

Role of Family Climate in Shaping Entrepreneurial Characteristics

Varun Sharma*, Avinash Kumar**, Gopal Chandra Mahakud***

Abstract

In order to gain insights into entrepreneurial behaviour from a psychological perspective, this study examined the role of family climate in development of Entrepreneurial Behaviour. Two standardized self-report measures, namely Family Climate Scale and Entrepreneurial Behaviour Inventory, were used on 61 participants (30 corporate employees and 31 venture owners). Then, the results were analysed using Pearson product moment correlation to see the relationship between Family Climate and Entrepreneurial Behaviour. For the comparison of both family climate and Entrepreneurial Behaviour between corporate employees and venture owners, the researchers used student's t-test. The results of the present study indicate that family does not play a major role in determining entrepreneurial behaviour as there were a number of other external factors, which played a huge role in determining the entrepreneurial spirit. Future studies should explore other factors that affect the entrepreneurial spirit. Besides the family climate, taking the other psycho-social factors like locus of control, family, gender, and caste, further studies can be suggested as there is a growing need for entrepreneurial growth in the under developed and developing country like India.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Venture Owner, Family Climate, Corporate Employees, Locus of Control

Introduction

Throughout history, many significant examples of entrepreneurial actions are witnessed. Colossal structural changes in civilization globally were witnessed during the 1970s and 1980s such as oil catastrophe, economic depression, expansion of technology, rising globalization, along with reaching political transformation by the side of a stronger market-oriented philosophy that made the chaos and the ambiguity in the society that in turn led to the birth and generation of new businesses (Bettis & Hitt, 1995; Meyer & Heppard, 2000). Drucker (1985) defines entrepreneurship as, "an act of innovation that involves endowing existing resources with new wealthy-producing capacities." Further, Gartner (1988) stated that "Entrepreneurship is the creation of organizations, the process by which new organizations come into existence." In Indian context, Venkatraman (1997) added that "Entrepreneurship is about how, by whom, and with what consequences opportunities to bring future goods and services into existence are discovered, exploited and created."

Simply, it can be said that there is disparity on the subject of how to delineate a phenomenon should be acknowledged in a view that has exemplified almost all disciplines of research in their premature developmental years. In this concern, Gartner, Bird, and Starr (1992) stated that entrepreneurship can be defined as a nucleus concept. In entrepreneurship, McClelland (1961) affirmed that

* M. A. Applied Psychology, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Delhi, South Campus, New Delhi, India.
Email: casper.vsh@gmail.com

** Associate Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Delhi, South Campus, New Delhi, India.
Email: avikumar74@gmail.com

*** Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Delhi, South Campus, New Delhi, India.
Email: gopal1631979@gmail.com

nAch to be a key factor in his work on need achievement. Moreover, McClelland (1961) concluded that the relationship between nAch and entrepreneurship meant if any nation that wants to progress economically needs to foster achievement motivation within its boundaries; thus, it stated that in economic development, nAch was essential (McClelland, 1961).

A plethora of research has developed nearby the essential topic of locus of control (LOC) and its relation to entrepreneurial behaviour. The internal LOC can be explained as the faith an individual has over himself that one has authority over outcomes through his skills, ability, effort; on the contrary, the credence that external forces directs the effects is the external LOC (Rotter, 1966). Enormous amount of studies (e.g. Brockhaus 1982) has been associated with internal LOC of individual's life to one's susceptibility to slot in the entrepreneurial behaviour. Perry (1990) stated that an internal LOC is a psychological trait mostly referred to as an antecedent of entrepreneurship. Therefore, it suggests that when an entrepreneur has external LOC, it means that he/she has no control over his market and organization and it's the external sources that are controlling them. There is considerable empirical evidence that to become an entrepreneur, internal LOC is associated with intentions (Bonnet & Furnham, 1991).

Empirical studies have been conducted to inspect the socioeconomic origins of entrepreneurs. In the study of 40 enterprises in a couple of districts of Andhra Pradesh, there were many socioeconomic factors that were examined such as- Kamma, Kapu, Vysya, Brahmin, and Kshatriya communities are some of the community groups that produce more able and larger number of entrepreneurs than rest of the group and thus more appropriately dominate the entrepreneurial arena. The *Parsees*, *Jain*, *Baniya*, *Sindhi*, and *Khatri* communities are also the minority ethnical communities that have produced and imbibed the entrepreneurial spirit (Hadimani, 1985).

