

Motives and Perceived Problems of Students as Aspiring Entrepreneurs: Differences across the Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States

Nergis Aziz

257 Rich Hall

State University of New York at Oswego

Oswego, New York, 13126 U.S.A

&

Suleyman Sah University

Istanbul, Turkey

Barry A. Friedman

247 Rich Hall

State University of New York at Oswego

Oswego, New York, 13126 U.S.A

&

Suleyman Sah University

Istanbul, Turkey

Salavat Sayfullin

International Black Sea University

Tbilisi, Georgia

Abstract

We developed a theory-based instrument that measured entrepreneurial motives, and (2) contrasted the motives of aspiring entrepreneurs in Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States. We administered the Aspiring Entrepreneurial Motive Questionnaire (AEMQ) to 305 business school senior students. Entrepreneurial motives significantly differed across the three countries. Financial motives were significantly higher in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia than in the United States. Recognition motives were significantly higher in Kyrgyzstan. Compared to Kyrgyzstan and Georgia, freedom and perceived marketing opportunities motivated students more in the United States, yet these students perceived economic conditions to be no more favorable. We discuss the implications of these findings.

Key Words: entrepreneurship, motives, aspiring entrepreneurs, post-Soviet Union countries, transitional economies

Introduction

Effective entrepreneurship increases national prosperity and economic growth (Friedman, 2011; Baumol, 1968; Kirzner, 2009; Kent, 1989; Petrakis, 2005). Entrepreneurship therefore plays an important role in moving developing economies forward, exemplified by Hong Kong's transition from a latecomer into a rich economy (Yu, 2001). Kyrgyzstan and Georgia are post-Soviet Union countries that face similar economic problems. Both countries need entrepreneurs who will contribute to economic growth, offer employment opportunities, pay taxes, and add value to the well-being of their respective societies. The governments of Kyrgyzstan and Georgia must therefore motivate and encourage their citizens to be entrepreneurs. The objective of our study is to shed light on entrepreneurial motives of aspiring Kyrgyz and Georgian entrepreneurs and compares them with their counterparts in the United States. We argue that entrepreneurial motives, perceived marketing opportunities, and perceived economic conditions are country specific contingent on a nation's political, cultural, and economic environment.

We hypothesize that the desire for freedom motivates entrepreneurs in developed economies and stable political environments. On the other hand, financial motives drive entrepreneurial motivation in transitional economies and less stable political environments. We test these hypotheses empirically by comparing differences in aspiring entrepreneurs' motives, perceived marketing opportunities, and perceived economic conditions in Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States. We first compare Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States with respect to their respective general demographics and economy. We then review literature related to entrepreneurship as it relates to these three countries, followed by a description of the Aspiring Entrepreneurial Motive Questionnaire (AEMQ). We then empirically test our hypotheses, followed by a discussion of the results and areas for future research.

Literature Review

Entrepreneurship as a field has developed quickly over the last 20 years (Hills et al., 2008). Despite this development, there is no universal definition of entrepreneurship (Bustamam, 2010; Humbert, 2010; Kobia and Sikalieh, 2010; Baumol, 1968). There are many entrepreneur definitions: "innovator" (Schumpeter, 1934 in Brouwer, 2002), "leader" (Baumol, 1968), and "innovator and job generator who characterized by taking risk and motivated by achievement" (Kent, 1985, in Tucker, 1988). Kent (1989, p. 154) defines an entrepreneur as one:

"a) who introduces a new service or product in the market or implements a new approach to a social problem, b) develops and implements a new technology that lowers costs and improves efficiency, c) opens a new market by introducing new products, services, or technologies not previously available in that market, d) discovers a new source of supply for a scarce resource or discovers methods for increasing the supply from existing sources by more efficient exploitation, and e) reorganizes an existing enterprise, either private or public, by innovative management".

Schumpeter (1934) defined the process of entrepreneurship as a driving force of a particular economy, and an entrepreneur himself or herself is an innovator (in Brouwer, 2002). According to Schumpeter, entrepreneurs initiate new products and services that change lives. High (2009, p. 7) states, "entrepreneurship can be conceived of as the causal agent that recognizes and evaluates opportunities and introduces new practices into social life." Shane and Venkataraman (2000, p.18) provides a broader definition by stating that entrepreneurship is the "scholarly examination of how, by whom and with what effects opportunities to form future goods and services are discovered, evaluated, and exploited." Yalcin and Kapu (2008, p. 186) define entrepreneurship as "a process with different important dimensions, including entrepreneurial motives, problems and opportunities." We adopt this broad definition in the present study.

Danis and Shipilov (2002) state that entrepreneurship drives economic growth in developing countries. Developing countries conceive entrepreneurship as an important element that plays a pivotal role in economic growth. Therefore, entrepreneurship should be developed, encouraged, and fostered in transitional economies. In addition, it is very important to understand individuals' qualities leading to successful entrepreneurship and socioeconomic environment needed for performing successful entrepreneurial activities (Kirzner, 2009).

