

659:Degree Project in Economics
Bachelor's Thesis
Department of Economics
Stockholm School of Economics
Spring 2013

Entrepreneurial intentions

A comparative study of Swedish and Namibian Business students

Johan Sjöstrand (22345)

Maral Shadloo (21931)

JEL: C01, L26, O10

Keywords: Entrepreneurial intentions, Economic Development, Students, Namibia, Sweden

Abstract

In this paper we aim to shed light on the differences in how entrepreneurship is generated in Sweden and Namibia. Our target group is business students and we seek to identify differences in the determinants and level of entrepreneurial intentionality in the two countries. In order to research the relationship between intentions and actions we also measure the rate of nascent entrepreneurship and established entrepreneurs. We found that the entrepreneurial intentions are higher in Namibia than in Sweden. Some variables were found to have an effect in both countries while others only affected either Sweden or Namibia.

Among Namibian business students we also found a higher rate of nascent entrepreneurs than established entrepreneurs. In Sweden however, no such difference was found.

Date: May 15, 2013

Tutor: Mikael Samuelsson & Örjan Sjöberg

Examinator: Maria Perotta

Opponents: Mattias Almqvist & Alice Nyman

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our supervisor Örjan Sjöberg for his feedback and for letting us write this essay in Namibia. We would also like to thank Global Business Labs for their support and Mikael Samuelsson for his assistance, advice and practical help with our thesis. Lastly we would like to thank Daniel Fürth for his advice and help with the statistical analysis of our data.

Contents

1 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Our study	6
1.2 Purpose	9
1.3 Research question.....	9
2 Theoretical background.....	10
2.1 History of Entrepreneurship theory.....	10
2.2 Previous research	12
3 Hypotheses	17
4 Method	18
4.1 Research method	18
4.2 Statistical method	18
4.3 Population of interest	19
4.4 Data collection	19
4.5 Pilot survey.....	19
4.6 Questionnaire Design.....	19
4.7 Data reliability	23
5 Data.....	23
5.1 Introduction to data	23
5.2 Econometric data analysis	25
5.3 Response rate	25
6 Results.....	26
6.1 Summary of statistics	26
6.2 Entrepreneurial intentions	27
6.3 Established entrepreneurs and the differences between entrepreneurship stages.....	29
6.4 Answering our hypotheses.....	30
7 Discussion.....	31
8 Conclusion.....	35
9 Further research	35
Bibliography	37
10 Appendix.....	40
10.1 Tables.....	40
10.2 Questionnaire	44

1 Introduction

For many years, entrepreneurship and the nature of the entrepreneur was an ignored subject in mainstream economics. Economics described economic growth but did not care about the human action behind it. Economist Baumol described this paradox with a famous quote “The theoretical firm is entrepreneurless – the Prince of Denmark has been expunged from the discussion of Hamlet”. He argued that the accumulation of factors of production per se cannot explain economic growth. They are necessary inputs in production but it takes human creativity and productive entrepreneurship to turn these inputs into economic development (Eliason & Henrekson, 2004). He thought that the entrepreneur had been ignored in economic theory not because he or she is not important but because it simply didn’t fit into the model (Baumol, 1968). Since then, the interest for entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs has increased and during the last decades, entrepreneurship has been a well-studied subject.

Today many economists believe that entrepreneurs play a huge role in economic development (Wennekers & Thurik, 1999; Acs & Szerb, 2010). The role of the entrepreneur is to recognize an opportunity to use resources that yield low return and shift them into a function that yields a higher return from which they can personally gain (Casson 1982). In doing this, they constantly reallocate resources in a way that improves efficiency. When offering a new or better product to the market they also force competitors to constantly improve their offer and use the resources in the most efficient manner (Acs & Storey, 2004). Several studies have also shown that this effect exists in reality by looking at the impact of new firm creation on economic development (Acs & Storey, 2004; Stel, et al., 2004). Holcombe sees entrepreneurship as the very engine of economic growth. He means that growth policies should focus more on entrepreneurs and less on factors of production in order to generate economic development (Holcombe, 1998).

During the last decades, the understanding of how entrepreneurship generates growth has also increased the interest for what generates entrepreneurship. Policy makers in both developed and developing countries are interested in understanding how entrepreneurship is created in order to create laws and regulations that lead to an entrepreneurial environment that boosts the economy (Turker & Selcuk, 2009).

As a result, several international research projects have started to measure entrepreneurship globally to be able to understand what drives entrepreneurship (Acs & Szerb, 2010). Among them are the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and the GEDI index.

One way of understanding how entrepreneurship is generated is by trying to understand what makes people start a business. Schumpeter was the first one to bring psychology into economics by defining a number of psychological traits that

characterized the entrepreneur and since then scholars have suggested a number of non-economic factors that influence a person's propensity to become an entrepreneur (Praag, 1999; Davidsson, 2006). Studies are not only made to see what characterizes established entrepreneurs but also on people who are in the process of starting a business (Nascent entrepreneurship) and on individuals who are planning to do so (Entrepreneurial Intentions).

The findings vary slightly between different studies although there are also many similarities. When it comes to psychological factors, a person's "need for freedom and independence" when choosing career path, has been shown to be one of the most important factors when people choose to start their own business (Davidsson, 1995). When it comes to other non-economic factors, the educational level was shown to have a big positive influence on a person's entrepreneurial activity and the same goes for the number of self-employed people that can be found among a person's friends and relatives (Davidsson, 2006).

Today the highest entrepreneurial activity is found in Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America. Sub-Saharan Africa also has the world's highest entrepreneurial intentions and they have the most positive view when it comes to perceived business opportunities (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012).

For obvious reasons, this also makes Sub-Saharan Africa an interesting area to study when it comes to entrepreneurship. Traditionally, most studies made on what makes people start a business have been made on western entrepreneurs (Moriano, et al., 2011; Drennan & Saleh, 2008). Since Africa is now the entrepreneurial hotspot of the world we believe it is interesting to see whether there are differences in how entrepreneurship is created in developed and developing countries. If different factors make people start companies then policies that work in a western society might not work in Africa and the opposite way around.

Some comparative studies of entrepreneurial intentionality among students across nations have been made and the main finding is that the entrepreneurial intentions differ greatly between countries. A study made on 14 developed countries found a wide spread in the percentage of graduate students who consider entrepreneurship as a career option with Australia (18%) scoring almost twice as high as Finland (9.7 %) (Fueglistaller, et al., 2006).

Studies comparing developed and developing countries often find the intentionality to be higher in developing countries (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012) and this has also been found to be true for graduate students (Haase & Lautenschläger 2011; Indarti, 2004; Ren, 2010). There is a lack of comparative studies covering African countries and it is hard to get a consistent picture of the level and causes of entrepreneurial intentionality in Africa (Haase & Lautenschläger 2011). Studies conducted in Botswana (Mgaya, 2007) suggests that the main motivations for students to start a business is to reach status, independence and a higher income and a South African study adds increased creativity as a motivation for African students to start a business (Fatoki, 2010). To our knowledge, so far only one comparative study on graduate entrepreneurial intentions has been made in Namibia (Haase &

Lautenschläger, 2011). The study compared German and Namibian students and found differences in both the level of entrepreneurial intentionality and the variables connected to it. This study has some similarities to our but there are even more differences. Not only do we focus on different target groups, our study also use a broader range of variables and we compare several stages of entrepreneurship.

1.1 Our study

In this paper we will do a comparative study of the entrepreneurial intentions of Namibian and Swedish Business students. We will also compare the level of entrepreneurial intentions with the rate of nascent entrepreneurs and established entrepreneurs in the two countries.

In this section we seek to explain why we believe this is an interesting subject to study and motivate our decisions when it comes to the design and focus of our study.

Measuring Intentionality

When studying entrepreneurship a number of different measurements are used. In this paper we use entrepreneurial intentionality- measuring to what degree one plans to start a business in the future. Intuitively, simply comparing entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs might seem like the best and most efficient way of studying what makes people become entrepreneurs. However, there are good reasons for measuring intentionality too. The early empirical research on entrepreneurship was very much focused on the psychological characteristics of *business founders* and an almost endless number of traits describing the typical entrepreneur were suggested (cf. Hornaday, 1982). However the research did not manage to answer the question “What makes people found new firms?” (Davidsson, 1995). Therefore, researchers tried new ways of approaching the problem. Variables like personal background and demographic variables were added to the questions about psychological characteristics. Also, the surveys got directed towards “prospective” entrepreneurs rather than to business founders; the entrepreneurial *intentionality* was researched. It was argued that since founding a firm is a planned action and not something one does out of an impulse, the relationship between intention and actual behaviour should be fairly strong (Ajzen, 1991). As long as this assumption holds, studying entrepreneurial intentionality has also been found to have a number of advantages. Normally a small percentage of a population are running their own business (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012), it is therefore likely to be easier to gather data on entrepreneurial intentionality. Furthermore, a number of traits common for business founders may have been developed by the founders as a result of running a business and was not indeed what made them start the business. Finally, entrepreneurship studies often aim at understanding what policy

decisions are effective when it comes to stimulating the creation of new firms (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). It is then probably more useful to know what kind of people are considering starting up a business than to learn more about the characteristics of those who are already running their business (Davidsson, 1995). The accuracy of entrepreneurial intentions as a predictor of future entrepreneurial behaviour has been tested and found to be rather good. A two-wave survey made in Finland found that intention is a significant predictor for subsequent behaviour. This research thus provides support for the study of entrepreneurial intention as a way to “understand the emergence of complex economic behaviour” (Kautonen, et al., 2013). For these reasons, we choose to measure the entrepreneurial intentionality when trying to find out what makes people become entrepreneurs in Sweden and Namibia.

Measuring Nascent entrepreneurship and established entrepreneurs

In addition to measuring the entrepreneurial intentionality, we are also interested in the relationship between the entrepreneurial intentions and “real entrepreneurship”. GEM describes entrepreneurship as a process of several stages where the intentionality is the first stage (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). In our study we have simplified the GEM Model by describing a three-phase process of becoming an established entrepreneur.

- First one plans to start a business- Intentionality.
- Then enters the process of actually starting a business- Nascent entrepreneurship.
- If the business is successful and survives the person enters the third stage of becoming an established entrepreneur.

