



## Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development

Impediments on the way to entrepreneurship. Some new evidence from the EU's post-socialist world

K. Batsakis Georgios

### Article information:

To cite this document:

K. Batsakis Georgios , (2014), "Impediments on the way to entrepreneurship. Some new evidence from the EU's post-socialist world", Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, Vol. 21 Iss 3 pp. 385 - 402

Permanent link to this document:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-04-2014-0062>

Downloaded on: 18 August 2014, At: 03:53 (PT)

References: this document contains references to 64 other documents.

To copy this document: [permissions@emeraldinsight.com](mailto:permissions@emeraldinsight.com)

Access to this document was granted through an Emerald subscription provided by All users group

### For Authors

If you would like to write for this, or any other Emerald publication, then please use our Emerald for Authors service information about how to choose which publication to write for and submission guidelines are available for all. Please visit [www.emeraldinsight.com/authors](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/authors) for more information.

### About Emerald [www.emeraldinsight.com](http://www.emeraldinsight.com)

Emerald is a global publisher linking research and practice to the benefit of society. The company manages a portfolio of more than 290 journals and over 2,350 books and book series volumes, as well as providing an extensive range of online products and additional customer resources and services.

Emerald is both COUNTER 4 and TRANSFER compliant. The organization is a partner of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and also works with Portico and the LOCKSS initiative for digital archive preservation.

\*Related content and download information correct at time of download.



# Impediments on the way to entrepreneurship. Some new evidence from the EU's post-socialist world

Impediments  
on the way to  
entrepreneurship

385

Georgios K. Batsakis

*Kent Business School, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK*

## 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.

**Keywords** Transition economies, Entrepreneurship, European Union, Risk aversion, Bureaucracy

**Paper type** Research paper

## 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



The author would like to thank the editor and the referees for their helpful suggestions. The author is particularly indebted to Gael Terzopoulos for his support and valuable suggestions at the beginning of this research work. Special thanks are due to Peter van der Zwan and Sarah Drakopoulou Dodd for commenting on earlier versions of the paper. This study was partially developed when the author was studying at the Erasmus University Rotterdam. The views expressed here are those of the author and should not be attributed to the European Commission.

generation around the globe (Audretsch and Thurik, 2001b; Thurik *et al.*, 2008; Wennekers and Thurik, 1999).

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 strives 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 (Chilosi, 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

Variable	Short definition	Source	Formation	Expected sign
Gender	Male = 1, Female = 0	Survey	Binomial	+
Age	Age of respondent	Survey	Scale	+/-
Education	Entrepreneurial education each respondent has received at school	Survey	Scale	+/-
Father	Father's occupation entrepreneur = 1, otherwise = 0	Survey	Binomial	+
Mother	Mother's occupation entrepreneur = 1, otherwise = 0	Survey	Binomial	+
Urban	Urban/metropolitan zone = 1, rural zone = 0	Survey	Binomial	+/-
Unemployment	Percentage of unemployed people among the total labor force of the country	WDI (world bank indicators)	Scale	+/-
Ln GDP Per Capita	Logarithm of gross domestic product per capita	WDI (world bank indicators)	Scale	+/-
Financial Lack	It is difficult to start one's own business due to lack of available financial support	Survey	Likert (1-4)	-
Bureaucracy	It is difficult to start one's own business due to complex administrative procedures	Survey	Likert (1-4)	+/-
Startup Procedures	Procedures required to start a business	WDI (world bank indicators)	Scale	+/-
Inefficient Business Environment	It is difficult to start one's own business due to difficulty in obtaining relevant information	Survey	Likert (1-4)	-
Tax Rate	Amount of taxes and mandatory contributions payable by businesses	WDI (world bank indicators)	Scale	-
Legal_Rights	The degree to which collateral and bankruptcy laws protect the rights of borrowers and lenders and thus facilitate lending	WDI (world bank indicators)	Scale	+
Risk Aversion	One should not start her own business when risk of failure is high	Survey	Likert (1-4)	+

**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

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

**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.

	My school education	Rotated factor loadings	Eigenvalue	Cronbach’s $\alpha$
1	Helped me to develop my sense of initiative – a sort of entrepreneurial attitude	0.84	2.11	0.79
2	Helped me to better understand the role of entrepreneurs in society	0.86		
3	Made me interested to become an entrepreneur	0.82		

**Table III.**  
Factor analysis  
for education

*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

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

**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:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Entrepreneur}_i = & \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Gender}_i + \beta_2 \text{Age}_i + \beta_3 \text{Education}_i + \beta_4 \text{Father}_i + \beta_5 \text{Mother}_i \\ & + \beta_6 \text{Urban}_i + \beta_7 \text{LnGDPPC}_i + \beta_8 \text{Unemployment}_i + \beta_9 \text{Financial Jack}_i \\ & + \beta_{10} \text{Administrative\_complexities}_i + \beta_{11} \text{Start-up\_procedures}_i \\ & + \beta_{12} \text{Inefficient\_business\_environment}_i + \beta_{13} \text{Total\_tax\_rate}_i \\ & + \beta_{14} \text{Legal\_rights}_i + \beta_{15} \text{Risk\_Aversion}_i + \varepsilon_i \end{aligned}$$