Academics have explored factors that motivate entrepreneurs to startup businesses. According to Carsrud and Brännback (2011), "researchers assumed it was possible to identify personality traits that would uniquely define an entrepreneur; and when this was not easily demonstrated, this line of research was quickly abandoned." Nevertheless, a number of studies explore entrepreneurial motivation. Naffziger et al. (1994) argue that goal accomplishment motivates entrepreneurs. "Achievement" is another important motive that leads individuals to become entrepreneurs (Kent, 1985, in Tucker, 1988; Tucker, 1988; Carraher et al., 2010). Cromie (1987) found that individuals are primarily motivated by needs for achievement, autonomy, desire to avoid frustrating jobs, and by a desire to earn more money.

Singh et al. (2011) found out that "educational" and "family capital" motives were significant in Nigerian women's decisions to perform entrepreneurial activities. They stated that a willingness to strive for a better environment for family members strongly affected female entrepreneurial motives.

Fatoki (2010) studied South African graduates, and found five motivators of entrepreneurial intentions: employment, autonomy, creativity, economic and capital. While these motives are important, spirituality select appears in the literature.

Research suggests that many entrepreneurs may not be motivated primarily by wealth, and they are eager to become entrepreneurs in order to make a difference or create change for social progress (Rindova, Barry, and Ketchen, 2009, in Kauanui, 2010). After an extensive literature review, Yalcin and Kapu (2008) classified four entrepreneurial motives: financial gain, recognition, freedom, and family tradition. Financial gain refers to increases in personal wealth afforded by entrepreneurial activities. Recognition is an internal motive characterized by the need for achievement and self-actualization. The freedom motive refers to the independence and flexibility that entrepreneurship allows. Finally, family tradition is the motivation to continue a family business. Yalcin and Kapu (2008) also review problems faced by entrepreneurs in transitional economies, such as high supplier prices, difficulty in securing business loans, and red tape.

As it is reasonable to assume that entrepreneurial motives significantly affect entrepreneurial behavior, and it is therefore important to understand motives in order to predict entrepreneurial behavior (Garsrud and Brännback, 2011). Despite its importance, there is a little known related to motives of entrepreneurs in post-Soviet countries. Furthermore, research has not developed a reliable instrument that measures entrepreneurial motives. This study aims to contribute to the body of literature related to entrepreneurial motives of individuals in transitional economies, and contrast these motives with those in developed countries (e.g., the United States). We first overview the three countries addressed in our study.

Kyrgyzstan

Kyrgyzstan is located in mountainous area in Central Asia and borders Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and China. Capital city is Bishkek. The population is 5,587,443, ranked 110th (July 2011 est.). Sixty-five percent (65%) of the population is Kyrgyz, and the remaining 25% consists of various ethnic groups (e.g., Russians, Uzbeks, and Turks). The population is young (median age is 25 years), the literacy rate is 98.7 %, and the unemployment rate is 14.6% (Central Intelligence Agency, 2011). The Kyrgyz Republic achieved independence in 1991 due to the Soviet Union's collapse. Due to its poor economic conditions hundreds of thousands Kyrgyz people left country in order to find a job. Kyrgyzstan is heavily dependent on the inflow of Kyrgyz workers from Russia and Kazakhstan. Kyrgyz workers account for up to one-quarter of the total GDP (Country Intelligence: Report Kyrgyzstan, 2011).

Entrepreneurship in Kyrgyzstan

Kyrgyzstan is one of the poorest countries among the transition economies in Middle Asia. Several problems inhibit entrepreneurship in Kyrgyzstan such as unfavorable credit conditions (Met, 2011). Increased entrepreneurship might reduce poverty and increase the standard of life, provide job opportunities, promote innovation, and encourage social responsibility. Entrepreneurship is vital, especially in an environment weakened by political instability and economic recession factors that reduce foreign investment. Therefore, government should encourage entrepreneurship. Individuals should be motivated to be entrepreneurs, and the government should collaborate with colleges and universities to motivate young people to start businesses.

Georgia

Georgia, known officially from 1990 to 1995 as the Republic of Georgia, is located to the east of the Black Sea, mostly in the South Caucasus with a portion of the territory in the North Caucasus. A former republic of the Soviet Union, it shares borders with Russia in the north and Turkey, Armenia, and Azerbaijan in the south. Ethnic Georgians constitute a majority of the population. The official language is Georgian, one of the oldest languages in the world (About Georgia, 2011). Georgia's strategic location is an asset to investors. As a bridge between Europe and Asia, Georgia offers direct access to European, Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) markets with its more than 1 billion consumers. Georgia is a prime location for centralized market operations in the Black Sea Region and the preferred choice for Regional Headquarters and multinational distribution and service centers (Kbilitsetskhlashvili, 2009). According to Invest in Georgia (2011), the 2010 literacy rate was 100%, the GDP was 11.7 billion (USD), but the GDP per capita was only \$2,692 (USD), with a high unemployment rate (16.3%). By undertaking numerous economic reform initiatives and ensuring a strong legal system to protect investor rights, Georgia is an attractive destination for foreign investment (Kbilitsetskhlashvili, 2009). In 2011, the World Bank ranked Georgia 16th out of 183 economies in their "ease doing the business" index (World Bank & IFC Doing Business Report, 2011).

