

## WORK MOTIVATION AND ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

*Evan Douglas: Queensland University Of Technology, Brisbane, Australia*

~

**Contact:** Evan Douglas, Queensland University of Technology, 2 George Street, 4001  
Brisbane, Australia, Email: [evan.douglas@qut.edu.au](mailto:evan.douglas@qut.edu.au)

### ABSTRACT

Since becoming an entrepreneur typically entails a change from employment to self-employment, and since entrepreneurship may involve harder work than being an employee, it is instructive to consider the nascent entrepreneur's preference to work more or less hard as a potential antecedent of the decision to become an entrepreneur. In this paper we examine worker types in the context of types of entrepreneurship, and suggest propositions for empirical testing concerning whether particular worker types are more or less likely to start their own business and whether they are more or less likely to start particular types of new ventures.

### INTRODUCTION

It is commonly supposed that entrepreneurs have a high tolerance for work effort, since entrepreneurship often requires hard work. Hofer (1976) and Schein (1987) argued that successful entrepreneurs work long and hard hours, and put their new venture ahead of their family life. Bird & Jellinek (1988) found that entrepreneurs enjoy their work and willingly work longer hours even when there is low chance of extraordinary financial gain. Thus we might expect nascent entrepreneurs to be willing to work hard in pursuit of their objectives. Douglas & Shepherd (2000) built this supposed high tolerance for work effort into their utility-maximizing model of the intention to become an entrepreneur, but in a later empirical study they found no significant relationship between attitude to work effort and intention to become an entrepreneur (Douglas & Shepherd, 2002).

Perhaps this unexpected result arose because 'entrepreneurship' means different things to different people. Acting entrepreneurially might involve a relatively small investment of work time and other resources, such as gathering fruit for sale, or a relatively large investment of work time and other resources, such as commercializing a disruptive new technology. Perhaps entrepreneurial intentions only apply to a particular type of entrepreneurship that is commensurate with the nascent entrepreneur's attitude to work effort. Indeed, we observe 'lifestyle' entrepreneurs who choose to work less hard than they might as an employee, and others who engage in even lower work-effort variants of entrepreneurship, such as panhandling and busking. Thus, the type of entrepreneurship envisioned would seem to be important in the decision of the nascent entrepreneur to become an entrepreneur.

The 'work motivation' literature (see, e.g. Locke, 1968; Steers, Mowday & Shapiro, 2004) is concerned with the work behavior of employees and what managers might do to motivate them to work harder. Organizational citizenship behavior (Organ, 1988; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Paine & Bachrach, 2000) is discretionary work effort over and above that expected by managers. Spence & Robbins (1992) and Buelens & Poelmans (2004) identified eight worker types ranging from high-work-effort 'workaholics' to low-work-effort 'disengaged' workers. Machlowitz (1980) argued that workaholicism is favourable for entrepreneurial success, while Porter (1996) argued the reverse causality – that workaholics may choose self-employment because it allows them to work hard without suffering the condemnation of their fellow employees. Scott, Moore & Miceli (1997) found achievement-oriented workaholics more likely to pursue occupations that provide autonomy and require a great deal of personal dedication, such as entrepreneurship. Snir & Harpaz (2004) found that the self-employed worked more hours than the employed and had a greater likelihood of being a workaholic. Thus, there is evidence that some entrepreneurs tend to work harder than employees, while others are

not motivated to work as hard, but the underlying motivations for work effort in the context of different types of entrepreneurship has not been examined.

In this paper we examine the relationship of worker types, and their underlying motivations to work, with the formation of the intention to become an entrepreneur of a particular type, and argue that particular types of workers might be more likely to become particular types of entrepreneurs. We first review the relevant literature. Next we consider whether each of six attitudinal orientations will predispose an individual towards entrepreneurship or not. Third, we consider combinations of these orientations and whether there might be any association between these and the four main types of entrepreneurship. Fourth, we look for 'fit' between types of worker and types of entrepreneurial venture, and argue which types of workers are predisposed to which types of entrepreneurship. Finally, we conclude with implications for policy makers, educators, and further research.

### LITERATURE SURVEY

Douglas & Shepherd (2000) argued that individuals have a choice between taking a job as an employee and creating a job for themselves by starting a new venture. Any job offers attributes that are desirable (income, autonomy, and net perquisites) and attributes that are undesirable (work effort and risk) and different jobs offer these attributes in different combinations. The individual will have an attitude towards each of these attributes and is expected to choose the job (either the best available employment situation or the best-available self-employment opportunity) that maximizes his/her psychic satisfaction, or utility. This model demonstrates that no single attitude is a necessary or a sufficient condition for forming an intention to become an entrepreneur. Although we might expect entrepreneurs to be willing to work hard, it is the sum of the utility from the five attributes of each job, each weighted by the individual's attitude to the attribute that determines the total utility expected from the employment and self-employment alternatives. Subsequently, Douglas & Shepherd (2002) analysed a sample of business school alumni and found, *inter alia*, that entrepreneurs were not significantly different in their attitude to work effort.

This result is puzzling, given the findings of Hofer (1976), Machlowitz (1980), Schein (1987), Bird & Jellinek (1988), Porter (1996), Scott et al (1997) and Snir & Harpaz (2004) reported earlier. Apparently the relationship between the decision to be an entrepreneur and work attitude is not a simple one. Thus it might be instructive to search more widely in other literatures that investigate work attitudes. Maslow (1954) argued that individuals have needs that may be satisfied via purchasing power accrued from working. McClelland (1961, 1971) argued that the individual's need for achievement, affiliation, power and autonomy will motivate workplace behavior. Cognitive theories of workplace behavior, such as Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, argue that employees rationally evaluate and choose work behavior patterns that they believe will result in their gaining the best combination of monetary and non-monetary rewards. Goal-setting theory (Locke & Latham, 1990) advocates that individuals tend to increase their performance in pursuit of goals or targets set for them to achieve. Each of these strands of work motivation theory seems relevant in the entrepreneurial context. We envision entrepreneurs as desiring some beneficial combination of monetary and non-monetary outcomes, seeking achievement and autonomy, and being motivated to work hard to achieve the goals they have set for themselves.

The 'careers' literature has been much concerned with workaholics, whose hard work may have detrimental consequences for themselves, co-workers and families (Oates, 1971). To better identify workaholics, Spence & Robbins (1992) developed measurement scales for 'work involvement', 'psychic need for work' and 'work enjoyment'. Cluster analysis revealed six distinct worker types, based on combinations of high (above average) and low (below average) scores on this triad. Worker types identified were enthusiastic workaholics (high work involvement, high psychic need, and high work enjoyment, or HHH); workaholics (HHL); work enthusiasts (HLH); relaxed workers (LLH); unengaged workers (LLL); and disenchanted workers (LHL). This categorization depends on a single driver of work involvement, namely the psychic need to work, and includes work enjoyment as a seemingly unrelated variable. Scott, Moore & Miceli (1997) investigate need for achievement and need for perfection as drivers of work involvement and identify three types of workaholic behavior; namely compulsive-dependent, perfectionist, and achievement oriented workaholicism. The compulsive-dependent workaholic is essentially the same as the Spence and Robbins workaholic (HHL); the perfectionist workaholic is a new category (HLL) and the achievement-oriented workaholic is effectively the same as the work enthusiast (HLH). Burke and co-authors in a series of papers (1999a, 1999b, 2001) validated the Spence and Robbins scales across both genders and various national cultures and industries.

Buelens & Poelmans (2004) observed that three scales with two options (high or low) imply eight ( $2^3 = 8$ ) potential worker types, and identified the two ‘missing’ categories, namely reluctant hard workers (HLL) and alienated professionals (LHH). Note that reluctant hard workers have the same triad characteristic (HLL) as Scott, Moore & Miceli’s (1997) perfectionist workaholic, suggesting the low work enjoyment by this workaholic is due to perfectionist tendencies and the inevitable disappointment that occurs in the workplace when co-workers and supervisors are content to achieve less-than-perfect outcomes.

Snir & Harpaz (2004) investigated the relationships between workaholism, work hours, work enjoyment, family centrality, leisure centrality, and religiosity. Thus they injected the value of non-work time into the equation, arguing that the more important are these non-work activities the less time one will want to spend working. Earlier Snir & Harpaz (2002) had discussed the concepts of economic orientation and leisure orientation in a study of the trade-off relationship between work and leisure. They define economic orientation as “one’s disposition to instrumental or extrinsic work outcomes” and note that “the most important role of work...is that of providing income for sustaining life and fulfilling other important needs” (2002:182-183). They also note that individuals have an intrinsic orientation and state “It is generally agreed that intrinsic or expressive variables include work aspects such as an interesting job, variety, autonomy, challenging work, and so on” (Snir & Harpaz, 2002:183).

Douglas & Morris (2006a) focus on the antecedents of high work effort and incorporate work, economic, leisure and perquisite orientations into a model that simultaneously determines work effort and work enjoyment. They subsequently identify three sub-categories of work enthusiast, namely materialist work enthusiasts, low-leisure work enthusiasts, and perk-loving work enthusiasts. Later they extend the model to encompass all worker types (Douglas & Morris, 2006b). In this paper we incorporate the perfectionist and achievement orientations of Scott, Moore & Miceli (1997) into the model to argue that work effort for all worker types will be positively motivated by five of these orientations, namely economic (i.e. materialism); work (i.e. psychic need to work); perquisite (i.e. desire for the net perquisites or intrinsic benefits associated with working); perfectionist (i.e. need for perfectionism); and achievement (i.e. need for achievement); and negatively motivated by leisure orientation. The first five drivers of work effort will induce the individual to work more, while a strengthening of leisure orientation will reduce the supply of work effort offered at any given wage rate. In Table 1 we show the eleven worker types identified by previous authors and our conjectures regarding their probable scores on the six orientations.

**Table 1: Worker Types and Attitudinal Orientations\***

	Orientation => Worker Type	Work Effort	Work Orient'n	Work enjoymt	Economic orientation	Leisure orientation	Perquisite orientation	Perfectionist orientation	Achievem ent orientation	Total satisfactio n
1	Enthusiastic Workaholic	High	High	High	High?	Low?	<b>High</b>	High?	High?	High?
2	Work addict Workaholic	High	High	Low	High?	Low?	<b>Low</b>	High?	Low?	Low?
3a	Materialistic work enthusiast	High	Low	High	<b>High</b>	Low?	High?	Low?	High?	High?
3b	Low-leisu re work enthusiast	High	Low	High	High?	<b>Low</b>	High?	Low?	High?	High?
3c	Perk-loving work enthusiast	High	Low	High	High?	Low?	<b>High</b>	Low?	High?	High?
3d	High-achieving work enthusiast	High	Low	High	High?	Low?	High?	Low?	<b>High</b>	High?
4	Reluctant hard worker	High	Low	Low	High?	High?	<b>Low</b>	<b>High</b>	Low?	Low?
5	Alienated work aholic	Low	High	High	Low?	<b>High</b>	Low?	Low?	High?	High?
6	Disenchanted Work aholic	Low	High	Low	Low?	<b>High</b>	Low?	Low?	Low?	Low?
7	Relaxed worker	Low	Low	High	Low?	<b>High</b>	High?	Low?	Low?	High?
8	Disengaged worker	Low	Low	Low	Low?	<b>High</b>	Low?	Low?	Low?	Low?

**Bold** indicates the Douglas & Morris (2006c) proposition, and question marks (?) indicate speculations.

## ATTITUDINAL ORIENTATION AND ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

Based on the foregoing it is instructive to consider the impact of the six attitudinal orientations on the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. Accordingly, we investigate the relationship between each orientation and the utility of the individual as self-employed vis-a-vis employed. If we expect the individual's utility to be enhanced by self-employment because of a particular orientation held, we conclude that the individual will have an increased propensity to become self-employed, other things being equal.

### **Economic Orientation**

Employees are typically paid less income than what they generate. The employer is the residual claimant of the surplus of income over expenses, which include income paid to the employee which is determined in the labor market. Simple economics predicts that the profit-maximizing employer will hire employees up to the point where their marginal revenue product is just equal to the wage rate. Given diminishing marginal revenue productivity, a residual accrues to the employer which contributes to overhead costs and profits for the employer. If self-employed, the individual would be the residual claimant of this surplus generated. It follows that the stronger is the individual's economic orientation, the more the individual will want to be self-employed, other things being equal.

### **Leisure Orientation**

Leisure orientation refers to the strength of preference for non-work time and its uses, such as sleeping or resting, being with one's family, participating in recreational and/or community activities, and so on. (Snir & Harpaz, 2002). The stronger is one's leisure orientation, the less time willingly spent at work, other things being equal (Douglas & Morris, 2006a). Entrepreneurship involves a variety of time-consuming activities, such as opportunity recognition, viability screening, market research, prototype development, and problem solving, and that the time requirement of these tasks is unpredictable *a priori*, and thus they may cut into what would otherwise be leisure time. In most employment situations the employee is not required to undertake so many time-unpredictable work tasks, and can more likely go home at a predictable hour, and thus spend less time at work. Therefore we expect leisure orientation to be negatively related to the intention to become an entrepreneur.

### **Work Orientation**

Work orientation is the strength of preference for work *per se*. Douglas & Shepherd (2000) assumed that work orientation is negative, but for workaholics it is positive, meaning they gain utility rather than disutility from work itself (although they would simultaneously gain utility from the other orientations). From Douglas & Morris (2006a) we conclude that a workaholic would work for no income at all, if an alternate job with some sufficiently more attractive combination of income, perks, achievement, and/or perfectionism is not available. Since entrepreneurship often requires hard work with little prospect of income (Bird & Jellinek, 1988), we expect that work orientation will be positively related to the intention of becoming an entrepreneur.

### **Perquisite Orientation**

Perquisites are the psychic benefits (net of psychic costs) associated with working, either as an employee or as an entrepreneur. For employees, perquisites are largely controlled by the employer, but entrepreneurs have greater control over perquisites. While they may be constrained financially in the provision of material perquisites, particularly in the start-up phase, they are less likely to put up with irksome co-workers, uncomfortable working conditions, and congested commutes to work, that as employees they might be powerless to change. More importantly, the psychic benefits they expect to obtain, such as the pleasure of being one's own boss, are likely to be substantially greater in self-employment. Thus, we expect that the stronger is the individual's perquisite orientation, the greater the probability they will seek to be self-employed.

### **Perfectionist Orientation**

The stronger is one's perfectionism orientation, the more one wants things to turn out perfectly. But in entrepreneurship there is great uncertainty due to consumer, producer and manager ignorance (Shepherd, Douglas & Shanley, 2002), so little confidence can be placed in estimates of costs, sales, rivals' reactions, and emergence of new rivals and/or substitute technologies. Conversely, in an employment situation we expect greater certainty about such things, since the firm will have more experience in the market and consequently less managerial ignorance. Thus we expect the intention to become an entrepreneur to be negatively related to perfectionist orientation.

### **Achievement Orientation**

Need for achievement induces individuals to attempt tasks that are novel and/or relatively rare, difficult to achieve and achieved first, rather than as a replication of someone else's prior achievement. Entrepreneurship, particularly with disruptive innovations, involves innovation and therefore novelty. Entrepreneurship requires new tasks, new routines, and new structures (Stinchcombe, 1965), and first-mover advantage is prized by entrepreneurs (Lieberman & Montgomery, 1988). Shane (2003: 99-103) reports many studies that find entrepreneurs have higher need for achievement than employed managers. Thus, the higher one's achievement orientation, the stronger would be one's intention to become an entrepreneur, other things being equal. In summary, we expect that, in general, high economic, work, perquisite, and achievement orientations will militate in favour of building an intention to become an entrepreneur, while high leisure and perfectionist orientations will militate against forming the intention to become an entrepreneur.

### ENTREPRENEURIAL TYPE

It is important to qualify entrepreneurial intentions in terms of what kind of entrepreneurship is envisioned. At one extreme is the low-growth, low-potential, day-to-day type of self-employment undertaken in order to survive, known as 'necessity entrepreneurship'. This includes a variety of small-scale entrepreneurial activities such as hunting, gathering, panhandling and busking, as well as criminal activities such as stealing and drug dealing. Typically, necessity entrepreneurship is undertaken when there is no employment option available, but more precisely it will be undertaken when there is no employment position available that offers greater psychic utility (Douglas & Shepherd, 2000). A necessity entrepreneur might forgo a full-time employment opportunity in favour of part-time self-employment, for example, if he/she has low work orientation, low economic orientation and/or high leisure orientation. Similarly, since necessity entrepreneurship is likely to involve unspectacular achievements, imperfect outcomes, and few employees, it may be preferred if the individual has low achievement, perfection and/or perquisite orientation. We note that individuals may not have any employment options available in poverty-stricken regions or disaster situations, in which case they must seek necessity entrepreneurship regardless of their orientations, since survival is paramount.

A second category is 'lifestyle entrepreneurship' where the entrepreneur conducts a business that does not make as much money (as he/she might in an employment position) but which provides non-monetary benefits that more than compensate for the monetary shortfall. Lifestyle entrepreneurs create a job which is an extension of their preferred leisure pursuits, and gain a substantial portion of their total utility from the perquisites of their job (such as being one's own boss and avoiding high-stress work situations) rather than from a higher income that may be available in employment or a different self-employment option. They seem less likely to have a compulsive need to work, or to seek novel and/or rare achievements, but they may seek perfection in aspects of their life, such as choosing the perfect location for their business, finding the best employees, and so on. Thus we expect the intention to become a lifestyle entrepreneur to be associated with low work orientation, low economic orientation, high leisure orientation, high perquisite orientation, low achievement orientation, and perhaps high perfection orientation.

A third category is 'speculative entrepreneurship', where the entrepreneur identifies an opportunity to make a relatively large amount of money within the short-term (up to several years), after which the entrepreneur might exit the venture by asset sale or acquisition by a rival. This may involve commercializing an innovation that does not have great prospects for sustainable competitive advantage. For example, a biotechnologist might start a business to exploit a new herbal medicine and expect an exit by sales of assets to a large pharmaceutical company. This probably reflects high economic orientation, and may occur despite high leisure orientation, since 'getting rich quick' would facilitate the subsequent enjoyment of one's later leisure activities. Conversely, a serial entrepreneur who moves from one speculative project to the next almost certainly does not have high leisure orientation, since such new ventures are very time consuming. The nascent entrepreneur should anticipate that successfully undertaking a speculative venture requires hard work and would be a noteworthy achievement, and thus high work orientation and high achievement orientation might be associated with the intention to be a speculative entrepreneur. A speculative venture might fail or be taken over, and thus the entrepreneur must understand that the perquisites associated with the new venture are not permanent and indeed could end suddenly. Thus low perquisite orientation might be an indicator, but the 'enjoy it while it lasts' attitude could be associated with high perquisite orientation. Finally, since a speculative venture is likely to face high uncertainty in the market, technology, and managerial realms, it seems unlikely to attract an individual with high perfectionism orientation. In summary, the intention to become a speculative entrepreneur is likely to be associated with some combination of high economic orientation, low perfectionism orientation, and high achievement

orientation, with the other orientations being high or low according to the individual and the circumstances.

The fourth main type is the high-growth, high-potential new venture that could potentially become a global corporation with a relatively long corporate life. Here, the entrepreneur manages the commercialization of a disruptive new technology, such as occurred with Microsoft, Google, Dell and various other now-familiar but relatively young fast-growth high-potential new businesses. To form the intention to start a high-growth entrepreneurial venture, the individual probably has high economic orientation and low leisure orientation, since this type of business could make the entrepreneur very rich but consume a great deal of what might otherwise be leisure time. The individual probably also has high perquisite and high achievement orientations due to higher perquisites and sense of achievement expected to be associated with a high-growth business venture. Perfection orientation is more likely to be low, since the future is uncertain and disruptive innovations are associated with greater uncertainty than imitative new ventures and most employment situations. Work orientation might be high or low, although a compulsive need to work might be an advantage in a career path that will require a lot of hard work over the long term. In summary, we expect the intention to be a high-growth entrepreneur to be associated with high economic orientation, low leisure orientation, high perquisite orientation, high achievement orientation, low perfectionism orientation, and work orientation might be positive or negative with necessarily restricting the work effort the entrepreneur will deliver (Douglas & Morris, 2006a). Table 2 summarizes our expectations for the polarity of each orientation with respect to forming an intention to become each of the four main types of entrepreneur.

Table 2: Proposed Correlation of Entrepreneurship Types with Orientations

	Work orientation	Economic orientation	Leisure orientation	Perquisite orientation	Perfection orientation	Achievement orientation
Necessity entrepreneurship	Low	Low	High	Low	Low	Low
Lifestyle entrepreneurship	Low	Low	High	High	Low/High?	Low
Speculative entrepreneurship	Low/High?	High	Low/High?	Low/High?	Low	High
High-growth entrepreneurship	Low/High?	High	Low	High	Low	High

### WORKER TYPE, ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS, AND ENTREPRENEURIAL TYPE

We now discuss each of the worker types in terms of the likelihood that each might want to start a new venture, and the type of new venture that they might favour, given the attitudinal orientations that underlie their work behavior.

#### Enthusiastic Workaholics

Enthusiastic workaholics (HHH) are pre-disposed to delivering high work effort, because of their positive work orientation (Spence and Robbins, 1992) and their high perquisite orientation (Douglas & Morris, 2006a). As indicated in Table 1, their economic orientation and achievement orientation might also be high and their leisure orientation is expected to be low. We have argued that all five of these orientations militate for a positive attitude towards self-employed entrepreneurship. Conversely, perfectionist orientation is expected to be negatively associated with entrepreneurial intentions, but we do not expect enthusiastic workaholics to be perfectionists since they have high work enjoyment (Scott, Moore & Miceli, 1997). Thus enthusiastic workaholics are prime candidates for entrepreneurship. But what kind of entrepreneurship will the enthusiastic workaholic want to undertake? The analysis immediately above suggests they are most likely to seek high-growth entrepreneurship, with speculative entrepreneurship next most likely. The other forms of entrepreneurship would seem to be at odds with their compulsion to work and with their probably high economic and achievement orientations.

#### Work Addicts

Work addicts (HHL) deliver high work effort because of their positive work orientation (Spence and Robbins, 1992) and their low leisure orientation (Douglas & Morris, 2006a). Since they derive relatively low work enjoyment we speculate that their economic, perquisite and achievement

orientations must also be relatively low, and/or their perfectionist orientation might be relatively high, as indicated in Table 1. While the first two orientations auger well for entrepreneurship, the latter four appear to militate against it, as argued earlier. It will come down to the strength of preference for the first two relative to the strength of preference for the latter four. Very strong work orientation and very weak leisure orientation, combined with moderate economic, perquisite, achievement and perfectionist orientations, for example, would indicate that entrepreneurship would promise more utility, while moderate work and leisure orientations combined with very weak orientations in the other four dimensions, would militate in favour of an employment position being the utility-maximizing choice. If the work addict workaholic does choose entrepreneurship, we speculate that it is more likely to be the high-growth type due to that type's demand for hard work over a long period and at the expense of leisure time. Depending on the strength of the other orientations, an intention to become a speculative entrepreneur is also possible. The high work orientation of this individual seems to rule out the lower-effort types of entrepreneurship.

### **Work Enthusiasts**

Work enthusiasts (HLH) work hard despite having low work orientation and they gain high work enjoyment (Spence & Robbins, 1992) which we expect is due to their high economic, perquisite, and/or achievement orientation, and/or to their low leisure and perfectionist orientations. Thus the work enthusiast hits all six indicators for forming an intention to become an entrepreneur! Previously Scott, Moore and Miceli (1997) have identified the high-achiever work enthusiast, and Douglas & Morris (2006a) identified the materialist, low-leisure and perk-loving work enthusiasts. Here we note that in addition to these four 'pure' types of work enthusiast there are several combinations and mutations of these orientations – while the 'pure' work enthusiast is high in one of the orientations, 'combination' work enthusiast might be high in two, or more of the orientations that militate for a preference for self-employed entrepreneurship, and low in one or both of the orientations that militate for a preference for employment.

But what type of entrepreneurial venture might best suit the work enthusiast? As shown in Table 3, this depends on what type of work enthusiast we are talking about. The 'combination' work enthusiast is more likely to prefer high-growth new ventures, since they offer higher income, perquisites and achievement over a longer term, as compared to the speculative venture. The (pure) materialist work enthusiast seems most likely to prefer a speculative new venture, since this individual has strong preference for income and that type of venture is an opportunity to get rich quicker than the high-growth type, which is the next most likely to be preferred. The (pure) low-leisure work enthusiast seems likely to prefer the high-growth type of new venture, since it promises less leisure over a longer period, with the speculative venture being next most likely. The (pure) perk-loving work enthusiast seems likely to prefer the high-growth new venture since it promises more psychic benefits over a longer period. And finally, the (pure) high-achieving work enthusiast seems likely to prefer the high-growth venture, with the speculative venture being next most likely. Because of their orientation bundles, work enthusiasts seem unlikely to opt for necessity or lifestyle entrepreneurship, unless survival mandates that they do.

### **Reluctant Hard Workers**

Reluctant hard workers (HLL) display high levels of work effort despite low work orientation and derive low work enjoyment (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004). Scott et al (1997) argue that high perfectionist orientation may induce them to work hard, while Douglas and Morris (2006b) argue they work hard due to high economic orientation and/or low leisure orientation. We note that high perfectionism serves to reduce work enjoyment while high economic and/or low leisure orientation serves to raise it. Douglas & Morris (2006b) argue that since work enjoyment is low overall, perquisite and achievement orientation must also be low. Thus the reluctant hard worker has low work, high perfectionist, low perquisite, and low achievement orientations that militate against entrepreneurial intention, and only one or two that militate for an entrepreneurial intention (i.e. high economic and/or low leisure orientation).

Accordingly, they are unlikely to form an intention to become an entrepreneur unless it is the best job option available. Thus, the form of entrepreneurship that is most likely for this worker type is necessity entrepreneurship.

Table 3: Proposed Correlation of Worker Types with Entrepreneurship Types

	Necessity entrepreneurship	Lifestyle entrepreneurship	Speculative entrepreneurship	High-growth entrepreneurship
Enthusiastic workaholic (HHH)	Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Most likely
Work addict workaholic (HHL)	Unlikely	Unlikely	Most likely	Likely
Work enthusiast (HLH)	Unlikely	Unlikely	Likely	Most likely
<i>Materialistic work enthusiast (HLH)</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Most likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>
<i>Low-leisure work enthusiast (HLH)</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Most likely</i>
<i>Perk-loving work enthusiast (HLH)</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Most likely</i>
<i>High-achieving work enthusiast (HLH)</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Most likely</i>
Reluctant hard worker (HLL)	Most likely	Unlikely	Likely	Unlikely
Alienated workaholic (LHH)	Likely	Most likely	Unlikely	Unlikely
Disenchanted workaholic (LHL)	Most likely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely
Relaxed worker (LLH)	Likely	Most likely	Unlikely	Unlikely
Disengaged worker (LLL)	Most likely	Unlikely	Unlikely	Unlikely

### Alienated Workaholics

The alienated workaholic (LHH) has low work involvement despite high work orientation due to high leisure orientation (Buelens & Poelmans, 2004), and high work enjoyment due to high perquisite orientation (Douglas & Morris, 2006b). Buelens & Poelmans (2004) characterized alienated workaholics as professional accountants or lawyers, and Douglas & Morris (2006b) suggest we consider academics as well. Such people might be more attached to their profession than they are to their present employer. Activities outside the employer's workplace (which we have defined as 'leisure' in this paper) such as conferences and consulting, are relatively more important to these individuals, and thus we say they exhibit high leisure orientation and thus offer low work effort to their employer. We expect that their economic and achievement orientations are low, since they offer relatively low levels of work effort, and that their perfectionist orientation is also low, since they both offer low work effort and enjoy high levels of work enjoyment. Thus the alienated workaholic has four orientations militating against forming an entrepreneurial intention (viz: high leisure, low economic, low achievement, and low perfectionist orientations) and only two militating in favour of forming an entrepreneurial intention (viz: high work and high perquisite orientations).

Accordingly we expect the alienated workaholic to be unlikely to form an intention to become self-employed, but if they do, it is most likely that they would choose a 'lifestyle' business such as consulting or writing books, followed in probability by necessity entrepreneurship which would become necessary if they lost their job (by failing to 'make partner' or to gain tenure, for example).

### Disenchanted Workaholics

The disenchanted workaholic (LHL) has low work involvement despite high work orientation, and gains relatively low work enjoyment (Spence & Robbins, 1992). This combination suggests low economic orientation, high leisure orientation, low perquisite orientation, low achievement orientation and high perfectionist orientation. All five of these militate against forming an entrepreneurial intention, with only high work orientation being a possible driver for entrepreneurship. Thus we do not expect disenchanted workaholics to form an intention to become an entrepreneur, unless they are forced to become a necessity entrepreneur to fulfil their psychic need to work in the absence of any employment possibilities.

### Relaxed Workers

The relaxed worker (LLH) has low work involvement, low work orientation, and high work enjoyment (Spence & Robbins, 1992). This combination suggests low economic orientation, high leisure orientation, high perquisite orientation, low perfectionist orientation, and low achievement orientation. Of the six orientations, only the high perquisite orientation and the low perfectionist orientation militate in favour of forming an intention to become an entrepreneur, so the probability of choosing self-employment is relatively low. But note that low economic orientation, high leisure orientation,

high requisite orientation, and low perfectionist orientation do militate in favour of forming an intention for lifestyle entrepreneurship, with necessity entrepreneurship being the next most likely if a superior employment position is unavailable.

### **Disengaged Workers**

Finally, disengaged workers (LLL) have low work effort, low work orientation and low work enjoyment (Spence & Robbins, 1992). This combination suggests low economic orientation, high leisure orientation, low requisite orientation, low achievement orientation, and low perfectionist orientation. Thus, all six of these orientations militate against forming an intention to become an entrepreneur, but in the absence of a superior employment position we might expect this individual to form the intention to become a necessity entrepreneur.

## **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

Based on the Douglas & Shepherd (2000) model that demonstrates that employees might ‘make the jump’ to self-employed entrepreneurship if they expect to gain greater psychic satisfaction, we investigate the potential relationship between employee types and the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. This analysis has indicated that certain types of employee, as identified by the Spence & Robbins (1992) triad, can be characterized by six attitudinal orientations identified in the entrepreneurship and organizational behavior literatures, and that these types of workers are more or less likely to form an intention to become an entrepreneur because of the nature of their bundle of orientations. Moreover, since there are four main types of entrepreneurial venture which each deliver more or less of the items to which the orientations refer, we can draw conclusions about which type of entrepreneurial venture each worker type is most likely to prefer, other things being equal.

We found that necessity entrepreneurship is likely to be most attractive to reluctant hard workers (HHL), disenchanted workers (LHL) and disengaged workers (LLL), assuming they cannot find an employment position that offers greater expected total utility. These worker types have in common low work enjoyment, which is essentially due to their low requisite orientation and low achievement orientation. All three types are expected to have high leisure orientation. Two of these have high psychic drive to work which does not contribute much to work enjoyment, particularly if associated with high perfectionist orientation.

Lifestyle entrepreneurship is likely to be most attractive to alienated workaholics (LHH) and relaxed workers (LLH) who have in common low work effort and high work enjoyment, and probably also high leisure, requisite, and/or achievement orientation. If these low-work effort individuals must undertake self-employment (due to no better employment position being available) they would most likely form an intention to start a lifestyle business that allows them to maximize utility via the consumption of leisure and perquisites. Another group that might form an intention to start a lifestyle business is the perk-loving work enthusiast, since a lifestyle business allows the entrepreneur to align the perquisites of the business with lifestyle preferences.

Speculative entrepreneurship is considered most likely to be attractive to work addict workaholics (HHL) and perhaps also to (pure) materialist work enthusiasts (HLH). These two groups are willing to supply high work effort, but differ in that the former is driven to work hard by a high work orientation (and gains low work enjoyment) while the latter has low work orientation and high work enjoyment. We speculate that the former might also exhibit high economic orientation, and perhaps also high perfectionist orientation which increases work effort but decreases work enjoyment. As indicated in Table 3, we consider the next most likely entrepreneurship type for these groups to be the high-growth venture. For the (pure) materialist work enthusiast, the speculative new venture might be preferred, due to the ‘get rich quicker’ aspect of the speculative venture, discussed earlier.

Finally, high-growth new ventures are likely to be most attractive for combination work enthusiasts (HLH) – i.e. those who work hard because of high economic and/or low leisure orientation plus some combination of high requisite and/or high achievement orientation, and who derive high levels of work enjoyment from the latter two of these. Pure achievement and pure perk-loving work enthusiasts are also likely to prefer high-growth new ventures, although the latter might prefer a lifestyle new venture, as indicated above.

### **Implications for Policy**

Public policy in some jurisdictions encourages transforming the unemployed into self-employed entrepreneurs, and/or provides financial and technical assistance for the employed to jump to self-employed entrepreneurship with the expectation that the new ventures will grow and subsequently boost employment and tax revenues. We propose here that some individuals are innately suited to some types of entrepreneurship and innately unsuited to other types. Treating all nascent entrepreneurs

the same might serve to raise the failure rate of new ventures. Thus, an analysis of the orientations of potential or nascent entrepreneurs might be beneficially conducted prior to supplying these individuals with funding and/or technical assistance and effectively pushing 'square pegs into round holes' (which might be regarded as entrapment).

### Implications for Educators

Similarly, in our entrepreneurship classes we might be guilty of paying excessive attention to the grand vision of the high-growth new venture, at the expense of speculative, lifestyle, and necessity entrepreneurship opportunities. If indeed some crucial skills of entrepreneurs cannot be learned in classrooms and must be learned in practice, we might do better to emphasize less the absence of sustainable competitive advantage and emphasize more the opportunity to 'learn by doing' and even 'learn by failing'. Investors commonly prefer serial entrepreneurs (even with failures on their record) over novice entrepreneurs, and yet we teach students to recognize and mitigate risks and to not proceed to launch unless they can foresee sustainable competitive advantage. We might do better to build self-efficacy and let students back their own judgement in the new ventures for which they develop passion.

### Suggestions for Further Research

This conceptual paper has hopefully laid the foundation for a variety of empirical studies that might support or deny the assertions here. The first group of research propositions concerns the potential association of the worker types with the attitudinal bundles shown in Table 1. A second group of propositions concerns the contents of Table 2. Can we demonstrate empirically that the formation of an intention to start each of the four main types of new venture is related to the combinations of the six attitudinal orientations as asserted in that table? A third group of propositions is contained in Table 3, where the likelihood of forming an intention to start a new venture of the four types is related to the attitudinal characteristics of each worker type, culminating in propositions that each type of worker is most likely to start a new venture of a particular type. Finally, is the conceptual model right? Are there missing variables, significant cross-effects, moderators and/or mediators of these attitudinal orientations on either or both the work effort decision and/or the level of work enjoyment? There is much scope for further research in this area.

### References

- Bird, B., & Jellinek, M. (1988). "The operation of entrepreneurial intentions." *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, Winter, 21-29.
- Buelens, M. and Poelmans, S. A. (2004). "Enriching the Spence and Robbins' typology of workaholism: demographic, motivational and organizational correlates." *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5), 440-458.
- Burke, R. J. (1999a). "Workaholism in organizations: Gender differences." *Sex Roles*, 41(5-6), 333-345.
- Burke, R.J. (1999b). "Workaholism in organizations: measurement validation and replication." *International Journal of Stress Management*, 6(4), 225-239.
- Burke, R. J. (2001a). "Spence and Robbins' measures of workaholism components: Test-retest stability." *Psychological Reports*, 88, 882-888.
- Douglas, E.J. and Morris, R.J. (2006a). "Workaholic, or just Hard Worker?" *Career Development International*, 11(5): 394-417.
- Douglas, E.J. and Morris, R.J. (2006b). "The antecedents of workaholism and other worker behaviors." Paper presented at the *Academy of Management* annual meetings, Atlanta, GA.
- Douglas, E.J. and Shepherd, D.A. (2000). "Entrepreneurship as a utility-maximizing response." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(3): 231-251.
- Douglas, E.J. & Shepherd, D.A. (2002). "Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization." *Entrepreneurial Theory and Practice*, 26(3): 81-90.
- Hofer, C.W. (1976). "Research on strategic planning: A survey of past studies and suggestions for future efforts." *Journal of Economics and Business*, 38(3), 261-87.
- Lieberman, M.B. and Montgomery, D.B. (1988). "First-mover advantages." *Strategic Management Jnl.* 9:41-58.
- Locke, E.A. (1968). "Towards a theory of task motivation and incentives." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3: 157-189.

- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G., P. (1990). *A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance*. Englewood Cliffs N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G., P. (2004). What should we do about motivation theory? Six recommendations for the twenty-first century." *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3): 388-403.
- Machlowitz, M. (1980). *Workaholics: Living with Them, Working with Them*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, N.J. Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D.C. (1971). *Assessing Human Motivation*. New York: General Learning Press.
- Oates, W. (1971). *Confessions of a Workaholic: The Facts About Work Addiction*, New York: NY. World Publishing.
- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000). "Organizational citizen behaviors: A critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature and suggestions for further research." *Journal of Management*, 26(3): 513-563.
- Shane, S. (2003). *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Scott, K. S., Moore, K. S. and Miceli, M. P. (1997). "An exploration of the meaning and consequences of workaholism." *Human Relations*, 50(3), 287-314.
- Schein, E.H. (1987). "Individuals and careers." In J. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Behavior*, pp. 155-171 Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shepherd, D.A., Douglas, E.J. and Shanley, M. (2000). "New venture survival: Ignorance, external shocks, and risk reduction strategies." *Journal of Business Venturing*, 15(5-6): 393-410
- Snir, R. and Harpaz, I. (2002). "Work-leisure relations: Leisure orientation and the meaning of work." *Journal of Leisure Research*, 34(2), 178-203.
- Snir, R. and Harpaz, I. (2004). "Attitudinal and demographic antecedents of workaholism." *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 17(5), 520-536.
- Spence, J. T. and Robbins, A. S. (1992). "Workaholism: Definition, measurement, and preliminary results." *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 58(1), 160-178.
- Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T. & Shapiro, D.L. (2004). "The future of work motivation theory." *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3): 379- 387.
- Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965). "Social structures and organizations." In J.G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*, 149-193. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: McGraw Hill.