The age and time of entry into entrepreneurship is one of the important characteristic of entrepreneur. In this regard the Kamma community is the earliest one who have been showing their enterprising nature in Indian subcontinent (Hadimani, 1985). The kinds of interpretation of the religious values rather than the religion practice affect the attitude of the entrepreneurs and thus reflect in the success

of entrepreneurs. Therefore, the values of Marwari community of *dharma* (moral duty), *artha* (wealth), and *kama* (desire) separate and put them above the rest of the people in the dome of entrepreneurship (Hadimani, 1985). Being knowledgeable and resourceful is among the few pre-requisites, which helps in augmenting the pace of the person in the entrepreneurship; therefore, due to unified nature of education and entrepreneurship, *Kamma* and *Brahmin* communities were more knowledgeable and refined than the rest (Hadimani, 1985). So finally, most of the entrepreneurs were found to engage in partnership rather than the sole trading so as to avoid the legal formalities involved in starting a company (Hadimani, 1985).

As soon as the individual starts developing, the person starts imbibing these ideals, values, attitudes, and patterns of behaviour in congruence with his family members. Therefore, the family functioning and surrounding keep affecting the life of an individually continuously. Most of the social, physical, and psychological needs of an infant are satisfied by this very institution. Therefore, it can be stated that a lot of factors affect the development of autonomy, LOC, initiative taking, and self-confidence. Thus, family's attitude and family nurturing play a crucial role in determine the development of both internal and external LOC in children. Further, Hadimani (1985) affirmed that family size, family type, and family's economic status affect the entrepreneurship as the background of a family in manufacturing granted a cause of industrial entrepreneurship. Therefore, the family of Zamindar exhibited a higher level of entrepreneurship, which helped to gain access to political power. The physical, social, and emotional surroundings that the child focuses in a family refer to the family climate. Therefore the "sum total of the social factors which surrounds person" from the very commencement of his existence has a great impact on the development of entrepreneurship behaviour. On the basis of various definitions, many sub-dimensions of family climate have evolved. Consequently, family climate involves sub-dimensions like: intergenerational authority, intergenerational attention, emotional cohesion, cognitive cohesion, open communication, and adaptability.

On the other hand, the new recent concept in organisational sector – Intrapreneurship – refers that, in many organisations, some of the employees take responsibilities and initiatives to undertake something

new, productive, profitable, and beneficial for their organisation voluntarily without the instruction or demand of their immediate boss (De Jong, & Wennekers, 2008). Some of the behavioural characteristics of intrapreneurship are – perception of opportunities, generation of idea, designing a new product or another by making the combination of resources, building of internal coalition, persuading the management, acquisition of resources, planning, and organizing. The above mentioned characteristics of intrapreneurship may be successful by taking personal initiative, active information search, out-of-the-box thinking, voicing, championing, taking charge, finding a way, and some degree of risk taking (De Jong & Wennekers, 2008). Although the concept of intrapreneurship is new and recent in Indian organisational system, still, in some organisations, it is present and the organisations felicitating Intrapreneurship behaviour in their organisations are performing well than others. In this paper, the concept of Intrapreneurship has not taken into consideration by the researchers. The comparison of the effectiveness Intrapreneurship and entrepreneurship in relation to the role of family climate as a mediating variable could be suggested for further researches.

Review of Literature

Therefore, the impact of the family climate is obvious as enterprises are established and run in a social setting, in which the family plays an important role in it. Entrepreneurs are inseparably linked to their families and rely on their support in pursuing their entrepreneurial endeavours (Rogoff & Heck, 2003). Jufri et al. (2017) terms the family climate as the “first school” that shapes the attitude and behaviour in the direction of venture creation and guiding the universal understanding at the early age regarding the innovation and creativity of the children towards the entrepreneurship. The family climate proves to be the antecedent to the entrepreneurial behaviour in many ways such as the closeness of kinship relation between family members to make up as a team to the resource (DiscuaCruz, Howorth, & Hamilton, 2013) and providing diverse set of resources (Sirmon & Hitt, 2003). It is also found that the family climate in which the family conflicts are less, the business performance and satisfaction are more (Nosé et al. (2017)). Nurmaliza, Caska, and Indrawati (2018) stated that family climate as an external factor helps in developing the personality