Standard and Poor (2011) rated Georgia B+, and Transparency International (2011) placed Georgia 68th place on its Corruption Perception Index, and the Forbes Tax Misery & Reform Index (2011) indicates Georgia as the fourth friendliest tax regime globally.

Entrepreneurship plays a vital role in transitioning countries from planned to market economies. During the Soviet Union era, state-owned firms operated the Georgian economy. Only recently has entrepreneurship been welcomed in Georgia. Fostering entrepreneurship in the transition countries presents difficulties (Estrin et al, 2006). Aidis (2005) concluded that cultural perceptions of entrepreneurship, the state of the economy, and policy implementation influence entrepreneurial activity in low-tech sectors such as retail trade and basic services. Estrin et al. (2006) argues that a critical mass of successful reforms is required for entrepreneurship to evolve. Georgia has developed a sustainable economic environment through successful reforms that created a friendly business environment that encourages investment. These reforms include low corporate taxes, less bureaucracy, and a well-educated labor force (Invest in Georgia, 2011). This indicates that Georgia understands the importance of developing its private sector, and developing an entrepreneurial culture.

United States

The United States is among the world's most powerful and prosperous nations (CIA Factbook, 2011). Figure 1 contrasts Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States on demographic, economic and governance variables. The United States is considerably larger than Kyrgyzstan or Georgia. The United States population is much larger than Kyrgyzstan or Georgia, but its population is older. Relative to Kyrgyzstan and Georgia, the United States labor force is much larger with a significantly higher Gross Domestic Product per capita (ranked 11th highest in the world), and its unemployment rate is lowest of the three countries. The "ease of doing business" index (World Bank, 2011) ranks the United States much more favorably than either Kyrgyzstan or Georgia. Finally, the World Governance Indicators (World Bank, 2011) are considerably more favorable than the other two countries on each of the six dimensions.

Figure 1: Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States: Demographics, Economy, and Governance

	Kyrgyzstan	Georgia	United States
Demographics			
Population	5,587,443	4,585,874	313,232,044
Growth rate	- 1.4%	1.23%	.96%
Religion	Muslim 75%, Orthodox 20%, others 5%	Orth. 83.9%, Muslim 9.9%, Armenian 3.9%, Catholic 0.8%, other 0.8%	Protestant 51.3%, Roman Catholic 23.9%
Median age	25 years	39.1 years	36.9 years
Education Expenditures	3.2% of GDP	5.9% of GDP	5.5% of GDP
Literacy rate	98.7%	100%	97%
Unemployment rate	14.6% (world rank 79)	35.5% (world rank 11)	9.6% (world rank 107)
Economy¹			
GDP per capita (PPP)	\$2,200 USD (world rank 187)	\$4,900 USD (world rank150)	\$47,200 USD (world rank 11)
Labor Force	2.34 million (world rank 112)	1.91 million (world rank 122)	153 million (world rank 4)
Population below Poverty line	40%	31%	15.1%
Ease of Doing Business Rank ²	67	17	4
Governance			
Type	Republic	Republic	Constitution federal republic; democratic
Corporate tax rate ³	73.2%	15.3%	46.8%
World Governance Indicators⁴			
Voice and Accountability	20.3	42.6	84.1
Political Stability	16.5	24.5	52.9
Government Effectiveness	30.6	64	90.8
Regulatory Quality	44.5	70.8	92.2
Rule of Law	7.58	48.8	91.9
Control of Corruption	13.4	54	85.9
Index of Economic Freedom ⁵	world rank-83	world rank-29	world rank-9
Corruption Perceptions Index ⁶	world rank -164	world rank-64	world rank-24

¹Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>, retrieved 20.12.2011.

²Ease of Doing Business Index. The World Bank, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.EASE.XQ>, retrieved 20.12.2011.

³Corporate Tax Rate. The World Bank. <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.TAX.TOTL.CP.ZS>, retrieved 20.12.2011.

⁴World Governance Indicators, The World Bank, <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>., retrieved 20.12.2011.

⁵ 2011 Index of Economic Freedom, <http://www.heritage.org/Index/Country/>, retrieved 9.1.2012.

⁶ Corruption Perceptions Index, <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/#CountryResults> , retrieved 9.1.2012.

Hypotheses

We hypothesize that entrepreneurial motives, problems, and opportunities differ across Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States due to the different economic and political factors experienced by entrepreneurs in their respective countries. Entrepreneurs in transitional economies are motivated primarily by the desire to earn money (Kapu and Yalcin, 2008). As economies of these countries are in the process of transition, there are many problems such as unemployment, poverty, bureaucracy, and corruption. In addition, these countries underwent revolutions that affected their economies significantly. Especially, Kyrgyzstan is a country where two revolutions happened in last six years. Therefore, we propose that aspiring entrepreneurs in these countries are motivated by the desire to earn money and survive.

Hypothesis 1: Kyrgyz and Georgian aspiring entrepreneurs are motivated more by financial motives than are aspiring entrepreneurs in the United States.

The majority of entrepreneurs in higher-income countries who start up their own firm are motivated by independence (Hessels, 2008). Individuals prefer to do what they love to do and be his or her own boss. Flexibility job provides freedom to entrepreneurs. Therefore, we propose following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: United States aspiring entrepreneurs are motivated more by freedom than are aspiring Kyrgyz and Georgian entrepreneurs.

Aspiring entrepreneurs in transitional economies face with such problems as bureaucracy, unstable regulations and economic conditions, high taxation, ineffective banking system, corruption, difficulty in getting credit, material cost, and red tape (Yalcin and Kapu, 2008). The United States aspiring entrepreneurs have much more opportunities to start up business compared to their counterparts in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia. Therefore, we propose following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: Aspiring United States entrepreneurs will have fewer perceived problems for starting a business than aspiring entrepreneurs in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia.

The United States has a free market economic system where marketing is aggressively used. Kyrgyzstan and Georgia are countries with transitional economies and that are moving towards free markets. Even though these countries gained their independence from the former Soviet Union almost twenty years ago, their economies still struggle. Marketing is not developed in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia but it is aggressively utilized in the United States. However, transitional economies also provide a chance for entrepreneurs to identify new opportunities that may provide new products and services to market. According to Smart and Conant (1994), entrepreneurs who possess marketing competencies are more successful as they differentiate their products using such tools as marketing research. Therefore, we propose following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: Aspiring Kyrgyz and Georgian entrepreneurs are driven by marketing opportunities more than aspiring entrepreneurs in the United States are.

Method

Based on Yalcin & Kapu's (2008) comprehensive literature review, we developed the AEMQ that measured four entrepreneurial motives: financial, recognition, freedom, and family tradition. Financial motives contain items such as the desire to earn money and security. Recognition motives include such items as the need for achievement, innovation, taking risk, and creating employment opportunities. Freedom motives contain items such as the wish to be independent, to be the boss, to do what someone likes to do, and to have flexibility job. Family tradition motives include items such as the desire to continue a family business (Yalcin and Kapu, 2008). Problems describe various economic factors such as access to money and taxation. Marketing opportunities describe the ability to offer products and services that one chooses. In order to check comprehension and understanding, we pilot tested the AEMQ with 52 School of Business senior level students in an upstate New York university (United States). All questions were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The AEMQ items were clearly understood by the students. Scales reliabilities were determined using Cronbach's Alpha estimates of internal consistency.

Sample

We administered the AEMQ during classes to senior level students from Colleges of Business senior level students in four-year undergraduate universities located in North Kyrgyzstan, South Georgia, and a state university in upstate New York (USA). We selected this sample because students were enrolled in Business Administration, Marketing, Accounting, and Finance courses. This commonality increased cross-national comparability and controlled for prominent variables such as age, literacy, and education (Mueller & Thomson, 2001). Another reason is the convenience, accessibility and controllability of student sample (Mueller & Thomson, 2001). Three hundred and five (N = 305) completed questionnaires representing samples of the United States (N = 97), Kyrgyzstan (N = 102), and Georgia (N = 106), representing an 82% response rate. No differences were observed among the three countries with respect to response rate. These students are aspiring entrepreneurs; therefore, they represent a significant group that is valid for this study. Table 1 contains sample demographic characteristics. Forty seven percent (47.9%) were males. The sample majored mostly in Business Administration (45.6%), Marketing (10.2%), and Finance (28.9%). Student majors significantly differed across the three countries. Students' majors in the USA were mostly Business

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

	Kyrgyzstan		Georgia		United States	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Gender						
Male	39	38.2%	54	50.9%	53	54.6%
Female	63	54.5%	52	49.1%	44	45.6%
Family Run Business						
Yes	50	49%	57	53.5%	33	34%
No	51	50%	49	46.2%	64	66%
Major						
Business Administration/						
Management	35	34.3%	57	53.8%	47	48.5%
Marketing	0	0%	9	8.5%	22	22.7%
Finance	44	43.1%	37	34.9%	7	7.2%
Accounting	0	0%	1	1%	9	9.3%
Human Resources	0	0%	0	0%	6	6.2%
Other	23	22.5%	2	1.9%	6	6.2%

Administration and Marketing, and in Georgia and Kyrgyzstan students' majors were mostly Business Administration and Finance ($\chi^2 = 107.15, p \leq .001$). The average age was 21 years. The United States students were older than Kyrgyzstan or Georgia students were (22 versus 20 years, respectively) ($F_{(2,300)} = 36.02, p \leq .001$). Of the participants, 49% (N=146) had family businesses. The US had the least participants with businesses (34%), Kyrgyzstan had 49%, and Georgia had the largest number of students with family businesses (53.8%). While not possible to ascertain from the data, students that responded to the AEMQ in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia were from private universities where wealthier families sent their children and a greater percentage came from families that owned or ran businesses. The second reason is the larger number of corporations in the United States that provide more corporate job opportunities. Two hundred and thirty-seven students (N = 237) responded that they either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that they wanted to be entrepreneurs. We used these respondents in subsequent analyses.

Results

Table 2 contains the items and Cronbach's Alpha estimates of reliability for the AEMQ scales: Finance Motive (.70), Recognition Motive (.66), Freedom Motive (.52), family tradition motives (.80) marketing opportunities (.56), economic conditions (.71), and Governance (.52). The scale reliabilities (Cronbach's Alphas) were adequate for Finance, Recognition, and Family motives, as well as for Economic Conditions. However, the Freedom Motive, Marketing Opportunities, and Governance scales did not reach a desired level of internal consistency. Scales were used in subsequent analyses when reliable was adequate; otherwise, single items were used.

Table 2: The Aspiring Entrepreneurial Motive Questionnaire (AEMQ) Scale Items and Reliability**Finance Motive (.70)¹**

- My reason to be an entrepreneur is to earn more money.
- I want to own or run a business because it leads to larger financial opportunities.
- I want to be an entrepreneur to become wealthy.
- Being an entrepreneur is likely to result in my financial security.

Recognition Motive (.66)

- Being an entrepreneur will allow me to achieve my goals.
- I can achieve greater results by being an entrepreneur.
- I can better reach my potential by being an entrepreneur.
- Being an entrepreneur will allow me to challenge myself.
- Being an entrepreneur will allow me to make a greater contribution to society.

Freedom Motive (.52)

- Being an entrepreneur will allow me greater freedom.
- Entrepreneurship will allow me greater control my own destiny.
- Entrepreneurship gives me greater flexibility in my work.
- Entrepreneurship provides me a better opportunity to be my own boss.

Family Tradition Motive (.80)

- Running my own business will help me to keep family traditions.
- Entrepreneurship will help me keep a business within my family.
- Running a business gives me a better chance to be like my other family members.
- Entrepreneurship will allow me to keep up my family's traditions.

Economic Conditions (.71)

- Economic conditions support entrepreneurship where I live.
- Taxation in my country supports entrepreneurship.
- Money is reasonably accessible in my country to start and run a business.
- Material costs are reasonable in my country.
- Credit policies and rates are reasonable where I live.

Marketing Opportunity (.56)

- Entrepreneurs have the opportunity to offer new products and services to markets.
- By being an entrepreneur, I can decide my products/services prices.
- Running a business would give me a chance to sell my products/services wherever I want.

Governance (.52)

- Business laws and regulations support entrepreneurship.
- Corruption is a barrier to my running a business.
- My government's policies help me run a business.
- Bureaucracy is a barrier to entrepreneurship where I live.
- My government encourages entrepreneurship.

¹Cronbach Alpha reliabilities are in parentheses.

Table 3 shows results of One-Way ANOVA tests conducted to determine if the dependent variables differed across Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States. We conducted Scheffé tests to gain greater insight into between country differences. Overall main effects were found for Finance ($F = 7.06, p \leq .001$), Recognition ($F = 3.01, p \leq .01$), and all single items related to Freedom motives.

Table 3: Entrepreneurial Motives and Opportunities in, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States

Dependent Variables	Kyrgyzstan		Georgia		United States		F		Scheffé
	M	s.d.	M	s.d.	M	s.d.			
Finance Motives	4.06	.59	3.97	.71	3.61	.91	7.06	***	KY,GE>US
Recognition Motives	4.12	.51	3.92	.68	3.90	.57	3.01	**	KY>GE,US
Freedom Motives									
Being an entrepreneur will allow me greater freedom.	3.90	1.00	3.20	1.15	4.45	.71	27.83	***	US>KY>GE
Entrepreneurship will allow me greater control my own destiny.	3.62	1.05	3.72	1.28	4.18	.85	5.53	**	US>KY,GE
Entrepreneurship gives me greater flexibility in my work.	3.99	1.04	3.74	.94	4.16	.80	3.61	*	US>KY>GE
Entrepreneurship provides me a better opportunity to be my own boss.	4.24	.83	4.17	.91	4.61	.56	5.26	**	US>KY,GE
Family Tradition Motives	3.36	.88	3.07	.93	3.06	1.07	2.82		
Economic Conditions	3.30	.76	3.28	.72	3.09	.75	1.48		

Table 3: Entrepreneurial Motives and Opportunities in, Kyrgyzstan, Georgia, and the United States, continued

Dependent Variables	Kyrgyzstan		Georgia		United States		F	Scheffé	
	M	s.d.	M	s.d.	M	s.d.			
Marketing Opportunities									
Entrepreneurs have the opportunity to offer new products and services to markets.	4.17	.91	4.09	.89	4.09	.79	.23		
By being an entrepreneur, I can decide my products/services prices.	3.46	1.12	3.51	.96	4.09	.99	7.14	***	US>GE,KY
Running a business would give me a chance to sell my products/services wherever I want.	3.77	.99	3.40	1.13	3.82	.93	3.82	**	US>KY>GE
Governance									
Business laws and regulations support entrepreneurship.	3.33	1.17	3.36	.92	3.50	1.04	.48		
Corruption is a barrier to my running a business.	3.55	1.27	3.18	1.29	2.87	1.26	5.15	**	KY>GE>US
My government's policies help me run a business.	2.78	1.04	3.15	1.15	3.21	1.05	3.85	*	
Bureaucracy is a barrier to entrepreneurship where I live.	3.49	1.13	3.22	1.13	3.21	.73	1.89		
My government encourages entrepreneurship.	2.97	1.02	3.23	1.00	3.34	1.08	2.66		

*** $p \leq .001$; ** $p \leq .01$; * $p \leq .05$

The Kyrgyz and Georgian students were motivated more by Finance than were students in the United States. Students in the United States were motivated more by freedom than their counterparts in the other two countries. There were no differences with respect to family tradition motives or perceived economic conditions. Two of the three single items related to marketing opportunities reached statistical significance, and only two of the five items related to governance did so.

In summary, students in the United States are motivated to be entrepreneurs by the expectation that their work will afford greater flexibility, an opportunity to be one's own boss, and control over one's own destiny (i.e., Freedom Motive). Students in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia were motivated more by the aspiration for larger financial gain and wealth. Students in Kyrgyzstan were motivated most by achievement and challenge (i.e., Recognition). These differences were present despite the fact that students in the three countries did not differ with respect to how they perceived their respective countries economic practices towards entrepreneurs (i.e., Economic Conditions).

Kyrgyz students were concerned with corruption as an obstacle to the business more than their student peers in Georgia and the United States were. Among the three countries studied, corruption control is weakest in Kyrgyzstan, moderate in Georgia, and strongest in the United States (Corruption Perception Index, 2012). Shelley (2007) describes Georgia as one of the most corrupt and crime-ridden nations of the former Soviet Union. In 2003, the Georgia government was replaced without violence in the "Rose Revolution." By 2012, the new government offered transparent services that significantly reduced public services corruption, reduced bureaucracy, and fostered the development of new cultural values (OECD Anti-Corruption Network reports as reported by the World Bank (2012) book "Fighting Corruption in Public Services: Chronicling Georgia's Reforms", Global Corruption Barometer Survey by Transparency International, 2010). The Georgian case can be offered as the benchmark for other former Soviet Union nations.

Unlike the United States, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan are undergoing transitions from a centrally planned economy to a free market economy. Their governance is not as effective as compared to countries such as the United States with developed economies. Unlimited government power, weak rule of law, and high corruption are issues in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia. While Kyrgyzstan and Georgia are similar in terms of land size, population, and economic development, they are both smaller than the United States with respect to land mass, population and labor force. Kyrgyzstan also has the highest poverty rate (40%), the lowest GDP ppp, and is ranked less favorably with respect to the ease by which business is conducted. Georgia experiences a higher unemployment rate than Kyrgyzstan or the United States. These macroeconomic conditions may have differently affected the motives of aspiring individuals in each country; that is, the Kyrgyz and Georgian aspiring entrepreneurs were driven more by financial motives, and the United States aspiring entrepreneurs were driven by freedom motives. Due to relatively poor economic conditions in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia, students may decide to be entrepreneurs to earn more money and survive.

On the other hand, students in the United States may choose to be entrepreneurs because they are not satisfied with the independence the corporate world offers, and view entrepreneurship as a way to increase freedom in their work life. Kyrgyz students were motivated more by recognition motives than their United States and Georgian peers. It can be concluded that aspiring entrepreneurs in Kyrgyzstan wish to be recognized by reaching their goals and challenging themselves. Kyrgyz people have close relative relationships and as one gains wealth, he or she helps family members and relatives by providing financial support or providing jobs. Such cultural characteristic of Kyrgyz society increase the recognition motive.

Limitations and Implications

The present study has four limitations. As most samples conducted with students within universities, the sample was one of convenience. Basil (1996) argues that such samples are valid for study if the sample is relevant for the subject under study. The generalizability of the student sample to entrepreneurs is another study limitation. It is argued here that senior level students enrolled in four-year universities that desire to be entrepreneurs are aspiring entrepreneurs, and therefore worthy of study. Aspiring entrepreneurs represent an important feeder pool for nations' future ranks of entrepreneurs, thus increasing generalizability new entrepreneurs. While most the AEMQ scales were reliable, a third limitation of the study is that a few scales require further revision in order to reach acceptable levels of reliability. A fourth limitation is the scope of countries presently studied. Once revised, the AEMQ should be administered in other countries that have developed or transitional economies.

As entrepreneurship is an important element of a national growth, countries would do well to monitor closely the aspirations and motives of both aspiring and present entrepreneurs. Nations should tailor their policies strategically so that their unique history, political, social, and economic conditions are considered.

Under Soviet rule for 75 years, Georgia and Kyrgyzstan had a planned economic system. Today these countries are trying to transition to market system. Even though twenty years have passed after the collapse of Soviet Union, the transition period is not yet complete. Slow progress is likely attributable to old habits that remain from the old system that dominated political, social, and economic life of Georgia and Kyrgyzstan: bribery, bureaucracy, red tape, and corruption. Entrepreneurship may be inhibited in such an environment.

