



## **Are we born entrepreneur or do we become entrepreneur ?**

### **Is there a profile of entrepreneur?**

#### **Introduction**

The entrepreneur is the one who creates a product or a service for his account. Composed of “*entre* and *prendre*. The meaning is "begin, implement" from the latin " *imprehendere* "start (something), to implement and get to run. "

We will voluntarily take as a premise that entrepreneur stands for independent worker or self-employed, and we focus on the part of entrepreneurs who are considered micro or home (the latter term is to be taken in the literal sense of the term and not as the name of the legal status of which we will further explore the ins and outs)

Several schools of thought exist on how the entrepreneur behaves in its project. Different research on the subject have been done. (Knight, Kanbur and more recently Verstraete, Faye or Bruyat).

What should be taken out from these studies and what are the main factors of decision emerging from this research?

What external factors will influence the entrepreneur in its choices and what are the keys to success or longevity in the status of the self-employed?

#### **Literature Review**

When we discuss the theme of the desire to create his own business, several elements come into play in the process of the entrepreneur from modeling until the creation of the project.

From an economic point of view, the passage of an employee to a status of self-employed status necessarily means taking a risk, and this factor is considered a priori assumption by many researchers (Knight, 1921).

The propensity for risk-taking may vary depending on the culture of the country of origin of the entrepreneur (Kanbur 1979), or depending on its degree of impatience or patience towards the expected gain (Kanbur 1979). This school of modern thought, also resumed as the work of Khilstrom and Laffont (1981), poses as a postulate that the entrepreneur is a person who has an aversion to the risk greater than other individuals and that any business opportunity is within the reach of anyone: it is only a personal choice of whether to exploit this opportunity or not.

On the contrary, the school of classical thought, Schumpeter (1939), Knight (1921), most individuals are not sufficiently experts to detect business opportunities, there is no objective assessment of the entrepreneur risk. Innovative entrepreneurs can expect that their income from their activity exceed the income they would get as salaried men, and the attitude to risk is not considered to be a central point in the decision to become independent.

Verstraete and Fayolle (2005) address the assumption of 4 paradigms, opportunity, innovation, value creation and creation of an organization in the process of entrepreneurship. However need to clarify Verstraete research mainly focused on the entrepreneurs who have the desire to create an organization, to set-up partnerships and to start their activity with a structure, a starting capital and human basis far wider than what it would be for a simple self-employed individual.

Is there a breed of entrepreneurs or are we all would-be entrepreneurs? Is entrepreneurship something innate? Bruyat (2001), in his model CSIP, or instant strategic Configuration perceived by the creator, explains that this CSIP is part of an area of convergence between Aspirations, skills and resources collected, as well as opportunities in the perceived environment.

The concept of opportunity is a key element in the decision to create, as the concept of Time-space (Bruyat, 2001)

When there is decision making, doubt is an essential element to be taken into account, a form of uncertainty that one will find at all stages of life of the company as a constant and with which will have to live the entrepreneur (Valeau, 2006)

"It is necessary to hope to create," said Yvon Gattaz, former boss of the CNPF.

Would hope and doubt be they intimately linked to the entrepreneur? entrepreneurship attracts mainly individuals with a strong confidence in them (Hundley 2001).

What are the key decision factors pushing the individual towards entrepreneurship? According to Taylor (1996), several factors come into play, the most important being the independence in his work, followed paradoxically by the security position and the fact that some members of the family also have experience as a self-employed. It is indeed surprising to discover that the self-employed person feels safer than his alter ego employee, with less fear of losing his job and ending up unemployed, because his job depends only on him (Hundley 2001, Taylor 1996)

Having relatives entrepreneurs is also in the process of decision. In fact, it might be simply an example of a self-employed person within his immediate family (Taylor, 1996) being considered as an asset in providing social, human or capital help (Mac Kernan and Salzman 2008) or being of significant contribution in terms of professional network (Aldrich and Carter 2004, Coleman 1988), close environment plays an important role for the future success of the entrepreneur. Being married seems to be also a significant advantage in the worker choice to become independent (Taylor 1996)

The degree of satisfaction of the self-employed is not related to the hope of gain but rather to the degree of independence and autonomy in their work compared to an employee (Hundley 2001). The hope of short-term gain is not a factor in decisions, patience and hope of gain in the long term is accepted in this status of creator.

Are the chances of success of the entrepreneur the same according to their originating status?

Here again, we have to qualify the results of the various studies and research.

If there are more entrepreneurs former job-seekers as former employees who give-up this status after a few years (Pfeiffer and Reize 2000), it appears that job seekers who quickly decided to become self-employed have more chance of success than long-term job-seekers (Andersson 2006).

The market however leaves little chance for former job-seekers, often considered to be less serious than the "pure creators" (coming from the employed environment) especially because they are supposed to be entrepreneurs out of necessity and not by choice. (Caliendo 2007)

It appears also that the entrepreneurs abandoning their status return most of the time to their former status: unemployed-unemployed, inactive-inactive > > employee-> employee, without real social evolution (Andersson 2006)

The main paradigm of the entrepreneur is the loss of income in the first months or the first years of activity, hence the importance of a capital of departure or outside help (Mc Kernan and Salzman 2008). The desertion of the status is often linked to disappointment or disillusion regarding the revenues derived from independent activity, due to an excess of optimism. (Arabsheibani and De Meza, 2000).

Assistance to the start-up activity is most often the key to success in entrepreneurial activity, increasing the chances of survival in the critical period of development of the company during the first months or years (Caliendo and Kritikos 2007). This assistance may take the form of a start-up capital or a regular allowance during the first months of activity.

In summary, if you detail the personality of the entrepreneur, it is someone married, stable and experienced, confident, averse to risk-taking, coming from the world of labor and receiving social assistance (family or office network) as well as financial support (personal or via government aid)

## **How would we define an Entrepreneur ?**

We assume that the entrepreneur is taken as « intuitu personae », and not as a legal or fiscal entity.

We consider as entrepreneur any individual who creates its own income, therefore we shall exclude all employed workers.

We will also exclude « intrapreneurs » from our research. We qualify as intrapreneur any person who set-up and/or develop a business for a company, as we consider them as project managers. Regarding the individuals responsible of a subsidiary or branch set-up, the development managers, the expatriates alone in a country to grow a new factory or develop a new market, they do not meet the entrepreneur qualities as defined for our research.

Indeed, the risk factor is one of the key factors influencing the entrepreneur decision. This element is reduced or singled out, since they are employed and whatever the risk they take, they still have the solution to integrate back the headquarters of their company. This status usually leads to a lack of fear for failure, since it is no more linked to the risk and to the decisions taken.

This financial net through their monthly salary brings a peace of mind throughout the development of the project, as even if the mission fails, it is not necessary linked to the end of their employment contract. In a big company, the collapse of a project is not considered a failure for the person in charge. The individual might keep its responsibilities inside the company, might be moved to another department and might even be rewarded and promoted for its job.

We exclude also from this research the independent professionals.

The case of independent professionals such as lawyers, expert accountants, doctors...is here another specificity. Most of these professions are legally framed, some do have a *numerus clausus*, they bear rules and regulations attached only to their activity and they can only grow their business through partnership with another professional. We cannot consider them as entrepreneurs.

We defined the exclusions, now let us explain what we include when we define an entrepreneur.

As long as it is a full time occupation, we might consider the “auto-entrepreneur” status (see the paragraph on “the case of France”) as entrepreneur.

Shopkeepers and Merchants are considered Entrepreneurs. Any person whose business is based on buying and selling, without production activity, such as reseller, wholesaler in any business, is included as an Entrepreneur.

In some countries such as France, some economic institutes like Insee classify anybody running a business with less than 10 employees as a merchant, and only above 10 employees classify them as business men.

When we are talking about craftsmen, this occupation is also an Entrepreneur one. Everywhere in the world, we can meet successful plumbers, electricians, air-cond specialists who have build empires out of nothing.

A Farmer is also an entrepreneur, a « green entrepreneur ». Nowhere else we can find an activity so exposed to risk : weather risk, health hazard, economic hazard (market price fluctuation, demand and offer variation), politic instability (sectorial help and grants can change from one year to another)...the list is not exhaustive. If there is a job where the meaning of “taking risks” is understood, it is really in the farmer’s world.

Serial entrepreneur, Auto-entrepreneur, individual Entrepreneur ... what do we mean by « Entrepreneur » ? Does any individual have the entrepreneur profile, or does he become one?

We also have to assume that the term entrepreneur might have a different meaning, and imply different things in different cultures and countries.

## **The entrepreneur : a singular psychologic profile ?**

Different schools of thought exist and dissent among researchers, especially between Schumpeter whose main thinking states that the Entrepreneur is someone willing to take risk and looking for risk on his path to development and growth, and Kanbur, who assumes that the Entrepreneur prefers safety to risk and act accordingly in his decision process.

Does the entrepreneur bear unique psychologic characteristics, that lead him to take the decision to set-up his own activity or his own business should all auspicious elements be present at the time of that decision, like Fayolle suppose?

Is there a race, an entrepreneur ethnic group, a special breed of business men or are we all could-be entrepreneurs? Is the fact of starting a business something natural or temperamental ? Are we born entrepreneurs?

We need to determine whether we were born with this faculties, whether this ability is inhibited or sublimated during our first years in this world, or whether they are developed through events, outside agents influencing the person during his life and bringing him to decide to become an entrepreneur.

How to explain that some families do have generations of entrepreneurs when some other carry generations of civil servants? And how to explain that the offspring of an entrepreneur will become civil servant or that the kids of a civil servant can become successful business men ?

Furthermore, we can wonder : what are the agents or elements that trigger the decision to start a business ? Do we have a couple of common elements between all these individual, or everything is totally subjective from one individual to another ? What is the reason that pushes one person to become an entrepreneur, while the other person decides to wait and not to act?

Can an entrepreneur pass on his offspring his will to take risks, to develop a business, to be an entrepreneur ?

Let's take the example of a couple with 4 kids. The father is a successful entrepreneur, owner of a middle size company. If we lay the assumption that we become entrepreneur through the influence of our close family circle. We assume that the education provided to all kids is similar. In that case, we should deduct that we will have 4 potential entrepreneur when the children reach the adult age.

Is that always the case ? Just consider this family, how the influence of the father can be felt, in a negative or in a positive way ? Depending economic ups and downs, the unique company or successive companies of the head of the family can face success, mild success or failure. This brings necessary different reactions in the family cell, and might influence the future decision of the heirs to create or not.

Out of 4 kids, one can be scared by the importance of responsibilities born by the father and therefore decide to refuse to become entrepreneur, the second one might want to do exactly the opposite of his parents, the third one might desire to prove his parents he can do better than them and set-up his own business and the fourth one might want to take over the family business.

The way the many events in the life of a company are seen, explained, interpreted, understood through the filter of children comprehension may influence their opinion and their future behavior. Should we accept the paradigm that we become entrepreneur through education and close environment, this is a fact that needs to be researched.

This is also the way the father is going to react to these events, the way he's going to describe them (if he takes the time to explain to its close family), the way he's going to tackle the problems, the way he reacts and manages his business that is going to influence the future way of behaving from his offspring.

Understanding this basic assumption, why in a family of employed individuals (workers, white or blue collars) are we going to see one of their children becoming entrepreneur ? In such a family, Education and close environment are not really favorable to the development of entrepreneurial values. How to explain then that some of these individual with non-entrepreneur parents can become successful entrepreneurs themselves?

In dynasties, where the family business or the family company is handed over from generation to generation, is the « entrepreneurial Gene » transmitted genetically or is it acquired through education, social and family breeding, as the kids are breast-fed with the entrepreneur culture from the day they were born ?

Now, we assume that we do have either an entrepreneurial temper or a non-entrepreneurial temper. Let's take 2 persons, one that we name E (entrepreneurial temper), the other one that we name  $\bar{E}$  (non-entrepreneurial temper). Whatever events and fact that could influence E and  $\bar{E}$ , E shall tend towards a company set-up when  $\bar{E}$  shall become part of the employed workforce. It can happen by pure accident (replacement of a deceased parent for instance) that  $\bar{E}$  finds himself in the position of being an entrepreneur. It is interesting to study the evolution of the company run by  $\bar{E}$  : will the supposed non-entrepreneur do everything to come back to an occupation and a situation closer to his personality, that is to try to sell off or hand over the company he inherited, in order to become back an employee in a company? Or is he going to accept to run the company, minimizing the risks in every decision he makes, liking the entrepreneurial profile described by Kanbur?

When we consider E, if no business opportunity lets him set-up a business within good conditions, can he stands long in an occupation such as employee in a corporation, will he find a third way such as becoming independant, will he be able to succeed in his job or will he put aside his entrepreneurial temper at work only to accomplish something in an entrepreneurial way on extra-professional activities (charity, sport, association...)?

What can influence E? His or her culture, economic environment, geographic dynamism?

Could it be possible that a specific culture from a country or a region influences the number of entrepreneurs in that area?

If we go further, each language carries a singular syntax and a unique way of thinking. For instance, the german language structure of language produced more philosophers than the english language. Indeed, if we compare the Shakespeare's language to the Goethe's language, the way to elaborate a sentence is more straight forward in english, which implies for the english tongue native a way of thinking and reasoning totally different than the german tongue native. It would then sound logical to assert that the native language of every individual can influence his will to become entrepreneur or employee.

How to explain that the entrepreneurial spirit differs so much depending on cultures, countries ?

If we take a look at the entrepreneurial spirit between France and United Kingdom : what are the key factors that influence a business set-up, are they common to both countries ? How to explain the difference in companies set-up between both countries? How to explain the difference in the percentage of success in each country ?

If we place ourselves from another point of view, the religion point of view : France for instance, has a latin culture and also a catholic culture. Therefore it does not carry a strong entrepreneurial culture, and this country is not considering success and wealth as a goal, since money is judged as something dirty or not pure, as opposed to people from Scandinavian countries, who as protestant and lutherian, do not have the same approach with money.

**Prospect Theory from Khaneman and risk theory from Bernouilli**

## The Idea of Success, approach to risk and prospect theory

We talked about risk taking, which is linked to entrepreneurship in different ways, according to Schumpeter and Kanbur. When an entrepreneur decides to take a risk, it is not for the sake of getting some thrills out of it. There is a goal, every entrepreneur is aiming for achievement and success.

But how to define success for an entrepreneur ?

Considering the salarymen world, the success translates in a higher hierarchical position in the company chart, and is evaluated in term of decision power, responsibilities... On the money side, success means a higher salary but also different perks such as company car, mobile phone, stock-options, retirement scheme...

Regarding the independant professional, success is seen in the income drawn by the activity but also by the involvement in the civil society (charity, politics...). This professional could or could not make a lot of money, but he can be recognized as an expert in his field, for which is also considered as a successful individual.

How to evaluate the success for an entrepreneur ? It is really more complicated and also more subjective. Indeed, the entrepreneur might feel he succeeds in his activity but it might not be the case for its peers !

So on which fact can we judge whether the entrepreneur is successful or not?

We cannot judge on the sole financial factor, as it is kind of subjective, even between two persons from the same country, the same city and even the same family. From which level are we deemed successful ? 3000 euros a month, 5000 euros a month, 10 000 euros a month? What is the minimum asset supposed to be achieved ? 1 million ? If we take the work of Dr Yunus, who eased the set-up of business for poor people, through micro-finance, any individual who manages to get more money from his own business than from his previous professional life can be considered successful, even if the entrepreneur draws only 1 euro a day from his business. From the micro-finance point of view, a woman who manages to pay the fees for the school of her children, through her business, is considered a successful micro-entrepreneur.

Is it the size of the company, the number of employees in the structure that are going to be taken in account ?

Can the social status in the city -a kind of public reconnaissance among his peers- be an element of success ? How to evaluate this factor of success if it is one? In some cultures and countries (like France), some sayings teach people to hide their success in order to live peacefully, when some other countries might praise the success and expect the successful person to involve in the city (like in USA).

The Start-up paradox is a concrete example of this interrogation. At which point of the development of this Start-up can we say the entrepreneur is successful or succeeded in his business?

- When he gets the first investors inside his company, even if he has not made a single buck out of his business?
- When he hires his team, then what is the number of employees that is considered successful?

- When we count the number of patents registered? then what is the minimum number to be deemed successful ?
- When he manages to launch on the market his service or his product ?
- When he is named for « entrepreneur of the year... » ?
- When he manages to sell his company, even if there has not been a single benefit ?
- Or when the start-up begins to draw a benefit ?

Some others factors can be taken in account to acknowledge the success of our entrepreneur, such as financial independence for the company, financial sufficiency for the entrepreneur...If the entrepreneur refuses to develop his company –no more hiring, no more investing- once he reaches his defined target and just keeps the business at a level allowing him to sustain a living and to be economically independent, then we cannot say it is not a success. (Walker et Brown)

Still, one important factor of success is the financial gain.

The prospect of a future financial gain is still an important element in the decision to set-up a business for the Entrepreneur, even if it is not the only factor influencing the decision to create. It is necessary to research more precisely the motivation of the Entrepreneur to be.

On top of that, the financial gain is totally subjective, as it depends on the existing assets of the individual, its financial needs that are also linked to its family situation, the country or the region he's living in and also from its personal ambition...There might have some other external factors that we will not detail in this research.

## **The case of France**

In France, since August 4, 2008, there is a status that allows a very easy and safe way to set-up a business: The Auto-entrepreneur status.

The avowed aim of the Government is to develop an entrepreneurial culture, in France to revive a moribund economic state of SME hampered by an administration too heavy and sclerotic. (Ashta and Raimbault, 2009)

The French Status of “auto-entrepreneur” which was first created to ease the burden of company set-up and to boost the entrepreneur spirit of French people, allows in fact lots of people to multiply their source of income through multiple activities, as only 31% of auto-entrepreneurs are full time in the business. (observatory of the Auto-entrepreneur, February 2010). Indeed, most of the auto-entrepreneurs are retired individuals, civil servants, students or non-active people looking for a side income. As no investment is needed through this Auto-entrepreneur status, since you pay a tax based on your turnover, it is an easy solution for someone who's willing to work and have its business activity officially declared and recognized.

Today, only 1 auto-entrepreneur out of 2 declares getting an income from its business, income which is on average 775 euros a month before social taxes. (Observatory of auto-entrepreneur, Feb 2010).

From a macro-economic point of view, if law makers launched this particular status, it was mainly to give the opportunity to various professional categories with low income to get a side income legally, as



one of the goal was to reduce undeclared work and to increase social taxes perception. Before this, a retired person or a civil servant was barred from making money with any extra professional activity.

Risk also depends on the national culture as well as demonstrated by Kanbur (1979) and it is true that France is not a country with a strong entrepreneurial spirit.

A second government objective through this status of entrepreneur is to help people in difficulty and excluded from the system to get out of poverty through the creation of their own jobs. (an idea of Dr Yunus already applied in Bangladesh)

Can we understand the motivations of this new category of entrepreneurs, after 4 years of existence of the auto-entrepreneur status? :

In fact, if you count at end of April 2010 there were nearly 440,000 auto-entrepreneurs in France.» Still, only one entrepreneur out of two declares a monthly turnover of 775 euros on average. (Observatory AE, 2010)

An amount so small that many of these new businessmen are required to have a second activity!

The auto-entrepreneurship, a precarious status? More than half of the people who opt for this status live in an already difficult situation: people under government economical assistance, young unemployed... And if we look into the research of Caliendo and Kritikos (2007), the chances of survival of the entrepreneur are 70% after 2.5 years of operation in the event that a grant or severance has been paid to the small entrepreneur. What is often possible for unemployed people with important compensatory rights or for people in difficulty (inactive, unemployed with no more employment benefits...) eligible for grants or loans via organizations of micro finance (folder Adie and Microcredit, 2008)

Problems of the status of the small entrepreneur: disguised employment, insufficient management and commercial skills...

"Thanks to this status, I can unilaterally stop the contract from my collaborator, I don't pay no expenses, contributions, or severance pay. I can change the terms of its activity without notice... only good things for me", welcomes a young boss in textile business.(blog lautoentrepreneur.com) This is a disguised employment contract and is strictly prohibited by law, but how to set up a system of control against the abuse and the excesses of this status. Does a small entrepreneur have the means to defend itself against its client / boss?

Originally created to boost entrepreneurship and fight unemployment, auto-entrepreneur status is today used by employers in lieu of a normal employment contract. From a status of company governed by the law of corporations, it is fast becoming a contract of employment governed by the labor law.

Individuals deciding to enroll in this status have a mix of motivations "pull and push", namely by necessity (end of unemployment rights) as well as a motivation for freedom and independence in a professional activity. (Caliendo and Kritikos 2007)

## Positioning our research

We are half way between the school of thinking of distinctive characteristics and psychological characteristics (Carland et Al., 1988), as we believe that the Entrepreneur has unique psychological features (value, behavior, needs) that guide him (Fayolle, 2002) and the school of thinking of business

opportunity, which is based on the paradigm : « an entrepreneur is someone who perceives an opportunity and set-up an organization to develop it » (Bygrave, 1994).

We position ourselves in the research field of the entrepreneurship

Our approach is interpretativist (developing understanding from inside) and exploratory.(Saporta, 2003)  
From an epistemology point of view, we are pragmatist and realist.

The object of the research is to understand the real motivations and reasons of the individual who chose to create its activity via the status of the auto-entrepreneur.

Auto-entrepreneur status is open to retirees, employees of the public and the private sector, students and inactive. This originally to reduce work said, by allowing all assets to have a parallel activity declared.

Our target population focuses on the individual auto-entrepreneur without other occupation declared, and focusing 100% on this activity. This is between 19 and 31% of the individual reported (crossing of the statistics of pages 9-14 of the Observatory of AE, February 2010) .

Regarding decision factors previously detailed, (network, entourage, situation prior to creation, approach to risk..) extensive researches on the decision factors have been done, therefore we are going to use these research as a basis for our search.

The decision to start its own business is linked to the administrative and legal ease to set-up or install oneself as an independent. Indeed, the more administrative barriers (bureaucracy, cumbersomeness administrative resulting in the lengths in the record of the files...) are important, the more entrepreneurial freedom is slowed by a public administration and laws not promoting entrepreneurship, and the more the countries in question will have difficulty to attract individuals to business creation.

Red tape in France : France is not a country with strong entrepreneurial culture and is a country where the monetary success is not considered a goal in itself, in part because of a Latin and Catholic culture (money is considered as "dirty", as opposed to Nordic Lutheran populations).

## Research course

We are trying to answer the question : Are we born entrepreneur, is there a unique entrepreneur profile, or do we become entrepreneur through different events in our life, factors in our environment that lead us to take the decision to set-up his company?

We propose to study a sample of 20 French Auto-Entrepreneurs through a qualitative questionnaire, based on interviews in order to understand how they came to this state of entrepreneurship. We have already access to a few database of Auto-entrepreneurs (professionals associations) and we will focus on the individuals registered inside these associations. Our assumption is that as such a status is easy to start, the entrepreneur willing to grow his full time activity will necessarily try to look for peers to develop its business and to get some help and advice (power of networking)

We may need to confirm our findings through a quantitative research, at that time of the research, we still need to weigh the pros and the cons.

The main challenge is to target the right individuals in order to get accurate results for our research.

## Research contribution

If we can understand what brings the individual to make his decision to start a business as Auto-entrepreneur, and dress the profile of the typical French auto-entrepreneur, it will help the education industry as well as the administration to detect earlier through specific tools these profiles in order to orientate these people sooner in their career.

It might help by giving more chances to these individual in the development of their project.

## Plan proposal

In a first part, we detail the different school of thought existing so far, as well as summarize all the research paper written so far on this field. Our literature review include as well all the research and works done in human resource and in profiling schools such as process.com from Kahler, Meyers Briggs, Eneagrams...

The second part, will detail the results of the qualitative research.

French = high uncertainty avoidance culture (risk averse) SJ more than NF “cultural personality”  
Most common types (ashridge research) : ESTJ 20.5% ISTJ 16.7% INTJ 11.0% ESTP 7.6% total 55.8%  
New Auto-entrepreneurs a year :..... quite important

Why is the auto-entrepreneur status so successful in such a culturally adverse to risk french society ? a qualitative study of French auto-entrepreneurs, and first a study of risk taking and entrepreneurship in France, study with both mbti results, kanbur school of thinking...

*Excerpted from MBTI® Manual (CPP, Inc. 1998). Used with permission.*

While type has not been assessed in *all* cultural societies, it has been surveyed in about 30 countries on all continents, some with more than one culture. So far, the studies have suggested the following:

1. All type preferences (E-I, S-N, T-F, and J-P) appear in all cultures studied to date.
2. People in different cultures report that the descriptions of the individual preferences make sense to them. They find value and usefulness in using type concepts in various ways, for example, to improve interactions and communication between diverse individuals and within groups.

3. People in different cultures report that Isabel Myers' original whole type descriptions, or more recent versions, are appropriate and applicable. They react with, "This is me!"
4. Distributions of the sixteen types *differ* across different cultures. However, distribution patterns are *similar* across all the cultures studied.
  - STJ types predominate in all cultures.
  - Males within each culture report a preference for Thinking that is 10 percent to 25 percent higher than that reported by females.
  - Business people in various cultures in North America, Asia, Africa, and Europe were grouped according to temperament pairs (SJ, SP, NF, and NT types). When asked to select an animal to represent their groups, they selected similar animals, as appropriate to their physical environment: The SJ types chose loyal hard-working animals, the SP types chose independent adaptable animals, the NF types chose companionable animals who engaged in teamwork, and the NT types selected animals of competence and vision.
  - People in the same profession often have similar types. For example, law enforcement officers in Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States show preferences for ISTJ and ESTJ.
  - Structured interviews of the same types across different cultures produced similar reactions. For example, ESTJ men and ESFJ women found great support from their environment as they grew up. The opposite types, INFP men and INTP women, reported more difficulty in finding a satisfactory fit for themselves as they grew up.

In summary, studies to date provide clear support for the theory that psychological type is universal across cultures.

### **Type and Culture**

Regardless of its multicultural effectiveness, the MBTI® instrument is not a device for identifying *features* of a culture. Even when the type distributions of two cultures are quite similar, the cultures themselves are not necessarily similar. Each culture defines appropriate acceptable ways for people to express themselves, including ways to express their type preferences. Cultural norms and expectations guide the expression of type.

As a result, preferences may not look the same in different cultures. Britain and the United States offer good examples. The type distributions of business groups are almost the same, yet Britain appears to have more people with preferences for Introversion and the United States more people who prefer Extraversion. Researchers believe this is because the behavior British Introverts use to express their Introversion is quite different from the behavior Introverts in the U.S. use to express their Introversion. The

differences in behavior do not necessarily indicate differences in type, but differences in ways the preferences can be expressed within those cultures.