of the child as it is the first and the longest climate that is experienced by the child at the time of growth and development. The higher entrepreneurial zeal will be in a climate where the support from family is higher (Yunemey et al., 2015). The family climate which already has an entrepreneur in it helps in forming of a role model in the field of entrepreneurship; as a result, the next generation gets into family entrepreneurship or gets into a diverse field, as the family environment will be an example for the students, seeing their parents or relatives succeeding in the field of entrepreneurship (Muh et al., 2017). Santos et al. (2014) states that the family climate plays a crucial role in forming subjective norms regarding entrepreneurship and thus also helping it to prosper, which in turn forms the positive attitude towards entrepreneurship and greater control over entrepreneurial behaviour, which results in the formation of entrepreneurial intention. Alvarez and Busenitz (2001) states that entrepreneurs have a unique ability of identifying the opportunities that others may overlook as they react proactively to the changes rather than reactively by converting the thought into an idea and an idea into an organization.

Entrepreneurs or the venture owners are said to be different in their abilities and styles from the corporate employees. The entrepreneurs are found to be high on achievement motivation than corporate employees and this difference arises because of the venture goals they have in their mind (Stewart & Roth, 2007). Moreover, in the case of risk propensity, the entrepreneurs who are more driven for venture growth are more risk taking than corporate employees (Stewart & Roth, 2004). Alvarez and Busenitz (2001) stated that entrepreneurs have a unique ability of identifying the opportunities that others may overlook as they react proactively to the changes rather than reactively by converting the thought into an idea and an idea into an organization. Entrepreneurs have different styles of thinking as they are very less involved in counterfactual thinking and thus have overconfidence in their decision but they are high on social competence (their ability to interact with others) as they have better social perception and better adaptation to new social situations (Baron, 2000). The entrepreneurs are fundamentally different from the corporate employees in their entrepreneurial passion, which is the being passionate about venture creation, opportunity recognition, and venture growth, which allow the entrepreneur to play the role of founder, developer, and inventor that in turn enhances the entrepreneurial

behaviour of being persistent, a problem solver, an agent of change, and being creative (Singh & Drnovsek, 2009).

Mathias and Williams (2014) explains that the way entrepreneurs think, behave, and act, which is different to the corporate employees, is because of the different roles they have to perform as, in some cases, an entrepreneur has to be an investor, in some cases an entrepreneur, or sometimes an inventor, which gradually develops their ability of opportunity recognition as compared to the corporate employees.

Rationale

The making of an entrepreneur depends upon the economic and sociocultural factors in which economic opportunities drive for a venture creation in which people see the futuristic result of their investment and they go for it. Now, the other part is that sociocultural factor also plays a huge role in shaping as well as nurturing an entrepreneur which encompasses the role of family in cultivating environment conducive for entrepreneurial orientation. Family is the primary environment in which the beliefs and the values of a person are established; thus, based on these values and beliefs, these people make their decisions by prioritizing their needs according to the situations. Thus, there is a need to address the role of families in shaping of entrepreneurs and also identify the potential pitfalls in the process so that the need of the nation could be fulfilled. Nowadays, the youngsters are job creators rather than job seekers. Therefore, the youth of the nation can be suggested to be a potential entrepreneurs who can provide employment to the rest of the citizens. The new entrepreneurs should be more innovative and nation building oriented, so that they can satisfy the needs of the countrymen. In this regard, it can be said that, for the fostering of entrepreneurship behaviour in young generation, the role of family climate should not be neglected. Therefore, the present study was planned to see whether there is any relationship between family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour in both corporate employees and venture owners and/or there is significant difference in family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour between corporate employees and venture owners.

Methodology

Objectives

- To investigate the role of family climate in shaping entrepreneurial characteristics
- To find out the differences among the entrepreneurs and corporate employees

Hypotheses

- There will be a significant relationship between family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour.
- There will be significant differences of family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour between the entrepreneurs and corporate employees.

