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Abstract

Entrepreneurs are portrayed as salient drivers of regional development and for a number of years nascent entrepreneurs have been studied in a large number of countries as part of the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor project and the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics. Scholars have devoted much effort to investigating factors that determine how individuals engage in entrepreneurial activities, with most of the discussion limited to business start-ups. However, since this type of project does not follow identical nascent entrepreneurs over time, limited knowledge exists about their development and whether they stay in this nascent phase for a long time. In practice, it is common for entrepreneurs to run a business and at the same time work in wage work, so-called combining entrepreneurs. In Sweden, almost half of all business owners combine wage work with a business. However, not all combining entrepreneurs will eventually decide to leave the wage work and invest fully in the business. Consequently, much research has focused on the first step of entering entrepreneurship full time, but less has focused on the second step, the transition from the combining phase to full-time self-employment. The aim of this thesis is therefore to contribute to the theory of entrepreneurship by gaining a deeper understanding of combining entrepreneurs and their motives and intentions.

In the context of combining entrepreneurs, the theory of identity, resources and choice overload has been used to examine how entrepreneurs' age (when starting the business), entrepreneurial tenure (the length of engagement in the side-business), hours spent (weekly involvement in the side-business), involvement in entrepreneurial teams (leading the business with one or more partners) and involvement in networks (business networks) influence their passion for engaging in entrepreneurship while sustaining wage work. Different categories of combining entrepreneurs and their intentions have also been examined.
A survey was administered to 1457 entrepreneurs within the creative sector in two counties in Sweden (Gävleborgs County and Jämtlands County). Since there were no separate mailing lists to only combining entrepreneurs, the survey was sent to all entrepreneurs within the chosen industry and counties. The total response rate was 33.5 percent and of them 57.6 percent combined, yielding 262 combining entrepreneurs who answered the questionnaire. The survey was then followed up with eight focus group interviews and two single interviews to validate the answers from the questionnaire.

The results indicate three types of combining entrepreneurs: nascent – with the intention to leave the combining phase for a transition into full-time self-employment, lifestyle – with the intention to stay in the combining phase, and occasional – with the intention to leave the combining phase for full-time wage work and close down the business. Transitioning fully to self-employment increases with the individual’s age. Also, a positive interactive effect exists with involvement in entrepreneurial networks. The results also indicate that the ability to work with something one is passionate about is the top motive for combining wage work with a side-business. Passion is also more likely to be the main motive behind the combining form among individuals who are older at business start-up, but passion is less likely to be the main motive behind the combining form among individuals who spend more time on the business. The longer the individual has had the side-business, the less likely passion is the main motive behind the combining form, and passion is less likely to be the main motive among those who are part of an entrepreneurial team.

**Keywords:** Combining entrepreneurs, hybrid entrepreneurs, self-employment, nascent entrepreneurs, lifestyle entrepreneurs, occasional entrepreneurs, passion, entrepreneurial tenure, entrepreneurial teams, choice, logistic regression
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1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines combining entrepreneurs and the aim is to contribute to a better understanding of who they are, why they combine and their motives and intentions with their side-business.

1.1. Background

In the last decade, the work form has no longer been dichotomised within the research of entrepreneurship and occupation; it’s been developed to include more than only employees or the self-employed\(^1\). Today an individual has a variety of choices and can choose whatever is best for him or her: to be a traditional wage worker\(^2\), combine two or more wage jobs, combine wage work with self-employment, be purely self-employed, own several businesses or just work part-time in either wage work or self-employment. The same goes for those who start a business and become a nascent entrepreneur, where different choices can be made regarding the business start-up. For this thesis, the focus is on individuals who combine wage work with self-employment, so-called combining entrepreneurs. The concept is not new; in every era individuals have combined, but today it is more common for people in employment to start a side-business, either because they have to (a push factor) or simply because they want to (a pull factor).

Businesses are important for any country and they often contribute to economic growth, the labour market and/or regional development. In Sweden, 96.4 percent of all businesses are micro-businesses with up to 10 employees (73.9 percent are solo-businesses) (Ekonomifakta 2014) and four of five employment positions are created within these small businesses (Företagarna 2014). Nearly half of all business owners combine wage work with a business (Statistics Sweden 2010). In 2006, combining entrepreneurs made up 32 percent of all business owners (Delmar et al. 2008); in 2010, this number increased to 47 percent\(^3\) (Statistics Sweden 2010). If this increase persists, the majority of all business owners in Sweden will combine and thus be those who represent the regional and national development of the future. Since nearly half of all business owners in Sweden combine (in the UK this figure is 80 percent), they are an interesting group to study, but in the research about entrepreneurs and nascent entrepreneurs, they are mentioned briefly but not

---

1 In this thesis, self-employed describes both those who run a business alone, and also those who have employees. They could also be part- or full-time self-employed.
2 Another name used in this thesis is wage-employment.
3 This number can differ depending on what kind of data have been used and what has been included; sometimes, it includes directorships, and in other cases those with low or no income are excluded (Tillväxtverket 2013; Företagarna 2012).
discussed in detail. It is thought that the combining phase involves just a short period, but does it?

In the literature about combining entrepreneurs, various terms are used depending on what motives and intentions entrepreneurs have for starting a business alongside their wage work, and the most common terms are hybrid entrepreneurs, part-time entrepreneurs, side-activity entrepreneurs, lifestyle entrepreneurs, soci(etal) entrepreneurs and moonlighters. These terms will be described in more detail in the theory chapter. For individuals who work in wage work but intend to become full-time self-employed, the term hybrid entrepreneur has been used most recently (Raffiee and Feng 2013; Folta et al. 2010). In this thesis, both combining entrepreneur and hybrid entrepreneur are used; the latter is used in the papers and the first in the introductory chapters of this thesis to distinguish between the different definitions. In Sweden, the word to describe these combining entrepreneurs is kombinatör; this word entered the Swedish language in 2010 (Language Council 2010). The Language Council (2010) described a new trend in the workplace in which the combining entrepreneur "combines a solid job and secure income with self-realization, creativity, and hopefully lucrative business ideas. The best of two worlds". Because this kind of work form is becoming more and more common in Sweden (Statistics Sweden 2010; Language Council 2010), it is important to increase the knowledge about the phenomenon to adapt support systems for combining entrepreneurship. As the Swedish government’s ambition is to encourage entrepreneurship and new business creation, it is important to also develop the support systems further so that those who intend to become full-time self-employed can obtain the support and help they need for their transition. However, not all combining entrepreneurs want to become full-time self-employed; therefore, support systems must also be developed to serve entrepreneurs who have no intention of leaving the combining phase. Although they may not have the ambition to grow and become self-employed full-time, they may contribute to the community economy and therefore also need support and help, but maybe in a different way.

Entrepreneurship and business owners are, as illustrated, important concepts in the discussion of economic development and new businesses start-ups (Reynolds and Curtin 2009). Today very few would raise their eyebrows if someone said they were self-employed, compared with just a decade ago. Many see self-employment as a career path that is as important as that of any wage worker in the community (Reynolds and Curtin 2009). Start-ups in Sweden account for about 70,000 new businesses each year (Statistics Sweden 2010), but far from all businesses that start survive. For some individuals, the adventure comes to an end even before the

---

4 In paper 3, the term full-time entrepreneur has also been used, meaning the same.
business has started, maybe because their business idea was not sufficient or they realised that this career choice was not for them. For some, the business might have a jumpstart and grow rapidly, but for others it may take a while.

1.2. The problem in general

Will all the combining entrepreneurs businesses achieve economic growth? Is that the aim for every entrepreneur? What is combining entrepreneurs’ opinion? Do these individuals start a business just to test an idea or are other motives behind their start? The concept of the entrepreneurial process or venture start-up includes everything from idea, start-up and development/persistence through termination (Reynolds and Curtin 2009; Reynolds et al. 2004). However, there is still little knowledge about whether these models fit all work forms, and especially whether the models are relevant to the work form for combining entrepreneurs.

1.2.1. Nascent entrepreneurs

Since new businesses are important to any country (Henrekson and Johansson 2008; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Daunfeldt and Halvarsson 2013), new business creation has had a major focus in research, particularly through the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics (PSED) and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) reports. In these studies, many individuals, entrepreneurs/business owners and students from all over the world were asked about how they look at starting a business, if they were planning to start a business in the future and if they already had started a business (Allen 1998; Campbell and De Nardi 2009; Reynolds et al. 2004; Reynolds and Curtin 2009; Acs and Szerb 2007; Amorós and Bosma 2014; Bosma 2013). These studies, among others, aimed to predict who will become an entrepreneur in the future (Elfving 2009). One finding from these studies is that many nascent entrepreneurs choose to combine the start-up of the business with wage work (Burke et al. 2008; Burmeister-Lamp et al. 2012; Folta et al. 2010; Delmar et al. 2008), but how long they stay in the combining phase is not as explored. Previous research has mainly focused on the nascent entrepreneurs who go directly into self-employment and transition quickly from conception to firm birth, two transition phases described in the research about nascent entrepreneurs. Recent research has shown that the nascent entrepreneurs who combine only do so for a short time as a way of bootstrapping and to acquire knowledge about, for example, the market before taking the step in full (Petrova 2012; Raffiee and Feng 2013; Folta et al. 2010). As mentioned earlier, combining entrepreneurs make up half of all entrepreneurs in countries like Sweden, Germany and Great Britain (Burke et al. 2008; Burmeister-Lamp et al. 2012; Folta et al. 2010; Delmar et al. 2008), and therefore they constitute a large group to study. The issue this thesis aims to raise is that the combination may not be temporary and that many may combine
for a long time, which can cause bias in the research data about nascent entrepreneurs. Combining entrepreneurs should therefore not be ignored and the data about them should be detached from the data about entrepreneurs who go directly into self-employment and looked at separately.

1.2.2. The motives and intentions for entrepreneurship

Starting a business requires an underlying intention and a motive. Intention refers to thinking ahead, the future ambition, and is the result of the motive, which is the reason why individuals want to start a business in the first place (Jenkins 1965). In the classic entrepreneurship research with Cantillon (1755) as the forerunner, and supported later by both Schumpeter (1934) and Kirzner (1978), the main motive for why individuals become entrepreneurs has been to make money. However, the motive for starting a business and becoming an entrepreneur is usually more complex. Thus, it is important to look at other factors. Passion is one such factor, and Smilor (1997) suggested that passion is perhaps the main reason motivating the entrepreneurial process. Passion means having a drive for something and for most individuals it is this drive/passion that makes them start a business. However, this effort also allows them to challenge themselves and take risks (Carsrud and Brännback 2011). Cardon et al. (2009b) described passion as "consciously accessible, intense positive feeling ... and results from engagement in activities with meaning and identity salience to the entrepreneur" (p. 515). Without passion for what the entrepreneur does, the risk is that the business will end up in a downward spiral, and everything will become a burden (Binder and Coad 2013; Carland et al. 1984). The research on passion has revealed harmonious and obsessive passions. However, very little effort so far, even though this area is growing, has been given to studying passion among entrepreneurs and no studies exist on combining entrepreneurs.

Passion for something (e.g. a hobby) can say something about an individual’s identity. Identity theory focuses on the emotions that govern the different roles and create the identity, as well as how these roles are prioritised (Stryker and Burke 2000). Individuals have as many identities/roles as society demands, including, for example, wage worker, entrepreneur, wife/husband and parent (Mead 1934). Depending on the importance of each role, the roles are measured differently, where wage work for a combining entrepreneur may be valued more highly when it pays the bills and funds the business. If the individual has young children, maybe parenting comes second. Nurturing the relationship with the wife/husband might come in third place, and the business may come in fourth. This priority may not always conform to the ideal of what the individual really wants, but sometimes these entrepreneurs must make decisions that are not always
to their own advantage or desire (Murnieks 2007). Every individual has his or her own priorities, and some people prioritise the business over of wage work while others value family first (Stryker and Burke 2000). The greater the number of priorities the role has, the more likely it is that the commitment will be strong, just as is the passion (Murnieks et al. 2012). When identity is well integrated in the self-concept, the individual feels a strong motivation to act and do so in a manner consistent with the rest of his or her identities (Murnieks et al. 2012; Burke and Reitzes 1981; McCall and Simmons 1966). Also within this theory, research on combining entrepreneurs is lacking, something that should be further explored since combining entrepreneurs often have more identities than average. Little is known about how the work form affects combining entrepreneurs, how long they stay in the start-up process and whether there is room/time to develop a business and when it will fit into life.

To maintain and defend the resources needed to do what the individual wants in the different identities, without increasing stress, the individual needs a framework to understand and predict how to optimise the balance of resources, costs and benefits (Hobfoll 2011; Grandey and Cropanzano 1999; Taris et al. 1999). This is discussed in the conservation of resource theory (COR). With excessive demands from the environment and even from combining entrepreneurs themselves, these different roles can outmanoeuvre the individual, impoverishing the resources needed to successfully manage the different roles. The basis of COR theory is that the individual achieves, nourishes and protects the resources that are crucial and attempts to find a balance among health, welfare, family, self-preservation and self-esteem (Hobfoll 2011). The essence is to try to find ways to successfully handle any challenges that arise, so the mechanism for passion for what the entrepreneur loves can be developed. The knowledge of the right time in life to start a business and protect its resources has not been fully explored; nor has whether it is better to be self-employed full-time than to combine.

Sometimes, the choices that must be made can be difficult when the individual wants more than he or she can handle. The smart choice can be to wait until resources are available, as mentioned earlier, but not all people are capable of doing that (Hsee and Hastie 2006). Instead of waiting, individuals might choose something that provides direct satisfaction (Hsee and Hastie 2006). Starting a business may initially provide pleasure and give vent for the individual’s creativity. However, studies have shown that individuals usually want to have a lot to choose from and do not settle on just doing one thing, so the hobby/business may expand (Scheibehenne et al. 2009). The more choices there are, the harder it is to make the right choice (Schwartz 2008; Shah and Wolford 2007; Binswanger
An individual who previously was rational in his or her decisions might be less rational and act impulsively, even knowing that it affects the well-being (Hsee and Hastie 2006). How this influences the combining entrepreneur is still unknown, as is whether too many choices have a negative effect on development of the business.

To make smart choices, starting a business with a team member can be a good idea. Then the risks and funding will be shared (Lanivich 2013; O’Connor et al. 2006; Matlay and Westhead 2005), as well as time and resources. However, even here the team must make good choices and choose members who complement each other, while not being too different (Chowdhury 2005; Kanmogne and Eskridge 2013). Many businesses start with a team member (Lanivich 2013; Barringer and Ireland 2008), but few succeed over time (Mohr and Spekman 1994). Because team members are common when businesses are started, more information is needed on why so few are successful over time and what factors influence this trend. Mohr and Spekman (1994) argued that one explanation is that after a while the various team members want different things and, therefore, choose to go different ways, but the knowledge is still inadequate and needs more attention.

Much of the research about entrepreneurs has aimed to describe or predict who becomes an entrepreneur (Elfving 2009), while less research has been conducted on combining entrepreneurs and their motives and intentions. Combining entrepreneurs constitute a gap in the entrepreneurship theory, a theory that has so far mostly developed the notion of who becomes a “pure” entrepreneur and the start-up process. One explanation might be that combining entrepreneurs are not believed to be a group on which to focus as they are only in this combining phase for a short period. However, this thesis will demonstrate that this is not the case.

Many research fields have intriguing theories, like Choice and COR theory, that have not been applied to entrepreneurs. Choice theory has mostly been focused on marketing and the number of choices an individual has when he or she is shopping. However, the theory can be developed into much more, particularly in the entrepreneurship and combining entrepreneurship research, since entrepreneurs are faced with many choices in regards to employment, family and leisure. The same applies for the COR theory, where individuals need to be able to adjust resources so stress and conflict does not arise. For combining entrepreneurs, this is especially important since they have different roles to consider. The theory of passion has begun to be developed in entrepreneurship theory, but no studies have investigated combining entrepreneurs. Because research is so scant regarding combining entrepreneurs in general, knowledge is low on their intentions and what it is that drives them. Also, the questions to measure passion are not
currently developed for entrepreneurship and more research is thus needed to provide more relevant questions so the measurements will be improved.

1.3. **Research aim and questions**

The aim of this thesis is to contribute to the theory of entrepreneurship by developing a deeper understanding of combining entrepreneurs and their motives and intentions. It is important to understand that not all entrepreneurs want to become self-employed and some may not even have the ambition to leave the combining phase at all. The problem with the studies performed on nascent entrepreneurs is that all the models are developed on the basis that the individuals go directly into self-employment or that they combine for a limited time. However, Reynolds (2011) found in a follow-up study from the PSED I that many were still in the start-up phase a couple of years later, which means that the models and theories about nascent entrepreneurs can be challenged.

The reason why individuals start a business may depend on passion. For those who combine, the passion motive can be especially prominent when they can really give air to their dreams without having to worry about their financial situation. Even here, though, the research on passion is scant. Other problems for those who combine involve all the choices that must be made and how to find the resources to make them. There are only 24 hours in a day and during this time many activities must be completed, such as wage work, taking care of family, exercising, meeting friends and having time to develop the business. These entrepreneurs also need time for networking. This is an equation that does not compute, especially over time. Therefore, many identities/roles must be managed and it is essential for the individuals to choose well.

Since there is relatively little research on combining entrepreneurs, the main research concern has been to (1) identify and analyse factors on who they are and where they belong in the entrepreneurship process and (2) test and analyse factors that affect the motive for why they start a business and the choices they must make.

To address the aim of this thesis, the following research questions have been formulated:

1 – Who are combining entrepreneurs?
2 – What are the intentions of combining entrepreneurship?
3 – What factors affect the decision to leave parallel wage work?
4 – What are the motives behind the individuals’ choice to maintain wage work in tandem with a side-business?

To address this aim, five papers have been generated. The papers are based on data from two questionnaires, eight focus group interviews and two single interviews, all of which I collected. Three of the five papers have been co-authored and several people were involved in the writing process. My role in the first two papers was sole author. In paper 3, I contributed all the data and was involved in writing the method section. In this paper, I am the fourth author. In paper 4, I stand as second author, but I have been very involved in the whole process and have contributed with text and results to all parts. The writing process has been an interaction between me and the first author. In paper 5, I am the first author and also here there has been an interaction between me and the second author.

1.4. Outline of the study

This thesis consists of six chapters, as illustrated in figure 1.1. Chapter 2 reviews the main theoretical concepts of the research: the wage work and the business, as well as combining entrepreneurs’ intentions and motives. Chapter 3 discusses the methods applied, how data were collected and analyzed and what overall scientific methods were used. Chapter 4 presents a summary of the five papers. Chapter 5 provides discussion of the key findings, and chapter 6 follows with the study’s contributions, implications and directions for future research.

![Diagram of thesis structure]

Figure 1.1 Structure of thesis
2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

To illustrate entrepreneurship and its complexity, the chapter begins by highlighting the history of entrepreneurship followed by the different types of combining entrepreneurs. In the next parts, the intentions and motives are discussed.

2.1. The entrepreneurial background

The concept of entrepreneurship goes back a long time. In the 12th century, the word was used in French writings and described the entrepreneur/contractor as hard and willing to risk his life and fortune. In the 15th century, the word came into the French dictionary and described a person who was active and got something done, and to make (act) something (Landström 2005). The first attempts to interpret the term in an economic sense came in the 18th century, when entrepreneurship was defined on the basis that the entrepreneur bought the work and materials at a price that was uncertain, but sold the final product at a specified price. This concept was revised by Cantillon, who published his work Essai Sur la Nature du Commerce a General in 1755, when he turned on the notion, saying that the entrepreneur purchases at a safe price but does not know the level of demand or the price at which he can sell (Landström 2005). One of the most common definitions of entrepreneurs is Schumpeter’s:

"To make new things or do things that have already been done in a new way" (Schumpeter 1934).