The connection between these three stages may be strong or weak. Obviously, everyone who plans to start a business will not actually do so. Likewise, out of the people who enter the process of starting up a business, not everyone will have the skill, persistence and luck to actually make it into an established business.

Emerging economies often have a high rate of entrepreneurial intentions and nascent entrepreneurship. However, the rate of established businesses is often low, meaning many businesses do not survive the start-up phase. According to the latest GEM report, Namibia is a country where the rate of nascent entrepreneurship is significantly larger than the rate of established business owners. Sweden on the other hand has exactly the same rate of both categories. In the end, it is the established firms that truly contribute to the economy with new goods and services and stable employment (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). If we assume that people with high entrepreneurial intentions really do start their own business, then it is also important that a high proportion of these businesses manage to move from the stage of nascent entrepreneurship (being in the process of starting) to established entrepreneurs. Since it is the established

entrepreneurs that really contribute to the economy in the long term, we want to test the connection between nascent entrepreneurship and established business owner. In addition to measuring the entrepreneurial intentions we therefore measure the rate of nascent and established entrepreneurs as well. We will then try to see if the trend revealed looking at GEM data can also be found among business students.

Targeting Business Students

Entrepreneurship is often divided into necessity entrepreneurs and opportunity entrepreneurs. GEM defines necessity-driven entrepreneurs as “those who are pushed into starting businesses because they have no other work options and need a source of income.” Opportunity-motivated entrepreneurs, on the other hand, “are those entering this activity primarily to pursue an opportunity” (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). As a well-developed country with an extensive well-fare system and free education we believe the majority of Swedish entrepreneurs are opportunity driven, this assumption is also supported by GEM showing that the rate of opportunity entrepreneurs is about twice as high in Europe as in Sub Saharan Africa (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). The GINI Index is a measurement of how the income and/or consumption is distributed in a country. A low number indicates a very equal distribution and a high number indicates a very unequal distribution. Namibia is a country with one of the world’s highest GINI coefficients while Sweden has one of the world’s lowest GINI score. (GINI Index, 5/5 2013) Parts of the population in Namibia still live traditional lives in the bush and at the same time others live in luxury homes in the capital. GEM conducts their research on a randomized sample of the population in each country and such comparisons are very interesting when looking at the level of entrepreneurship in a country as a whole. However it also means that their result is a mean of bushmen and millionaires and might not say much of the entrepreneurial intentions of either group.

In this study we handle this problem by comparing business students in Sweden and Namibia. We believe that by comparing business students we compare two similar groups with each other. Furthermore we believe that we minimize the likelihood of comparing two different types of entrepreneurship since we are less likely to measure necessity entrepreneurship. Our theory is that business students in general can enjoy more opportunity when it comes to career choices than other people and they should thus be less likely to start a business out of necessity.

The second motive for us to target business students is that they are tomorrow’s entrepreneurs. Many scholars have realized that targeting university students mean that you study the future of entrepreneurship and that graduate entrepreneurs are also more likely to really contribute to the economy. (Turker &

Selcuk, 2009) (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011; Moriano, et al., 2011; Autio, et al., 2001; Tong, et al., 2011). People are most likely to start a business when they are between 25-34 years old (Davidsson, 2006). Studying people younger than 25 thus means that you can understand what factors that affect the intentions of a country's future entrepreneurs (Turker & Selcuk, 2009).

Comparing Sweden and Namibia

The knowledge of how entrepreneurial intentionality differs across nations and between developed and developing countries is still rather weak. We wanted to contribute to this knowledge and chose to compare an African and a western country. We thought this would be interesting since most studies so far have been conducted in western countries whilst the entrepreneurial activity is the highest in Africa. To our knowledge no study comparing Swedish and Namibian business students had been done before and thus we believe it to be interesting to conduct such a study.

1.2 Purpose

The wider purpose of this paper is to contribute to the knowledge about how economic development is created. We will do this by studying how entrepreneurship is generated. We want to see what seems to make people start a business and if there are differences to be found across nations.

More specifically, our purpose is to see if there are differences between Swedish and Namibian business students when it comes to the level and causes of entrepreneurial intention. Furthermore, we want to investigate the relationship between the rate of nascent entrepreneurship and established entrepreneurs when it comes to business students in the two countries. This is to see if the entrepreneurial intentions are hindered or if it transforms into lasting businesses.

1.3 Research question

Does entrepreneurial intention differ between Swedish and Namibian students?
Are there differences in whether the entrepreneurially inclined business students in Sweden and Namibia actually end up running an established business?

2 Theoretical background

2.1 History of Entrepreneurship theory

Entrepreneurship is not a new phenomenon in the academic world and it is by no means a new field of research. Looking back through history many economists have had different opinions about the role of entrepreneurs in the market.

It was as early as in the mid-18th century that Richard Cantillon brought entrepreneurship into the economic system. Richard Cantillon put considerable amount of attention into the entrepreneur and in his publication “Essai sur la Nature du Commerce en Général” he talked about how entrepreneurs create markets where prices are established through supply and demand. He gave entrepreneurs an economic meaning by introducing the risk-seeking entrepreneur as a factor towards equilibrium in the economic field of research (Praag, 1999).

Many economists such as Adam Smith and Jean Baptiste Say, have been referring to Cantillon and his definitions about entrepreneurship in economic theory and it was not until the 19th century that Joseph Schumpeter invented the modern and revolutionary way of looking at entrepreneurs in economic theory (Seymour, et al., 2008). It was through his book, *The Theory of Economic Development*, published in 1911 that his ideas were mostly introduced. Joseph Schumpeter introduced the idea of the entrepreneur as an innovator and a leader rather than a risk-bearer and that it is the entrepreneur who fosters economic growth.

Moreover Schumpeter was the first economist to bring psychology into economic theory of entrepreneurship. Schumpeter argued that being an innovative entrepreneur demands psychological motives as well as economical motives. He acknowledges the fact that many economists would object to his theories since one cannot quantify the psychological motives into equilibrium. (Praag, 1999). Schumpeter defines the entrepreneurial type with four different psychological motives. The first one being that the individual has to have a will and a dream to start a business. The second motive describes the feature of being a competitive individual, the need of proving oneself to be superior to others. Furthermore he explains the feeling of power and independence, as one motive and lastly the joy of creating and getting things done (Endres & Woods, 2010). Schumpeter is not the only economist that believes that non-economic factors are important when triggering entrepreneurship (Vivarelli, 2011). The non-economic factors include demographic factors such as gender, education, and family background as well as psychological factors (Burke, et al., 2008; Vivarelli, 2011; Vivarelli, 2004).

Another economist that underlines the importance of psychological factors when measuring entrepreneurship is Zoltan Acs. He highlights the meaning of

understanding economic development through entrepreneurship and has therefore created the Global Entrepreneurship and Development Index (GEDI). The GEDI measures features of entrepreneurship by determining entrepreneurial attitudes, activity and aspirations. Not only does he include institutional and environmental factors but also individual factors (Acs & Szerb, 2010).

Two different schools

The most dominating economic school today, the neoclassical school has sometimes been accused of ignoring the importance of the entrepreneur. In the quite different Austrian school on the other hand, the entrepreneur has been a central phenomenon. Today most neoclassical economist obviously acknowledges that entrepreneurs exist, however they see them as a part of the greater neoclassical model. The entrepreneur is to most neoclassical economists merely another example of the rational and maximizing individual and does not make up a unique category of analytical interest. The neoclassical economists seem to view the entrepreneurship as a result of chance (Kreps, 1997; Cowen, 2003). If a great business opportunity exists in the neo classical school, then that opportunity will soon be exploited and the person that happens do so is called an entrepreneur. On the other hand, this does not mean that the entrepreneur is of greater analytical interest than other individuals that make up the network of economic development by rational decisions and an attempt to maximize profit.

The Austrian school has a radically different view of the entrepreneur. They stress the nature of the entrepreneur as something distinctly different from a maximizing behaviour. The Austrian school believes that the neoclassical school has a lack of understanding about the real mechanisms of the market. In general, the Austrian school emphasizes the feature of human action and the special nature of the entrepreneur (Cowen, 2003). One famous Austrian economist in modern research is Israel M. Kirzner. According to Kirzner, an entrepreneur is “a decision-maker whose entire role arises out of his alertness to hitherto unnoticed opportunities” (Kirzner, 1973). Compared to Neo classical economists, Kirzner did not assume a competitive market to be an outset, instead he believed that the attempt for market equilibrium is caused by actions of the entrepreneurs. The process towards market equilibrium is pushed by the “alertness” of the entrepreneurs and by alertness Kirzner means “an attitude of receptiveness” (Kirzner, 1997).

In this study we will be influenced by the Austrian way of thinking in the sense that we believe the entrepreneur to be a unique factor in the economic system that can and should be studied. We believe entrepreneurial activity is influenced not just by a maximizing behaviour but by several non-economic factors. When trying to understand entrepreneurship we think one needs to understand the entrepreneur and the human action behind new ventures.

2.2 Previous research

Stages of entrepreneurship

As already mentioned, we are measuring entrepreneurship in three phases. We measure the rates of entrepreneurial intentions, nascent entrepreneurship and established entrepreneurs. These phases are also measured by The Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) which is the world's largest study on entrepreneurial activity. It is an annual valuation of entrepreneurial activity in several different countries around the globe. GEM reports have found that the nature of the entrepreneurial activity in these stages depend on the GDP-per capita of the country. Countries with a low GDP per capita tend to have high rates of nascent entrepreneurship and include a relatively high proportion of necessity entrepreneurship (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). When the GDP per capita increases, industrialization and economies of scale allow large firms to grow and increase their relative role in the economy by satisfying a larger share of the demand. More people can find stable employment in industrial plants and this causes the rates of nascent entrepreneurship to decrease. In other words, for poorer countries a decline in nascent entrepreneurship may be a good sign. If a high rate of nascent entrepreneurship is caused by a lack of job opportunities forcing people to necessity entrepreneurship, then a high rate is probably not good for the economy. For the nascent entrepreneurship to have a long-term positive effect, the entrepreneurs must have a high survival rate leading to a higher level of established entrepreneurs. (Bosma, et al., 2008). In many developing countries this is not the case. In the latest GEM report, Zambia (neighbouring country to Namibia) had 27 % of the people engaged in nascent entrepreneurship (defined as running a business less than 3 months old) while only 4 % had been running a business for more than 3 years. In Namibia 11% were nascent entrepreneurs while only 3% had been running a business for three years. In some cases these differences can be a sign of a new trend regarding entrepreneurship, but in most African countries the difference between nascent and established entrepreneurs have been more or less fixed over the years (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012).

In European countries, the percentage of the population running their own business is normally low, around 5 %, however the rate of nascent entrepreneurs is rarely above 7% either. Two theories have been suggested as to why European entrepreneurs manage to sustain their businesses to such a high rate compared to entrepreneurs in emerging economies. First, there are many more employment alternatives in societies where industrialization and institutionalization has taken hold, which may lead more people to choose employment instead of self-employment. Second, people who start a business in a developed country are

more likely to sustain it thanks to much more favourable conditions for starting a business. Access to finance, an educated work force, sophisticated legal system and working institutions and infrastructure may all facilitate for people to succeed with their ventures (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012).

What motivates and characterizes current and prospective entrepreneurs

The research on this area often study factors connected to nascent entrepreneurship or entrepreneurial intentionality. Some of them also look at what motives established entrepreneurs had for starting their business. We will measure what leads to entrepreneurial intentionality, however we believe all findings in what leads to entrepreneurship is of interest when we design our survey. Given that the decision of starting a business is not an action done purely out of impulse, we assume that there is a connection between entrepreneurial intentionality and propensity to actually start a business. Hence, all characteristics that have been found to increase an individual's propensity to start a business will also be of interest when designing a study on entrepreneurial intentionality. Below is therefore a report of the major findings of what leads to entrepreneurship on an individual level. After that comes a section where the differences that have been found between countries are reported.

Education has been found to have a positive correlation with entrepreneurship. However different studies have found different forms of correlation. A US study (Reynolds, 1997) shows that the positive effects of education on entrepreneurship disappears after medium levels of education while a Swedish study (Honig, 2003) shows that the positive relation remains throughout the whole spectrum of education. One study shows that the prevalence of nascent entrepreneurs goes down slightly in the highest education groups (Wagner, 2004) and on the other hand Arenius and De Clerk found that people with a higher education are more likely to think that there is a good opportunity to open up a business within the next 6 months. This apparent paradox might be explained by the fact that people in the highest education groups normally have more alternatives when it comes to career choice leading them to be less likely to act upon the entrepreneurial opportunities that they claim to see (Clerck, 2005).

A specific type of education that has become more and more common the last years is courses teaching entrepreneurship (Noel, 2002). Most studies in western countries have shown a positive effect of entrepreneurship education on the entrepreneurial intentions (Noel, 2002; Comisson, 2012; Karali, 2013). However two studies conducted in Africa showed no or a very small positive effect (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011; Byabashaija & Katono, 2011).

Other demographic factors also influence a person's likelihood of becoming a nascent entrepreneur. Being a man rather than a woman seems to increase the

chances significantly and also being in the age between 25 and 34 which had been showed to be the peak of entrepreneurial activity (Davidsson, 2006).

Having parents, relatives and friends who are running their own businesses has also been shown to have a strong effect on an individual's propensity to become an entrepreneur (Honig, 2003; Drennan & Saleh, 2008). GEM data shows that people who know others who are self-employed are twice as likely to start their own business (Wagner, 2004). On the other hand, other studies have shown that having a role model is actually less important for people choosing to be an entrepreneur than for people choosing different career paths. Entrepreneurs also seem to care less about what other people think and score lower in "need for external recognition" than others (Davidsson, 2006). This supports a "rebel" theory of the entrepreneur, drawing a picture of the typical entrepreneur as someone who breaks away from well-trodden paths and ignores what others might think about it. This picture is also consistent with the fact that entrepreneurs have been found to care less about job security when choosing their career. People who instead choose to be employed often value job-security higher and are more risk averse than the entrepreneur (Newman, 2007; Kolvereid, 1996).

A person's attitudes and perceptions of his environment do also affect his propensity to take part in entrepreneurial activity. Analyses of GEM data have shown a strong effect of self-reported *confidence in having the relevant skills for running one's own business* (Arenius & Minniti, 2005). Furthermore, nascent entrepreneurs tend to score lower when it comes to fear of failure and they are also more positive when it comes to their perception of the economic outlook both for them personally and for the country as a whole. Not surprisingly they also score higher when asked about whether they think it would be a good opportunity to start a business within the next 6 months (Davidsson, 2006).

Cross-national differences in the level of entrepreneurial intentionality

Looking at GEM Data it is clear that the level of entrepreneurial intentionality as well as the rate of nascent entrepreneurs is on average higher in African Countries than in European (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). Whether this is true even for university students is not as clear. (Fueglistaller, et al., 2006) surveyed students from South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Singapore and ten European countries and found great differences in the students entrepreneurial intentions. However, the biggest differences were between western countries while South Africa scored in between. Australian students had the highest entrepreneurial intention with 18 % and Switzerland scored lowest with 9,6% planning to enter the job market as an entrepreneur. A study made in Botswana shows that only 2.3 % of the students were planning to start a business, which can be compared to the GEM data of the average intentionality in Botswana of being 72% (Plattner, 2009).

In the only comparative study including Namibia however, the intentionality was found to be significantly higher in Namibia than in Germany. In Namibia 44 % of students considered starting their own business after finishing their studies while the same number for German students was only 15%. (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011).

If we look outside Africa at comparisons between developed and developing countries we find results consistent with (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011). A comparison of university business students in China and USA found the intentionality to be higher in China (Ren, 2010) and the same result was found in a study comparing Norwegian and Indonesian studies (Indarti, 2004).

To sum up, even though entrepreneurial intentions in general is higher in Africa than in Europe it is hard to say if this trend is also true for university students. The few studies made on the subject in Africa sometimes give different results. However, studies comparing western countries and developing countries outside of Africa seem to show that students in developing countries have higher entrepreneurial intentions.

Cross-national differences in the determinants of entrepreneurial intentions

When it comes to differences in what factors that are connected to entrepreneurial intentions in European and African countries the knowledge is weak.

Some studies have been made to find what motives established entrepreneurs had for starting a business. In developed countries self-realization (Kolvereid, 1996) and the need of autonomy and independence (Carter, 2003) have been found to be factors explaining why some people start their own business while they are not as motivated by the chance of a higher income (Baumol, 1993). In some developing countries however, the chance of a higher income has been found to be a strong motivator. A study done on Ghanaian and Kenyan business owners shows that their main motivation for becoming entrepreneurs was the possibility of a higher income, (Chu, et al., 2007) and the same has been found for Nigerian entrepreneurs (Chu, et al., 2008).

The study comparing Namibian and German students also showed that entrepreneurial intentions are influenced by different factors in the two countries (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011). In Namibia it was positively influenced by the wish for self-realization and also by higher age. In Germany, none of those factors had a significant influence, however other factors, like the need of autonomy and independence as well as the pursuit of influence and power, had a strong positive effect on the entrepreneurial intentions. Furthermore, continuation of family traditions and the number of self-employed family members had a positive correlation with the students' interest in starting their own business. Perhaps surprisingly, participation in entrepreneurship courses was not a factor found to have a positive influence on the German students' entrepreneurial intentions. Also

somewhat surprisingly, the chances of a higher income did not turn out to be a main motivator for the Namibian students the way studies in other African countries have found (Chu, et al., 2008).

Our own variables

In addition to the factors reported above, we included two other variables that to our knowledge have not been used in similar studies before. These variables measure the perception of access to funding as well as the perception of how complex the bureaucratic process is when starting a company. Below is an explanation to what these variables are based on and why we think they might have an effect on entrepreneurial intentions.

The indirect and long term goal of many of the studies described above is to increase the understanding of entrepreneurship in order to advise on how to design policies and institutions that increase the level of entrepreneurship and lead to economic growth. This can also be achieved by studying the direct effect of different policies on the number of new firms created etc. One such study of the relationship between the level of entry regulations and the number of created firms shows a clear negative relationship. The harder it is to start up a company the less people will do so. However, low rates of entry regulations may only prevent low quality entrepreneurs and thus not affect the entrepreneurs that really contribute to economic growth (Klapper, et al., 2006). To investigate this phenomenon further, we construct a variable that measures people's perception of how hard it is to start a business to see if this affects their intentions of doing so.

Once the entrepreneur has passed through the regulations and started the company, *financing* is often the main obstacle to growth. Lack of financing is the most common self-reported reason to discontinuance of a business (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). Some studies also show that easier access to finance leads to more start-ups. For example Kerr and Nanda find that the an abolition of a bank regulation in USA that resulted in easier loans and more access to funding also lead to a significant increase in start-up activity. (Kerr & Nanda, 2009) On the other hand, the importance of financing from banks and other institutions is often greatly exaggerated. Entrepreneurs normally expect to get funding from banks, institutions and governmental programs however, the real sources of finance is normally informal investors. Family friends and work colleagues are much more likely to invest in an entrepreneurs business and the focus on formal investors is therefore wrong and unnecessary (Bygrave & Quill, 2006). Since we are looking at what makes people become entrepreneurs, we are also interested in if people's perception of the complexity of registering a company and getting funding will affect their propensity to start a business.

3 Hypotheses

Based on the previous research found above we have worked out three hypotheses that we want to test in this comparative study of Swedish and Namibian business students.

Our first hypothesis is derived from GEM-data and the comparative cross-national studies reported above. On average intentionality is found to be higher in developing countries than in developed. This is also true for the population of Sweden and Namibia, according to GEM data. Data on whether this is also true for university students is not as extensive. However several studies show that the difference in entrepreneurial intentions in developing and developed countries exists even among university students. This have been found when comparing USA and China (Ren, 2010), Norway and Indonesia (Indarti, 2004) and Germany and Namibia (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011). This makes us believe that we will get the same results comparing Sweden and Namibia and makes the base for our first hypothesis.

H1: The entrepreneurial intentions among business students are higher in Namibia than in Sweden.