Materials

The current research used standardized and already-in-practice scales to measure the variables under the research. The following materials are used for the collection of information in the present study.

- *The Entrepreneurial Behaviour Inventory (EBI)*: The tool is developed by Theresa Lau, Shaffer, Chan, and Man (2012) to assess major entrepreneurial behaviours like risk taking, innovation, change orientation, and opportunism. As the scale is developed in conjunction with the working managers of firms, it uses simulated incident method along with the behaviourally rated anchor scales. The simulated incident method along with the behaviourally rated anchor scales includes the advantages of traditional rating scale and advantages of case study method, mock interview and role playing techniques in research. The reliability is good with the Cronbach's Alpha being .80. To validate the instrument, 40 MBA students, who were all experienced, were called to take the test with evenly distributed gender.
- *The Family Climate Scale- (Björnberg and Nicholson, 2007)*: The Family Climate Scales (FCS) questionnaire is a multilevel, self-report, whole-

family index of aspects of family culture and process for use in nonclinical settings with families where the children may be adults. The FCS measures on six scales: Open Communication, Adaptability, Intergenerational Authority, Intergenerational Attention to Needs, Emotional Cohesion, and Cognitive Cohesion. It is a self-report measure that assesses the family culture and process for the non-clinical uses in the families where children are adults. It measures emotional cohesion, cognitive cohesion, communication, adaptability, intergenerational authority, and intergenerational attention. Cronbach's (coefficient) alphas ranging from 0.75 to 0.90 for the six scales boasts high internal consistency. The correlation analysis of the scales appropriately points out a high degree of positive inter-correlation between all the dimensions of the scale except the Inter-generational Authority dimension. The Inter-generational Authority dimension of the scale is negatively correlates with Adaptability and Open Communication dimensions of the scale.

Sample

Sampling technique used for the present study was a purposive random sampling. The sample included a total of 61 participants ($n_1=31$ = Entrepreneurs (owning a venture of their own) and $n_2=30$ =Corporate Employees (who are presently pursuing job in an MNC). The sample varied in terms of family type, age, duration of current profile, and their family's profession. The entire data was collected from the respective workplace setting of the participant's from Delhi, NCR region.

Design

A single case experimental design was used in the present study where the family climate is the independent variable and entrepreneurial behaviour is the dependent variable.

Procedure

The researcher contacted all the participants in their offices and randomly selected a total of 61 participants for the present study. From there, the researcher contacted the participants who own a venture by seeing their profile,

which depicted their roles and responsibilities held in the past which was to validate their profile as the participants were not known. After a proper rapport formation, the researcher instructed to fill the materials used in the present study one by one following their respective manuals. The data was collected from each participant individually following taking their consent and debriefing about the study. All the participants' participation in the present study was voluntary in nature.

Scoring and Data Analysis

The raw data was scored according to the scoring keys of the respective manual used in the study. Demographics were then coded and all the aggregate scores were keyed in an excel sheet. After that, the data was electronically sorted and checked for any missing values and any other discrepancies. This collated data was then transferred to SPSS to test the hypotheses developed for the present study. The inferential statistics such as t-test and Pearson's product moment correlation were used for both comparison and correlation between variables. All the statistical analyses were performed on SPSS IBM-22.

Results and Discussion

The results and the discussion of the present study are based on the two prescribed hypotheses, which are as follows:

Hypothesis-1: There will be a significant relationship between family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour.

The inter-correlation between the dimension of family climate scale and the dimensions of the Entrepreneurial behaviour inventory of the entrepreneur participants of the present study indicates no significant difference, (Table 1). Therefore, the hypothesis is rejected as there is no strong correlation between the family climate and entrepreneurial scales. There can be possible reason as to why family is not playing an important role such as the major factors contributing for development were economic and political environment, positively effecting Indians' mindset about entrepreneurship. Dana (2000) and Shivani (2006) concluded that the alteration in the Indian society resulted in the liberalization of Indian economy in the last decade of the 20th Century. Dana (2000), Handy

et al. (2002), and Shivani et al. (2006) stated that it is the modification in culture and ways of education. The main possible reasons for this result could be that, the world is demanding innovative, risk-taker, change-oriented entrepreneurs. But till date, in Indian setting, very few families are ready to encourage their youngster to enter in to the risk-taking and challenging profession, especially to be an entrepreneur. Reynolds et al. (2004) had argued that environmental factors such as culture and concern for entrepreneurial training & education are important sources with which the entrepreneurial activity is majorly influenced by. It is a main driving economic sector for urbanized nations.