However, entrepreneurship encompasses so much more than this definition suggests, which begs the question of whether all entrepreneurs fit this definition. The answer would most likely be no, they don’t fit. Some researchers have argued that traits and cognitive issues are at stake (Baron 1998; Shane and Venkataraman 2000) and that an entrepreneur cannot be described just by saying that an innovation is all that’s required. Rindova et al. (2009) viewed entrepreneurship as an emancipatory process, which means that the main focus is not on earning money but on bringing something good for the new economy, society, institutions and the cultural environment. One assumption is that entrepreneurs are more willing to take risks than non-entrepreneurs. Thus, a definition that better suits the description is a person who is willing to risk his or her money on a new business (Zander 2007) and act on an opportunity, a definition very close to the original French from the 12th century. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) offered the interesting notion that, in general, everybody can become an entrepreneur; the only thing that separates successful entrepreneurs from less fortunate
entrepreneurs is their ability to spot an opportunity and act on it and to be the first so that the cost to manufacture the product or provide the service will yield a profit. Imitators can take market share but only to the point that everyone in the market will gain something; when the market is saturated, the entrepreneurial aspects of the business shut down. This may be why individuals who start up clothing shops or pizza restaurants can be called entrepreneurs.

Kirzner (1978) argued that entrepreneurs lead the economy towards equilibrium by correcting existing imbalances (Kent 1989). This means that the existence of imbalances offers business opportunities and if entrepreneurs find something that nobody else has found, and make something of it, such equilibrium can be established (Kent 1989; Kirzner 1978). On the other hand, Schumpeter (1934) considered the entrepreneur to be creative – an innovator, and by entrepreneurs’ entry into the market with their innovations, chaotic markets rather than perfect markets are the result. He based his argument on the fact that almost all markets are governed by a few vendors, and their ambition is not to encourage buyers without increasing their own profits (Schumpeter 1934). However, no matter how one chooses to define the entrepreneurial role, the entrepreneur uses his or her ability to pay attention to what has not been detected and to think in a visionary manner. It is all about a process, a process of attention to meeting consumer demands and thinking ahead to what the future holds; above all, entrepreneurship involves thinking outside the box (Kirzner 1978; Florida 2004).

2.2. The entrepreneurial start

Entrepreneurship theory has focused on nascent entrepreneurs, primarily through the Panel Study of Entrepreneurial Dynamics (Allen 1998; Campbell and De Nardi 2009; Reynolds et al. 2004; Reynolds and Curtin 2009) and the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor reports (Acs and Szerb 2007; Reynolds et al. 2003; Amorós and Bosma 2014; Bosma 2013). Both these studies are extremely time consuming as it takes considerable effort to locate nascent entrepreneurs who are in the process of starting a business (Reynolds et al. 2004; Carter et al. 2003). The first PSED, which was conducted in the United States, was therefore the first attempt to obtain a more comprehensive and representative picture of entrepreneurs and their activities (Reynolds et al. 2004). What both surveys overlook, to a large extent, is how long these nascent entrepreneurs have been in

---

5 In this paper, innovation refers to the commercialising of the invention, and an invention refers to the development of a new idea (Ahuja and Morris Lampert 2001; Schumpeter 1934).
the start-up phase (after starting the actual business) and what they do during the start-up process, that is, whether they rely on wage work as they build up the business, which is very common (Petrova 2012; Reynolds et al. 2003), and to what extent. On average, the nascent entrepreneur thinks about starting a new business for three to four years before taking action (Campbell and De Nardi 2009). Thus, to be called a nascent entrepreneur, the entrepreneur must have actively worked to start up a business (Parker and Belghitar 2006), but not gained enough income to cover salary or other expenses together with financial investments to the business (Carter et al. 1996; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; PSEDII 2014). Reynolds et al. (2004) explained the entrepreneurial process in a simple figure (Figure 2.1). The figure shows the number of processes that affect an individual’s choice to engage in entrepreneurial activity.

![Figure 2.1 – Conceptualization of the entrepreneurial process, Reynolds et al. (2004), pp. 265](image)

The first phase in the process is the stock of possibilities, which means that all people have the same opportunities to start a business. Far from everyone wants to start a business, however, but those who do can be categorised as two types, those who start something entirely on its own (nascent independent entrepreneur; NIE) and those who develop an idea gained through their wage work (nascent corporate entrepreneur; NCE). After the first phase in the process, the individuals go into the gestation phase, which means that they actively work to get the business started; it is in this phase that they become nascent entrepreneurs. This phase can differ in length of time, and depending on the progress the business is either born or nothing at all happens. If the entrepreneur pursues the building of the business, the next phase is infancy. In this phase, the business is born, developed and
managed without any changes or it is closed down (Reynolds et al. 2004). Many entrepreneurs do not further develop the business after it reaches infancy because they have no desire to grow the business (Davidsson 1991). The business will therefore remain as a micro-firm with less than 10 employees for a long time or as long the business operates (Landström and Johannisson 2001). According to Parker and Belghitar (2006), some nascent entrepreneurs do not make the full transition to mature entrepreneurship and Reynolds and Curtin (2009) reported that one third do not proceed with the business start-up because the motivation is not sufficiently strong; thus, the business will be shut down within the first six years. Based on Swedish studies on entrepreneurs and small businesses, these micro-firms are an extremely important part of the labour market because they generate new jobs (Landström and Johannisson 2001; Davidsson et al. 1994, 1996). This is consistent with other countries, where research has concluded that nascent entrepreneurs have a significant effect on economic growth, innovation and job creation (Reynolds et al. 2004; Acs et al. 1999; Reynolds 2001, 2000). Reynolds showed that many of those who claimed to be in the start-up phase or to be thinking of starting a business in the first interview were still in the same situation a couple of years later (Reynolds 2011). This means that the concept of nascent entrepreneurs differs based on how the term is defined.

2.2.1. Nascent entrepreneurs
In previous research, the nascent entrepreneur has often been characterised as a man (Aldrich et al. 1986; DiMaggio 1997), mostly probably because only men were allowed to start and own a business in the past and thus more men than women started businesses, something that is beginning to change. Entrepreneurs generally have a high education and good prospects to succeed as self-employed (Parker and Belghitar 2006; Delmar and Davidsson 2000). The nascent entrepreneur is also relatively young (Campbell and De Nardi 2009; Parker and Belghitar 2006); Delmar and Davidsson (2000) defined a range in age between 25 and 40 years old for Swedish entrepreneurs. The nascent entrepreneur also has highly developed social and human capital (Block and Sandner 2009; Shane and Venkataraman 2000; Davidsson and Honig 2003). Human capital theory suggests that the closer higher education is to the requirements for entrepreneurship, the better chances the nascent entrepreneur has for a successful business (Block and Sandner 2009; Becker 1962, 1964; Schultz 1961). Thus, the more knowledge the entrepreneurs have, the better equipped they are to spot opportunities compared with entrepreneurs who have less human capital (Block and Sandner 2009; Davidsson and Honig 2003; Shane and Venkataraman 2000). In addition, if entrepreneurs have a role model, they are more likely to perceive and succeed in an entrepreneurial career (Burke et al. 2008; Delmar and Davidsson 2000). This role model is often the father, and the family background is especially important for women who pursue
entrepreneurship (Campbell and De Nardi 2009). For those whose parents have their own business, the chances increase that they also start a business of their own and that they also choose to start a business at a young age (Burke et al. 2008). Starting a business at a young age increases the probability that these entrepreneurs start more businesses and become serial entrepreneurs, also called portfolio entrepreneurs (Burke et al. 2008). In Sweden, one-third of all new businesses in 1996 was started by serial entrepreneurs (Delmar and Davidsson 2000).

When it comes to success of a start-up, the entrepreneurs who can reach important milestones are the most successful (Carter et al. 1996; Parker and Belghitar 2006; Davidsson and Honig 2003; Shane and Delmar 2004; Kessler and Frank 2009). Success requires time, commitment and planning, which indicates that the entrepreneurial process is very clear (Carter et al. 2003) and that the desire to succeed is great (Khan et al. 2014). However, research has shown that the longer it takes before the decision is made to start a business, the lower the expectations of success (Khan et al. 2014). However, there is still much to study because relatively little is known about the process leading up to the business being started and becoming successful (Delmar and Davidsson 2000). Labour, leadership and previous entrepreneurial experience influence the success (Block and Sandner 2009; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Gimeno et al. 1997; Robinson and Sexton 1994) as does combining employment and entrepreneurship. According to Burke et al. (2008) “pure” entrepreneurs (self-employed full-time) are in the minority; the ones who combine employment and self-employment constitute the majority. Through the combination with work, they have entrenched themselves in different directions so that they have gained extensive knowledge in various areas, and with the help of the various forms of work, they keep learning more. According to Burke et al. (2008), these entrepreneurs are the ultimate-jacks-of-all-trades, a development from Lazear (2004) that maximises the model for jacks-of-all-trades. In this model, Lazear (2004) assumed that entrepreneurs need a variety of skills and not just a specialisation in one area, as many employers seek in hiring employees (Daghbashyan and Hårman 2014). In addition, interest in running a business on one’s own comes from previous experiences as a wage worker (Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Matthews and Moser 1996; Storey 1994). However, the longer individuals are wage workers, the more likely they are to continue in this work form (Caliendo et al. 2009). According to Amiraull (1997), it is mostly teachers, nurses, technicians and individuals in the service profession who become combining entrepreneurs, as their work schedules allow side-missions. Early entrepreneurship research argued that individuals who have been pushed into entrepreneurship, also called necessity entrepreneurs, such as the unemployed or the low paid, to a greater extent fail (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002), but later research has not been able to prove this (Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Birley and
Westhead 1994; Dahlqvist et al. 2000). However, those individuals who acted on an opportunity (so-called pull entrepreneurs) have greater possibilities for a successful business. This is because they are often more systematically prepared to start the business and have also invested more capital (both human and financial) than the entrepreneurs who have been pushed into this work form (Block and Sandner 2009).

The reasons why people start businesses are many. Carter et al. (2003) referred to six motivational factors: innovation, independence, recognition, roles, financial success and self-realisation. These factors highlight the individual’s desire to do something new, control his or her own time, achieve a higher status, follow family traditions, make extra money and fulfil own goals as strong motives. For men, financial success and innovation are more important than for women (Carter et al. 2003). Nevertheless, money is just a small part of what really matters. Achieving independence and the opportunity to develop ideas are of major importance (Frey and Benz 2003; Hundley 2001) and the self-employed tend to be more satisfied with their work form than people who perform wage work (Blanchflower 2000; Frey and Benz 2003; Block and Sandner 2009), despite the self-employed earning about 35 percent less than wage workers (Hamilton 2000). According to social cognitive theory, self-efficacy is the most important mechanism for personal growth and self-determination (Khan et al. 2014; Bandura 1982). For individuals with low self-efficacy and not so high goals, establishing the business means that they fight on despite the business not doing well. They fight on because they believe their chances of success are greater than they really are (Khan et al. 2014).

Unlike a few decades ago, entrepreneurship is more common today and seen as a regular job (Carter et al. 2003), which probably gives rise to individuals who lack the knowledge to run a successful business. People who realise that running a business is not for them will return to wage work, and those who stay are likely to become successful entrepreneurs (Hamilton 2000). However, statistics show that entrepreneurial individuals are only self-employed for a short period, less than four years (Hamilton 2000), but the experience they gain by running their own business can improve their chances of securing a higher salary in wage work than employees who shift employers/employment (Hamilton 2000). Unfortunately, those who operate their own business for a longer period of time cannot expect as high a salary as those who are self-employed only for a short period (Hamilton 2000).

Being an entrepreneur is not always a bed of roses; it involves a lot of risk. Therefore, knowledge and experience are key factors for success (Caliendo et al. 2009; Gifford 2010). Many choices must be made and individuals who are more sensitive to risk are less likely to become entrepreneurs (Caliendo et al. 2009; Dalborg 2014), although Rosen and Willen (2002) concluded that risk is not a factor
determining whether an individual starts a business or not. One way to overcome the risk factor is to combine wage work with a business and by doing this obtain both knowledge and experience. The risk will be minimised since the entrepreneur will not depend on immediate financial success and can develop the business at a pace of his or her own choosing (Folta et al. 2010).

2.3. The employment and the venture

In research about entrepreneurship, individuals combining different work forms are found in various definitions, often embedded in other research questions, including hybrid entrepreneurs, part-time entrepreneurs, side-activity entrepreneurs, lifestyle entrepreneurs, soci(et)al entrepreneurs and moonlighters. Therefore, it has sometimes been difficult to gain an idea of who these individuals are; the different definitions of combining entrepreneurs and how they are interrelated will be discussed below to illustrate the dynamics in the combining entrepreneurship literature.

2.3.1. Hybrid entrepreneurs

In 2010, Folta and colleagues coined the term hybrid entrepreneur. The hybrid entrepreneur is someone who combines employment with self-employment and devotes time to entrepreneurial ventures while holding regular wage work, often full time (Folta et al. 2010; Raffiee and Feng 2013). Hybridship is a common and relatively successful start-up strategy (Raffiee and Feng 2013; Folta et al. 2010; Wennberg et al. 2006; Delmar et al. 2008) and enables the individual to gain experience (Folta et al. 2010; Burke et al. 2008; Raffiee and Feng 2013) and test the entrepreneurial abilities (Wennberg et al. 2006; Folta et al. 2010). Hybridship also offers the possibility of acquiring necessary financial resources for the entrepreneurial venture through the salary from the wage work when bank loans may be hard to obtain (Folta et al. 2010).

Most hybrid entrepreneurs start on a small scale and are often home-based. In most cases, the business is an extension of a hobby and it distinguishes who they are (Folta et al. 2010; Delmar et al. 2008). It is something they really are passionate about and know well (Vallerand 2008). By starting a business based on a passion, they have the chance to pursue their ideas and work more independently (Block and Sandner 2009). They will devote significant time and energy to the entrepreneurial activities and may ultimately work fully as an entrepreneur if the passion persists and the income from the business is sufficient (Folta et al. 2010; Raffiee and Feng 2013; The Ministry of Industry 2003). In the US, hybrids that invest in full-time self-employment have a higher survival rate than individuals entering self-employment directly (Raffiee and Feng 2013). In addition, most of the
innovative entrepreneurs in the world, such as Steve Wozniak (Apple), Pierre Omidyar (eBay), Henry Ford (Detroit Automobile) and 20 percent of the CEOs on Inc. Magazine’s list of the top 500 fastest-growing businesses, combined wage work after their business was started (Raffiee and Feng 2013). However, not everyone will finally make such a full investment in their side-business (Folta et al. 2010; Delmar et al. 2008; Wennberg et al. 2006; The Ministry of Industry 2003). Delmar et al. (2008) showed that only 31.88% of the Swedish hybrid entrepreneurs converted to full-time self-employment, and most remained in the hybrid phase. This is also consistent with findings from The Ministry of Industry (2003), Wennberg et al. (2006) and Folta et al. (2010), all using Swedish data. According to The Ministry of Industry (2003), 42 percent stayed in the hybrid phase and only 13 percent became full-time self-employed.

For nascent hybrids, the hybridship can be regarded as a step on the way to full-time self-employment (Folta et al. 2010; Burke et al. 2008; Petrova 2012). Burmeister-Lamp et al. (2012) noted that roughly one out of four entrepreneurs in Germany holds on to wage work when the initial steps are taken to start a business and Burke et al. (2008) reported that in Great Britain hybrids outnumber pure entrepreneurs. Hybrid entrepreneurs are dynamic and go back and forth among employment, hybridship and entrepreneurship (Burke et al. 2008; Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010). The high ratio of the self-employed who have commenced their entrepreneurship as hybrid entrepreneurs indicates that hybridship offers certain advantages to nascent entrepreneurs. For example, they may want to test the business idea without actually risking the career and to evaluate the market demand before the eventual decision to become self-employed full-time (Burke et al. 2008; Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010; Wennberg et al. 2006; Raffiee and Feng 2013). The risk is not entirely an economic risk: it is also a matter of avoiding the loss of face involved if a self-employed person goes bankrupt. In Scandinavian countries, failure is not considered positive, as it can be in the US, and entrepreneurs who have gone bankrupt often suffer from isolation and depression, and in the worst cases they lose their social network (Hyytinen and Rouvinen 2008).

The hybrid entrepreneur is often portrayed as a man (The Ministry of Industry 2003), perhaps because women often are absent from the labour market on parental leave at some time in their work life (Folta et al. 2010). When they are absent, they disappear from the annual statistics that many researchers use, which makes it difficult to follow women over time (Folta et al. 2010). Delmar et al. (2008) reported that the ratio is more or less even between the sexes, but they found that men rely more on self-employment than women do. Hybrid entrepreneurs are generally middle-age, but they are relatively evenly spread across different age categories (The Ministry of Industry 2003; Sätre Åhlander 2006). The hybrid is generally
married or living in a cohabitant relationship and has on average two children (Delmar et al. 2008). Having children is no barrier for men, while it is for women (The Ministry of Industry 2003; Burke et al. 2008). Hybrids tend to have a relatively high education, which is consistent with the observation that individuals with a higher education are more likely to have more than one job (Shane 2003; Amirault 1997; Mann et al. 2003; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Mata 1996; Evans and Leighton 1990; Averett 2001). Their incomes also tend to be average or above average (Delmar et al. 2008) and a relatively high proportion of hybrid entrepreneurs lives in rural areas (Delmar et al. 2008). Rural hybrids tend to prefer full-time wage work, and if an opportunity arises for wage work, they often leave the hybrid phase (The Ministry of Industry 2003). When it comes to motives, financial reasons are not the main motive for why individuals start a business or become a hybrid (Folkeringa et al. 2009); it is more the non-financial aspects, such as flexibility, autonomy and personal satisfaction (Bönte and Jarosch 2010; Folta et al. 2010; Folkeringa et al. 2009). Another reason why individuals become hybrids is that they are less confident about being entrepreneurs and lack experience (Folta et al. 2010; Raffiee and Feng 2013), something that hybridship can bridge, this when most Swedish hybrids start a business in a different sector from the one in which they hold wage work (The Ministry of Industry 2003).

