

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Drivers of entrepreneurial start-ups and challenges on start-ups success: implications for entrepreneurial education in Ghana
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/50267/
DOI	https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEXPORTM.2023.135650
Date	2023
Citation	Gameti, Daniel Komla and Akuffo, Isaac (2023) Drivers of entrepreneurial start-ups and challenges on start-ups success: implications for entrepreneurial education in Ghana. International Journal of Export Marketing, 6 (1). pp. 47-74. ISSN 2059-089X
Creators	Gameti, Daniel Komla and Akuffo, Isaac

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
<https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEXPORTM.2023.135650>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

Lead Author: Dr. Daniel Komla Gameti,

Department of Management Science,

GIMPA Business School,

Ghana Institute of Management and public administration.

Ghana

Email: dgameti@gimpa.edu.gh

Daniel K. Gameti is a lecturer of Service Operations Management, Entrepreneurship, and Innovation Management, Department of Management Science at the GIMPA Business School. He holds BSc and MPhil degrees in Business Administration from the University of Cape Coast and the University of Ghana, respectively, and a Ph.D. in Management from the University of Canterbury. He has over 20 years of teaching experience at secondary and tertiary institutions. He has also been involved in managing a number of SMEs and training SME owner-managers in Ghana. He was the faculty advisor for ENACTUS GIMPA, a global students' entrepreneurship group, from 2014 to 2019. Daniel's research interest includes Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Marketing, Innovations, and Service Operations Management.

Corresponding author: Dr. Isaac Nana Akuffo

Lancashire School of Business

University of Central Lancashire

England, UK.

Email: IAkuffo@uclan.ac.uk

Isaac is a faculty member at the University of Central Lancashire specifically at the School of Business. And he has been teaching in higher education for over ten years. He has teaching experience in different countries such as the UK, China, Estonia, and Ghana. His current research interests centre on leadership, innovation and strategy, ethics, internationalization of firms, and work attitudes. He is passionate about uncovering and imparting knowledge to shape lives and sustain organizations in turbulent business environments. He has over the years taught many courses such as strategic management, innovation management, entrepreneurship, organizational behaviour, principles of management, and management skills. He currently teaches strategic business futures, international strategic management, and sustainable management and ethics at the University of Central Lancashire. And He has attended and presented at different international conferences.

Drivers of entrepreneurial start-ups and challenges on start-ups success: Implications for Entrepreneurial Education in Ghana.

Abstract

The need for entrepreneurial education has become essential in Ghana due to the increasing number of graduate unemployment. As a result, we explored the factors that drive start-up success, start-up challenges, and their implications for entrepreneurial education in Ghana. We sampled 323 SMEs from different sectors in Ghana using convenient sampling. The study employed a survey design and a quantitative research approach. We analyzed the data with exploratory factor analysis and multiple regression. The findings showed that personal freedom and knowledge acquired through entrepreneurial education are the major drivers that positively influence start-up success. We also found that start-ups with more full-time employees tend to experience more success than start-ups with more part-time employees. The study further observed that the challenges faced by start-ups play a significant positive role in their success. Finally, we found that entrepreneurs' level of education positively influences the critical success factors of start-ups. Therefore, government and entrepreneurship curriculum designers in Ghana must consider the drivers of start-ups to enhance entrepreneurship education and training in Ghana. Discussion of findings, limitations, and recommendations for future research are discussed below.

Keywords: Drivers of start-ups, entrepreneurial start-ups, entrepreneurial education, Ghana, challenges of start-ups, start-up success, critical success factors.

Introduction

Entrepreneurial education is no longer a privilege of few business schools because most business schools today teach entrepreneurship-related courses not only in business school but in engineering and other schools. The aim is to enhance students' entrepreneurial skills to prepare them for the world of work or encourage them to take up entrepreneurship as a career. In most developing countries, including Ghana, entrepreneurship education is compulsory for all business students and students from other departments to instill entrepreneurial intention in students.

The need for entrepreneurial education has become essential in Ghana due to the increasing number of graduate unemployment. The World Bank reported in 2014 that 50% of graduates remain unemployed two years after their national service in Ghana (Robb, Valerio, & Parton, 2014). This has attracted the attention of government, policy makers, researchers, academics, and student groups to adopt different approaches that would encourage graduates not only to create jobs for themselves but also for others to reduce the growing unemployment. The recent Covid-19 pandemic now exacerbates the situation as many businesses in the country are folding up, and others are laying off some employees. Entrepreneurship education is a way to encourage many youths to start their ventures to reduce growing unemployment (Matlay & Owusu-Mintah, 2014).

Apart from addressing the problem of unemployment, start-up firms have also contributed significantly to economic growth, poverty reduction, development of new products/services, and innovation, among others (Abor & Quartey, 2010; Battistella, De Toni, & Pessot, 2017; Beckman, Eisenhardt, Kotha, Meyer, & Rajagopalan, 2012; Elali & Al-Yacoub, 2016; Schmitz, Urbano, Dandolini, de Souza, & Guerrero, 2017; Schumpeter, 1934; Weiblen &

Chesbrough, 2015). Therefore, it is important for all economies to support start-ups to be established to contribute to economic development. It is against this background that numerous studies have been conducted on entrepreneurship education, start-ups, and the small business sector to elicit relevant information to support students in starting and sustain their businesses (Burns, 2012; Carsrud & Brännback, 2011; Matlay & Owusu-Mintah, 2014; Pedrini, Langella, & Molteni, 2017; Souitaris, Zerbinati, & Al-Laham, 2007). However, most of the studies on entrepreneurial education have focused on methodological issues to help students understand the necessary steps needed to start their own businesses without paying adequate attention to modern methods such as integration of motivation in the entrepreneurial education literature (Bartha, Gubik, & Bereczk, 2019). Farhangmehr, Gonçalves, and Sarmento, (2016) reported that entrepreneurship education alone did not motivate students to start their own ventures and recommended that entrepreneurial pedagogy must encapsulate entrepreneurial motivation-related topics and emotional dimensions that would motivate them to create their own businesses. Entrepreneurial motivation is defined as “.... a link between activation of internal energy and its channelling towards business creation” (Estay, Durrieu, & Akhter, 2013, p. 247). Understanding different motivational factors that either pull or push entrepreneurs to start their own businesses to influence start-up motivations during entrepreneurial education programmes is critically important. Although there are a number of studies on pull and push drivers of motivation in the entrepreneurial motivation literature, researchers are yet to integrate the findings of these studies in the entrepreneurial education literature (Farhangmehr et al., 2016).

Entrepreneurial motivation has been identified as “the cornerstone of the entrepreneurial process” because it drives entrepreneurial behaviour in starting a venture and growing the business (Murnieks, Klotz, & Shepherd, 2020, pp. 138-139). Entrepreneurship educators must begin to expose students to outcomes of different entrepreneurial motivational drivers, associated challenges, critical success factors, as well as the relationship between different motivations and performance. In Ghana, although few studies have been conducted on the entrepreneurial intention of students (Adu, Boakye, Suleman, & Bingab, 2020; Asitik & Nunfam, 2019; Gameti, 2016; Matlay & Owusu-Mintah, 2014; Pedrini et al., 2017; Puni, Anlesinya, & Korsorku, 2018), it appears that no study has looked at motivational factors and their impact on the performance of start-up firms to inform entrepreneurial education. This is particularly important as studies have shown that what motivates people to start their own businesses differ from country to country (Chu, Kara, Zhu, & Gok, 2011).

As a result of this gap, this paper explored how entrepreneurial motivational drivers, critical success factors, and challenges influence start-up success. The paper also contributes to the literature by being the first study to explore how full-time and part-time employees of start-ups influence start-up success. The rest of the paper is structured as follows: The next section presents a literature review, followed by the methodology, and results. The article is concluded with the discussions, limitations, and implications.

Literature review

This section presents literature related to drivers of entrepreneurial motivation, critical success factors, challenges faced by start-ups, and the relationship between entrepreneurial motivation and business success.