Since now, the consumer growth is backed by mobile revolution, it can possibly give a colossal amount of opportunities to the service providers as well as the recipients to take the advantages of mobile phone. It is observed that, the availability of the services are more easy for the society which has good access to mobile phone than to the society which has no or little access to mobile phone. Thus, the person can now own an organization with just a small sign-up and creation of an application. Therefore, family could be one of many contributing factors; but in today's world, it cannot be the triggering factor for entrepreneurship. Roja and Năstase (2014) lamented that technical progress and entrepreneurship have become sources of financial and social firmness and advancement. Technological progress, technical expertise along with globalisation and creativity as the main drivers of financial growth guides venture owners to innovate new business strategies and models. Pavic et al. (2007) points out that entrepreneurs achieve a competitive advantage from advances in technology through innovation, advertising, competence gains, enhanced quality, and client responsiveness. Levy and Powell (2000) argued the increasing emphasis on competitiveness in small business has led to a new focus on the competitive advantage promised by the appropriate use of ICT.

From the critical analysis of the availability of entrepreneurial literature, it is observed that, in recent years, most of the youngsters are getting motivation and inspiration to be an entrepreneur rather than searching jobs in a traditional manner. Thomas and Mueller (2000) established that exposure to education and training, stimulating environment and co-workers effects influencing entrepreneurial behaviour. Ministry

of Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) develops and implements policies for fostering and supporting young and budding entrepreneurs along with the possible resources and loans for the endurance of the young enterprises through policies such as Mudra Bank, Ministry of Skill Development and Entrepreneurship. 10,000 crore fund for venture capital in MSME sector and district-level Incubation and Accelerator Program. These plans cover such areas as obtaining unrefined substance up to final merchandise manufacturing, personality of entrepreneurs, consumer relationship, innovative thinking, discovering the big business opportunities, and critical concepts of entrepreneurship. Mishra (2011, 2012) found that state's plans and policies are encouraging for the venture owners now; it was not the same 10 years ago.

Table 1 presents the results of the present study related to the family dimension. Open communication and Intergenerational Authority are negatively correlated with each other; thus, it can be said that although the values of family which used to be permanent in the heart of the people is skirted or modified these days by their children since the youth of this era demands proof and is able to check the validation of something with the access to information. Thus, the family values are turning lenient these days as the strenuous hardship that first generation underwent in their days, those hardships are not faced by second generation; thus, they have a variety of career options with the first generation taking a stand for their innovative endeavours.

Hypothesis-2: There will be significant differences of family climate and entrepreneurial behaviour between the entrepreneurs and corporate employees.

The results of the present study (Table 2) indicate that there lie only two dimensions, i.e., risk taking and change orientation, which possess a significant difference among the entrepreneurs and the corporate employees. Although the dimensions such as innovativeness and opportunism stay with no significant difference at all, signifying that on these two dimensions the venture owners and corporate employees are same. According to Lyon et al. 2000, "*Innovativeness* is motion resulting in new ideas, and attempts which may result in production in new processes, products, or services. Innovativeness indicates the product and service innovation focusing on development and innovation in technology." Similarly the

comparison results also indicate that there is no significant difference among corporate employees and entrepreneurs. The possible reason could be the rise in Intrapreneurship, which is employees developing new business activities for their employer. This observable fact is usually called 'corporate entrepreneurship', 'corporate venturing' or 'intrapreneurship'. E-ship in existing organizations can be studied at the individual, the organizational and the macro level'. Central behavioural aspects of intrapreneurship are personal initiative, pro-activeness, innovation and out of the box thinking, rising to the occasion, championing, being in charge, finding a route, and risk taking propensity (Lumpkin, 2007). At the same time as of now most of the companies have switched to Intrapreneurship, such as Microsoft is taking huge initiatives in nurturing entrepreneurs within the organization by blessing them with not only capital but autonomy and ownership of the organizations. Intrapreneurship has been seen by Arslan and Cevher (2014) as the actions of persons within organizations leading to creativity in product, services or procedures. Intrapreneurship or corporate entrepreneurship is almost inseparable from creativity in most researches and studies on intrapreneurship.

