

The Influence of Family Background and Motivation on Entrepreneurship Development in Zimbabwe

Brian Hove¹, Michael Kamoyo², Dr Tinashe Ruvinga³ and Nhamo Manuel⁴

^{1,2,3}Chinhoyi University of Technology, Department of Marketing

⁴Chinhoyi University of Technology, Department of Retail Management

¹bhove@cut.ac.zw, ²mkamoyo@cut.ac.zw, ³truvinga@cut.ac.zw,

⁴nmanuel@cut.ac.zw

Abstract

The research sought to determine how family background and motivation influence entrepreneurship development in Zimbabwe. Purposive sampling was used to select 200 family business entrepreneurs. The study confirms that family social class is an important determinant of entrepreneurial decision while having a village childhood background is not a barrier to entrepreneurship entry. Company founders tended to be well-educated. On the other hand, entrepreneurs were found to be motivated by the need for self-realization and economic security, the need for greater business achievement, the need for institutional power, and need for social capital factor. However, we find no tendency for the motivators driving family business formation to change when economic conditions changes. We recommend for an education policy that emphasise more on developing entrepreneurship talent and that government make an attempt to ensure an enabling environment for entrepreneurship development by maintaining the socioeconomic (middle) class. There is also need for a well-crafted family entrepreneurship development program to support family business succession planning for sustainable family entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe.

Keywords: *entrepreneurship, family background, influence, motivation, succession.*

1. Introduction

Zimbabwe is still confounded by prohibitive barriers to entrepreneurship development. Family entrepreneurship which can be viewed as a key self-employment strategy with enormous potential to uplift communities economically is still retarded by structural constraints. Given that large industrial capital is diminishing in Zimbabwe and unemployment is rising, a well-crafted family entrepreneurship development programme can play a significant role in stimulating economic growth, propping up the failing state-owned enterprises and empower the disadvantaged segment of the population (Abimbola and Agboola, 2011). In this regard, understanding family background factors that motivate entrepreneurship is an initial step towards developing a sound policy for family business development.

¹ Correspondent author

While in developing countries entrepreneurship is the least studied economic and social phenomenon, it is without exception that Zimbabwe has a huge gap in entrepreneurship literature (Lingelbach et al. 2005). It is not known how the current generation of Zimbabwean entrepreneurs are being influenced by their parents' entrepreneurship or social status and how their decisions are likely to change with shifts in economic environment. Without a better understanding of how the interaction of family background factors and changing economic conditions influence entrepreneurs' motivation structure, government struggles to provide the correct policy interventions.

Zimbabwe is struggling to recover from decades of economic malaise, its effort to mobilise both internal and external entrepreneurial resources for development is yielding disappointing results (Hawkins and Ndlela, 2009). The impact of the 1999 to 2008 economic crisis is still frustrating entrepreneurship development efforts, with the combined effects of the poorly resourced Fast Track Land Reform Programme, economic sanctions, droughts, hyperinflation and macroeconomic policy implementation failures, still retarding the success of existing and new start-ups (Kamoyo, 2011 and Moyo, 2011). In fact, the greatest predicament facing policy-makers are diminishing foreign and private sector entrepreneurship capital, accelerating de-industrialisation with estimated 711 companies having closed shop between 2011 and 2013, and 149 firms having made liquidation applications with the High Court in 2013 (Gumbe and Chaneta, 2014). Additionally, formal employment has been fast shrinking having dropped by 40.3% between 1998 and 2004 from 1.4 million to 998 000 (Raftopoulos, 2009). Capacity utilisation in the manufacturing sector was only 38% in 2013 according to the Confederation of Zimbabwe Industries (CZI) report of 2013.

The disturbing fact is that, this economic quandary is occurring at a time when government is emphasising on the need for entrepreneurship development. This is also despite the liberal economic reforms of the early 1990s under the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP) that were supposed to attract foreign direct investment (FDI) and competition to rejuvenate the economy (Hawkins and Ndlela, 2009), expand economic opportunities for growth, prosperity and unlocking job opportunities following the abolishment of state monopolies to ensure competitive market equilibrium (Mlambo, 2000). The liberalisation was expected to promote private sector participation and stimulate small enterprise development through economic empowerment and government subsidy programmes. However, the results were disappointing and dismal (Gumbe and Chaneta, 2014). The economy continued to experience severe loss of productivity, efficiency and competitiveness, with a sharp decline in capital formation, causing unemployment to rise to extremely high levels in excess of 60% of labour force (Hawkins, 2012).

Considering the economic doldrums currently confronting Zimbabwe, inculcating entrepreneurship spirit would be imperative. This requires developing an effective family entrepreneurship strategy that is based on a thorough understanding of behavioural characteristics of family entrepreneurs.

1.1 Objectives

This study sought to fill in some of the information gaps about entrepreneurs by:

- a) Determining how family background factors like socio-economic, educational and parental entrepreneurship status helps to shape the current crop of entrepreneurs in Zimbabwe.
- b) Establishing what motivates entrepreneurs to do what they do.
- c) Exploring how the Zimbabwean macroeconomic environment affected entrepreneurs' motivational structure as well as the backgrounds (socio-economic, educational, and familial) of entrepreneurs.

