The formal employment of disabled people is not specifically determined by economic factors but by direct technical ones or ultimately by social interests and values. A solution, neutral in economic terms and achievable in technical terms, to the problems hindering the employment of people with disabilities and health conditions would be a realistic technical solution and actual employment, but only if the society making the relevant decisions and aiming for the inclusion of disabled persons. In a period of economic upturn with a huge expansion of the labour force, higher employment rates appear not only among non-disabled persons but also among people with disabilities and health conditions. However, once an economic downturn occurs and the demand for labour falls we see the appearance of groups that ‘cannot be employed in a profitable manner’. These groups include not only people with disabilities and health conditions but also unskilled workers, long-distance commuters, women with no more than secondary school graduation, immigrants, the Roma minority and others, in other words, all groups in a weak social position, to whose detriment it is easier to implement dismissals, or who can safely be blamed for any declining efficiency of company output. As finding a job is increasingly difficult in general so those labour groups that are unable to protect themselves are excluded from the labour market while intensive efforts are made to serve the interests of those who benefit from this exclusion, with the suggestion of some ideology. In this context, the losers in this game are given a label to legitimise the situation or for some ideological purposes. Labels such as ‘lazy’, ‘drifter’, ‘lumpen elements’, or negative perceptions of people with disabilities or health conditions also serve to disguise the fact that unemployment is rooted in macroeconomic and social inequalities lying behind the direct causes. It is obvious that only those in a vulnerable position are excluded from the labour market or are dismissed, but also that it is easier to dismiss those in a weak position. We see a similar exclusion in the same environment, where accidents of labour market successes and failures, putting individual excellence or fault to the fore serves to facilitate the exclusion of social groups unable to defend themselves within the labour environment. This upside-down logic is all the more dangerous as many disabled people, and generally all those in a marginalised position, believe that the fault lies with them. The resulting frustration reinforces harmful behaviour such as alcoholism, crime and voluntary dropping out from the labour market. For disabled persons, employment may contribute to a lower public burden in the same way as would their better social inclusion. Arguing for the many-sided necessity of employment, Tegyey summarised his view as follows: ‘in the employment of the disabled with reduced working capacity, it must be ensured to give them the most appropriate job opportunity despite their handicap, that is, such a job where working capacity requirement could be provided to the fullest extent possible, for this, it is necessary for them to undergo re-education, that is, to develop working abilities and fine-tuning those as far as possible, all the disabled persons’ social
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INTRODUCTION

Social cohesion and the well-being of individuals have gained growing recognition as societal assets and as important benchmarks for evaluating human progress (Eurofound 2018a). The risk of social exclusion is highest in the socio-economically disadvantaged population: citizens who are unemployed, have low incomes or low levels of education, or live with a chronic illness (Eurofound 2018b). According to the European Quality of Life Surveys (Eurofound 2018b), people with disabilities (PWD) comprise one of the most disadvantaged groups in the European Union, and show less favourable scores regarding such indicators as perceived social exclusion or participation in society. Despite any improvements due to policy initiatives such as the European Disability Strategy 2010-2020 or the European Pillar of Social Rights (2017), inequalities for PWD, especially in the labour market, seem persistent.

The lack of employment opportunities and secure employment pose personal, societal and economic difficulties and challenges for PWD (Yamamoto et al., 2012). Where reliable statistics are available, they show that the unemployment rates of PWD are considerably higher, and that their labour market participation rates and economic activity are well below those of non-disabled people. Evidence shows that the right of PWD to meaningful work is frequently denied, based mostly on a medical picture of disability, which frames disability as an individual medical problem requiring cure and care (Barnes and Mercer, 1996). Although good practices can be found where the employment of PWD appears as part of corporate social responsibility (CSR), this topic is still marginal. Even if companies deal with responsible employment, they usually choose disadvantaged groups that are easier to manage, e.g. mothers with small children or older workers (Győri & Csillag, 2019).

