

CHAPTER 5

Conclusions and Implications

5.1 Introduction

The final chapter of this thesis describes limitations that might limit the conducted research. Moreover, conclusions are presented which base on the previous analysis and are compared with the elements of the theoretical framework. In the end, implications and suggestions for future research are given.

5.2 Limitations

Before explaining the conclusions about the diverse factors influencing individuals to think and act in an entrepreneurially way, the limitations of this thesis are presented and outlined in the following section.

The research used online research questionnaire form as data collection method for the sample in the United States. Even though the final sample obtained was relatively high, it was very difficult to get the data because not being present to push the participants prolonged the data collection for months. Also the main points of contacts were university professors and students who already have a large workload on them and adding a 30 statements questionnaire was very difficult.

Another limitation was the fluency in Indonesian Language of the researcher. The translation process of the questionnaire took several meetings and sometimes when collecting the data in Indonesia, students had questions that I was able to answer with some difficulties. Similar to this topic is the cultural difference, many local students wanted to always answer positively even when they had a disagreement on the statement.

Language barrier also leads to biases when translating the questionnaire from English to Indonesian. This could also explained why there are two negative standardized beta values in the

regression analysis for the Indonesian Sample. Some questions might need to be reversed when analyzing the data which can also lead to different beta values including negative ones. As explained previously the analysis of any field that predicts human behavior can have negative beta values because human behaviors are very difficult to predict with exact precision.

Only some driving factors relating to entrepreneurship are analyzed in this thesis. Moreover, the chosen factors were only investigated in two countries: Indonesia and United States of America. In addition, this thesis focused exclusively on students and all other groups of people that might have affinity to entrepreneurship are excluded. Furthermore, this research drew 156 respondents from students in Yogyakarta.

The number of respondents may not cover all students' population in Indonesia not even in the island of Java. This could lead to biases on the results shown on this research because the sample is too small and does not really represents the total population of University students in Indonesia.

5.3 Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to investigate a popular field within entrepreneurship and to provide answers for the formulated research problem. The main focus was to examine the influence of entrepreneurial characteristics on the tendency to be entrepreneur in university students of two very different countries: Indonesia and United States of America. A broad literature review helped to get an insight into the area of driving factors influencing individuals to think and act entrepreneurially.

After the theoretical consideration of available factors that influence individuals to become entrepreneurs, seven of them were chosen to be in the main focus of the further analysis. The seven factors are achievement motivation, need for affiliation, locus of control, risk taking propensity, tolerance for ambiguity, self-efficacy and last but not least fear of failure. These

factors were also part of the defined hypotheses that was tested based on the findings of the empirical part.

Due to the results on the reliability and validity test two of the independent variables; self-efficacy and risk taking propensity could no longer be taken into consideration for further analysis. The variables mentioned above did not have significant results on the reliability test and because of that; the researcher did not perform any other analysis.

The results of the analysis section illustrates that it is not possible to prove four of the five valid hypotheses on the students in United States but this hypotheses are supported in the Indonesian sample. To decide if a hypothesis is accepted or rejected the researcher needs to consider the country of origin of the students in the sample. One outcome of the analysis is that ‘fear of failure’ is the factor which is the most influential one in comparison to the others because this hypothesis was accepted twice and also significant in these both cases. Compared to the reviewed literature, the statement about fear of failure is proved regarding its impact (Koellinger et al., 2005; Arenius, Minniti, 2005).

In conclusion, the tested hypotheses need to be considered on basis of country levels. Hence, the results of the study show that some of the investigated factors have an impact and others do not. Here from, it can be deviated that the varying degrees of impact levels in connection with the driving factors are explained by country-specific differences.

5.4 Implications and Future Research

Based on the conclusions to identify which other factors particularly influence individuals to become entrepreneurs, a single and deeper single country research is necessary. To improve the understanding of these factors in different countries, we should consider other aspects like politics, institutions, technological development and culture that can be merged as

the macroeconomic framework of a country and by which individuals are surrounded and affected (Thurik et al., 2002).

In contrast to the outlined implications, there are several options to extend and widen the scope of the conducted research in this thesis that will be presented on this chapter. The first aspect which could be improved in future research is the limitation of the sample and use a broader scope that includes not only students but any other person that might be inclined to start a venture alone. Also, by using bigger data sets and also by ensuring that there is a balanced ratio between the numbers of data of the investigated countries, the explanatory power can be enhanced. Second, future research should include more questions per factor to understand its influence. Furthermore, the number of regarded factors should be increased for future studies to achieve a broader overview.