An understanding of these information gaps will lead to policy recommendations that address entrepreneurship challenges according to the specific entrepreneurial characteristics.

2. Literature review

Families as economic units undertake investment in physical and human capital for members and as cultural institutions promote socialisation of children and human capital formation. The formation can be influenced by parents' occupational skills and experiences, mentalities, family intergenerational interactions, education and behavioural attitudes on socio-economic development (Sato and Li, 2013).

2.1 Parental experience and family entrepreneurship

The fundamental proposition is that entrepreneurial parents enhance the process of their children's human capital formation through human capital transfer over generations. Entrepreneurs can then be viewed as 'family products' due to parental influence, with the probability of one owning a business increasing with family background in business ownership (Aldrich and Cliff 2003; Kirkwood, 2009). Parents as role models shape children's perceptions on entrepreneurial career by exposing them to business opportunities with a lasting impact on their career choices (Schindehutte et al, 2003; Scherer et al., 1989., Bandura, 1986; Krumboltz, Michael, and Jones, 1976).

On the other hand, the closure proposition maintains that parents transfer entrepreneurial resources (financial or social), in a way that helps children to overcome entrepreneurship entry barriers. While exposure encourages children to try to enter into entrepreneurship, closure improves the likelihood that they will succeed upon entry into entrepreneurship (Sorenson, 2006). Thus, both the exposure and closure propositions associate the motivation for entering into entrepreneurship with occupational experiences of parents and family position in the social strata like having parent entrepreneurs and sibling entrepreneurs (Dombrovsky and Welter, 2006; Sato and Li, 2013).

Cooper and Drunkelberg (1987) using US data found that entrepreneurs are more likely to come from families with entrepreneurs than non-entrepreneurs, while Ohe, et al. (1991) corroborates this by revealing that 25% of entrepreneurs in Japan had parents who were also entrepreneurs. In Sweden Lindquist et al. (2015)

noted that entrepreneurs' children have a 60% likelihood of becoming entrepreneurs themselves than others, because entrepreneurship background transfers knowledge, skills, self-confidence and positive attitudes towards family business. Thus parents' experiences of self-employment have positive impacts on the likelihood of self-employment of the off-spring generation. However, Finnie and Laporte, (2003) noted that self-employment tends to be more prevalent among men than women with 20% of men compared to 12.5% for women being self-employed.

2.2 Education and previous work experience

There is no consensus among researchers on whether entrepreneurial character is a product of educational success or an organisational product. On one side entrepreneurs are viewed as more educated, with knowledge of more foreign languages (Dombrovsky and Welter, 2006). Wadhwa et al (2009) using US company data noted that, company founders tend to be middle-aged, better educated and more entrepreneurial than their parents. Education plays an important role in the development of entrepreneurship by influencing both returns and entrepreneurial ability (Naudé, 2008; Burke, et al, 2002; Barba-Sanchez and Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2012).

On the other hand, Brockhaus, (1982) noted that entrepreneurs lack formal qualifications but succeed upon hiring managers who are more formally educated than entrepreneurs themselves. This supports the popular myth of college drop-out entrepreneurs. Freeman (1986), on the other hand, views most entrepreneurs as former employees of established firms and hence are 'organizational products'. Experience helps them to get knowledge about useful contacts, suppliers and expose them to potential markets (Audia and Rider, 2005; Shepherd et al, 2000), mobilise financial and human resources (Stuart and Sorenson, 2003). Despite the seemingly different perspectives on the classification of entrepreneurs, it is the interaction between education attributes and past working experience that drives entrepreneurship success, while motivational factors are integral in shaping entry decision.

2.3 Motivation and entrepreneurship

Theories that disregard the role of motivational factors in the creation of new organizations should be regarded as incomplete (Segal et al, 2005). According to the "pull" theory, individuals are attracted into entrepreneurial activities seeking independence, self-fulfilment, the need to build wealth, own a company, start-up culture, capitalizing on a business idea and achieving other desirable outcomes (Gilad and Levine, 1986; Wadhwa et al, 2009). This can be motivated by inspiration from neighbours, friends or relatives, family members, and role models that are already involved in enterprise management (Dollinger, 1999). Barba-Sanchez and Atienza-Sahuquillo (2012), Brockhaus and Horwitz (1986), Herron and Robinson (1993) concurred that entrepreneurs are motivated by the need for competition, achievement, affiliation, power and a tolerance for ambiguity, a willingness to take risks, preferences for innovation, and proactiveness or persistence. On the other hand, the "push" theory argues that

individuals are pushed into entrepreneurship by negative external forces, such as job dissatisfaction, difficulty finding employment, insufficient salary, or inflexible work schedule (Keeble et al., 1992; Orhan and Scott, 2001).