As it comes to *opportunism*, (Table 2) indicates that the t value for this dimension is -2.469 at 0.05 level which proves that there is a significant difference among Venture owners and Corporate employees. Recognition and exploitation of opportunities to develop novel products, improve active operations is called opportunism. The possible reason could be the shift to idiosyncratic culture in the organizations could be a significant reason might have led the entrepreneurs to think about their benefits and grab them as and when they arrive. Identifying and choosing right opportunities for new commerce are among the most significant abilities of a successful venture owner (Stevenson et al., 1985). Alexander Ardichvili et. al., (2003) states that, "creation of successful businesses follows a successful opportunity development process which includes recognition of an opportunity, its evaluation, and development per se.

Taking the case of *risk-taking* it can be inferred that Entrepreneurs are more risk-taking than corporate

employees because of the fact the entrepreneurship requires more ownership and accountability as the bigger stakes are at risk. Direct relationships between the need for achievement, LOC and risk taking propensity with success in most cases was found by Acharya et al. (2011). Thus analyzing the situation with the holistic picture in mind and taking a calculative risk in more in entrepreneurs. According to Thomas and Mueller (2000), entrepreneurial intentions are culturally habituated and inclined by the environment (Thomas & Mueller, 2000). According Eagly & Chaiken (1993), orientations include the ABCs model of risk taking i.e. affective, cognitive and behavioural (e.g. enjoying risky situations, accurate risk analysis, acting in a risky way) mechanism that become obvious in, an individual's orientation towards risk taking.

When it come to change orientation, it is seen as not only being the agent of change but also being open to environmental and surrounding change, taking measures for the change i.e. resistance in a pro-active or reactive manner. Pro-active change refers to taking initiative and shaping the environment to own advantage and whereas reactive change refers to responding to the situations rather than initiating or exploiting the change. It can also be seen as someone who welcomes uncertainty and change it to his/her benefit. As the comparison results (Table 2) indicates that the t value for this dimension is 0.787 at 0.05 level which indicates that there is no significant difference among entrepreneurs and corporate employees. The possible reason could be the frequent exposure to changing environment to the managers in the corporate as well in the venture owners setting. Thus taking care of these needs training programs offered in Corporate sector could be a leading reason for the rise in change orientation in employees these days as they get to know about the stages of change which includes Lewin model of Change i.e. unfreezing, change and refreezing and thus can look forward to capitalize on these changes. Thus both the corporate employees and entrepreneurs operate on same principles when it comes to change management.

Table 2: Comparison of Variables between the Employees from Corporate and Venture (n1=30, n2=31; df=59)

Variables	Categories	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t- Value	P=Value
OpenCommunication	Corporate	75.2500	12.60046	2.30052	-.583	.562
	Venture	77.0968	12.14662	2.18160		
Intergenerationalauthority	Corporate	55.8090	12.98939	2.37153	.614	.541
	Venture	53.7319	13.40850	2.40824		
Intergenerationalattention	Corporate	71.5000	14.51218	2.64955	-1.172	.248
	Venture	75.4032	11.36693	2.04156		
CognitiveCohesion	Corporate	61.5000	10.69966	1.95348	-497	.621
	Venture	62.9839	12.50699	2.24632		
EmotionalCohesion	Corporate	74.7500	15.54124	2.83743	-1.365	.177
	Venture	80.2419	15.86866	2.85010		
Adaptability	Corporate	75.0833	13.98095	2.55256	-1.560	.124
	Venture	80.6452	13.85893	2.48914		
Innovation	Corporate	60.2223	18.40292	3.35990	.618	.539
	Venture	57.4190	17.01131	3.05532		
Risk-taking	Corporate	58.0003	17.78074	3.24630	-2.036	.046
	Venture	67.0977	17.12068	3.07496		
Change-orientation	Corporate	60.8893	16.95110	3.09483	.787	.435
	Venture	57.8490	13.04113	2.34226		
Oppurtunism	Corporate	74.6667	12.79386	2.33583	-2.649	.010
	Venture	82.1516	9.00822	1.61792		

Conclusion

The study concludes that family climate do not affect the entrepreneurial characteristics largely, the external factors like change in technology and workforce, education and Govt. policies and initiatives play a crucial role in encouraging people to opt for entrepreneurship. The study could have been better if the sample would have been more, the success criteria for entrepreneurs would be defined and also if the results could be supplemented with the subject matter expert's feedback and verbatim.