Drivers of Entrepreneurial Motivation of Start-Ups

Motivation has been defined by Verheul et al. (2010), cited in Asah, Fatoki, and Rungani (2015), as “the process that accounts for an individual’s intensity, direction, and persistent effort towards attaining a goal.” Entrepreneurs are motivated by different factors to start a business. As indicated in Table 1, these factors are classified differently by various authors (Block & Sandner, 2009; Bourlès & Cozarenco, 2018; Gilad & Levine, 1986; Mahto & McDowell, 2018; Murnieks et al., 2020; Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003; Singh, Simpson, Mordi, & Okafor, 2011). The famous classification in literature is the push and pull factors (Gilad & Levine, 1986), where push factors are described as necessities and negative circumstances that push people into entrepreneurship. These include unemployment, job dissatisfaction, insufficient or unattractive remuneration, lack of promotion, and inflexible work schedule. On the other hand, pull factors are described as favourable external forces or opportunities that pull people into entrepreneurship, such as the need for independence, wealth, self-fulfilment, recognition, and other attractive circumstances (Benzing & Chu, 2009). Although these factors can occur in any country, the literature suggests that push factors are more associated with lower-income countries, while pull factors are more akin to higher-income countries. For example, in a qualitative study of what influences ethnic entrepreneurs to start up in Aberdeen, Scotland, Ullah, Rahman, Smith, and Beloucif (2016) found a combination of traits, pull and push factors that influence ethnic entrepreneurs. Regarding personal traits, the authors found opportunism, self-confidence, self-motivation, and proactivity as factors that affect ethnic minority entrepreneurs to start-up. They also found that unemployment, redundancy, disagreement, and discomfort with their jobs were push factors that contributed to ethnic entrepreneurs starting-up. The study further revealed that locus of control, need for independence, need for achievement, experience, flexibility, and comfortable lifestyle were pull factors that influenced ethnic minority entrepreneurs to start their businesses. However, religion, education, and financial security did not significantly influence ethnic entrepreneurs (Burns, 2012; Shane et al., 2003; Stokes & Wilson, 2010; Ullah et al., 2016).

These findings support the earlier result of Watson, Hogarth-Scott, and Wilson (1998), who reported redundancy, unemployment, frustration with previous employment, and the need to earn a reasonable living as factors that push entrepreneurs to start their businesses. On the other hand, the authors found that independence, being one’s own boss, using creative skills, doing enjoyable work, and making a lot of money are the most important factors that pull entrepreneurs to start their businesses. According to Garcia-Cabrera, Garcia-Soto, & Dias-Furtado, (2018), some entrepreneurs were also influenced by a combination of push and pull factors to start their own businesses, and there are many entrepreneurs who started businesses due to unfavorable external forces (push factors) but became successful entrepreneurs based on positive external forces (Williams & Williams, 2009). Garcia-Cabrera et al. (2018) also argued that, beyond push and pull factors, social factors drive people to start their own businesses. Some entrepreneurs are motivated to start their businesses not because of necessities or attractive opportunities but because of the desire to create a venture to address societal challenges. Walter and Heinrichs (2015) note that people go into entrepreneurship based on different perspectives. They described six perspectives that motivate entrepreneurs to start their own ventures: trait perspective, cognitive perspective, affective perspective, intention perspective (Ajzen, 1991; Shapero & Sokol, 1982), learning perspective, and economic perspective.

From the preceding discussion, it can be observed that motivation to start one's business goes beyond pull (opportunity) and push (necessity) factors and include personal traits such as the need for achievement, risk-taking, self-efficacy, and drive (Shane et al., 2003). There are also social factors, such as the desire to address societal problems (Bartha et al., 2019; Garcia-Cabrera et al., 2018). Therefore, the drive to start one's business is not based on fixed attributes but a combination of factors. That is why it is essential to integrate these factors into entrepreneurial pedagogy. The literature also suggests that motivation to start one's business differs from country to country and region to region (Chu et al., 2011). For example, Benzing, Chu, and Callanan, (2005) found that in the Vietnam city of Ho Chi Minh, entrepreneurs were influenced by pull factors, i.e., personal satisfaction and growth. However, in Hanoi, entrepreneurs were motivated by push factors (Benzing et al., 2005). In India, entrepreneurs in more developed regions were found to be inspired by a desire for independence (to be their own boss) and to increase their income. However, in less developed regions, people were pushed into entrepreneurship because of necessity (Benzing et al., 2005). In Africa, Benzing and Chu (2009) found significant differences among motivating factors in Ghana, Nigeria, and Kenya. While Ghanaian entrepreneurs were motivated by public recognition and the opportunity to create a legacy, Nigerian entrepreneurs were inspired by proximity to their families, and Kenyan entrepreneurs were predominantly motivated by a desire to increase their income (Benzing & Chu, 2009, p. 73).

Other studies buttress the multiplicity of drivers influencing motivation to start a business. In an exploratory study of 114 would-be entrepreneurs, Segal, Borgia, and Schoenfeld found that, tolerance for risk, perceived feasibility, and net desirability were the main drivers attracting graduates to start their own businesses.

Education and training have also been found as a critical motivation for would-be entrepreneurs to start their own businesses. In a study of 133 fashion graduates in the USA, Lang and Liu (2019) concluded that, providing assistance in the form training to students in an incubation programme is a better way to get graduates to start their own businesses. Singh et al. (2011) also found that education is a significant motivation besides family capital, internal orientation to social recognition, and external environment. Based on the expectancy theory developed by Vroom 1964, Barba-Sánchez and Atienza-Sahuquillo (2017) argue that the desire to start one's business is based on the perception to succeed, and the education and training could influence this. The education factor was also echoed by Bartha et al. (2019), who found that, in central and eastern Europe, modern methods of education could influence the desire for people to start their own businesses, which confirms other studies (Arthur & Arthur, 2020; Birley & Westhead, 1993; Evans & Leighton, 1990). However, Lee and Lee (2014) argued that although education may be an essential motivation to start a business, it is not a critical source of success in the later stages of the venture. To determine what motivates academics to start their businesses, Morales-Gualdrón, Gutiérrez-Gracia, and Roig Dobón (2009) examined six entrepreneurial motivations related to personal characteristics, scientific knowledge, entrepreneurial opportunity, availability of resources to create a business, incubator organisation, and social environment. The study found that an entrepreneurial opportunity was not part of the entrepreneurial motivation, but it was important to academic entrepreneurs. However, the main driver of entrepreneurial activities in academia was scientific knowledge derived from research findings for consultancy businesses.

In a systematic review of entrepreneurial motivation literature to establish a non-entrepreneur's journey to becoming an entrepreneur, Mahto and McDowell (2018) argues that individual self-assessment of their identity is the primary antecedent of entrepreneurial motivation. That is an individual's desire to seek a higher social identity or establish a new one is the primary source of entrepreneurial motivation. They also argued that individuals' exposure to entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial activities in their social environments enhances their self-identity (Mahto & McDowell, 2018). Murnieks et al. (2019) proposed that what motivates an entrepreneur differs from stage to stage. That is what motivates individuals to start their own businesses may vary from what motivates them at the growth stage and the exit stage. Their review found that at the start-up stage, the most influencing motivation factors include economic, intrinsic, identity congruence, prosocial, and regulatory focus. These motivations may lead to different start-up outcomes (Murnieks et al., 2019). Most people starting their own businesses are uncertain about the result of their entrepreneurial behaviour. According to Roy (2020), uncertainty is a push motivator for most people to start their businesses. They argued that uncertainty is a powerful motivator of creativity, imagination, and entrepreneurial temperament. It is, therefore difficult, based on these studies, for one to assume that what influence entrepreneurs in one country or region may influence others in other regions to start their own businesses.

Table 1: Drivers of entrepreneurial motivation

Drivers	Classification	Authors
Unemployment, job dissatisfaction, insufficient or unattractive remuneration, lack of promotion, inflexible work schedule.	Push drivers	(Benzing & Chu, 2009)
Redundancy, unemployment, frustration with previous employment and the need to earn a reasonable living.	Push drivers	(Watson et al., 1998)
Independence, being one's own boss, using creative skills, doing enjoyable work, and making a lot of money.	Pull drivers	(Watson et al., 1998)
Independence, wealth, self-fulfilment recognition, an opportunity to create a legacy, proximity to families, desire to increase income.	Pull drivers	(Benzing & Chu, 2009)
Unemployment, redundancy, disagreement, and discomfort with their jobs.	Push drivers	(Ullah et al., 2016)
Locus of control, need for independence, need for achievement, experience, flexibility, and comfortable lifestyle.	Pull drivers	(Ullah et al., 2016)
Opportunism, self-confidence, self-motivation, and proactivity.	Traits drivers	(Ullah et al., 2016)
Desire to increase their income, become their own boss, and to prove	Pull drivers	(Chu et al., 2011)

that they can succeed to start their own businesses.		
Business opportunities in multiple locations.	Pull drivers	(Lin & Tao, 2012)
To address societal challenges.	Social drivers	(Garcia-Cabrera et al., 2018)
Desire to take risks and achievement	Trait drivers	(Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
Ability to acquire, store, and apply information.	Cognitive drivers	(Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
Emotions and feelings to start a business.	Affective drivers	(Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
Perceived desirability, perceived feasibility, a propensity to act on opportunities, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control.	Intention drivers	(Ajzen, 1991; Shapero & Sokol, 1982; Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
Entrepreneurial knowledge is based on education, training, and observation.	Learning drivers	(Barba-Sánchez & Atienza-Sahuquillo, 2017; Bartha et al., 2019; Lang & Liu, 2019; Lee & Lee, 2014; Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
To maximise utility through economic gains.	Economic drivers	(Walter & Heinrichs, 2015)
Tolerance for risk, perceived feasibility, and net desirability.	Traits drivers	(Segal et al., 2005)
Need for achievement, risk-taking, self-efficacy, and drive.	Traits drivers	(Shane et al., 2003)
family capital, internal orientation to social recognition as well as external environment	Internal and external environment	(Singh et al., 2011)
Economic, intrinsic, identity congruence, prosocial, and regulatory focus.	Multiple drivers	(Murnieks et al., 2020)
Uncertainty.	Push drivers	(Roy, 2020)

