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Abstract
Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to shed light on traditionally important determinants (demographics, peoples’ perceptions, and environmental characteristics) of entrepreneurial engagement in the post-socialist region of the European Union (EU).

Design/methodology/approach – A rich data set obtained from the Flash Eurobarometer Survey on Entrepreneurship 2007 is used, while a binomial probit regression model is employed.

Findings – Gender, mother’s occupation, unemployment, and economic growth are reported as significant determinants of entrepreneurship. The econometric results also suggest that lack of financial resources, individual’s risk aversion, a large number of start-up procedures, and increased tax rates are all positively, rather than negatively related to entrepreneurial engagement.

Research limitations/implications – It is suggested that the recent structural changes that have occurred in the examined region, as well as the transition process under which the examined countries operate have influenced the attitude of individuals towards entrepreneurial engagement.

Originality/value – The study provides useful information in relation to the attitude of a post-socialist society towards structural issues which have possibly impeded its engagement to entrepreneurship. Both the geographic area (post-socialist European countries) and the time the data were collected (i.e. three years after the examined countries’ accession to the EU) can be perceived as factors of great interest for both policy makers and entrepreneurs.
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Introduction
A plethora of research studies, policy reports, and scientific articles dedicated to entrepreneurship have been published over the last 30 years, where a phenomenal shift from managed to entrepreneurial economy has also been observed (Audretsch and Thurik, 2001a). Apart from that, nowadays economic growth does not merely originate from industrialised multinational corporations, but also from innovative and knowledge-based small and medium enterprises (SMEs). Indeed, during the past decades, heavy industrialisation used to be the hub of global economic prosperity and growth. Nowadays, it could be supported that entrepreneurial engagement is one of the most influential determinants of both economic development and employment.
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Many research studies have been conducted from multiple perspectives and based on various geographic locations in regard to determinants of entrepreneurship. As concerns developed economies, such as the USA (Verheul et al., 2002), France (Henriquez et al., 2002), Germany (Tamásy, 2006), the UK (Parker, 2004), Japan (Masuda, 2006), and Hong Kong (Fu-Lai Yu, 2000), several studies have been conducted and reveal intriguing findings associated with determinants of entrepreneurial engagement. Furthermore, other research works have examined the same topic, with the difference that a cross-country comparison analysis was conducted (Audretsch et al., 2002; Freytag and Thurik, 2007; Grilo and Thurik, 2006; van der Zwan et al., 2010). The findings from the aforementioned studies indicate that cultural, political, and demographic differences occur among countries and reveal that each country has a unique viewpoint towards entrepreneurial engagement. This belief is even greater for transition countries, since substantial changes in their political and economic scene have emerged during the last two decades (Knaack and Jager, 2003). In reality, the fact that transition economies have attracted research attention only over the last 15 years cannot be characterised as paradoxical. Their recent accession to the European Union (EU) in 2004, the relatively recent change in their political scene, and the move from a socialistic to a capitalistic economy during the 1990s, indicate why this particular region has attracted the interest of global research nowadays.

In general, it is argued that, in transition countries, severe problems exist mainly due to government imperfections (Bartlett and Bukvic, 2001; Enste, 2003; Schleifer and Vishny, 1993), financial deficiencies (Aidis, 2005; Pissarides et al., 2003), and lack of efficient business support (Djankov et al., 2002; Smallbone and Piasecki, 1995). These facts can be further illustrated by considering the distinguishing work on this topic, which is conducted by Smallbone and Welter (2001). The authors come across substantial findings regarding the negative impact of the unstable business environment, informal networks, bureaucracy, and individuals’ pessimistic attitudes towards entrepreneurship in Southeast European (SEE) economies.

Although numerous research studies have been conducted with respect to determinants of entrepreneurship in transition economies, there are several reasons motivating this study to proceed to further examination. First, while a great range of research work has concentrated its interest on transition economies of Europe, the vast majority of it has been conducted during the past century, and/or at the beginning of the previous decade, where not many structural and institutional changes had been implemented. Second, due to the nature of the topic, as well as the important role that personal traits play in explaining the determinants of entrepreneurial activity, time series, and panel data analyses are almost infeasible to conduct in order to give more precise information regarding the time trend towards entrepreneurship in such a constantly changing environment. For this reason, updated cross-section data analysis is the most effective method for examining this sort of research question.