Being present in the labour market offers several advantages and may mean a variety of work options. Moreover, self-employment, business ownership or entrepreneurship may provide viable and realistic options toward overcoming at least some of the traditional obstacles to employment, such as negative attitudes and ignorance, environmental barriers (especially mobility barriers), inadequate vocational rehabilitation services, and lack of opportunities for career development (Hästbacka et al., 2016). At the same time, some obstacles may remain, such as lower levels or
lack of educational or social networks and lack of inclusive entrepreneurial initiatives, while new challenges may also appear, such as competence-deficit.

Although self-employment as a career option is nothing new, as a strategy it has been neglected by policy makers and rehabilitation agencies alike, considering it a last option, or a safety valve for PWD (Ashley & Graf, 2014). This attitude may originate in traditional Western culture, which sees the entrepreneur as a proud and independent (white male) hero attaining outstanding accomplishments. This is in distinct contrast to the widespread and distorted image of PWD as dependent and vulnerable people who expect others to make decisions on their behalves, or wait for job offers rather than take the initiative and actively seek employment (Cooney, 2008, Harper & Momm, 1989).

Pagán’s (2007) analyses of the European Community Household Panel (ECHP), in addition to US data, suggest that self-employment rates are indeed higher among PWD than non-disabled people, showing notable national differences (Kitching, 2014, Renko et al., 2015). Unfortunately, there is presently no official Hungarian data on the ratio of self-employment or business ownership for PWD, as Hungary did not participate in the European Community Household Panel survey (Pagán, 2007, Csillag et al., 2019). Nevertheless, as the rate of self-employment is lower in Hungary than the European average, a lower rate of self-employment among PWD should be expected.

In our paper, we wish to examine the possibility of societal participation through entrepreneurship for PWD as a way of avoiding traditional adverse circumstances that might appear in workplace environments. The results of our exploratory research project contribute to the growing body of empirical research on entrepreneurs with disabilities (EWD), from which the findings regarding the goals and motivational background will be discussed here.

The structure of the paper is as follows: firstly, we introduce the literature on the entrepreneurship of PWD especially focussing on the motivational aspects. Next, we describe the methodology used, after which the main results of the research are presented. The paper closes with a discussion providing arguments for the points of the contributions mentioned above.

1. Literature review

Entrepreneurs are ‘individuals who exploit market opportunity through technical and/or organizational innovation’ (Schumpeter, 1965, 45). They represent a driving force for economic development and job creation, at the same time playing a significant role at various levels of social connection and also in personal fulfilment. For becoming an entrepreneur certain (internal) competences and suitable (external) conditions are needed, which can shape both the strengths and the weaknesses of the business venture in question. Entrepreneurial competences have cognitive, attitudinal, behavioural, social and functional aspects and can be both inborn and acquired through education, training and experience. As they form a rather complex set of expectations, clearly nobody can perfectly fit all characteristics. Nevertheless, with sufficient awareness, the lack of particular abilities can be detected and improved upon, and possible shortcomings ay be complemented by partners and business associates. This makes entrepreneurship a viable opportunity for PWD to use and
develop their own competences, to be flexible in terms of management, time and place (Jones & Latreille, 2011) and finally to improve their economic standing and quality of life (Dhar & Farzana, 2017).

Prior research suggests that over the past decade PWD tend to prefer self-employment and entrepreneurship to being employed more than other people do (Parker Harris et al., 2013, Bagheri et al., 2015). The reason and motivation behind their decision to launch their own enterprises may be diverse and complex, just as the enabling and disabling environment and the aspects of the entrepreneurial ecosystem (Isenberg, 2011) around them may also differ. The next part of our paper gives an overview of the goals and motivations possessed by EWD, as we provide some insights into the general entrepreneurial factors, then list some of the special characteristics of EWD from the findings.

1.1. Motivations

A significant body of the existing literature on EWD examines the potential motivations for and barriers to entrepreneurial activities of PWD, including macro-level national or global policies as well as individual perceptions and backgrounds (Cooney, 2008, Kitching, 2014). Vecsenyi (2017) suggests that the main motivations for becoming an entrepreneur in general are as follows: need for income; independence/freedom; job satisfaction; willingness to pursue an idea/opportunity; educational or occupational skills/experience; need for new challenges; and self-realisation or encouragement from others (from family or broader society). In our inquiry, we wished to investigate whether these were the same for EWD. Based on the relevant literature, we have identified four sets of motivations for PWD to become entrepreneurs, with both pull and push factors (incentives and disincentives) being grouped according to either personal (internal) or social and economic (external) aspects. Table 1 shows the four groups of factors concerning the potential motivations of EWD.

The reason and motivational background for becoming an entrepreneur is of the utmost importance in self-employment. Motivation arising from a constraint or a fear of something (e.g. unemployment or employer discrimination) creates a completely different situation than if entrepreneurship is based on an independent and positive decision. The literature distinguishes between ‘self-employment’ and ‘self-directed employment’ (Rizzo 2002) or ‘need-driven’ and ‘opportunity-driven’ entrepreneurs (Howard 2017). In the case of self-directed employment, ‘people with disabilities, to a significant degree, have a prime, decision-making role in the kind of work that is done, how time is allocated, what kinds of investment in time and money should be made, and how to allocate revenue generated. The essential feature is that the people taking responsibility for doing the work also have a significant say in how the work is organized and managed’ (Rizzo 2002, 98). Cooney and his colleagues (2008) distinguish between the situation of taking the initiative to start one’s own business and that of having no real alternatives. Based on the above, we introduced the categories of pull and push factors, based on which we can distinguish between the level of agency of EWD in determining their own career options.
Table 1. Potential motivations of EWD (edited by the authors)

| Pull factors (incentives) | Personal (internal) | Social and economic environment (external) |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------------|
|                           | wealth creation and financial security (Cooney, 2008); flexibility (Bagheri et al., 2015); self-determination (Howard, 2017); higher level of job satisfaction (Pagán, 2009); ‘making an impact’ (Atkins, 2013) | network connections (Atkins, 2013); role models (Parker Harris et al., 2013); supportive family (Renko et al., 2015); ecosystem: policy, finance, support, human capital (Bagheri et al., 2015); market (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016); rehabilitation agencies (Seekins & Arnold, 1999); business services and contexts (Rizzo, 2002); small business development programmes (Heath & Reed, 2013) |

| Push factors (disincentives) | personal challenges of everyday life (Dhar & Farzana, 2017); coping with personal disadvantages and previous unpleasant experiences (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016); dissatisfaction with previous job (Yamamoto et al., 2012) | fighting for social acceptance and existential independence (Dhar & Farzana, 2017); recovery from poverty and a disadvantaged situation (De Clercq & Honig, 2011); fighting against prejudice (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016); ecosystem: changing of culture (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016) |

Personal features and previous experience also determine the starting and successful operation of an enterprise. Yamamoto and his colleagues (2012) list gender (e.g. women’s discrimination experiences), the type of disability (e.g. entrepreneurs with blindness or physical disability are overrepresented among EWD – we too have found this pattern in our research), and qualification (e.g. the self-employment of PWD is more common in the IT sector). De Clercq and Honig (2011) underline the importance of knowledge and competences, while Renko and his colleagues (2015) claim the impact of family patterns to be crucial. We call these personal, internal factors. The broader social and economic environment (its support or obstruction) is another source of motivation (Howard, 2017), which we call social and economic, or external motivation factors.

Among personal pull factors (in the first quadrant) we grouped personal incentives for being an EWD. Wealth creation and financial security (Cooney, 2008) are important for EWD just as for anyone else. Some scholars also suggest that the relative independence and flexibility of entrepreneurial life could be important motivations compared to being an employee, as being disabled forces a person to overcome
obstacles on a daily basis. Being an entrepreneur enables a PWD to achieve professional and personal goals and could result in a higher level of job satisfaction (Pagán, 2009), as well as involving greater flexibility in time and tasks (Bagheri et al., 2015, Dhar & Farzana, 2017). A will to exercise self-determination is also identified (Howard, 2017). In some cases, this involves strategic, long-term thinking and at the same time the willingness to do good for others (the public or other PWD) as well. Atkins (2013) writes about the desire to ‘make an impact’ and about pursuing a passion for displaying one’s experience and skills. Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2016) mention the desire to prove one’s knowledge and talent.

Among the social and economic environment as pull factors (in the second quadrant) we identified the motivating role of network connections and role models as listed by Atkins (2013), Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2016), Renko et al. (2015), Bagheri et al. (2015) and Parker Harris et al. (2013). The motivating role of a supportive family is also mentioned here (Renko et al., 2015). Mostly US articles list the importance of a supporting ecosystem, emphasising the possible role played by vocational rehabilitation agencies (Bagheri et al., 2015, Seekins & Arnold, 1999, Ipsen et al., 2003, Rizzo, 2002, Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016). Potential business services such as mentoring and social services (Rizzo, 2002) and small business development programmes (Heath & Reed, 2013) are also mentioned in the literature, which draws attention to the human capital (labour market and education), support (NGOs and venture-oriented professionals) and financial aspects of entrepreneurship (Isenberg, 2011). The appropriate business context (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2016) may also be associated with support, with regard to infrastructure, in which transport and communication should, in particular, be accessible.

Few factors were found for the personal push factors (in the third quadrant). Dhar and Farzana (2017) claim that the wish to overcome the personal challenges of everyday life can be a great motivator (e.g. earning enough money to afford to pay an assistant). Howard (2017) conducted a qualitative research study with EWD and highlighted the importance of family values (such as entrepreneurial spirit, courage and education for independence) offsetting the fear of failure. Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2016) elaborate on the ability to cope with personal disadvantages and previous unpleasant experiences. Yamamoto et al. (2012) emphasise the effect of previously experienced discrimination and dissatisfaction in previous jobs.

For social and economic environment as push factors (in the fourth quadrant), we identified drivers for social acceptance and existential independence (Dhar & Farzana, 2017). This involves, among others, fighting against prejudice and recovery from poverty and disadvantaged situations (De Clercq & Honig, 2011, Balcazar et al., 2014). Miller and Le Breton-Miller (2016) claim that people living with negative personal circumstances of an economic, socio-cultural, cognitive or physical nature (such as those experienced by people living in poverty, immigrants, PWD or those with learning disorders such as dyslexia and ADHD) show the same career path with regard to their becoming entrepreneurs while coping with their own, specific types of challenges. Moreover, ‘to compound the difficulties of these populations, there is often a bias against them that makes traditional career paths, and even entrepreneurship, a most challenging endeavour’ (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2017, 8). Dominant ideas about disability and about the roles PWD should play may be linked to Isenberg’s culture domain (2011), as the only domain which presents as a discouraging, or push
factor, while others are rather encouraging incentives or pull factors for becoming an entrepreneur.

2. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research method to explore the entrepreneurial motivations of EWD experience for two reasons. Firstly, qualitative methodology has proved to be effective for investigating complex and multifaceted social phenomena, such as issues connected to disability (Cooper & Emory, 1995). Secondly, research on EWD is still in an exploratory stage and there is little information in this field of inquiry (Bagheri et al., 2015). Previous studies have also used qualitative methods to investigate EWD (Heath & Reed, 2013, Atkins, 2013, Reddington & Fitzsimons, 2013, Bagheri et al., 2015, Dhar & Farzana, 2017, Ashley & Graf, 2017). Data was collected from semi-structured interviews lasting between one and two-and-a-half hours (as in Kvale, 2007), conducted in various locations, depending on the demand of the interviewee. Interviews were recorded and transcribed word-for-word. Altogether, we conducted 10 interviews.

A snowball sample selection strategy (Silverman, 2008) was followed. Firstly, we sent the summary of the research plan to various stakeholders (both individuals and organisations), among others vocational and rehabilitation agencies, disability advocacy organisations and service providers, state government representatives from disability, employment, education and small business departments, private or state funded entrepreneurship development centres, academic faculties and networks of researchers, entrepreneurs and social entrepreneurs. We asked them to recommend possible respondents, together with their availability. Interviewees were also asked to recommend further potential respondents.

At this stage of the research, we did not restrict the sample according to the type or severity of disability or field of entrepreneurship, taking into consideration the explorative purpose of the study. We invited participants who claimed to be entrepreneurs with a disability and who had experience of entrepreneurship for at least three years as well as having employees. The participants – nine men and one woman – with an average age of 44.6, were located nationwide in Hungary and they had either physical impairment or sight loss. This is in keeping with Ashley and Graf (2007), who found that among PWD, persons with visual impairment have the highest self-employment rates (based on US statistics). Heath and Reed (2013) and Bagheri et al. (2015) on the other hand conclude that people with physical and mobility issues may face fewer difficulties and challenges in performing entrepreneurial tasks. The spectrum of the business sectors represented by the entrepreneurs was wide, including various commerce activities, the IT sector, construction, energy, accountancy, project management or event organising.

Four members of the research team, all having experience of working with or studying PWD, took part in the coding process. In the first phase of the analysis, each interview was coded by at least two persons from the research group. The texts of the interviews were coded around themes based on the research questions. In the second phase, the texts of all codes were re-read and a condensed text (Kvale, 2007) was produced describing each code with the aim of detecting significant statements,
typical patterns and relationships, using word-for-word quotations. The researchers met several times to discuss results and formulate interpretations. Ethical standards were maintained throughout the research process with consideration paid to participant contact, communication and behaviour.

3. Results

According to the respondents, becoming an entrepreneur can be both a constraint and an autonomous, positive decision. Some participants failed to become employed, while for others, the salary they had earned was simply not enough to live on. Even now, half the respondents stressed that they still had to work on several projects or jobs at the same time in order to avoid becoming financially vulnerable. Thus, necessity-driven entrepreneurship (Howard, 2017) is strongly present in the sample.

3.1. Personal pull factors

The strongest motivation of EWD is related to the fulfilment of individual and professional goals. Half the respondents mentioned that above all, they were striving for financial security, earning a living, pursuing self-interest and focussing on personal gains. ‘I realised that it was not my goal in life [to remain at a sheltered workplace]. I did not want to remain on such a financial level’ (V1).

The passion for work and for related social causes also appeared as a motivating factor. The majority of the entrepreneurs spoke about their determination, pursuing a passion for demonstrating their experience and skill, and taking pride in the achieved results. ‘I am basically proud of myself, that with all my disadvantages, starting from below zero, I am way in the positive already’ (V1). Independence, autonomy and flexibility were also of great importance to EWD, as opposed to being an employee. ‘I can’t imagine sitting in an office for eight hours where they’re checking whether I’m on Facebook or filling out an excel chart, and it is not because of my condition, but because of my attitude’ (V2).

Half the entrepreneurs mentioned long-term plans for company growth, service or product development and stressed that it was important to think in a strategic way. ‘So I quit my job for various reasons and started my own business. Well, of course I’m still waiting for my big dreams to come true, though I’m not doing badly at all’ (V1). At the same time, the idea of being satisfied with achievements and consciously not wanting to grow the business further also appeared in the interviews. The wish to spend ample time on family and leisure activities shows a multi-dimensional approach to life, success and happiness. ‘And thank God I can say that my life is full, irrespective of the fact that I am in this [wheelchair]. But is it worthwhile to develop further, to let’s say having fifty thousand more a month plus a five times higher stress level? I’m not sure it’s worth it, on the contrary, I would say, it’s not worth it. I’d rather spend my time with my family, my kid, my dog, my hobby or whatever’ (V3).

Appreciation and recognition in the form of entrepreneurial or innovation prizes (the Disability-friendly Workplace Award, the Hungarian Quality Product Award) can also form part of the personal motivation. Such awards are not goals in themselves but may serve as good PR, make achievements visible and be a testimony to making
mainstream business irrespective of any personal differences. ‘It’s good to know that what you do leaves a mark, and that you are motivated by high quality, pride and timelessness’ (V4).

3.2. Social and economic environment as pull factors

The importance of a favourable business context and supporting business network connections was also mentioned in the interviews. Support and motivation, besides inspiration, can come from the closer circle of family and friends, or from official incubator schemes or mentor programmes. Even the idea of starting a business might come from outside, from a role model or from members of the family who believe strongly in the person’s talents and skills. ‘Starting a business basically came from him [the role model]. I saw things at his place and I also had an idea of a kind’ (V1).

The need for a better supporting ecosystem was also mentioned by some respondents, which goes beyond the narrower personal business connections and entails a whole system of support. The respondents had generally not received any help from entrepreneurial ecosystems, either from vocational rehabilitation agencies or from general business development programmes. ‘Theoretical support, [I received] from everywhere, [but] any practical assistance, let’s say material support or something like that, not at all’ (V1). Support would have been welcome regarding capital, the attainment of entrepreneurial skills, business networking or accessibility, but these are said to be missing for EWD in Hungary. ‘These programmes in every country, wherever they operate, are supported by the local government, or the ministry of education, [and] there is no private funding anywhere’ (V5). ‘They should connect us with potential customers or investors. Credit is not enough, in fact: if you are not good enough, the credit can ruin the whole enterprise: it can put you in a worse position than you were originally’ (V6).

The government does not seem to believe that PWD represent a competent workforce who might even launch their own businesses. ‘Let’s switch our brains a little bit: people with disabilities are not a poor, unhappy, useless population, sitting at home, but a potential workforce, even an excellent, loyal workforce’ (V5).

3.3. Personal push factors

With regard to motivations, the respondents mentioned the importance of a positive personality and self-knowledge. They emphasised that a very important step and recognition in their becoming EWD was to realise that disability does not define them as human beings or as entrepreneurs. ‘You need to accept the state you are in, you do not need anything else. … First I need to accept myself, [then] others will also accept me for what I am’ (V8). Some respondents believed that being a successful entrepreneur was fundamentally based on personal properties: ‘I think it’s just about personal qualities. So, for someone to be successful you need to be persistent, you need willpower, to run headfirst into a brick wall, and break down any door in your way, so it depends on you. A person can only become a good entrepreneur if he has the attitude it takes’ (V7).
The respondents, however, tended to agree that being positive and resilient was not always easy. Psychological barriers do exist, and are created by previous negative life experiences such as discrimination, humiliation, failures, the lack of others believing in them or they themselves not believing in their own possible success. As many as three of the ten respondents revealed that they had had mental health issues, were in depressive moods and that starting a company was in fact what pulled them out of the situation. Regarding other PWD, some respondents drew a negative picture of them in general, claiming that they lacked any motivation to make an effort to change their disadvantaged positions in life. ‘I noticed that the majority of them [other PWD] are wretched and closed. ... It’s easier to be at home and feel sorry for themselves, hiding in the world of internet’ (V7).

3.4. Social and economic environment as push factors

Among social and economic push motivations, we have identified the following: a need for existential independence, recovery from a disadvantaged situation, drive for social acceptance, and fighting against prejudice. In line with the personal wish to secure financial stability, the fear of financial vulnerability and limited employment potential represented major external driving forces for EWD. One of the respondents even formed a rather clear-cut critique of other possible forms of employment: ‘And whatever employment there is, it is mostly slave labour in these sheltered workplaces’ (V5). The financial means provided by establishing a business also has the important role of supporting an individual’s independence and agency: ‘I’m not self-sufficient physically ... but if you get to the level where you are financially self-sufficient, then if we are being really pragmatic, you can also pay for your independence’ (GG).

Some EWD consider themselves to be mediators between mainstream society and the PWD community, and wish to support them with the means they have. Some respondents called it their mission to help their peers in overcoming their deprived positions. Service and giving back to the community seems motivating for EWD: ‘Every obstacle that you overcome makes you stronger. Our mission is to help people with visual impairment freely access information, integrate into the ‘intact’ society more easily, and improve their quality of life through our IT services and activities’ (V9). The topic of becoming role models for fellow PWD, to motivate and empower was also mentioned: ‘I would like to show my peers that there is a way other than the one followed by many. This one is a lot more difficult, but possibly a lot better in the long run’ (V1). At the same time, some EWD said that they could not countenance taking on more responsibility. The image of a successful, confident, self-sufficient (male) entrepreneur may seem too difficult to achieve for someone with issues of self-esteem, physical and communicational disadvantages or even financial difficulties.
4. Discussion

The narratives of EWD show that both push and pull motivation factors are present in their decisions to start and run a business venture. While various sources of personal and social motivation are evident (self-fulfilment, ambition, social change, etc.), economic pressure and the lack of any further alternatives are at least equally strong motivating factors, as Cooney (2008) and Howard (2017) also suggest. Highlighting the importance of reaching a work-life balance besides achieving the goal of becoming a successful entrepreneur may, however, indicate that EWD have a somewhat atypical approach to interpreting the benefits of entrepreneurship. Considering profit as a means to finance free time and leisure activities or pay for any personal assistance required due to a disability may be important motivations to escape from everyday existential problems and be able to fulfil higher aims.

Using the personal and financial benefits of entrepreneurship, EWD find a way of self-fulfilment and earning a living while escaping the traditional barriers in employment. In this sense, becoming an entrepreneur might also be seen as a form of resistance to the mainstream norms of the labour market. Avoiding low-paid work and supported employment might be strong personal push motivators, especially when having had personal experience of them. For a young person entering the labour market with a good education and a stable family background, the grim prospect of a precarious, low-paid job as a lifelong career represents a horror to be avoided. While there are certain risks involved in becoming an entrepreneur, the opportunities to gain financial autonomy, have a meaningful job and achieve possible success far outweigh the possible hardships, missing skills or lack of a suitable ecosystem which might be encountered (Doyel 2002).

Concerning the path to becoming an entrepreneur, two distinct patterns emerged from the interviews, according to whether the respondents’ disabilities were congenital or acquired. The respondents who were born with a disability consciously prepared themselves for their chosen professional field and also for becoming entrepreneurs (education, career choice, networking etc.). The other pattern, in the case of acquired disabilities, was of those who made use of competences, skills, and previous life and work experiences, based on which they were able to create and build a new venture or continue previous business activities but adapted to the disability. In both patterns, the role of the family seems to be decisive in becoming an entrepreneur. On the one hand, they influence the upbringing of the child with a disability (overprotection, education in mainstream or special schools, life experiences, attitude etc.) and on the other, they may provide practical support (entrepreneurial skills, experience, expertise, business partnership, capital, attitude, etc.) and positive role models (Németh & Németh, 2018, Csákné Filep et al., 2018). These seem to make a long-term impact and finally create a positive micro-ecosystem in which to start a career in business, as Howard (2017) also emphasises.

Besides having a supportive family and other role models to follow, a high level of self-knowledge and self-esteem was also emphasised. This applies not only to entrepreneurial competences, but also to the acknowledgement and acceptance of one’s own disability. It seems that having a positive attitude to life, overcoming any psycho-emotional hardships and freeing oneself from general negative attitudes is necessary in becoming a successful entrepreneur. The gap between the image of a
goal-oriented, creative and flexible EWD with a good business attitude and that of a helpless, passive, defenceless PWD who may or may not work and who depends on sheltered work or government benefits is wide. Unsurprisingly, it was important for EWD to distinguish and distance themselves from that image.

At the same time, we also found patterns for the motivations of ‘giving something back’ to the ‘disabled community’, as Atkins (2013) suggests. Some of the entrepreneurs focus on providing services to special PWD groups (e.g. software for blind people, or special wheelchairs), in which their special, insider knowledge of the given condition is converted into competitive advantage, as De Clercq and B. Honig (2011) claim. Other entrepreneurs organise free programmes or provide services for lower prices for PWD, based on their perceived responsibility and willingness to support their peers. Respondents tended to emphasise the importance of sharing experiences and providing a role model and encouragement to the ‘disability community’, which role is nevertheless controversial in the narratives since respondents also need ‘othering’, that is, distancing themselves from other, less able PWD as a form of self-protection (Procknow et al., 2017).

Generally, the respondents did not attend any special mentor programmes and did not receive any special government support tailored to encourage entrepreneurial activities or self-employment, and only one of the ten respondents encountered any general mentoring or incubator programmes. Although all experienced difficulties or even crises in their businesses, such as financial issues, mental health issues or difficulties with physical or communications access, these were solved individually. For a favourable business context, providing equal opportunities for all possible entrepreneurs, strategically planned national policies are considered necessary to support those PWD who endeavour to start their own businesses with significantly more disadvantages than the average population.

**5. Conclusion**

In our paper we aimed to explore and analyse the motivational background of EWD based on a classification of pull/push and personal/social factors. Based on the narratives of ten research respondents, we can conclude that the entrepreneurial ecosystem for EWD is not a favourable one in Hungary. Among others, accessibility is a general problem and the lack of a supporting business environment with specifically tailored mentor programmes is also discouraging for EWD. At the same time, personal and family related factors are important resources and have huge importance in choosing this career path and in starting and running businesses.

Both the acceptance of one’s own condition and the acquisition of entrepreneurial knowledge are of high importance. Typical entrepreneurial skills and competences (self-realisation, knowledge management, flexibility, risk taking, creativity, innovation, leadership skills, etc.) usually contradict the common image of PWD, so EWD have had to overcome further ‘twice as many obstacles to personally accept and make others accept their situation and business activities. Thus, having sufficient motivation is a crucial factor in overcoming both material and discursive barriers, demonstrating suitability for all parties concerned and aiming for high goals in life. This, nevertheless,
may also entail paying a high price, such as burnout, alcoholism or mental health issues, which has not generally been addressed in the literature (Campbell 2008).

By identifying the motivational background of EWD we believe that we have contributed a necessary and crucial step to making the general public, the business community and policy makers aware of the hitherto mostly hidden life situation and potentials that lie in EWD. By employing a complex and flexible support strategy matching the actual system of benefits and adapted to individualised needs and aspirations, entrepreneurship may become a potential means of vocational rehabilitation to support the participation of PWD in the labour market and eventually achieve higher levels of societal inclusion and quality of life in general (Kitching 2014).

LIMITATIONS

Naturally, our findings are restricted by the limitations of the study, the literature accessed and the low number of interviews. Integrating entrepreneurial literature and that of disability was challenging, especially regarding the different languages and approaches, starting points and ways of reasoning, as well as gaps in theory and research. The interpretations reflect our perceptions of what is important and relevant and are framed by our situated knowledge. While the issue of entrepreneurship among PWD seems global, the differences in the economic, employment, social and disability states and systems of various countries as sources of information certainly have an impact on its cultural understanding and interpretation. Accepting and being aware of the limitations, our intention was to acknowledge the existence of entrepreneurs with disabilities and explore and indicate some initial patterns and insights, which could deepen our understanding of their situation in the future.
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