However, empirical evidence has shown that it is a combination of pull and push factors that drive entrepreneurship ventures. Lau and Chan (1996), McManus, (2001) and Benzing et.al, (2009) have shown that autonomy, achievement, making money, a desire to innovate, actual or threatened redundancy, making use of skills acquired, the desire to exploit market opportunities, frustration with the last job or career, social mobility and a resistance to geographical mobility are important decision factors in becoming an entrepreneur. Kuratko, Hornsby and Naffziger (1997) and Robichaud, McGraw and Roger (2001) using entrepreneurs from North America found that extrinsic rewards, intrinsic rewards, autonomy and family security played an important role on entrepreneurs' business success and motivation. Whereas Benzing, Chu and Szabo (2005) found that job security and income needs were strong motivators than personal needs and self-satisfaction in Romania, entrepreneurs in India were mostly motivated by the desire for autonomy and to increase income (Benzing and Chu 2005). Bewayo (1995) found that Ugandan entrepreneurs are motivated by "making money". However, Chu et al (2007) noted that entrepreneurs in Kenya and Ghana are motivated by the desire to increase income and provide self-employment.

2.4 Socioeconomic status

The effect of social class was addressed by Newman (2007) who noted that the wealthy class is more likely to dominate entrepreneurship, as they assume more risk whereas extremely poor families are naturally excluded from entrepreneurial activities because they are perceived to be risk averse. Banerjee and Duflo (2007) observed that, extremely poor families, living on less than US\$1 per day are psychologically reluctant to venture into income generating projects. Hence, extreme poverty is a significant barrier to entrepreneurship (Wadwa et al, 2009). Sato and Li (2013) noted that the collapse of the socialist regime in China culminated into the disturbance of inter-generational transmission of economic status, with wealth groups before the socialist regime moving to the lower economic status and the poor and lower-middle peasant moving to the top of the pyramid following the land reform that redistributed resources.

Giannetti and Simonov (2004) pointed out that governments can foster an 'entrepreneurial culture' in a society as a way to raise productive entrepreneurship by encouraging role models. However, Licht (2007) has argued that because many entrepreneurs are motivated by non-pecuniary gains, policy efforts to stimulate entrepreneurial entry by reducing the costs of exit may not be effective. Opafunso and Okhankhuele (2014) further confirm this arguing that management's failure to consistently provide motivational packages and the general lack of government support obstructs the development of small and medium scale enterprises.

3. Methodology

The research adopted a quantitative approach guided by the positivist philosophical thought. The study contents that reality is measurable (Antwi and

Hamza, 2015) and, purposive sampling was adopted for a sample of 200 SMEs. For Zimbabwe’s SME sector, not much is known about what motivates entrepreneurs to do what they do, how family background factors like socio-economic, educational and parental entrepreneurship status help to shape the current crop of entrepreneurs and how the Zimbabwean macroeconomic environment affected entrepreneurs’ motivational structure. Hence, a 17-item structured questionnaire was used to explore educational, social status, family entrepreneurial background and motivational factors that influence entrepreneurial decisions. The respondents comprised of company founders and non-founders who were asked about their backgrounds and experiences in launching companies. The questionnaires also required the owners to rank how motivators like, wanted to capitalise on a business idea, wanted to build wealth, had sufficient capital, always wanted to form own company, inability to find a formal job, the need for independent work, co-founder encouraged me and entrepreneurial role model encouraged me, influenced then to be entrepreneurs.

In order to capture any change in motivation due to economic transition, the enterprises were classified into those that were established during the pre-crisis period, crisis period and post-crisis period. All businesses whose lifespan extended to more than 15 years were classified as having been formed before 1999 the pre-crisis period, the crisis period constituted those businesses whose lifespan was between 6 and 15 years (and were formed between 2000 and 2008) and those that were less than 6 years are formed during the post-crisis period after 2008. This allowed the researchers to analyse behavioural effects of family characteristics like parental social status, entrepreneur’s childhood background and inter-generational business succession attributes during economic transition.

3.1 Results

The study sought to establish how family background and motivation influence entrepreneurship development in Zimbabwe. Descriptive statistics and one-way analysis of variance were used to analyse the data.

3.1.1 Demography, education and work experience

Table 1 shows the demographic characteristics of entrepreneurs.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of entrepreneurs

Start-up status	Gender		Marital status		Age of business owner			
	M	F	M	S	18-25	26-35	36-45	Above 45
Yes	6	34	66	30	16	55	16	9
No	3	66	81	23	42	54	7	1
N	10	100	147	53	58	109	23	10

Highest Educational qualification of business owner										
Start-up status	O' level	VCT	Diploma	Degree	Professional	Total				
Yes	27	3	13	51	2	96				
No	19	8	35	25	16	104				
N	46	11	48	77	18	200				
Parents' educational characteristics										
Start-up status	Father					Mother				
	NF	PE	SE	VCT	TE	NF	PE	SE	VCT	TE
Yes	8	14	22	37	15	3	28	25	34	6
No	0	26	35	12	31	1	34	48	7	14
N	8	40	57	49	46	4	62	73	41	20
Working experience prior to starting business										
Start-up status	1-2 yrs	3-5 yrs	> 5 yrs	never worked	Total					
Yes	17	22	55	2	96					
No	37	30	36	1	104					
N	54	52	91	3	200					