Source: prepared by authors

Critical Success Factors

The literature is clear on the fact that not all start-up firms fail or become successful (Segal et al., 2005). As stated by Murnieks et al. (2019), the motivational factors at the start-up stage may differ from the growth stage and exit stage. This section reviews critical success factors of start-up ventures. Watson et al. (1998) found that training and relevant advice about their businesses were essential factors for start-up firms to be successful. According to Chu et al. (2011), critical success factors may be classified into three categories, including (1) the psychological and behavioural traits of entrepreneurs, (2) managerial skills and training, and (3) the external environment in which the entrepreneur operates. In China, a reputation for honesty, providing good customer service, having good management skills, friendliness to customers, and hard work were identified as critical success factors (Chu et al., 2011). In a study of the entrepreneurial success of cottage-based women entrepreneurs in Oman, Ghouse

et al. (2019) found that government support and training were critical factors to be considered if Arab women entering entrepreneurship must be successful. Again, customised education and training were identified as essential for start-up entrepreneurs to succeed (Lang & Liu, 2019; Lee & Lee, 2014; Rudhumbu, Plessis, & Maphosa, 2020). It is therefore obvious that whether entrepreneurs are pulled or pushed to start their own businesses, they need training relevant for their businesses in order to be successful. Lee and Lee (2014) however, argue that although education and training are important, it is hardworking characteristics that help start-up firms to be successful (Lee & Lee, 2014). Apart from education and training, Rudhumbu et al. (2020) also found that favourable legal and regulatory environment were critical to be a successful entrepreneur in Botswana. van den Born and van Witteloostuijn (2013) concluded that favourable external environment is critical for start-ups to be successful. Consequently, entrepreneurial education courses must not only focus on motivational factors to start but also critical success factors.

Relationship between entrepreneurship challenges and start-up success

Start-up challenges are well documented in the entrepreneurship literature (Chu et al., 2011; Gonzalez, 2017). Watson et al. (1998) noted that marketing and finance are particular problems for all start-ups. That is finding and keeping sales outlets, marketing or selling products, and dealing with competition. The issue of initial capital has also been identified as a significant challenge confronting most start-up firms (Cooper et al., 1994). Besides, selecting the right team with the right skills for the business is equally challenging for start-up firms (Crowne, 2002). Cromie (1991) cited in Watson et al. (1998) found in a study of young males and females that the main challenges facing start-up firms in the early stages of their ventures include accounting and finance, marketing, management of people, workload, and loneliness. The wrong direction in product development, marketing, and lack of managerial abilities were also found as challenges confronting start-ups (Battistella et al., 2017). In a study of challenges faced by start-up firms in different countries, inadequate infrastructure, labour regulations, inflation, corruption, high taxes, financing, tax regulation, theft, bad roads, water and electric supply, poor communication, lack of government support were revealed problems facing start-ups in different countries. (Chu et al., 2011; Kisunko, Brunetti, & Weder, 1999; Liao & Sohmen, 2001; Mambula, 2002).

In Botswana, Rudhumbu et al. (2020) found that challenges confronting women start-ups include access to finance, lack of training and technical skills, lack of knowledge of sources of finance, market competition, marginalisation of women, and lack of marketing strategies. In Ghana, SMEs, for that matter start-ups, face a myriad of challenges, some of which include lack of access to finance, lack of access to appropriate technology; the existence of laws, regulations, and rules that impede the development of the sector; weak institutional capacity and lack of management skills and training, inadequate institutional ability and lack of access to the international market (Abor & Biekpe, 2006; Abor & Quartey, 2010). In a comparative study of Ghanaian and Kenyan entrepreneurs, Chu, Benzing, and McGee (2007) found that Ghanaian start-ups are usually concerned with access to financial capital, while their Kenyan counterparts have issues with government regulations and business locations. In a study of recent graduates in Ghana, Arthur and Arthur (2020) found that although graduates used their knowledge acquired from education to start their own businesses, they are challenged by financial, operational, marketing, and managerial skills. These studies suggest that the common

problems facing most start-up firms involve finance, marketing, people management, and appropriate management skills resulting from lack of training. Entrepreneurship educators must provide proper training for would-be entrepreneurs to alleviate some of these challenges.

Relationship between start-ups motivation and business success

Studies on the relationship between start-up motivation and business performance are limited in the entrepreneurship literature (Mahto & McDowell, 2018). There is, however, evidence to suggest that some types of entrepreneurial motivation impact entrepreneurial success. For example, Asah et al. (2015) found a significant positive relationship between start-up motivations and firm performance. In an extensive literature review of entrepreneurial motivation, Murnieks et al. (2020) concluded that motivation drives entrepreneurial behaviour at the initiation, growth, and exit states of any venture. This suggests that motivation drives growth (Murnieks et al., 2020, p. 139). Block and Sandner (2009) also found that opportunity-motivated entrepreneurs remain in entrepreneurship longer than necessity-motivated entrepreneurs. This is contrary to Wong, Ho, and Autio (2005), who found no significant relationship between pull and push motivations and economic performance. There are a number of scholars who argue that start-up firms motivated by pull factors e.g., opportunity and independence are likely to perform better than start-ups motivated by push factors such as unemployment and dissatisfaction with previous job (Block & Sandner, 2009; Block & Wagner, 2007; Bourlès & Cozarenco, 2018; Vivarelli, 2004). In a study of entrepreneurial motivation and business performance using microfinance institutions in France, Bourlès, and Cozarenco (2018) found that, although there is no significant difference between pull and push motivations and business survival, there was evidence that entrepreneurs motivated by pull factors are better at repayment of their loans than entrepreneurs motivated by push factors. Staniewski and Awruk (2019) also concluded that there is a positive relationship between achievement motivation and business success. Although this may not apply to all ventures, it appears that firms that started their ventures by identifying an opportunity will inspire positive attitude and hard work which have been described as critical success factors (Chu et al., 2011; Lee & Lee, 2014). This is not to suggest that every student will start entrepreneurship by identifying an opportunity, but entrepreneurship educators must emphasize the importance of graduates seeing their ventures as an opportunity whether it was born out of necessity or positive factors. This will release the adrenaline and positive attitude required to pursue their goals to achieve success.

Based on the review of the literature, the study seeks to address the following research questions:

1. How does entrepreneurial motivation influence the success of a start-up?
2. How do the demographic characteristics of start-ups influence their success?
3. How do challenges encountered by entrepreneurs influence the success of start-ups?
4. How do entrepreneurs' level of education influence the critical success factors of start-ups?

Methods

Sample and data collection

Recent graduates were recruited as research assistance to collect data from a sample of 500 SMEs in Ghana through a convenience sampling technique. Only 350 questionnaires were returned, and only 323 were considered usable for the analysis of the current study representing approximately a 65% response rate. The research assistants collected the contact details of all respondents for validation by the authors. Table 2 below presents the summary of the descriptive statistics.

Table 2: Summary of descriptive statistics

Variables	Percentage	
Types of industry/sectors/business	Manufacturing	13.3%
	Agric tools and equipment	8.7%
	Services	42.1%
	Wholesaling	9.9%
	Retailing	22.3%
	General construction	1.9%
	Others	1.8%
Level of education	Diploma and above	86.1%
	Basic or high school	11.1%
	No formal education	1.9%
SMEs with full-time employees	< 5 employees	17.1%
	5 – 10 employees	61.9%
	11 – 20 employees	10.2%
	21 – 30 employees	3.4%
	31 – 99 employees	4.3%
	Over 100 employees	3.1%
SMEs with part-time employees	1 – 10 employees	45.5%
	11 – 20 employees	4.4%
	21 – 30 employees	2.4%
	31 – 99 employees	0.6%
	None	47.1%
Gender	Males	64.4%
	Females	34.7%
	Did not mentioned	0.9%

Source: prepared by authors

From Table 2 above, the SMEs were sampled from different sectors such as manufacturing (13.3%), Agric tools and equipment (8.7%), services (42.1%), wholesaling (9.9%), retailing (22.3%), and general construction (1.9%) while media and advertisement, mining and farming made up 1.9%. The average age of the respondents ranged between 31 – 40 (57.3%), with a standard deviation of 2.75. The analysis also showed that most of the respondents (86.1%) had a higher level of education (diploma, bachelor, or postgraduate) – 278 respondents. Thirty-six (11.1%) respondents had primary or high school education, while 6 (1.9%) had no formal education. Three respondents did not indicate their level of education. The results showed that most of the sampled SMEs had between 5 to 10 full-time employees (200 – 61.9%). Thirty-

three respondents had 11 to 20 full-time employees (10.2%), while 11 had 21 to 30 full-time employees (3.4%). Also, fourteen and ten respondents had 31 to 99 (4.3%) and over 100 (3.1%) full-time employees, respectively. The results revealed that 147 (45.5%) respondents had between 1 to 10 part-time employees, and 14 (4.4%) respondents had part-time employees between 11 to 20 part-time employees. Eight (2.4%) respondents had between 21 and 30 part-time employees, while two (0.6%) had between 31 and 99 part-time employees. A hundred and fifty-two respondents (47.1%) did not have part-time employees. Finally, respondents consisted of 208 (64.4%) males and 112 (34.7%) females, while 3 (0.9%) respondents did not indicate their gender.