References

- Acharya, V. V., Amihud, Y., & Litov, L. (2011). Creditor rights and corporate risk-taking. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 102(1), 150–166.
- Alvarez, S. A., & Busenitz, L. W. (2001). The entrepreneurship of resource-based theory. *Journal of Management*, 27(6), 755–775.
- Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), 105–123.
- Arslan, E. T., & Cevher, E. (2013). Intrapreneurship enabling organizations to drive innovation. In *First International Conference on Management and Economics*.
- Baron, R. A. (2000). Psychological perspectives on entrepreneurship: Cognitive and social factors in entrepreneurs' success. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9(1), 15–18.
- Bettinelli, C., Fayolle, A., & Randerson, K. (2014). Family entrepreneurship: A developing field. *Foundations and Trends® in Entrepreneurship*, 10(3), 161–236.
- Bettis, R. A., & Hitt, M. A. (1995). The new competitive landscape. *Strategic Management Journal*, 16(S1), 7–19.
- Björnberg, Å., & Nicholson, N. (2007). The family climate scales - Development of a new measure for use in family business research. *Family Business Review*, 20(3), 229–246.
- Bonnet, C., & Furnham, A. (1991). Who wants to be an entrepreneur? A study of adolescents interested in a young enterprise scheme. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12, 465–478.

- Brockhaus, R. H., & Horwitz, P. S. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship: Critical Perspectives on Business and Management*, 2, 260–283.
- Brockhaus, R. H., Sr. & Horwitz, P. S. (1986). The psychology of the entrepreneur,” in *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*, ed. D. L. Sexton and R. W. Smilor, Cambridge: Bailinger, 25–48.
- Cardon, M. S., Wincent, J., Singh, J., & Drnovsek, M. (2009). The nature and experience of entrepreneurial passion. *Academy of Management Review*, 34, 511–532.
- Chandler, G. N., Keller, C., & Lyon, D. W. (2000). Unraveling the determinants and consequences of an innovation-supportive organizational culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(1), 59–76.
- Chung, H., & Gale, J. (2009). Family functioning and self-differentiation: A cross-cultural examination. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 31(1), 19–33.
- Dana, L. P. (2000). Creating entrepreneurs in India. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(1), 86.
- De Bruin, A., Brush, C. G., & Welter, F. (2007). Advancing a framework for coherent research on women’s entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 323–339.
- De Jong, J., & Wennekers, S. (2008). Intrapreneurship; conceptualizing entrepreneurial employee behaviour (No. H200802). *EIM Business and Policy Research*.
- Drucker, P. F. (1985). Entrepreneurial strategies. *California Management Review (pre-1986)*, 27(2), 9.
- Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.
- Gartner, W. B. (1988). Who is an entrepreneur? is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 11–32.
- Gartner, W. B., Bird, B. J., & Starr, J. A. (1992). Acting as if: Differentiating entrepreneurial from organizational behavior. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(3), 13–32.
- Hadimani, R. N. (1985). *Dynamics of industrial entrepreneurship*. APH Publishing.
- Handy, F., Kassam, M., & Renade, S. (2002). Factors influencing women entrepreneurs of NGOs in India. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 13(2), 139–154.
- Jufri, M., Akib, H., Ridjal, S., Sahabuddin, R., & Said, F. (2018). Improving attitudes and entrepreneurial behaviour of students based on family environment factors at vocational high school in Makassar. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 21(2), 1–14.
- Kenyon-Rouvinez, D. (2001). Patterns in serial business families: Theory building through global case study research. *Family Business Review*, 14(3), 175–191.
- Lau, T. L., Shaffer, M. A., Fai Chan, K., & Wing Yan Man, T. (2012). The entrepreneurial behaviour inventory: A simulated incident method to assess corporate entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 18(6), 673–696.
- Levy, M., & Powell, P. (2000). Information systems strategy for small and medium sized enterprises: An organisational perspective. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 9(1), 63–84.
- Lumpkin, G. T. (2007). Intrapreneurship and innovation. *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*, 237.
- Mathias, B. D., & Williams, D. W. (2017). The impact of role identities on entrepreneurs’ evaluation and selection of opportunities. *Journal of Management*, 43(3), 892–918.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achievement society*. Princeton, NJ: Von Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965). *The achieving society*. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). *The achievement motive*.
- McClelland, & David, C. (1965). Achievement motivation can be developed. *Harvard Business Review*, 43, 6–25.
- McClelland, D. C., & Winter, D. G. (1969). *Motivating economic achievement*.
- Meyer, G. D., & Heppard, K. A. (2000). Entrepreneurial Strategies. *Entrepreneurship as strategy: Competing on the entrepreneurial edge*, 1.
- Mueller, S. L., & Thomas, A. S. (2001). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(1), 51–75.
- Mungai, E., & Velamuri, S. R. (2011). Parental entrepreneurial role model influence on male offspring: Is it always positive and when does it occur?. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 35(2), 337–357.
- Nosé, L., Korunka, C., Frank, H., & Danes, S. M. (2017). Decreasing the effects of relationship conflict on family businesses: The moderating role of family climate. *Journal of Family Issues*, 38(1), 25–51.