3.1.1.1 Demography

Gender, marital status and age characteristics of entrepreneurs were considered and are summarized on Table 1 above. Start-up entrepreneurs are defined by YES and those defined by NO inherited their businesses either from parents or brothers and sisters. Only 48% of the respondents indicated that their businesses are start-up, while 52% indicated that they inherited from their parents or siblings. Given that 52% of the surveyed entrepreneurs inherited businesses, inter-generational succession of businesses is still very important aspect of family entrepreneurship development. Table 2, under family members who started business, indicates that parents to child business transmission with 72 (69%) respondents is the dominant form of family business transfer and siblings to siblings has 31% of the respondents. More importantly the middle class has the highest rate of intergenerational business transfers with 66% of the entrepreneurs. Overallly the study showed that the level of family business succession is higher than new ventures created by 1.08 times.

While 23(11.5%) of the respondents were between 36-45 years of age, 10(5%) were over 45 years, the majority of business owners 109(54.5%) were within the age bracket of 26–35 years which is the most socio-economically active age category. It is also at this age category that most start-up entrepreneurs are concentrated consisting of 57.3% in this study, of them and 51.9% of those who inherited businesses also falling into this category. It is also clear that 147 (73.5%) of business owners were married leaving 53(26.5%) as single. However, the

number of married start-up entrepreneurs is lower relative to those who had pioneers in the family while the number of single pioneer entrepreneurs is more than the number of entrepreneurs with pioneers in the family. This reflect the role parents with business background play in making it is easier for their children to understand the challenges in business (Ismail, Zain and Ahmed, 2006).

3.1.1.2 Education

Most business founders are well-educated with more than 71% having attained tertiary qualifications, of which 38.5% are holders of bachelor’s degrees, while 24% have diplomas, 9% professional qualifications and 5.5% have vocational training. However, only 23% have had completed high school at the time of founding their business. The study also noted that current entrepreneurs are also more educated than their parents with an average of 23% and 10% of entrepreneurs’ fathers and mothers having tertiary education respectively against 71% for current entrepreneurs. Thus education is one of the key components of entrepreneurship development in Zimbabwe. This result and conclusion is consistent with Wadwa et al, (2009) and Naudé (2008), Burke, et al (2002), Barba-Sanchez and Atienza-Sahuquillo (2012) who posit that education plays an important role in the development of entrepreneurship by influencing both returns and entrepreneurial ability respectively.

3.1.1.3 Work experience

In the study, there was a general observation that most entrepreneurs had significant industrial experience prior to starting their companies. About 98.5% of respondents indicated that they had had at least one year working experience in industry, with 71.5% having worked for more than three years and a meagre 1.5% having confessed that they do not have working experience from other companies. However, 80% of the pioneer entrepreneurs pointed out that they had had more than 3 years of work experience prior to establishing their own business. From the foregoing statistical data, it shows that most of Zimbabwe’s entrepreneurs come from existing workforce and not from college, implying that Zimbabwe’s entrepreneurs are organisational products. The result support findings by Bhaduri and Worch (2008) and Luber, et. al (2000) who observed experience increases potential entrepreneurs’ chances of success, if they pursue a new business related to earlier business experiences.

3.2 Social status and business formation by transitional periods

The highest proportion of entrepreneurs came from the middle class, with 66.3% of them having inherited the business and 80.2% of them having had start-up ventures falling in this category. This is followed by lower class with 28.8% of those who inherited businesses and 19.8% of start-up entrepreneurs and only 4.8% of those who inherited businesses claimed to be from the upper class.

Table 2: Social Status

		Social status			
Started business	Childhood background	upper class	middle class	lower class	n

No	City	3.8%	26.9%	1.0%	33
	Town	1.0%	33.7%	16.3%	53
	Village	.0%	5.8%	11.5%	18
	Total	4.8%	66.3%	28.8%	104
Yes	City		31.3%	.0%	30
	Town		12.5%	6.3%	18
	Village		36.5%	13.5%	48
	Total		80.2%	19.8%	96
Family member who started business					
	Family member	upper class	middle class	lower class	n
No	Parents	2.9%	46.2%	20.2%	72
	brothers/sister	1.9%	20.2%	8.7%	32
	Total	4.8%	66.3%	28.8%	104

Source: Survey Data

This highlights that family entrepreneurial businesses are most important to income and livelihood opportunities for the middle and lower income earners.