Measures

The authors designed the questionnaires based on the literature. The study used four different measures. The measures assessed the drivers of start-ups, critical success factors, challenges encountered, and the success rate of a start-up. Because the authors designed the measures, we used exploratory factor analysis to test whether items indeed measured the themes, or the structure of the items measured the variables in this study. From the exploratory factor analysis results, drivers of start-ups loaded under four different factors with maximum item loading of 0.85 and a minimum loading was 0.41. The KMO indices of the sampling adequacy were 0.86, and the benchmark was greater than 0.8 (Hauben, Hung, & Hsieh, 2017). Also, Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant (0.00). Indicating that the correlation matrix was significantly different from the identity matrix and is indeed factorable (Akuffo & Kivipöld, 2020; Hauben et al., 2017). The authors named the dimensions of drivers of start-ups as personal freedom (Cronbach Alpha – 0.76) – with six items. Application of entrepreneurship knowledge (Cronbach Alpha – 0.63) – with five items, application of creative skills (Cronbach Alpha – 0.64) – with three items, and the final factor is jobs for family (Cronbach Alpha – 0.47) – with three items.

The exploratory factors analysis (EFA) conducted for the critical success factors questionnaire revealed four factors. However, the fourth factor had only one item and was, therefore, dropped for further analysis. We conducted analysis again, bringing out three factors: good general management skills (Cronbach Alpha -0.89), political involvement (0.74), and tenacity. Good management skills had 12 items, while political involvement and tenacity had three items each. However, political involvement was not used for further analysis because it did not provide any significant results. Again, these names were provided by the authors. The KMO measure for sampling adequacy was 0.91 – benchmark KMO >0.8 (Hauben et al., 2017). Bartlett's test was significant (0.00), showing that the correlation matrix was factorable (Akuffo & Kivipöld, 2020; Hauben et al., 2017).

We also conducted EFA for the questionnaire for measuring challenges encountered by entrepreneurs in establishing their SMEs. From the EFA results, all items except one loaded under one factor. The start-up challenge had 15- items, and the KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.90 – benchmark KMO >0.8 (Hauben et al., 2017). And Bartlett's test for sphericity was significant (0.00). It indicated that the correlation matrix was factorable (Akuffo & Kivipöld, 2020; Hauben et al., 2017). As a result, we named the factor challenge, and it had a Cronbach Alpha value of 0.89, which met the benchmark established by Nunnally (1978).

We also conducted an EFA for the questionnaire that measured the success rate. The analysis extracted three factors, but one factor had just one item, and that factor was discarded. We named the two factors extracted as market share and meeting expectations. Market share had six items, while meeting expectations had five items. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.91 – KMO benchmark >0.8, and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant

(0.00). The market share and meeting expectations had Cronbach Alpha values of 0.87 and 0.78, respectively. The Alpha values met the benchmarks established by Nunnally (1978). We also checked for common method bias for all the questionnaires since they were self-reported. We used Harman's single-factor method to check for the common method variance. The analysis showed that all the items accounted for 28.26% of the variance, which showed no common method variance in the measures used in the data collection.

Results and interpretation

The study examined how factors that motivate entrepreneurs to start their businesses influence their success rate. It also explored how the challenges faced by entrepreneurs influence their success rate. Apart from these two key interests, the authors also examined how entrepreneurs' educational level affects critical success factors. Finally, the authors examined how start-up demographic characteristics such as the average age of the business, the number of full-time or part-time employees, and the age at which the business was started to influence a business's success rate. The interpretation below explains the results obtained.

RQ1. How does entrepreneurial motivation influence the success of a start-up?

Table 3 below depicts the relationship between start-up drivers and the start-up's success rate.

Table 3: the relationship between drivers of start-up and success of the start-up.

Variables	Market share Model 1 (β)	Meeting expectation Model 2 (β)
Constant	2.21***	2.40***
Personal freedom	0.28**	0.23***
Entrepreneurship knowledge	0.07	0.13**
Creative skill application	0.10 ⁺	-0.05
Jobs for family	-0.02	0.03
R^2	0.09	0.11
F	8.11***	10.25***

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.00$, + $p \leq 0.1$, Entrepreneurship knowledge= knowledge acquired through entrepreneurial education

From Table 3 above, personal freedom as a start-up driver had a significant and positive relationship with success rate – market share. It implies that entrepreneurs seeking freedom to manage their businesses are more likely to achieve success rates underpinned with great market share without interferences or strict adherence to superiors' whims and caprices. They work hard to set up their own business to have the freedom to manage the organization in the best possible manner, which, in turn, help attract a chunk of the market share of the industry they operate. Therefore, this desire assists entrepreneurs in being successful. Apart from this

dimension, the rest of the dimensions did not have a significant influence. Another result that needs acknowledgment is the driver of a start-up underpinned by providing jobs for the family. This dimension rather had a negative influence on the success rate – market share. In other words, if entrepreneurs start a business to provide jobs for the family, their success is likely to decrease. Model one was overall significant ($F = 8.11, p < 0.00$), contributing 9% of the variance in the success rate – market share. However, it is also essential to acknowledge that the percentage of variance contributed by the four drivers of start-up shows that other factors other than these dimensions may also play a significant role in the success rate – market share.

In model 2, personal freedom was again positive and significantly related to the success rate – meeting expectations. The result indicates that people's desire to have control of the business drives them to institute measures that can satisfy the successful expectation of the owners of start-ups. We observed that entrepreneurs' desire to apply the knowledge acquired through entrepreneurial education also increased the success rate – meeting expectations. In other words, the entrepreneurial education acquired by the entrepreneurs increases the extent to which entrepreneurs would be successful and, by extension, meets the expectation to which the start-up was established. Another interesting result showed that the desire to apply the creative skills of the entrepreneur rather decreased the extent to which entrepreneurs can be successful by way of meeting their expectations. The authors expected a positive influence. However, the finding obtained was negative even though it was not significant. Model 2 was overall significant ($F=10.25, p < 0.00$) and contributed 11% to the variance of successful rate – meeting expectations.

As indicated above, we also explored the relationship between the demographic characteristics of start-up firms, such as the number of employees the start-up firm started the business with, the number of full-time employees, no part-time employees and the average age of the business, and the success rate. Table 4 below explains the results obtained.

RQ2. How do demographic characteristics of start-ups influence their success?

Table 4 below presents the results of how some demographic characteristics influence start-ups' success.

Table 4: the relationship between firm demographics and the success rate of start-ups

Variables	Market share	Meeting expectations
	Model 3(β)	Model 4 (β)
Constant	3.53***	3.55***
Initial no. of employees	0.04	0.05
No. of full-time employees	0.06*	0.06*
No. of part-time employees	-0.04	-0.09**
The average age of business	0.00	0.01
R^2	0.02	0.04
F	1.77	3.08*

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.00$, + $p \leq 0.1$, initial no. of employees= number of employees entrepreneurs started business with.

In Table 4 above, the number of employees start-firms started their business with did not influence the success rate of the start-up firm. However, the number of full-time employees a in start-up firms has had an increasing influence on the success rate of the start-up – market share ($\beta = 0.06$, $p < 0.05$) and meeting expectations ($\beta = 0.06$, $p < 0.05$). The results mean that start-up firms that have many full-time employees tend to be very successful. On the contrary, start-up firms with many part-time employees tend to be less successful. Thus, the more start-up firms employ part-time employees, the less successful they become. It is an interesting finding and one of the significant contributions of this paper.

Interestingly, the average age of the start-up firm did not significantly influence both models. Model 3 was non-significant, while model 4 was statistically significant ($F = 3.08$, $P < 0.05$). However, variances contributed by both models were 2% and 4%, respectively, suggesting that factors other than these variables may also play a role in determining the success of a start-up firm.

RQ3. How do challenges encountered by entrepreneurs influence the success of start-ups?