2.3.2. Part-time entrepreneurs

The part-time entrepreneur is in some cases very much like the hybrid entrepreneur and many part-time entrepreneurs also combine to test the entrepreneurial waters (Blanchflower and Oswald 1990; Petrova 2012). However, the part-time definition also encompasses individuals who combine unemployment with a business or combine several jobs (Amirault 1997). For these part-time entrepreneurs, the second job tends to be within the same occupation (Amirault 1997) and if the occupation is a manager they are more likely to become self-employed full-time (Delmar and Davidsson 2000). The GEM report (2003) found that nearly 80 percent of all the individuals who implemented a start-up also had wage work (Reynolds et al. 2003; Arenius and Minniti 2005; Bosma and Harding 2007). One reason could be economic; they need wage work to finance the business, but also because it can be difficult for many to obtain a bank loan (Blanchflower and Oswald 1990; Evans and Jovanovic 1989; Evans and Leighton 1990). However, Petrova (2012) found that the part-time entrepreneur in the US is not capital constrained; what was more important to have when starting a business was human capital. Another important aspect of starting the business is the parent’s influence. Both Delmar and Davidsson (2000) and Petrova (2012) found that if either or both parents owned a business, the child/children would most likely also start a business. Petrova (2012) found that these individuals were more likely to become part-time entrepreneurs than full-time. They are also more often serial entrepreneurs (Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Petrova 2012).
The characteristics are also similar to those in the hybrid definition. The part-time entrepreneur is more likely to be a man (Petrova 2012); nearly two thirds of all self-employed in Sweden were men in 1998 (Delmar and Davidsson 2000). The education is relatively high (Shane 2003; Amirault 1997; Mann et al. 2003; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Mata 1996; Evans and Leighton 1990; Averett 2001) and they have a long work history (Petrova 2012). When it comes to motive, it is often to develop a hobby (Dahlin et al. 2004; Frith 2007; Petrova 2012) but it also involves the quality of life that a business can provide (Blanchflower and Oswald 1990; Folkeringa et al. 2009). These entrepreneurs are around 38 years of age (Petrova 2012), and Delmar and Davidsson (2000) found that Swedes were less active in starting a business at the early ages of 25 to 34 years than Americans, who were especially active. The amount of time the individuals spend in the business depends on whether they rely on their ability or not. In the beginning, when everything is new, the individuals spend more time in the business to learn; those who believe in their ability, like serial entrepreneurs, devote less time (Petrova 2012).

2.3.3. Side-activity entrepreneurs

Side-activity entrepreneurs are similar to part-time entrepreneurs in that they work part-time with their business, but also very much like the lifestyle and soci(et)al entrepreneur (Koster et al. 2010; Markantoni et al. 2013). They are small-scale and home-based and often start a business to improve the household income and to improve the countryside, which is in line with the lifestyle definition (Markantoni et al. 2013; Markantoni and van Hoven 2012; Koster et al. 2010; Herslund and Tanvig 2012). The motive to start a business is to gain self-fulfillment (Markantoni and van Hoven 2012), and often for non-economic reasons because of their small scale, but they will contribute to the development of rural areas, like the lifestyle entrepreneurs, by opening up the countryside for tourists and visitors (Koster et al. 2010). If the side-activity entrepreneurs work together with local businesses, they can create marketplaces that attract tourists and visitors, which means that the local economy can be improved, and some businesses may be able to employ so that more people can stay in rural areas (Markantoni et al. 2013; Markantoni and van Hoven 2012; Koster et al. 2010). However, in reality, this is not simple. If the local businesses and the side-activity entrepreneurs are within the same service sector, they often will not collaborate due to competition (Markantoni et al. 2013). Thus, it has become apparent that the side-activity entrepreneurs will gain by working together and building social networks to activate a vital community and that their smallness can be an advantage (Markantoni et al. 2013; Markantoni and van Hoven 2012).
Side-activity entrepreneur are often women living in a rural area and the side-business is an important part of the woman’s needs, identity and lifestyle.

2.3.4. **Lifestyle entrepreneurs**

The lifestyle entrepreneur is an individual who sets up a business closely aligned with personal values, beliefs, interests and passions (Marcketti et al. 2006; Ateljevic and Doorne 2000; Herslund and Tanvig 2012; Peters et al. 2009). The motive for the decision to start a business is often to gain self-fulfilment (Buttner and Moore 1997; Maritz and Beaver 2006; Peters et al. 2009; Marcketti et al. 2006) and to be one’s own boss (Wetzels 2008; Maritz and Beaver 2006). However, this could be quite fragmented, partly because some lifestyle entrepreneurs combine a professional job with a lifestyle and have to be both managers and creators in their own business, which can create friction and identity problems (Eikhof and Haunschild 2006; Herslund and Tanvig 2012). These entrepreneurs often start a business based on a hobby and to balance the demands of work and family life (Marcketti et al. 2006; Maritz and Beaver 2006). Depending on the type of business and employment these entrepreneurs have, it can be a difficult balance to manage. In Eikhof and Haunschild (2006) case of actors in Germany, the actors were at the same time exercising their artistic ability on stage and forced to calculate for the next assignment and think forward while constantly monitoring their personal brand as managers. For other individuals, the combination and the choice to become a lifestyle entrepreneur may depend on the relative flexibility it offers; this is a common argument among female entrepreneurs (Herslund and Tanvig 2012).

Within domestic life, women and men are able, as never before, to make their own choices about where and how to live. New freedoms, however, can also bring new insecurities, and losses and gains are not distributed evenly throughout the population. Evidence suggests that informal and precarious employment arrangements transform the way in which family lifestyles and familial roles are negotiated (Baines and Wheelock 2000; Jordan et al. 1994; Wheelock and Mariussen 1997). For example, women who want to pursue their dream will build up their businesses based on their hobbies and interests and hope that one day they can live off the business (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). Adventurers might want to build up a business based on something they love and will live in areas that suit their interests, for example, cave climbing or river rafting (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). This means that the business is usually not started for economic reasons, but more to perpetuate a chosen lifestyle and at the same time help develop the rural environment so they can stay and more people can derive pleasure from it (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000; Marcketti et al. 2006; Herslund and Tanvig 2012). If the business grows and attracts customers, other entrepreneurs might spot the opportunity and thus widen the local market as new players enter (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). Ateljevic and Doorne (2000) therefore suggested that the cultural
context has great significance for the identity and the regional/local location for small businesses. One problem Peters et al. (2009) found with lifestyle entrepreneurs was that when the balance between work and family becomes too difficult to manage or when they have reached a maximum level of self-fulfilment they may close down the business, leaving a hole in the marketplace. These lifestyle entrepreneurs are also very good at networking with people they know can help them (Maritz and Beaver 2006), and such people may find themselves in a difficult situation when the lifestyle entrepreneur closes down and the network either ceases or changes character.

The lifestyle entrepreneur is often an older woman with a high education who lives in a rural area (Herslund and Tanvig 2012). These entrepreneurs often have limited capital and lack the skills for running a business, but they are motivated by lifestyle (Peters et al. 2009; Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). They are more interested in life quality than growth, their main priority is themselves and they hope for sufficient income from the business to maintain their lifestyle (Peters et al. 2009). In the literature about lifestyle entrepreneurs, they are often portrayed as full-time self-employed but there are combining entrepreneurs among them also.

2.3.5. Soci(et)al entrepreneurs

The social entrepreneur can be described in many different ways, social, societal, community and commercial, and the definitions range from broad to narrow (Austin et al. 2006; Mair and Marti 2006; Dees 1998). Also, the social entrepreneur can combine employment with a social business, or just work with the business full time (Tillmar 2009). The definition is therefore hard to pinpoint, but the essence involves creating social value (Austin et al. 2006; Mair and Marti 2006; Dees 1998; Peredo and McLean 2006; Zahra et al. 2009). The aim of the business can therefore incorporate both profit and non-profit reasons (Austin et al. 2006; Mair and Marti 2006; Pierre et al. 2014; Zahra et al. 2009; Tillmar 2009). The profit reason is not the most essential; making money is seen more as a means to an end (Peredo and McLean 2006; Tillmar 2009; Dees 1998), and for entrepreneurs who want to benefit the community, it is more a perceived necessity to engage in what they can to help the community and at the same time develop an opportunity (Gawell 2012, 2006). These entrepreneurs are often called social bricoleurs and described as individuals who discover and address local social needs (Korschning and Allen 2004; Zahra et al. 2009).

Many rural areas around the world are suffering from a downward spiral of population and businesses (Besser and Miller 2013; Korschning and Allen 2004). To address this, rural communities should improve the infrastructure to allow a stronger business base (Besser and Miller 2013), but most often the decisions
regarding infrastructure are made at a high level and local residents and business owners are not involved in them (Peredo and Chrisman 2006). Community-based entrepreneurs can help solve some of these problems, according to Pierre et al. (2014), and one way to do this is through networks. These networks can help enhance the efficiency of the society (Pierre et al. 2014), but according to Besser and Miller (2013), these networks will not help rural entrepreneurs to succeed; they will only serve the community at large.

2.3.6. **Moonlighters**

The moonlighter is an individual who has dual jobs in the form of two wage jobs, wage work combined with self-employment or unemployment and wage work (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Guariglia and Kim 2001; Shishko and Rostker 1976; Perrella 1970; Averett 2001; Sussman 1998). In most cases, the main job is full time and the second part time (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Guariglia and Kim 2001; Shishko and Rostker 1976). The reasons they moonlight often include constraints in income, the need to cover household expenses (Allen 1998; Shishko and Rostker 1976; Sussman 1998; Guariglia and Kim 2001; Perrella 1970) and the tough labor market (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Guariglia and Kim 2001; Allen 1998; Averett 2001; Perrella 1970). Most moonlighters are constrained financially, and only a small number combines because they enjoy the work (Sussman 1998); they are often older, between 45 and 64 years, and are most likely to stay a moonlighter for a long period of time (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002). They use the time to gain experience and to test the waters so that they have a smooth transition (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Sussman 1998; Perrella 1970). Working to develop human capital is a success factor for moonlighters (Block and Sandner 2009; Guariglia and Kim 2001). Financially constrained moonlighters tend to stay a very short time in this phase (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Guariglia and Kim 2001). One reason is family time and the need to take care of children (Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002); this is why more women than men moonlight (Sussman 1998). The women also moonlight part time; they have two part-time jobs (Averett 2001). The labor constrained are mostly younger individuals who moonlight due to not working enough hours in the primary job (Averett 2001; Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Perrella 1970) and difficulties finding full-time wage work (Averett 2001).

The moonlighter is generally a younger (even though moonlighters who are more like hybrid entrepreneurs are older) married woman with a 12-year education or more (Allen 1998; Sussman 1998; Guariglia and Kim 2001; Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002). The greater the income, the more likely they will reduce the moonlighting (Allen 1998). They spend between 33 and 52 hours in their primary
job and an additional 8 to 20 hours in their second job (these data are taken from US and Canada) (Averett 2001; Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002; Perrella 1970). Recent research has shown that more and more moonlighters combine to do opposite jobs, for example, office during the day and artist at night (Averett 2001; Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002), and moonlighters are a group that continues to grow; in 1997, 51 percent of the Canadian moonlighters combined wage work with self-employment, an increase from the previous year (Sussman 1998).

The descriptions above have tried to show the complexity of the different definitions and how they are linked to each other, which is also shown in Figure 2.2. Table 2.1 contains a list of the various definitions, work forms and research into the combining entrepreneur.

![Figure 2.2 – The different combining forms, there connection to each other and names](image)

The definition that highlights only individuals who combine wage work with self-employment is that of the hybrid entrepreneur. The moonlighting, part-time and side-activity entrepreneurship literature suggests that individuals combine but it need not be with the goal of self-employment. Rather, it may involve combining several wage jobs or having several businesses, so-called serial/portfolio entrepreneurs, or using parental leave to start up a business. Lifestyle and soci(et)al entrepreneurship also includes individuals who combine, but most studies have focused on individuals who only have employment, either in wage
work or as a self-employed, or on the serial/portfolio entrepreneur, whose one business pays for the second.

One interesting point regarding these characteristics is that within nascent entrepreneurship the entrepreneur is often described as a young male who lives in an urban area, but, as shown above, this is contrasted in the hybrid context. Many combining entrepreneurs live in the countryside, they are older and they are mostly women. In that the combining phase is rather common in the start-up, these contradicting data are quite interesting. Table 2.1 shows a summary of the different definitions, some of their authors and a short description of how these entrepreneurs/individuals have been described.
### Table 2.1 – Summary of some of the authors and definitions used to describe the combining entrepreneur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Burke et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Individuals who combine employment and self-employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burmeister-Lamp et al. (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bönke and Jarosch (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delmar et al. (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folta et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raffiee and Feng (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sätre Åhlander (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wennberg et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burmeister-Lamp (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delmar et al. (2008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Folta et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raffiee and Feng (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sätre Åhlander (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wennberg et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Amirault (1997)</td>
<td>Individuals that combine employment and self-employment, unemployed who are self-employed part-time, students who are self-employed part-time and parents leave moms/dads that start or run a business part-time from home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blanchflower and Oswald (1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delmar and Davidsson (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Petrova (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side activity entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Koster et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Individuals that combine employment and self-employment, but also unemployed who are self-employed part-time, parents leave moms/dads that start or run a business part-time from home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markantoni (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markantoni et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Markantoni and van Hoven (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Ateljevic and Doorne (2000)</td>
<td>Individuals that combine employment and self-employment, pure self-employed full-time, unemployed who are self-employed part-time, students who are self-employed part-time, parents leave moms/dads that start or run a business part-time from home, farmers that develop activities such as B &amp; B, visit/live on a farm, locally produced food sales. There are also very many soci(etal)al entrepreneurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eikhof and Haunschild (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herslund and Tanvig (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marcketti et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maritz and Beaver (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peters et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soci(etal) entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Austin et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Individuals that combine employment and self-employment or are pure self-employed full-time to fill a soci(etal) need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Besser and Miller (2013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gawell (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gawell et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mair and Marti (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peredo and Chrisman (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peredo and McLean (2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pierre et al. (2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tillmar (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zahra et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4. The combining entrepreneur's intentions

Much of the discussion above has highlighted the different variants of entrepreneurs and combining entrepreneurs, where also the intentions have been brought up. To have an intention to do something does not always mean that it will be done (Elfving 2009; Malle 1999). In Reynolds et al. (2004) model (Figure 2.1), one can see that in the start-up phase the business does not need to be started even though the individual’s intention has been to do so. Starting a business requires skills and that the conditions allow it. These conditions vary from person to person and can depend on the individual’s stage in life (Elfving 2009; Malle 1999). Intending to do something (e.g. start a business) usually carries an underlying reason/motive, especially for individuals who start a business, whether it’s an idea they want to develop or because they must start a business. As mentioned earlier, starting a business is not done by chance; in most cases, it is a planned action (Elfving 2009) and a function of three things: a perceived desire to be one’s own boss, a strong belief in oneself (self-efficacy) and a tolerance of risk (Segal et al. 2005). In this discussion, the theory of planned behaviour is often mentioned, which is designed to explain the concept that an intention is intentional, i.e. that there is a willingness to start a business (Elfving 2009). For many entrepreneurs, other job options may be more advantageous but they still choose to invest in their own business. This is probably because they see an opportunity they do not want to miss and they believe the business can succeed (Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Segal et al. 2005). The goal for many entrepreneurs is a successful business, whether self-sufficient or one that grows and becomes successful (Isaksson 2006). However according to Flamholtz and Aksehirli (2000), it is important that the development of the business be incremental so the entrepreneur can keep up. If the goal for the business is to grow, for example, then a business culture must be created that is right for the business and the right resources must be employed. The business is often also started primarily to make money, according to Jayawarna et al. (2011) and Roche et al. (1996), but Hessels et al. (2008) argued that this motive will come later, when the entrepreneurs see that their business goes well and that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals that combine employment and self-employment, but also individuals who have several jobs, several private businesses. The core is that they never, regardless of employment, will come up in an average wage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they can make money from their idea. According to Littunen (2000), the motives are altered over time, so anything that was the prime motive at the beginning may change. At first, the motive may only apply to starting the business and ensuring that it survives, where the goal is not to fail (Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Pervin 2003). Starting a business because it is a necessity does not mean that financial reasons are always behind the decision. It might well be that the individual feels frustrated and is no longer happy in the wage work, and this results in starting his or her own business (Mallon and Cohen 2001; Jayawarna et al. 2011; Segal et al. 2005). Being self-employed offers personal challenges in that the entrepreneur is the company director and decides what should be done and how, circumstances which many prefer (Segal et al. 2005).

2.4.1. Financial intentions

Most often, the business is a development of the entrepreneur's personality, especially if the business is small (Carsrud and Brännback 2011). These entrepreneurs prefer to have control over what to do, which means they often self-finance the business, compared to those who are not so keen on independence. The entrepreneurs who are not so keen on independence are more inclined to take financial help from business angels or venture capitalists (Shane et al. 2003). According to Isaksson et al. (2004), there are three different options for financing:
(1) Debt financing, which involves taking a bank loan; however, many small business owners feel that it is difficult to get a bank loan (Isaksson 2006; Isaksson et al. 2004; Campbell and De Nardi 2009) and it may be a struggle to jump-start the business while paying mortgages.
(2) Self-financing or bootstrapping, which means investing one's own capital. The literature discussing entrepreneurs has shown that individuals with some wealth are more likely to start up a business (Arenius and Minniti 2005). For individuals who are combining, it is the ultimate work form because it enables them to collect both means and knowledge while securing the family income (Burke et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010; Delmar et al. 2008).
(3) Funding support from venture capitalists or angel investors, which means they usually want a percentage of the business (Isaksson et al. 2004).

The choices made to fund the start-up reflect the risk of starting a business. Individuals who are risk tolerant are more likely to start a business full-time (Segal et al. 2005) than those who are risk averse (Carsrud and Brännback 2011). Risk-averse individuals are more motivated by the security and stability that wage work offers, which makes them more attracted to a traditional career than self-employment (Sullivan et al. 1998), a category to which combining entrepreneurs also can belong.
For traditional entrepreneurs, the start-up can be highly risky because not only do they have pressure to find financial capital, they also need to earn acceptance in the marketplace, which can be stressful (Reich 2001; Brockett 2006). For example, a business must be attractive to develop resources purposefully, yet it is often low in bargaining power (Choi and Gray 2008; Grichnik et al. 2013; Fritsch and Rusakova 2010; Wilson and Stokes 2005). Combining entrepreneurs, on the other hand, face little risk because they are not fully financially dependent on whether their products or services sell to manage the family income (Berthold and Neumann 2008); they have security from their regular wage work. Although challenges may be less prominent, it takes time to establish a business, and research has pointed out that most businesses fail within a five-year period (Hyytinen and Rouvinen 2008). Furthermore, it can take up to two years for a first-time entrepreneur to get established financially (Mason 2007; Hyytinen and Rouvinen 2008). For a combining entrepreneur, the challenge lies mostly in finding the necessary time to invest in developing the business and in making the right choices.

2.4.2. Age influencing the intention

Because time is of the essence, previous research has suggested that the age at which an individual enters entrepreneurial endeavours is an important factor to consider. For example, studies conducted by GEM clearly indicate that age is important for entry (Reynolds et al. 2002). Even if entrepreneurship studies rarely examine the extent to which the start-up age matters for subsequent behaviour, there are reasons to expect that the age at which one engages in venturing while also being in wage work is important. The literature on role behaviour, socialisation and coping skills suggests that being mature when entering entrepreneurship may improve obtaining the coping skills needed to mitigate disturbing interference with other roles (Grandey and Cropanzano 1999; Arenius and Minniti 2005; Herslund and Tanvig 2012; Kautonen et al. 2013). Because older individuals are often more risk averse, they also might not have the drive to start something new and risk their savings (Sullivan et al. 1998), but older individuals have accumulated knowledge, social capital and assets which better equip them to engage in a venture (Kautonen et al. 2013). In previous literature, the age of active entrepreneurs has been described as relatively young (Arenius and Minniti 2005; Blanchflower 2004; Reynolds et al. 2002) and, according to Levesque and Minniti (2006), the highest likelihood of starting a business comes at an early age and decreases thereafter. The literature examining Swedish combining entrepreneurs, on the other hand, has shown that individuals start a business when they are older, specifically in mid-life (Delmar et al. 2008; The Ministry of Industry 2003; Wennberg et al. 2006). Why combining entrepreneurs start a business later in life may be explained by financial constraints in the earlier years (Arenius and Minniti 2005; Blécourt et al. 2002).
Researchers studying combining entrepreneurs have argued that older individuals with some wage work tenure are more likely to become nascent combining entrepreneurs and that such tenure helps keep the challenge and risk at manageable levels (Sätre Åhlander 2006; Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010). In starting up a business, one’s work and personal domains provide the social networks that are needed for a new venture (Putnam 1997; Baron and Markman 2003; Bourdieu 1980; Coleman 1994). Networks make it possible to highlight one’s ability to coordinate action and visionary thinking (Johannisson 2005). For combining entrepreneurs, this means that they can take advantage of networks from their wage work, self-employment and private domains (Bourdieu 1980; Coleman 1994; Putnam 1997). Combining entrepreneurs’ age may play a role here, as they will have had time to develop sustainable networks. In contrast, younger people do not have the same interactions that several years of employment and family life provide, which means they may not have the emotional support and social resources to overcome challenges successfully.