Not just the level but also the determinants of entrepreneurial intentionality differ across countries and cultures. In the western world people tend to care more about independence and self realization while entrepreneurs in developing countries often rank the chance of a higher income as their main motivator. In the study by Rena et al, the German students' intentionality was affected by their need of independence but there was no significant effect of need for higher income among the Namibian students. There were other differences to be found however; for example significant effects were found on certain types of entrepreneurship courses among Namibians while Germans were influenced by self-employed family members. (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011) We believe we will find differences in the determinants of entrepreneurial intentions among business students as well and that is our second hypothesis.

H2: Different variables correlate with entrepreneurial intention among business students in Sweden and Namibia.

Data often show that developing countries have high rates of nascent entrepreneurship while the rate of established business owners is significantly lower. Necessity entrepreneurship is thought to be part of the explanation for these high rates in developing countries. In poor countries, the career opportunities are often limited resulting in people starting up new companies because it is their least bad alternative and not because they see a great opportunity. In developed countries on the other hand, the rates of both nascent entrepreneurship and established entrepreneurs often at an even and low rate

(Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). This might be because more opportunities cause less people to start a business and good business infrastructure means more people manage to sustain their business. GEM data show that Namibia have high rates of nascent entrepreneurs (11%) and low rates for established entrepreneurs (3%) while Sweden has the same rate of nascent entrepreneurs and established entrepreneurs (5%,5%) (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). It is possible that this gap will be smaller when looking at university students since their career opportunities should be larger and thus prevalence of necessity entrepreneurship smaller. However, we still believe students in each country will be affected by the conditions in the country they live in. Based on theory and empirical data we thus expect to find a higher rate of nascent entrepreneurs than established entrepreneurs in Namibia whilst we don't expect to find such a gap in Sweden.

H3: In Namibia there will be a higher rate of nascent entrepreneurs compared to established entrepreneurs. In Sweden no such difference will exist.

4 Method

4.1 Research method

In order to get answers to our research question, quantitative data was required to be able to perform statistical hypothesis test. We needed data covering both Sweden and Namibia. Since we did not have access to data that measure the entrepreneurial intention among business students in neither Namibia nor Sweden, we needed to collect the data ourselves. The quantitative data comes from a survey that we conducted ourselves. Collecting data electronically via e-mail or an online survey is hard in Windhoek, since the use of Internet is not as common as in Sweden. Hence we have done a field study in Windhoek during the spring 2013.

4.2 Statistical method

To be able to test our hypothesis and find the different factors that influence the entrepreneurial intention we have performed multiple regression analysis by completing two separate regressions, one for each country. We have analysed the different influences and the level of the statistical significance. We used t-tests to detect the statistical significance when comparing the variables between the two countries. The STATA software has been used for the process of computing regressions and analysing the data.

4.3 Population of interest

The population of interest for this study are business students from Namibia and Sweden. The business students are from the Polytechnic of Namibia (PoN), University of Namibia (UNAM) and the Stockholm School of Economics in Sweden.

4.4 Data collection

We collected the data from Namibia by handing out the survey in different business classes at UNAM and PoN. We chose the business classes randomly by going to different lecture halls at different times. In Sweden we collected the data via online surveys made in Qualtrics that was distributed out via email to 1000 students. Taking part in the survey was entirely non-obligatory, however, in Namibia some of the students might have felt a pressure to answer since the teacher might have given the impression that they were all supposed to take part.

4.5 Pilot survey

Before sending out our final survey we had two rounds of pilot surveys directed to both Namibian and Swedish students where we handed it out to ten respondents per round and asked for feedback. After each round some minor changes were made to clarify questions perceived as strange or hard to understand. Through our pilot surveys we managed to ensure the quality of the data gathered through the final questionnaire.

4.6 Questionnaire Design

We designed a questionnaire based on the previous research described above. The majority of the questions were copied or inspired by the GEM studies and the GEDI. The GEM model was developed by a multidisciplinary group of scientists and they collect enormous amount of data each year. They use two different surveys that each consists of hundreds of questions covering several scientific fields. One of the surveys is aimed at the average adult population whilst the other survey is directed to national experts.

Another well-known model is “The Global Entrepreneurship and Development Index” (GEDI) constructed by Zoltan Acs. The GEDI Index is focusing on the entrepreneurial attitudes, activity and aspirations and has a

complex system multiplying a number of individual variables with an institutional variable to get 14 entrepreneurial pillars that are then divided into the three main fields that make up the Index (Acs & Szerb, 2010).

As mentioned above there is no data that covers business students in both Sweden and Namibia. When conducting our study, we could not use the GEM or the GEDI Index since they are both far too complex and extensive. For example, the GEM questionnaire contains well over 100 questions and requires an interviewer to gather the data. We simply did not have the resources to collect that amount of data in two countries and thus we constructed our own survey. When constructing our own survey we used the GEM questionnaire directed to adult population and the GEDI questions used to measure entrepreneurial attitudes as a point of departure. Constructing our own survey gave us some freedom and to choose the most relevant questions, we looked at what previous research had found to be the most common significant variables to affect entrepreneurial intentionality. In the end we had a survey based on research from several different studies similar to the one we were to conduct. We also added two variables that we thought might be relevant but that were missing in existing questionnaires. Constructing a new questionnaire has some downsides since it makes it harder to compare our results to previous research. With nothing to compare with, it can be hard to know what your results indicate. However, since almost all our questions were taken or inspired by other studies this problem was limited. Furthermore, since we did a comparative study between two countries, our results were in fact presented in relation to something and not just numbers in a regression. Our main interest was to look at the difference between these two countries and not to compare it with a certain previous study. Lastly, constructing our own study means that we can try our own variables and perhaps contribute with new knowledge rather than just confirm or reject what is already known.

The final questionnaire consisted of 33 questions out of which 18 were to be used in our thesis and the rest were out of interest for our job initiator Global Business Labs. The questions were divided into five different sections. The first section contained demographic questions, such as gender and educational level. The second part contained the dependent variables and asked about the respondents' attitude towards starting a business. Further the questionnaire then continued to ask psychological questions about the respondents priorities when it came to choice of career. The fourth part included social factors; such as if the respondent had a mom or a dad that was an entrepreneur.

Lastly there was a section that asked the respondents about their perceptions of his /her own abilities when it comes to entrepreneurship, the perception of how simple/hard it is to get funding and how simple/complicated the bureaucratic process is when starting a company.

H1: The entrepreneurial intentions among business students are higher in Namibia than in Sweden.

When measuring the entrepreneurial intentionality we were inspired by (Davidsson, 1995). In the study the question used to measure intentionality is “How likely do you consider it to be that five years from now, you will be running your own firm?” Due to a misunderstanding our question was altered slightly to “How likely do you think it is that you will start your own business within 5 years?”.

We realize that there is a risk of people being over-confident and might overestimate the chances of them being business owners within five years. This is also one reason why we also look at the connection between intentionality and the actual activity.

H2: Different variables correlate with entrepreneurial intention among business students in Namibia and Sweden

To be able to test this hypothesis we asked questions about the student’s demographic factors, psychological factors, social factors as well as factors about her perception. We asked questions about the students, educational level, gender, if the respondent knew anybody personally that was an entrepreneur as well as if they knew about any entrepreneurship programs that helped entrepreneurs. The questionnaire included questions asking about the student’s motives for choosing their professional career, e.g. the need for freedom and independence, the need for job security and the need for higher income. The respondent could choose to answer on a scale from 1-7 where 1 was not at all important and 7 was extremely important. We also asked the students if they thought they had the skill required to start their own business. As mentioned above these questions are mostly inspired by the GEM survey and questions from the GEDI, the questions about the student’s motives for choosing their professional career are directly taken from a similar study (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011). Furthermore all the questions asked to test this hypothesis are described in the questionnaire in the Appendix.

Besides using the questions from GEM and GEDI we formulated two questions on our own that we believe fit into the model. Previous research has found that easy access to funding will lead to a significant increase in start-ups (Kerr & Nanda, 2009). For this reason we were interested to see if the perception of easy access to funding would increase the entrepreneurial intention and we thus added the question: *How difficult/easy do you believe it is for entrepreneurs in your country to get funding from investors and institutions?* The respondent could answer on a scale from 1-7 where 1 is equal to very difficult and 7 is equal to very easy.

As described in “Previous research”, entry regulations are negatively correlated with entrepreneurship (Klapper, et al., 2006). We therefore asked about people’s

perception of how complex the bureaucracy is when starting a business in their respective country. Our pilot studies showed that the respondents in the two countries interpreted the question differently. We therefore communicated the question slightly in a different manner in the two countries, in order to be sure that the interpretation was the same. In Sweden we asked: *How complicated/simple do you think the bureaucratic process is when starting your own company?* In Namibia we asked: *How complicated/simple do you think the process is when registering your own company?* The respondents could choose to answer on scale from 1-7 where 1 was equal to very complicated and 7 was equal to very simple. We believe the meaning of these two questions to be practically identical.

H3: In Namibia there will be a significantly higher rate of nascent entrepreneurs compared to established entrepreneurs. In Sweden no such difference will exist.

Different definitions exist on what a nascent and an established entrepreneur is (Wagner, 2004). The GEM studies talk about “new entrepreneurs” as something in between nascent and established and define established entrepreneurs as those who have been running their business for 3 years. (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012) Other studies divide nascent entrepreneurship into four smaller stages with three transitions (Wagner, 2004).

In this study we have simplified the definitions to suit our study and our young target group. Defining established entrepreneurs as those who have already been running their business for three years would probably not be ideal since our target group is relatively young and we would risk finding no one or very few that would fit into this definition. Furthermore, since we were not interested in the different stages within nascent entrepreneurship we did not find it relevant to use such a breakdown. Our only interest was to compare the rate of those who were in the process of starting a business with those who were already running one and see if differences were to be found between Sweden and Namibia. We therefore simplified the GEM definitions to fit a survey of our scope directed to university students.

We defined nascent entrepreneurs as those who are in the process of starting a business and established entrepreneurs as those who are already running a business.

We used the question “Are you currently in the process of starting up your own business?” The respondents were then given the alternatives “Yes”, “No” and “No, I am already running by own business”.

4.7 Data reliability

To be able to get consistent and unbiased estimators the ideal case would be to have data from a completely randomized experiment. In our case we have distributed the survey in two different ways depending on which country the students are from as described above. In Sweden the survey was distributed via email to our classmates. To minimize the problem with selection-bias, we sent the survey out to 1000 students and not just to our own friends or acquaintances. Since our data might suffer from selection bias, our data might not be perfectly random and therefore might suffer from getting consistent and unbiased estimates. Answering the survey was completely voluntary and there was no way for us to see if a specific individual had in fact answered or not. Since we do not know the reason why people choose to respond or not, there is a risk that this might lead to the data being biased. However since we have gathered the data ourselves we have an understanding and are aware about the problems that could affect and limit our data.

A measurement error problem is also something that we have considered in our data collection. Due to the fact that there can be some communication issues when the students were answering the questionnaire they might have misinterpreted the question and answered differently. We have tried to reduce this problem by sending out a pilot questionnaire to see what questions people had trouble answering.

5 Data

5.1 Introduction to data

We performed a cross-sectional study exploring the entrepreneurial intentions among 335 business students from Namibia and Sweden. The data of our sample is from Polytechnic of Namibia (PoN), University of Namibia (UNAM) in Windhoek and Stockholm School of Economics (SSE) in Stockholm. Our main interest was whether there exist differences between Namibian and Swedish students in their intentions of starting up their own business. If there exist differences what can these differences be attributed to, in terms of psychological factors, social factors, demographic factors and perceptual factors?

We also examine the level of nascent and established entrepreneurs in the two countries in order to see if there is any difference in the levels.

Table 1: Description of variables

Dependent Variable	
Likely to start	Likelihood of starting a business within 5 years, on a scale from 1-7 If 0= Very Unlikely, if 7= Very likely
Independent Variables	
Male	If male=1, if female=0
Years of higher education	Years of completed university studies If 0 years=1, if 5 or more years=6
Need for freedom	How important/unimportant the need for freedom and independence is when choosing professional career, on a scale from 1-7 If not at all important=1, if extremely important=7
Need for job security	How important/unimportant the need job security is when choosing professional career, on a scale from 1-7 If not at all important=1, if extremely important=7
Need for higher income	How Important/unimportant the need for higher income is when choosing professional career, on a scale from 1-7 If not at all important=1, if extremely important=7
Perceived skill	The extents of agreeing/disagreeing with having the skill, knowledge and experience to start a business, on scale from 1-7 If strongly disagree=1, if strongly agree=7
Fear of failure	The extents of agreeing/disagreeing with having the fear of failure that would prevent someone to start a business, on scale from 1-7 If strongly disagree=1, if strongly agree=7
Knowledge of programs	The knowledge of number of programs (governmental or private) that help entrepreneurs If 1 program=1, if 4 or more=4
Perceived access to funding	The perception of how easy/difficult it is to get funding in the respondents country If very difficult=1, if very easy=7
Mom & Dad	If the respondent have a mom or a dad that are entrepreneurs If mom=1, if dad=1, if mom and dad=2, if neither=0
Friends & class mates	If the respondent have a friend or a classmate that are entrepreneurs If friend=1, if classmate=1, if friend and classmate=2, if neither=0
Other acquaintances	If the respondent knows a relative or other acquaintance that are entrepreneurs If relative=1, if other acquaintance=1, if relative and other acquaintance=2, if neither=0
Entrepreneurship courses taken	Any entrepreneurship courses taken, by the respondent If taken a course=1, if not take a course=0
Good opportunity to start business	The extent of agreeing/disagreeing with where the respondent live there is good opportunity to start a business within 6 months, on scale from 1-7 If strongly disagree=1, if strongly agree=7
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	The perception of how complicated/simple the bureaucracy is when starting a business in their country, on a scale from 1-7 If very complicated=1, if very simple=7

5.2 Econometric data analysis

To be able to make inference on the entrepreneurial intention, we have used a multiple linear regression model using ordinary least square (OLS) estimation. To compare the two countries we divided the respondents into a Namibian and a Swedish group and made two separate regressions. The measurement of the respondents' judged likelihood of starting up their own business within 5 years was entered as a dependent variable into the regression.

To assess whether we have normally distributed error terms, we did the Shapiro-Wilks test of normality (Sweden: $W = 0.99$, $p < .067$ Namibia: $W = 0.99$, $p < 0.04$). As can be seen we fail to reject the null for Sweden and Namibia; that the error terms are normally distributed on a 1% significance level. The null can be rejected on a 10% significance level for both countries, and therefore one should be cautious when interpreting our results. Transforming the dependent into logs did not yield into a distribution that was closer to normal distribution and thus we did not transform our data into logs (see Appendix). (Wooldridge, 2008).

To be sure that our data does not suffer from heteroskedasticity, we have used heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors to get valid confidence intervals and t-statistics. As for multicollinearity we have not found any problem in our data (see Appendix) and hence we have not taken into account such a problem when making inference.

5.3 Response rate

The response rate in Namibia was nearly 100% and the response rate in Sweden came down to 16%. The difference in the response rate can perhaps be explained by how the survey was distributed. As mentioned above, in Namibia, the survey was distributed during class under the supervision of a lecturer and hence the student may have felt a pressure to answer the survey.

6 Results

6.1 Summary statistics

The descriptive data shows that the entrepreneurial intention as well as the rate of nascent entrepreneurs is higher in Namibia than in Sweden. The rate of established entrepreneurs however is exactly the same in the two countries. The gender distribution in the two countries was fairly even with 54 % men in Namibia and 42 % in Sweden. The education level of the Swedish respondents was slightly higher than in Namibia however, the Namibian students had attended more entrepreneurship courses. The means of all variables except for one differ significantly from each other in Sweden and Namibia. The only variable where no difference was detected was the variable for established entrepreneurs.

Table 2: Data descriptive and a cross-country comparison

Variable	Sweden			Namibia			t-value
	Obs	Mean	St. Dev.	Obs	Mean	St. Dev.	
Entrepreneur	167	0.05	0.23	168	0.05	0.21	0.26
Nascent	158	0.06	0.23	160	0.3	0.46	-5.96***
Likely to start	149	3.58	1.56	112	5.03	1.89	6.62***
Male	167	0.54	0.5	168	0.42	0.49	2.36**
Years of higher education	167	2.98	1.33	168	2.7	1.45	1.88*
Need for freedom	167	5.36	1.08	168	5.81	1.51	-3.14***
Need for job security	167	4.48	1.39	168	5.96	1.24	10.39***
Need for higher income	167	5.46	0.92	168	5.97	1.34	-4.05***
Perceived skill	167	4.26	1.59	168	5.26	1.52	-5.87***
Fear of failure	167	4.07	1.72	168	3.63	2.1	2.10**
Knowledge of programs	167	1.63	1.21	168	1.38	1.31	1.89*
Perceived access to funding	167	3.55	1.2	168	2.67	1.57	5.78***
Mom & Dad	167	0.75	0.93	168	0.6	0.68	1.72*
Friends & classmates	167	2.00	0.91	168	0.6	0.7	15.80***
Other acquaintances	167	0.84	0.7	168	0.52	0.58	4.56***
Entrepreneurship courses taken	167	0.19	0.39	168	0.49	0.5	6.17***
Good opportunity to start	158	4.8	1.19	156	4.1	2.01	3.79***
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	167	3.57	1.36	168	2.78	1.7	4.73***
***=1% sign. level **=5%sign. level *=10% sign. level							

6.2 Entrepreneurial intentions

As can be seen in table 3 below, there are both differences and similarities between the two countries. In both Sweden and Namibia the importance of freedom and independence when choosing career has a significant effect on a person's will to start a business in the foreseeable future. The effect seems to be stronger in Sweden than in Namibia. On the other hand the need for job security, in the sense of probability of keeping the job, showed a significant negative effect in both Sweden and Namibia. This supports the image of the entrepreneur as a rebel and a risk-taker.

As in most studies on the subject, the self-perceived skill, knowledge and experience also show a significant effect on a person's entrepreneurial intentions.

There were also a number of ways in which the Swedish and Namibian students seem to differ. The Swedish students were more likely to have higher entrepreneurial intentions the more support programs for entrepreneurs they knew about. Whether this is because students interested in entrepreneurship actively gather data about such programs or if the knowledge of the programs inspires the student to become an entrepreneur is something we cannot answer from this study though. In Namibia however, knowledge of support programs did not have a significant effect on the respondents.

A very interesting difference is the effect of a person's perceived access to external funding. In Sweden, people who thought it easy to get funding also showed higher entrepreneurial intentions which is consistent with the GEM report showing that entrepreneurs often greatly overestimate the importance of external funding. (Bygrave & Quill, 2006) In Namibia this effect didn't exist at all. There was even a negative correlation although far from significant. The number of years of higher education completed by the respondents did not have an effect on the Namibian regression either. In Sweden however, the number of years completed had a significant negative correlation to the entrepreneurial intentions.

Only one factor had a positive impact on Namibia without significant effects in Sweden. The perception of how complex the bureaucratic process is when starting up a business does affect the entrepreneurial intentions of Namibians. The easier one thinks it is to start-up, the higher are the entrepreneurial intentions. When comparing our results from the two regressions it should be noted that a non-significant effect in either country does not mean that we have proved that it does not have an effect but merely that the effect is not strong enough to be significant. Comparing a significant and a non-significant result should therefore not be interpreted as if the difference itself is significant (Gelman & Stern, 2006).

However, some of the non-significant results are interesting since one could expect them to be significant by looking at the previous research.

Neither in Sweden nor in Namibia could significant effects be found on the impact of entrepreneurs in a person's family or among her friends. Neither did entrepreneurship courses show any effect on entrepreneurial intentions that may lead one to question the effectiveness of such courses. Lastly “Need for higher income” was not significant in Namibia as it has been for several other studies conducted in Africa.

Table 3: How likely is it that you will start a business within 5 years?