We further analysed how challenges experienced by start-up owners influence the success of start-up firms. Table 5 below presents the results obtained.

Table 5: the relationship between challenges and success rate of start-ups

Variables	Market share Model 5 (β)	Meeting expectation Model 6 (β)
Constant	2.79***	2.55***
Challenge	0.29***	0.36***
R^2	0.08	0.13
F	28.74***	46.42***

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.00$, + $p \leq 0.1$

Table 5 notes that the more entrepreneurs face bigger challenges, the more successful they become. It relates to the proverbial saying, "no risk, no gain." In other words, the highest risk leads to higher rewards or benefits, and the findings in Table 3 support this. The results revealed that the more challenges entrepreneurs face, the more successful the start-up would be. Both models 5 and 6 were significant ($F = 28.74$, $P < 0.00$) and ($F = 46.42$, $P < 0.00$), respectively. In model 5, the challenge contributed 8% of the variance in the success rate – market share while it accounted for 13% of the variance in the success rate – meeting the expectation in model 6.

RQ4. How do entrepreneurs' level of education influence the critical success factors of start-ups?

The analysis between education level and critical success factors of the start-ups also brought out some interesting findings. Table 6 below presents the findings in connection with how education influences critical success factors of start-up firms.

Table 6: the relationship between education and critical success factors

Variables	Good management skills	Tenacity
	Model 7 (β)	Model 8 (β)
Constant	3.61***	3.72***
Education	0.20 **	0.27*
R^2	0.02	0.01
F	6.83**	4.00*

Notes: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.00$, + $p \leq 0.1$. Education: no formal education= 1, basic education=2, higher level of education=3

From Table 6, education influences the good management skills dimension of critical success factors of entrepreneurs positively. The more educated the entrepreneurs are, the more they would consider good management skills as the foundation of business success. Therefore, such entrepreneurs would use management skills that best fit the situation to achieve the best results. Model 7 was overall significant ($F=6.83$, $p<0.01$) with a variance contribution of 2%. Findings also showed that education was positively related to the tenacity of the entrepreneur. In other words, the more educated the entrepreneur, the more they possess a resilient spirit to persist despite setbacks. Model 8 was also significant ($F=4.00$, $P<0.05$). The finding also supports the results that showed that education positively influenced challenges. It implies that entrepreneurs with higher education take higher risk or challenges due to the persistent behaviour, which motivate them to keep pushing until they achieve their desire.

The analyses of the study also explored how educational level drives entrepreneurs to start their own businesses and the challenges faced by start-ups. The result showed that education positively ($\beta= 0.20$, $p< 0.05$) influenced the desire to apply the creative dimension as a start-up driver. It means that entrepreneurs with a higher level of education are more likely to be motivated by the desire to start their own businesses to apply the creative skills acquired during their academic journey. The model was overall significant ($F=4.13$, $P<0.05$), contributing 1.3% of the variance of the driver – desire to apply creative skills. Similarly, education had an increasing influence on challenges encountered by entrepreneurs ($\beta= 0.18$, $p< 0.1$). It suggests that the more entrepreneurs are educated, the more they face challenges in their entrepreneurial journey. We argue that this finding could be attributed to the fact that educated people tend to target the apex of success due to their self-belief that their level of education may serve as a yardstick to overcome greater challenges. As a result, they take greater risks which, in turn, leads to greater challenges. The model was significant ($F= 3.70$, $P<0.1$), contributing 1.1% of the variance in challenges faced by entrepreneurs.

Discussion of findings

The study explored how factors other than education influence people or entrepreneurs to start new businesses. Over the years, interest in entrepreneurial studies focused on how entrepreneurial education influences entrepreneurship students to start their own business (Martin, McNally, & Kay (2013). However, studies on other underlying factors that drive entrepreneurs to start their own businesses have received little attention in the literature (Bartha et al., 2019; Farhangmehr et al., 2016). Considering the above, we explored how entrepreneurial motivation, challenges encountered by entrepreneurs, and demographic characteristics of entrepreneurs influenced entrepreneurial success. The discussion centred on four key questions – the first three explored how factors other than methods of education influence entrepreneurial success.

In contrast, the final question found out whether the level of education plays a critical role in the success of a start-up. It is essential to mention that the authors measured start-up success with two dimensions while we measured drivers of a start-up with four dimensions. The authors identified and named these dimensions based on the exploratory factor analyses.

RQ1. How does entrepreneurial motivation influence the success of a start-up?

The findings showed that personal freedom as a driver of motivation had an increasing influence on the success rate of a start-up in terms of market share. In other words, entrepreneurs' desire for personal freedom influences them to institute measures and strategies that help the start-up succeed by capturing a chunk of the market share. Gilad and Levine (1986) support this result and acknowledge that two factors that drive people to start their business are push and pull factors. We classify the desire for freedom as a pull factor because the individual is motivated to manage one's business and life to avoid excess pressure experienced by working for people. The finding was also supported by a study conducted in China by Chu et al. (2011). They found that many factors drive entrepreneurs; the key is the desire to be their own boss. This finding could be attributed to the desire by most people to have freedom in making decisions that they believe could affect one's life and, by extension, the business efficiently and effectively. A choice that my elude people with such desires if they work for people as subordinates. In contrast, a study by Gok, Kara, Lakshman, Demirtas and Chu (2021) found that the most essential factor that motivates entrepreneurs to start one's own business is economic worries.

The results further revealed that the personal freedom dimension of drivers of entrepreneurial motivation had a significant positive influence on the success of a start-up within the context of meeting the expectation of the entrepreneur. The finding is supported by Chu et al. (2011) and Barringer and Ireland(2012), who acknowledged that one factor that pushes entrepreneurial success is the founders' desire to succeed and meet expectations. Every entrepreneur starts a business with some expectation of success. At a point in time, the entrepreneur may take a critical analysis of the business to see if they are on course to meet their expectations. Therefore, people who start a business with the desire to have freedom do that with certain targets or expectations, which, in turn, influence such people to strategically implement measures to help meet such expectations of business success. The finding is again supported by (Block & Sandner, 2009; Block & Wagner, 2007; Bourlès & Cozarenco, 2018; Vivarelli, 2004). The authors argued that entrepreneurs who are moved by pull factors such as

opportunity and independence are more likely to perform better or be successful by meeting expectations than their counterparts motivated by push factors. In other words, entrepreneurs who desire to be independent are more likely to have successful start-ups than people motivated by dissatisfaction with previous jobs. We, therefore, have confirmed it in this study. Finally, on research question one, we found that entrepreneurs' desire to apply entrepreneurial knowledge acquired throughout education or training has an increasing influence on the success rate of start-ups in terms of meeting expectations. In other words, the entrepreneurial education or training acquired by the entrepreneurs increases the extent to which entrepreneurs would be successful and, by extension, meets the expectation to which the start-up was established. This finding is supported by Watson et al. (1998), Neto, Rodrigues, Stewart, Xiao, and Snyder(2018), who opined that entrepreneurs' desire to employ one's entrepreneurial knowledge influences the start-up's success in meeting entrepreneurial success expectations. The results imply that entrepreneurs who obtained education within the context of entrepreneurship seek to manage their own businesses and meet specific targets. It pushes them to work hard at it, influencing such entrepreneurs to enjoy meeting the established success expectations.

RQ2. How do demographic characteristics of start-ups influence their success?

This part of the research explored how the characteristics of start-up firms influenced the success of the start-up. We specifically emphasized four essential characteristics: the initial number of employees the start-up firm began operations with, the number of full-time and part-time employees, the start-up firms sampled had, and finally, the average age of business, and how they each influenced the start-up's success. Again, the success of the business was measured with two dimensions – market share and meeting success expectations or targets. The analyses revealed some interesting results, which contributed significantly to the literature. We found that the number of full-time employees in start-up firms tends to positively influence the start-up's success regarding market share and meeting success expectations. The findings imply that start-ups that start or maintain full-time employees will likely perform better than firms that start or maintain more part-time employees. In other words, keeping more part-time employees tends to decrease the start-up firm's success in market share and meeting success expectations. Our finding is supported by Pauka (2015), who found that full-time employees influence firm performance. This finding could be attributed to the fact that full-time employees are likely to spend more time with the organization and therefore be more committed and emotionally attached to the organization than part-time employees (Akuffo, 2020). The reason for this argument stems from the argument provided by Akuffo (2020) that employees who spend more time with the organization are likely to absorb themselves into the culture of the organization, enhance the easy transfer of knowledge, build a culture of emotional and psychological support which, in turn, influence the performance of the organization positively. However, employees who spend little time with the organization may not be fully absorbed into the organization's norms, beliefs, and values. They may not be fully committed to the organization, which explains why having more part-time employees decreases the organization. Full-time employees are likely to see the organization as their own since its success guarantees their continuous stay with the organization. Therefore, they would go the extra mile by helping the organization grow and succeed. We also found that part-time employees had a negative influence on success – market expectations, and this finding is

supported by Chadwick and Flinchbaugh (2013), and Pauka (2015), who established those part-time employees had nonlinear and negative influence on firm performance, respectively.