Age and funding are therefore important parts of running a business, but just as important is family. Without the understanding of family who support and condone the hours spent on the business and contribute to the household income, many entrepreneurs would not survive. Above all, women find it difficult to integrate family life with a business and therefore spend significant time in the planning of what might happen to the family if they start (Kirkwood 2009). Something that is common, maybe not in the beginning, is that conflicts arise when one role gets a more prominent place that takes up the person’s whole self-concept (Arenius and Minniti 2005). The individual running a business alongside their regular wage work often has a strong vision for the business and does not give up easily, which means he or she is inclined to over-invest time and energy (Baum and Locke 2004; Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Elfving 2009). Being involved in the business can therefore create friction and conflicts in the family and with friends because of the time spent, which may ultimately interfere with how the entrepreneur feels about the business (Binder and Coad 2013; Carland et al. 1984; Thorgren and Wincent 2013; Vallerand et al. 2003). Balance therefore needs to be established between work and family because a protracted conflict can create tensions and may ultimately affect the quality of life (Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999; Arenius and Minniti 2005; Rice et al. 1992). The balance among wage work, self-employment and family is therefore important, which is probably why it is relevant for combining entrepreneurs to start up a business later in life. Those who are older have more resources at their disposal due to their age and often their status, so stress is less likely to interfere (Parasuraman et al. 1992; Grandey and
The above reasoning about resources and conflicts is developed from the conservation of resource theory (COR) (Hobfoll 1989).

### 2.4.3. Team members and intentions

One way to balance the constraints between work and family is to share a business with a team member, which is perceived as more conducive when it comes to risk-taking and creativity. The team can share the initial capital as well as the time and commitment (Halonen 2002; Luo 2007; Cooney 2005; Klotz et al. 2014; Harper 2008; Ruef et al. 2003). Of all the start-ups, half or more start with a partner (Lanivich 2013; Barringer and Ireland 2008; Beckman 2006) and they mainly become a team to gain competitive advantage (Mohr and Spekman 1994; Powell 2003; Bleeke and Ernst 1991). The more they put into the business, the more likely it is that the business will succeed (Lanivich 2013; Mohr and Spekman 1994; Masuda 2009).

Through teamwork, they can enter new markets, which as sole owners they might not get into otherwise (Mohr and Spekman 1994; Halonen 2002; Luo 2007). Therefore, it may be advantageous to complement each other in terms of knowledge and experience. However, this can set high demands on the relationship, and both parties’ need to respect their differences and together set goals and plan the future of the business. If they do, chances are greater that the team survives and succeeds (Mohr and Spekman 1994). Differences between team members can develop their skills and thereby reduce the risk of business failure (Lanivich 2013; Matlay and Westhead 2005). Most people who accumulate a positive experience in their efforts have a higher self-perception and higher self-efficacy, and they demand more and set higher goals for themselves and the business partner (Avey et al. 2010). What they seek is shared revenue and high autonomy (Mohr and Spekman 1994). Unfortunately, the number of successful businesses run with a team is low (Mohr and Spekman 1994). The reasons may be many, but if one team member, for example, wants more than the other and acts according to his or her own head, the relationship will suffer and both will feel the negative impact (Mohr and Spekman 1994). If one team member then backs away or renounces the partnership, very complex situations can arise, where the independence of both parties decreases, as does information management (Mohr and Spekman 1994; Breugst et al. 2015). However, there is a difference between joint ownership with a business partner and a spouse. Running a business with a spouse involves similar attitudes towards growth as sole owners (Baines and Wheelock 2000). Thus, involving a spouse in the business venture can be the most optimal choice, especially for combining entrepreneurs because it can be hard to find an outside partner who shares the same interests and values and can work flexible hours. They may also feel awkward including others in their creative sphere (Baines and Wheelock 2000). However, it could also serve as a balance
between family life and the business and, for combining entrepreneurs, also the employment. Involving a spouse in the business can legitimise the time put into the business (Fletcher 2010; Caudroit et al. 2011).

2.5. Passion as the driving force

The passion literature is emerging rapidly in entrepreneurship (Baum and Locke 2004; Chen et al. 2009; Baum et al. 2001; Cardon et al. 2009a; Dalborg 2014) and the freedom to decide and set goals is a major driver for many of entrepreneurs who start a business (Smilor 1997). Another drive is the desire to feel good and do something they like, which is why most entrepreneurs start a business related to something they feel passionate about (Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010; Petrova 2012). However, it takes time and devotion to get a business running, and the process is often described as a rollercoaster ride (Smilor 1997); therefore, passion is an important motivator to remain persistent and committed to the business (Philippe et al. 2010; Baum and Locke 2004). A model used in research into passion is the dualistic model of passion, created by Vallerand and colleagues (Vallerand 2008; Vallerand et al. 2003; Vallerand and Houfort 2003) where two types of passion are described: harmonious and obsessive. Harmonious passion is a strong dedication to an activity which is important to the individual, without any contingencies attached to it (Philippe et al. 2010; Bonneville-Roussy et al. 2011; Vallerand et al. 2003). What this mean is that the individual can at any time decide not to engage in the activity and stop the engagement (Philippe et al. 2010; Vallerand et al. 2003). The second type, obsessive passion, is the opposite. This type also entails a strong desire for the activity but the individual cannot control it and cannot help but be engaged because they like it too much (Philippe et al. 2010; Bonneville-Roussy et al. 2011; Vallerand et al. 2003; Burke and Fiksenbaum 2009).

The combining entrepreneurs are nascent entrepreneurs in the belief that their business will generate income (Campbell and De Nardi 2009) and that the longer they continue, the more likely they will succeed (Haapanen and Tervo 2009). Many combining entrepreneurs therefore spend significant energy to keep pushing the business even when the business prospects are quite weak (Cardon et al. 2009b; Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Smilor 1997; Thorgren and Wincent 2013). In these cases, they are driven by their passion for what they want to do and they have made a choice to invest in the business. The passion is thus motivated by their desire, the potential to reach a set of goals and the opportunity to engage in something that is deeply meaningful (Smilor 1997). The business returns energy, pleasure and engagement, into which these entrepreneurs wholeheartedly submerge themselves (Cardon et al. 2009b; Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Smilor
This type of entrepreneurial passion is often described as a love for the business (Cardon et al. 2009b; Baum and Locke 2004; Shane et al. 2003), which ensures the entrepreneurs have higher job satisfaction even though financial means may be lacking (Delmar et al. 2008). Furthermore, their venture is linked to who they are and provides meaning to their identity (Vallerand et al. 2003; Vallerand and Houlifort 2003; Forest et al. 2011; Murnieks et al. 2012; Cardon et al. 2009a). Identity is created by social context and can categorize our role (Murnieks et al. 2012). The different roles can be “manager”, “father/mother”, “teacher” and “entrepreneur”, among others. Through society, individuals learn how to interpret a particular role, and for entrepreneurs, it’s about how these roles are perceived by society (Murnieks et al. 2012). When they decide to become an entrepreneur, the new identity is formed (Murnieks et al. 2012). The identities are often related to passion (Murnieks 2007; Cardon et al. 2009b; Murnieks and Mosakowski 2006) and the individuals that hold the entrepreneurial identity as more central will experience greater passion (Murnieks et al. 2012).

Although passion is likely present during the early stages of the combining phase, this drive is also likely to be reduced once the business has been running for a certain period. Entrepreneurs must persist through multiple challenges, compromise and be able to adjust to the unexpected, all of which are part of the entrepreneurial process (Smilor 1997). The passion these entrepreneurs have rests on visions of the future (Carsrud and Brännback 2011), and sometimes these visions disappear while the business is being established (Cardon et al. 2009b). Combining entrepreneurs therefore might be in a situation in which adjusted goals and true possibilities drain the true source of passion (Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Hobfoll 2011; Philippe et al. 2010; Vallerand et al. 2003). If this happens, a defensive strategy is likely to be developed (Thorgren and Wincent 2013). In this context, this implies that combining entrepreneurs find other motivators than passion to drive their entrepreneurial efforts. Although passion might be lost, the individuals will defend and protect their choices and may pursue them for a long time (Thorgren and Wincent 2013; Vallerand et al. 2003). Thus, many entrepreneurs may continue with their businesses over time even though true passion for the activity is lost (Cardon et al. 2009b; Forest et al. 2011).

2.6. Choices

Starting a business is all about choices, and according to choice theory it is important to make smart choices with the highest perceived utility (Dagbashyan and Härsman 2012; Blanchflower and Oswald 1990; Evans and Jovanovic 1989). If
this perceived utility is through entrepreneurship, and the individual has assessed all the rewards and risks, then the individual will choose this work form (Dagbashyan and Hársman 2012; Blanchflower and Oswald 1990; Evans and Jovanovic 1989). For entrepreneurs who are more risk averse, the combining phase may be a better alternative and it all comes down to focusing on what is closest to the heart and prioritising wage work, self-employment, family, friends and leisure. How good they are at prioritising depends on how many choices they face and how they choose (Brockett 2006; Schwartz 2009, 2004). Research has shown that individuals tend to choose something they know or with which they are familiar when they start a business, and that is why the business often is the development of a hobby, but when starting a business they often embark on unfamiliar ground when it comes to the actual starting and running of the business (Brockett 2006; Schwartz 2009, 2004). Therefore, it is important to find a balance between the unknown and the known and to manage them successfully. As with material goods, individuals often tend to overestimate the benefits of the immediate joy they feel when starting the business; this feeling may subside as running the business becomes a habit (Binswanger 2006). According to Hsee and Hastie (2006), individuals are not always good at choosing what is best for them and which option will yield the best experience. When faced with several options, they may end up choosing the option with immediate appeal (Hsee and Hastie 2006).

There is an optimum range of choices at which satisfaction peaks (Johns et al. 2013) but when the choices become too many, the number of options can have a negative effect (Scheibehenne et al. 2009). Iyengar and Lepper (2000) have conducted several tests on how individuals react to choices and one was with jams. They first introduced 23 exotic jams to customers in a supermarket. A lot of customers came forward and tested the jams but few bought the product. A week later, they returned but this time with only six jams. Not so many customers came forward and tried the product, but several of them actually bought the jam. They concluded that offering too many options puts people off, something Procter and Gamble also noticed with its shampoo series, Head & Shoulders (Shah and Wolford 2007). When people have too many choices to make, they easily return to their original position (Iyengar and Lepper 2000), which in this case may involve going back to wage work and closing down the business. This is because people usually avoid activities that they do not think they can handle (Lanivich 2013). If this happens, it can have a devastating effect on motivation (Iyengar and Lepper 2000).
2.7. Summary of the theory chapter

This chapter has summarised the theoretical framework, which is the basis for the thesis research questions. This thesis, which studies combining entrepreneurs, describes the stages a nascent entrepreneur goes through before, during and after the business is started and the ways the business can be started and operated by looking at different types of combining entrepreneurs. The chapter has also described the motives (passion) and intentions the individual feels for the business and the choices that must be made for the business to operate. The next chapter describes how the data collection was conducted for this thesis.
3. METHOD

This chapter discusses the methods this research applied to gather and analyse the data to achieve the thesis research aim. The first parts discuss the methodology and the context from which the data are retrieved, followed by the research design where a mixed-method approach has been used. The last part offers a discussion of the method and the ethical issues involved.

3.1. Methodology

One purpose of this research is to fully understand the phenomenon of combining entrepreneurs. According to Layder (1998), the research question should determine which methods to use instead to lock it in a specific methodological area. To investigate combining entrepreneurs, two different methods of gathering data have been used: questionnaires and interviews. When using a mix of methods, quantitative and qualitative, both epistemology and ontology are represented (Bryman and Bell 2011). The epistemological position takes a stand for an objective view of the world and uses questionnaires or statistics to test hypotheses. The ontological position is the opposite and focuses on a subjective view of the world through interpretation and construction. This is accomplished through participant observation and interviews to gain deeper knowledge (Bryman and Bell 2011). Since these two methods are each other’s opposite, together they provide a nuanced picture of what is being studied (Bryman and Bell 2011; Bhaskar 2013; Fleetwood 2004). In research about entrepreneurship, the phenomenon cannot always be captured using the objective side only since it deals with individuals, so the subjective side also must be present. The emphasis in this thesis has therefore been on finding pieces of the puzzle so a picture can emerge to better understand the phenomenon of combining entrepreneurs. The complexity of the puzzle has been the drive to find as many pieces as possible (Kuhn 1996; Bengtsson 1988; Halldén 2005).

3.2. The cases and their context

To find pieces of the puzzle, a cross-case study has been conducted. In case studies, the strategy is to explore in depth the activities, processes and other events in one or more individuals (Creswell 2009; Yin 2014). The information is collected using a variety of data collection techniques over a sustained period of time (Creswell 2009; Stake 1995; Yin 2014). For the researcher, it is important to find cases that explain the phenomenon so that causal mechanisms from the cross-cases can be distinguished (Seawright and Gerring 2008; Eisenhardt 1989). In a cross-case study,
two contexts are compared, which can be different communities, regions or organisations (Neuman and Neuman 2006; Eisenhardt 1989). The key to good cross-case comparisons is to look at the tendencies of the phenomenon in many divergent ways (Eisenhardt 1989). For this research, two counties have been studied, Gävleborg and Jämtland. To a lesser extent, the study also offers a comparison between the pure self-employed and combining entrepreneurs.

3.2.1. The creative industry

All individuals from the two chosen counties belong to the creative industry. The reasons for choosing the creative industry are many. The main reason is that this particular industry consists of many combining entrepreneurs since the industry is represented by craftsmen and artists. These trades often offer earnings that are hard to live on and additional income is essential for some. The second reason is that Gävleborg launched a project in 2008 to develop its creative industry and an initial interest was to see whether the project had resulted in more business start-ups and how many of the entrepreneurs were combining the work form (here it proved difficult to get an idea of whether more new businesses had been started as a result of the project). In addition to the more practical aspects of the choice of industry, the research has raised the issue of whether the creative industry, both nationally and regionally (Howkins 2002; Florida 2004), will stand for economic growth. Especially after Florida's book on the creative class, attempts have been made in many countries all over the world to promote the creative industries, including commercialisation of the outputs of these industries (Kolmodin et al. 2008; Nielsén and Daal 2006; British Council et al. 2010).

There is no common definition of what constitutes the creative industries (Kolmodin et al. 2008). Part of the picture is that the terms creative industries, cultural industries and experience industries are used interchangeably. The definition presented by the Department for Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) at the end of the 1990s has, however, been influential and used as a role model in most attempts to define the industries in question (Kolmodin et al. 2008). The DCMS defines the creative industries as “those activities which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (British Council et al. 2010). With such a definition, one assumes that entrepreneurs in the creative industry can use the potential, which demands knowledge of start-up processes and development of the venture. The activities that belong in the creative industry, include advertising, architecture, arts and antique markets, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, video and photography, software, computer games and electronic publishing, music and the visual and performing arts, publishing, television and radio (British
Council et al. 2010). Inclusion of the antiques trade could be questioned since it does not generally involve a new production except for reproductions and fakes. Likewise, the inclusion of all computer services has also been questioned (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005).

Creativity requires a context to be developed and when creative ideas are realised in economic terms it is called process innovation, which often is central in entrepreneurship. In Sweden, the Knowledge Foundation presented the first report on the creative industries (Almquist et al. 1999), which was called the experience industry, a term coined as a substitute for creative industry. The responsibility for designing a policy to promote the creative industries was then delegated to the Swedish Agency for Economic and Regional Growth (ITPS). Part of the task was to define these industries. The definition was influenced by the British definition to a significant extent. “Creative industries” is regarded as a concept that captures the notion that “expressive values like esthetical aspects and experiences have grown in importance in the economy” (Kolmodin et al. 2008). ITPS notes that the concepts of experience economy and creative and cultural industry overlap. Due to the regional development perspective emphasised in the Swedish perspective, the tourism industry was included in the definition of creative industries/experience industries. The activities focused on in the Swedish context are architecture, computer and video games, design, film, photography, crafts, literature, media, music, food, arts, business communications, fashion, tourism industries and experiential learning (Kolmodin et al. 2008). SNI codes are used to operationalise what is meant by the creative industries. In this study, the image of the creative industries presented by ITPS is used, and the SNI codes are presented in Appendix II.

3.2.2. Gävleborgs County

The place can say a lot about its inhabitants and its climate, both geographically and in terms of business (Aronsson and Braunerhielm 2011). Gävleborg County is not far from Stockholm (Figure 3.1), the capital of Sweden, but the region has been struggling with a demographic challenge, a challenge many other regions in Sweden also face. To create conditions for growth and prosperity instead of out-migration, the region had to find new ways to retain or grow the population and one was to strengthen the cultural and creative industries, which was decided in 2008 (KKN 2009). Along with the regional associations in Gävleborg, Dalarna and Värmland (two other counties in Sweden), it started a project whose purpose was to inventory and strengthen entrepreneurship and contribute to the knowledge of the creative industry (KKN 2009). It also sought to become the European Capital of Culture 2014, which unfortunately went to another town, Umeå, instead. In its application, it stated that it wanted the city of Gävle (the largest city in the county)
to become one of the nation's top cities when it comes to having a diverse cultural program (Municipality 2008).

Gävle is a coastal city and during the 15th century its shipping prospered, mostly illegally as no town except Stockholm was authorised to receive foreign ships. Because the shipping was so extensive and prosperous, Gävle city was accepted by the state of Sweden and given royal privileges, which led Gävle to become an official city in 1446. However, in the early 16th century, Gävle was again prohibited from operating ships from foreign countries. The ships that defied the prohibition were regarded as outlaws and became fair game for pirates. Despite this, shipping continued and grew. During the mid-19th century, shipping in Gävle city was bigger than in the three largest cities, Stockholm, Göteborg and Malmö. At the end of the century, more than 100 factories were producing everything from perfume, cigars and steamers to prefabricated houses. Gävle strengthened its position during the 20th century and had the world's largest sawmill, as well as the majority of coffee roasters and candy factories. In Sandviken, 50 kilometers inland from Gävle, Göran Fredrik Göransson started one of the largest companies in the world, Sandvik AB.

When it comes to culture, the politicians in Gävle instituted a regional arts council and a special unit to administer culture during the 1960s. At one time, culture was considered a luxury, when most regions could only afford to build a library and a museum. The objective in the region of these cultural initiatives was to encourage artistic talents and attract more people to get involved and spread their cultural expressions. Gävle has always been a major cultural city and produced many famous artists, actors and artisans.

3.2.3. Jämtlands County

Jämtland County is located in the middle of Sweden (Figure 3.1) and is an inland county, with its largest city Östersund, listed as Sweden's centre. Jämtland was long a border among Denmark, Sweden and Norway, where the inhabitants of Jämtland swore allegiance to either the Swedish or the Danish king (Norway belonged to Denmark and Sweden in certain periods). Both Denmark and Sweden tried to get the inhabitants to choose their kingdoms, something Sweden succeeded with in 1699. Jämtland was the last county to be conquered in Sweden (Ekervald 1994).

The city of Östersund was formally founded in 1786, after a private person the year before had taken the initiative to build the city, something authorities that year did not consider necessary (Family - Record 1881). However, when the farmers were
more engaged in commerce, often far away, and neglected their farms, it was
decided that the city would be built. Additionally, the highly profitable trade
annoyed the Swedish government when it could not control it, so the building of
the city was a relief. The trade, which for many in Jämtland was the main industry,
was primarily in game, skins, fish, salt, cloth and other commodities and shipped
primarily between Jämtland and Norway (Rentzhog 1996). With the new city,
the inhabitants no longer had to go on long journeys and could stay on the farms and
sell their wares at the market in the city (Jacobsson 1993). The inhabitants of
Jämtland were not pleased, however, which led Östersund for an extended period
to remain a small town. Not until the late 19th century did the city grow. This was
when the railroad opened up the connection to Sundsvall (a coastal city due east)
(Edlund 1996). With the railroad and the tax reduction for settlers, several new
communities emerged like islands in the wilderness, which Jämtland was at the
time (Rentzhog 1996).

In the late 19th century, Jämtland became more accessible by railroad, and the
military presence increased. The threat of Russia was imminent and Östersund
became a priority city, which laid the foundation for becoming a distinct garrison
city, through the rifle regiment and air wing. Although sawmills were established
in the county, all had difficulty competing with the already established plants
along the coast, in turn throwing the farmers into a severe economic crisis
(Rentzhog 1996). The farmers therefore changed the business towards crafts and
some factory industries. Agriculture went over to dairy farming and hydropower
was established in the many streams and rivers in the county. Before World War II,
Jämtland exported electricity from its rivers to the south of Sweden. Unfortunately,
the farmers did not get the county’s share of the profits and remained poor
(Rentzhog 1996).

Jämtland has not been an industrial society, but it has been an agricultural and in
more recent years also a service society. Tourism is great, especially in winter
sports such as downhill skiing, long skiing, biathlon, ski orienteering and snow
cross. Therefore, Östersund established itself as a winter city, and it has a national
winter sports centre (VIC 2014). However, other parts of the creative industry are
also important, as they have been since 1720, when everything artistic flourished
(Rentzhog 1996). In 2011, Östersund was named the food capital of the year
(Erlandsson 2010) and since 1963 it has held a music festival (Storsjöyran) where
known Swedish and international guests perform. That same year, 1963, the
Republic of Jamtland was founded and, to start the music festival each year, the
president delivers a speech to the public.
3.3. Data collection

There are many ways to collect empirical data, where the choice is between the main methods, quantitative and qualitative, and the research question/s, as mentioned earlier, should determine which method to choose.

3.3.1. Pre-study

The initial idea for this thesis was to use a qualitative method to get a deeper understanding of combining entrepreneurs and their context (Bryman 2008) and also to be able to ask follow-up questions. Since the focus of this research is to explain why people combine wage work with a business, and how they get everything to work, interviews are very useful. Thus, to formulate an interview guide, a pre-study was used. Five combining entrepreneurs were interviewed, one in the computer and information technology (IT) security industry, two in the construction industry, one within the economy and the last within agriculture.
Four of these were residents of Stockholm and one of Uppsala. The interviews with these individuals were informal and not recorded.

3.3.2. Snowball effect

To reach the combining entrepreneurs, the original idea was to use the snowball method, where the first individual suggests another and then they guide to the next and so on, until enough information or no new information has been added. It is important to achieve saturation with this type of method (Devine 2002) and it is therefore important that the sample is sufficiently large. The snowball method is useful when respondents are not known in advance and when establishing how the network pattern looks for these individuals (Farquharson 2005). By studying the network patterns, the idea was to see who had reciprocal contacts (i.e. who was selected and who also chose whom). This would show who had key roles in the network, thus contributing a further dimension of the literature about combining entrepreneurs (Hanneman and Riddle 2005).

Unfortunately, the snowball method proved to be difficult. The first combining entrepreneur did not know of any other who combined; neither did the second. The Confederation of Swedish Enterprises, the municipality and the Chamber of Commerce were then contacted, but they also could not provide information about combining entrepreneurs to interview. Thus, the snowball method was abandoned and the ideas for how to reach combining entrepreneurs were running out.

As a last effort, Sweden Statistics (SCB) was contacted, and a contact was made with Jan Andersson, who specialised in combining entrepreneurs. It was also he who helped Delmar, Folta and Wennberg get statistics for their reports and articles on combining entrepreneurs (2006, 2008, 2010). According to Jan Andersson, 220 combining entrepreneurs were within the county of Gävleborg in 2009, but unfortunately address information could not be purchased. The SCB could, however, provide a mailing to these entrepreneurs. The combining entrepreneurs had to respond to this mailing for me to get contact information. This proved to be too expensive and as a last attempt/idea, another department in SCB was contacted, the Business Directory. It could not tell which were combining entrepreneurs, but a mailing list could be bought covering all entrepreneurs/business owners for a very low price. That became the start of the data collection. Since a mailing had to be sent out, the decision to create a questionnaire was made.
3.4. Combination of data material

Combining the two methods of quantitative and qualitative analysis can be considered to be both a strength and a weakness (Bryman 2008). In terms of weakness, the researcher only superficially enters the two methods and no one method is sufficient to obtain the depth needed to study the subject properly (Bryman 2008; Onwuegbuzie 2003; Bryman and Bell 2011). It has also been argued that the epistemological and ontological aspects cannot be mixed and are separate paradigms and there may not exist a third paradigm, where both methods are mixed (Bryman 2008). The mixed-methods aim is not to replace the two survey methods, but to take advantage of their strengths and reduce their weaknesses (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004). For the complex social contexts in which phenomena are studied, a combination of the two methods can be fruitful (Greene et al. 2005). Regardless of paradigmatic orientation, the research in social science often strives to show an image of the human being and how the environment affects humans’ living and evolution in society (Biesta and Burbules 2003). By using both methods, research results become more objective because hypothesis trials also can be validated by interviews. This means that instead of the researcher interpreting what is behind the answers, he or she can provide an objective explanation (Bryman 2008).

Mixed methods can be based on different designs, and the more challenging mixed-method designs are those in which each method has relatively equal importance (Greene et al. 2005). The different designs have been described as triangulation, complementarity, initiation, development and expansion (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004; Greene et al. 2005). Triangulation is perhaps the design that is most abundant and is intended to reduce errors in the survey in which the same phenomenon is studied. All methods have shortcomings and limitations, so choosing only one method to explain a phenomenon will lead to failure and limited results (Bryman 2008; Greene et al. 2005). Triangulation also tries to explain how different aspects which emerge in the method itself affect or explain the phenomenon (Bryman 2008; Greene et al. 2005). A complementarity design study overlaps and shows different phases of the phenomenon through the various methods (Greene et al. 2005). This is similar to the peeling off of layers of an onion to reach its core. It uses the results of one method to develop, enhance and illustrate the results of the other. Complementarity design is similar to triangulation; what sets them apart is that complementarity examines overlapping phenomena and performs best when both methods are used simultaneously (Greene et al. 2005). Development design means that the first method is used to assist with the development of the other (Greene et al. 2005; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004). It may be that from the quantitative method the researchers find a sample
for more detailed questions based on the responses received (Greene et al. 2005; Sieber 1973). A *initiation* design finds paradoxes and contradictions that help in refining the survey and survey questions (Greene et al. 2005; Johnson and Onwuegbuzie 2004). The final design is the *expansion*, which involves using qualitative methods to assess programs processes and quantitative methods to assess program outcomes. In this thesis, several mixed-methods designs have been used but triangulation is the design running through the entire investigation. In the first phase of the investigation, the initiation design was used, followed by complementarity and then development (Table 3.1). When the methods were performed simultaneously, they are marked with a plus (+) and if they come in succession, they are marked with an arrow (→).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Applied mixed-method design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUAL → QUAL + QUAN/qual ➔ QUAN/qual ➔ QUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qual stands for qualitative and quan stands for quantitative methods. If the terms are in capital letters, they had a significant role in the interpretation and analysis of the material (Creswell, 2009). Quan/qual means that the questionnaire contained both closed-questions and open-questions (Creswell, 2009).

### 3.5. Quantitative data

Surveys can be valuable tools to gather information from a large number of people and the method is helpful when a new area or phenomenon is to be studied to see how prevalent it is and what characterises it (Bryman 2008; Hayes 2000). Surveys have, however, the disadvantage that the researcher does not know who filled in the answers or whether the answers are correct, which could result in a response bias (Hayes 2000). Therefore, it is extremely important that the survey is carefully planned, designed and tested to minimise biases (Chidlow et al. 2014). Designing a questionnaire is thus extremely time consuming and the questionnaire for this research took a long time to design.

#### 3.5.1. The questionnaire selections

According to the data received from the SCB, there were 407 741 combining entrepreneurs, and 32 191 belonged to the creative industry (Appendix III) in Sweden 2010 (Statistics Sweden 2010). This amount could be much higher as it requires the entrepreneurs to submit income information to the national tax board.
and to be a registered, income-generating business. The entrepreneurs working illegally or individuals working alongside their wage work, without having registered a business, are therefore not included in these figures. Thus, it is difficult to say for sure how many businesses are run by a combining entrepreneur in Sweden. Also, the number of active businesses can differ depending on which database is used. According to the SCB website, in 2010, there were 981,349 registered businesses, but according to the SCB’s Business Register there were only 914,043 the same year. It is therefore even more difficult to say exactly how many combining entrepreneurs there are in all businesses during this period, but the number equals between 41 percent and 47 percent. Looking at the trend, the number of combining entrepreneurs, overall, increased by 1 percent between 2009 and 2010 (Statistics Sweden 2010) and creative combining entrepreneurs increased by 7 percent (appendix III). In the counties studied, the increase has not been as large, but there has been an increase, albeit with only one business in Gävleborgs County and eight in Jämtlands County.

Most businesses run by a combining entrepreneur are small and fit within the statute of sole proprietors (Statistics Sweden 2010). In Sweden 2010, 58 percent of all businesses were sole proprietors, 30 percent limited companies, 6 percent trade and limited partnerships, 5 percent cooperatives and 1 percent other types of businesses, such as government entities, municipalities and foundations (Statistics Sweden 2010). In Gävleborg County 2010, only one combining entrepreneur had a limited company in the creative industry, which meant that the address list bought contained only sole proprietors. For the Jämtland study, the address list contained all types of businesses.

3.5.2. Survey appearance

The interviews from the pre-study together with questions from previous research (Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010; Petrova 2012; Burke et al. 2008; Shane et al. 2003; Sätre Åhlander 2006) were the basis for the design of the questionnaire. The questions asked were mainly based on Delmar et al. (2008) and Folta et al. (2010), where the following variables were taken: gender, age, education, marital status, number of children, regional affiliation, tenure at main workplace, entry into the combining phase, salary income, household wealth, self-employment experience, employment tenure, employer size, hybrid experience and partnership. From Petrova (2012) came questions about ethnicity, foreign birth, either parent foreign born, labour force participation, either parent a business owner and started other businesses, industry (both from employment and self-employment). From Burke et al. (2008) and Shane et al. (2003) came questions about the motives and from Sätre Åhlander (2006) came questions regarding the county and its significance. The
questions concerning networking came from Greve and Salaff (2003) and Hill et al. (1999).

As a template for the design, earlier questionnaires sent by SCB and other research groups were used (SCB has been/still is a leader in collecting data from the Swedish population and its response rate is very high). Hayes (2000) argued that designing questionnaires is an art and not nearly as easy as it looks. By using already-tested designs, the hope was to get a high response rate. A cover letter was also formulated, as Fox et al. (1988) noted is very important when sending out questionnaires. The cover letter should be written in a simple and casual way and explain what will happen to the information after the respondents fill out the questionnaire (Bryman 2008). The questionnaires were anonymous, but each respondent had a code number, which was only used for the mailings, to be able to tick off how many individuals responded and facilitate and minimise the cost of the reminder mailings. In the database, the respondents got a different ID number, a serial number. This means that the database and the address list are not compatible.

The questionnaire was tested several times before being sent out and the individuals used were those from the pre-study and snowball study together with colleagues from the University of Gävle. According to Hayes (2000), it is important to test the questionnaire on a few and to analyse the responses. From the pilot and analytical tests, valuable inputs were found, and the questionnaire was revised slightly before it was sent out for the first survey in February/March 2010 to all entrepreneurs in the creative industry in the county of Gävleborg. The responses showed that some questions should have been asked in a different way and that additional questions should have been added (Appendix Ib). Some questions were corrected for the second survey in Jämtlands County, which was sent out in March 2012. Other questions could not be changed or added; doing so would have made the comparison between the counties difficult, so they were left as they were.

3.5.3. Survey questions

Since the questionnaire was sent to all business owners regardless of whether they were combining entrepreneurs or not, the questionnaire contained questions for both groups and was divided into five sections: demographics, the business, the combination, the wage work and the networking (Table 3.2). The first two and last sections could be filled out by all, while the combining entrepreneurs could fill out all the sections.
Table 3.2  Question parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Gender, age, children, education, ethnicity, marital status, work form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employment</td>
<td>Development, years active, hours worked per week, income, partnership, employees, office space, motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>Years active, progression/intentions, motive, pros and cons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Branch, occupation, years active at present employer, years active in total, income, motive, concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Business networks, other networks, collaborations, new collaborations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The purpose of the first section was to get an overview of who the respondents were, how they lived and where they came from. The second part contained information about the business (e.g. how long they have had their business, whether they run it together with a team member, amount of hours they put weekly and income). The third part addressed the combining phase, the entry into this phase (from wage work or from self-employment), number of years as a combining entrepreneur, motives, intentions and pros and cons. The fourth part contained information about the wage work, what occupation they had, how long they had been employed, if they were worried about losing their jobs, within which branch the firm belonged, their motive and so on. The last and fifth part contained information about networks, if they belonged to any corporate networks, if they had any collaborations and, if so, how many, who they had contact with and with whom they would like to have contact in the future.

3.5.4. Mailings and reminders

In addition to the head mailings and two reminder mailings, the entrepreneurs in Gävleborgs County also had the opportunity to respond to the survey online. The interest, however, was minimal; only 32 people responded via the online survey, which is why that option was not included in the Jämtland study. In the first mailing and the second reminder mailing for Gävleborg County, the whole survey was attached. For the first reminder mailing, only a postcard was sent with reference to the online survey. For the survey in Jämtland County, a head mailing
and one reminder mailing were sent out, both with the whole survey. The reminders were sent out four weeks after the last mailing for both surveys and the response rate for each mailing is shown in table 3.3. The two counties are segregated in separate columns and divided between combining entrepreneurs and pure self-employed. The use of follow-up mailings is considered to be effective in raising the response rate (Roth and BeVier 1998; Jobber 1986), which is why this method was used. Also, post-cards are considered good (Roth and BeVier 1998), something the survey from Gävleborgs county could not prove since more replied when the whole questionnaire was sent out.

Table 3.3. The response rate per dispatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gävleborgs County</th>
<th>Jämtlands County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combining</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>entrepreneurs</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch 1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch 4</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.5. Responses

There were 754 registered sole proprietors in the creative sector in Gävleborgs County. Of this total, 77 had reached retirement (over 67 years of age) and were therefore excluded from the study, 8 had moved and 8 were inactive, leaving a sample size of 661, consisting of individuals between the ages of 20 and 67 years. Of the 661 surveys sent out, 188 were returned, yielding a response rate of 28.4 percent. Looking only at the combining entrepreneurs, the response rate was 68 percent (127 combining entrepreneurs and 61 self-employed). Based on the data from SCB that this county only had 220 combining entrepreneurs, the response rate was 57.7 percent for these entrepreneurs.

In Jämtland, the study was carried out exactly two years after the first. At that time, the input fee for limited companies had just been reduced from 100 000 SEK to 50 000 SEK, which meant that more combining entrepreneurs could have limited companies; therefore, all types of businesses instead of just sole proprietorships were chosen. Economic associations and large corporations, corporations that had

---

6 In appendix III, this number is higher because in those data all individuals who combine are counted, which means that even people who serve on boards are counted and I have not been interested in them.
a very high annual turnover and/or corporations that had more than 10 employees were removed. This resulted in 882 registered businesses. Of these, 84 of the owners had reached retirement, 34 had moved, 16 were inactive and 51 where either a large corporation or an association which was missed in the first screening, leaving a sample size of 697, consisting of individuals between the ages of 20 and 67 years. Of the 697 surveys sent out, 267 were returned, yielding a response rate of 38.3 percent. Looking only at the combining entrepreneurs, the response rate was 50.6 percent (135 combining entrepreneurs and 132 self-employed).

In total, the response rate for both surveys was 33.5 percent, and of them 57.6 percent were combining entrepreneurs.

3.5.6. Methods of statistical analysis

The methods used for the various articles were selected on the basis of what best explains the research question for each of the respective papers (Table 3.4). The first paper used a descriptive analysis method to explain who combining entrepreneurs are. This was based on virtually all categories from table 3.2.

Table 3.4 Framework for design and method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research designs</th>
<th>Research methods</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1</td>
<td>quan + QUAL</td>
<td>Descriptive + focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2</td>
<td>QUAN + qual</td>
<td>ANOVA + focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3</td>
<td>QUAN</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 4</td>
<td>QUAN + qual</td>
<td>Logistic regression + focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 5</td>
<td>QUAN</td>
<td>Logistic regression</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second paper follows the first and explains the different combining intentions as presented in the first paper. The third paper goes deeper into the nascent combining entrepreneurs described in the second paper. The fourth and fifth papers discuss the passion motive, which emerged in paper 1. Various statistical analysis models have been used. For papers 3, 4 and 5 logistic regressions were employed. With this analysis model, it was possible to test whether various factors have an effect on passion. Another model used in paper 2 is analysis of variance (ANOVA) to test for statistical differences between the intentions of the combining entrepreneurs. All analyses have been conducted using the statistical program SPSS.

3.6. Qualitative data

In an effort to understand combining entrepreneurs, an additional question was added to the questionnaire if they were willing to participate in an interview. Very surprisingly, one third, or 140, of all respondents accepted. To manage as many as possible, focus group interviews were used. What the qualitative method seeks to provide is a full description, and it is very convenient when it comes to capturing a phenomenon. The idea behind focus groups is that people get together and talk about a topic they have in common (Bryman 2008; Bryman and Bell 2011; Murray 1998), in this case, being business owners and combining entrepreneurs. Based on what others say, the respondents can think of things they have not before considered and that seem commonplace for them. By raising various topics, everybody has something to talk about and the debate can either be supportive and developmental or the respondents can have different views (Bryman 2008). What focus group interviews offer is an opportunity to study how people together explain and understand a phenomenon (Bryman 2008; Bryman and Bell 2011; Murray 1998) and to generate ideas or identify problems (Murray 1998); they can also be used to validate questionnaires (Jackson and Holbrook 1995).

3.6.1. Selection

Everyone who accepted the invitation to an interview was invited to attend a focus group interview, so no sampling was done. The focus group interviews took place nearly six months after the first questionnaires were mailed and were intended to validate responses from the survey. According to Wibeck (2010), focus group interviews should not be used on sensitive topics. In this study, there were no sensitive topics; however, the substance was such that they had to give voice to this phenomenon and explain why the result looked like it did. In Gävleborg County, the groups were divided by municipality, so different parts of the region
could be studied. By doing so, differences between the combining entrepreneurs residing in rural areas versus urban areas could be studied. According to Bryman (2008), it is important when conducting interviews to reach saturation because it increases the reliability and durability of the material. In focus group interviews, it may be difficult to achieve saturation when the interviews often can pull in different directions. In this study, eight focus group interviews and two individual interviews were conducted. A disadvantage of focus group interviews is that the researcher does not know how many will attend (Bryman 2008) and Kitzinger (1994) argued that large groups, between 10 and 15, are preferable. For each focus group, 10 to 15 persons were invited, but at most 5 attended. It was difficult to get everyone to talk and participate in the discussion when five were participating. When they were three, the conversation flowed very well and all three had a voice, which made the discussions much more interesting. In one of the groups that had five persons, two people did not always agree, which I appreciated as a moderator.

In Gävleborg County, five focus group interviews were held, three in the rural municipalities of Bollnäs, Hudiksvall and Sandviken and two in the only urban municipality Gävle (Table 3.5). On one occasion, only one person (Table 3.6) came, but the same interview guide (Appendix IV) was used regardless of number of respondents. In total, 19 persons were interviewed in the county of Gävleborg.

In Jämtland County, all focus group interviews were held in the urban city of Östersund. The choice was made on the fact that regardless of where the interviews were to be held all respondent had to travel a good distance, this when the distances are very large in this county and the respondents lived very spread out. Since several respondents worked in Östersund, it seemed to be the best alternative. Ultimately, four rural areas belonging to Östersunds municipality, Brunflo, Fäker, Lit and Orrviken, and one urban city, Östersund, were represented in three focus group interviews (Table 3.5). Even in Jämtland, only one person showed up at an interview, but also with this person the same interview guide was used (Table 3.2). In total, 10 persons were interviewed in the county of Jämtland.

A weakness with focus group interviews is that they take a very long time (Bryman 2008). It takes time to organise, find places to meet and ensure those invited can come on that particular day and time. The interviews must also be transcribed, which resulted in more than one hundred pages of text. The benefits, however, are great. The discussions gave so much more information than the individual interviews provided. Since a limited phenomenon was discussed, saturation of information about the phenomenon was relatively quickly established. In contrast, there were always new and different ways to network for
virtually every focus group. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to take advantage of this momentum in this thesis. The interviews have been presented on the basis of one-to-one interviews.

Table 3.5  The focus group participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gällleborg County</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>G3</th>
<th>G4</th>
<th>G5</th>
<th>G6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1 F, 4 M</td>
<td>3 M</td>
<td>1 F, 2 M</td>
<td>1 F, 3 M</td>
<td>1 F, 2 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (average)</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Bollnäs</td>
<td>Gävle</td>
<td>Gävle</td>
<td>Sandviken</td>
<td>Hudiksvall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been combining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to combine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>21-sep</td>
<td>29-sep</td>
<td>03-okt</td>
<td>05-okt</td>
<td>06-okt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>02:30</td>
<td>02:45</td>
<td>02:05</td>
<td>01:37</td>
<td>02:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G stands for Gästleborg County and the number represents the interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jämtlands County</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>J3</th>
<th>J4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1 F, 2 M</td>
<td>1 F, 2 M</td>
<td>2 F, 1 M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (average)</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Östersund</td>
<td>Östersund</td>
<td>Östersund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been combining</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to combine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>06-nov</td>
<td>08-nov</td>
<td>09-nov</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>02:34</td>
<td>02:31</td>
<td>02:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-female, M-male

J stands for Jämtlands County and the number represents the interview
Table 3.6  The single interviews participations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>J2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (average)</td>
<td>1 F</td>
<td>1 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining</td>
<td>Gavle</td>
<td>Östersund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to combine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of interview</td>
<td>04-okt</td>
<td>07-nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>01:22</td>
<td>01:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-female, M-male

G stands for Gävleborgs County, J for Jämtlands County and the number represents the interview

3.6.2. Description of respondents

On all meetings, the networking started directly. Business cards and project requests were exchanged. At one meeting, one person got a job immediately from another. Of the 29 who were interviewed, 8 were self-employed entrepreneurs; of them, 4 had been combining prior to the transition and 1 wanted to combine, and 19 were combining entrepreneurs (Table 3.5 and 3.6). All of the respondents also expressed joy and positivity around the groups and they appreciated the opportunity to meet others like them. For example, one man called the day before a focus group interview and was exuberantly happy because he would get to meet others like him. He had thought he was alone. After each group interview, all expressed that they wanted a meeting with all respondents in their county and that the discussion during the interviews had given them so much energy, joy and inspiration that they wanted to get more. Unfortunately, it was not possible to arrange this, although it would have been very interesting.

3.6.3. Interview design and implementation

All interviews started with a little information about the research project and then everyone in the group introduced themselves. Then statistics from the survey were shown, using the interview guide (Appendix IV) (Murray 1998), and questions asked what they thought of the results, if something was surprising and why it looked like it did. The interview guide contained statistics on individual characteristics, business engagement, wage work engagement and their
combination, work-business link, reasons for being a combining entrepreneur and network. The statistics led the conversation in the right direction even if it sometimes became difficult when many of the images overlapped conversations that arose. The interviews in Gävleborg County took place in the evening so everyone could have an opportunity to attend. The interviews were expected to last for two hours, but most took around two and a half. Nobody wanted to go home. In Jämtlands County, the interviews were conducted around lunchtime, which seemed to fit the respondents’ best, despite evening hours being offered.

3.6.4. Analyses of the interviews

The focus group interviews provided very good insight into how the different respondents saw the combining phase and explanations as to why the data results looked like they did. Using focus group interviews to validate the survey proved to be a good idea because the interviews interpreted and explained the results. It is not possible as a researcher to stand outside a survey completely, but using this technique made it easier and also the respondents could comment on questions asked that were difficult for them to understand. This was especially true for the questions concerning networks. The result from the questionnaire concerning the network variables was not very good (a large number of respondents did not consider networks to be good), and a sense that the respondents did not understand the questions was evident, which was confirmed to some extent during the focus group interviews. That is why the interview responses regarding networking issues had more weight than the responses from the questionnaire in paper 1.

The analysis of the interviews in the papers was based on direct quotations and summaries. For paper 1, 10 respondents out of the 29 were used to maintain manageable communication. The aim was to present their voices and it was therefore important to use direct quotations. In paper 1, the focus was on qualitative data, even if quantitative data were reported. In papers 2 and 4, the focus group interviews were integrated into the discussion to highlight and validate the results. Also, here a selection was used to lift up the core of the discussion, and people were chosen based on their background and comments during the interview.
3.7. Discussion of method

With the choice to study a phenomenon that is common but not well known, the structure of the whole survey took different shapes and orientations. Each methodology has strengths and drawbacks, as well as degrees of generalisation, credibility and sustainability. Based on a logic sense, it is difficult to make generalisations from only one sector and two counties. So, for generalisations, more research is needed in other sectors and counties. With that said, generalisations can be obtained for the creative industry when a cross-case study is applied. The demographic results from this study are also similar to those from Delmar et al.’s (2008) study, which is one of the few papers to describe Swedish combining entrepreneurs. Thus, even if it is not possible to generalise about all combining entrepreneurs, the information can be treated as a guide.

The response rate of 33.5 percent may seem low, but considering the number of questions in the survey (around 100 in total), the result is good. A survey conducted by Jobber and Saunders (1988) found that the response rate was between 5 percent and 13 percent, depending on the country (US and Great Britain) and number of pages in the questionnaire. Longer questionnaires involve more effort and time to complete so these surveys tend to have a lower response rate. The questionnaire is attached in appendix I, and with the additions of changes between the two studies, it is possible to replicate the study. Also, the focus group interview can be replicated, providing that a survey with the same questions is administrated first, so there are results on which to build the interview guide. The results presented at the focus groups are attached in appendix IV.

3.7.1. Ethical issues

All focus group interviews (eight) plus the two single interviews were recorded and transcribed in full after approval by all respondents, which is important according to Minichiello et al. (2008). None of the respondents rejected the recording.

Sweden also has a Privacy Law (PuL), which says: “Protect people from having their privacy violated by the processing of personal data. The premise of the PuL is that the individual himself should decide whether personal data concerning him or her should be treated” (www.datainspektionen.se).

When dealing with information about individuals, the issue of ethics, such as conduct and moral judgment, is of the essence. For this research, all respondents, who represent a profession as business owners, have been given fictitious names to make the text easier to read and to protect their identity, even if some did not care
if their real names were mentioned. In the cover letter distributed with the questionnaire, the respondents were informed about the research purpose and criteria for participation in the study. If the individual felt that he or she did not approve, that individual did not need to fill in the survey. All information has been stored out of the reach of unauthorised persons and used only for the specified research purposes.
4. PAPER REVIEWS

In this section, the various papers will be presented and are based on the studies (surveys and focus group interviews) which have been conducted for the purposes of this thesis.

The papers builds on paper 1, which is the main paper for explaining combining entrepreneurs and it is from this paper that all the other papers drew their specialisations (figure 4.1). Paper 1, *Kombinatörer och livsstilsföretagare – även samhällsentreprenörer? / Combining entrepreneurs and lifestyle entrepreneurs – also soci(et)al entrepreneurs?*, focuses on identifying and analysing the combining entrepreneurs to address the first purpose of the thesis. In this paper, an identification of these combining entrepreneurs was intended to see whether they can also be counted as soci(et)al and/or lifestyle entrepreneurs as they operate their businesses in counties that are minor in terms of population. Paper 2, *The combining nascent entrepreneurs - motives and intentions*, takes off from paper 1 and studies how combining entrepreneurs operate their business, and what their motives and intentions are, which goes deeper into the first purpose. Paper 3, *Transitioning from wage-employment to self-employment: the changing effects with age*, focuses on the entrepreneurs who belong to the group who want to leave the combining phase (the combining nascent entrepreneurs), where two factors are raised: their current age and networking. This is illustrated by using identity theory. Paper 4, *Hybrid Entrepreneurship: the importance of passion*, continues to illuminate the passion motive raised in papers 1 and 2 to obtain deeper insight into the factors affecting combining entrepreneurs: the individual’s age at start-up and entrepreneurial tenure. In this paper, the COR theory is applied. Finally, paper 5, *Passion in hybrid entrepreneurship: The impact of entrepreneurial teams and tenure*, focuses on the effect of entrepreneurial teams and how long they have been running their businesses on passion, with a special focus on choice theory. The last two papers answer the second purpose.

![Figure 4.1](image_url)  
*How the papers are linked to each other*
4.1. Paper 1

Kombinatörer och livsstilsföretagare – även samhällsentreprenörer? /
Combining entrepreneurs and lifestyle entrepreneurs – also soci(et)al entrepreneurs?

The first paper describes both the combining entrepreneurs and full-time self-employed: who they are, how long and how much time they spend in the business, why and how long they have combined and what they think of the importance of the place and networking. The literature is derived primarily from social entrepreneurship and lifestyle theory and this paper is included as a chapter in the Swedish anthology, *Samhällsentreprenörskap – samverkande för lokal utveckling / Social Entrepreneurship - cooperating for local development*, which is written in Swedish and whose purpose is to present the results of the research conducted in the framework of the research project Societal Entrepreneurship in sparsely Populated Areas (SESPA). The purpose of this paper was to describe the characteristics of combining entrepreneurs with reference to full-time self-employed for those who are, have been and want to become combining entrepreneurs. Within this group, some of the full-time self-employed had been combining entrepreneurs prior to the focus group interviews and a small number of full-time self-employed wanted to combine. Another purpose was to see if they all could be seen as soci(et)al entrepreneurs and/or lifestyle entrepreneurs and to determine their importance in the local and regional areas.

In table 4.1, some of the results are presented. What the table shows is that whether they combine or are self-employed, they have had their businesses an average of ten years, which means they have passed the critical age of five years, often referred to as the toughest (Hyytinen and Rouvinen 2008; Evans and Leighton 1990).
Table 4.1  The tenure and time in between work forms and county

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gävleborg</th>
<th>Jämtland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurial tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time self-employed</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours worked in the business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>17 hours/week</td>
<td>19 hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time self-employed</td>
<td>42.5 hours/week</td>
<td>43 hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combining tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>9.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continue to combine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>85 %</td>
<td>86 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>70 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wage work tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining entrepreneurs</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The combining entrepreneur puts an average of 18 hours a week into the business, while the self-employed puts in around 43 hours. Given that those who combine also put time into their wage work (on average 35 hours), these combining individuals are working on average of 53 hours a week, considerably more than the self-employed. Before they started combining their business, they had been employed as a wage worker for a long period. Here, the results differed between the counties, where those in the county of Jämtland worked an average of 14 years before they started the business while in Gävleborgs County they worked for around 5 years on average. This difference may depend on the situation on the labour market and the distance to the capital area because Jämtland is located very far away. Those with wage work would hold onto it because it is not certain they can find a new job if they choose to quit to try to be full-time self-employed.

Both surveys (questionnaires and focus group interviews from the counties of Gävleborgs and Jämtlands) have been used. The results show that both the combining entrepreneurs and the full-time self-employed are both lifestyle and soci(et)al entrepreneurs in some ways. These entrepreneurs want to continue living where they live and want their village or region to survive. The focus group interviews revealed that many stayed to save the local community, but also because they liked to live and work where they were. They also knew that they
could never live the way they did if they decided to move to the capital, Stockholm. This was especially evident for those living outside the major cities, Gävle and Östersund.

The motive that was most evident was passion, even if they did not earn a lot of money on the business; rather, they did something they truly liked. Of the combining entrepreneurs, 60 percent wanted to leave the combining phase and invest fully in the business, 35 percent liked the combination and did not want to leave this form of work and only 5 percent wanted to be employed in wage work only. These results differ from previous research, where Delmar et al. (2008) noted that of those leaving the combining phase 32 percent became full-time self-employed and 68 percent went back to wage work. These numbers are based on statistics taken from SCB and highlight what these individuals actually have done, while this study shows intention and that is why the numbers differ.

4.2. Paper 2
The combining nascent entrepreneurs – motives and intentions

In the second paper, the aim was to increase the understanding of nascent entrepreneurs by highlighting the phenomenon of combining entrepreneurs. In the GEM reports, much has been emphasised about nascent entrepreneurs to provide a comprehensive and representative picture of these entrepreneurs and their intentions and activities during the start-up phase (Acs and Szerb 2007; Reynolds et al. 2003; Amorós and Bosma 2014; Bosma 2013). Researchers have also concluded that combining entrepreneurs exist when the business is started, and that the phenomenon is very common (Burke et al. 2008; Burmeister-Lamp et al. 2012). In contrast, in these kinds of studies, it is assumed that the combining phase is only temporary, that individuals only stay in this phase until the business can stand on its own and that the wage work contributes to financing the venture. In this paper, the purpose has been to investigate whether there are different intentions/groups of nascent entrepreneurs who combine, for how long they stay in this combining phase and what characterises them. The following research questions have been asked:

Q1 – What intentions do the combining entrepreneurs in this study have with their entrepreneurship?
Q2 – How do they look at their present situation (e.g. for how long do they want to stay in this phase)?
Q3 – What are the characteristics of the combining entrepreneurs in this study?
Some of the combining entrepreneurs, the combining lifestyle entrepreneurs, want nothing more than to remain in this form of work, a work form they feel is the best of both worlds. A minority of the combining entrepreneurs, the combining occasional entrepreneurs, feels it is too difficult to combine and run a business and would rather just be employees and have wage work. The majority from the surveys, the combining nascent entrepreneurs, wants to focus more on the business, but the time in the combining phase is long. The paper considers the combining nascent entrepreneurs to still be nascent since they have not yet come to the point that the business can pay its expenses and salary (Carter et al. 1996; Delmar and Davidsson 2000; PSEDII 2014). As for the second research question, about how they view their current situation and what they want in the future, almost all combining nascent entrepreneurs mentioned that they thought they would combine for a maximum period of five years. Half thought they would leave the combining phase within a year. It didn’t, however, matter how long they already had been combining, they all had the same ambitions for the future.

The three groups are very similar in characteristics. As a business advisor, it would be impossible, based on these data, to see which combining groups would go into self-employment full-time and which do not want to develop the business at all. It is also difficult to state whether the combining phase is voluntary or not. This is because the combining entrepreneurs enter into this form in different ways, either from self-employment or from wage work. Those who came from self-employment had economic difficulties had to become wage workers, or they liked to alternate between the two and acquire knowledge. Those who were employed and had wage work when they started the business (the majority) often did so voluntarily.

4.3. Paper 3

Transitioning from wage-employment to self-employment: the changing effects with age

The third paper focused on the combining nascent entrepreneurs living in the county of Jämtland who said they wanted to invest more in the business and become self-employed (the 60 percent from the previous paper). The reason for the choice of county was to single out one of the two studied counties to provide deeper knowledge of that county. The intent was to examine factors that shape the choice to focus further on the entrepreneurial role, with particular interest in the effects of the individual’s age and whether the individual participates in networks.
To answer these questions, we used identity theory. This theory is based on the notion that individuals have as many identities as society demands (e.g. employee, parent). When it comes to entrepreneurship, the role is based on the expectations the individual has for this particular role and how it stands against other roles. Each individual has his or her own hierarchical order of roles depending on the size of their focus (Stets and Burke 2000). The more the role means to the individual, the more the individual will put into that role. We therefore believe that the role of entrepreneurship is affected by age, consistent with previous studies showing that age has an impact on entrepreneurship (Lévesque and Minniti 2006; Kautonen et al. 2014; Lévesque and Minniti 2011) and that individuals with children probably prioritise them above the start of a business. However, when the children become old enough the roles may be reprioritised and the individual may be able to start the business (Grilo and Irigoyen 2006). We also believe that if these individuals are part of different types of networks, they can get help and support to dare to start a business. Also, the interaction with others who have already started a business is important when new roles are created (Stryker and Burke 2000).

In this paper, we have divided entrepreneurship choices into two steps. The first step involves deciding whether to start a business directly or as a combining entrepreneur. The second step concerns whether entrepreneurs choose to leave wage work to only invest in their business full-time (Figure 4.2). Many choices must be made, choices that may not always be easy when the individual might want one thing, but must take another.
Figure 4.2. Conceptualizing the entrepreneurial choice among combining entrepreneurs as a two-step process

The dashed grey rectangle captures the focus of the present study: a second-step entrepreneurial choice among combining entrepreneurs (those who combine self-employment and wage work). The remaining parts of the figure illustrate how the second-step entrepreneurial choice is distinct from the first-step entrepreneurial choice in entrepreneurial entry.

Combining entrepreneurs have already overcome many of the obstacles and challenges associated with venture start-ups and the first-step entrepreneurial choice. They have already identified a business opportunity and acquired the necessary resources, they have learned the rules and regulations and they have tested whether the business idea is economically viable. Drawing on identity theory, we therefore suggest that the second-step entrepreneurial choice, in which efforts are directed to a transition away from wage-employment and full devotion to self-employment, relates to identifying as an entrepreneur and developing the value connotations of the entrepreneurial role. Recognizing that certain role identities may gain importance over time, we propose that the older combining entrepreneurs are, the more they will value what it means to occupy an entrepreneurial role.
H1 – Among combining entrepreneurs, the individual’s age increases his or her efforts to transition fully to entrepreneurship.

H2 – Among combining entrepreneurs, the individual’s involvement in entrepreneur networks increases his or her efforts to transition fully to entrepreneurship.

H3 – Among combining entrepreneurs, the individual’s involvement in entrepreneur networks strengthens the positive relationship between the individual’s age and the efforts to transition fully to entrepreneurship.

The results demonstrate that as age increases, the probability of making a full transition to entrepreneurship also increases. Such effects are even stronger among combining entrepreneurs who are involved in entrepreneur networks.

With regards to the networking variable, the results indicate—in contrast to our prediction—that no direct relationship exists between being involved in entrepreneur networks and making a full transition to entrepreneurship. As hypothesized, however, we found an interactive positive effect between the combining entrepreneurs’ age and network involvement.

4.4. Paper 4

Hybrid entrepreneurship: The importance of passion

In the fourth paper, passion was the focus, also raised in the first and second paper. Here we looked at two factors that can affect passion: the actual age and the number of hours spent on the venture per week. The aim was to identify reasons why people choose to combine, with an emphasis on passion. In the theoretical part, we used the theory obtained from entrepreneurship, passion and psychology, and integrated them with the COR theory because we believe that combining entrepreneurs who are older when they start the business feel more passion for their business since they have had time to think through the business idea well. Their children have also become older, which means they can now indulge their passion. We also believe that the more time the combining entrepreneurs put into the business, the less passion they feel for what they do. The day only has 24 hours and it is important to manage/prioritise how and where to invest resources. It is especially important for combining entrepreneurs, as besides their normal work in wage work they also have a family and business to manage. We therefore believe that COR theory is important in this context.
Passion is a strong feeling that entrepreneurs experience. It may be that they feel passionate about a hobby and will do basically anything to spend time on it. Some individuals may only work with their hobby once in a while, while others, like combining entrepreneurs, choose to develop a business based on it. In research about passion, two types are highlighted, harmonious and obsessive passion, through the dualistic model of passion (Vallerand et al. 2003). When everything is in harmony, there is a balance between the different activities, and if something collides (e.g. if the family wants to do something when time was set aside for the business), then that entrepreneur can change the schedule. An individual who experiences obsession and is not in balance would use the appointed time for the business instead of spending it with the family. In this paper, these two types have not been tested because the data collection method would not be the same, but it gives a good indication of the differences and it is also one reason why we have chosen to integrate the COR theory.

The two hypotheses tested are:

**H1** – The older combining entrepreneurs are at business start-up, the more likely the wage work/business combination is driven by passion.

**H2** – The more time combining entrepreneurs spend on the business, the less likely the wage work/business combination is driven by passion

The result shows that passion is the top reason why individuals combine wage work with a business. Based on 16 alternative motives, 34 percent picked passion as the main reason for combining. In second place, with only 16 percent, came earning money. It is also more likely that older combining entrepreneurs feel more passion than younger entrepreneurs and the less time spent on the business, the more passionately the combining entrepreneurs feel.

### 4.5. Paper 5

**Passion in hybrid entrepreneurship: The impact of entrepreneurial teams and tenure**

The fifth paper also highlights passion but from a choice perspective. What has been studied is how entrepreneurial tenure (referring to the length of the engagement in the business) and involvement in entrepreneurial teams affect passion as the underlying motive for combining entrepreneurs. Having a lot of choices is often seen as a given in today’s society, but having many choices is not always a blessing. Research about marketing and psychology has concluded that
more choices of the same product in a shop attract customers to come and try it out (Iyengar and Lepper 2000). Unfortunately, customers do not buy when there are too many options to choose from, unlike if only a few variants of the same product are displayed (Shah and Wolford 2007; Iyengar and Lepper 2000). What happens is that the customers end up in a tyranny of choice, which means that they go back to what they know or choose not to make a choice at all (Schwartz 2004; Scheibehenne et al. 2009). The same situation can arise for entrepreneurs when they are faced with too many choices that must be made for the business to operate, choices they usually are not accustomed to making and with which they have no experience. Since combining entrepreneurs also have wage work (mostly full time), they do not always have time to go through all the choices in a satisfactory manner, which can create frictions. In the beginning when everything is new and exciting, the drive and passion to get the business started will give the individuals the extra energy needed. However, as time goes by, these motives wane and the business becomes a burden instead of something that is fun and stimulating. Combining entrepreneurs will then have a very big choice to make: to continue, invest more and become self-employed or close down the business and return to wage work. The advantage these combining entrepreneurs have versus those who go directly towards self-employment is that they have the opportunity to test their idea while they have the security from the wage work if something should go wrong. In the longer term, however, this advantage is converted into a disadvantage that allows passion to subside.

In this paper, we have also chosen to look at combining entrepreneurs who share the business with a team member. It is important to find a team member who has the same values but who is not like the first member. Also, it is good if both are combining entrepreneurs or put in equal time in the business so neither has greater responsibility than the other (Chowdhury 2005; Mohr and Spekman 1994). This is particularly important in the creative industry because the business is usually a development of the entrepreneur’s own interest and a willingness to create something of his or her own. Three hypotheses were tested:

**H1** – Passion is less likely to drive the wage work/business combination among combining entrepreneurs who have longer entrepreneurial tenure.

**H2** – Passion is less likely to drive the wage work/business combination among combining entrepreneurs who are part of an entrepreneurial team.

**H3** – Entrepreneurial team involvement strengthens the negative impact of entrepreneurial tenure on passion as the driver behind the wage work/business combination.
We found that the longer a business had operated and being driven with a team member dictated that passion would decrease. We also tested a moderation effect of both factors (tenure and team member) and also here the result was negative. The odds that combining entrepreneurs who operate their business either alone or with a team member over a long period are driven by passion is very low.
5. DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the theory and the two cases are developed to address the aim of this thesis, which is to (1) identify and analyse factors that explain who combining entrepreneurs are and where they belong in the entrepreneurship process and (2) test and analyse factors that affect the motive for why they start a business and the choices they must make.

5.1. Combining entrepreneurs

In Sweden, almost half of all business owners are combining entrepreneurs and in many European countries they often outnumber pure entrepreneurs (Burmeister-Lamp et al. 2012; Burke et al. 2008). Even if that is the case, research about them is still scant and they are often included in research about nascent entrepreneurs without any further discussion. This can create errors when studies are conducted on entrepreneurship in its entirety, which does not take into account the entrepreneurs’ phases in the process, their intentions, or problems in the support systems. Thus, to answer the first research question, it was necessary to determine who the combining entrepreneurs are; first and foremost, combining entrepreneurs are individuals who have wage work and start a business that is often built on a hobby (paper 1), which is consistent with previous research (Delmar et al. 2008; Petrova 2012; Frith 2007; Dahlin et al. 2004; Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). This work form provides them with the opportunity to test their idea without losing the security the monthly salary brings (Folta et al. 2010; Wennberg et al. 2006; Raffiee and Feng 2013). Therefore, some use the time to build up the business while others just maintain it. The combining entrepreneurs in both this study and Delmar et al. (2008) have on average a higher salary than normal, indicating that the business was not started to add to the household income but rather for other reasons. It also says that most of these combining entrepreneurs are not moonlighters, as moonlighters generally have a much lower income and cannot survive on earnings from just one job.

The research on combining entrepreneurs uses different terms, but the most appropriate term is hybrid entrepreneur. The word hybrid comes from the Greek hy’brida ‘crossing’ and indicates, in this scenario, that entrepreneurs come from different settings and work forms (Nationalencyklopedin 2015). What is important when using this term is that the entrepreneur combines wage work with a parallel side-business; the other terms also encompass other work forms. The research on hybrid entrepreneurs has addressed both part-time and side-activity entrepreneurship and also soci(et)al and lifestyle entrepreneurship, even though these last two often describe full-time entrepreneurs. Despite this, many combining
entrepreneurs can be counted as both soci(et)al and lifestyle entrepreneurs as they often start a business to save the local area so that the villages are not depopulated (Markantoni et al. 2013; Markantoni and van Hoven 2012; Ateljevic and Doorne 2000; Tillmar 2009; Besser and Miller 2013; Korschning and Allen 2004); they also want to develop something in the environment that they enjoy and others may want to try, like wilderness safaris, climbing or skiing (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). According to previous research in regional development, the entrepreneurship in rural areas is declining and the businesses do not have the same opportunities to succeed that they would if they moved and settled in an urban area (Schulz and Baumgartner 2013; Tamasy and Heron 2008; North and Smallbone 2006). In paper 1, however, quite different results are shown. Here, several entrepreneurs mentioned that they did not want to live anywhere else and that with their presence their village can survive. Since they are combining entrepreneurs, they work in different conditions than if they were self-employed full-time. Since they have an income, they do not need to rely on the business to bring in money. This enables them to be more daring, and they can stay in the village/town of their choice. The advantage is that this work form opens up for more businesses, both full-time and in combination, which in turn allows remote areas to remain viable and individuals to continue living the life they want. Based on paper 1, many combining entrepreneurs from the focus group interviews would earn much more if they resided in a metropolitan region, but most of them had no such desire. They wanted to stay where they were and, moreover, they wanted their presence to benefit their region. However, one should remember that in counties like Jämtland, distances are great; for many of the combining entrepreneurs, their choice of place usually means long travel distances to get to wage work, which affects the time resources for the business and/or family.

When it comes to the characteristics of the combining entrepreneurs, previous research has stated that the hybrid and part-time entrepreneur is a man⁷, and the side-activity entrepreneur, lifestyle entrepreneur and moonlighter is a woman. Their age is between 20 and 44 years, they earn well and they have a high education (Delmar et al. 2008; Folta et al. 2010). This study shows broadly similar results, with the exception that entrepreneurs are older when they start their business (the average age is 38 years) and are evenly divided between the sexes. The actual age when they filled out the questionnaire was 47 years, which means that they are older than the average nascent entrepreneur, who is around 40 (Delmar and Davidsson 2000; Campbell and De Nardi 2009; Parker and Belghitar

---

⁷ Delmar et al. (2008) found an even split between the genders, but chose to study only males in their next paper, Folta et al. (2010).
Based on papers 1 and 2, the combining entrepreneurs live in rural areas. A majority is married or cohabiting, and they have an average of two children (paper 1). The income from the wage work is above average, and with the total income (from both the wage work and the side-business) they have a very high annual income (papers 1 and 2), all consistent with Delmar et al. (2008) findings. In their wage work, the combining entrepreneurs are teachers, journalists or managers, and their own business often involves art, crafts or literature. In some cases, they perform the same work in both forms (journalist in wage work and writer in side-business). This is particularly evident among the combining entrepreneurs who were writers but could not survive on the business; they took a job in the same occupation, probably because they felt most comfortable with it, a finding that emerged from the focus group interviews. For the majority, the two work forms were completely different; for example, in paper 1, we saw manager during the day and artist at night, which is consistent with research about moonlighters (Averett 2001; Kimmel and Smith Conway 2002).

### 5.2. Three combining groups

The second research question involved the intentions the combining entrepreneurs had with their business and wage work. For many of the combining entrepreneurs in this study, this combining phase has been long, but the dream is still alive that one day they will be able to live on earnings from their business. Paper 1 revealed three groups of combining entrepreneurs, nascent, lifestyle and occasional; these findings were further developed in paper 2. The nascent combining entrepreneurs represented 60 percent of the respondents and their intention was to leave the combining phase to become self-employed full-time. The average time they had been in this combining phase was eight years and they put an average of 18.5 hours per week into the business (paper 2). Most of them only thought they would combine for another year before making the transition. According to previous studies, the combining phase is short and based on the respondents’ own answers, they consider it short as well. The experience from the focus group interviews was that they did not see the time elapsed but only the time in front. In studies of entrepreneurial processes, particularly those of nascent entrepreneurs, not considering the entrepreneurs’ background can lead to errors. Reynolds (2011) found in the follow-up studies from PSED I that two thirds still counted themselves in the start-up process and by definition were nascent entrepreneurs. This shows that the entrepreneurial process is extremely complex and that individuals who combine should be studied separately and not together with those who go directly into full-time self-employment.
The focus group interviews revealed that some of the combining entrepreneurs had accomplished the transition during the time between the survey and the interviews and also a couple had started to downsize the wage work in favour of the business. Caliendo et al. (2009) suggested that the chances are higher for an individual to become full-time self-employed if less time has been put into the combination, which is also confirmed in paper 5. So, if the intention is to become self-employed full-time, these combining entrepreneurs should leave the combining phase relatively quickly. However, the risk is that the combination has become a habit, a lifestyle that is difficult to break, so even if their intention is to leave, they will stay.

The lifestyle combining entrepreneurs represented 35 percent of the respondents and they have no ambition to leave this phase. They have been in this phase for eleven years and 78 percent believe they will stay for at least five more years. According to the focus group interviews, the lifestyle combining entrepreneurs enjoy the opportunity to work with something they love in combination with having work colleagues and work tasks they also like. Lifestyle entrepreneurs are often portrayed as full-time self-employed and running their business because it is part of their personality (Marcketti et al. 2006; Ateljevic and Doorne 2000; Herslund and Tanvig 2012; Peters et al. 2009). In New Zealand, lifestyle entrepreneurs often are adventurers who take advantage of the caves and rivers and have found a way to merge their passion with getting paid for introducing it to tourists (Ateljevic and Doorne 2000). Within the creative industry and the counties studied for this thesis, the tourist group is relatively large, especially in Jämtland County with its winter activities. An area that has grown in this county is also culinary arts. One member of the focus group took advantage of the county he lived in and developed his passion for hunting and food. He escorts tourists on hunting safaris and in the evenings cooks the meat they capture, creating an adventure and an experience for the participating tourists and at the same time getting to do what he loves the most.

The last group was the occasional combining entrepreneurs. They did not want to continue the side-business and only work in wage work. One might assume them to be like moonlighters, and some would probably fit that description. An interesting finding, however, is that some of these occasional combining entrepreneurs had employees. One explanation for why they wanted to leave the combining phase for wage work could be that entrepreneurship turned out to be hard and their passion waned. In the focus group interviews, one person mentioned that her husband also was combining and that he had employees, but
running the business and finding customers and at the same time being present at
the wage work hit him hard, so the business was for sale.

What distinguishes the first two groups is how long they have been running the
business and the amount of hours they put into the business, where the nascent
combining entrepreneurs have had the business a shorter time and spend fewer
hours on the business. This supports previous research suggesting that the
combining phase is relatively short (Reynolds et al. 2003; Petrova 2012). However,
that those with growth ambitions spend fewer hours in the business is surprising.
In the comparative studies between those who are full-time self-employed and
those who combine, from paper 1, the combining entrepreneurs work an average
of 17 hours more. This time is put into the business, while an equal amount of time
is spent on the primary job. As suggested earlier, many choose to lose time on the
wage work position to put that time into the business, which may explain why
those with growth ambitions spend fewer hours. Also detected in both this study
and in Delmar et al. (2008) is that the combining entrepreneurs are dynamic; they
go back and forth between the different work forms. They might combine for a
while, be full-time self-employed for a while and be exclusively wage workers for a
while. Based on the focus group interviews, several switched the different work
forms periodically, and for them this mix worked very well; ideally, they would be
self-employed full-time, but their economic situation does not allow it. Delmar et
al. (2008) found that of those leaving the combining phase, 68 percent went back to
wage work and 32 percent became full-time self-employed.

One of the overall aims of this thesis was to identify and analyse who the
combining entrepreneurs are and where they belong in the entrepreneurship
process, which was accomplished in papers 1 and 2. Three different phases/groups
have been identified: full-time self-employed (nascent), combining (lifestyle) and
exclusively wage work (occasional). Factors that may influence the process are
time, motive, choice and resources. The next aim, presented below, will test and
analyse factors that affect the intention to start a business and the choices that must
be made.

5.3. The nascent entrepreneurs’ prosperity

For any country, it is important to have business start-ups to stimulate job creation
and develop growth. Within the research on entrepreneurship, much focus has
therefore been on nascent entrepreneurs (Acs and Szerb 2007; Allen 1998; Bosma
2013; Reynolds et al. 2003), especially from the PSED and the GEM studies, and
even if combining entrepreneurs are mentioned in these studies, very little research
has been conducted on them, even if the data exist. What’s been mentioned is that wage work often finances entrepreneurs’ business in the start-up process and that the survival rates increase if the entrepreneur combines in the beginning of the start-up (Folta et al. 2010; Burke et al. 2008; Petrova 2012; Burmeister-Lamp et al. 2012; Raffiee and Feng 2013). However, as shown above and in the papers, not all will transition into full-time self-employment.

In Reynolds et al. (2004) model (Figure 2.1), the nascent entrepreneurial process is assumed to be straightforward. When the business is born, it enters the infancy phase where it is developed to grow persist or closed down. The definition of nascent entrepreneurs suggests that no positive cash flow is available to cover expenses and salaries. This indicates that the entrepreneur could be in the nascent phase even after the business is born and does not transition into the infancy phase until the business has reported profits for 3 to 42 months (Reynolds 2012). This model (Figure 2.1) does not consider combining entrepreneurs with even longer development time than pure entrepreneurs, so the model has been further developed (Figure 5.1). Combining entrepreneurs entering the start-up phase are the same as before; they either have an independent idea (NIE) or get an idea from their wage work (NCE) (Reynolds et al. 2004). Based on the questions from this thesis survey and focus group interviews, the combining entrepreneur has developed a hobby, an independent idea or something about which he or she feels passionate. Based on the survey, 65 percent started a business while in wage work and 35 percent were self-employed full-time when they started working in wage work. The business had been conceptualised and passed the first transition and entering the gestation process. Hereafter, the model is changed from Reynolds et al. (2004). For many combining entrepreneurs, the firm may be born but nothing happens, and the combining entrepreneur will still be in the gestation process even after several years have passed. Several from the focus group interviews were a bit hesitant at first, both to accept the interview and to participate in the discussion. This was because they did not consider themselves to be entrepreneurs/business owners and thought they had nothing to contribute; what they did was only for fun and they did not make any or very little money on the business, plus the business in some cases had a low priority in favour of the wage work and family. Based on the data from the survey, the average time the combining entrepreneurs stay in this phase is nine years and they believe they will combine for up to five more years.
When the combining nascent entrepreneurs have come to a decision regarding what they want to do with the business, they transition into the third phase, firm development, and into maturity. In paper 3, this is called the second-step entrepreneurial choice (the first step is to engage in a business start-up). As mentioned earlier, several years have passed since the business was born and, based on the focus group interviews, it has taken this time to try the business idea, get the business started and grow into the role of being an entrepreneur/business owner. An individual who combines can have multiple roles: employee, self-employed, husband/wife, father/mother, friend and member of various associations. The roles will be as many as are played in society (Stryker and Burke 2000; Mead 1934). Having many roles can therefore have a stressful effect when resources are not sufficient, but create harmony if they are positive. The negative effects often start when one role becomes more prominent, like the side-business, and when the individual overinvests time and energy in the business, leaving the family behind (Baum and Locke 2004; Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Elfving 2009). In the focus group interviews, several of the respondents mentioned that they would not be able to work with the side-business as long as their children were young and needed their attention, but as soon as they grew older, they either picked up the business again or started anew. Thus, age is an important factor to consider when starting a business. Previous research has pointed in different directions, however; Levesque and Minniti (2006) showed that the likelihood of starting a business is greater at an early age and decreases thereafter, while Grilo and Irigoyen (2006) showed that entrepreneurial activity increases with age. From the findings of this study, one potential conclusion is that both research directions

Figure 5.1 Conceptualization of the combining process, a remodel of Reynolds et al. (2004)
are correct. Young individuals are more fearless and sometimes do not have an alternative if they want a job, but the primary reason is that generally they do not yet have a family. Older individuals have gone through the family phase and now have more time to do something they like, but as they are older they also have more to lose in terms of a reliable and steady income each month (Singh and DeNoble 2003; Weber and Schaper 2004; Sullivan et al. 1998). In this study, it was found that a full transition to full-time self-employed increased with age (paper 3). One positive aspect of being full-time self-employed is the independence and autonomy of being one’s own boss. Karaoylas (2010) found that these motives increased with age. Also, their age means that they have likely been able to acquire social capital and develop networks which can support the role identity of being an entrepreneur (Kim et al. 2013; Higgins and Kram 2001). Paper 3 also revealed that networks had positive effects in facilitating a full transition and that these effects were even stronger as the entrepreneurs’ age increased.

Thus, to answer the third research question regarding the decision to leave the parallel wage work, both age and social capital are important factors.

5.4 Passion and choices

The last research question was what motives drove the individuals’ choice to maintain wage work in parallel with a side-business. In papers 4 and 5, respondents said the underlying motive for starting a business and becoming a combining entrepreneur was passion. Out of sixteen motives from which to choose regarding why they started and became a combining entrepreneur, 34 percent chose ‘to do something I feel passionate about doing’; in second place with only 16 percent came ‘to earn money’. To balance the different work forms, the business must be managed so the wage work and family and leisure time are not compromised. When it is, and more time is put into the business instead, the risk is very high that passion will subside, as reflected in paper 4, and that conflicts will occur within the family (Rice et al. 1992; Greenhaus and Parasuraman 1999; Arenius and Minniti 2005; Binder and Coad 2013; Carland et al. 1984; Vallerand et al. 2003). Passion might also subside the longer the business is operated (paper 5). Of note, in both papers 3 and 4, it was found that older individuals become combining entrepreneurs and that the older they are, the greater their passion for the business.

In paper 5, one finding is that the longer the business is operated the more likely passion will decrease. The reasons that passion subsides may be many, but a likely explanation is that the time to put into the business is not sufficient, that the
interest in the hobby changes or simply because the pleasure of doing it decreases (Scitovsky 1992; Nisticò 2014; Gossen and Blitz 1983). Most of the combining entrepreneurs in this study aim to work with the business full-time, but when the economic factors are decisive, the business must become self-sufficient. Since the combining entrepreneurs have wage work that requires their full dedication, their strength after a couple of years will subside along with their drive to push forward. This leads to passion eventually decreasing (Carsrud and Brännback 2011; Hobfoll 2011; Philippe et al. 2010; Vallerand et al. 2003). Sharing a business together with a team member should better equip both team members since both invest capital, time and engagement (Halonen 2002; Luo 2007). It is, however, important that the choice of team member be made carefully to ensure that both have the same aspiration for the business and both invest the same amount of time. If not, passion may decrease and the team members may seek different outcomes for the business. If this occurs, the team members will end up with a choice – to keep pushing or abandon the business (Schwartz 2004, 2009; Mohr and Spekman 1994). Sometimes it can be hard to give up an idea, and when this occurs, confidence and motivation can decline (Mohr and Spekman 1994). The clear-cut proofs regarding “why” are unknown at this point and it is therefore important to follow this up. Something that used to be of interest has now subsided and running a business with a team member should be more conducive to success (Halonen 2002; Luo 2007). If the combining entrepreneurs are to maintain passion for their side-business, they must be in balance, feel passionate about both the business and the wage work and have time for family (Hobfoll 1989; Vallerand et al. 2003). This may require them to rethink the role hierarchy and prioritise which role should have the most influence. Many argue that passion is not needed to run a business, which of course is true; some entrepreneurs start a business just to make money, but given the industry studied passion plays a major role.

The present study provides several new insights and contributes to the main dialogue in the literature about entrepreneurs because the combining entrepreneurs who combine wage work with a side-business are a relatively new group to study. The study also contributes to the literature on passion and choice. The results help explain Delmar et al. (2008) finding that more than two thirds of the combining entrepreneurs (68.12%) return to their wage work from the combining phase. When the choices become too daunting and the combining entrepreneurs come to a stage involving a tyranny of choice (Scheibehenne et al. 2009), frictions may be created, especially the longer the business is operated. When this happens, many combining entrepreneurs decide to fall back to their wage work and leave the combining phase entirely. Passion thus has high explanatory power for understanding combining entrepreneurs, but to fully
understand the intentions and motives of combining entrepreneurs, more research is needed. If these factors are unknown, neither researchers nor government organisations can offer help or advice to combining entrepreneurs as they pursue their dream and seek to make their business successful. This study also contributes to entrepreneurship theory because even full-time entrepreneurs are affected by all the choices they must make, either alone or together with a team member, and their passion may also decrease when the choices become overwhelming.
6. Conclusions and contributions

In this last chapter, the overall results from the research questions are described. This is followed up by the implications, limitations and suggestions for future research.

6.1. General conclusions

The main research goal for this thesis was to identify, test and analyse who combining entrepreneurs are, where they belong in the entrepreneurial process, what factors affect their motive and what choices they must make.

Working as a combining entrepreneur is quite common today, perhaps because it is easier today to start a business than ever before and doing so is not seen as strange. This thesis has identified three types of combining entrepreneurs, those who want to become self-employed full-time (nascent combining entrepreneurs), those who want to remain in the combining phase (lifestyle combining entrepreneurs) and those who feel that the combining phase is not for them (occasional combining entrepreneurs). The three groups have different intentions but in terms of characteristic dimensions, they are quite similar. On the basis of statistical analyses, what separates the nascent from the lifestyle group is the time the entrepreneurs remain in the combining phase; the shorter the time, the more likely to transition into full-time self-employment. Previous research has pointed out that the combining phase is temporary and short, but this study shows that the time the combining entrepreneurs are in this phase can be prolonged, even if the intention is to become full-time self-employed. If new research is to be conducted using time series, the data should stretch for a much longer period, preferably fifteen years or longer; otherwise, the researcher risks not finding the correct transfers and correct information about the combining entrepreneurs’ movements. By studying a longer time span, even individuals who go on parental leave can be traced; they usually disappear from the statistics when they are at home with their child/children.

A major reason why individuals become combining entrepreneurs and start businesses is that they feel passion for what they do. If they do not feel passion, they have no reason to continue, which is evident in papers 4 and 5. Previous research on entrepreneurs has shown that one of the main reasons people start a business is to make money, something this study cannot confirm. In this study, the passion motive received twice as many responses as earning money. Most of these combining entrepreneurs already have a good income from their wage work, so
they are not in the same need for that extra income as perhaps the full-time self-employed, although many appreciated the extra money they received.

As pointed out earlier, much of the focus in the entrepreneurship literature is on starting a business and succeeding in that business. Even if two thirds of the combining entrepreneurs in this study want to become self-employed full-time, not many are likely to make the transition. The focus group interviews established that the combining entrepreneurs are dynamic, so even if they were to leave the combining phase, they might return to it after a year or two. The reason this is so is still to be researched; the need is to determine what can be done to help combining entrepreneurs invest more in their business. Since combining entrepreneurs in the creative industry were studied here, the respondents included artists and musicians, and most of them usually find it difficult to live on earnings from their craft. The focus group interviews also established that most of them had wage work so as to associate with work colleagues with whom to engage in conversation but also that they enjoyed the work tasks. However, the majority wanted the business to become the main source of income and to become full-time self-employed. Because their business is very small and generates little or no income, they are by definition nascent entrepreneurs. The disadvantage that many of the combining entrepreneurs mentioned was lack of time to achieve what they wanted in the business. In paper 4, the time issue was tested and the result indicated that the more time the combining entrepreneurs put into the business the more likely their passion would decrease and conflicts would arise within the family, so the claim regarding lack of time might therefore be contradicted. The combining entrepreneurs work on average 17 hours longer than both a normal wage worker and a self-employed, so to work more with the business they must devote less time to the wage work to establish a balance between family life and work. Therefore, they must make choices that might not benefit them. Another factor that has an effect on both passion and the development of the business is age. The older the combining entrepreneurs are when they start a business, the more likely it is that they are driven by passion. Individuals want to become combining entrepreneurs because they reached a point in life when they want to test an idea they have had for a long time or develop a hobby. When their children get older and no longer need the same attention, the individuals can spend the time on what they like.

The combining entrepreneurs in this study are largely lifestyle and soci(et)al entrepreneurs in that they do not want to move and they want their village/town to survive. They have started a business that is built on a hobby, which says a lot about who they are as persons. Even if they develop their business, as the majority wants, it is likely that many of them will still belong to the lifestyle and soci(et)al
entrepreneurship category. Of the entrepreneurs interviewed who already had left the combining phase, many were soci(et)al entrepreneurs. They were loyal to their local village and tried to make sure that their business could hire so that young adults could stay and the village would not die out. They are also best categorised as hybrid entrepreneurs since most of them intend to leave the combining phase in favour of the business.

6.2. Implications for theory and practice

This thesis has several implications for entrepreneurship research. Within the research on entrepreneurs, combining entrepreneurs have been mentioned, but not so deeply that they are understood. Therefore, more research is needed in this area, especially when the combining entrepreneurs are potentially those who will stand for regional development. Since up to half of all businesses in a country like Sweden isoperated by a combining entrepreneur, these entrepreneurs are important contributors to the economy and deserve to be studied more deeply. Instead of having a subordinate role in the research and being included in studies of nascent entrepreneurs, they should be lifted up as a separate category, with questions of motives, intentions, choice and identity linked to the choice of starting a business and then the choice of leaving wage work. Which variables stimulate or control the intention? What is the transition phase? What are the results of the choices made? These questions deserve more investigation. The findings about combining entrepreneurs’ passion towards full-time self-employment also have important implications for policy interventions and for facilitating the operation of a business alongside regular wage work. In its most abstract form, this study suggests that if the forms of work are in harmony and in balance each will stimulate the other, resulting in a win–win for all parties.

Government officials, policy makers and others interesting in stimulating entrepreneurial growth must understand combining entrepreneurs. If the goal is to get more people to start businesses, these parties must take into account that some might not dare to, want to or be able to start a business full-time. Unfortunately, most government officials/policy makers do not realise that combining entrepreneurs exist and, because of this, nothing is done to encourage or assist them in their development. As the findings from this thesis show, if nascent combining entrepreneurs do not receive the support and push they need to make the transition, their passion will be lost and so also the intention to become full-time self-employed. It is also important for government officials/policy makers to know that many of these combining entrepreneurs are older because, for them to even think of starting a business, their children must be older.
6.3. Limitations

The data sample in this thesis consists of both combining entrepreneurs and full-time self-employed (the latter only appears in paper 1) within the creative industry in two counties in Sweden, which is a limitation that must be considered. The findings may not be generalizable to all combining entrepreneurs in all sectors and all counties. That being said, the general demographic variables are consistent with Delmar et al. (2008), who studied the knowledge-intensive sectors in all counties of Sweden, and suggest some hope for general claims. Another limitation is the dependent variable of passion; respondents only had to tick one motivator out of sixteen possible choices for why they became combining entrepreneurs, and passion was one of these motivators. A ranking scale would have been preferable for these factors to obtain a more comprehensive view of motives and their relative importance. Also, additional questions from the dualistic model could have been used, but these questions are generated more for testing hobbies, such as sports, than business engagements. With that said, the majority responded that passion was the most important driving motive, and in both studies respondents all had the same conditions. Therefore, the dependent variable is considered credible. Also, the variable of team member could have had a follow-up question attached to it since it is unknown whether the team member is a spouse or a third person and how and in what way they run the business together. However, this is something future research can address.

6.4. Future research

As for other future research on combining entrepreneurs, more studies on the driving forces behind investing fully in the business, collaborations, team members and networking are needed. Within the research on entrepreneurship much is studied, even individuals who moonlight or are part-timers. However, not much has been researched about combining entrepreneurs who combine wage work with a side-business, and already have a stable income and do not need to combine to improve their financial situation. These types of entrepreneurs already constitute a large group and therefore more research is needed on their motivations and intentions. Based on this research, several new questions can be raised. What does the combining phase look like in other industries and are there any differences? What can be done to get combining nascent entrepreneurs to become self-employed full-time? What can be done to prevent the loss of passion when the business is shared with a team member? How did the combining entrepreneurs choose their team member? What choice-strategies do they have? What kind of
choices and how many choices are the combining entrepreneurs able to handle before the choices have a negative effect? Do the combining entrepreneurs influence the workplace, and if so in what way? Longitudinal statistical approaches in different contextual settings combined with in-depth case studies can address these types of issues.
Sammanfattning på svenska (Swedish Summary)

Tidigare inom entreprenörskaps- och organisationsforskningen var arbetsformen uppdelad mellan att vara anställd eller egenföretagare. Idag är det mycket mer uppdelat, där individer kan välja mellan att vara anställd, kombinera flera anställningar, kombinera en anställning med eget företag, vara egenföretagare, kombinera flera egna företag eller arbeta deltid som antingen anställd eller som egenföretagare. För denna avhandling har arbetsformen koncentrerat sig på de som kombinerar en anställning med eget företag s.k. kombinatörer. Att kombinera är vanligt idag och i Sverige är nästan hälften av alla företagare kombinatörer. Att företag startas är viktigt för ett lands ekonomiska utveckling och i Sverige drivs 96,4 procent av microföretagare, dvs. med upp till tio anställda (73,9 procent är soloföretagare) (Ekonomifakta 2014).

Inom den lilla forskning som finns om kombinatörer, förekommer ändock flera olika benämningar vad gäller arbetsformer och det kan vara svårt att urskilja vilka som kombinerar anställning med eget företagande, då flera av de benämningar som finns blandar dessa former. Ett begrepp som börjar bli mer och mer vanligt inom internationell forskning är ”hybrid entreprenuer” och myntades av Folta et al. (2010). Samma år kom ordet kombinatör, då det accepterades som ord av Svenska Språkrådet. De beskriver kombinatören som den nya trenden i arbetslivet där de menar att en kombinatör ”kombinerar ett fast jobb och tryggar inkomsten med självförverkligande, kreativitet och förhoppningsvis lukrativa affärsidéer. Det bästa av två världar” (Språkrådet 2010). Genom att så många idag kombinerar, måste stödsystemen för företagarna uppdateras så att de som vill gå mot eget företagande på heltid får den hjälps och stöd de behöver för att kunna genomföra förändringen av arbetsform. Men inte alla har en ambition att gå mot eget företagande utan de anser att kombinerandet är mer en livsstil. Även dessa kan behöva stöd och hjälp med företaget. För även om de inte har en ambition att bli egna kan de vara med och utveckla samhället och den ekonomiska tillväxten.

Forskningen inom entreprenörskap har till stor utsträckning studerat företag i uppstartsfasen (nascent entrepreneurs), mycket på grund av de GEM och PSED studier som gjorts (Campbell and De Nardi 2009; Reynolds et al. 2004; Reynolds and Curtin 2009; Acs and Szerb 2007; Amorós and Bosma 2014). Vad dessa studier belyser är att det tar cirka tre till fyra år för en individ att bestämma sig för att starta företag (Campbell and De Nardi 2009), där det kan vara en egenutvecklad idé eller så kan idén uppstå av att ett behov upptäckts i anställningen (Reynolds et al. 2004). Därefter går företaget över i uppstartsfasen och när företaget gör en vinst som kan generera en lön till företagaren under 3-42 månader då övergår företaget
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till mognadsfasen (Reynolds 2012). I denna fas avgörs om företagaren ska utveckla företaget, fortsätta som tidigare eller lägga ner det (Reynolds et al. 2004).


Huvudsyftet för denna avhandling är att 1) identifiera och analysera faktorer om vilka kombinatörerna är och vart de befinner sig i den entreprenöriella processen, samt 2) testa och analysera faktorer som påverkar motivet till varför de startar företag och de val som måste göras. För att kunna besvara dessa syften har följande forskningsfrågor formulerats:

1 – Vilka är kombinatörerna?
2 – Vilka är intentionerna med att kombinera?
3 – Vilka faktorer påverkar beslutet att lämna kombinatörsfasen?
4 – Vilka är motiven bakom individens val att vara kombinatör?

Vad som framkommit i papperna (framför allt papper 1 och 2) är att det finns tre typer av kombinatörer, de som vill bli egna på heltid (60 procent av alla som svarade vill lämna kombinatörskapet), de som vill stanna kvar som kombinatörer (35 procent) och de som känner att kombinatörskapet inte var något för dem (5 procent). De tre grupperna har därför olika intentioner, däremot sett till karakteristiska mått är de väldigt lika. Det är i stort sett omöjlig att utifrån beskrivande statistik kunna avgöra vilken typ av kombinatör en individ är. Från den ANOVA analys som gjorts i papper 2 framkom att det som särskiljer de som vill gå mot eget och de som vill stanna kvar är den tid de varit kombinatörer. Ju kortare tid som kombinatör, ju troligare är det att de blir egenföretagare på heltid. Tidigare forskning har visat att kombinatörskapet är en temporär och kortvarig arbetsform, vilket denna studie motsäger. Kombinatörskapet är snarare långvarig, även för de som har ambitionen att bli egenföretagare på heltid. Det har också framkommit att kombinatörer är mycket dynamiska då individerna pendlar mellan de olika arbetsformerna, vilket överensstämmer med Delmar et al. (2008) studie.
En stor anledning till varför individer är kombinatörer och startar företag är för att de känner passion för det de gör. Finns inte passionen, då finns heller ingen anledning att fortsätta, vilket även framkommer i två av papper (papper 4 och 5). Det har i tidigare forskning om entreprenörer lyfts upp att individer startar företag för att tjäna pengar (Jayawarna et al. 2011; Roche et al. 1996), något som inte framkom i denna studie. I den enkätstudie som genomförts finns det 16 motivationsalternativ, varav en var att tjäna pengar och en annan passion. Vad gäller dessa visar resultaten att passionsmotivet är dubbelt så motiverande för respondenterna än att tjäna pengar (34 procent valde passion och 16 procent att tjäna pengar). Dessa kombinatörer har dessutom redan bra inkomst från sin anställning, och är därför inte i samma behov att den extra inkomsten, även om många uppskattade den. Det sistnämnda kan förklara varför passionsmotivet ansågs viktigare.


ibland svåra beslut angående företaget, som kanske inte ligger i linje med vad som önskas.

För att kombinatorerna ska kunna vara en del av arbetsmarknaden måste näringslivskontor och andra beslutsfattare vara medvetna om att den här arbetsformen, kombinatorer, finns och skapa system så de kan få den hjälp de behöver. Är målet att öka företagandet i regionen/kommunen måste åtgärder göras snabbt för att få de kombinatorer som vill bli egenföretagare att ta steget. Annars finns risk att passionen minskar och med det företagandet dvs. risken att företaget avslutas. Kombinatorerna i denna studie är i stor utsträckning livsstils- och samhällsentreprenörer, i den aspekten att de vill bo kvar där de bor och att de vill att deras ort ska överleva. Av de företagare som intervjuades och som tagit steget och lämnat kombinatoriskapet var flera av dem samhällsentreprenörer. De värnade om sin ort och försökte se till så att deras företag kunde anställa ortens ungdomar så att de stannade kvar och att orten inte utarmades.
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