- Nurmaliza, N., Caska, C., & Indrawati, H. (2018). Analysis of factors affecting entrepreneurial interest of vocational high school students in Pekanbaru. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 2(2), 42–51.
- Pavic, S. C. L. K., Koh, S. C. L., Simpson, M., & Padmore, J. (2007). Could e-business create a competitive advantage in UK SMEs?. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 14(3), 320–351.
- Perry, C. (1990). After further sightings of the Heffalump. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 5(2), 22–31.
- Powell, M., & Ansic, D. (1997). Gender differences in risk behaviour in financial decision-making: An experimental analysis. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18(6), 605–628.
- Reynolds, P., Bosma, N., Autio, E., Hunt, S., De Bono, N., Servais, I., ... & Chin, N. (2005). Global entrepreneurship monitor: Data collection design and implementation 1998–2003. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 205–231.
- Roja, A., & Năstase, M. (2014). Technology entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial strategies. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Management Conference, Bucharest, Romania* (pp. 6–7).
- Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 80(1), 1.
- Santos, F. J., Roomi, M. A., & Liñán, F. (2014). About gender differences and the social environment in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54, 49–66.
- Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.
- Shivani, S., Mukherjee, S. K., & Sharan, R. (2006). Socio-cultural influences on Indian entrepreneurs: The need for appropriate structural interventions. *Journal of Asian Economics*, 17(1), 5–13.
- Stevenson, H. H., & Jarillo, J. C. (2007). A paradigm of entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial management. In *Entrepreneurship* (pp. 155–170). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Stevenson, H., & Gumpert, D. (1985). *The heart of entrepreneurship*.
- Stevenson, L. (1988). *Women and economic development: A focus on entrepreneurship*.
- Stewart Jr, W. H., & Roth, P. L. (2001). Risk propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 145.
- Stewart Jr, W. H., & Roth, P. L. (2007). A meta-analysis of achievement motivation differences between entrepreneurs and managers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45(4), 401–421.
- Teintang, Y., Sinolungan, J. S., & Opod, H. (2015). Sikap Orang Tua Terhadap Pembentukan Kepribadian Anak Pada Keluarga Petani Di Desa Talawaan Bantik Kecamatan Wori Kabupaten Minahasa Utara. *Jurnal e-Biomedik*, 3(2).
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (1966). Chicago: Rand McNally and Sons.
- Yusuf, M., Natsir, S., & Kornelius, Y. (2017). Pengaruh Kepribadian dan Lingkungan Keluarga Terhadap Minat Berwirausaha Mahasiswa Manajemen Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Tadulako. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 3(1), 244–258.