RQ3. How do challenges encountered by entrepreneurs influence the success of start-ups?

The analysis observed that the more challenges encountered by entrepreneurs, the more successful the start-up tend to be – in terms of market share and meeting expectation of success. It is an interesting finding because it was expected that the more challenges encountered, the less successful the start-up would be. But the results suggest that challenges encountered rather increase the success rate of start-up firms. The finding is supported by a similar study by Baron, Brandon, Mueller, and Wolfe (2016), who found that goal difficulty was positively related to performance. Challenges are the significant hurdles entrepreneurs face before and during the operation of the start-up. The literature has outlined different forms of challenges encountered by start-up firms. For instance, Chu et al. (2011) acknowledged that the major factors that underpin the challenges of start-ups are inadequate infrastructure, labour regulations, inflation, corruption, water and electricity supply, and lack of governmental support. Again, a study by Abor and Biekpe (2006) and Abor and Quartey (2010) established that some of the challenges encountered by SMEs in Ghana were lack of financial and technology access, lack of access to international markets, and lack of managerial skills. Finally, Chu et al. (2007) examined some challenges Ghanaian and Kenyan entrepreneurs faced. They found that Ghanaian entrepreneurs face financial challenges, while Kenyan entrepreneurs major challenge come from government regulations. Even though different studies have outlined many challenges that entrepreneurs face, little interest has been given to how such challenges influence the success of start-up firms. This study, therefore, contributes to the literature on this association. These results stem from the fact that entrepreneurs are risk-takers, and as such, even though challenges may come, such challenges rather spur them to work hard to manoeuvre such challenges. For instance, an entrepreneur with financial challenges may solicit help from friends and families to help establish the dream business. In other words, these challenges rather push entrepreneurs to work hard to achieve successful start-ups.

RQ4. How do entrepreneurs' level of education influence the critical success factors of start-ups?

This research question explored how the level of education of entrepreneurs play a critical role in the critical success factors of start-ups. It is essential to point out that critical success factors had two dimensions – good management skills and tenacity. For a start-up to be successful, entrepreneurs must have good managerial skills, which stems from the management of employees, customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders to build a good relationship with these stakeholders. Also, tenacity explains the extent entrepreneurs persist even in the face of drawbacks in their business operations.

We were interested in how entrepreneurs' level of education influences entrepreneur's managerial abilities and their zeal to fight no matter the outcome of a decision or a strategy. From the results obtained, a higher level of education tends to influence good managerial skills and tenacity – critical success factors. The result is supported by Colombo and Piva (2020), who observed that gaining education in specific fields like management and economics inspires

students to begin the entrepreneurial journey immediately after graduation. In other words, the more educated the entrepreneurs are, the more they possess good managerial skills, which is critical in managing start-ups. Because the more people climb the academic ladder, the more likely they are to be taught managerial skills, such as the best way to treat your employees or subordinates, since employees are the building rock of every organization. Therefore, entrepreneurs, as leaders of the firm, would try to implement measures that would build commitment and enhance the satisfaction of all start-up stakeholders.

Watson et al. (1998); Chu et al. (2011); Karlsson and Moberg (2013) support this finding that education and good managerial skills play a significant role in the critical success factors. Similarly, Lang and Liu, (2019), Lee and Lee (2014) Rudhumbu et al. (2020) found that education plays a significant role in the critical success factors for start-up entrepreneurs to be successful. Again, our findings showed that having a higher level of education tends to build hope in entrepreneurs to have self-belief and be resilient in their activities in connection with the start-ups. Interestingly, studies exploring how education influences entrepreneurs' tenacity are scant in the literature, and this study contributes significantly to this association.

We conclude by indicating that drivers of start-ups – specifically desire for freedom and application of entrepreneurial knowledge are critical in the success of start-up firms based on the results of our study. It, thus, suggests that apart from entrepreneurial education, which has been proven to influence start-ups. Other factors such as the desire for freedom, application of creative skills, and desire to create jobs for the family are other determinants in the success of start-ups. Also, start-up characteristics such as the number of full-time and part-time employees tend to have a positive and negative respective influence on the success of a start-up. Therefore, we conclude that having more full-time employees positively affects the success of the start-up compared to more part-time employees. Finally, the level of education tends to enhance entrepreneurs' managerial skills and their desire not to give up.

Limitations and future research directions

Despite the study's exciting findings, the study still had some limitations that must be addressed in future studies. The study was conducted via survey and did not have the power to predict cause and effect. The data was gathered from different sectors such as manufacturing, Agric tools and equipment, services, wholesaling, retailing, construction, mining, and farming. However, data was not gathered from the technological sector, and future researchers must gather data from the high-tech industries to see if the same results can be obtained. The data was gathered from Ghanaian SME, and results may be limited to Ghana and countries that have similar start-up attributes, such as those cited in this study, like Kenya and Botswana. We recommend future studies to explore the influence of full-time and part-time employees on the organisation's success since it has received little interest from the literature. We also recommend future studies to employ longitudinal study design to follow different start-ups or SMEs for about three years within the context of the variables in this study to see if similar results could be obtained. Finally, we recommend cross-country studies to explore the factors underpinning start-ups in developed and developing countries. This recommendation stems from the differences between the current study's findings and the findings obtained by Gok et al. (2021)

Study implications

The first implication of this study is that entrepreneurship educators can integrate the findings of this study into their curricula so that students will be informed about other drivers of start-up success and challenges and critical success factors.

We observed from the analyses that start-ups with more full-time employees are more likely to enjoy success than start-ups with more part-time employees. As a result, start-up firms are advised to use more full-time employees before and during the operation of the start-ups. This helps to build a more committed workforce, which would help enhance the start-up firm's success.

Because start-ups contribute to economic growth, poverty reduction, elimination of societal vices, and innovative products and services (Abor & Quartey, 2010; Battistella et al., 2017; Beckman et al., 2012; Elali & Al-Yacoub, 2016; Schmitz et al., 2017; Schumpeter, 1934; Weiblen & Chesbrough, 2015). It is prudent for the government of Ghana and other developing nations to devote more resources to building capacities that drive people to start their businesses. It would contribute to reducing unemployment and more innovative products and services that would collectively improve its economic growth.

Also, governmental organizations that help fund start-ups must not only limit their effort in providing financial support but also provide support in managing challenges that may crop up during the operation. It could help to reduce the potential failures of start-ups. People with an interest in starting their own business must not only do so because of stress or problems with previous jobs or interest in helping one's family but with a strong drive that supersedes these reasons above since research has proven such drivers are less likely to yield fruitful performance of the start-up as outlined in the literature (Block & Sandner, 2009; Block & Wagner, 2007; Bourlès & Cozarenco, 2018; Vivarelli, 2004)

References

- Abor, J., & Biekpe, N. (2006). Small business financing initiatives in Ghana. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 4(3), 69-77.
- Abor, J., & Quartey, P. (2010). Issues in SME development in Ghana and South Africa. *International research journal of finance and economics*, 39(6), 215-228.
- Adu, I. N., Boakye, K. O., Suleman, A.-R., & Bingab, B. B. B. (2020). Exploring the factors that mediate the relationship between entrepreneurial education and entrepreneurial intentions among undergraduate students in Ghana. *Asia Pacific Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Akuffo, I. N. (2020). Collectivistic Versus Individualistic Work Culture: A Theoretical Perspective in Farazmand, A. (Ed), Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance, Springer Nature, Cham: Switzerland, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-31816-5_4141-1, Forthcoming.
- Akuffo, I. N., & Kivipõld, K. (2020). Influence of leaders' authentic competences on nepotism-favouritism and cronyism. *Management Research Review*, 43(4), 369–386, DOI 10.1108/MRR-02-2019-0078.
- Arthur, K. N. A., & Arthur, A. K. (2020). The Student Entrepreneurial Journey: Motivations, Entrepreneurial Engagements and Challenges among Recent Graduates of Visual Arts Academic Programs in Ghana. *Artivate*, 9(1), 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.34053/artivate.9.1.91>
- Asah, F., Fatoki, O. O., & Rungani, E. (2015). The impact of motivations, personal values and management skills on the performance of SMEs in South Africa. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 6(3), 308-322. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ajems-01-2013-0009>

