousal, direction and persistence. (Franken, 2002) The following gives a short description of the history when it comes to the theories surrounding motivation.
3.3.1. Theoretical history of motivation

The first theory of motivation came from Thomas Aquinas as early as during the 13th century. Aquinas believed that motivation could be described as instinctive for animals whereas humans were governed by body and soul. Instincts were seen as something in animals, coming from the creator that caused them to behave in ways to preserve their species. Instinct theory grew in the later centuries and in the 17th century Renée Descartes came with his theory that humans also had instincts that controlled the body, such as the need to eat, but that other behaviors, such as sex, were controlled by the mind and hence that humans had some control over their behavior. (Franken, 2002)

During the 19th century, the rise of Darwinism caused a slight shift in motivation theory towards a more biological view. The Evolutionary theory arose and raised the view that animals and humans had the same basic motivations. In these early stages the motivational theories were mostly based on instinct and the idea that the behavioral responses for instincts are predetermined and fixed. But later on, psychologists have come to add the influences of learning and cognition as major factors influencing motivation as well as the inherited instincts. (Franken, 2002)

Another major contributor to behavioral theory and motivation theory was Sigmund Freud who believed that while instinct is the energy behind motivation, learning and cognition is the direction determinants. (Franken, 2002)

In the late 19th early 20th century, motivational theories moved towards discussing instincts in the definition of needs, drives and urges. (Franken, 2002)

The first to come with a theory of needs as motivation for certain behavior was Henry Murray but these days the most famous and well known theory is Maslow’s hierarchy of needs. (Franken, 2002)
Maslow divided up the needs into those that deal with deficiency and those dealing with growth. In order to tend to growth needs, the deficiency needs have to be satisfied first. The deficiency needs are e.g. physiological and safety needs whereas the growth needs are e.g. cognitive and, at the top, self-actualization needs. (Franken, 2002)

Later on came ideas that needs coupled with some sort of reward could strengthen the motivation for satisfying that specific need meaning that environment plays an important part in molding motivation. With the addition of the importance of environment on motivation came theories focused on principles of learning. (Franken, 2002)

One major contributor to these theories was Clark Hull who believed that when a person feels a need (or drive), they accidentally respond in a behavior that reduces that need (or drive) and thus the behavior is strengthened. Hull thus believes that habits are a result of random behavior that is rewarded. This theory came to be called drive theory. (Franken, 2002)

The drive theory was replaced by the reinforcement theory during the later half of the 20th century. Skinner, the brain behind the reinforcement theory, believed that a behavior could be learned without having a drive being reduced
with rewards being the key. Positive rewards meant that the behavior increased whilst negative rewards reduced that behavior. (Franken, 2002)

Later theories have also added the fact that humans can learn behavior by watching others and their behavior and that the biology underneath had less importance. (Franken, 2002)

Another part of motivational theory is the idea that one major motive is to be able to interact with the surrounding environment. This idea is the basis for growth motivation theories, in other words, the need to develop abilities to process information in order to reduce tensions in order to successfully deal with the surrounding environment. (Franken, 2002)

Humanistic theories is based on the belief that humans are unique and have an innate need for growth and self-actualization meaning that humans have a tendency to coordinate the responses to their needs in a way that develops the self. A big contributor to this theory was Carl Rogers who, among other things, believed that the need for approval and acceptance from the environment is a result of an interaction with the environment while working toward self-actualization. (Franken, 2002)

Cognitive theories are based on mental representation playing a key part in motivation. Mental representations can be expectancy (the expected outcome of a specific behavior) coupled with values making up the cognitive-choice theory (expectancy-value theory). Cognitive-choice theory suggests that humans choose the behavior that leads to the greatest feeling of pleasure. (Franken, 2002)

Expectancy lead to the goal-setting theories that means that motivation can come from setting up a goal for the future. Humans tend to set up goals for the future if they believe they have the possibility to attain, learn and acquire the necessary abilities to reach those goals. (Franken, 2002)

Combining entrepreneurship field of study with motivation theory from the above, next section will present the entrepreneurial motivation in order to show the reason why individual wants to start own business.

### 3.4. Motivation to become an entrepreneur

One of the main theories for entrepreneurial motivation comes from Schumpeter who believes that there are three major motives for becoming an entrepreneur (Swedberg, 2000):

1. Founding a private kingdom – a desire for power and independence including spiritual ambition.
2. A will to conquer – wanting to succeed, to prove one-self and also social ambition that kind of relates to no 1
3. Joy of creating – getting satisfaction from seeing things get done or by using ones ingenuity.
According to Swedberg (2000), this theory has nothing to do with the traditional motivational theories of satisfying wants and needs. By looking at the theories and comparing them with Schumpeter’s theory, there are some similarities e.g. in the mentioning of the desire for independence etc.

Several studies on motivation to become an entrepreneur propose a number of theories such as;

3.4.1. **Push / Pull theory**

Motivations for becoming an entrepreneur have generally been categorized as either push/pull situational factors or personal characteristics. Some individuals are pushed into entrepreneurship by negative factors such as dissatisfaction with existing employment, loss of employment, and career setbacks. Alternatively, individuals may be pulled into entrepreneurship by positive factors such as early training and exposure to business which encourages the search for business opportunities. (Mueller & Thomas 2001, p.54)

The “push” or negative factors are associated with the necessity factors that force the female into pursuing her business idea. These can be redundancy, unemployment, frustration with previous employment, the need to earn a reasonable living and a flexible work schedule, reflective of the family caring role that is still expected from women (Alstete; Orhan & Scott, cited in McClelland et al. 2005, p.85). Similarly, Deakins and Whittam (cited in McClelland et al. 2005, p.85) emphasize that in this situation becoming an entrepreneur is not a first choice, but nevertheless argue that such negative, motivational factors are more important with entrepreneurs drawn from certain groups in society that may face discrimination, such as ethnic minority groups, younger age groups and women.

“The “pull” or positive factors are those associated with factors of choice (Orhan & Scott) and the desire for entrepreneurial aspirations (Deakins & Whittam)” (McClelland et al. 2005, p.86). These relate to independence, self-fulfillment, autonomy, self-achievement, being one’s own boss, using creative skills, doing enjoyable work, entrepreneurial drive and desire for wealth, social status and power (Alstete, 2002; Orhan and Scott, 2001; Schwartz, 1976).

Research (Keeble et al.; Orhan & Scott, cited in Segal, Borgia & Schoenfeld 2005, p.44) indicates that individuals become entrepreneurs primarily due to “pull” factors, rather than “push” factors.

3.4.2. **Need for achievement (nAch)**

McClelland believes a high need for achievement is one major motivation for becoming an entrepreneur. This theory have later been examined and been found to have a base in reality by several researchers (Shane et al. 2003, p.263).

Lee (1996, p.19) quoted “This need to achieve excellence motivates individuals to overcome obstacles, to exercise power, to strive to do something
difficult as well and as quickly as possible” (Murrey, 1938) and “to do something better than it has been done before” (McClelland, 1974).

According to McClelland, entrepreneurs are individuals who have a high need for achievement, and that characteristic makes them especially suitable to create ventures (Delmar 2001, p.142). Delmar concluded that ‘it is the prospect of achievement satisfaction, not money, which drives the entrepreneur.’

Further, McClelland (cited in Shane et al. 2003, p.264) argued that entrepreneurial roles are characterized as having a greater degree of tasks that have a high degree of individual responsibility for outcomes, requiring more or different individual skills and efforts than other careers; thus, it is likely that people high in nAch will be more likely to pursue entrepreneurial jobs than other types of roles. High achievement motivation may be correlated with venture performance (Begley & Boyd; Carsrud & Olm; Morris & Fargher; Smith & Miner; Wainer & Rubin, cited in Stewart Jr. et al. 1998, p.193), suggesting that not only may the achievement motivation of the entrepreneur influence the ownership decision, but it could also influence the viability of the organization.

The Need for achievement have been found to be an effective tool when differentiating between firm founders and the general population though not when differentiating between the firm founders and the managers. It was also concluded that it may be highly effective when differentiating between successful and unsuccessful groups of firm founders. Thus, the need for achievement might play a useful role when explaining entrepreneurial activity. (Collins et al., as mentioned in Shane et al. 2003, p.264)

3.4.3. Locus of control

Rotter (cited in Delmar 2001, p.143) composed the concept of locus of control by explaining how individuals’ perception of control affects their behavior. Delmar explained that a person believing that the achievement of a goal is dependent on his or her own behavior or individual characteristics believes in internal control. An “internal” believes that one has influence over outcomes through ability, effort, or skills (Rotter, cited in Mueller & Thomas 2001, p.50). As “internals,” entrepreneurs believe in their own abilities to achieve and give little credence to external forces such as destiny, luck, or powerful others (Rotter, cited in Mueller & Thomas 2001, p.59).

Prospective entrepreneurs are more likely to have an internal locus of control origination than an external one (Brockhaus; Brockhaus & Horowitz, cited in Mueller & Thomas 2001, p.56). Rotter (cited in Shane et al. 2003, p.266) argued that individuals with an internal locus of control would be likely to seek entrepreneurial roles because they desire positions in which their actions have a direct impact on results.
3.4.4. Risk-taking

Another belief of McClelland (cited in Shane et al. 2003, p.264) was that willingness for risk-taking was a motivational factor. McClelland (1961) claimed that individuals with high achievement needs would have moderate propensities to take risk. Atkinson (cited in Shane et al. 2003, p.264) argued that individuals who have higher achievement motivation should prefer activities of intermediate risk because these types of activities will provide a challenge, yet appear to be attainable. McClelland (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.398) posited that entrepreneurs are high in Need for achievement and therefore prefer moderate levels of risk.

3.4.5. Need for affiliation

Lee (1996, p.19) defined affiliation motivation as basically the concern with maintaining warm, friendly relations with others. Further, Lee proposed that studies have shown that individuals with a moderate need for affiliation tend to be more effective managers and helpers than those with high and low affiliation. According to past studies, businesses owned by women are usually small because of limited capital; thus they may not be as good as large organizations in fulfilling affiliation needs.

3.4.6. Need for autonomy

In the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, autonomy was defined as “to do things without regard to what others may think” and “to avoid responsibilities and obligations” (Lee 1996, p.19). People with high needs for autonomy generally prefer self-directed work, care less about others’ opinions and rules, and prefer to make decisions alone (Pritchard & Karasick, cited in Lee 1996, p.19). ‘Entrepreneurs have been found to have a high need for autonomy (Sexton & Bowman) and fear of external control (Smith)’ was cited by Delmar (2001, p.144).

3.4.7. Need for dominance

The dominance drive manifests itself by a desire to control the sentiments and behaviors of others (Murrey, cited in Lee 1996, p.19). Those who have high needs for dominance have the tendency to seek leadership opportunities and prefer to control others and events (Pritchard & Karasick; Veroff; Uleman; Winter, cited in Lee 1996, p.19). Lee (1996, p.19) explained that since people with high need for dominance enjoy persuasion, cajoling and seduction as a means of influencing others, they are attracted to occupations such as teaching and public speaking. In additional, being the owner of the business, an entrepreneur exerts great power in the company, since he/she is the ultimate source of authority (Lee 1996, p.20).

3.4.8. Independence

Another motivator is the desire for independence. In this context, independence means to use one’s own judgment instead of blindly following others and also taking responsibility for one’s own life as opposed to using others. Many researchers have observed that there is a necessity for
independence in the entrepreneurial role. Not only because the entrepreneur has to take responsibility for pursuing a previously nonexistent opportunity, but also because the entrepreneur is responsible for whatever the result is. (Shane et al. 2003, p.268)

All above theories that focused in motivation to become an entrepreneur are showing the internal factors affecting the start of the business. There are, however, a number of external aspects showing a possibility on influencing on motivation to become an entrepreneur.

3.5. External factors influencing motivation

Besides the internal motivations that make people become an entrepreneur, there are some external factors that also influence the impact on motivation.

3.5.1. Education Background

First factor is the education background. Some hypothesis showed that entrepreneurs are less well-educated than the general population (Gasse, cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.396). However, for female entrepreneurs it seems to be different. Lee (1996, p.25) argued that on average, women entrepreneurs received higher level of education (median of diploma level) than women employees (median of secondary level). This is consistent with DeCarlo & Lyons (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.397) which stated that female entrepreneurs have more education than the average adult female. Connolly, O‘Gorman & Bogue (2003, p.164) concluded from their interviews of recently graduate entrepreneurs from University College Cork in Ireland that all five interviewees mentioned that their self-employment endeavor benefited from their participation in university life in certain ways, such as provided an environment to find business partners, contacts with industry and facilitated finding initial clients for the business. So from the research of Connolly, O‘Gorman & Bogue (2003) showed that the education background has helped the recently graduated entrepreneurs to build more networks, self-confidence, and basic knowledge for starting their businesses.

Even though some researches showed that female entrepreneurs tend to be graduates of liberal arts programs and to lack necessary understanding and skills in finance and management (Hisrich & Brush, cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.396) as well as women frequently suffer from a math anxiety which must be overcome before they can become effective in financial planning and control (Carter, cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.396). We still found one aspect show that ‘A university education was found to increase need for achievement drastically’ (Lee 1996, p.26). Nelson (cited in McClelland et al. 2005, p.89) has proposed that women approach the entrepreneurial experience with advantages rooted in education and experience and therefore they often lack the knowledge of skills required to develop their businesses. In other words, we find that education background is an important factor for the entrepreneur in order to start and run their businesses.
3.5.2. **Family Background**

Second factor is the family background. Bowen & Hisrich (1986, p.399) have studied and indicated strong evidence that entrepreneurs tend to have self-employed fathers. This is equivalent with Lee (1996, p.25) who identified that women entrepreneurs had a higher tendency to have a self-employed parent, compared to women employees. Furthermore, Shapero & Sokol (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.399) stated that the family, particularly the father or mother, plays the most powerful role in establishing the desirability and credibility of entrepreneurial action for the individual. In addition, Watkins & Watkins (cited in Lee 1996, p.25) suggested that female entrepreneurs are some four times more likely to have been subjected to the influence of an entrepreneurial parent than a member of the general population. Therefore, there is a higher possibility for children in a family in which the father, or at least the mother, is an entrepreneur to make the decision to start their own businesses. Networking of people from entrepreneurial parents can provide help to the entrepreneurs. The finding from Verheul, Stel & Thurik (2006, p.177) showed that family can be supportive of the firm by giving the entrepreneur a helping hand.

Another perspective of family is current family. Caputo and Kolinsky (cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.830) found that the presence of children increased the propensity of women to start their own businesses. DeMartino & Barbato (2003, p.830) found that entrepreneurship as a career can offer a degree of flexibility and balance that some other careers do not offer.

Several researchers have their findings to support this. Buttnner & Moore (cited in Mirchandani 1999, p.224) noted that women’s desire for challenge and self-determination, their desire to balance work and family responsibilities and blocked mobility within corporate structures motivate them to become entrepreneurs. Women are to a much larger extent motivated by the possibility of flexibility and finding a balance between their work and their family life (Brush, cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.818). Venheul, Stel & Thurik (2006, p.177) found that self-employment enables flexible working hours and working from the home.

Besides this, Still and Timms (cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.819) proposed that for female business owners family considerations are important, especially for those who do not have to rely on their business as the primary source of family income.

3.5.3. **Career Experience**

The last factor that has an impact on the motivation to become entrepreneur is career experience.

Brockhaus and Shapero & Sokol (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.400) reviewed several studies that indicated that entrepreneurs were dissatisfied in their most recent previous job. Brush (cited in DeMartino & Barbato 2003, p.818) also observed that there is a high proportion of women who are motivated by a dissatisfaction with their current employment and who view
business ownership as an alternative career that is more compatible with the other aspects of their life. In a study by Hisrich & Brush (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.400), they found that 42 percent of their 463 female entrepreneurs reported frustration in their previous job as a major reason for becoming involved in an entrepreneurial venture.

Shapero & Sokol (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986, p.400) found another evidence that "negative displacement" (being fired, demoted, transferred to an undesirable location; changes in the organization or ownership with negative career implications, etc.) is a major factor encouraging entrepreneurship in several cultures.

3.6. Conceptual framework/Model

From the above study, we found that internal motivation can be influenced by different factors. Different theories are explaining the different perspectives on why people become entrepreneur or wanted to start their own businesses. This model explains the different factors influencing motivation. It could be a need for achievement that leads to the motivation of becoming an entrepreneur or it could be the need for independence, having locus of control, being a risk-
taker, need for affiliation, need for autonomy, or need for dominance. Theories mentioned in the conceptual framework are illustrating the internal factors in motivation to become an entrepreneur for female entrepreneurs in our study. We call this model the Motivational circle.

Fig 3 – Model of other factors influencing motivation (Own creation)

From the first model, where we focused on the internal motivation perspective of the entrepreneur, we move on to show another model drawing a bigger picture including the external factors influencing the motivation to start own business. This model explains the internal motivation with the Motivation circle in the middle and the external factors, that could influence motivation, are circles of their own joining the Motivational circle. Besides motivation of entrepreneur herself, external factors such as family background, education background and career experience are also affecting the motivation when starting the business.
4. Empirical results

Here the reader will find the empirical data collected for the thesis through a number of interviews with female entrepreneurs in Sweden and in Thailand. The sections are divided into Swedish entrepreneurs and Thai entrepreneurs with one sub-section for each interview.

4.1. Swedish female entrepreneurs

4.1.1. Interview 1

Ms Emma Svalander founded Emmagjort HB together with her, soon to be, husband in order for her to be able to use her creativity and get it out to the public. The company has recently celebrated its first birthday. Emmagjort HB is a company that sells handcrafted products designed by Emma Svalander as well as products with personal prints.

Ms Svalander is now 30 and she grew up surrounded by a family with many entrepreneurial ideas. Her father started a company called Svalander Audio and her mother is currently on the verge of starting a free school.

Ms Svalander has an education in media, economics and 2 years of IT-economics from university. She started her career in the insurance business at the customer service, then continued with working at an advertising agency, graphical design at a newspaper, internship at a radio station, florist and is currently employed as a TM seller and cashier. When growing up she wanted to be her own boss, walk around in a suit and to have her own ‘empire’.

When starting the company, she wanted to get appreciation for her own creations, do what she loves, get an out for her creativity, self-actualize herself and also, to an extent, get cred. She wanted to see if she could get her hobby to sell and pay off. She also mentioned that even though she might have eventually started her own company, it would not have been in this form had she not been ‘pushed’ into it by boyfriend, family and friends.

She has no previous experience of owning her own company but she has some experience in being entrepreneurial in that she has previously sold what she created.

All of the above information is from personal interview (E Svalander 2008, personal interview, 08 May).

4.1.2. Interview 2

Mrs. Charlotte Nilsson founded Mindmatch in an attempt to find out if an education her own design could sell. The company is jointly owned with Mrs. Nilsson and her husband sharing responsibilities. Mindmatch offers education for staff working in an intercultural environment, recruitment assistance and a program for academic trainees.
Mrs. Nilsson grew up in an entrepreneurial family where both sides of her divorced parents had their own firms. While growing up, she thus became aware of the different positive and negative sides of having your own company. This also meant that already at the age of 10 she knew she wanted to be an entrepreneur. She is now 39 years old and has 4 children.

Her educational background is in social anthropology in Stockholm University and she spent 7 years in Spain during this time. When she realized that there were very few options of employment for her education she decided to continue studying and this time created her own education with focus on intercultural communication. When finishing her Bachelor degree she realized that there was a lack of education in that area in Sweden for those working in an intercultural environment. Mrs. Nilsson saw that this was her way on to the market, she’d have a niche from get go and there were no real competition in the beginning. Her main motivation was curiosity and the challenge she saw in founding a company on an education package she had herself designed. The reason she started the company was that this was an obvious niche for her since there really wasn’t anything like it in Sweden before.

Her career experience consists of working for her parents companies, working on different short term employments during high school such as cleaning in hotels, consulting, recruitment, sales.

She has no previous experience of being an entrepreneur herself but, as mentioned above, have gained much from being surrounded by entrepreneurs her whole life.

All of the above information is from personal interview (C Nilsson 2008, personal interview, 07 May).

4.1.3. Interview 3
Mrs. Lena Andersson founded Ellens Byrålåda together with her friend named Lena Engström. The company is an advertising agency focused on the production part of advertisement.

Mrs. Andersson is now 57 years, married with 2 grown children who are themselves thinking of starting their own companies. Growing up, she had no entrepreneurs around her. Her father was working in a leading position and her mother was a housewife. Despite this, she started to think of starting her own company around the age of 25.

After graduating from school she read some courses at university mainly focusing on Management and Business. She also took a project management course later on.

She started her career in marketing at ICA-förlaget in Västerås and has since then worked in different companies with marketing and advertisement in different positions. When her friend Lena found herself unemployed they decided it was time to start their own company.
The reason for starting Ellens Byrålåda was that Mrs. Andersson saw a gap in the market. She had also noticed that these requests were often seen as too simple at her previous employments (most people at advertising agencies prefer to deal with design and projects concerning leading brands). Thus, they decided to use this as their niche. The motivation was to be independent, that it is easier to work for yourself than for others and the ability to influence the situation.

She has some previous experience of being an entrepreneur since she has stood by her husband when he started his company, which she is part owner of.

All of the above information is from personal interview (L Andersson 2008, personal interview, 07 May).

4.1.4. Interview 4

Ms Margareta Hammarström founded Pumha in 2002 as a result of her previous employment ending due to the company being on the verge of bankruptcy. Ms Hammarström enjoys changes and makes sure her situation changes at least once every 3 years.

She is now 62 and grew up in a family without entrepreneurs though they turned up in her life at a later stage. Her father worked in farming and later on as a mailman and her mother was a school secretary. The first ideas of starting her own company came from her ex husband and his father who inspired her a lot in those days. Today, her current partner is an entrepreneur for many years.

She went to a technical high school where she read a Machine technology program. When it was time for her to do her internship it was difficult to find a position due to the male dominance in that industry. She found one at the Industry School in Köping where she was the first female engineer. She has worked with production and production techniques in different varieties her entire careers. Working as a female engineer in Köping she soon realized that she was falling behind in the salary compared to the men so she quit and started her own company working as a consultant and teacher. When her children came, she had to give up the company and started working extra as a teacher while her children grew up. She then worked in different companies in positions such as consultant, technician, management etc. When she got an offer to start working for Storm enterprise, a new company on the rise, she decided to try it out and if the company did not succeed, she would start her own company. The company did not succeed so in 2002 she founded Pumha.

Her main motivation for starting her own company is the ability to be autonomous, decide when to work, be her own boss, can be free when you want to. For her, security means constant change. When starting Pumha she never applied for another employment, she knew from the get go that she wanted to start her own company. She saw an opportunity and she wanted to help companies increase productivity, decrease storage and make them
stronger competitors on the market. She wanted the challenge of starting her own company and wanted not to have to answer to anyone else.

She has had experience of being an entrepreneur before this, she had her own company between the ages of 24-29.

All of the above information is from personal interview (M Hammarström 2008, personal interview, 13 May).

4.1.5. Interview 5
Ms Mari Hellblom founded NoGap as a consultancy agency to help companies make their economy more efficient.

She grew up in a family that was not entrepreneurial but the thought of starting her own company has always been there in the back of her mind. She went to high school in Västerås and then continued on to University where she educated herself in social, economy and pedagogy on the Lund, Uppsala and Västerås Campuses.

She has been working in this industry her entire career starting by working in a controller function, as Business and accounting controller, CFO and responsible for consultancy offices. She worked in a large company long enough to know about the ups and downs and when the recession started she didn’t feel inspired to stay on for the downs. Instead, she wanted to help other companies become more efficient.

Her main motivation was to be in control, take full responsibility, dare to expose herself to the unknown and to be her own boss.

She has no previous experience of being an entrepreneur.

All of the above information is from personal interview (M Hellblom 2008, personal interview, 14 May).

4.2. Thai female entrepreneurs

4.2.1. Interview 1
Ms Sirikul Vuthipanyakom is the founder of Blue Gems Company Limited in Thailand. She is now working as Executive Vice President. Blue Gems Co., Ltd. has been opened since year 2003. Blue Gems is dealing with trading and exporting gemstones to international markets, i.e. U.S.A., Canada, Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland, England, Hong Kong, Japan, India, China, Korea, and so on. Company’s product is loose stone which Burmese ruby and Sri Lanka blue Sapphire are most specialized.

Ms Sirikul is now 32 years old and Blue Gems is now 5 years old. She is married and has one child. Her father is the owner of S.V.D. Gems Company Limited, one gemstones company in Thai’s Gems and Jewelry industry, which operates for 30 years already.

Ms Sirikul has her bachelor degree in Language from Chulalongkorn University from Thailand. She also graduated her master degree with
distinction from two universities. Her first master degree is in Entrepreneurship Management from Mahidol University in Thailand, while her second master degree is in International Business Management from Kalmar University in Sweden.

For her career experience, Ms Sirikul has worked as Management Trainee and Assistant to Managing Director in retail banking group of DTDB, DBS Thai Danu Bank for one year.

She saw the high market potential of this business, that is why she wanted to start her own business. Her family background, with her father as successful entrepreneur, and her educational background, where she mentioned in her answers that knowledge in both master degrees could be applied in the business she wanted to start, also are factors for starting her business. She concluded that the main reason for starting her own business is to be independent, high risk with high return, and be able to earn money faster than being an employee, while her motivation is to be her own boss and it is challenging for her to make necessary decisions for the success of the company.

All of the above information is from e-mail communication (S Vuthipanyakom 2008, e-mail comm., 06 May).

4.2.2. Interview 2

Wang-Burapa Dental Clinic was formed by Ms Kannika Thepchatree. The clinic has opened for 14 years. Ms Kannika is now 48 years old. She already married and also has one child.

She received her bachelor degree in Dentistry from Chulalongkorn University in Thailand and master degree from Temple University in Philadelphia, U.S.A. She stated in questionnaire that there are 3 entrepreneurs in her family.

She decided to open her own clinic after her graduation because she wanted to be self-employ. She concluded that the main reason for starting her own business is to achieve self-satisfaction and be rich while her motivation is to be independent.

All of the above information is from e-mail communication (K Thepchatree 2008, e-mail comm., 06 May).

4.2.3. Interview 3

Idealounge Group is a leading company in wedding invitation cards and premium gifts with 3 main stores in Thailand. Ms Cattleya Thuampratom is Managing Director of the company. She started Idealounge Group in year 2004, 5 years up until now. With the expert of her family's business in wedding industry for 20 years, Ms Cattleya has combined the idea of design and style together with the skills and experiences making the excellent products and services within the reasonable price.
Ms Cattleya is now 30 years old and single. Her parents have their own businesses. The background of Idealounge Group is also affected from her parents’ business expert, the wedding industry.

From the education background, Ms Cattleya graduated in bachelor degree of Business Administration from Chulalongkorn University in Thailand and master degree of Entrepreneurship from Babson College in Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Ms Cattleya has her career experience in Uniliver (Thailand) as Management Trainee for 3 years. She noted in the interview questionnaire that this career experience in this position has provided her strong marketing background.

While her main reason for starting her own business is to be independence and want to be her own boss, her motivation to start her own business is also that she wanted independence and not wanted to work for others.

All of the above information is from company’s homepage (http://www.idealoungegroup.com/) and e-mail communication (Ch Thuampratom 2008, e-mail comm., 10 May).

4.2.4. Interview 4

Ms Suthasinee Sawinthorn is the owner of N2S Solutions Company Limited and now has the position of Managing Director of the company. The company provides accounting and financial services. The services are including preparing financial statement for tax purpose and management purpose, analyzing financial statement and financial ratio, providing internal auditing, providing assessment of internal control, as well as providing other financial analysis. N2S Solutions has operated for 2 years already.

Ms Suthasinee is now 33 years old and single. Even though her father works as teacher, however her mother owns retail shop in the school, therefore we can conclude that in her family background, we also found one entrepreneur.

According to her education, Ms Suthasinee has graduated from Thammasat University in Thailand for her bachelor degree in Accounting. She also graduated her master degree from the same university in Master of Science (Accounting). From her answer in questionnaire, we found that she has stated that she also got an education in Entrepreneurship field in her master degree, which means that in her master degree education, she has took a course of entrepreneurship as a minor course for her degree.

Ernst & Young is a global leader in assurance, tax, transaction and advisory services. Ms Suthasinee has started her career experience with Ernst & Young (Thailand) 9 years ago, right after her graduation. For the last 2 years she worked with Ernst & Young, she positioned as Assistant Audit Manager.

Her main reason for starting her own business is to balance her personal time. She also had ambitious in all the works she was ordered including believed in herself and her ability in the career she works, as her reasons for
become entrepreneur. Her motivation to start her own business, however, is wanted to achieve self-satisfaction which is to earn money and therefore have small desired business, such as book store, flower shop or coffee shop.

All of the above information is from company’s homepage (http://www.n2s-solutions.com/) and e-mail communication (S Sawinthorn 2008, e-mail comm., 11 May)

4.2.5. Interview 5

Sri Janya Company Limited is owned by Ms Janya Worrasett. The company is involved in wholesaling and retailing air conditioner and its spare parts of all brand names, such as Panasonic, Mitsubishi, Samsung, Daikin, Central Air, etc. The company has operated for 21 years already, since 1987.

Ms Janya is now 53 years old, married and has one child. In her family, we found 3 entrepreneurs, older and younger sisters of hers, operated their businesses in the same industry. Ms Janya has her highest education in Vocational Certificate in Secretary.

Ms Janya started her career path in 1975 where she worked as Sales Officer in one Construction company until 1981. During 1982 to 1984, she had no employment. From 1984, she got married and helped her husband with his business on selling air conditioner spare parts until 1985. However, she had problem with her husband and his family, and they divorced afterward. Being unemployment for one year, then she started her own business in 1987.

Her motivation to become entrepreneur is to be independent and want to achieve self-satisfaction, while her main reason to start her own business is to be independent and need for employment.

All of the above information is from e-mail communication (J Worrasett 2008, e-mail comm., 14 May).

4.3. Result from Questionnaire

4.3.1. General Information

1. Age: Varied from 30 to 61 years

2. Marital status:
   SFE - Married 2, Partner 3, Single 0
   TFE - Married 3, Partner 0, Single 2

3. Children:
   SFE - Yes 4, No 1
   TFE - Yes 3, No 2

4. No. of children: Varied from 1-4

5. How long since you started company: Varied from 1-21 years
6. Industry: advertising, commerce, manufacturing, dental, air conditioner, consulting/coaching/recruitment/training, wedding/invitation cards, gems/jewelry, accounting/finance

4.3.2. **Family Background**

7. Entrepreneurs in family:
   - SFE - Yes 4, No 1
   - TFE - Yes 5, No 0

8. No. of entrepreneurs: Varied from 1-3, with one having everyone they know as entrepreneurs.

4.3.3. **Education Background**

9. Highest degree of education:
   - SFE - High School 1, Some courses at Uni 2, Bachelor 2, Master 0, Doctoral 0
   - TFE - High School 0, Some courses at Uni 0, Bachelor 0, Master 4, Doctoral 0. One had vocational certificate which is just below Bachelor.

10. Subject: Economics 3, Management 4, Language 1, Engineering 1, Architecture 0, Arts 0, Computer 1, Other 7. Other consists of subjects such as sociology, graphical design, entrepreneurship, secretary, accounting, dentistry and social sciences.

11. Education in entrepreneurship:
   - SFE - Yes 1, No 4
   - TFE - Yes 3, No 2

4.3.4. **Career Experience**

12. Worked in industry before:
   - SFE - Yes 3, No 2
   - TFE - Yes 2, No 3

13. How long: Ranged from 1-34 years

14. Previous experience as leader:
   - SFE - Yes 2, No 3
   - TFE - Yes 2, No 3

15. How long: Ranged from 1-10 years

16. How long from last employment to start: Ranged from 0 year to 1 year, with one actually still being employed.

17. Previous experience of being entrepreneur:
   - SFE - Yes 2, No 3
   - TFE - Yes 0, No 5
18. Yes (SFE), same industry: Yes 1, No 1

19. No, was in building painters.

20. Position in last employment ranged from economy, recruitment consultant/sales division, TM seller, senior consultant/vice president, sales, management trainee/assistant to managing director, and assistant manager.

4.3.5. Motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21. How important is it to (1 = completely disagree and 5 = completely agree)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be your own boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve your goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have good relations with others in your network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Which of the following was the main reason for starting own business?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need for independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Which of these was the motivation for starting own business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Swedish female entrepreneurs</th>
<th>Thai female entrepreneurs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted independence</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to be in control</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to be dominant</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t find employment</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted more time with family</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to achieve self-satisfaction</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to be rich</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to take a risk</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was dissatisfied with previous employment</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Analysis

In this chapter the reader will find an analysis of the material that has been viewed in chapter 3 (Previous research) and chapter 4 (Empirical results) with the use of the model described in chapter 3.

5.1. Motivation

When looking at the theory for the motivation of the entrepreneur we noticed that all the different factors we have written about in the theory are a part of either the push or the pull factors in the Push/Pull theory as it is mentioned in Mueller & Thomas (2001) and McClelland et al. (2005). For instance, the need for independence (Shane et al., 2003) is one of the strong pull factors (McClelland et al., 2005).

5.1.1. Interviews

Many of our respondents answered that independence was a big motivational factor (Andersson, Vuthipanyakom, Thuampratom, Worrasett, Thepchatree). Then they also answered the need for self-fulfillment/self-actualization (Svalander, Vuthipanyakom, Thepchatree, Sawinthorn, Worrasett), be one’s own boss (Andersson, Hammarström, Hellblom, Thepchatree, Thuampratom, Vuthipanyakom), being autonomous (Hammarström), wanting to be in control (Hellblom), need for achievement (Thepchatree) are all examples of pull factors found in McClelland et al. (2005) description of the Push/Pull theory. Only one of our respondents (Worrasett) had need for employment as a motivational factor which is an example of a push factor. Thus we would say that all our respondents had pull factors as their motivation whilst one also had a negative motivation (McClelland et al., 2005) in the need for employment as a motivational factor.

Svalander also mentioned a desire to see her creations come to life or to see the effects of her creativity as a motivational factor which has a clear connection to Schumpeter’s theory of entrepreneurial motivation found in Swedberg (2000).

Neither of our respondents mentioned a need for affiliation (Lee, 1996) or any need for dominance (Lee, 1996) though we in a way consider these to be a part of the other factors mentioned above. Three of our respondents mentioned wanting to meet the challenge (Hammarström, Nilsson, Vuthipanyakom) which we think could mean that they want to take risks (McClelland et al., 2005). Three respondents (Thepchatree, Vuthipanyakom, Sawinthorn) mentioned that one of their motivations to start their own businesses is to earn money faster and become rich. Another of our respondents mentioned that she believes in her own abilities to do the required work (Sawinthorn) which we think could be connected in a way to the locus of control (Delmar, 2001) since we think you need to believe in your own abilities in order to get internal control. Sawinthorn, further, mentioned that she believed that having her own business would give her more flexible time which is also similar to
Hammarström who mentioned that one of her motivations were to be able to decide when to work and that you can be free when you want to.

5.1.2. Questionnaire

From our questionnaire we can see that there is some differences in the result between the Swedish (SFE) and the Thai (TFE) female entrepreneurs where 2/5 of TFE put independence as the motivation which is the same as SFE but where the rest of the TFE put self-satisfaction as motivation, while 2 of the 5 SFE had that as the motivation. One of the SFE put take risks as motivation. All of these are found in the pull factors as described by McClelland et al. (2005). In order to check these answers, we also asked for the main reason and then we found some differences where 3 of TFE cited the need for independence whereas 2 of SFE cited that one. The other 2 of TFE cited need for achievement, with the same with 1 SFE. The other two SFE were divided on need for autonomy and encouraged by others. These are also connected to the pull factors (McClelland et al., 2005) though we consider the ‘encouraged by others’ to be a possible push since it could be that the ‘others’ push you to it before you are really ready.

When looking at how our respondents graded the different factors of Push/Pull theory, we can see that all of them considered independence to be very important. The rest of the factors gained a variety of grades where the ones gaining 4 or 5 were being successful and achieving own goals. Being your own boss also got mostly 4 or 5 while one TFE disagreed by answering 1. Having good relations with others in the network got 5 from 4 of SFE and 4 from 1 SFE while in the TFE there was one 4 and one 2, the rests are 5. Having control got higher marks from SFE than from TFE, with SFE graded from 3 to 5 while TFE graded from 1 to 5. In the other two, taking risk and having dominance, the answers were scattered between 1 and 5 in both SFE and TFE. Thus we can see some differences in motivation between TFE and SFE in the questionnaire answers.

5.2. Education Background

5.2.1. Interviews

The education background of our respondents differ a lot from having education in Media (Svalander), to having education in dentistry (Thepchatree), to economics (Svalander, Hellblom), to social anthropology (Nilsson), to management (Andersson), to business (Andersson, Vuthipanyakom, Thuampratom), to engineering and machine technology (Hammarström), to language (Vuthipanyakom), to entrepreneurship management (Vuthipanyakom, Thuampratom), to accounting (Sawinthorn), and also secretary (Worrasett). Thus there are only a few that are even close to being entrepreneur in the same educational area. Also noticeable is the difference in the degree of education. Among the SFE, most of them have a Bachelor as the highest degree where some have finished high school. Among the TFE, however 4 out of the 5 have a master degree and one even had two
master degrees. Thus we can see that the TFE have a higher degree of education than SFE.

Having a high degree of education is consistent with the theory written in Bowen & Hirsch (1986) where they mentioned that women entrepreneurs usually have a higher degree of education. Lee (1996) also considered a university education to increase the need for achievement.

5.2.2. Questionnaire

In the questionnaire, we found that the TFE had a higher degree of education since 4/5 had a master degree whereas among the SFE the highest degree was Bachelor where there were 2/5 who had a Bachelor, the rest had a lower degree of examina.

We also found that there were only 3 of our 10 respondents that had any education in entrepreneurship.

In our theory we found no support for the need of entrepreneurship education but we did find evidence of an educational background to be important when starting and running the business (Verheu, Stel & Trurik, 2006). So, in other words we consider that as long as they have some education in their industry, they can still manage to start and run their businesses.

5.3. Family Background

5.3.1. Interview

To begin with, we found that those having entrepreneurs in their family are more prone to becoming entrepreneurs themselves (Lee, 1996). We find evidence of this in the fact that a majority of our respondents had family members that were entrepreneurs when they grew up (Svalander, Nilsson, Vuthipanyakom, Thumipratom, Sawninthere, Worrhasett, Thepchatree). Also a couple of them have children or husbands that are entrepreneurs (Andersson, Hammarström). Only one of the respondents from SFE did not have any entrepreneurs in her family.

This is relevant with the theory from Lee (1996) and Shapero & Sokol (cited in Bowen & Hisrich 1986) that having entrepreneurial parents will influence the motivation to start a business. From this point of view, we can conclude that both SFE and TFE are similar in the influence of the family factor since most of SFE and TFE are surrounded by entrepreneurs in their family and some of them even mentioned that their parents are one of the motivators for starting their businesses.

5.3.2. Questionnaire

From the questionnaire, we found that 9 out of 10 had entrepreneurs in their family varying from 1 to everyone they know. Which is, once again, consistent with theory that those having entrepreneurs in the family are more prone to becoming entrepreneurs (Lee, 1996). From the questionnaire we can also see
that 8 of the 10 are either married or are living with someone, whereas only 2 are single. Out of the 10, we also found that 7 had children. This is consistent with theory that women who have children are more prone to start their own businesses (DeMartino & Barbato, 2003). Though we have no evidence if they had children before starting their own business or if the children came afterwards. Moreover, none of the respondents answered that their motivation to become an entrepreneur was to balance work and family life, which DeMartino & Barbato (2003) mentioned in their theory.

5.4. Career Experience

5.4.1. Interviews

In the theory they say that one main motivation for entrepreneurs is dissatisfaction with employment situation (DeMartino & Barbato, 2003). We did not find any evidence of this in our interviews where only one (Worrasett) mentioned the need for employment as motivation but this does not mean that she was dissatisfied with her previous employment, just that she needed a job. One of our respondents did mention being dissatisfied with the way the company she worked for handled the questions that she later on started a company in (Andersson) which could be seen as a sort of dissatisfaction leading to the motivation of being an entrepreneur. We did get a lot of information on their career paths, though this has no evidence of influencing motivation in the literature.

5.4.2. Questionnaire

In the questionnaire we found a lot of information on how long they have worked in the industry, which position they had before starting their own company and if they had any previous experience of being an entrepreneur or being in a leadership role. The last two, we thought, would be interesting since we personally think that leadership experience should be helpful when starting your own business. Also that having previous experience of being an entrepreneur should make it simpler when, once again, being one. We found that only 2 of 5 respondents in SFE had any previous experience of being an entrepreneur, while none of TFE had. In addition, out of the 2 SFE who had entrepreneurial experience, only 1 had experience in the same industry. When it comes to the experience of being a leader, there were 4 out of the 10 who had been in a leadership position previously, there were 2 from SFE and 2 from TFE. Out of our respondents, half had previous experience in the industry, with 3 from SFE and 2 from TFE. We have not found any evidence in the theory that these factors improve or affect the motivation.
6. Conclusion and discussion

In this last chapter the reader can find conclusion drawn from the analysis in the previous chapter. There are also some questions for further research to be found in this chapter as well as an end discussion containing some conclusions that were found outside of the research question.

6.1. Conclusion

From our analysis, we can conclude that there are few, if any, differences in the motivational factors between the TFE and SFE. All of them were pulled into being an entrepreneur (McClelland et al., 2005). Though there were some differences in the pull factors between the respondents.

We did find some differences between the questionnaire answers and the interview answers, such as all of the respondents graded being independent as 5 in questionnaire whereas only 4 respondents mentioned it in the interview question. Out of these 4 respondents, only one is Swedish. Most of the SFE answered being their own boss or being autonomous whereas the TFE answered self-actualization or the like. Thus, we can see that there are some differences in which of the pull factors they mentioned when interviewed and which they graded highest when answering the questionnaire. On the other hand, if we focused on the answers only, we found that both SFE and TFE had similarity in answering pull factors as their motivation, even though one TFE had answered push factor as one of her motivation. We, then, concluded here that push factors are rarely affected on motivation of both SFE and TFE.

When it came to education, we found that the TFE had, overall, a higher degree of examina than the SFE which is one difference that could affect the few differences we could see in the motivation. Our study also shows the relevance with the theory regarding education background which confirms that education is important when starting and managing the business. Yet, the entrepreneurship education is not necessary as education in the industry.

When it came to family, we saw few differences. Most of our respondents were involved in a relationship, the two that weren’t are TFE. Most of them were surrounded by entrepreneurs in their family, only one had no entrepreneur in their family and she is Swedish. Therefore, having an entrepreneurial parent is one important factor in influencing the female entrepreneur to start the business. Both nationalities also showed the similarity on having entrepreneurs in the family. We, moreover, found that the theory of having children as more likely to add motivation to the female entrepreneur, in order to balance timing between work and family, has no proof in our study.

When it came to career, we found one SFE who had been dissatisfied in her previous employment but the dissatisfaction was not with the employment as such, it was the response of her managers on issues she thought was equally important as other factors. None of the others mentioned dissatisfaction,
though one TFE did mention the need for employment. We did not count that as dissatisfaction and thus there was only one out of 10 even mentioned that fact. This means we can conclude that career was not contributing or affecting the motivation except for, perhaps, that one SFE. On the other hand, we found that both SFE and TFE had similarity in an aspect of career experience. Most of them had the experience in the field of their business before they started their company.

So, in answer of our question, the similarities are many and the differences are few though noticeable when looking at the variety of pull factors mentioned in the interviews.

6.2. Delimitation

This research paper was using an interview method to 5 female entrepreneurs from each country in order to collect the empirical data. Each of them is in different industries and has different characters and motivations. Therefore, the 5 female entrepreneurs from both Sweden and Thailand were not representing the picture of whole population of female entrepreneurs in each country. From several perspectives in meaning of entrepreneur, we found that the interviewees we chose in our research can be questionable whether they are appropriate as entrepreneurs or just business owners. However, we found that our interviewees are fit with one of our literatures on entrepreneurship from Penrose (1995) which provided a general meaning of entrepreneur. Therefore, though the interviewees from our research might not be able to represent the entrepreneur perspective to all scholars’ definitions we consider them to be applicable for our research purpose.

6.3. End discussion

Something we noticed that does not really have to do with our research question is that the motivation for becoming an entrepreneur can mainly be found in the higher steps of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (see fig 1) which is somewhat consistent with Swedberg (2000) who claimed that entrepreneurial motivation has nothing to do with traditional need theory.

6.4. Suggestions for further research

We suggest that adding a larger amount of respondents to this research could result in more conclusive findings. We have seen some differences but by having a larger sample, the results might become clearer. Another suggestion is to add the culture aspect and investigate that point of view. And perhaps, to look closer on the gender perspective.

We think that the topic of entrepreneurial motivation is worth investigating further since we think it is important to know the ‘why’ as well as the ‘how’ and ‘when’. And also this thesis shows that there are some differences between the TFE and SFE, maybe investigating differences and similarities between other countries could also be an interesting research.
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Appendixes

Interview questions

1. Could you give a brief presentation of yourself and your ideas when you started your own business?

2. What would you say was your motivation for starting your own business?

3. What was your main reason for starting your own business?

4. Could you describe your family background? Any entrepreneurs in your family?

5. Could you please describe your educational background?

6. Could you describe your career background?

7. Have you any previous experience of being an entrepreneur?

Interview questions in Swedish

1. Skulle du kunna ge en kort presentation av dig själv och de idéer du hade när du startade företaget?

2. Vad skulle du saga var din motivation till att starta ett eget företag?

3. Vilken var din största anledning till att starta eget företag?

4. Skulle du kunna beskriva din familjebakgrund? Finns det några entreprenörer i din familj?

5. Skulle du kunna beskriva din utbildningsbakgrund?

6. Skulle du kunna beskriva din arbetsslivserfarenhet?

7. Har du någon tidigare erfarenhet av att vara entreprenör?

Questionnaire

General information

1. Age: ........

2. Marital status: □ Single □ Married □ Partner
3. Do you have any children?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

4. If yes, how many: .............

5. How long since you started your company? .................... years

6. Which industry do you consider your company belonging to?

.................................................................

**Family background**

7. Do you have any entrepreneurs in your family?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

8. If yes, how many?  ☐ 1  ☐ 2  ☐ 3  ☐ 4  ☐ More........

**Educational background**

9. Which is your highest degree of education?

   High school
   Some courses at university
   Bachelor
   Master
   Doctoral

10. In which subject is your degree?

    Economics
    Management
    Language
    Engineering
    Architecture
    Arts
    Computer

    Other: ..........................................................

11. Do you have any education in entrepreneurship?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

**Employment history**

12. Have you worked in this industry before?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No
13. If yes, how long? …………….. years

14. Have you any previous experience of being in a leadership role?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

15. If yes, how long? …………………… years

16. How long was it between ending your last employment and starting your company?
   [ ] 1 year [ ] 2 years [ ] 3 years [ ] 4 years [ ] Other ……….years

17. Have you any previous experience of being an entrepreneur?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

18. If yes, was that in the same industry?  [ ] Yes [ ] No

19. If no to question 18, which industry?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

20. What was you position in your last employment?
   ……………………………………………………………………………………………

**Motivation**

21. How important is it for you to: (Rank the following from how well you agree with them where 1 = completely disagree & 5 = completely agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be your own boss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve your goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have good relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Which of the following was your main reason for starting your own business? (Choose the one that best describes your reason)

- Need for independence
- Need for achievement
- Need for affiliation
- Need for autonomy
- Need for dominance
- Need for employment
- Like taking risks
- Need to be in control
- Need more time with family
- Was dissatisfied with previous employment
- Encouraged by others

23. Which one of these was your motivation for starting your own business? (Choose the one that best describes your motivation)

- Wanted independence
- Wanted to be in control
- Wanted to be dominant
- Couldn’t find employment
- Wanted more time with family
- Wanted to achieve self-satisfaction
- Wanted to be rich
- Wanted to take a risk
- Was dissatisfied with previous employment