Table 3: Family business formation by transitional periods

Family members who started a business before you					
Did you start the business?		Post Crisis period	Crisis period	Pre-crisis period	n
No	Parents	2.9	34.6	31.7	72
	brother s/sister	.0	18.3	12.5	32
	Total	2.9	52.9	44.2	104
Yes	Self-started	2.1	49.0	49.0	96
Parental social class					
Did you start the business		Post Crisis period	Crisis period	Pre-crisis period	n
No	upper class	.0%	1.0%	3.8%	5
	middle class	1.9%	38.5%	26.0%	69
	lower class	1.0%	13.5%	14.4%	30
	Total%	2.9%	52.9%	44.2%	104
Yes	middle class	.0%	41.7%	38.5%	77
	lower class	2.1%	7.3%	10.4%	19
	Total%	2.0%	49.0%	49.0%	96
Childhood background					

Did you start the business		Post Crisis period	Crisis period	Pre-crisis period	n
No	City	1.9%	16.3%	13.5%	33
	Town	1.0%	25.0%	25.0%	53
	Village	.0%	11.5%	5.8%	18
	Total	2.9%	52.9%	44.2%	104
Yes	City	.0%	15.6%	15.6%	30
	Town	1.0%	13.5%	4.2%	18
	Village	1.0%	19.9%	29.2%	48
	Total	2.0%	49.0%	49.0%	96

Table 3 indicates that 44.2% of the businesses were transferred from one generation to another and 49% of the start-ups were established during the pre-crisis period before 1999. About 52.9% of inherited business and another 49% of start-ups were formed during the crisis period between 2000 and 2008, only very 2.9% of the inherited and 2.1 % of start-ups were formed in the post-crisis period. This distribution of business formation reflects that economic transition act as an important stimulus to venture creation since the proportion of businesses formed during this period is 1.2 times more than those that were formed during the pre-crisis period and 18 times more than those that were formed in the post crisis period.

Furthermore, findings from this study show that family social class plays an important role in determining the distribution of business ownership and start-up rates. The middle class was shown to constitute the biggest proportion of business founders with 38.5% of the inherited businesses formed during the crisis period, 26% during the pre-crisis and 1.9% during the post-crisis periods. It also emerged that for start-ups 41.7% were formed during the crisis and 38.5% during the pre-crisis period. However, the fact that 44.2% of inherited businesses and 49% of start-ups were able to survive the crisis period is an indicator of good survival rate inherent with the family owned business. The view that family businesses can survive economic turbulence is consistent with Braun and Latham's (2009) findings that family firms tend to be able to survive poor economic (economic downturn or recession) conditions than nonfamily businesses in their United States study.

It also came to the fore that 52.9% of the businesses were inherited companies formed during the crisis period, with 25% having been formed by family members who have a town childhood background, and 16.3% with a city childhood background. However, the highest proportion of start-up companies formed during the crisis and pre-crisis periods had 19.9% and 29.2% of the founders having a village background respectively. Village background at 29.2% is more than half of the total 49% of started-up entrepreneurs during the pre-crisis era. This implies that village childhood background although traditionally associated with poverty and usually humbleness, is also a key factor for successful entrepreneurship and is not itself a barrier to entrepreneurship entry.

3.3 Motivation factors

Table 4 presents a summary of the motivational factors by family background with respect to parental social status. Each of the categories were motivated by the desire by entrepreneurs to capitalise on a business idea, the need to build wealth and to form own company with the mean responses that are all below 3. Only entrepreneurs with parents of upper class background started business because they had sufficient capital at their disposal with a mean response of 2.20, the lower and middle class were neutral with mean responses of 3.22 and 3.64 respectively. It emerged that start-up culture is only a motivator for lower classes herein represented by a mean response of 2.63 with the other categories being neutral.

Table 4: Motivational factors mean responses

Parental Social class	Lower n=49		Middle n=146		Upper n=5	
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Wanted to build wealth	1.92	.838	1.89	.983	2.20	1.095
Had sufficient capital	3.22	1.246	3.64	.938	2.20	1.095
Capitalize on a business idea	2.08	.702	1.71	.813	2.20	1.304
Start-up company culture	2.63	.883	3.05	1.131	3.80	1.095
Form own company	2.88	1.130	2.10	1.075	2.80	.837
Independent work	3.27	1.169	2.86	1.232	2.20	1.789
Inability to find employment	3.49	1.609	4.08	1.090	4.00	.000
Co-founder encouraged me	3.57	1.190	3.61	1.267	3.80	1.095
Entrepreneurial friend	3.29	1.443	3.02	1.372	2.80	1.095
Childhood background	City n=63		Village n=66		Town n=71	
Wanted to build wealth	1.83	.752	2.20	1.243	1.70	.705
Had sufficient capital	3.48	.859	3.79	1.074	3.27	1.146
Capitalize on a business idea	1.67	.967	1.71	.548	2.04	.836
Start-up culture appealed to me	2.79	1.080	3.05	1.208	3.06	.984
Form own company	2.25	.967	1.92	1.168	2.72	1.111
independent	2.78	1.211	2.82	1.369	3.20	1.116

work						
Inability to find employment	4.13	.635	3.85	1.384	3.83	1.493
Co-founder encouraged me	3.54	1.216	3.26	1.351	3.99	1.049
Entrepreneurial friend encouraged me	3.10	1.364	2.86	1.498	3.27	1.276
Transitional periods	Pre-crisis n=93		Crisis n=102		Post-Crisis n=5	
Wanted to build wealth	1.92	.935	1.90	.980	1.60	.548
Had sufficient capital	3.53	1.069	3.53	1.031	2.60	1.140
To capitalise on a business idea	1.88	.806	1.76	.823	1.60	.894
Start-up culture inspired me	2.98	1.142	2.97	1.057	2.80	1.095
Form own company appealed to me	2.34	1.175	2.26	1.107	2.60	.894
Independent work appealed to me	2.95	1.263	2.92	1.216	3.20	1.643
Inability to find formal employment	3.91	1.265	3.98	1.243	3.20	.837
Co-founder encouraged me	3.47	1.265	3.75	1.191	3.20	1.643
Entrepreneurial friend encouraged me	3.01	1.371	3.19	1.391	2.20	1.304