- Asitik, A., & Nunfam, V. (2019). Quality and relevance of entrepreneurial education in Ghana: Perspectives of undergraduate students. *UDS International Journal of Development*, 6(3), 41-56.
- Barba-Sánchez, V., & Atienza-Sahuquillo, C. (2017). Entrepreneurial motivation and self-employment: evidence from expectancy theory. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 13(4), 1097-1115. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-017-0441-z>
- Baron, R. A., Mueller, B. A., and Wolfe, M. T. (2016). Self-efficacy and entrepreneurs' adoption of unattainable goals: The restraining effects of self-control, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 31, 55–71.
- Barringer, B. R. and Ireland, R. D. (2012). *Entrepreneurship: successfully launching new ventures (4.ed.)*, Pearson Limited; Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Bartha, Z., Gubik, A. S., & Bereczk, A. (2019). The Social Dimension of the Entrepreneurial Motivation in the Central and Eastern European Countries. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, 7(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.15678/eber.2019.070101>
- Battistella, C., De Toni, A. F., & Pessot, E. (2017). Open accelerators for start-ups success: a case study. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 20(1), 80-111. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejim-10-2015-0113>
- Beckman, C., Eisenhardt, K., Kotha, S., Meyer, A., & Rajagopalan, N. (2012). Technology entrepreneurship. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(2), 89-93.
- Benzing, C., & Chu, H. M. (2009). A comparison of the motivations of small business owners in Africa. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 16(1), 60-77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14626000910932881>
- Benzing, C., Chu, H. M., & Callanan, G. (2005). A REGIONAL COMPARISON OF THE MOTIVATION AND PROBLEMS OF VIETNAMESE ENTREPRENEURS. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 3-27. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1084946705000033>
- Birley, S., & Westhead, P. (1993). A Comparison of New Businesses Established by 'Novice' and 'Habitual' Founders in Great Britain. *International Small Business Journal*, 12(1), 38-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242693121003>
- Block, J., & Sandner, P. (2009). Necessity and opportunity entrepreneurs and their duration in self-employment: evidence from German micro data. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade*, 9(2), 117-137.
- Block, J. H., & Wagner, M. (2007). OPPORTUNITY RECOGNITION AND EXPLOITATION BY NECESSITY AND OPPORTUNITY ENTREPRENEURS: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FROM EARNINGS EQUATIONS. *Academy of Management Proceedings*,
- Bourlès, R., & Cozarenco, A. (2018). Entrepreneurial motivation and business performance: evidence from a French microfinance institution. *Small Business Economics*, 51(4), 943-963.
- Burns, P. (2012). *Entrepreneurship and Small Business: Start-up and Growth*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Carsrud, A., & Brännback, M. (2011). Entrepreneurial Motivations: What Do We Still Need to Know? *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 9-26. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00312.x>
- Chadwick, C., and Flinchbaugh, C. (2013) The Effects of Part-Time Workers on Establishment Financial Performance, *Journal of Management*, 20(10), 1-28.
- 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*, 12(3), 295-322. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1084946707000691>

- Chu, H. M., Kara, O., Zhu, X., & Gok, K. (2011). Chinese entrepreneurs. *Journal of Chinese Entrepreneurship*, 3(2), 84-111. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17561391111144546>
- Colombo, M. G. and Piva, E. (2020). Start-ups launched by recent STEM university graduates: The impact of university education on entrepreneurial entry, *Research Policy*, 49, 103993.
- Cooper, A. C., Gimeno-Gascon, F. J., & Woo, C. Y. (1994). Initial human and financial capital as predictors of new venture performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(5), 371-395.
- Crowne, M. (2002). Why software product startups fail and what to do about it. Evolution of software product development in startup companies. IEEE International Engineering Management Conference,
- Elali, W., & Al-Yacoub, B. (2016). Factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions among Kuwaitis. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, 12(1), 18-34. <https://doi.org/10.1108/wjemdsd-07-2015-0029>
- Estay, C., Durrieu, F., & Akhter, M. (2013). Entrepreneurship: From motivation to start-up. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 11(3), 243-267.
- Evans, D. S., & Leighton, L. S. (1990). Small Business Formation by Unemployed and Employed Workers. *Small Business Economics*, 2(4), 319-330. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00401628>
- Farhangmehr, M., Gonçalves, P., & Sarmento, M. (2016). Predicting entrepreneurial motivation among university students: The role of entrepreneurship education. *Education & training (London)*, 58(7/8), 861-881. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-01-2016-0019>
- Gameti, D. K. (2016). Has the Intention of Venture Creation Intention among Undergraduate Students been Achieved through Entrepreneurship Education? Evidence from Ghana. ICSB World Conference Proceedings,
- Garcia-Cabrera, A. M., Garcia-Soto, M. G., & Dias-Furtado, J. (2018). The individual's perception of institutional environments and entrepreneurial motivation in developing economies: Evidence from Cape Verde. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 21(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v21i1.2377>
- Ghouse, S. M., McElwee, G., & Durrah, O. (2019). Entrepreneurial success of cottage-based women entrepreneurs in Oman. *International journal of entrepreneurial behaviour & research*, 25(3), 480-498. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-10-2018-0691>
- Gilad, B., & Levine, P. (1986). A behavioral model of entrepreneurial supply. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24, 45.
- Gok, K., Kara, O., Lakshman, S., Demirtas, O., and Chu, H.M. (2021). A Factor Analysis of the Entrepreneurial Success, Motivation and Problems Faced: The Case of Chinese Entrepreneurs, *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 7(2) 165–193.
- Gonzalez, G. (2017). What factors are causal to survival of a startup. *Muma Business Review*, 1(9), 97-114.
- Hauben, M., Hung, E., & Hsieh, W.-Y. (2017). An exploratory factor analysis of the spontaneous reporting of severe cutaneous adverse reactions. *Therapeutic advances in drug safety*, 8(1), 4-16.
- Karlsson, T., and Moberg, K. (2018). Improving perceived entrepreneurial abilities through education: Exploratory testing of an entrepreneurial self-efficacy scale in a pre-post setting, *The International Journal of Management Education*, 11, 1–11.
- Kisunko, G., Brunetti, A., & Weder, B. (1999). *Institutional obstacles to doing business: region-by-region results from a worldwide survey of the private sector*. The World Bank.

- Lang, C., & Liu, C. (2019). The entrepreneurial motivations, cognitive factors, and barriers to become a fashion entrepreneur: A direction to curriculum development for fashion entrepreneurship education. *International journal of fashion design, technology and education*, 12(2), 235-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17543266.2019.1581844>
- Lee, S. M., & Lee, B. (2014). Entrepreneur characteristics and the success of venture exit: an analysis of single-founder start-ups in the U.S. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 11(4), 891-905. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-014-0324-5>
- Liao, D., & Sohmen, P. (2001). The development of modern entrepreneurship in China. *Stanford Journal of East Asian Affairs*, 1(1), 27-33.
- Lin, X., & Tao, S. (2012). Transnational entrepreneurs: Characteristics, drivers, and success factors. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 50-69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10843-011-0082-1>
- Mahto, R. V., & McDowell, W. C. (2018). Entrepreneurial motivation: a non-entrepreneur's journey to become an entrepreneur. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 14(3), 513-526. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-018-0513-8>
- Mambula, C. (2002). Perceptions of SME growth constraints in Nigeria. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 40(1), 58-65.
- Matlay, H., & Owusu-Mintah, S. B. (2014). Entrepreneurship education and job creation for tourism graduates in Ghana. *Education+ Training*.
- Morales-Gualdrón, S. T., Gutiérrez-Gracia, A., & Roig Dobón, S. (2009). The entrepreneurial motivation in academia: a multidimensional construct. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 5(3), 301-317. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-009-0113-8>
- Murnieks, C. Y., Klotz, A. C., & Shepherd, D. A. (2019). Entrepreneurial motivation: A review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 41(2), 115-143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2374>
- Murnieks, C. Y., Klotz, A. C., & Shepherd, D. A. (2020). Entrepreneurial motivation: A review of the literature and an agenda for future research. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 41(2), 115-143.
- Neto, R. D. C. A., Rodrigues, V. P., Stewart, D., Xiao, A., and Snyder, J. (2018). The influence of self-efficacy on entrepreneurial behavior among K-12 teachers, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 72, 44-53.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd edit.) mcgraw-hill. Hillsdale, NJ, 416.
- Pauka, Kira (2015) : How does Part-time Work Affect Firm Performance and Innovation Activity?, WWZ Working Paper, No. 2015/05, University of Basel, *Center of Business and Economics (WWZ)*, Basel.
- Pedrini, M., Langella, V., & Molteni, M. (2017). Do entrepreneurial education programs impact the antecedents of entrepreneurial intention? *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*.
- Puni, A., Anlesinya, A., & Korsorku, P. D. A. (2018). Entrepreneurial education, self-efficacy and intentions in Sub-Saharan Africa. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*.
- Robb, A., Valerio, A., & Parton, B. (2014). *Entrepreneurship education and training: insights from Ghana, Kenya, and Mozambique*. The World Bank.
- Roy, N. (2020). Uncertainty as Entrepreneurial Motivation: Tuche, karma and the Necessity of Action. *Philosophy of management*, 19(1), 89-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40926-019-00122-z>
- Rudhumbu, N., Plessis, E. C. d., & Maphosa, C. (2020). Challenges and opportunities for women entrepreneurs in Botswana: revisiting the role of entrepreneurship education. *Journal of international education in business*, 13(2), 183-201. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIEB-12-2019-0058>

- Schmitz, A., Urbano, D., Dandolini, G. A., de Souza, J. A., & Guerrero, M. (2017). Innovation and entrepreneurship in the academic setting: a systematic literature review. *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 13(2), 369-395. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-016-0401-z>
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The theory of economic development* Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., & Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 11(1), 42-57. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552550510580834>
- Shane, S., Locke, E. A., & Collins, C. J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human resource management review*, 13(2), 257-279. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822\(03\)00017-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1053-4822(03)00017-2)
- Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign's Academy for Entrepreneurial Leadership Historical Research Reference in Entrepreneurship*.
- Singh, S., Simpson, R., Mordi, C., & Okafor, C. (2011). Motivation to become an entrepreneur: a study of Nigerian women's decisions. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 2(2), 202-219. <https://doi.org/10.1108/20400701111165641>
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., & Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566-591.
- Staniewski, M. W., & Awruk, K. (2019). Entrepreneurial success and achievement motivation – A preliminary report on a validation study of the questionnaire of entrepreneurial success. *Journal of Business Research*, 101, 433-440. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.01.073>
- Stokes, D., & Wilson, N. (2010). *Small business management and entrepreneurship*. Andover. Hampshire, United Kingdom: Cengage Learning EMEA.
- Ullah, F., Rahman, M. Z., Smith, R., & Beloucif, A. (2016). What influences ethnic entrepreneurs' decision to start-up. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 23(4), 1081-1103. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsbed-12-2015-0182>
- van den Born, A., & van Witteloostuijn, A. (2013). Drivers of freelance career success. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 34(1), 24-46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1786>
- Verheul, I., Thurik, R., Hessels, J., van der Zwan, P. (2010). Factors Influencing the Entrepreneurial Engagement of Opportunity and Necessity Entrepreneurs, *Eurasian Economic Review*, P. 1 – 26.
- Vivarelli, M. (2004). Are all the potential entrepreneurs so good? *Small Business Economics*, 23(1), 41-49.
- Walter, S. G., & Heinrichs, S. (2015). Who becomes an entrepreneur? A 30-years-review of individual-level research. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 22(2), 225-248. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jsbed-09-2012-0106>
- Watson, K., Hogarth-Scott, S., & Wilson, N. (1998). Small business start-ups: success factors and support implications. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 4(3), 217-238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13552559810235510>
- Weiblen, T., & Chesbrough, H. W. (2015). Engaging with startups to enhance corporate innovation. *California Management Review*, 57(2), 66-90.
- Williams, C. C., & Williams, C. C. (2009). The motives of off-the-books entrepreneurs: necessity- or opportunity-driven? *International entrepreneurship and management journal*, 5(2), 203-217. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0098-8>
- Wong, P. K., Ho, Y. P., & Autio, E. (2005). Entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth: Evidence from GEM data. *Small Business Economics*, 24(3), 335-350.

Appendix 1

Dear Entrepreneur,

We are conducting a study on **“Drivers of entrepreneurial start-ups and challenges on start-ups success: Implications for Entrepreneurial Education in Ghana”**. The main objective of this work is to understand what drives entrepreneurs in Ghana to start-up businesses and the impact on their success and challenges. Your contribution to the study will enable us to make very relevant recommendations to entrepreneurs, students and unemployed graduates. The data that you provide will be handled confidentially and will not be shared with any government officials or competitors. In fact, your company will not be uniquely identified in the report which will emerge from this study. Thank you.

Part 1: Personal and Business Profile

1. Which of the following categories does your business belong to?

Manufacturing ☐ Agricultural products, tools, equipment ☐ Service ☐ Wholesaling ☐
Retailing ☐ others please state _____

2. What type of business ownership do you have?

Established by you ☐ Bought from another ☐ Inherited ☐ Independently owned ☐
Partnership ☐ Company ☐ Franchise ☐ Joint venture ☐ Cooperative ☐ NGO ☐
Others _____

3. What is the average number of employees?

Full-time _____

Part-time _____

4. What is the average age of your business (in years) _____

5. What is your Gender? Male ☐ Female ☐ Prefer not to mention ☐

6. Educational level achieved by entrepreneur.

No formal education ☐ Non-Formal education ☐ Basic School ☐ Senior high school
Diploma ☐ Degree ☐ Post graduate degree ☐ Other _____

7. How many employees did you start the business with? _____

8. Marital status Married ☐ Divorced ☐ Single ☐

9. What is your age in years? Less than 18 ☐ 18 – 25 ☐ 26 – 30 ☐ 31 – 35 ☐ 36 – 40
☐ 41 – 45 ☐ 46 and above ☐

10. At what age did you start business? _____

Drivers (Motivation)	SD	D	N	A	SA
To be my own boss/ To be Independent	1	2	3	4	5
To overcome frustration in life or my previous job	1	2	3	4	5
To exploit an opportunity or meet a need in the market	1	2	3	4	5
To use a creative skill I have to start a business	1	2	3	4	5
To do something I enjoy	1	2	3	4	5
To be able to use my past experience and training	1	2	3	4	5
To prove I can do it	1	2	3	4	5
To practice what I studied in entrepreneurship class	1	2	3	4	5
To increase my income	1	2	3	4	5
To gain public recognition	1	2	3	4	5
To provide jobs for family members	1	2	3	4	5
For my own satisfaction and growth	1	2	3	4	5
So I will have job security	1	2	3	4	5
To build a business to pass on	1	2	3	4	5
To be closer to my family	1	2	3	4	5
To make a difference in my world	1	2	3	4	5
To maintain my personal freedom	1	2	3	4	5

11. What is your average working hours per week (hours)

Part 2: Drivers (Motivation) of Start-Ups

This section concerns factors that motivated you to start your own business. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree). Please circle the number applicable to you.

Part 3: Critical Success Factors

This part concerns what you consider to be critical success factors for business start-ups. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree). Please circle the number applicable to you

Critical Success Factors	SD	D	N	A	SA
Reputation for honesty (credibility or integrity)	1	2	3	4	5
Good customer service	1	2	3	4	5
Creativity/innovation (coming with new ideas)	1	2	3	4	5
Good general management skills	1	2	3	4	5
Charisma, friendliness to customers	1	2	3	4	5
Hard work	1	2	3	4	5
Tenacity (persistence or not giving-up)	1	2	3	4	5
Access to capital	1	2	3	4	5
Good product at a competitive price	1	2	3	4	5
Previous business experience	1	2	3	4	5
Ability to manage personnel	1	2	3	4	5
Marketing factors including sales and promotion	1	2	3	4	5
Maintenance of accurate records of sales/expenses	1	2	3	4	5
Appropriate training	1	2	3	4	5
Satisfactory government support	1	2	3	4	5
Good location	1	2	3	4	5
Support of family and friends	1	2	3	4	5
Political involvement	1	2	3	4	5
Community involvement	1	2	3	4	5

Part 4: Challenges Encountered

This section concerns the challenges encountered by the entrepreneurs. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree 3 = Not sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree). Please circle the number applicable to you

Challenges Encountered	SD	D	N	A	SA
Unreliable and undependable employees	1	2	3	4	5
Too much competition	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of management training	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of marketing knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Inability to maintain accounting records	1	2	3	4	5
Unable to obtain short-term financial capital	1	2	3	4	5
Too much government regulation, bureaucracy	1	2	3	4	5
Complex and confusing tax structure	1	2	3	4	5
Unable to obtain financial capital	1	2	3	4	5
Weak economy	1	2	3	4	5
Poor road transportation	1	2	3	4	5
Business registration process	1	2	3	4	5
Electricity problem	1	2	3	4	5

Limited parking	1	2	3	4	5
Business related stress	1	2	3	4	5
Foreign exchange limitations	1	2	3	4	5

Part 5: Success Rate

This section concerns the overall success of your business. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree 3 = Not sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree). Please circle the number applicable to you.

Success Rate	SD	D	N	A	SA
Your business is successful	1	2	3	4	5
You are satisfied with your business success	1	2	3	4	5
Your success has met your expectations	1	2	3	4	5
You are successful because of your motivation to start	1	2	3	4	5
Your start-up drive has affected your success negatively	1	2	3	4	5
Your business is growing (expanding)	1	2	3	4	5
Your sales have increased	1	2	3	4	5
Your turnover has increased	1	2	3	4	5
Your market share has increased	1	2	3	4	5
Your employees have increased significantly	1	2	3	4	5
Your business is making good profit	1	2	3	4	5
You have the support of your family and friends	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU