

INTRINSIC AND EXTRINSIC MOTIVATIONS ON BUSINESS SCHOOL STUDENTS' ASPIRATIONS: THE GENDER ROLE MODELS PERSPECTIVE

Madher Ebrahim Hamdallah^{*}, Anan Fathi Srouji^{**},
Bushra Khalid Mahadin^{***}

^{*} Corresponding author, Accounting Department, Faculty of Business, Al-Zaytoonah University, Amman, Jordan

Contact details: Accounting Department, Faculty of Business, Al-Zaytoonah University, P. O. Box 130, Amman 11733, Jordan

^{**} Accounting Department, King Talal School of Business Technology, Princess Sumaya University for Technology, Amman, Jordan

^{***} Marketing Department, Faculty of Business and Finance, American University of Madaba, Madaba, Jordan



Abstract

How to cite this paper: Hamdallah, M. E., Srouji, A. F., & Mahadin, K. (2021). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations on business school students' aspirations: The gender role models perspective. *Journal of Governance & Regulation*, 10(4), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv10i4art15>

Copyright © 2021 The Authors

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0). <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISSN Print: 2220-9352
ISSN Online: 2306-6784

Received: 22.06.2021
Accepted: 24.09.2021

JEL Classification: I240, I260, L260
DOI: 10.22495/jgrv10i4art15

This study aims to explore the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on business school students' aspirations to become entrepreneurial managers in the future and whether the gender of their university instructor affects such a relationship. Gender equivalence proved to devour an instructive advantage over students (Aragonés-González, Rosser-Limiñana, & Gil-González, 2020), in addition to the idea that gender competence is a key element in the educational field (Palmén et al., 2020). The hypothesized paradigm is tested through multiple regression and univariate tests based on the responses of 321 Jordanian university students who finished entrepreneurship courses to pursue nexuses between the endogenous and exogenous variables. Results indicated that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations affect students' aspirations to become entrepreneurial managers in the future in favor of their role models. Additionally, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are affected by female instructors. However, male instructors only inspired the intrinsic motivation of the students. As female academic instructors face challenges attributed to gender bias, especially in the Arab and Middle Eastern countries, the results of the study hope to help change the discerning negative perceptions of female instructors in Jordanian and Arab universities. Such problems in gender inspiration affect the prospect of the outcomes required and may have an indirect effect on the educational field in general. The study recommends focusing more on the effect of motivation and innovation efficiency based on gender type in addition to converging entrepreneurship educational research due to the COVID-19 pandemic (Ratten & Jones, 2021).

Keywords: Motivation, Entrepreneurship, Education and Gender, Teacher Quality, Educational Outcomes

Authors' individual contribution: Conceptualization — M.E.H. and A.F.S.; Methodology — M.E.H. and A.F.S.; Investigation — M.E.H., A.F.S., and B.K.M.; Writing — Original Draft — M.E.H., A.F.S., and B.K.M.; Writing — Review & Editing — M.E.H. and A.F.S.; Supervision — M.E.H.

Declaration of conflicting interests: The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study addresses how gender diversity of university instructors and their attitudes may affect students and their willingness to become entrepreneurial managers in the future. The gender-specific roles and standards interrelate and appear inflexible, as they both started to openly share their interpretations based on labor and gender equality (Carnegie, Cornish, Htwe, & Htwe, 2020). Female managers in equal civilizations retain greater skills and exercise more influence due to improved access to educational and professional opportunities and more cordial refinements (Belaounia, Tao, & Zhao, 2020).

More and more academia is witnessing an increase in mixed-gender professors, teachers, and decision-makers. Around the world women professors' presence is changing on college campuses, for example, India statistics show that slightly more than one-fourth of academic instructors in India are women, while parity has been reached at junior colleges in Japan between female and male professors. Moreover, women's representation among faculty is rising in Canada, where they comprised 41.0% of the full-time academic teaching staff at Canadian universities in 2018-2019 (Catalyst, 2020). Additionally, in Europe it has been found that the higher up position in the academic ladder, the wider gender gap between two genders, and women are less likely to attain tenancy and embrace high-ranking positions than men. However, in the United States females are found in lower-ranking academic positions (Catalyst, 2020). Women in Turkey are trying to retrieve change in order to improve gender equality in the academic profession through offering certain advantages in women's academic life in order to influence equality with men, which are expected to dominate precise inadequacies (Sağlamer et al., 2018). Meanwhile, Kiliç, Kiliç, and Akan (2021) added that motivation attracts attention of all branches of social sciences these days, especially in classrooms.

Moreover, male educators are found to have a positive influence on students in Peter and Horn's (2005) study, as they are being viewed as role models who increase students' motivation and engagement, and therefore their academic achievement. Some studies appealed to expressive security as a prerequisite for male instructors' motivation and commitment (Basow, Codos, & Martin, 2013). In the arena of learning, the attachment theory states that male teachers are an important requirement for amplified male and female scholar motivation, engagement, and academic achievement (Basow et al., 2013; Roorda, Koomen, Spilt, & Oort, 2011; Riley, 2011). The theory of motivation claims that self-directed motivation is always optimal and comprises intrinsic motivation (Ahn, Chiu, & Patrick, 2021), in addition to autonomous extrinsic motivation arising from one's identity or values and goals (Ryan & Deci, 2020). Against this backdrop, we ask ourselves: How are students motivated at the university level? How do they see their professors? Are they impressed and influenced by them? Does the gender of the university professor influence their future aspirations? Accordingly, this research aims to scrutinize the effect of intrinsic motivation (IM) and

extrinsic motivation (EM) on students' future managerial aspirations by taking into consideration the influence of gender role models.

This study investigates whether females and males have the same level of IM and EM or if it differs depending on the professor's gender. This research contributes to the existing literature by expanding self-determination theory through testing the influence of both IM and EM on future managerial aspirations, as most pragmatic studies have focused mainly on the association concerning intrinsic motivation and students' success, as motivation is a respected constituent that touches all aspects of life these days (Kiliç et al., 2020). Moreover, research on this topic in the MENA region is rare, and based on the authors' awareness it may be the first in Jordan.

The remainder of the paper is structured as following. Theoretical framework and hypotheses development are presented in Section 2, which underpin the current paper, firstly, intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and future managerial aspiration, secondly, whether instructor's gender may actually affect the students' aspirations to become future entrepreneurial managers or not. Then the research methodology is elucidated in Section 3. Section 4 includes the study analysis and results. Section 5 discusses the results. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Discernments of the academic career may present a challenge (White et al., 2014); however, it is a pragmatic assignment to authorize the entitlement of gender proportion relations and additional values when signed to an academic position. The growth of the number of female members in academic leadership does not essentially mean a reduction in gender stereotypes and discrimination (Park, 2020). Humphreys, Dunne, Durrani, Sankey, and Kaibo's (2020) conclusions are mainly based on the essentials to move beyond the amassed numbers of feminine instructors, as improving the quality of education and paying attention to out-of-college conditions too. Such disparity is a delinquent issue that can be eliminated through education; for, gender equivalence is a discrete and instructive advantage (Aragonés-González et al., 2020).

However, "the classroom can become a place that supports the formation of gender bias and stereotypes that stress boys are superior and more competent than girls" (İncikabi & Ulusoy, 2019, p. 299). Increased gender equality in education is related to lower maternal humanity and longer life keenness for both genders, while increased gender equality in work is related to inferior mortality and longer feminine life keenness (Gadoth & Heymann, 2020). Dong et al. (2020) stated that the educational gender gap in China has been decreasing. Moreover, the educational gender gap depends on the parents' education level, as whenever it increases the educational gap would decrease. Proposing an acquaintance to stereo feminine role models, which might decrease the biasness in management selection, and endorse environments needed to adopt innovation and amendment related to entrepreneurial managers. As entrepreneurship is

a key element of competition for countries in the knowledge-based international market (Boldureanu, Ionescu, Bercu, Bedrule-Grigoriuță, & Boldureanu, 2020).

Citing Broussard and Garrison (2004), Guay et al. (2010) clarify that motivation is “the reasons underlying behavior” such reasons are what moves us to act (p. 712). Motivation is considered a vital element for academic enhancement and achievement through different life stages; it sponsors students’ inquisitiveness, perseverance, erudition, and performance (Elliot & Dweck, 2013). Based on the previous studies a major question is notified whether this presence influence students’ motivation and their future aspirations or not. Disagreement over engaging professor’s gender and its influence on students is stimulated from the lack of research in such area (Saeed & Zyngier, 2012). In academia, research stated that students favor instructors from identical gender (Martino, Mills, & Lingard, 2005; Punyanunt-Carter & Carter, 2015).

Motivation is categorized into internal and external factors that encourage aspiration and energy in individuals continually attentive and dedicated to the profession and determined to accomplish the objectives (Hamdallah, 2012; Sarpong, 2016).

It states that motivation is based on the collaboration between awareness and unawareness influences as 1) desire or need, 2) motivation or reward, and 3) expectations of specific aristocracies regardless of gender. Accordingly, motivation is divided into two types — intrinsic motivation (IM) and extrinsic motivation (EM) (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2017; Zaccone & Pedrini, 2019; Ryan & Deci, 2020).

IM embodies all the internal motivational drivers like proficiency and erudition motivation, assertiveness motivation, success motivation, inventive motivation, and physiological motivation. IM can be enduring and self-sustaining; to build such kind of motivation determination is needed to endorse the educational process. IM is the normal, integral drive to seek out challenges and new opportunities, which associates with cognitive and social development. There is a link between individuals’ requirements and their ability to motivate; as the need for competence, self-determination and autonomy is the base for IM (Deci, 1971; Ayub, 2010). According to Ayub (2010) “academic intrinsic motivation plays a significant role in achievement, competency and academic learning” (p. 3). Research indicates that individuals engage with their surroundings so they would feel competent, and have a sense of accomplishment (Deci, 1971; Deci, Cascio, & Krusell, 1975; Ayub, 2010).

On the other hand, EM stands for all the external motivational drivers like doing something for a raise or reward. It includes inducement motivation, anxiety motivation, power motivation, affiliation, and social motivation (parental expectations, expectations of other trusted role models) (Al-Zubi, Shaban, & Hamdallah, 2014; Blake, 2015; Yarborough & Fedesco, 2020; Tarver, 2020). EM comes from external sources; Deci et al. (1975) defined it as a wide variety of behaviors that are engaged in as a means to an end and not for their own sake. According to self-determination, there are several types of EM: external regulation, introjections, and identification. Extrinsically motivated behaviors can be integrated into the self

(Deci & Ryan, 1985). In sum, autonomy stipulates that an individual’s wellbeing is a consequence of fulfilling the competence need, where gender competence is a key element (Palmén et al., 2020).

“Social boundaries”, reliant on the cultural perspective, may include inequalities of competition, gender, and nationality. These boundaries are socially built and may differ over time and across areas (Christou & Janta, 2019). The gender gap in teaching evaluation changes within the period as pupils evaluate their lecturers based on gender, which is statistically distinguished thoroughly based on the depiction diminution of females in academia (Keng, 2020). However, endorsing gender equality and authorizing women is beneficial even when the reasons for doing so may be tenuous (Wellalage, Fernandez, & Thrikawala, 2020). It was stated that organizations directed by feminine managers’ propensity to display inferior extensiveness and seriousness of innovation through marketing (Strohmeier, Tonoyan, & Jennings, 2017).

Unfortunately, in the Middle East generally and the Arab world specifically, there is a scarcity of studies based on the inspiration of professor’s gender on the learning outcomes, motivation, engagements and aspiration of students. Oga-Baldwin and Fryer’s (2020) study results state that males are more likely to reveal low quality, externally controlled motives, on the opposite of females, indicating the necessity to improve males’ internally regulated motivation. Mendonça and Reis (2020) indicated that gender has no indirect results concluded by any of the behavioral features, while it was found hard to incorporate gendered innovations (Dalziel & Saunders, 2019). However, Leicht, de Moura, and Crisp’s (2014) study clarified that gender thinking affects the evaluation and choice of management contenders by exposing participants’ role models in a positive manner.

Performing with the propensity in the environment and carrying out tasks is required. Those who succeed in satisfying this need are motivated by IM. Whilst, failing to fulfill this need, when conducting these activities, is channeled by external regulation or pressures, that is EM (Srouji, Abed, & Hamdallah, 2019; Zaccone & Pedrini, 2019), which may be managed through increasing relevance in the stereotype social environment (Ma, Axt, & Kay, 2019).

Accordingly, the influence of IM and EM has been investigated in many academic domains. Research suggested that the higher the academic IM the more competent individuals are in school, the greater the seeking for better academic accomplishments, additional positive acuties of their academic proficiency, inferior academic nervousness, the less EM (Gottfried, Cook, Gottfried, & Morris, 2005). Additionally, Saeed and Zyngier (2012) stated that most scholars displayed elements of IM and EM in Burundi, India, and Morocco where researchers concluded a gap in the literature in relation to instructors’ gender stereotype and its effect on scholars’ motivation.

Moreover, the relation between IM and educational effectiveness has been well explored in the literature. Vansteenkiste, Sierens, Soenens, Luyckx, and Lens (2009) confirmed that scholars have extraordinary IM and a minimum level of EM revealing better learning effectiveness in Flanders, Belgium. Guay and Vallerand (1996), Vansteenkiste, Lens, and Deci (2006), and Dweck (2013) indicated that IM effects students learning process in

a positive way, considering it creates more engagement and higher tenacity in learning activities. Yet, there is no accord on the influence of EM on learning effectiveness. Ayub (2010) proposed a positive relationship between IM and EM and academic performance. Furthermore, motivation is found to develop the academic performance of scholars in Pakistan, referring to gender dissimilarity in motivation type and academic performance. What is more, Kuvaas, Buch, Weibel, Dysvik, and Nerstad (2017) found that EM is related to spiritual suffering and inferior levels of comfort, which might hinder the engagement in different tasks leading to decreased learning effectiveness. Tasgin and Coskun (2018) determined a direct significant association between both IM in addition to EM and academic motivation, on the contrary of Turkey, where an indirect relationship is stated. In the same vein, Zaccone and Pedrini (2019) stipulated that IM has a positive learning competence, while EM has a negative one, displaying that students' gender has a moderating role in Burundi, Morocco, and India.

Extensive scanning of the literature on the relationship between two types of motivation and the managerial aspirations of students influenced by the gender of their professors is rare if non-existent, especially in the Middle East and Arab countries. For example, researchers have investigated the extent of association between factors of students' concern and professional perceptions and aspiration which vary according to gender (Smith, 2015; Walker, 2018; Kang, Hense, Scheersoi, & Keinonen, 2019), in addition to how gender and professional experience influence students perception toward their instructors (Tindall & Waters, 2015). Moreover, according to Solanki and Xu (2018), most gender match studies center on the academic performance of students and lack measures associated with motivation. Meanwhile, Rahim and Mukhtar (2021) indicated that the curriculum in entrepreneurship education and teaching methods by the lecturers can help enhance the students' intention to venture into entrepreneurship.

Hence, the motivation-related elements inspiring scholars' professional achievement are, for now, unclear. Therefore, against the previous backdrop, we hypothesize that:

H1: There is a relationship between students' intrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.

H2: There is a relationship between students' extrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.

During the learning process itself, Smith (1997) found that males and females have more confidence in giving their opinions in same-gender student groups, and females offered their opinions confidentially in class when the lecturer was of the same gender as themselves. The researcher indicated a macho bias in Australian business tutoring, which hinders the process of learning for both females and males discouraging future entrepreneurial managers from exploiting gender variance in the workplace.

Bandura (1992) stated that women, in general, believe that they suffer from the absence of capabilities and skills, thus limiting their career aspirations. Some research even substantiated that female students show less assurance in their

professional abilities than males (Wilson, Kickul, & Marlino, 2007; Díaz-García & Jiménez-Moreno, 2010; Yordanova & Tarrazon, 2010). Moreover, Jennings and McDougald (2007) suggest that socio-cultural factors have more effect on female managers than males; hence, role models may have a greater inspiration in relation to the perceptions of entrepreneurship for females than for males (Karimi, Biemans, Lans, Chizari, & Mulder, 2014). Females are more receptive to social influences, and they incline to emphasize the social features of connections in a greater manner than males. Danziger and Eden (2007) stated that students of both genders share similar aspirations and goals in their last year. Yet, females lower their occupational aspirations in later academic years, and they look for a more expedient equilibrium between their jobs and other life aspects.

Furthermore, Varughese (2017) indicated that students display greater altitudes of motivation and commitment once educated by male tutors, this outcome was drawn from students of different ethnicities studying science courses at an online university. Additionally, Solanki and Xu (2018) found that having a female instructor in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics reduces the gender gap in relation to commitment, curiosity, and concentration; furthermore, at the University of California, both female and male students tend to react with their university lecturers based on their gender. Limited evidence exists regarding the effect of the relationship between the instructor's gender and their students at higher education levels. Moreover, there is no accord on the methods that drive a positive influence on students' academic performance, let alone future professional advancement. This research aims to provide a present-day relevance perception to relate whether a university professor's gender may affect the students' future managerial aspirations. Most importantly, it bridges a gap in the literature by utilizing intrinsic and extrinsic motivations as independent variables. To our knowledge, an exhaustive examination of such relationship is understudied, thus validating the purpose of this study to derive the following hypotheses:

H3: There is a relationship between the instructor's gender and students' future entrepreneurial manager aspirations.

H4: There is a relationship between the instructor's gender regarding their effect on students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study is quantitative research that depends on both primary and secondary techniques of data collecting, which aims to study the relationship between students' motivations and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations, in addition, the effect of their instructor's gender in Jordan. The secondary data are mostly the literature published and online search for relevant journal articles. The primary data are collected through anonymous e-surveys via Jordanian University pages on social media from June 2019 until February 2020 relying on anonymous surveys, which protect the confidentiality of the information of the students who completed an entrepreneurship course; as motivation is a respected constituent that touches

all life aspects (Kiliç et al., 2020). In addition, the use of anonymous surveys is more practical as compared to field studies, which require the disclosure of details. The e-survey tools are distributed to students in both private and public universities, the research utilized a questionnaire where respondents were to indicate their agreement on each question. The population is students who finished an entrepreneurship course; which is hard to identify; as not all universities teach such courses, in addition to the idea that such courses are department compulsory, or faculty mandatory, or even electives, depending on each department and its graduation requirements. Due to a large number of the study sample and confidentiality purposes, an e-survey is preferred compared with other alternative research methods, such as interviews. Three hundred and fifty (350) questionnaires were distributed to employed students; where 325 students answered the mandatory question required to continue the analysis relying on the idea of whether they took their instructors as role models or not. However, from the 325 only 321 were suitable for the required analysis based on some unreciprocated inquiries in the questionnaire.

The survey is divided into four parts. The first is related to the demographic information of the respondents, yet the second part is related to the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as dependent variables distinguished to four and three questions for each section, respectively. The instructors'

gender stereotype is the third part included in the analysis as a dummy variable that equals 1 if the student's role model is a female and 0 otherwise. However, management aspiration related to the dependent variable consists of four questions is the last part.

4. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Alpha indicated an 87% degree for the model in total illustrating reliability coefficient, which is relatively high and accepted for scientific research. A high Cronbach's alpha augments the results reliability in relation to the research tools, accuracy, and consistency based on the research objectives (Hair, Risher, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2019); detailed output is stated in Table 1 for the questionnaire in total and each question individually.

4.1. Descriptive analysis

Mean as stated in Table 2 for the dependent (management aspiration) and independent (intrinsic and extrinsic motivations) variables are relatively high. The low-value degree of the standard deviation gives higher consistency in the data derived from the questionnaire examination and the hypotheses testing used in the study process and achieving their goals, as all the variables studied have a high degree of significance.

Table 1. Reliability test

Question	Cronbach's alpha
I decided to attend the course because learning something is very exciting.	0.853
I decided to attend the course because learning is enjoyable.	0.850
I decided to attend the course because learning is useful for my family and friends.	0.853
I decided to attend the course because I could share knowledge with my family and friends.	0.860
I decided to attend the course to do my job better and have bonuses.	0.850
I decided to attend the course to find a better job and be better paid.	0.853
I decided to attend the course to get extra paying on my job.	0.860
To which degree would you like to become a manager at your present workplace?	0.860
To which degree would you like to become a manager at another workplace?	0.853
Do you think you have the possibility to become manager at your present workplace?	0.853
Do you think you have the possibility to become a manager at another workplace?	0.888
Is your role model instructor a male or a female?	0.879
Total questionnaire	0.870

Table 2. Descriptive analysis

Question	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard deviation
Intrinsic motivation				
I decided to attend the course because learning something is very exciting.	1.00	5.00	3.9688	1.20116
I decided to attend the course because learning is enjoyable.	2.00	5.00	4.0841	0.98541
I decided to attend the course because learning is useful for my family and friends.	2.00	5.00	4.0779	0.86792
I decided to attend the course because I could share knowledge with my family and friends.	2.00	5.00	4.1900	0.69689
Extrinsic motivation				
I decided to attend the course to do my job better and have bonuses.	2.00	5.00	4.0841	0.98541
I decided to attend the course to find a better job and be better paid.	2.00	5.00	4.0779	0.86792
I decided to attend the course to get extra paying on my job.	2.00	5.00	4.1900	0.69689
Entrepreneurial management aspiration				
To which degree would you like to become an entrepreneurial manager at your present workplace?	2.00	5.00	4.1900	0.69689
To which degree would you like to become an entrepreneurial manager at another workplace?	1.00	5.00	3.9688	1.20116
Do you think you have the possibility to become an entrepreneurial manager at your present workplace?	2.00	5.00	4.0779	0.86792
Do you think you have the possibility to become an entrepreneurial manager at another workplace?	3.00	5.00	4.4019	0.65945

4.2. Multiple and univariate analysis

Multiple regression and univariate tests were used to conduct the research analyses. Based on the regression test it is indicated that both the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation effects students' inspiration to become entrepreneurial managers in the future; as the significant results indicated are 0.000 and 0.008 respectively based on the effect of motivation type and students' aspirations, as in Table 3 and Table 4.

Table 3. Model summary-ANOVA

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Estimated error	Sig.	F
1	0.923	0.852	0.851	0.20538	**0.000	913.786

Table 4. Coefficients of management aspiration as a dependent variable

Model	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. error	B		
Constant	1.235	0.075		16.457	**0.000
Intrinsic motivation	0.574	0.048	0.761	11.958	**0.000
Extrinsic motivation	0.141	0.053	0.170	2.679	**0.008

Notes: ** significant at $\alpha \leq 0.01$; * significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

Adding the gender stereotype as a student's role model, and using univariate test results indicated that both genders effect students' aspirations to be entrepreneurial managers in the future as in Table 5. As stated in Table 4, both male and female instructors affect their business students' intrinsic motivation to become entrepreneurial managers. However, only female role model instructors inspired their students' extrinsic motivation to become entrepreneurial managers in the future.

Table 5. Levene's test of equality (management aspiration)

	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Male	3.367	26	174	**0.00
Female	3.777	22	97	**0.00

Notes: ** significant at $\alpha \leq 0.01$; * significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

As Solanki and Xu's (2018) study lacks measures related to students' motivation, this study came to support the literature. All hypotheses results are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Gender univariate test

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.	Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Intrinsic motivation											
Male						Female					
Correlated model	56.739	26	2.182	87.079	**0.00	Correlated model	26.353	22	1.198	65.872	**0.00
Intercept	1320.468	1	1320.468	52690.691		Intercept	891.599	1	891.599	49.30.208	
Q1	0.623	2	0.311	12.430	**0.00	Q1	2.011	2	1.006	55.307	**0.00
Q2	0.073	1	0.073	2.920	0.089	Q2	0.169	1	0.169	9.274	*0.03
Q3	2.590	3	0.863	34.454	**0.00	Q3	1.690	2	0.845	46.457	**0.00
Q4	2.600	3	0.867	34.580	**0.00	Q4	1.623	3	0.541	29.758	**0.00
Extrinsic motivation											
Male						Female					
Correlated model	56.739	26	2.182	87.079	0.08	Correlated model	26.353	22	1.198	65.872	**0.00
Intercept	1416.011	1	1516.011	60493.435		Intercept	1121.273	1	1121.273	61660.313	
Q5	0.702	2	0.351	13.997	**0.00	Q5	0.150	1	0.150	8.273	**0.005
Q6	0.173	3	0.058	2.298	0.079	Q6	0.009	1	0.009	0.515	0.475
Q7	0.009	1	0.009	0.347	0.557	Q7	0.073	1	0.073	4.042	*0.047

Notes: ** significant at $\alpha \leq 0.01$; * significant at $\alpha \leq 0.05$.

Table 7. Hypotheses results

Hypothesis	Statement	Results
H1	There is a relationship between students' intrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.	Accepted
H2	There is a relationship between students' extrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.	Accepted
H3	There is a relationship between the instructor's gender and students' future entrepreneurial manager aspirations.	Accepted
H4	There is a relationship between the instructor's gender regarding their effect on students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and future entrepreneurial managers' aspirations.	Partially accepted

5. DISCUSSION

Schools may play a major role in reducing stereotyping, they are able to carry out gender inequality actions they conduct, categorize, evaluate and adjust the academic contents to elude a feminine stereotyping (Aragonés-González et al., 2020). Some research focused on the organization efficiency and career development based on poor

representation of female leaders by shifting to logistic thinking not only related to entrepreneurship but also to social fields (Liu & Li, 2020). Students may feel motivated to learn by exterior influences, such as their willingness to follow their instructors' footsteps or to satisfy them, all are based on the environment. Even though some students' actions may be based on internal motives, others choose to learn and develop themselves

because of interest or personal advantages; however, some may have the sensation of both (Oga-Baldwin & Fryer, 2020), as proved in this research.

Women, in general, might tend to be more interested in people, whereas men might be more interested in things (Mendenhall & Singer, 2019), so the discovery of data related to gender biasness is revealed to the difference of existing assumptions and practices in the academic life (Romero-Hall et al., 2018). Salinas and Bagni (2017) indicated a creative and successful workplace through diversification in entrepreneurship. Connections between gender and businesses might support the explanation of gender-related activity conflicts. Liu and Li (2020) clarified that female managers try to assign gender standards into workplaces in order to enhance moral leadership ethics.

Based on the analysis, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations indicate effectiveness on students' willingness to become entrepreneurial managers, as in Ayub (2010), as this study came with interesting results indicating that students' are actually inspired by their feminine role model instructor toward becoming managers in the future. Meanwhile their male role model instructors motivated their intrinsic but not their extrinsic motivation. Zaccone and Pedrini's (2019) study, in addition to Oga-Baldwin and Fryer's (2020), clarified that IM has a positive influence on learning effectiveness. This study results also compromise with Walker's (2018) and Kang et al.'s (2019) studies based on the inspiration itself and not on any differences. On the contrary, Hartman and Barber's (2020) study identified statistically significantly higher career aspirations for men than women. However, by focusing on the previous studies, it is noticed that the tests are done in general, as this study focuses on the motivation of becoming entrepreneurial managers and at the same time on both the intrinsic and extrinsic inducements. Students' subjective abilities prod them to consider certain majors through encouraging self-developing relevant skills, dealing them to strong mutual interconnection, all estimated through a framework related to IM (Sadowski & Zawistowska, 2020).

As in Kuvaas et al. (2017), EM is associated with psychological distress, which may indicate that female instructors are more capable of dealing with their students. Diverse representations in academia might lead to dissimilar outcomes regarding prevailing gender relations (Le Feuvre, 2009). Mahajan's (2020) study stated that respondents should strongly support the need intended to form a sustainable management education away from stereotyping as gender diversity acts as a insemination of stereotyping between genders averting men from attaining a higher management position (Nielsen & Madsen, 2019). Females in senior academic positions are an indication that conspicuous gender inequalities persevere in career and academic leadership; thus, females develop more gradually and are capable to solve more problems during their professional life than men (Roberto, Rey, Maglio, & Agliata, 2020).

Rationalizing gender concluded that informal behavior and perceiving women is indicated as an important issue in relation to social inequality (Gupta, 2020). Hartman and Barber (2020) focused on the idea of no differences in entrepreneurship

between both gender personalities as managers. However, human resource specialists must emphasize the characteristics in relation to educating construct leadership aptitude, increasing self-interest and professional improvement talent. Leadership development is highly required for females in the public starting from primary elementary school (Dixit, Agrawal, Agarwal, Gerguri-Rashiti, & Said, 2020). Even though gender stereotypes concerning leadership are emphasized as the main difficulty females as seniors have to prevail on such issues if they want to prosper in entrepreneurship (Ramohai, 2019).

Belaounia et al. (2020) implied that the influence of female managers on organizations is contingent on the nation's overall gender equivalence level; the social gratitude of female abilities is anticipated to inspire their gratitude before entering the market, which may be done through schools. Furthermore, gender diversity has a direct positive effect on innovation competence, which is reinforced when the assignment intensity is high, or the market rivalry is high (Xie, Zhou, Zong, & Lu, 2020). Striebing, Schmidt, Palmén, Holzinger, and Nagy (2020) claimed that gender equivalence still requires widespread and extra effectiveness intended to contribute an increasing representation of females in research and innovation. Skilled female managers might bring additional viewpoints and exclusive proficiency; their ability may perhaps be subdued by incompatible underlying forces (Belaounia et al., 2020).

The authors hope that this study will provide a present-day relevant perspective of university professor's gender setting based on students' future managerial aspirations. Most importantly, concluded by bridging a gap in the literature via utilizing intrinsic and extrinsic motivations as the exogenous variables in specific and the extraneous variables of the study in general assisting a change of the discriminating negative perceptions of female instructors in Jordanian universities specifically and Arab universities in general. The authors hope this research will be an adequate resource to make crucial decisions via its users.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this research indicated that motivation affects students' aspirations to become entrepreneurial managers in the future in favor of their role models. Furthermore, as indicated, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are affected by female instructors. On the contrary, male instructors only inspired the intrinsic motivation of their students. As gender affects the prospect of innovation and has an indirect effect on education fields, in Jordan, there is still a lack of studies related to gender in general. Quintana-García and Benavides-Velasco's (2016) study claimed that female managers could enhance an organization's capabilities to be more profitable. Mousa, Massoud, and Ayoubi (2020) stated that the variety of gender management could arbitrate between workplace happiness and organizational social responsibility behavior. Maybe gender cognizance in entrepreneurship is an issue previously overlooked, and an important issue related to innovation (Staffansson Pauli, Kristoferson, & Stevenson, 2020)

but not enough to reduce the literature gap. The role of gender and innovations in competence management is important because when the directing concerns generating innovations, it is necessary to break the inequalities in the business; and help in creating new solutions (Staffansson Pauli, Kristoferson, & Stevenson, 2020). Even though it was indicated in Mendonça and Reis's (2020) study that men innovate more, however, females demonstrated no clear differences in the behavioral and physiognomies of innovations. All variables are recommended to be tested in the future, in Jordan in specific and the MENA or Arab countries in general.

The greatest weakness of this study is its reliance on anonymous surveys as the main technique of collecting data. As a larger sample of private and public students analyzed individually, it may give us more details on the effect of their instructors' stereotyping on their motivation to be

entrepreneurial managers in the future. In Abalkhail's (2020) study, it is believed that multilayered elements comprising sociocultural and family morals, religious beliefs, and organizational philosophies and erections may affect a relationship between parties. Mendonça and Reis (2020) claimed that although men innovate in a higher manner than females, there is no unblemished change on innovation behavior and characteristics; while (Xie et al., 2020) added that it would increase innovation efficiency. However, Ratten and Jones (2021) stated that the entrepreneurship education research area requires further attention due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Adding any of the mentioned variables, changing time periods are all recommended and may change the results of entrepreneurship and the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations influences of future studies.

REFERENCES

1. Abalkhail, J. M. (2020). Women managing women: Hierarchical relationships and career impact. *Career Development International*, 25(4), 389–413. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CDI-01-2019-0020>
2. Ahn, I., Chiu, M. M., & Patrick, H. (2021). Connecting teacher and student motivation: Student-perceived teacher need-supportive practices and student need satisfaction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 64, 101950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2021.101950>
3. Al-Zubi, Z., Shaban, O. S., & Hamdallah, M. E. (2014). The extent of employee's compliance to the internal control system on the reliability and creditability of financial statements. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 3(7), 939–952. <https://doi.org/10.9734/JSRR/2014/8130>
4. Aragonés-González, M., Rosser-Limiñana, A., & Gil-González, D. (2020). Coeducation and gender equality in education systems: A scoping review. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 111, 104837. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.104837>
5. Ayub, N. (2010). Effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on academic performance. *Pakistan Business Review*, 8, 363–372. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/2599275/Effect_of_intrinsic_and_extrinsic_motivation_on_academic_performance
6. Bandura, A. (1992). On rectifying the comparative anatomy of perceived control: Comments on "Cognates of personal control". *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 1(2), 121–126. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849\(05\)80153-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-1849(05)80153-2)
7. Basow, S. A., Codos, S., & Martin, J. L. (2013). The effects of professors' race and gender on student evaluations and performance. *College Student Journal*, 47(2), 352–363. Retrieved from https://discs.ie/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Basow-et-al-2013-The-effects-of-professions-race-and-gender-on-student-evaluations-and-performance.asp_.pdf
8. Belaounia, S., Tao, R., & Zhao, H. (2020). Gender equality's impact on female directors' efficacy: A multi-country study. *International Business Review*, 29(5), 101737. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2020.101737>
9. Blake, C. (2015). Cultivating motivation: How to help students love learning. *Resilient Educator*. Retrieved from <https://resilienteducator.com/classroom-resources/cultivating-student-motivation/>
10. Boldureanu, G., Ionescu, A. M., Bercu, A. M., Bedrule-Grigoriu, M. V., & Boldureanu, D. (2020). Entrepreneurship education through successful entrepreneurial models in higher education institutions. *Sustainability*, 12(3), 1267. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12031267>
11. Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. E. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary-school-aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 106–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077727X04269573>
12. Carnegie, M., Cornish, P. S., Htwe, K. K., & Htwe, N. N. (2020). Gender, decision-making and farm practice change: An action learning intervention in Myanmar. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 78, 503–515. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.01.002>
13. Catalyst. (2020, January 23). *Women in academia: Quick take*. Retrieved from <https://www.catalyst.org/research/women-in-academia/>
14. Christou, A., & Janta, H. (2019). Affecting solidarities: Bringing feeling into feminism, empathy in employment and compassion in academic communities of crises. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 30, 232–239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2019.02.007>
15. Dalziel, P., & Saunders, C. (2019). Gendered innovations in economics: Marilyn Waring's approach to social science research. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 72, 137–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2018.05.004>
16. Danziger, N., & Eden, Y. (2007). Gender-related differences in the occupational aspirations and career-style preferences of accounting students: A cross-sectional comparison between academic school years. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 129–149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710733622>
17. Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0030644>
18. Deci, E. L., Cascio, W. F., & Krusell, J. (1975). Cognitive evaluation theory and some comments on the Calder and Staw critique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31(1), 81–85. <https://content.apa.org/doi/10.1037/h0076168>

19. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
20. Diaz-García, M. C., & Jiménez-Moreno, J. (2010). Entrepreneurial intention: The role of gender. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 6, 261-283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-008-0103-2>
21. Dixit, J. K., Agrawal, V., Agarwal, S., Gerguri-Rashiti, S., & Said, D. S. (2020). Competencies development for women edupreneurs community – An integrated AHP-TOPSIS approach. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, 15(1), 5-25. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-04-2020-0060>
22. Dong, Y., Bai, Y., Wang, W., Luo, R., Liu, C., & Zhang, L. (2020). Does gender matter for the intergenerational transmission of education? Evidence from rural China. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 77, 102220. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2020.102220>
23. Dweck, C. S. (2013). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315783048>
24. Elliot, A. J., & Dweck, C. S. (Eds.). (2013). *Handbook of competence and motivation*. New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
25. Gadoth, A., & Heymann, J. (2020). Gender parity at scale: Examining correlations of country-level female participation in education and work with measures of men's and women's survival. *EClinicalMedicine*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100299>
26. Gottfried, A. W., Cook, C. R., Gottfried, A. E., & Morris, P. E. (2005). Educational characteristics of adolescents with gifted academic intrinsic motivation: A longitudinal investigation from school entry through early adulthood. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(2), 172-186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620504900206>
27. Guay, F., & Vallerand, R. J. (1996). Social context, student's motivation, and academic achievement: Toward a process model. *Social Psychology of Education*, 1(3), 211-233. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02339891>
28. Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 711-735. <https://doi.org/10.1348/000709910X499084>
29. Gupta, N. (2020). Rationalizing gender inequality at scientific research organizations: A reproduction of the Indian socio-cultural context. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal*, 39(6), 689-706. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-09-2018-0168>
30. Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
31. Hamdallah, M. E. (2012). Corporate governance and credibility gap: Empirical evidence from Jordan. *International Business Research*, 5(11), 178. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v5n11p178>
32. Hartman, R. L., & Barber, E. G. (2020). Women in the workforce: The effect of gender on occupational self-efficacy, work engagement and career aspirations. *Gender in Management*, 35(1), 92-118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-04-2019-0062>
33. Humphreys, S., Dunne, M., Durrani, N., Sankey, S., & Kaibo, J. (2020). Becoming a teacher: Experiences of female trainees in initial teacher education in Nigeria. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 87, 102957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102957>
34. İncikabi, L., & Ulusoy, F. (2019). Gender bias and stereotypes in Australian, Singaporean and Turkish mathematics textbooks. *Turkish Journal of Education*, 8(4), 298-317. <https://doi.org/10.19128/turje.581802>
35. Jennings, J. E., & McDougald, M. S. (2007). Work-family interface experiences and coping strategies: Implications for entrepreneurship research and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 747-760. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.25275510>
36. Kang, J., Hense, J., Scheersoi, A., & Keinonen, T. (2019). Gender study on the relationships between science interest and future career perspectives. *International Journal of Science Education*, 41(1), 80-101. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1534021>
37. Karimi, S., Biemans, H. J. A., Lans, T., Chizari, M., & Mulder, M. (2014). Effects of role models and gender on students' entrepreneurial intentions. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 38(8), 694-727. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJTD-03-2013-0036>
38. Keng, S.-H. (2020). Gender bias and statistical discrimination against female instructors in student evaluations of teaching. *Labour Economics*, 66, 101889. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.labeco.2020.101889>
39. Kiliç, M. E., Kiliç, M., & Akan, D. (2021). Motivation in the classroom. *Participatory Educational Research*, 8(2), 31-56. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.21.28.8.2>
40. Kuvaas, B., Buch, R., Weibel, A., Dysvik, A., & Nerstad, C. G. L. (2017). Do intrinsic and extrinsic motivation relate differently to employee outcomes? *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 61, 244-258. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2017.05.004>
41. Le Feuvre, N. (2009). Exploring women's academic careers in cross-national perspective: Lessons for equal opportunity policies. *Equal Opportunities International*, 28(1), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02610150910933604>
42. Leicht, C., de Moura, G. R., & Crisp, R. J. (2014). Contesting gender stereotypes stimulates generalized fairness in the selection of leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(5), 1025-1039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.05.001>
43. Liu, T., & Li, M. (2020). Performing femininity: Women at the top (doing and undoing gender). *Tourism Management*, 80, 104130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104130>
44. Ma, A., Axt, J., & Kay, A. C. (2019). A control-based account of stereotyping. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 84, 103819. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2019.103819>
45. Mahajan, R. (2020). Sustainability of Indian management education institutions: Perspectives from leaders in academia. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 21(3), 613-626. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-02-2019-0093>
46. Martino, W., Mills, M., & Lingard, B. (2005). Interrogating single-sex classes as a strategy for addressing boys' educational and social needs. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 237-254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117843>
47. Mendenhall, E., & Singer, M. (2019). The global syndemic of obesity, undernutrition, and climate change. *The Lancet*, 393(10173), 741. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(19\)30310-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30310-1)

48. Mendonça, J., & Reis, A. (2020). Exploring the mechanisms of gender effects in user innovation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 155, 119988. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.119988>
49. Mousa, M., Massoud, H. K., & Ayoubi, R. M. (2020). Gender, diversity management perceptions, workplace happiness and organisational citizenship behaviour. *Employee Relations*, 42(6), 1249–1269. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-10-2019-0385>
50. Nielsen, V. L., & Madsen, M. B. (2019). Gender diversity and management aspirations in public sector workplaces in Denmark. *Gender in Management*, 34(6), 465–488. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-06-2018-0063>
51. Oga-Baldwin, W. L. Q., & Fryer, L. K. (2020). Girls show better quality motivation to learn languages than boys: Latent profiles and their gender differences. *Heliyon*, 6(5), 04054. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04054>
52. Palmén, R., Arroyo, L., Müller, J., Reidl, S., Caprile, M., & Unger, M. (2020). Integrating the gender dimension in teaching, research content & knowledge and technology transfer: Validating the EFFORTI evaluation framework through three case studies in Europe. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 79, 101751. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2019.101751>
53. Park, S. (2020). Seeking changes in ivory towers: The impact of gender quotas on female academics in higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 79, 102346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2020.102346>
54. Peter, K., & Horn, L. (2005). *Gender differences in participation and completion of undergraduate education and how they have changed over time* (Statistical analysis report of National center for education Statistics). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005169.pdf>
55. Punyanunt-Carter, N., & Carter, S. L. (2015). Students' gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Higher Learning Research Communications*, 5(3), 28–37. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.234>
56. Quintana-García, C., & Benavides-Velasco, C. A. (2016). Gender diversity in top management teams and innovation capabilities: The initial public offerings of biotechnology firms. *Long Range Planning*, 49(4), 507–518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2015.08.005>
57. Rahim, I. H. A., & Mukhtar, D. (2021). Perception of students on entrepreneurship education. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 12(1), 94–102. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Iklima_Husna_Abdul_Rahim/publication/352374212_Perception_of_Students_on_Entrepreneurship_Education/links/60c732e04585157774d764b4/Perception-of-Students-on-Entrepreneurship-Education.pdf
58. Ramohai, J. (2019). Women in senior management positions at South African universities. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 34(3), 217–232. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-10-2017-0138>
59. Ratten, V., & Jones, P. (2021). Entrepreneurship and management education: Exploring trends and gaps. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), 100431. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100431>
60. Riley, P. (2010). *Attachment theory and the teacher-student relationship: A practical guide for teachers, teacher educators and school leaders*. London, UK: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203845783>
61. Roberto, F., Rey, A., Maglio, R., & Agliata, F. (2020). The academic “glass-ceiling”: Investigating the increase of female academics in Italy. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 28(5), 1031–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-06-2019-1779>
62. Romero-Hall, E., Aldemir, T., Colorado-Resca, J., Dickson-Deane, C., Watson, G. S., & Sadaf, A. (2018). Undisclosed stories of instructional design female scholars in academia. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 71, 19–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2018.09.004>
63. Roorda, D. L., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher-student relationships on students' school engagement and achievement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 493–529. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793>
64. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
65. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. <https://doi.org/10.1521/978.14625/28806>
66. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
67. Sadowski, I., & Zawistowska, A. (2020). The net effect of ability tilt in gendered STEM-related choices. *Intelligence*, 80, 101439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intell.2020.101439>
68. Saeed, S., & Zyngier, D. (2012). How motivation influences student engagement: A qualitative case study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 1(2), 252–267. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v1n2p252>
69. Sağlamer, G., Tan, M. G., Çebi, P. D., Çağlayan, H., Gümüşoğlu, N. K., Poyraz, B., ... Kahraman, S. Ö. (2018). Gendered patterns of higher education in Turkey: Advances and challenges. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 66, 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2017.11.002>
70. Salinas, P. C., & Bagni, C. (2017). Gender equality from a European perspective: Myth and reality. *Neuron*, 96(4), 721–729. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2017.10.002>
71. Sarpong, J. (2016). *Analyzing research dynamics at the University of Ghana: A case study of the Department of Economics and the Department of Physics* (Master's thesis, University of Oslo). Retrieved from <https://www.duo.uio.no/bitstream/handle/10852/54543/1/JOSHUA-SARPONG-S-MASTER-S-THESIS.pdf>
72. Smith, C. R. (1997). Gender issues in management education: A new teaching resource. *Women in Management Review*, 12(3), 100–104. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09649429710171136>
73. Smith, J. (2015). Gendered trends in student teachers' professional aspirations. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 43(6), 861–882. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214543200>
74. Solanki, S. M., & Xu, D. (2018). Looking beyond academic performance: The influence of instructor gender on student motivation in STEM fields. *American Educational Research Journal*, 55(4), 801–835. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831218759034>
75. Srouji, A. F., Abed, S. R., & Hamdallah, M. E. (2019). Banks performance and customers' satisfaction in relation to corporate social responsibility: Mediating customer trust and spiritual leadership: What counts! *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 19(3), 358–384. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJBIR.2019.100327>
76. Staffansson Pauli, K., Kristoferson, C. W., & Stevenson, A. (2020). “Gender” and “innovation” in facility management: Do they matter? *Property Management*, 38(2), 296–310. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PM-09-2018-0052>

77. Striebing, C., Schmidt, E. K., Palmén, R., Holzinger, F., & Nagy, B. (2020). Women underrepresentation in R&I: A sector program assessment of the contribution of gender equality policies in research and innovation. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 79, 101749. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2019.101749>
78. Strohmeyer, R., Tonoyan, V., & Jennings, J. E. (2017). Jacks-(and Jills)-of-all-trades: On whether, how and why gender influences firm innovativeness. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 32(5), 498-518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2017.07.001>
79. Tarver, E. (2020, July 15). *11 types of motivation: What they are & how to use them 2020*. Retrieved from <https://www.evantarver.com/types-of-motivation/>
80. Tasgin, A., & Coskun, G. (2018). The relationship between academic motivations and university students' attitudes towards learning. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(4), 935-950. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11459a>
81. Tindall, N. T. J., & Waters, R. D. (2017). Does gender and professional experience influence students' perceptions of professors? *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 72(1), 52-67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077695815613932>
82. Vansteenkiste, M., Lens, W., & Deci, E. L. (2006). Intrinsic versus extrinsic goal contents in self-determination theory: Another look at the quality of academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 41(1), 19-31. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4101_4
83. Vansteenkiste, M., Sierens, E., Soenens, B., Luyckx, K., & Lens, W. (2009). Motivational profiles from a self-determination perspective: The quality of motivation matters. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 671-688. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015083>
84. Varughese, Z. J. (2017). *The influence of teacher gender on college student motivation and engagement in an online environment* (Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University). Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2562&context=doctoral&httpsredir=1&referer=>
85. Walker, M. (2018). Aspirations and equality in higher education: Gender in a South African University. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 48(1), 123-139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2016.1254159>
86. Wellalage, N. H., Fernandez, V., & Thrikawala, S. (2020). Corruption and innovation in private firms: Does gender matter? *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 70, 101500. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2020.101500>
87. White, C., Louis, B., Joyner, P., Townsend-Howell, D., Simmons-Yon, A., & Griffin, L. (2014). Pursuing a career in academia: Perceptions of pharmacists and student pharmacists. *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 6(3), 449-454. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2014.02.012>
88. Wilson, F., Kickul, J., & Marlino, D. (2007). Gender, entrepreneurial self-efficacy, and entrepreneurial career intentions: Implications for entrepreneurship education. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 387-406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00179.x>
89. Xie, L., Zhou, J., Zong, Q., & Lu, Q. (2020). Gender diversity in R&D teams and innovation efficiency: Role of the innovation context. *Research Policy*, 49(1), 103885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.103885>
90. Yarborough, C. B., & Fedesco, H. N. (2020). Motivating students. *Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching*. Retrieved from <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/motivating-students/>
91. Yordanova D. I., & Tarrazon, M.-A. (2010). Gender differences in entrepreneurial intentions. Evidence from Bulgaria. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15(3), 245-261. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1084946710001543>
92. Zaccone, M. C., & Pedrini, M. (2019). The effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on students learning effectiveness. Exploring the moderating role of gender. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(6), 1381-1394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2019-0099>