VARIABLES	Sweden	Namibia
Male	-0.267 (0.287)	-0.0439 (0.372)
Years of higher education	-0.158* (0.0923)	-0.0660 (0.110)
Need for freedom	0.420*** (0.118)	0.171* (0.0876)
Need for job security	-0.173* (0.0999)	-0.274** (0.117)
Need for higher income	-0.159 (0.148)	-0.154 (0.128)
Perceived skill	0.197** (0.0793)	0.296** (0.121)
Fear of failure	0.0171 (0.0771)	0.0339 (0.0821)
Knowledge of programs	0.223* (0.115)	0.193 (0.125)
Perceived access to funding	0.247** (0.105)	-0.124 (0.111)
Mom & Dad	0.114 (0.132)	0.0999 (0.341)
Friends & classmates	-0.0241 (0.182)	-0.350 (0.335)
Other acquaintances	0.0875 (0.242)	0.462 (0.314)
Entrepreneurship courses taken	0.0600 (0.381)	-0.408 (0.372)
Good opportunity to start business	0.169 (0.117)	0.156 (0.120)
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	-0.0555 (0.105)	0.246** (0.0979)
Constant	0.764 (1.117)	4.095*** (1.138)
Observations	140	104
R-squared	0.266	0.289

Robust standard errors in parentheses *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

6.3 Established entrepreneurs and the differences between entrepreneurship stages

As shown in table 3 and table 4 below, the entrepreneurial intentions as well as the level of nascent entrepreneurs in Namibia completely outperforms the Swedish rates. In Namibia, 50 % of the respondents thought it likely or very likely that they would start a business while the same number for Sweden was 8,6 %. On the 7 point likert scale the Swedish mean was 3.58 while the Namibian mean was over 5 and the difference is significant on a 1 % significance level. To see if this difference would persist when controlling for other variables we also made a combined regression where the dummy variable from Namibia was added (taking on the value of 1 if the respondent was “From Namibia” and otherwise 0). The result was the coefficient for “From Namibia” took the value of 1.8 at a 1% significance level meaning that a person from Namibia is likely to score almost 2 steps higher on the likert scale even when controlling for all other variables (See Appendix).

When moving our focus closer to actually running an established business we investigated the rate of nascent entrepreneurs and found that although the numbers had dropped slightly there was still a big gap between the two countries. 30% of the Namibian respondents were in the process of starting up their own business, which can be compared to 5.7 % in Sweden, and this difference was also significant on a 1 % significance level.

However, when measuring the number of established entrepreneurs, this trend is broken. 4,8 % of the Namibian students were running a business at the moment and in Sweden the same number was slightly higher, 5,4%. This was also the only variable where a significant difference could not be detected between the countries at 10% significance level. In other words, despite the very high levels of entrepreneurial intentions and the high rate of people in the process of starting a business among Namibian students, there is no difference in the percentage of people who run their own business.

Table 4: Differences in stages of entrepreneurship

	Sweden			Namibia		
	Yes	No	%	Yes	No	%
Nascent	9	149	5.6	48	112	30
Entrepreneur	9	158	5.4	8	160	4.8
Likely or very likely*	12	137	8.6	56	56	50

*Number of respondents who answered likely or very likely to the question: "How likely do you think it is that you will start your own business within five years?"

Table 5: T-test H0:Nascent entrepreneur=Established entrepreneur

	Nascent entrepreneurs			Established entrepreneurs			
	Obs	Means	St.dev	Obs	Means	St.dev	t-value
Sweden	167	0.053	0.226	167	0.053	0.226	0.000
Namibia	168	0.285	0.453	168	0.047	0.213	5.850***

***= p<0,01

6.4 Answering our hypotheses

H1:

We found strong support for our first hypothesis. On average the Namibian students had higher entrepreneurial intentions than the Swedish students. When conducting a t-test we found the difference between Namibia (M=5,03 S=1,89), and Sweden (M=3,58 S=1,56) to be significant and we could reject the null hypothesis; that the means were equal. (t=6,62 and p=0,0000).

H2:

Both similarities and differences were found in what variables had a correlation to entrepreneurial intentionality in the two countries.

Three variables, “Need for freedom”, “Need for job security”, “Perceived skill” had significant positive effects on the entrepreneurial intention in both countries although the size of the impact differed somewhat.

There were also some differences between the countries; four variables had a significant and positive effect on just one country. For Sweden these were “Years of higher education”, “Knowledge of programs” and “Perceived access to funding”, while Namibia only had one unique significant variable “Perceived simplicity of bureaucracy”. These differences support our hypothesis.

H3:

We found strong support for our hypothesis. In Sweden, no significant difference was found between the rate of nascent ($M = 0.0539$ $S = 0.0226$) and established entrepreneurs ($M = 0.0539$ $S = 0.0226$) ($t = 0.0000$ and $P = 1.0000$). In Namibia on the contrary, we found a strong significant difference between the rate of nascent ($M = 0.2857$ $S = 0.4531$) and established entrepreneurs ($M = 0.0476$ $S = 0.2136$) ($t = 5.8499$ and $P = 0.0000$).

7 Discussion

In many aspects our results regarding what leads to entrepreneurial intentionality in the two countries is consistent with previous research. The “Self-perceived skill” is often found to be strongly correlated with nascent entrepreneurship (Davidsson, 1995). It is therefore not surprising to find that this variable had significant effects both in Sweden and Namibia. The “need for freedom and independence” is also a variable that, especially in western countries, is often found to be one of the strongest predictors of both nascent entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial intentionality (Carter, 2003; Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011). This is consistent with the fact that the effect was stronger in Sweden than in Namibia.

The third and last variable that showed significant effects for both countries was Job security. The negative correlation between entrepreneurial intentions and need for job security was also found by Rena (Haase & Lautenschläger, 2011) and is consistent with other studies describing the entrepreneur as a risk taker and a rebel that cares little about what others think (Davidsson, 2006). The effect seems stronger in Namibia than in Sweden, which perhaps can be explained by the differences in the level of welfare systems between the two countries.

Regarding the educational level, our results are not as consistent with previous studies. Most research shows a positive correlation between entrepreneurship and education. However, as already mentioned, some studies have found that the effect disappears after medium level of education (Honig, 2003) and Wagner even shows that the effect can become negative in the very highest education group (Wagner, 2004). Since our respondents can probably be regarded as belonging to the highest educational group our results do not contradict the findings in previous research, as it first may seem. Also, given the limited variation in the education variable one should probably be careful when drawing any conclusions from our results regarding the effect of education on entrepreneurial intentionality.

One of the most interesting results was that the perceived simplicity of bureaucracy had a significant positive effect on entrepreneurial intentions in Namibia. In Sweden this effect was not found. Perhaps this is because the bureaucracy is so simple that it is an irrelevant factor in Sweden; the Swedish respondents on average thought the bureaucratic process to be easier than the Namibians.

In Namibia however the effect was significant. This means that the more complex a person perceives the bureaucracy to be, the less likely is he or she to start a business. This is consistent with (Klapper, et al., 2006) showing that the harder it is to start a business the less people will do so. However, our findings might provide more understanding to why fewer companies are started the harder the bureaucratic process is. Is it because people try but fail due to the complexity or is it because people hear that it is hard and choose not to try? Our findings suggest that the latter might be part of the reason to why fewer companies are started. However, all this is based on the causality assumption that the perception affects the intention. It might of course also be the opposite way around, that people who are planning to start a business are better informed regarding the bureaucratic process and thus know that it is in fact not as complicated as many people think.

Regarding the factor “Perception of access to funding” the same arguments can be used for the causality. It might be that people with higher intentions have done their research and found that it is easier to get funding than most people think. However, it might also be that people’s perception of the access to funding really does affect their entrepreneurial intentions. This is not improbable since funding is no doubt important for entrepreneurs. They often rank it as one of the biggest hurdles to starting a business (Kerr & Nanda, 2009) and lack thereof is among the most common reasons to businesses discontinuation (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). However GEM studies show that most funding to entrepreneurs does not come from banks and institutions but from family and friends (Bygrave & Quill, 2006). It therefore seems irrational that the entrepreneurial intentions are

affected by the perceived access to funding, a factor that for most entrepreneurs is rather unimportant.

The big gap between the rate of nascent and established entrepreneurs among Namibian students is interesting and raises two different questions, why is the rate of nascent entrepreneurs so much higher than in Sweden? And why do the Namibian numbers drop so dramatically when going from nascent entrepreneurship to established entrepreneurs?

One explanation to the latter question might be that since they are all students they have simply not had time to get their business up and running yet, but that many of them will be established business owners within a few years. However this does not explain the difference compared to Swedish students unless starting a company in Namibia takes a very, very, long time compared to doing it in Sweden. It is not improbable that complex bureaucracy in Namibia does explain part of the effect. This is also consistent with the significant effect of the “Perception of bureaucratic simplicity” which implies that bureaucracy plays a bigger role in the eyes of Namibian entrepreneurs than in Swedish.

It might also be that most newly started companies in Namibia simply do not survive for very long. This would be consistent with the theory of business discontinuance explained in GEM 2012 saying that the favourable conditions for starting a business in a developed country means it is much easier to sustain it. Access to finance, an educated work force, sophisticated legal system and working institutions are all factors that make it easier to run a business and they are normally more developed in developed countries (Roland Xavier, et al., 2012). The same report also suggests an explanation to why the gap in the rate of nascent entrepreneurs is so big to start with; developed countries normally offer a greater variety of career opportunities and people are thus more likely to choose employment instead of self-employment compared to developing countries.

Another theory would of course be that there is a cultural difference in how people answer questions asked in our survey. Our questions were rather vague and allowed the respondent to define both what “in the process” really means and how probable something needs to be to be called “likely”. It is possible that Swedes are simply much more conservative in their definitions than the Namibians and that no real difference is to be found. A qualitative analysis with interviews would probably have shed light to what the respondents really meant by their answers.

Implications for policy makers

To policy makers, first of all the fact that entrepreneurs seem to be motivated by different factors should be of interest. This fact implies that a policy that has been successful in one country might not work in the other and it is important to know

why it was successful in order to predict how it will turn out in a country with other factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions and activity.

Assuming that our results regarding the variables “Perceived access to funding” and “Perceived bureaucratic simplicity” really implies that these perceptions affect the intentionality and not the other way around, our results reveal implications that could be interesting for policy makers. Since these result show that those who think it is hard to start a business will be less likely to do so, it is important that they are reached by the right information. If a policy change leads to a more efficient bureaucratic process, then this change might not have an effect in the entrepreneurial activity unless this it is also communicated properly.

When it comes to the perception of financing the same arguments could be raised to how this can be interesting for policy makers. If you don’t communicate improvements in the access to funding, then the improvements might not have as strong an effect as they would otherwise have had. But it also raises a different question interesting to policymakers who want to boost entrepreneurship. Why do potential entrepreneurs care so much about the access to funding from financial institutions when the research says that they are likely to get the majority or all of their funding from informal investors. If potentially successful entrepreneurs refrain from starting a business because of their perception of the financial institutions then that is a loss for the society that maybe could have been avoided by informing entrepreneurs of how important banks really are.

Furthermore, the fact that Job security was significantly negatively correlated to entrepreneurial intentions might also be of interest for policy makers. It implies that people who are more risk averse might avoid self-employment. If the objective is to get more people to start a business, making self-employment less risky by an increased welfare system might be the cure.

Implications for researchers

Assuming that our results indicate that many of the Namibians claiming to have high entrepreneurial intentions and/or being in the process of starting a business will in fact not become established entrepreneurs, there are reasons to question whether measuring entrepreneurial intentionality is relevant in Namibia. The reason for measuring intentionality is to better understand how entrepreneurship is generated. In our study it seems like the high intentions in Namibia do result in people trying to start a business, however very few seem to survive the start-up phase. This means that the correlation between entrepreneurial intentions and established entrepreneurs is probably rather weak and the objective of understanding what motivates future entrepreneurs might not be reached.

Perhaps there are not only differences in intentionality in developed and developing countries but there are also differences in how good a measurement it is and how good a predictor it is of long-lasting entrepreneurial activity.

8 Conclusion

Despite the fact that our data may be limited, we believe that we can draw some interesting conclusion with caution.

We found support for all three of our hypotheses, and the first thing that we can conclude is that there are differences in the level of entrepreneurial intentions between Swedish and Namibian Business students. Namibian students have significantly higher intentions than Swedish students.

Secondly, we found that the determinants of entrepreneurial intentions between Namibian and Swedish business students seem to differ at least partly. In Sweden, an individual's perception of the access to funding as well as his or her knowledge of programs supporting entrepreneurs both had positive effects on the entrepreneurial intentions. The number of years of higher education on the other hand had a negative effect in Sweden. Neither of these variables had significant effects in Namibia, however, we cannot be sure that they have no effect at all. On the other hand, the variable measuring a person's perception of bureaucratic simplicity had a significant effect in Namibia but not in Sweden. We also found three variables that had a significant effect in both countries.

Thirdly, we can conclude that the rate of nascent entrepreneurs is much higher in Namibia than in Sweden while the rate of established entrepreneurs is almost the same. In Namibia there is a significant difference between the rate of nascent and established entrepreneurs however no such difference exist in Sweden. We believe this implies that many people who intend to start a business in Namibia do not end up running a lasting venture.

9 Further research

We advise further research on whether entrepreneurial intentionality is a good way of understanding how entrepreneurship is generated in developing countries. We also advise more research on how people's perception of access to funding and the complexity of bureaucracy affect their entrepreneurial intentions and how this knowledge can be used in policy making.

Bibliography

- Acs, Z. J. & Storey, D. J., 2004. Introduction: Entrepreneurship and Economic Development. *Regional Studies*, , 38(8), pp. 871-877.
- Acs, Z. J. & Szerb, L., 2010. *The Global Entrepreneurship and Development Index (GEDI)*. London, DRUID, pp. 1-20.
- Ajzen, I., 1991. The Theory of Planned Behavior.. *Organizational Behavior & Human Decision Processes; Dec91, Vol. 50 Issue 2*, p. 179.
- Arenius, P. & Minniti, M., 2005. "Perceptual variables and nascent entrepreneurship,". *Small Business Economics*, vol. 24, p. 233-247.
- Autio, E. et al., 2001. Entrepreneurial Intent among Students in Scandinavia and in the USA. *Enterprise and Innovation Management Studies*, pp. Vol.2, No. 2, 2001 146-148.
- Baumol, J. W., 1968. Entrepreneurship in Economic theory. *American Economic Review*, Volume 58, p. 66.
- Baumol, W., 1993. 'Toward operational models of entrepreneurship'. p. 29-48.
- Bosma, N., Acs, Z., Erkkö, A. & Levie, J., 2008. GEM 2008 Executive report.
- Burke, E. N., FitzRoy, F. R. & Nolan, M. A., 2008. What makes die-hard entrepreneur? Beyond the "employee or entrepreneur" dichotomy. *Small Business Economics* 31, pp. 93-115.
- Byabashajja, W. & Katono, I., 2011. The impact of college entrepreneurial education on entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions to start a business in Uganda. *Journal of developmental Entrepreneurship*, 16(1), pp. 127-144.
- Bygrave, W. D. & Quill, M., 2006. *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2006 Financing Report*, s.l.: s.n.
- Carter, N. e. a. (., 2003. 'The career reasons of nascent entrepreneurs'. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), p. 13-39..
- Chu, H., Kara, M. & Orhan Benzing, C., 2008. An empirical study of Nigerian entrepreneurs: Success, Motivations, Problems and Stress. *International Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 8(2), pp. 1-5.
- Chu, H. M., Benzing, C. & McGee, C., 2007. Ghanaian and Kenyan Entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis of their motivations, success, characteristics and problems.. *Journal of developmental Entrepreneurship* Vol. 12, No. 3.
- Clerck, P. A. a. D. D., 2005. "A network-based approach on opportunity recognition,". *Small Business Economics*, p. 249-265.
- Comisson, E., 2012. *Effects and Impact of Entrepreneurship programmes in higher education*, Brussels: Entrepreneurship Unit.
- Cowen, T., 2003. Entrepreneurship, Austrian Economics, and the Quarrel Between Philosophy and Poetry. *Springer Science & Business Media*, 16(1), pp. 1-15.
- Davidsson, P., 1995. *Determinants of entrepreneurial intentions*. Piacenza, Italy, RENT XI Workshop, pp. 2-4.
- Davidsson, P., 2006. Nascent Entrepreneurship: Empirical Studies and Developments. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, 2(1), pp. 5-9.
- Davidsson, P. & Delmar, F., 2000. Where do they come from? Prevalence and characteristics of nascent entrepreneurs. " *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 12, pp. 1-23, 2000., p. 1-23.

- Drennan, J. & Saleh, M. A., 2008. Dynamics of entrepreneurship intentions of MBA students. An Asian Developing Country Perspective. Queensland University of technology, pp. 1-10.
- Eliason, G. & Henrekson, M., 2004. William J Baumol: An entrepreneurial economist on the economics of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, pp. 1-3, 5-6.
- Endres, A. & Woods, C. R., 2010. Schumpeter's "Conduct model of the dynamic entrepreneur" Nature scope and distinctiveness. *journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 20(4), p. 11.
- Fatoki, 2010. Graduate entrepreneurial intention in South Africa: motivations and obstacles. *International Journal of Business and Management, Vol 5, No 9*, pp. 87-98.
- Fueglistaller, U., Klandt, H. & Halter, F., 2006. *International Survey on Collegiate Entrepreneurship*, St Gallen: s.n.
- Gelman, A. & Stern, H., 2006. The Difference Between "Significant" and "Not Significant" is not itself. *The American Statistician*, November, 60(4), pp. 327-333.
- GINI Index, C. W. F. B., 5/5 2013. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2172.html>.
- Haase, H. & Lautenschläger, A., 2011. The entrepreneurial mind-set of university students: a cross-cultural comparison between Namibia and Germany. *International Journal of Education Economics and Development*, 2(2), pp. 10-22.
- Holcombe, R. G., 1998. Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth. *The quarterly journal of austrian economics*, 1(2), pp. 50-58.
- Honig, P. D. a. B. H., 2003. P. Davidsson and B. Honig, "The role of social and human capital among nascent entrepreneurs". *Journal of Business Venturing, vol 18, no 3*, pp. 301-331.
- Indarti, S. K. a. N., 2004. Entrepreneurial Intentions Among Indonesian and Norwegian students. *Journal of Enterprising Culture, Mar2004, Vol. 12 Issue 1,* pp. 55-78.
- Karali, S., 2013. The impact of entrepreneurship education programs on entrepreneurial intentions: An application of the theory of planned behavior. Erasmus University of Rotterdam, pp. 1-5.
- Kautonen, T., Gelderen, M. v. & Tornikoski, E., 2013. Predicting Entrepreneurial Behaviour: A Test of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Applied Economics, Vol. 45, No. 6,*
- Kerr, W. R. & Nanda, R., 2009. Financing Constraints and entrepreneurship. Harvard Business School, pp. 5-10.
- Kirzner, I. M., 1973. Competition and Entrepreneurship. In: Chicago: The university of Chicago Press, p. 39.
- Kirzner, I. M., 1997. Entrepreneurial Discovery and the Competitive Market Process. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35(1), pp. 60-85.
- Kirzner, I. M., 1999. Rationality and Economic Imperialism. p. 17.
- Klapper, L., Laeven, L. & Rajan, R., 2006. Entry Regulations as barrier to entrepreneurship. *Journal of financial economics* 82, pp. 591-629.
- Kolvereid, L. (., 1996. 'Organizational employment versus self-employment: reasons for career choice intentions'. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Vol. 20, No. 3*, p. 23-31.

- Kreps, D., 1997. Economics: The Current Position. *Daedalus*, pp. 126: 59-86..
- Mgaya, K. a. M. B., 2007. Attitudes of university students towards entrepreneurship. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, Vol 3 No.2*, pp. 196-206.
- Moriano, A. J. et al., 2011. A Cross-Cultural Approach to Understanding Entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Career Development*, 39(2), pp. 2-4.
- N. M. Carter, W. B. G. K. G. S. a. E. J. G., 2003. "The career reasons of nascent entrepreneurs,". *Journal of Business Venturing*, vol. 18, p. 13-29.
- Newman, A. F., 2007. Risk-Bearing Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 137(1), pp. 1-2.
- Noel, T. W., 2002. Effects of Entrepreneurial education on intents to open a business: An exploration study. *Journal of entrepreneurship education*, Volume 5, pp. 1-10.
- Plattner, I., 2009. 'Are university students psychologically ready for Entrepreneurship? A Botswana study. *African Journal of Business Management*, 3(7), p. 305-310.
- Praag, C. V., 1999. Some classical views on entrepreneurship. *De Economist*, 147(3), pp. 313-316 319-322.
- Ren, R. P. a. J., 2010. A comparative study of motivation and entrepreneurial intentionality: Chinese and American perspectives. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15(2), pp. 187-204.
- Reynolds, P. D., 1997. "Who starts new firms? Preliminary explorations of firms-ingestation". *Small Business Economics*, pp. 449-462.
- Roland Xavier, S. et al., 2012. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, 2012 Global Report. pp. 7-9, 12-16, 18, 20-29.
- Seymour, Ahmand, N. & Richard G., 2008. *Defining Entrepreneurial Activity*, s.l.: Organisation for economic cooperation and Development (OECD).
- Stel, A. v., Carree, M. & Thurik, R., 2004. *The effect of entrepreneurship on national economic growth: An analysis using the GEM database*. Babson Park, Babson College, Arthur M. Blank Center for Entrepreneurship.
- Tong, X. F., Tong, D. Y. K. & Loy, L. C., 2011. Factors influencing entrepreneurial intention among university students. pp. Vol 3, No 1 487-489.
- Turker, D. & Selcuk, S. S., 2009. Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students?. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 33(2), p. 142.
- Wagner, J., 2004. Nascent Entrepreneurs. *IZA DP No. 1293, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit, Bonn, Germany*, pp. 2-7.
- Wennekers, S. & Thurik, R., 1999. Linking Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13(1), pp. 27-31.
- Vivarelli, M., 2004. Are all potential entrepreneurs so good?. *Small Business Economics*, 23(1), pp. 41-44.
- Vivarelli, M., 2011. Baumol. W.J.: The microtheory of innovative entrepreneurship. *Journal of Economics* 103, pp. 199-202.
- Wooldridge, J. M., 2008. *Introductory econometrics, A modern Approach, 4th ed*, s.l.: South Western College.

10 Appendix

10.1 Tables

Shapiro-Wilk test for normality in the population error term:

Table 6: Swedish students

Shapiro-Wilk W		test for normal data				
Variable	Obs	W	V	z	Prob>z	
Sweden residuals	244	0.98927	1.904	1.497	0.06720	

Table 7: Namibian students

Shapiro-Wilk W		test for normal data				
Variable	Obs	W	V	z	Prob>z	
Namibian residuals	244	0.98791	2.147	1.775	0.03794	

Transforming dependent into logs:

Table: 8

Shapiro-Wilk W		test for normal data				
Variable	Obs	W	V	z	Prob>z	
log Namibia residuals	104	0.86926	11.154	5.362	0.00000	

Table: 9

Shapiro-Wilk W		test for normal data				
Variable	Obs	W	V	z	Prob>z	
log Sweden residuals	140	0.97675	2.550	2.115	0.01722	

As can be seen in table 8 and table 9 comparing with table 6 and 7, transforming the dependent variable into logs did not make it closer to a normal distribution.

Examining the correlation matrix for the data:

Table 10: Correlation matrix

	Years of higher education	Need for freedom	Need for job security	Need for higher income	Perceived skill	Fear of failure	Knowledge of programs	Perceived access to funding	Mom & Dad	Friends & classmates	Other acquaintances	Entrepreneurship courses taken	Good opportunity to start
Male	1												
Years of higher education	1												
Need for freedom	0,02	1											
Need for job security	-0,21	0,14	1										
Need for higher income	-0,04	0,38	0,24	1									
Perceived skill	0,20	0,18	0,12	0,07	1								
Fear of failure	0,13	0,08	-0,05	0,07	-0,04	1							
Knowledge of programs	0,11	0,01	0,00	-0,06	0,08	-0,12	1						
Perceived access to funding	0,00	-0,05	-0,13	-0,11	-0,07	0,01	-0,02	1					
Mom & Dad	-0,04	0,02	-0,06	0,00	-0,01	0,01	0,07	0,02	1				
Friends & classmates	0,22	-0,09	-0,39	-0,13	-0,09	0,04	0,13	0,22	0,02	1			
Other acquaintances	0,10	-0,11	-0,12	0,00	-0,05	0,02	0,09	0,13	-0,09	0,52	1		
Entrepreneurship courses taken	-0,04	0,17	0,15	0,12	0,14	-0,13	0,12	-0,18	0,06	-0,25	-0,10	1	
Good opportunity to start	0,07	0,12	-0,08	0,08	0,11	-0,05	0,07	0,28	0,01	0,22	0,07	-0,09	1
perceived bureaucratic simplicity	0,09	0,00	-0,17	-0,05	0,03	0,06	0,11	0,29	0,13	0,31	0,10	-0,16	0,29

Checking for multicollinearity using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). As can be seen in the tables we do not have a problem with multicollinearity since our VIF values are not larger than 10¹.

Table: 11

Likely-Sweden		
Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Friends & classmates	2,06	0,49
Other acquaintances	1,79	0,56
Good opportunity to start	1,35	0,74
Male	1,31	0,76
Need for higher income	1,27	0,79
Need for freedom	1,26	0,79
Perceived skill	1,25	0,8
Years of higher education	1,25	0,8
Perceived access to funding	1,22	0,82
Fear of failure	1,22	0,82
Knowledge of programs	1,18	0,84
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	1,18	0,85
Need for job security	1,16	0,86
Entrepreneurship courses taken	1,11	0,9
Mom & Dad	1,1	0,91
Mean VIF	1,31	

¹UCLA Institute for digital research and education. (13 May 2013).
<http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/webbooks/reg/chapter2/statareg2.htm>

Table: 12

Likely-Namibia		
Variable	VIF	1/VIF
Good opportunity to start	1,43	0,7
Need for freedom	1,36	0,73
Need for higher income	1,36	0,74
Friends & classmates	1,28	0,78
Perceived access to funding	1,25	0,8
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	1,23	0,81
Entrepreneurship courses taken	1,23	0,81
Perceived skill	1,22	0,82
Fear of failure	1,21	0,83
Other acquaintances	1,18	0,84
Mom & Dad	1,18	0,85
Male	1,16	0,86
Need for job security	1,16	0,86
Years of higher education	1,15	0,87
Knowledge of programs	1,07	0,93
Mean VIF	1,23	

Table 15: Combined regression Swedish and Namibian Respondents

VARIABLES	(1) Total
From Namibia	1.800*** (0.357)
Male	-0.101 (0.201)
Years of higher education	-0.118* (0.0686)
Need for freedom	0.260*** (0.0709)
Need for job security	-0.189** (0.0769)
Need for higher income	-0.198** (0.0869)
Perceived skill	0.246*** (0.0694)
Fear of failure	0.0738 (0.0535)
Knowledge of programs	0.186** (0.0880)
Perceived access to funding	0.0612 (0.0757)
Mom & Dad	0.174 (0.129)
Friends & classmates	-0.109 (0.151)
Other acquaintances	0.195 (0.188)
Entrepreneurship courses taken	-0.257 (0.250)
Perceived business opportunities	0.197** (0.0765)
Perceived bureaucratic simplicity	0.0687 (0.0704)
Constant	1.485** (0.739)
Observations	244
R-squared	0.351

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

10.2 Questionnaire

Attitudes towards entrepreneurship

Q1 Which University do you go to?

- ☐ Polytechnic of Namibia
- ☐ Stockholm School of Economics
- ☐ University of Namibia

Q2 How many years of university studies have you completed?

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4
- ☐ 5 or more

Q3 Gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Q4 What year were you born? (E.g. 1988)

.....

Q5 Would you like to start your own business?

- ☐ Definitely yes
- ☐ Probably yes
- ☐ Maybe
- ☐ Probably not
- ☐ Definitely not

Q6 How likely is it that you will start your own business within 5 years?

- ☐ Very Unlikely
- ☐ Unlikely
- ☐ Somewhat Unlikely
- ☐ Undecided
- ☐ Somewhat Likely
- ☐ Likely
- ☐ Very Likely

Q7 How important/unimportant are the following factors when choosing your professional career?

	Not at all Important	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important
The need of freedom and independence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Earnings -The chance of high income	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Career opportunities- The chances of advancements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Social recognition and status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pursuit of influence and power	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Self-realization- realizing my own ideas	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Choosing the same profession as my parents	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Job security- Probability of keeping the job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8 Please fill in to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I have the knowledge, skill and experience required to start a new business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fear of failure is preventing me from starting a new business	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have been encouraged to start my own business by my school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q9 Do you know of any program (private or governmental) that helps entrepreneurs start up and run their business? (If "No" skip next question)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q10 How many such entrepreneurship programs do you know about?

- ☐ 1
- ☐ 2
- ☐ 3
- ☐ 4 or more

Q11 At the moment, are you in the process of starting up your own company?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q12 Have you already started your own company? (If "No" skip next question)

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q13 Are you still running your own company?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q14 Do you know someone personally who has started their own business?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q15 Has anyone of the following started their own business? Several choices possible

- ☐ Mom
- ☐ Dad
- ☐ Sibling
- ☐ Other relative
- ☐ Friend
- ☐ Person from school
- ☐ Other acquaintance

Q16 In general, what would you say that an entrepreneur's social status is?

- ☐ Very Bad
- ☐ Bad
- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Neither Good nor Bad
- ☐ Fair
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Very Good

Q17 Have you attended any entrepreneurial courses?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

How difficult/easy do you believe it is for entrepreneurs in your country to get funding from investors and institutions?

- ☐ Very Difficult
- ☐ Difficult
- ☐ Somewhat Difficult
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat Easy
- ☐ Easy
- ☐ Very Easy

Q18 Please fill in to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewh at Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Somewh at Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Don't know
Where you live, those starting a new business have a high level of status and respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where you live, most people consider starting a new business a desirable career choice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where you live, most people who started their own business did so because they could not find a job	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where you live, there will be good opportunities for starting a business in the next 6 months	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Where you live, government is trustworthy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 How complicated/simple do think the process is when starting up your own company?

- ☐ Very Complicated
- ☐ Complicated
- ☐ Somewhat Complicated
- ☐ Neutral
- ☐ Somewhat simple
- ☐ Simple
- ☐ Very Simple

Q20 Have you heard about Global Business Labs?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q21 Do you know what Global Business Labs do?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