This study is based on Flash Eurobarometer Survey on Entrepreneurship data, while it is enriched with country-level data. The paper is structured as follows. The next section reviews the existing literature. A detailed analysis in regard to the design of the empirical study, including data specification and measurement methods, is developed in the third section. This is followed by a section reporting on the estimated results from the econometric analysis. Finally, this study is concluded by presenting both findings and policy implications, while presenting possible limitations.
Literature review

Despite the fact that the concepts of entrepreneurship and self-employment are not considered as identically equal, the vast majority of research work that has been conducted in the past has equated them (Parker, 2004). In reality, since most empirical studies concentrate their work on explaining the behavioural choice between paid- and self-employment, it can be supported that such an equation reasonably exists. Accordingly, this research perceives entrepreneurship and self-employment as equal, although not identical notions. Under this section, I will review the related literature on three important elements of entrepreneurial engagement. First, traditionally important demographic characteristics. Second, peoples’ perceptions and environmental impediments of entrepreneurial activity. Finally, acknowledging the positive relationship between entrepreneurship and the level of economic growth and employment (Audretsch and Thurik, 2001b), the literature will also review the two latter factors and their impact on entrepreneurial engagement.

Demographic characteristics

Gender. For entrepreneurship, gender has always been considered as one of its most influential determinants (Mathews and Moser, 1995). Especially for transition countries, where entrepreneurial engagement was in many occasions considered as a blockbuster occupational orientation, women were even more unlikely to get involved with new business venturing. This is also depicted in the work of Aidis et al. (2007), who conclude that there are still inheritances from the Soviet past, which are liable for some inequalities between genders as regards their activity with entrepreneurship. Recent empirical studies (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011; Krasniqi, 2009) which focus on transition economies stress that males are more likely to get involved with entrepreneurship compared to their female counterparts.

Age. Age is a factor of crucial importance for someone who is interested in engaging in entrepreneurship. Individuals who are keener to start up a new venture are usually younger, since they acquire energy, enthusiasm, entrepreneurial education, and other skills, which are all related with the newly introduced notion of “knowledge-based economy”. It is not surprising that two recent studies conducted in transition economies (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011; Krasniqi, 2009) find that the propensity of being older has a negative effect on entrepreneurial engagement. On the other hand, entrepreneurial activity requires that someone is able to adequately finance his/her own business venture. Possible absence of financial aid, subsidies, and other fiscal policies may negatively affect the possibility that a younger individual will be able to engage in entrepreneurship.

Education. The level of education of human capital in transition countries determines, up to a certain point, the level of entrepreneurial orientation of each individual (Estrin and Mickiewicz, 2011; Glas and Petrin, 1998). Furthermore, entrepreneurial engagement can be even greater when educational institutions focus on providing specialised learning dedicated to entrepreneurship. Peterman and Kennedy (2003), through their research study, find that students completing an enterprise programme revealed significantly higher perception of both desirability and feasibility of being engaged in entrepreneurship. On the other hand, high levels of education have the ability to foster individuals to wage employment, since the knowledge-based market strivess to absorb the most intelligent and well-educated human capital. Evidence from developing countries indicates that highly educated individuals normally prefer paid employment rather than self-employment (van der Sluis et al., 2005).
Parents’ occupation. Individuals whose parents are/were entrepreneurs are much more likely to become entrepreneurs (Stam et al., 2010). Indeed, considering the level of family business ownership in a worldwide scale, it is not deceitful to say that parental occupation is a rather strong and positive determinant of an individual’s entrepreneurial orientation. From a genetic point of view, a recent study on genetics and entrepreneurial orientation from Nicolaou et al. (2008) indicates that it is of vital importance for people to start considering genetic aspects as explanatory determinants on why people engage in entrepreneurship. Similarly, a study from Aldrich and Kim (2007) reveals robust effects on entrepreneurial engagement sourcing from genetic inheritances and parenting practice during childhood.