Source: Survey Data; Note 1= Strongly Agree, 2= Agree, 3= Neutral, 4=Disagree, 5= Strongly Disagree

It came up from the study that the key motivators of an entrepreneur's childhood background indicated that the need to build wealth, capitalise on a business idea and the need to form own company were cited by all entrepreneurs from the 3 childhood social structure comprising background city, village and town with mean responses less than 3. Entrepreneurs from the three childhood background were all neutral on having sufficient capital and co-founder encouraged me, with mean responses that are between 3 and 4. Start-up culture was only cited by entrepreneurs with city background with a mean response of 2.79, while those with village and town background were neutral. Entrepreneurs with city background disagreed with the assertion that failure to find formal employment forced them to venture into family businesses and this was presented with a mean response of 4.13, while those with village and town background were neutral on

this aspect. Only those with village background agreed that encouragement from entrepreneurial friends was a source of motivation while entrepreneurs with city and town background remained neutral.

The results also confirm that the desire to build wealth, need to capitalise on a business idea, start-up culture and the need to form own company were key motivators that drove entrepreneurship during the pre-crisis, crisis and post-crisis periods with responses below 3. While the need for independent work was only a motivator to entrepreneurs who formed their companies during the pre-crisis and crisis periods, while those who formed in the post crisis were neutral. Having sufficient capital and entrepreneurial friend encouragement were only cited as a motivator by entrepreneurs who formed their business during the post-crisis period, while those for the crisis and pre-crisis periods were neutral. However, all entrepreneurs were neutral on the co-founder and entrepreneurial friend encouragement as motivators to start the businesses during the pre-crisis, crisis and post-crisis periods.

3.3.1 Impact of Economic transition on motivational factors (Variance analysis)

The next step was to use the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to statistically test for the equality of mean responses. The approach first tested whether the data satisfies the homogeneity of variance assumption and the results are present on Table 5. There is violation of homogeneity assumption on 6 factors under family social class, with variables like wanted to build wealth, had sufficient capital, wanted to capitalise on a business idea, always wanted to form own company, the need for independent work and entrepreneurial friend encouraged me failing to satisfy the assumption.

Table 5: Levene Test of homogeneity of variance

	Social class			Transitional periods			Childhood background		
	Statistic	df1	df2	Statistic	df1	df2	Statistic	df1	df2
Wanted to build wealth	6.887***	2	197	0.239	2	197	0.476	2	197
Had sufficient capital	5.651***	2	197	0.019	2	197	7.64***	2	197
Capitaliz e on a business idea	4.809***	2	197	0.64	2	197	4.924** *	2	197
Start-up	1.533	2	197	1.509	2	197	1.872	2	197

company culture									
Form own company	3.948 **	2	197	1.053	2	197	1.282	2	197
Independent work	5.159 ***	2	197	0.619	2	197	2.642	2	197
Inability to find employment	16.66 3	2	197	0.206	2	197	19.297	2	197
Co-founder encouraged me	12.13 1	2	197	1.685	2	197	0.89	2	197
Entrepreneurial friend	3.697 **	2	197	0.536	2	197	1.35	2	197

Similarly, two factors which are whether the respondent had sufficient capital and wanted to capitalise on a business idea, failed to satisfy the assumption under entrepreneur's childhood background. In all other cases the homogeneity assumption was met. Where the homogeneity assumption was satisfied the one-way ANOVA and the Tukey HSD comparison were used to test on the equality of mean responses for each of the given factors. While the Welch robust equality of means and the Games-Howell comparison were used where unequal variance was assumed.

Based on Table 6 overleaf, the researchers found no evidence to suggest that the motivational factors vary significantly, over the economic transitional period. There was also no evidence of tendency for the motivators driving family business formation to change when economic conditions changes. The reason wanted to build wealth, had sufficient capital, need to capitalise on a business idea, start-up culture, want to form own business, need for independent work, inability to find formal employment, co-founder encouraged me and entrepreneurial friend encouraged me they are all seem to influence family entrepreneurship equally regardless of the changing macroeconomic environment.

However, the study found that there was evidence to suggest that motivators such as sufficient capital, the need to capitalise on a business idea, start-up culture, the desire to form own business and inability to find formal employment significantly varies according to entrepreneur childhood background.

Table 6 shows that on the desire to build wealth there was an observed variation between entrepreneurs with a village and those with a town background. For those

who expressed the desire to want to form own company, those with town background differed significantly from

Table 6: Results for ANOVA and the robust test equality of means

One Way ANOVA						
	Transitional Periods		Childhood background		Social class	
	F	Sig.	F	Sig.	F	Sig.
Wanted to build wealth	.277	.758	0.262	0.77	5.14	0.007
Had sufficient capital	1.900	.152	7.232	0.001	4.324	0.015
Wanted to capitalize on a business idea	.678	.509	4.492	0.012	4.482	0.012
Start-up company culture appealed to me	.063	.939	4.355	0.014	1.201	0.303
Have always wanted to form my own company	.286	.752	9.894	0.000		
Independent work	.121	.886	2.955	0.054	2.408	0.093
Inability to find traditional employment	.949	.389	4.188	0.017	1.154	0.317
Co-founder encouraged me	1.451	.237	0.08	0.923	6.356	0.002
An entrepreneurial friend was a role model	1.436	.240	0.778	0.461	1.471	0.232
df1, df2	2, 197		2, 197		2; 197	
Robust test of equality of means						
	Family social class			Childhood background		
	Statistic	df1	df2	Statistic	df1	df2
Wanted to build wealth	3.973**	2	124.477	0.192	2	10.604
Had sufficient capital	3.825**	2	130.649	5.828**	2	10.465
Capitalize on a business idea	4.39**	2	122.761	4.581**	2	10.411
Form my own company	8.458	2	130.764	9.195***	2	10.987
Independent work	2.655	2	128.849	2.483	2	10.421

those with village and city background, on co-founder encouraged me those with town background differs from those with village background. Those with town and village background expressed differences on the possession of sufficient

capital as a motivator of business. While on wanted to capitalise on business idea those with town background differs from those with city and village background.

Table 7 also shows that motivators like wanted to build wealth, had sufficient capital, need to capitalise on a business idea, want to form own business and co-founder encouraged me varies significantly according to family social class. Table 7 indicates that major difference are between entrepreneurs from the middle class and those from lower class who varies on each of the very motivators, from start-up culture, inability to find formal employment, need to capitalise on a business idea, want to form own business and co-founder encouraged me

Table 7: Comparisons Table

Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for family social class background					
Dependent Variable	(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Start-up company culture appealed	upper class	middle class	.745	.489	.282
		lower class	1.167	.505	.056
	middle class	lower class	.422*	.178	.048
Inability to find traditional employment	upper class	lower class	.510	.576	.650
	middle class	upper class	.075	.558	.990
		lower class	.586**	.203	.012
Games-Howell for family social class background					
Had sufficient capital	upper class	middle class	.488	.587	.706
		lower class	.118	.592	.978
	lower class	middle class	.369*	.121	.008
Wanted to capitalize on a business idea I had	upper class	middle class	.745	.499	.379
		lower class	1.167	.506	.153
	middle class	lower class	.422*	.157	.023
Have always wanted to form my own company	lower class	upper class	.078	.407	.980
		middle class	.775*	.184	.000
Tukey HSD Multiple Comparisons for entrepreneur childhood background					
Wanted to build	village	city	.372	.164	.063

wealth		town	.493*	.159	.006
Wanted to form my own company	town	city	.464*	.188	.038
		village	.794*	.186	.000
Co-founder encouraged me	town	city	.446	.209	.085
		village	.728*	.206	.002
Games-Howell for entrepreneur childhood background					
Had sufficient capital	village	city	.312	.171	.166
		town	.520*	.190	.019
Wanted to capitalize on a business idea I had	town	city	.376*	.157	.048
		village	.330*	.120	.019

4. Discussion of results

The view that motivators vary according to entrepreneur childhood background is also consistent with Banerjee and Duflo (2007) and Wadwa et al, (2009) who observed that poor families, living on less than US\$1 per day are psychologically reluctant to venture into income generating projects. With regards to motivational factors across transition periods, the results of this study were consistent with Wadwa et al, (2009) who view the desire to build wealth, need to capitalise on a business idea, start-up culture and the need to form own company as critical motivators that drive entrepreneurship.

5. Recommendations

The fact that most entrepreneurs come from the middle class gives birth to the recommendation that government should make an attempt to ensure an enabling environment for entrepreneurship development by maintaining the socioeconomic class. Relaxation of strict loan requirements for entrepreneurs as well as government guaranteeing loan may be well received as most of the entrepreneurs start their business at a younger age.

There is also need for policies that encourage new venture creation are needed, supporting family business succession planning is also very critical for sustainable family entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe. This can be achieved through training for family owned business entrepreneurs.

6. Conclusion

The research sought to determine how family background and motivation influence entrepreneurship development in Zimbabwe. Purposive sampling was used to select 200 family business entrepreneurs. The study confirms that family background shapes the motivation driving entrepreneurs. It was noted that family member attributes like educational background, family social class, entrepreneur's childhood background are important factors that help to shape entrepreneurs' motivational structure. Company founders tended to be well-educated, motivated

by the need for self-realization and economic security, the need for greater business achievement, the need for institutional power, and need for social capital factor. However, changes in economic environment did not significantly alter family entrepreneurship motivational structure while family entrepreneurs seem to be driven by similar motivations under different economic environments, that is during the pre-crisis, crisis and post crisis period. We recommend for an education policy that emphasise more on developing entrepreneurship talent and a well-crafted family entrepreneurship development program to support family business succession planning for sustainable family entrepreneurship in Zimbabwe.

Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the support and participation provided by the Small and Medium Enterprises Association of Zimbabwe (SMEAZ). We are also grateful to the SME the leadership for their cooperation and whose participation made this study possible.

References

1. Abimbola, O. H. and Agboola, G. M (2011). Environmental Factors and Entrepreneurship Development in Nigeria, *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 13(4).
2. Audia, P. G. and Rider C. I (2005). A Garage and an Idea: What More Does an Entrepreneur Need?" *California Management Review* Fall 48(1): 6-28.
3. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84, 191–215.
4. Bandura, A. (1986), *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
5. Banerjee, A.V. and Duflo, E. (2007). The Economic Lives of the Poor, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21 (1).
6. Barba-Sanchez, V. and Atienza, S. C. (2012). Entrepreneurial behaviour: Impact of motivation factors on decision to create a new venture, *Elsevier* 18p132-138.
7. Benzing, C., Chu, H.M. and Szabo, B., (2005), Hungarian and Romanian entrepreneurs in Romania-motivations, problems, and differences. *Journal of Global Business*, 32, p.77.
8. Burke, A.E., FitzRoy, F.R., and Nolan, M.A. (2002). Self-employment wealth and job creation: The roles of gender, non-pecuniary motivation and entrepreneurial ability. *Small Business Economics*, 19, 255-270.
9. Chu, H.M., Benzing, C. and McGee, C., (2007). Ghanaian and Kenyan entrepreneurs: A comparative analysis of their motivations, success characteristics and problems. *Journal of developmental entrepreneurship*, 12(03), pp.295-322.
10. Dollinger, M. J. (1999). *Entrepreneurship strategies and resources*. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

11. Finnie R and Laporte C (2003). Setting Up Shop:Self-Employment Among Canadian College and University Graduates, *Industrial Relations*, Vol. 58, No. 1.
12. Giannetti, M. and Simonov, A. (2004). On the Determinants of Entrepreneurial Activity: Social Norms, Economic Environment and Individual Characteristics, *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 11.
13. Gilad, B. and Levine, P. (1986). A behavioral model of entrepreneurial supply. *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 24 No. 4, pp. 45-54.
14. Gumbe S. and Chaneta I. (2014). Enhancing business opportunity identification processes in Zimbabwe's manufacturing sector: The case of Harare's manufacturing sector, *University of Zimbabwe Business Review*, Vol.2, No.1 pp 1-15.
15. Herron, L., Robinson, R.B. (1993). A structural model of the effects of entrepreneurial characteristics on venture performance, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 8 No.3, pp.281–94.
16. Kirkwood, J. (2009). Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship, *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 24 Iss: 5, pp.346 – 364.
17. Licht, A.N. (2007). The Entrepreneurial Spirit and What the Law Can Do About It, *Comparative Labour Law and Policy Journal*, 28.
18. Lindquist M. J., Sol J, and Van Praag M, (2015). Why Do Entrepreneurial Parents Have Entrepreneurial Children?, *Journal of Labour Economics*, Vol. 33, No. 2, Pp. 269-296.
19. Maunganidze, L (2008). Succession planning and business survival at crossroads; The case of family-controlled businesses in Harare, DPhil Thesis, University of Zimbabwe.
20. Naudé, W. (2008). Entrepreneurship in Economic Development, UNU-WIDER.
21. Newman, A.F. (2007). Risk-bearing and Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Economic Theory*, 137.
22. Oosterbeek, H., van Praag, M., and Ijsselstein, A. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation, *European Economic Review*, Vol 54, pp. 442–454.
23. Opafunso, Z. O. and Okhankhuele, O. T., (2014). Motivation as a Factor Responsible for Entrepreneurial Growth in Nigeria: A Case Study of Export Logistics Limited, Akure, Nigeria, *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol 5 No 4, ISSN 2039-9340.
24. Sato H and Li S (2013). Influence of Family Background On Current Family Wealth in Rural China, *Hitotsubashi Journal of Economics*, 54, Pp.95-11.
25. Schindehutte, M., Morris, M., and Brennan, C. (2003). Entrepreneurs and motherhood: Impacts on their children in South Africa and the United States. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 41(1), 94-107.
26. Segal, G., Borgia, D. and Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur, *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 11(1): 42-57.
27. Shane, S., Locke, E. A. and Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol 13 pp.257–279.

28. Sharma, L (2014), Impact of Family Capital and Social Capital on Youth Entrepreneurship – A Study of Uttarakhand State, Indiasharma Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research 2014, Vol.4, Pp14.
29. Sorenson, J. B. (2006). Closure and exposure: Mechanisms in the intergenerational transmission of self-employment: Forthcoming: Research in the Sociology of Organizations.
30. Wadhwa, V., Holly, R. A. K., Salkever, A. (2009). The Anatomy of an Entrepreneur: Family Background and Motivation, Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation.