

Entrepreneurial Ambitions and Migration Trends in Odisha: A Conflict of Contexts

¹Gautam Sahoo, ²Suresh Kumar Sahoo, ³Shiba Prasad Mohanty, ⁴Arpita Panigrahi,

¹Research Scholar Faculty of Management Studies

Sri Sri University Cuttack, Odisha, India

²Associate Professor Faculty of Management Studies

Sri Sri University Cuttack, Odisha, India

ORCID: 0000-0001-6496-4413

³Assistant Professor School of Management

Ajeenkya D Y Patil University Lohegaon, Pune, India

ORCID: 0000-0001-6941-6221

⁴Consultant, Swadha consultants Pvt Ltd

ORCID: 0009-0004-4997-6247

Abstract

This article delves into the intricate landscape of entrepreneurship and migration decisions within the context of a dataset comprising 210 observations. The introduction sets the stage by acknowledging startups as catalysts for economic growth and recognizing the pivotal role of government support in their success. The evolution of India's startup ecosystem and Southeast Asia's maturing innovation landscape provide the backdrop for this analysis. The conclusion synthesizes the regression results and cross-correlation matrix, revealing key insights. Government encouragement and policy support emerge as influential factors driving entrepreneurial activities, particularly "Entering into." Paradoxically, the presence of a survival challenge deters both entrepreneurship and migration, suggesting that the unpredictable nature of long-term survival appears less daunting than immediate entrepreneurial hardships.

Key words: Entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial migration, survival challenge, startup policy

1. Introduction

Startups have emerged as powerful engines of economic growth, driving nations towards trillion-dollar economies while simultaneously generating employment opportunities. However, the journey of a startup is influenced by various factors, including experience, setbacks, achievements, and effective leadership. Among these, government support, manifested through well-crafted policies at the local, state, and national levels, plays a pivotal role in ensuring the sustained growth of startups. This introduction sets the stage for a comprehensive exploration of the startup ecosystem in India, particularly focusing on the state of Odisha. Grassroots innovations have garnered attention as a potent force in emerging economies. These innovations often arise when

existing structures and practices fail to meet the needs of the population or due to the innate curiosity of innovators. They are characterized by their ability to address practical, everyday challenges, reflecting the informal nature of innovation (Sahoo et al, 2023). This form of innovation is gaining traction, especially in India, where it contributes significantly to GDP and employment, albeit with room for further research and management strategies.

Additionally, within the context of the state of Odisha, while the overall startup development and growth have been encouraging, the burgeoning IT service sector poses challenges due to increasing competition. Yet, remote and tribal districts, with their untapped potential, can become fertile grounds for future startups, addressing local issues

and providing technological advancements to underserved communities. Moreover, Odisha's wealth of natural resources, including forests and herbal products, offers opportunities for startups to bridge the gap between these resources and a broader consumer base. Furthermore, the manufacturing of agricultural equipment and restoration services represents an innovative avenue for startups in the state.

As India embraces entrepreneurship and innovation, the nation's journey to outpace economic giants like China depends on overcoming various obstacles. The commitment of the government and various institutions to support startups, including in defense-related domains, will be pivotal in shaping India's entrepreneurial landscape. In this context, this paper delves into the multifaceted landscape of startups in India, with a particular focus on Odisha, analyzing the various factors that contribute to their growth, sustainability, and impact on the economy. The subsequent sections will provide an in-depth examination of these factors and their interplay in shaping India's entrepreneurial ecosystem.

2. Review of Literature

Numerous writers, economists, entrepreneurs, and business leaders have recognized startup ventures as the driving force behind economic growth, propelling the economy towards trillion-dollar status while also creating job opportunities. Although experience, setbacks, achievements, and effective leadership contribute to the business journey's smoother navigation, paramount to all is the substantial and robust support from local, state, and national governments, primarily through well-crafted policies, which plays a pivotal role in the sustained growth of startups in the future. This evolution of India's startup ecosystem unfolded in three distinct stages. Phase 1, which commenced in the early 2000s, primarily focused on the commercialization of technology. Around 2008, Phase 2 began with the emergence of Internet 2.0, shifting the emphasis from research to technology startups. The pivotal moment came in 2016 when the government introduced a startup policy, signaling the inception of Phase 3. Notably, between 2016 and 2021, the ecosystem experienced remarkable growth, more than

doubling in size, and producing over 40 unicorn startups in just 2021. This trend isn't confined to India alone; it's indicative of the broader Southeast Asian innovation and entrepreneurship landscape, which is maturing. The region is witnessing a surge in exits and unicorn creations, especially in four ASEAN Member States: Indonesia (five unicorns), Singapore (four unicorns), Vietnam (two unicorns), and Malaysia (one unicorn). It's anticipated that over 700 companies will exit between 2023 and 2025, primarily through mergers, acquisitions, and initial public offerings facilitated by Special Purpose Acquisition Companies (SPACs). Despite differing levels of development in Southeast Asian nations, the region benefits from an increasingly robust ecosystem with more available resources and venture capital. According to Chintan Vaishnav of Atal Innovation Mission (AIM), India's innovation ecosystem acts as a transducer, taking creativity as input and producing innovation and entrepreneurship as output. In environments with limited financing, creative efforts often concentrate on addressing significant challenges with strong local community support. Southeast Asia offers examples of rural businesses succeeding over larger counterparts due to their local motivation and dedication to creating value for their customers.

When examining India's startup ecosystem, Singh, Chauhan, and Dhir (2019) conducted a descriptive analysis using a dataset of 53,115 tweets from fifteen different Indian startups representing various states and industries. Their analysis aimed to gain insights into the current state of the startup ecosystem in India. The research findings revealed that the Indian startup ecosystem exhibits a strong inclination towards innovation, with a notable focus on both renewable and non-renewable resources. The data from Twitter analytics allowed for the identification of clusters that conveyed a positive sentiment among these startups, offering a visual representation of the vibrancy of the Indian startup landscape. However, the study also recognized the presence of negative emotions that warrant attention and addressing within this ecosystem.

Ledgerwood and Gibson (2013) underscore the importance of regulations, encompassing both formal and informal ones, by highlighting their role

in shaping behavior within financial market systems and influencing financial market outcomes. Microfinance institutions (MFIs) are obligated to adhere to legal standards, occasionally set by local authorities or professional organizations relevant to their operations, as well as informal norms, which come into play when working with specific demographics such as women or particular communities. In recent decades, grassroots innovations have gained significant attention, with scholars exploring their multifaceted nature (Hossain, 2016; Nair et al., 2017). This increased interest can be attributed to the critical role played by the informal or unorganized sector in developing and emerging economies. For example, this sector contributes a substantial two-thirds of India's GDP and employs approximately 81% of the unregistered population (ILO, 2018). Despite being a hub for "frugal" innovation, India climbed to the 57th position on the 2018 Global Innovation Index, highlighting the lack of research on managing locally rooted technological advancements in the country (Chatterjee and Sahasranamam, 2018). There is growing recognition that grassroots innovations are better suited to address the needs and challenges of local communities (Kumar, 2014). Consequently, various organizations have devised strategies to disseminate these innovations through commercialization to benefit others facing similar issues. However, this approach raises several questions, such as whether there is a standardized process for commercializing grassroots innovations, the various pathways for such commercialization, and how formal sector organizations can effectively support and promote these innovations. Furthermore, grassroots innovations follow a distinct approach, emphasizing the capacity of communities and the public at large to innovate. In their article, Babalola and Omobowale (2012) investigate the factors influencing the survival strategies of micro-entrepreneurs operating cybercafés in Ibadan, Nigeria. Their study emphasizes the significance of trust, innovation, and knowledge management in sustaining these small businesses. By examining these critical elements, the research sheds light on how these micro-entrepreneurs navigate the challenges of the cybercafé industry in their pursuit of long-term viability. According to Gupta (2010)

and Bhaduri and Kumar (2011), grassroots innovations emerge when existing structures and practices fail to meet the population's needs or due to the innovators' inherent curiosity. Thus, this approach underscores the role of communities and the general public in innovation. According to Seyfang and Haxeltine (2012), grassroots innovations are solutions created by users or the public to address highly practical everyday challenges. Consequently, the grassroots approach places greater emphasis on the informal nature of innovations compared to the traditional Bottom of the Pyramid (BoP) approach, which focuses more on the formal dynamics and characteristics of innovations.

One of the world's fastest-growing economies is India, boasting a remarkable growth rate of 7%. Several factors contribute to this expansion, with entrepreneurship playing a pivotal role. To establish itself as a leading consumer market, India must harness its local resources, and this article delves into the burgeoning entrepreneurial ecosystem within the nation. The piece also explores organizations that support startups and underscores the importance of a robust startup ecosystem in fostering entrepreneurship's growth. Startups cannot thrive in isolation; they require a supportive ecosystem to flourish. India is witnessing a surge in entrepreneurial activity, boasting 48 million small enterprises, compared to the United States' 23 million. Nevertheless, access to funding remains a challenge in both countries. As the world's largest democracy, India is poised for significant economic growth, propelled by its burgeoning entrepreneurial culture, proactive government, and increased availability of capital. With unwavering support from the government and various institutions, India aspires to outpace China in the near future by surmounting all obstacles.

The overall progress and expansion of startups in the state of Odisha have been quite positive, with the highest number of startups registering in 2017. However, there is a concerning trend in the IT service sector, which hosts a significant number of startups in the state and is currently experiencing growth. This increase could potentially pose challenges for the long-term sustainability of

startups, as it leads to a crowded market with numerous players in the same category. On the other hand, remote and tribal districts in the state, where startup presence is minimal, hold substantial untapped potential for future entrepreneurial endeavors. These startups could not only address local issues but also provide technological benefits to the residents of these districts.

Odisha, with its abundant forests and herbal resources, presents an opportunity for startups specializing in bringing these products to a wider audience. Additionally, the manufacturing and development of agricultural equipment and restoration services could be a fertile ground for innovative startups in the state. It's worth noting that while the central government has announced specific subsidies and incentives for defense-based startups, Odisha currently lacks a presence in this sector. Both the state and central governments should take proactive measures to attract startup entrepreneurs in the defense-related domain to foster growth and innovation in this area as well.

Survival and growth

The paper discusses research conducted by Watson et al. in 1998, focusing on an empirical investigation into the initial stages of business start-ups, including their survival, growth, or failure. The study examines a group of small or micro businesses that were established with support from a government agency called the Training & Enterprise Council (TEC) in the West Yorkshire region. TECs, initiated by the British government in 1988, provide assistance to small and medium-sized businesses. The paper also provides background information on the services offered by the TEC. Notably, this study advances our understanding of issues related to small business start-ups and early development, with consistent findings obtained through various statistical analysis techniques. The research affirms the idea that even within the realm of very small businesses, there are significant variations in owner backgrounds, experiences, encountered challenges, motivations for starting a business, and objectives for growth and development. The startup scene in Odisha has shown significant growth, with the highest number of registrations in 2017, Patnaik et al (2019). However, the IT service

sector, which houses many startups, is becoming increasingly crowded, potentially posing long-term survival challenges due to market saturation. On the flip side, remote and tribal districts, with limited startup presence, hold immense potential for future ventures, offering solutions and technical advantages to local communities. The state's rich natural resources, including forests and herbal products, create opportunities for startups to reach a broader audience. Additionally, the agro-based equipment manufacturing and defense sectors could serve as innovative startup avenues, deserving attention and support from both state and central governments, Patnaik et al (2019). Kalyanasundaram et al.'s 2021 paper seeks to address two critical questions: Firstly, it examines the timing of tech start-up failures, considering the various stages they go through. Secondly, it investigates the specific attributes that accelerate the failure of tech start-ups throughout their life cycle. These inquiries remain largely unexplored, especially in the context of India's rapidly developing startup ecosystem, which is eager to thrive. In the paper authored by Jenkins and McKelvie in 2016, they examine various interpretations of entrepreneurial failure, encompassing both firm-level and individual-level aspects, as well as objective and subjective viewpoints of failure. They also explore how these interpretations can impact forthcoming research, influencing factors such as the selection of study participants and the types of inquiries that researchers pose.

3. Hypothesis of the study

On the basis of existing literatures, this study has proposed to obtain the following alternative hypotheses.

H₁: Entrepreneurs' decision for entering into Odisha's startup ecosystem is being impacted by government's encouragement drive, state government's policy support and survival challenge.

H₂: Entrepreneurs' decision for shifting their business base to other state is being impacted by government's encouragement drive, state government's policy support and survival challenge.

4. Data and Methodology

This study is based on a total of 210 responses received from entrepreneurs who did set up their business base in Odisha. The data has been collected on the basis of primary field survey.

Dependent Variables:

In this study two dependent variables have been considered. One is ‘entering into’ and the other one is ‘shifting to other state’. both are encoded in two binary numbers, i.e., 1 and 0. For ‘entering into’, taking the binary number 0(zero) represents, entrepreneurs find it not at all risky to entering into Odisha’s startup ecosystem and on the other hand, ‘entering into’, taking the binary number 1(one) represents, entrepreneurs find it very risky to entering into Odisha’s startup ecosystem. For ‘shifting to other states’, taking the binary number 0(zero) represents, entrepreneurs find it not advisable at this very point in time to shift to other states and on the other hand, ‘shifting to other states’, taking the binary number 1(one) represents, entrepreneurs find it absolutely advisable to shift to other states for various reasons.

Independent Variables:

In this study three independent variables have been considered, policy support from the state government, long term survival challenge and Odisha government’s encouragement drive. For policy support taking the value of 1(one) represents that entrepreneurs have accessed policy support from the government and on the other hand, 0(zero) represents that entrepreneurs have not accessed any policy support from the government. For this study, statistical software STATA 14 has been used.

5. Empirical Analysis and Results

The description of variables is of paramount importance in the realm of research for several compelling reasons. Firstly, it provides clarity and context to the data, allowing researchers to understand what each variable represents and its relevance to the study. This comprehension is

crucial for making informed decisions about data processing, statistical techniques, and the overall research methodology. Secondly, variable descriptions aid in the interpretation of results. When statistical analyses are conducted, knowing the nature of each variable helps researchers understand the significance of their findings. It allows for a deeper understanding of how different variables relate to each other and to the research question, facilitating the extraction of meaningful insights and conclusions. The description of the variables are as follows in the form of Table 1.

Table 1: Description of the Variables

Nature of the variable	Name of variables	Description of variable
Dependent variables	Entry mode	How risky does it feel for entrepreneurs to entering into startup ecosystem of Odisha?
	Shifting to other state	To what extent entrepreneurs try to shift the business base to other state?
Independent variables	Government encouragement drive	Odisha government's encouragement drive explained by entrepreneurs
	Policy support	Access to policy support offered by Odisha government
	Survival challenge	Regarding long term survival in the state Odisha

Source: Author’s own calculation

Data source: Primary field survey

In this study, all the variables are binary and mostly ordered. Dependent variables 'entering into' and 'shifting to other states', both are encoded in two binary numbers, i.e., 1 and 0. For 'entering into', taking the binary number 0(zero) represents, entrepreneurs find it not at all risky to entering into Odisha's startup ecosystem and on the other hand, 'entering into', taking the binary number 1(one) represents, entrepreneurs find it very risky to entering into Odisha's startup ecosystem. For 'shifting to other states', taking the binary number 0(zero) represents, entrepreneurs find it not advisable at this very point in time to shift to other states and on the other hand, 'shifting to other states', taking the binary number 1(one) represents, entrepreneurs find it absolutely advisable to shift to other states for various reasons.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable s	No. of observations	Mean	standard deviation	Min	Max
Entry mode	210	0.566667	0.49672	0	1
Shifting to other state	210	0.490476	0.501104	0	1
Government encouragement drive	210	1.566667	1.118711	0	3
policy support	210	0.514286	0.50099	0	1
survival challenge	210	0.980952	0.818225	0	2

Source: Author's own calculation

Data source: Primary field survey

In this dataset comprising 210 observations, several variables related to factors influencing migration and entrepreneurship are analyzed. On average,

56.67% of individuals are entering into entrepreneurship, with a standard deviation of 49.67%, indicating significant variation in this behavior. Similarly, shifting to another state is observed in 49.05% of cases, again displaying considerable dispersion with a standard deviation of 50.11%. Government encouragement drive is relatively higher, with an average score of 1.57 on a scale ranging from 0 to 3, reflecting moderate support from the government. Policy support is reported at 51.43%, with a narrow standard deviation of 50.10%, implying consistent policy backing for entrepreneurship. Lastly, individuals, on average, face a survival challenge score of 0.98, suggesting a moderate level of difficulty, although this score varies widely with a standard deviation of 0.82, highlighting the diverse experiences individuals encounter in entrepreneurship.

Table 3: Cross-correlation Matrix- 01

	Entry mode	Government encouragement drive	Policy support	Survival challenge
Entry mode	1.0000			
Government encouragement drive	0.81	1.0000		
Policy support	-0.0423	-0.1639	1.0000	
Survival challenge	-0.061	0.0589	0.1291	1.0000

Source: Author's own calculation

Data source: Primary field survey

The cross-correlation matrix provided shows the correlations between four variables: "Entering into," "Government encouragement drive," "Policy support," and "Survival challenge." Each cell in the matrix contains the correlation coefficient between two variables, providing insights into their

relationships There is a strong positive linear relationship (correlation) between "Entering into" and "Government encouragement drive." This suggests that as one variable increases, the other tends to increase as well. There is a very weak negative linear relationship between "Entering into" and "Policy support." The correlation is close to zero, indicating little to no linear association. There is a very weak negative linear relationship between "Entering into" and "Survival challenge." Again, the correlation is close to zero, suggesting minimal linear association. There is a weak negative linear relationship between "Government encouragement drive" and "Policy support." While the correlation is not very strong, it indicates a slight negative association. There is a very weak positive linear relationship between "Government encouragement drive" and "Survival challenge." The correlation is close to zero, suggesting minimal linear association. There is a weak positive linear relationship between "Policy support" and "Survival challenge." Although not very strong, this correlation indicates a positive association.

Table 4: Cross-correlation Matrix-02

	Shifting to other states	Government encouragement drive	Policy support	Survival challenge
Shifting to other states	1.000			
Government encouragement drive	0.0726	1.000		
Policy support	0.0196	-0.1639	1.000	
Survival challenge	-0.0817	0.0589	0.1291	1.000

Source: Author's calculation

Data source: Primary field survey

The cross-correlation matrix presented here illustrates the relationships between four variables: "Shifting to other state," "Government encouragement drive," "Policy support," and "Survival challenge." Notably, "Shifting to other state" exhibits a strong negative correlation with "Survival challenge," indicating that an increase in the tendency to "Shifting to other state" is associated with a significant decrease in "Survival challenge." Conversely, "Government encouragement drive" shows a very weak positive correlation with "Shifting to other state," suggesting a limited positive relationship. "Policy support" displays a negligible correlation with "Shifting to other state." Overall, this matrix provides insights into how these variables interact, highlighting the particularly strong inverse relationship between "Shifting to other state" and "Survival challenge."

Table-4: Regression Result (Ordered Logistic regression)

Explanatory variables	Entering into		Shifting to other state	
	Coefficient	P value	Coefficient	P value
Govt encouragement drive	1.29	0.019**	0.15	0.216
Policy support	-0.1078	0.708	1.19	0.047**
Survival challenge	-0.0816	0.036**	-0.23	0.018**

Source: Author's computation

Data source: Field survey

Note: Significance at *=90%, **=95%, ***=99%, Prob>chi2=0.000

The regression results reveal interesting relationships between the explanatory variables and the outcomes, "Entering into" and "Shifting to other state." "Govt encouragement drive" exhibits a statistically significant positive impact on "Entering into," with a coefficient of 1.29 and a low p-value of 0.019, indicating that higher levels of

government encouragement are associated with an increased likelihood of firms "Entering into" activities. Conversely, "Policy support" shows a significant positive influence on "Shifting to other state," with a coefficient of 1.19 and a p-value of 0.047, suggesting that when policy support is higher, firms are more inclined to "Shift to other state." "Survival challenge," on the other hand, has a statistically significant negative effect on both "Entering into" and "Shifting to other state," indicating that as the challenges of long-term survival becomes unpredictable, firms do feel it is less-riskier to entering into Odisha's startup environment as well as shifting to other states is not that required. Firms find unpredictable nature of long-term survival is way better than hardships predicted today for long term. These results provide valuable insights into how these factors impact the decisions of firms to enter new activities and relocate to other states, shedding light on the complexities of these relationships.

Conclusion and Suggestions

In conclusion, the regression results and cross-correlation matrix shed light on the complex interplay of factors influencing entrepreneurship and migration decisions. The findings highlight the significance of government encouragement and policy support in driving entrepreneurial activities, particularly "Entering into." Conversely, the presence of a survival challenge appears to deter both "Entering into" and "Shifting to other state" behaviors, suggesting that the unpredictability of long-term survival is perceived as less risky than the immediate hardships faced in entrepreneurship. The cross-correlation matrix underscores the importance of government encouragement in facilitating "Entering into" entrepreneurship, indicating a positive relationship. However, it also reveals minimal linear associations between other variables, suggesting that multiple intricate factors influence these decisions.

Overall, this analysis provides valuable insights into the nuanced dynamics of entrepreneurship and migration in the context of the dataset's 210 observations. It emphasizes the varying experiences and behaviors of individuals in response to factors such as government support, policy, and survival challenges, highlighting the

need for multifaceted approaches to support and promote entrepreneurship.

References

1. Babalola, S. S., & Omobowale, A. O. (2012). The role of trust, innovation and knowledge management in entrepreneurial survival strategies: a study of selected cybercafé micro-entrepreneurs in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Inkanyiso: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 128-136.
2. Boso, N., et al. (2019). Do entrepreneurs always benefit from business failure experience? *Journal of Business Research*, 98, 370-379.
3. Chatterjee, D., & Sahasranamam, S. (2018). Technological innovation research in China and India: A bibliometric analysis for the period 1991–2015. *Management and Organization Review*, 14(1), 179-221.
4. Eneh, O. C. (2010). Survival strategies for entrepreneurs in dwindling Nigerian economy. *Asian Journal of Industrial Engineering*, 2(2), 52-62.
5. Escalante, C. L., & Turvey, C. G. (2006). Business start-up survival challenges and strategies of agribusiness and non-agribusiness entrepreneurs. *Agricultural Finance Review*, 66(1), 61-75.
6. Etim, J. J., Adabu, M. U., & Ogar, C. A. (2017). Influence of entrepreneurial orientation as survival strategy for small and medium enterprises: The Nigeria experience. *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management*, 5(8), 502-518.
7. Hossain, M. M. (2016). Environmental Reporting Practices in Annual Report of Selected Pharmaceuticals and Chemicals Companies in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 5, 20-28.
8. Hunt, R. A. (2013). Essays concerning the entry and survival strategies of entrepreneurial firms: A transaction perspective (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder).
9. Jenkins, A., & McKelvie, A. (2016). What is entrepreneurial failure? Implications for

- future research. *International Small Business Journal*, 34(2), 176-188.
10. Kalyanasundaram, G., Ramachandrupa, S., & Hillemane, B. S. M. (2021). The life expectancy of tech start-ups in India: what attributes impact tech start-ups' failures? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 27(8), 2050-2078.
 11. Murray, J. A. (1984). A concept of entrepreneurial strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(1), 1-13.
 12. Nijkamp, P. (2003). Entrepreneurship in a modern network economy. *Regional Studies*, 37(4), 395-405.
 13. Ovhare, O. H., Woko, E. B., & Ezeocha, V. U. (2021). Remote working: Entrepreneurial risk and entrepreneurial survival in the micro firms in Niger-Delta, Nigeria (COVID-19 Pandemic Prospects). *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(4), 11-28.
 14. Patnaik, A., Pasumarti, S. S., & Nayak, B. (2019). Performance evaluation of startup Odisha policy. *Virtual reality*, 2.8, 8.
 15. Sahoo, G., Sahoo, S. K., Mohanty, S. P., & Rao, M. P. (2023). An Insight into The Start-Up Ecosystem in Odisha: A Comprehensive Study. *Innovation*, 52(4).
 16. Seyfang, G., & Haxeltine, A. (2012). Growing grassroots innovations: exploring the role of community-based initiatives in governing sustainable energy transitions. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 30(3), 381-400.
 17. Singh, S., Chauhan, A., & Dhir, S. (2019). Analyzing the startup ecosystem of India: A Twitter analytics perspective. *Journal of Advances in Management Research*, 17(2), 262-281.
 18. 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.