Moreover, creating a comparison between the economic conditions of countries and analyzing how these conditions affect the tendency to be entrepreneur would ensure a better and more advanced comparability in future research. Besides, it would be interesting to match the data of more than one country to do an overall investigation instead of considering them separately. Finally, future studies could make use of up-to-date data sets or conduct their own primary research by developing a questionnaire and collecting the data.

Last but not least, future research should be able to include all personal characteristics including self-efficacy and risk taking propensity which are essential factors when it comes to start an entrepreneurial adventure. Unfortunately the factors mentioned above could not be analyzed on this research because of the results on the reliability test.

References

- Alba-Ramirez, A. (1994): Self-employment in the midst of unemployment: the case of Spain and the United States. In: *Applied Economics*, Vol. 26, No. 3, 189-204.
- Amit, R.; Glosten, L.; Muller, E. (1993): Challenges to theory development in entrepreneurship research. In: *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 5, 815-834.
- Amit, R., Muller, E. (1995): Push and pull entrepreneurship – two types based on motivation, In: *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 12 No. 4, 64-80.
- Amit, R.; Muller, E.; Cockburn, I. (1995): Opportunity costs and entrepreneurial activity. In: *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 95-106.
- Arabsheibani, G.; de Meza, D.; Maloney, J.; Pearson, B. (2000): And a vision appeared unto them of a great profit: evidence of self-deception among the self-employed. In: *Economics Letters*, Vol. 67, No. 1, 35-41.
- Arenius, P.; Minniti, M. (2005): Perceptual Variables and Nascent Entrepreneurship. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24, 233-247.
- Audretsch, D. B. (2007): *The Entrepreneurial Society*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Babb, E. M., & Babb, S. V. (1992): Psychological traits of rural entrepreneurs. In: *Journal of Socio-Economics*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 353–362.
- Babbie, E. (1990): *Survey research methods*. 2nd edition, Wadsworth, Belmont, CA.
- Bandura, A. (1997): *Self-efficacy: the exercise of self-control*. Worth Publishers, Freeman, New York, NY
- Begley, T. M. (1995): Using founder status, age of firm, and company growth rate as the basis for distinguishing entrepreneurs from managers of smaller businesses. In: *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 10, 249–263.

- Begley, T. M.; Boyd, D. P. (1987): A comparison of entrepreneurs and managers of small business firms. In: *Journal of Management*, Vol. 13, 99–108.
- Bernhardt, I. (1994): Comparative advantage in self-employment and paid work. In: *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 27, 273-289.
- Bird, B. (1988): Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: The case for intention. In: *The Academy of Management Review*, 07/1988, Vol. 13, No. 3, 442-453.
- Borjas, G. J. (1986): The self-employment experience of immigrants. In: *The Journal of Human Resources*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 485-506.
- Borjas, G. J.; Bronars, S. (1989): Consumer discrimination and self-employment. In: *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 97, No. 3, 581-605.
- Bowen, D. D.; Hisrich, R. D. (1986): The female entrepreneur: A career development perspective In: *Academy of management review*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 393-407.
- Budner, S. (1982). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. In: *Journal of Personality*, Vol. 30, 29–50.
- Burns, R. B.; Burns, R. A. (2008): *Business Research Methods and Statistics Using SPSS*. SAGE, Los Angeles.
- Busenitz, L. W. (1999): Entrepreneurial Risk and Strategic Decision Making It's a Matter of Perspective. In: *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 35, No. 3, 325-340. 69
- Casson, M. (2010): *Entrepreneurship: theory, institutions and history*. Eli F. Heckscher Lecture, 2009. In: *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, Vol. 58, No. 2, 139-170.
- Chandler Jr., A. J. (1990): *Scale and Scope: The Dynamics of Industrial Capitalism*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

- Chen, C. C.; Greene, P. G.; Crick, A. (1998): Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers?. In: *Journal of Business venturing*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 295-316.
- Chell, E. (2013): Review of skill and the entrepreneurial process. In: *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 6-31.
- Cohen, M. D.; Bacdayan, P. (1994) Organizational routines are stored as procedural memory: evidence from a laboratory study. In: *Organization Science*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 554– 568.
- Comadena, M. E. (1984): Brainstorming groups: Ambiguity tolerance, communication apprehension, task attraction, and individual productivity. In: *Small Group Behavior*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 251-264.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009): *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Method Approaches*. 3rd edition, Sage Publications, London.
- Creswell, J. W.; Plano Clark, V. L. (2011): *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 2nd edition, SAGE, Los Angeles.
- Cromie, S. (2000): Assessing entrepreneurial inclinations: some approaches and empirical evidence. In: *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 7-30.
- Cuervo, A. (2005): Individual and environmental determinants of entrepreneurship. In: *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 1, 293–311.
- Curli, B. (2002): Women Entrepreneurs and Italian Industrialization: Conjectures and Avenues for Research. In: *Enterprise & Society*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 634-656.
- Dana, L. P. (2001): The education and training of entrepreneurs in Asia. In: *Education + Training*, Vol. 43, No. 8, 405-416.
- Deakins, D. (1999): *Entrepreneurship and Small Firms*, McGraw-Hill, London.

- DeCarlo, J. F., Lyons, P. R. (1979): A Comparison of Selected Personal Characteristics of Minority and Non-Minority Female Entrepreneurs. In: Academy of Management Proceedings, Vol. 1979, No. 1, 369-373.
- Denscombe, M. (2010): The Good Research Guide: For small-scale social research projects. 4th edition, Open University Press, Berkshire.
- Dillman, D. A. (2007): Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Design Method. 2nd edition, Wiley, Hoboken.
- Dollinger, M. (1983): Use of Budner's intolerance of ambiguity measure for entrepreneurial research. In: Psychology Reports, Vol. 53, 1019-1021.
- Drucker, P. (1993): Innovation and Entrepreneurship – Practice and Principles. Harper Business, New York.
- Evans, D. S.; Leighton, L. S. (1990): Some empirical aspects of entrepreneurship. In: The Economics of Small Firms, Vol. 79, No.3, 519-535.
- Fernandez, M.; Kim, K. C. (1998): Self-employment rates of Asian immigrant groups: An analysis of intragroup and intergroup differences. In: International Migration Review, 654 681.
- Field, A. (2013): Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics. 4th edition, SAGE, Los Angeles.
- Foster, L.; Haltiwanger, J.; Syverson, C. (2005): Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability? (NBER Working Paper Series #11555). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Gilad, B. (1982): On Encouraging Entrepreneurship: An Interdisciplinary Analysis. In: Journal of Behavioral Economics, Vol. 11, 132-163.

- Gilad, B.; Levine, P. (1986): A behavioral model of entrepreneurial supply. In: *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, 45-54.
- Glenn, J. C. (2010): *Handbook of Research Methods*. Global Media, Jaipur.
- Godley, A. (2001): *Jewish Immigrant Entrepreneurship in New York and London, 1880-1914*. Palgrave, Basingstoke.
- Hofstede, G. & McCrae, R. R. (2004). Culture and personality revisited: Linking traits and dimensions of culture. *Cross-Cultural Research*.
- Holtz-Eakin, D.; Joulfaian, D.; Rosen, H. S. (1994): Entrepreneurial decisions and liquidity constraints. In: *National Bureau of Economic Research*, Vol. 102, No. 1, 53-75.
- Honig, B.; Davidsson, P. (2003): The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs. In: *Journal of business venturing*, Vol. 18, No. 3, 301-331.
- Hornaday, J. A.; Aboud, J. (1973): Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs. In: *Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 24, 141–153.
- Johanisson, B. (2000): Networking and entrepreneurial growth. In: Sexton, D. L.; Lawrence, H. (eds) *The Blackwell Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Johnson, B. (1990): Toward a multidimensional model of entrepreneurship: the case of achievement motivation and the entrepreneur. In: *Entrepreneurship Theory and practice*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 39–54..
- Kirzner, I. (1997): Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: an Austrian approach. In: *The Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 35, 60–85.
- Klepper, S. (2002) The capabilities of new firms and the evolution of the U.S. automobile industry. In: *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 11, No. 6, 645-666.
- Koellinger, P.; Minniti, M.; Schade, C. (2005): "I think I can, I think I can": Overconfidence and Entrepreneurial Behavior, In: *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 28, No. 4, 502-527.

- Koh, H. C. (1996): Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics: a study of Hong Kong MBA students. In: *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 11, No. 3, 12-25.
- Koke, T.; Lace, N.; Oganisjana, K. (2011): Understanding entrepreneurship development in Latvia: a cross-disciplinary approach. In: *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Small Business*, Vol. 13, No. 3, 293-312.
- Krueger, N. F. (2009): Entrepreneurial intentions are dead: Long live entrepreneurial intentions. In: Carsrud, A. L.; Brannback, M. (Eds.): *Understanding the entrepreneurial mind*. 51–72, Springer, New York.
- Krueger, N. F.; Reilly, M. D.; Carsrud, A. L. (2000): Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. In: *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 15, No. 5, 411–432.
- Kuratko, D. F. (2005): The emergence of entrepreneurship education: development, trends and challenges. In: *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 29, No. 5, 577- 598.
- Langowitz, N.; Minniti, M. (2007): The entrepreneurial propensity of women. In: *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, Vol. 31, No. 3, 341-364.
- Levie, J. (2007): Immigration, In-Migration, Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship in the United Kingdom. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 143-169.
- Liñán, F.; Chen, Y.-W. (2009): Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions. In: *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 33, No. 3, 593-617.
- Littunen, H. (2000): Entrepreneurship and the Characteristics of the Entrepreneurial Personality. In: *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, Vol. 6, No. 6, 295.
- Litzinger, W. (1961): The motel entrepreneur and the motel manager. In: *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 8, 268–281.
- Long, J. E. (1982): The income tax and self-employment. In: *National tax journal*, 31- 42.

- Louart, P. (1997): Motivation. In: Simon, Y.; Joffre, P. (eds): Encyclopédie de gestion. 2nd edition, Economica, Paris.
- Malach-Pines, A.; Levy, H.; Utasi, A.; Hill, T. L. (2005): Entrepreneurs as cultural heroes. A cross-cultural, interdisciplinary perspective. In: Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 20, No. 6, 541-555.
- Marshall, A. (1920): Principles of Economics: an introductory volume. 8th Edition, London, UK: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.
- Martella, R. C.; Nelson, R.; Marchand-Martella, N. E. (1999): Research Methods. Learning to become a critical research consumer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961): The achieving society. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ.
- McClelland, D. C. (1965): Achievement and entrepreneurship: A longitudinal study. In: Journal of personality and Social Psychology, Vol. 1, 389-392.
- McClelland, D. C. (1978): Managing motivation to expand human freedom. In: American Psychologist, Vol. 33, 201-210.
- McMullan, W. E.; Long, W. A. (1987): Entrepreneurship education in the nineties. In: Journal of Business Venturing, Vol. 2, No. 3, 261-275.
- Mesch, G. S.; Czamanski, D. (1997): Occupational closure and immigrant entrepreneurship: Russian Jews in Israel. In: Journal of Socio-economics, Vol. 26, No. 6, 597-610.
- Miller, D.; Drodge, C. (1986): Psychological and traditional determinants of structure. In: Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 31, 539-560.
- Miner, J.B. (1996): The 4 routes to entrepreneurial success. Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Miner, J.B. (1997): A psychological typology and its relationship to entrepreneurial success. In: Entrepreneurship and Regional Development, Vol. 9, No. 4, 319-334.

- Miner, J.B. (2000): Testing a Psychological Typology of Entrepreneurship Using Business Founders. In: *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 36, No. 1, 43 - 69
- Mitton, D. G. (1989): The Complete Entrepreneur. In: *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 13, 9-19.
- Mueller, S. L.; Thomas, A. S. (2001): Culture and entrepreneurial potential: a nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. In: *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 16, No. 1, 51-75.
- Okhomina, D. A. (2010): Entrepreneurial postures and psychological traits: the sociological influences of education and environment. In: *Research in Higher Education Journal*, Vol. 8.
- Palich, L. E.; Bagby, D. R. (1995): Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risktaking: challenging conventional wisdom. In: *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 10, 425-438.
- Rees, H.; Shah, A. (1986): An empirical analysis of self-employment in the UK. In: *Journal of applied econometrics*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 95-108.
- Rea, L. M.; Parker, R. A. (2012): *Designing and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Reynolds P. D. (1997): Who Starts New Firms? – Preliminary Explorations of Firms-in-Gestation. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 9, 449-462.
- Ripsas, S. (1998): Towards an Interdisciplinary Theory of Entrepreneurship. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 10, No. 2, 103–115.
- Robinson, P. B.; Stimpson, D. V.; Huefner, J. C.; Hunt, H. K. (1991): An Attitude Approach to the Prediction of Entrepreneurship. In: *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 15, No. 4, 13-31.

- Robson, C. (2002): *Real World Research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. 2nd edition, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966): Generalised Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement. In: *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, Vol. 80, No. 1, 1–28.
- Rowe, A. J.; Mason, R. O. (1987): *Managing with style: A guide to understanding, assessing and improving decision making*. Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Saunders, M.; Lewis, P.; Thornhill, A. (2009): *Research methods for business students*. 5th edition, Pearson Education, London.
- Schere, J. (1982): Tolerance of ambiguity as a discriminating variable between entrepreneurs and managers. In: *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings*, Vol. 42, 404–408.
- Schiller, B. R.; Crewson, P. E. (1997): Entrepreneurial origins: a longitudinal inquiry. In: *Economic inquiry*, Vol. 35, No. 3, 523-531.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1934): *The Theory of Economic Development. An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle*. New Brunswick. NJ, London: Transaction Publishers.
- Segal, G.; Borgia, D.; Schoenfeld, J. (2005): The motivation to become an entrepreneur, In: *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, Vol. 11 No. 1, 42-57.
- Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual-opportunity nexus*. Edward Elgar Publishing, Northhampton, MA.
- Shane, S.; Venkataraman, S. (2000): The Promise of Entrepreneurship as a Field of Research. In: *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 217-226.
- Shane, S.; Locke, E. A.; Collins, C. J. (2003): Entrepreneurial motivation. In: *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 257-279.

- Sekaran Uma and Bougie Roger. (2013). *Research Methods for Business*. United Kingdom: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Silverman, D. (1993): *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text, and interaction*. Sage, London.
- Tegano, D. W. (1990): Relationship of tolerance for ambiguity and playfulness to creativity. In: *Psychological Reports*, Vol. 66, No. 3, 1047-1056.
- Thurik, A. R.; Uhlaner, L. M.; Wennekers, S. (2002): Entrepreneurship and Its Conditions: A Macro Perspective. In: *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, Vol. 1, No. 1, 25–64.
- Wagner, J. (2004): What a Difference a Y Makes: Female and Male Nascent Entrepreneurs in Germany. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 28, No. 1, 1-21.
- Ward, E. A. (1993): Motivation of expansion plans of entrepreneurs and small business managers. In: *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 31, 32-32.
- Westerlund, H.; Bolton, R. (2003): Local social capital and entrepreneurship. In: *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 77-113.

Appendix

English Version Questionnaire

This questionnaire includes 30 statements, and will take about 7 minutes to complete. There is no right or wrong answer. Your honest opinion is what counts. For each statement, write the number inside the box that best describes your opinion. Use the following scale on each statement.

1: Totally disagree	2: Somewhat disagree	4: Somewhat agree	5: Totally agree
----------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

1. I like to give myself challenges when I take on a new project
2. Where others see problems, I see possibilities
3. I want to build something that will be recognized publicly
4. I shoot for excellence in everything I do
5. I always give the best of myself in everything I do
6. I always worry about what others will think before doing something important
7. I have no problem working with others
8. I spend a lot of time socializing with others
9. I can influence my own destiny
10. According to me, we somehow make our own luck
11. Success is mostly luck
12. I am not afraid to take on initiatives

13. I always try to take calculated risks
14. There is a time for thought but action is more important
15. I strive to overcome unstable and unpredictable situations in order to do well
16. I have a hard time functioning in uncertain or ambiguous situations
17. I am fairly at ease in difficult situations
18. I manage my stress well in ambiguous and uncertain situations
19. I am capable of imagining how we can make things work
20. When faced with difficulties, I look for alternative solutions
21. When I take on a project I have confidence that I will carry it out successfully
22. I try to be the first or the best in my area of competency
23. I am a lot less effective in stressful situations
24. In general, I distrust my instincts
25. I often feel stuck by a difficult situation
26. After a failure, I am able to pick myself up and start over
27. Starting a business means taking on roles you may not want.
28. I have a strong desire to be my own boss
29. After I finished my studies, I want to developed my own business

30. First, I want to work in the private sector for 1 or two years and then open my own business

Indonesian Version Questionnaire

Kuesioner ini meliputi 30 laporan, dan akan memakan waktu sekitar 7 menit untuk menyelesaikannya. Tidak ada jawaban yang benar atau salah. Pendapat jujur Anda adalah yang terpenting. Untuk setiap pernyataan, pilih kotak yang paling menggambarkan pendapat Anda.

1: Sangat Tidak Setuju	2: Tidak Setuju	4: Setuju	5: Sangat Setuju
-------------------------------	------------------------	------------------	-------------------------

1. Saya ingin memberikan diriku tantangan ketika saya mengambil sebuah proyek baru
2. Dimana orang lain melihat masalah, saya melihat kemungkinan
3. Saya ingin melakukan sesuatu yang akan diakui publik
4. Saya mengajukan keunggulan dalam semua yang saya lakukan
5. Saya selalu memberikan yang terbaik dari diri saya dalam semua yang saya lakukan
6. Saya selalu khawatir tentang apa yang orang lain pikirkan sebelum melakukan sesuatu yang penting
7. Saya tidak punya masalah bekerja dengan orang lain
8. Saya menghabiskan banyak waktu bersosialisasi dengan orang lain
9. Saya bisa mempengaruhi nasib saya sendiri
10. Menurut saya, kita bisa membuat keberuntungan kita sendiri
11. Sukses adalah sebagian besar dari keberuntungan

12. Saya tidak takut untuk mengambil inisiatif
13. Saya selalu mencoba untuk menghitung risiko
14. Ada waktu untuk berpikir tetapi tindakan lebih penting
15. Saya berusaha untuk mengatasi situasi yang tidak stabil dan tak terduga untuk melakukannya dengan baik
16. Saya memiliki waktu yang sulit dalam situasi yang tidak pasti atau ambigu
17. Saya cukup nyaman dalam situasi yang sulit
18. Saya mengelola stres saya dengan baik dalam situasi ambigu dan tidak pasti
19. Saya mampu membayangkan bagaimana kita bisa membuat berbagai hal
20. Saat menghadapi kesulitan, saya mencari solusi alternatif
21. Saat saya mengambil sebuah proyek saya memiliki keyakinan bahwa saya akan melaksanakannya dengan sukses
22. Saya mencoba untuk menjadi yang pertama atau yang terbaik dalam kompetensi saya
23. Saya banyak kurang efektif dalam situasi stres
24. Secara umum, saya tidak percaya naluri saya
25. Saya sering merasa terjebak oleh situasi yang sulit
26. Setelah kegagalan, saya bisa membangun diri dan mulai lagi
27. Memulai bisnis berarti mengambil peran yang mungkin tidak anda inginkan

28. Saya memiliki keinginan yang kuat untuk menjadi bos pada diri sendiri
29. Setelah selesai studi saya, saya Ingin mengembangkan bisnis saya sendiri
30. Pertama, saya ingin bekerja di sektor swasta selama satu atau dua tahun dan kemudian membuka bisnis sendiri.

Table of Critical Value for Pearson's r

R Table: Table Distribution.

N	Level of sig		N	Level of sig		N	Value	
	5%	1%		5%	1%		5%	1%
3	0.997	0.999	27	0.381	0.487	55	0.266	0.345
4	0.950	0.990	28	0.374	0.478	60	0.254	0.330
5	0.878	0.959	29	0.367	0.470	65	0.244	0.317
6	0.811	0.917	30	0.361	0.463	70	0.235	0.306
7	0.754	0.874	31	0.355	0.456	75	0.227	0.296
8	0.707	0.834	32	0.349	0.449	80	0.220	0.286
9	0.666	0.798	33	0.344	0.442	85	0.213	0.278
10	0.632	0.765	34	0.339	0.436	90	0.207	0.270
11	0.602	0.735	35	0.334	0.430	95	0.202	0.263
12	0.576	0.708	36	0.329	0.424	100	0.195	0.256
13	0.553	0.684	37	0.325	0.418	125	0.176	0.230
14	0.532	0.661	38	0.320	0.413	150	0.159	0.210
15	0.514	0.641	39	0.316	0.408	175	0.148	0.194
16	0.497	0.623	40	0.312	0.403	200	0.138	0.181
17	0.482	0.606	41	0.308	0.398	300	0.113	0.148
18	0.468	0.590	42	0.304	0.393	400	0.098	0.128
19	0.456	0.575	43	0.301	0.389	500	0.088	0.115
20	0.444	0.561	44	0.297	0.384	600	0.080	0.105
21	0.433	0.549	45	0.294	0.380	700	0.074	0.097
22	0.423	0.537	46	0.291	0.376	800	0.070	0.091
23	0.413	0.526	47	0.288	0.372	900	0.065	0.086
24	0.404	0.515	48	0.284	0.368	1000	0.062	0.081
25	0.396	0.505	49	0.281	0.364			
26	0.388	0.496	50	0.279	0.361			

Source:

http://www.radford.edu/~jaspelme/statsbook/Chapter%20files/Table_of_Critical_Values_for_r.pdf

Data Analysis

Reliability: Achievement Motivation

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.831	.834	2

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Achievment Motivation Q4	4.1133	.98168	300
Achievment Motivation Q5	4.4933	.86745	300

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.303	4.113	4.493	.380	1.092	.072	2

Item-Total Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Achievment Motivation Q4	.
Achievment Motivation Q5	.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
8.6067	2.935	1.71321	2

Reliability: Need for Affiliation

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.789	.786	3

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.676	2.147	2.987	.840	1.391	.212	3

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Need for Affiliation Q6	5.0400	5.383	.685	.526	.650
Q7_r	5.8800	7.598	.502	.257	.836
Need for Affiliation Q8	5.1333	5.420	.724	.552	.604

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
8.0267	12.481	3.53283	3

Reliability: Locus of Control

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.661	.665	2

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.247	4.213	4.280	.067	1.016	.002	2

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Locus of Control Q9	4.2800	.925	.499	.249	.
Locus of Control Q10	4.2133	.690	.499	.249	.

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
8.4933	2.411	1.55284	2

Reliability: Risk Taking propensity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.492	.505	3

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.198	1.683	3.010	1.327	1.788	.507	3

Item-Total Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Risk Taking Propensity Q12	.261
Q13_r	.524
Q14_r	.277

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
6.5933	4.831	2.19789	3

Reliability: Tolerance for ambiguity

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.643	.473	4

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.004	2.280	4.290	2.010	1.882	.782	4

Item-Total Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q15	.853
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q16	.342
Q17_r	.256
Q18_r	.446

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
12.0167	10.940	3.30749	4

Reliability: Self-Efficacy

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.221	.237	4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Self-efficacy Q19	4.1000	.83205	300
Self-efficacy Q20	4.5367	.49949	300
Self-efficacy Q21	4.5333	.49972	300
Self-efficacy Q22	4.4267	.75267	300

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.399	4.100	4.537	.437	1.107	.042	4

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
17.5967	2.108	1.45179	4

Reliability: Fear to Failure

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.631	.629	3

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.376	1.863	2.893	1.030	1.553	.265	3

Item-Total Statistics

	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Fear to failure Q23	4.2333	2.822	.550	.308	.371
Fear to failure Q24	5.2633	5.486	.335	.119	.668
Fear to failure Q25	4.7567	3.837	.491	.265	.459

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
7.1267	7.690	2.77301	3

Reliability: Tendency to be entrepreneur

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	300	92.3
	Excluded ^a	25	7.7
	Total	325	100.0

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.688	.514	4

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.293	2.997	4.073	1.077	1.359	.273	4

Item-Total Statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Tendency to be entrepreneur Q27	.943
Tendency to be entrepreneur Q28	.364
Tendency to be entrepreneur Q29	.272
Tendency to be entrepreneur Q30	.374

Scale Statistics

Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
13.1700	18.550	4.30692	4

Descriptive: Full Sample

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement	300	1.00	5.00	4.3033	.85660
Affiliation	300	1.00	5.00	2.6756	1.17761
Control	300	1.50	5.00	4.2467	.77642
Tolerance	300	1.75	4.50	3.0042	.82687
Fear	300	1.00	4.67	2.3756	.92434
Tendency	300	1.75	5.00	3.2925	1.07673
Valid N (listwise)	300				

Descriptive: Sample in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement	156	2.00	5.00	4.4135	.46892
Affiliation	156	2.33	5.00	3.6667	.70329
Control	156	1.50	5.00	3.9840	.93915
Tolerance	156	2.50	4.50	3.7131	.45331
Fear	156	1.67	4.67	3.0321	.74850
Tendency	156	3.50	5.00	4.2692	.41498
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Sample in United States

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievement	144	1.00	5.00	4.1840	1.12621
Affiliation	144	1.00	2.67	1.6019	.36189
Control	144	3.00	5.00	4.5312	.38421
Tolerance	144	1.75	2.75	2.2361	.25395
Fear	144	1.00	3.00	1.6644	.44686
Tendency	144	1.75	2.75	2.2344	.26315
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Descriptive Achievement Motivation in USA

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievment Motivation Q4	144	1.00	5.00	4.0903	1.32704
Achievment Motivation Q5	144	1.00	5.00	4.2778	1.06071
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Descriptive: Achievement Motivation in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Achievment Motivation Q4	156	2.00	5.00	4.1346	.48309
Achievment Motivation Q5	156	2.00	5.00	4.6923	.57491
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Need for Affiliation in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Need for Affiliation Q6	156	1.00	5.00	4.1282	1.03934
Q7_r	156	1.00	5.00	2.7500	1.37548
Need for Affiliation Q8	156	1.00	5.00	4.1218	.85265
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Need for Affiliation in USA

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Need for Affiliation Q6	144	1.00	4.00	1.7500	.80644
Q7_r	144	1.00	2.00	1.4931	.50170
Need for Affiliation Q8	144	1.00	2.00	1.5625	.49781
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Descriptive: Locus of Control in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Locus of Control Q9	156	2.00	5.00	3.9038	.94888
Locus of Control Q10	156	1.00	5.00	4.0641	1.18963
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Locus of Control in USA

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Locus of Control Q9	144	4.00	5.00	4.5486	.49937
Locus of Control Q10	144	2.00	5.00	4.5139	.54177
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Descriptive: Tolerance for ambiguity in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q15	156	2.00	5.00	4.1090	.77521
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q16	156	2.00	5.00	3.7051	.88148
Q17_r	156	1.00	5.00	4.0064	.83856
Q18_r	156	1.00	5.00	3.0321	1.12117
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Tolerance for ambiguity in USA

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q15	144	4.00	5.00	4.4861	.50155
Tolerance for Ambiguity Q16	144	1.00	2.00	1.5069	.50170
Q17_r	144	1.00	2.00	1.4861	.50155
Q18_r	144	1.00	2.00	1.4653	.50053
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Descriptive: Fear to Failure in Indonesia

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fear to failure Q23	156	1.00	5.00	3.7500	1.16190
Fear to failure Q24	156	1.00	5.00	2.1603	1.06254
Fear to failure Q25	156	2.00	5.00	3.1859	1.12338
Valid N (listwise)	156				

Descriptive: Fear to Failure in USA

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Fear to failure Q23	144	1.00	5.00	1.9653	1.17320
Fear to failure Q24	144	1.00	2.00	1.5417	.50000
Fear to failure Q25	144	1.00	2.00	1.4861	.50155
Valid N (listwise)	144				

Regression Analysis Indonesian Sample

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.562 ^a	.316	.293	.34895

a. Predictors: (Constant), Fear, Affiliation, Control, Tolerance, Achievement

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.756	.348		10.800	.000
	Achievement	.110	.065	.124	1.698	.092**
	Affiliation	.256	.042	.434	6.108	.000*
	Control	-.077	.031	-.174	-2.450	.015*
	Tolerance	-.297	.065	-.325	-4.605	.000*
	Fear	.165	.039	.297	4.253	.000*

*Sig 0.005 **Sig 0.1

a. dependent variable: Tendency

Regression Analysis USA sample

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.291 ^a	.085	.051	.25629

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.882	.352		8.187	.000
	Achievement	-.020	.019	-.087	-1.055	.293
	Affiliation	.017	.060	.024	.284	.776
	Control	-.098	.056	-.143	-1.741	.084**
	Tolerance	-.138	.085	-.134	-1.621	.107
	Fear	.098	.048	.166	2.031	.044*

*Sig 0.005 **Sig 0.1 a. Dependent Variable: Tendency

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Achievement	Between Groups	3.942	1	3.942	5.452	.020
	Within Groups	215.455	298	.723		
	Total	219.397	299			
Affiliation	Between Groups	319.248	1	319.248	997.283	.000
	Within Groups	95.395	298	.320		
	Total	414.643	299			
Control	Between Groups	22.427	1	22.427	42.348	.000
	Within Groups	157.819	298	.530		
	Total	180.247	299			
Tolerance	Between Groups	163.360	1	163.360	1185.241	.000
	Within Groups	41.073	298	.138		
	Total	204.432	299			
Fear	Between Groups	140.071	1	140.071	361.725	.000
	Within Groups	115.395	298	.387		
	Total	255.465	299			
Tendency	Between Groups	310.051	1	310.051	2524.828	.000
	Within Groups	36.595	298	.123		