Urbanisation. Regarding transition economies, there is evidence that individuals who live in urban or metropolitan areas are more likely to engage in entrepreneurship compared to their counterparts who live in rural areas (Krasniqi, 2009). While urban areas benefit from relatively better educational quality, they also have to cope with other, equally important environmental problems (Pennings, 1982). In urban areas, where clusters are more strongly tied, knowledge transfer can be disseminated more frequently and efficiently, leading to knowledge-intensive venture creations. On the other hand, in rural areas people are more prone to engage in farming activities or other craft-based professions, which in reality increase the level of self-employment.

Environmental characteristics

Availability of financial resources. Access to financial resources is one of the most decisive problems that upcoming, young, and unsuccessful entrepreneurs face in the early stages of their careers. As Pinto (2005) points out, transition economies are characterised by a significantly low-level financial service sector and higher risk aversion by commercial banks. As it can be interpreted, these two issues completely contradict the interests of an entrepreneur. In addition, Pissarides (1999) demonstrates that even in the most advanced countries of the region, such as Poland, the Czech Republic, and Hungary, the major problem is the lack of long-term resources essential for business development. Furthermore, general macroeconomic circumstances and economic uncertainties, such as high credit costs, high bank charges, as well as an increasing level of interest rates resulted in a continuing number of banking crises in the SEE region. A related example is provided by the research study of Bitzenis and Nito (2005) who find that entrepreneurs in Albania rarely receive bank loans in order to finance their ventures, since bureaucratic and complex procedures force them to other financing methods.

Administrative complexities. Grey and informal economy is considered as one of the most imperative determinants of entrepreneurial inefficiency in the SEE region (Aidis, 2005). This inefficiency, as a rule, is produced by well-established and politically connected business owners through rent-seeking and lobbying activities. As Bartlett and Bukvic (2001) and Ovaska and Sobel (2005) indicate, larger firms are usually in a more privileged position than SMEs, and they engage in influencing activities through a fraudulent political environment. Schleifer and Vishny (1993) take this argument further by explaining that the adoption of techniques such as bribery and corruption comes from the cultural heritage of communist dregs in the past. In the same way, as supported by the recent work of Griffiths et al. (2009), the entrepreneurial intentions of a country are lessened because of high levels of corruption. Furthermore, Saar and Unt (2008) conducting research in Estonia find that no adequate direct support measures for the development of SMEs exist, while the government is characterised as “one with limited intervention”.

On the other hand, corruption can be an informal facilitator against bureaucracy and complex administration schemes, particularly in countries with poor financial resources and without control over their public administration (Dreher and Gassebner, 2007). Under a complex bureaucratic system individuals and firms learn how to be more flexible and creative. Accordingly, they become capable of adapting their needs to the existing system. In association to the previous argument, Hashi and Krasniqi (2011) researching entrepreneurship and small business growth in the transitional part of Europe, find that corruption is positively associated with the growth of entrepreneurship. Consequently, it can be assumed that both entrepreneurs and public policy employees act in some way illegally, and in many cases, follow methods such as bribing. This has often been proved an effective method, as it overcomes the complex procedures and the bureaucratic attitude of public policy instruments; however, such behaviour cannot be perceived as ethical.

**Inefficient business environment.** As supported by Djankov et al. (2002), legal entry into the business sector still remains a remarkably bureaucratic, difficult, time-consuming, and costly procedure in most countries of the world. In particular, in transition economies, regulation of entry seems to be both restricted and costly for entrepreneurs. Djankov et al. (2002) argue that more strict entry regulation is also related to a greater degree of corruption. Likewise, Pinto (2005) argues that the presence of an informal economy is of major concern in the SEE region, as it weakens public revenues and destabilises public services’ performance. As a consequence, this raises doubts and disbeliefs for most entrepreneurs towards the government and public services, as the latter is not able to support private business development (Smallbone and Piasecki, 1995). Additionally, other empirical studies conducted in transition economies also highlight the negative effect of insufficient business environment on entrepreneurship growth (Chîlosi, 2001; Krasniqi, 2007). Another crucial element for the efficient operation of the overall business environment and entrepreneurial culture is the level and effectiveness of the country’s legal structure. Estrin et al. (2006) argue that a strong legal system is perceived as a facilitator of entrepreneurship, since it sends a positive message that successful reforms have taken place.

**Risk aversion.** Transition economies have faced deep political, economic, and institutional reforms during the last two decades, leading people to a more idiosyncratic way of thinking and acting in this particular region. One of the most severe issues people have to confront is their own attitude towards entrepreneurship, as well as the level of risk associated with each new venture. Roberts et al. (2000) argue that many business owners in transition countries concentrate more on interim get-rich-quick business tactics rather than on long-standing business growth. From the same perspective, it can be illustrated why many entrepreneurs are both employed in the public sector and at the same time run their own business on a part-time basis. In accordance, many people may be risk averse towards self-employment, or may have a negative attitude towards people who have failed in a past entrepreneurial attempt. Various recent studies (Caliendo et al., 2009; Cramer et al., 2002; Dohmen et al., 2011) have observed that possible engagement in entrepreneurship is, in many cases, deterred by individuals’ attitude towards risk; that is, people with lower degrees of risk aversion are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Grilo and Thurik (2006) have recently studied the impact of risk attitude on entrepreneurship and find that people living in transition economies are more irresolute and risk averse in relation to their counterparts living in the “old” Europe, while they highlight that risk tolerance in transition economies has greater influence on both latent and actual entrepreneurship than in market economies.
Unemployment and economic growth. Entrepreneurship is related to both economic growth and employment generation (Audretsch and Thurik, 2001b; Thurik et al., 2008; Wennekers and Thurik, 1999). Also, economic growth yields prosperity, financial stability, market liquidity, and many business opportunities. Evidence from transition countries highlights the positive relationship between economic growth (and/or income increase) and entrepreneurial engagement (Belitski and Korosteleva, 2011; Earle and Sakova, 1999; Estrin et al., 2006). On the other hand, economic growth is related to job creation and inward investments, a fact that can lead individuals to paid employment rather than self-employment. Furthermore, there is no clear view in regard to the relationship between entrepreneurship and unemployment. The seminal study by Thurik et al. (2008) stresses that unemployment can have both a positive (refugee effect) and negative (Schumpeter effect) impact on entrepreneurship.

In order to better illustrate the views (and expectations) regarding the aforementioned literature review, Table I presents the expected outcomes of the determinants of entrepreneurship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Short definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Formation</th>
<th>Expected sign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male = 1, Female = 0</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Age of respondent</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial education each respondent has received at school</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father's occupation entrepreneur = 1, otherwise = 0</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>Mother's occupation entrepreneur = 1, otherwise = 0</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Urban/metropolitan zone = 1, rural zone = 0</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Binomial</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>Percentage of unemployed people among the total labor force of the country</td>
<td>WDI (world bank indicators)</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln GDP Per Capita</td>
<td>Logarithm of gross domestic product per capita</td>
<td>WDI (world bank indicators)</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Lack</td>
<td>It is difficult to start one's own business due to lack of available financial support</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Likert (1-4)</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>It is difficult to start one's own business due to complex administrative procedures</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Likert (1-4)</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup Procedures</td>
<td>Procedures required to start a business</td>
<td>WDI (world bank indicators)</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+/−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient Business Environment</td>
<td>It is difficult to start one's own business due to difficulty in obtaining relevant information</td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Likert (1-4)</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>Amount of taxes and mandatory contributions payable by businesses</td>
<td>WDI (world bank indicators)</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal_Rights</td>
<td>The degree to which collateral and bankruptcy laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders and thus facilitate lending</td>
<td>WDI (world bank indicators)</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I. Variables’ description
entrepreneurial engagement. Further, it introduces the variables’ sources and operationalisation and provides short definitions.

**Empirical study**

**Data**

The data used in this study is obtained from the Flash Eurobarometer Survey on Entrepreneurship, No. 192, which was conducted by The Gallup Organisation Hungary/Europe upon the request of the European Commission. The interviews were conducted in January 2007, while the survey was organised and managed by the Eurobarometer Team of the European Commission (Directorate-General of Communication). Although the survey is conducted in 28 countries, the data in this study are limited to eight transition economies of the EU, namely Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic, and Slovenia, while the initial sample is based on a total of 5,501 observations[1]. Table II reports on the characteristics of each country of the sample. More precisely, information regarding the number of employed and self-employed individuals of the sample is presented, while a ratio reporting the level of self-employment in each country is also revealed. The descriptive statistics show that Slovenia and Slovak Republic have the lowest rates of self-employment, while Czech Republic and Poland have the greatest.

**Data specification and measures**

Regarding the dependent variable, this takes the value “0” when the respondent answered that she/he is a paid employee and the value “1” when the respondent answered that she/he is self-employed[2]. Accordingly, the dependent variable is named **Entrepreneur**. The next step involves the determination of the explanatory variables. In total, 15 variables are used. These variables, according to their context, can be divided into the following three categories.

**Socio-demographic variables**

*Gender.* This is a dichotomous variable and the values are coded with “0” and “1” if the respondent is female or male, respectively.

*Age.* This is a continuous variable referring to the age of the respondent at the time this survey took place.

*Education.* This continuous variable is a product of three categorical-Likert variables. Precisely, three questions which are related to the entrepreneurial education each respondent has received at school are used (see Table III). Accordingly a factor analysis was conducted and revealed that these three variables can jointly be used as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Self-employed</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% ratio self-employed/employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>1,009</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak Republic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>5,062</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table II.* Share of self-employment per country
a proxy of entrepreneurial education. The mean of the sum of the above three answers is calculated in order to construct this variable.

Father. This is a dichotomous variable taking the value “1” if the respondent’s father was self-employed, and the value “0” otherwise.

Mother. This is also a dichotomous variable taking the value “1” if the respondent’s mother was self-employed, and the value “0” otherwise.

Urban. This measure is in a dichotomous formation and it takes the value “1” if the respondent answers that she/he lives in a metropolitan/urban zone, and the value “0” if she/he lives in a rural area.

Perception variables
The questions used for these variables ask the interviewees to choose among four different levels of agreement (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree) for a number of different statements. For the purpose of this study, a number of particular statements are chosen accordingly. More specifically, from the statement “it is difficult to start one’s own business due to lack of available financial support”, the variable financial lack is created. In the same manner, regarding two statements declaring difficulty in starting a business, given complex administrative procedures and difficulty in obtaining relevant information, the variables administrative complexities and inefficient business environment are created, respectively. Finally, the variable risk aversion is created from a statement asking whether a respondent should not start her/his own business when risk of failure is high. This means that a respondent who, for example, agrees with this statement can be characterised as risk averse. These four variables are in a Likert-type formation taking the value “1” if the respondent strongly disagrees with the question and the value “4” if she/he strongly agrees with it.

Country-level variables
Gross domestic product per capita (GDPPC). This is a valuable indicator measuring the growth inequalities among the examined countries. A logarithmic transformation is made for this particular variable. Data correspond to the year 2007 and are estimated in US dollars.

Unemployment rate. This factor is in many cases related to necessity entrepreneurship. This variable is calculated as the percentage of unemployed people among the total labour force of the country.

Start-up procedures. An efficient measure for observing the level of bureaucracy in each country is the number of start-up procedures an entrepreneur has to deal with. Start-up procedures are defined as those required to start a business, including interactions to obtain necessary permits and licenses and to complete all inscriptions, verifications, and notifications to start operations. This measure is in a count formation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My school education</th>
<th>Rotated factor loadings</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Helped me to develop my sense of initiative</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Helped me to better understand the role of</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entrepreneurs in society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Made me interested to become an entrepreneur</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total tax rate. This variable acts as a supplementary measure of the efficiency of the business environment. Regarding the operationalisation of this variable, total tax rate measures the amount of taxes and mandatory contributions payable by businesses after accounting for allowable deductions and exemptions as a share of commercial profits and is calculated as the percentage of tax corresponding to commercial profits.

Legal rights. This variable measures the degree to which collateral and bankruptcy laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders and thus facilitate lending. The variable is in a scale formation and the index ranges from “0” to “10”, with higher scores indicating that these laws are better designed to expand access to credit.

Table IV presents the descriptive statistics of all the examined variables.

Methodology
The dichotomous formation of the dependent variable leads to the assumption that a binomial probit regression model is the most efficient to be used. In case of a dichotomous dependent variable, the selection of a linear model for estimating the effects of the explanatory variables would cause problems. In order to overcome such problems I use a class of binary choice models which are designed appropriately in order to model the choice among two discrete alternatives (Verbeek, 2006). The dichotomous dependent variable Entrepreneur (Y) is used for the estimation of the probit model. The variable takes two possible outcomes, either the value “1” if the respondent is self-employed, or the value “0” if the respondent is employed. Apart from the dependent variable, there is a vector of regressors X which are assumed to have an impact on dependent variable Y. In general terms the model is formatted as:

\[ Pr(Y = 1|X) = G(X', \beta) \]

where Pr is the probability of dependent variable Y depending on vector X, G is the cumulative distribution function (CDF), and \( \beta \)s are the parameters which are estimated using maximum likelihood estimation.

In order to examine the impact of each factor separately, I run a stepwise regression model. Model 1 (basic model) estimates the probability that someone is an entrepreneur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneur</td>
<td>5,501</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>49.22</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4,859</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>5,225</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>5,549</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Lack</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient Business Environment</td>
<td>4,795</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Aversion</td>
<td>5,170</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.20</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup Procedures</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln GDP Per Capita</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal_Rights</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV. Summary statistics
based on the demographic (control) variables of this research, namely Gender, Age, Education, Father, Mother, and Urban, as well as on two country-level characteristics (GDPPC and Unemployment). Likewise, the next models are also estimated via a stepwise method using the appropriate variable(s) for each step. In the final model I use robust standard errors in order to estimate the coefficients. This means that, in order to control for correlation among observations within each of the examined countries, I need to cluster the standard errors. Especially when handling data sets with unequal observations across groups (countries), a standard robust estimator of variance will enable me to relax the assumption of independence. According to this technique, the standard errors are reported more efficiently, while at the same time the values of the coefficients are not affected. The full model is structured as follows:

\[
\text{Entrepreneur}_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Gender}_i + \beta_2 \text{Age}_i + \beta_3 \text{Education}_i + \beta_4 \text{Father}_i + \beta_5 \text{Mother}_i + \beta_6 \text{Urban}_i + \beta_7 \ln \text{GDPPC}_i + \beta_8 \text{Unemployment}_i + \beta_9 \text{Financial lack}_i + \beta_{10} \text{Administrative complexities}_i + \beta_{11} \text{Start-up procedures}_i + \beta_{12} \text{Inefficient business environment}_i + \beta_{13} \text{Total tax rate}_i + \beta_{14} \text{Legal rights}_i + \beta_{15} \text{Risk Aversion}_i + \varepsilon_i
\]

**Findings**

One of the most frequent problems faced in regression analyses, especially when a large number of dichotomous variables are used, is the presence of multicollinearity (Hair et al., 1998). In first order, multicollinearity can be identified through the correlation matrix, where variables can be highly, but imperfectly, correlated (Greene, 2003). In this case, after examining the correlation matrix, no serious presence of correlation of 0.80 or above is found. However, in order to further support my previous assumption, I also estimate the variance inflation factors for each coefficient. These range from 1.01 to 1.78, thus no significant multicollinearity exists in the estimated model.

Looking at the estimates presented in Table V it can be supported that the probability of being an entrepreneur is vastly related to the gender of the individual, and more precisely with the probability that the respondent is a man. It can be assumed that this finding is quite expected considering the previous empirical work which suggests that gender (i.e. being a man) indeed plays a crucial role regarding entrepreneurial activity of individuals (Roper and Scott, 2009; Verheul and Thurik, 2001).

Regarding the impact of age and education on entrepreneurship, the results are rather mixed. As far as the first two models are concerned, the sign indicates a slightly negative and significant impact of age and education on the likelihood that someone is an entrepreneur. With the incorporation of the additional determinants in the model, the impact of these two variables turns out to be insignificant, implying that neither of these two demographic characteristics has a considerable impact on the likelihood that an individual will be an entrepreneur. Regarding the remaining demographic characteristics (Father and Urban), there is evidence that neither of them can be considered as important for influencing the examined dependent variable. However, as regards the variable Mother, when the robust standard errors model is estimated, this variable turned out to be a positive and significant determinant of entrepreneurship.

Concerning the examined country-level control variables, GDPPC and Unemployment, these are found to have a negative and significant effect on entrepreneurial engagement.
### Table V.

Binomial probit estimates (dependent variable: entrepreneur = 1, otherwise = 0)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Model 1 (control variables)</th>
<th>Model 2 (Model 1 + financial lack)</th>
<th>Model 3 (Model 2 + bureaucracy)</th>
<th>Model 4 (Model 3 + business environment)</th>
<th>Model 5 (Model 4 + risk aversion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.413 (0.055)***</td>
<td>0.384 (0.059)***</td>
<td>0.384 (0.059)***</td>
<td>0.384 (0.059)***</td>
<td>0.346 (0.060)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.017 (0.009)***</td>
<td>0.017 (0.009)***</td>
<td>0.017 (0.009)***</td>
<td>0.017 (0.009)***</td>
<td>0.016 (0.009)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.001)***</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.009 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.001)***</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.011 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.011 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.011 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.011 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.011 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.011 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>0.008 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.008 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.008 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.008 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.008 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln GDP Per Capita</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Lack</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)***</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Startup Procedures</td>
<td>0.005 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.005 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.005 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.005 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.005 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient Business</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Rights</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.006 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Aversion</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)***</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model fit statistics

- Log Likelihood: 1,247.06, 1,172.93, 1,138.00, 1,090.96, 1,058.29
- LR $\chi^2$: 89.24***, 86.52***, 88.25***, 90.24***, 87.50***
- McFadden's pseudo $R^2$: 0.084, 0.085, 0.087, 0.087, 0.089
- $n$: 4,456, 4,090, 3,851, 3,569, 3,454

Notes: ***$p < 0.1$ per cent; **$p < 5$ per cent; *$p < 10$ per cent (SE in parentheses)

Impediments on the way to entrepreneurship
Concerning the first variable, GDPPC, its coefficient’s significantly negative sign implies that the greater the level of wealth and economic prosperity, the less likely is for an individual to engage in entrepreneurial activity. This finding is in line with De Backer and Sleuwaegen (2003) and Acs and Amorós (2008). Regarding the second country-level variable, it is observed that there is also a negative and significant relationship. This result indicates that the higher the level of unemployment, the less likely is for the individuals in the examined region to engage in entrepreneurship.

With regard to the remaining variables, the estimates are moderately diverse in terms of their impact on entrepreneurial engagement. First, Financial lack is found to have a significantly positive effect on the likelihood that an individual will become an entrepreneur. Concerning the complex administrative procedures, the estimates are not clear enough. First, while the perception variable Administrative complexities is reported as significantly positive in models 3 and 4, during the full model it turned out that there is no more significant effect on its relationship with the dependent variable. On the other hand, the country-level variable Startup procedures was found to be a significantly positive determinant of entrepreneurial engagement. As concerns the impact of business environment’s efficiency, the findings are rather mixed as well. The estimates for the perception variable Inefficient business environment provide no significant indication. Regarding the two country-level variables (Total tax rate and Legal rights), these are both positively and significantly related to Entrepreneur. First, Total tax rate is found to be a positive determinant of entrepreneurial activity. Second, according to the estimates the strength of legal rights act as a facilitator of entrepreneurial engagement, while this finding can be further supported by the existing literature (Éstrin et al., 2006). Finally, the last variable of the model’s estimation (Risk aversion) is found to have positive and significant effect on entrepreneurial activity.

Discussion
As concerns the demographic characteristics, it is suggested that men are more likely to get involved in self-employment compared to women. Furthermore, individuals whose mother was an entrepreneur in the past are more prone to engage in entrepreneurial activities. Interestingly, although past literature suggests that education, urbanisation, and age play a rather important role on the likelihood that someone will engage in entrepreneurship, no significant impact of these three characteristics on the examined dependent variable is found.

Intriguing results emerge from the incorporation of GDPPC and unemployment variables in the model. These two variables are found to have a significantly negative impact on entrepreneurship. It can be supported that high levels of GDP yield economic prosperity, which in reality has a more positive impact on creation of new jobs, rather than on entrepreneurial engagement. In other words, it could be implied that when the market demands more human capital in paid employment, there is an analogous negative effect regarding the supply of individuals towards self-employment (i.e. shift from self-employment to paid employment). Regarding unemployment, the findings suggest that a negative relationship exists between the level of unemployment and engagement in entrepreneurship. As was previously analysed, the existing literature has been quite diverse as concerns the relationship between these two measures. At this point, the author recalls the argument posed by Thurik et al. (2008) regarding the “refugee” and “Schumpeter” effects. First, the findings reveal that the “Schumpeter” effect may exist in the examined region, since
economic growth seems to have no positive effect on the level of entrepreneurial engagement, which possibly means that it has a positive effect on the level of new job creation. Second, the finding regarding the negative relationship between unemployment and entrepreneurship possibly indicates that the “refugee” effect does not take place in transition economies of the EU. A possible explanation for this outcome is that unemployment rates in this region are among the highest in the EU, and thus individuals are likely to have been used to deal with this particular difficulty following alternative, and in some cases unethical routes (e.g. grey economy, informal employment).

Some interesting results emerge from the econometric analysis regarding the environmental uncertainties and possible impediments hindering engagement to entrepreneurship. Interestingly, existence of financial lack, increasing numbers of start-up procedures, and higher tax rates are all positively related with entrepreneurial engagement. Although the existing literature has highlighted the immense negative impact of all these characteristics on self-employment (Smallbone and Welter, 2001), the findings reveal that individuals do not evaluate these parameters as of substantial importance as concerns their entrepreneurial endeavours. On the one hand, post-socialist countries have faced a recent political, economic, and social transition, while severe financial, administrative, and institutional impediments still exist. On the other hand, individuals who live, work, and operate in these regions have possibly developed creative, robust, and resistant mechanisms in order to deal with all possible problems discussed above. Furthermore, the results provide evidence that risk-averse individuals are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activities compared to risk lovers. Although high-risk attitude is one of the most influential characteristics concerning entrepreneurial engagement, on this occasion high risk towards entrepreneurial failure does not increase the likelihood of self-employment.

Conclusion
This study investigated the impact of demographic, environmental, and personal characteristics on the propensity that an individual based in a post-socialist economy of the EU will be engaged in entrepreneurship. Precisely, using individual-level data for eight transition countries of the EU, which are drawn from the 2007 Flash Eurobarometer Survey on Entrepreneurship, and supporting them with country-level data, it was examined how individuals who live in this particular area perceive environmental uncertainties, institutional inefficiencies, financial barriers, and administrative complexities in regard to their decision in engaging or not with entrepreneurship.

One of the main difficulties faced in this study concerns whether the sample of transition economies should be examined by focusing on each individual country or on the group of countries. The latter was chosen based on the assumption that, through this methodology, a region with high geographic and political proximities would be captured, while more accurate and robust statistic results would be provided, mainly given the large and (relatively) homogenous sample size. However, it should be kept in mind that merging the responses from eight different countries into one common group may sometimes result in inefficient outcomes, given that each country is not exactly homogenous to the other in terms of political, economic, and cultural aspects. Furthermore, the fact that the study lacks time series data is a further caveat that should be considered. However, in cross-section studies, where surveys measure individuals’ perceptions, possible incorporation of time series data is not always a straightforward process.
This study adds to our existing knowledge with regards to how entrepreneurial engagement is deterred or facilitated by important demographic, environmental, and personal characteristics. Considering that some of the countries of the sample are (to some extent) under the transition process, the impact of this research work can still be considered as important for both policy makers and individuals who are already engaged or wish to engage in entrepreneurship. While the vast majority of the extant studies provide evidence that administrative, financial, and business inefficiencies are the most influential factors impeding individuals' eagerness towards entrepreneurial engagement, this study's findings reveal that such problems are no more perceived, neither indicated as crucial barriers. Unquestionably, it would be naive to support that transition countries have managed to tackle all the aforementioned problems in such a short-time span. On the other hand, the results show that individuals in these countries have probably developed the appropriate self-capacity and experience to proceed more effectively towards entrepreneurial engagement, regardless the level of environmental difficulties surrounding them. The findings confirm that, in a continuously shifting environment, changes occur and in many occasions these are dramatically portrayed.

Notes
1. The initial population of the sample was 5,501 observations. Due to several explanatory variables' missing values, the sample was initially truncated to 4,456 observations (in Model 1), and finally to 3,454 observations (in Model 5).

2. All respondents who answered that they do not engage in a professional activity were treated as missing values.
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