One of the most important duties of government is to remove barriers to increased entrepreneurship. Governments must practice effective governance and avert corruption and bureaucracy. In some instances, entrepreneurs must bribe authorities to begin or maintain a business. Effective legislation and is passed and enforced to reduce such corruption may encourage entrepreneurship.

In order to increase awareness, confidence, and competencies, entrepreneur training courses should be included in the school curriculum. As not all of graduates of high school decide to go on to universities, some can be encouraged to start small businesses. For example, the Council of Entrepreneurship was recently founded under the leadership of Minister of Science, Industry, and Technology with the participation of 32 institutions in order to develop and foster entrepreneurship and prevent regional inequality of income distribution in Turkey. Council aims work hand in hand with Ministry of Education and Council of Higher Education and put an entrepreneurship as an integral part of curriculum of elementary, middle and high schools (Kabil, 2012). Universities should also address entrepreneurship in their curriculum. Students can be taught such important skills as creative thinking, foreseeing new opportunities, evaluating business and credit opportunities, the process of setting up a business, writing business and marketing and financial plans, and record keeping. Successful entrepreneurs can share their successes and best practices through social networking and formal mentoring programs. Existing entrepreneurs may become their mentors and partners as they decide to be entrepreneurs.

Loan systems can encourage entrepreneurs to start and manage businesses. Entrepreneurs in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia need credits with very low rates. Governments can collaborate with international institutions in order to provide low rate loans to individuals wishing start a new business. Mohammed Yunus' model can be adopted here. Muhammad Yunus is a Bangladeshi economist who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006. He is the founder of Grameen Bank that provides small loans without collateral in order to help poor entrepreneurs to be financially self-sufficient (Muhammad Yunus, 2012). Private banks of Kyrgyzstan and Georgia can evaluate projects of poor people and award micro loans. Furthermore, Central and Private Banks of these countries should cooperate in order to provide credits with low interest rates to entrepreneurs to start businesses. Wealthy individuals can be encouraged to help promising entrepreneurs.

Tax deductions can incent successful individual to provide assistance. Furthermore, such benefactors should be awarded and recognized for their contributors to society.

Conclusions

Kyrgyzstan and Georgia governments should pay close attention to the developing and fostering of entrepreneurship in their countries because it is one of the most important remedies in the healing of a weak economy. Though it is not a panacea, it can contribute to growing economies by decreasing unemployment, providing jobs, paying taxes and increasing well-being of society. Therefore, entrepreneurship culture can be placed stressed beginning in early ages to lead people to be entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurship itself should be encouraged, developed, and fostered through close cooperation among government institutions, schools, universities, and the private sector.

References

- About Georgia, 2011. [Online] Availble: <http://www.aboutgeorgia.ge/>, retrieved 5.12.2011.
- Aidis, R. (2005). Entrepreneurship in transition countries: A review. *Economics Working Papers* 61.
- Anti-Corruption Network (2012). Georgia: Anti-corruption achievements must become sustainable. OECD. [Online] Availble: http://www.oecd.org/document/34/0,3746,en_36595778_36595861_44999138_1_1_1_1,00.html, retrieved 7.5.12.
- Basil, M. D. (1996). The use of student samples in communication research. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 40.
- Baumol, W. (1968). Entrepreneurship in economic theory. *The American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings of the Eightieth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, 58 (2), 64-71.
- Brouwer, M. T. (2002). Weber, Schumpeter, and Knight on entrepreneurship and economic development. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 12 (1-2), 83-105.
- Bustamam, U. S. A. (2010). Entrepreneurial growth process of Malay entrepreneurs- A Malaysian. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 1(I. 3), 206-218.
- Carraher, S. M., Buchanan, J. K., & Puia, G. (2010). Entrepreneurial need for achievement in China, Latvia, and the USA. *Baltic Journal of Management*, 5 (3), 378-396.
- Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (2011). [Online] Availble: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kg.html>, retrieved 24.11.2011.
- Central Intelligence Agency World Factbook (2011).[Online] Availble: <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/us.html>, retrieved 20.12.2011.
- Country Intelligence: Report Kyrgyzstan 2011. *Kyrgyzstan Country Monitor*, 1-21.
- Corruption Perceptions Index. [Online] Availble: <http://cpi.transparency.org/cpi2011/results/#CountryResults>, retrieved 9.1.2012.
- Corporate Tax Rate. The World Bank. [Online] Availble: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.TAX.TOTL.CP.ZS>, retrieved 20.12.2011.
- Cromie, S.(1987). Motivations of aspiring male and female entrepreneurs. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 8 (3), 251-251.
- Danis, W.M., Shipilov, A.V. (2002). A comparison of entrepreneurship development in two post-communist countries: The cases of Hungary and Ukraine. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 7 (1),67-94.
- Doing Business (2011). [Online] Availble:<http://www.doingbusiness.org>, retrieved at 5.12.2011.
- Ease of Doing Business Index. The World Bank. [Online] Availble: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IC.BUS.EASE.XQ>, retrieved 20.12.2011.
- Estrin, S., Meyer, K., Bychkova, M. (2006). Entrepreneurship in transition economies. In M. Casson, B. Yeung, A. Basu, & N. Wadson, *The Oxford Handbook of*. Oxford University Press.
- Fatoki, O. O. (2010). Graduate entrepreneurial intention in South Africa: Motivations and obstacles. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5 (9), 87-98.
- Forbes Tax Misery & Reform Index (2011). [Online] Availble: <http://www.forbes.com>, retrieved 5.12.2011.
- Friedman, B. A. (2011). The relationship between governance effectiveness and entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(17), 221-225.
- Carsrud, A. & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial motivations: What do we still need to know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49 (1), 9-26.
- Hessels, J., van Gelderen, M.&Thurik, R. (2008). Entrepreneurial aspirations, motivations, and their drivers. *Small Business Economics*, 31(3), 323-339.

- High, J. (2009). Entrepreneurship and economic growth: The theory of emergent institutions. *Quarterly Journal of Austrian Economics*, 12 (3), 3-36.
- Hills, G. E., Hultman, C. M., & Miles, M.P. (2008). The evolution and development of entrepreneurial marketing. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 46(1), 99-112.
- Humbert, A. L., & Drew, E. (2010). Gender, entrepreneurship, and motivational factors in an Irish Context. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 2 (2), 173-196.
- Invest in Georgia 2011. [Online] Available: <http://www.investingeorgia.org>, retrieved 20.01.2012.
- 2011 Index of Economic Freedom. [Online] Available: <http://www.heritage.org/Index/Country/>, retrieved 9.1.2012.
- Kabil, A., 5.1.2012. Girişimcilik ilkokul müfredatına kadar girecek, *Ekonomi, Zaman*. [Online] Available: <http://www.zaman.com.tr/haber.do?haberno=1224426&title=girisimcilik-ilkokul-mufredatina-kadar-girecek>, retrieved 5.1.2012.
- Kauanui, S. K., Thomas, K. D., Rubens, A., & Sherman, C. L. (2010). Entrepreneurship and spirituality: A comparative analysis of entrepreneurs' motivation. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 23 (4), 621-635, 649-650.
- Kbiltseskhilashvili, T. (2009). Investment climate of Georgia after "Rose Revolution": Recent improvements and new challenges, *IBSU Scientific Journal*, 2(2), 47-86.
- Kent, C.A. (1989). The treatment of entrepreneurship in principles of economic textbooks. *Journal of Economic Education* (1986-98), 20 (2), 153-164.
- Kirzner, I. M. (2009). The alert and creative entrepreneur: A clarification. *Small Business Economics*, 32 (2), 145-152.
- Kobia, M., & Sikalieh, D. (2010). Towards a search for the meaning of entrepreneurship. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 34 (2), 110-127.
- Met, O. (2011). Küçük ve orta ölçekli işletmelerin finansal sorunları: Kırgızistan'da bir araştırma. *Sosyoekonomi*, 7 (1), 127-144.
- 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.
- Muhammad Yunus. [Online] Available: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Muhammad_Yunus, retrieved 4.01.2012.
- Naffziger D., Hornsby J., & Kuratko, D. (1994). A proposed research model of entrepreneurial motivation. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*, 18 (3), 29-42.
- Petrakis, P. E., (2005). Growth, entrepreneurship, structural change, time, and risk. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 7(1), 243-250.
- Shane, S., Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
- Shelley, I.L. (2007). *Organized Crime and Corruption in Georgia*, Routledge.
- Singh, S., Simpson, R., & Okafor, C. (2011). Motivation to become an entrepreneur: A study of Nigerian Women's' decisions. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 2(2), 202-219.
- Smart, D. T., & Conant, J. S. (1994). Entrepreneurial orientation, distinctive marketing competencies, and organizational performance. *Journal of Applied Business Research*, 10(3), 28-38.
- Standard and Poors, 2011. [Online] Available: <http://www.standardandpoors.com>, retrieved at 5.12.2011.
- The World Bank (2012). *Fighting Corruption in Public Services: Chronicling Georgia's Reforms*, Washington DC.
- Transparency International (2011). [Online] Available: <http://www.transparency.org>, retrieved 5.12.2011.
- Transparency International (2010), *Global Corruption Barometer 2010*. [Online] Available: http://www.transparency.org/research/gcb/gcb_2010, 5.5.2012.
- Tucker, I. B. (1988). Entrepreneurs and public-sector employees: The role of achievement motivation and risk in occupational choice. *Journal of Economic Education* (1986-1998), 19 (3), 259.
- Yalcin, S., & Kapu, H. (2008). Entrepreneurial dimensions in transitional economies: A review of relevant literature and the case of Kyrgyzstan. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 13 (2), 185-204.
- Yu, T. F. (2001). The role of the entrepreneur in the economic development of Hong Kong. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Economics & Business*, 5(2), 24-43.
- World Governance Indicators. The World Bank. [Online] Available: <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.asp>, retrieved 20.12.2011.