### 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.

Explanatory variables	Model 1 (control variables)	Model 2 (Model 1 + financial lack)	Model 3 (Model 2 + bureaucracy)	Model 4 (Model 3 + business environment)	Model 5 (Model 4 + risk aversion)	Model 5 (with robust SE)
Gender	0.413 (0.055)***	0.396 (0.057)***	0.384 (0.058)***	0.384 (0.059)***	0.346 (0.060)***	0.346 (0.082)***
Age	-0.005 (0.001)***	-0.004 (0.001)**	-0.003 (0.001)*	-0.002 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
Education	-0.072 (0.033)**	-0.064 (0.034)*	-0.057 (0.036)	-0.029 (0.037)	-0.046 (0.037)	-0.046 (0.053)
Father	-0.025 (0.094)	-0.007 (0.096)	-0.009 (0.097)	0.017 (0.099)	0.007 (0.101)	0.007 (0.120)
Mother	0.101 (0.110)	0.092 (0.112)	0.088 (0.115)	0.121 (0.118)	0.161 (0.119)	0.161 (0.070)**
Urban	0.015 (0.063)	0.009 (0.066)	-0.008 (0.067)	-0.024 (0.069)	-0.052 (0.069)	-0.052 (0.124)
Unemployment	-0.019 (0.014)	-0.013 (0.014)	-0.028 (0.016)*	-0.084 (0.022)***	-0.081 (0.023)***	-0.081 (0.022)***
Ln GDP Per Capita	-0.461 (0.147)***	-0.498 (0.151)***	-0.595 (0.161)***	-0.601 (0.172)***	-0.573 (0.173)***	-0.573 (0.273)**
Financial Lack		0.107 (0.034)***	0.089 (0.036)**	0.087 (0.037)**	0.078 (0.038)**	0.078 (0.031)**
Bureaucracy			0.073 (0.033)**	0.063 (0.035)*	0.058 (0.036)	0.058 (0.038)
Startup Procedures			0.023 (0.016)	0.055 (0.018)***	0.049 (0.019)**	0.049 (0.014)***
Inefficient Business						
Environment				-0.040 (0.032)	-0.046 (0.033)	-0.046 (0.035)
Tax Rate				0.017 (0.006)***	0.017 (0.006)***	0.017 (0.004)***
Legal_Rights				0.101 (0.031)***	0.090 (0.032)***	0.090 (0.028)***
Risk_Aversion					0.075 (0.032)**	0.075 (0.025)***
Intercept	3.441 (1.475)**	3.497 (1.514)**	4.226 (1.578)***	2.876 (1.718)*	2.652 (1.738)	2.652 (2.943)
<i>Model fit statistics</i>						
Log Likelihood	-1,247.06	-1,172.93	-1,138.00	-1,090.96	-1,058.29	-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	0.089	0.089	0.089
<i>n</i>	4,456	4,090	3,851	3,569	3,454	3,454

Notes: \*\*\* $p < 1$  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 (Estrin *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.

#### References

- Acs, Z. and Amorós, J. (2008), "Entrepreneurship and competitiveness dynamics in Latin America", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 305-322.
- Aidis, R. (2005), "Institutional barriers to small- and medium-sized enterprise operations in transition countries", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 25 No. 4, pp. 305-318.
- Aidis, R., Welter, F., Smallbone, D. and Isakova, N. (2007), "Female entrepreneurship in transition economies: the case of Lithuania and Ukraine", *Feminist Economics*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 157-183.
- Aldrich, H.E. and Kim, P.H. (2007), "A life course perspective on occupational inheritance: self-employed parents and their children", in Ruef, M. and Lounsbury, M. (Eds), *The Sociology of Entrepreneurship (Research in the Sociology of Organizations, Volume 25)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 33-82, available at: [www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1758694&show=abstract](http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1758694&show=abstract)
- Audretsch, D.B. and Thurik, A.R. (2001a), "What's new about the new economy? Sources of growth in the managed and entrepreneurial economies", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 267-315.
- Audretsch, D.B. and Thurik, A.R. (2001b), "Linking entrepreneurship to growth", OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers No. 2001/2 edn, OECD Publishing, Paris.
- Audretsch, D.B., Thurik, A.R., Verheul, I. and Wennekers, A.R.M. (2002), *Entrepreneurship: Determinants and Policy in a European-US Comparison*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston, MA and Dordrecht.
- Bartlett, W. and Bukvic, V. (2001), "Barriers to SME growth in Slovenia", *MOCT-MOST. Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 177-195.

- Belitski, M. and Korosteleva, J. (2011), "Entrepreneurship and cities: evidence from the post-communist world", *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Vol. 31 No. 4, Article 3.
- Bitzenis, A. and Nito, E. (2005), "Obstacles to entrepreneurship in a transition business environment: the case of Albania", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 564-578.
- Caliendo, M., Fossen, F. and Kritikos, A. (2009), "Risk attitudes of nascent entrepreneurs: new evidence from an experimentally-validated survey", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 153-167.
- Chilosi, A. (2001), "Entrepreneurship and transition", *MOCT-MOST. Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 327-357.
- Cramer, J.S., Hartog, J., Jonker, N. and van Praag, C.M. (2002), "Low risk aversion encourages the choice for entrepreneurship: an empirical test of a truism", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, Vol. 48 No. 1, pp. 29-36.
- De Backer, K. and Sleuwaegen, L. (2003), "Does foreign direct investment crowd out domestic entrepreneurship?", *Review of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 67-84.
- Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-De-Silanes, F. and Shleifer, A. (2002), "The regulation of entry", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 117 No. 1, pp. 1-37.
- Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., Schupp, J. and Wagner, G.G. (2011), "Individual risk attitudes: measurement, determinants, and behavioral consequences", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 522-550.
- Dreher, A. and Gassebner, M. (2007), "Greasing the wheels of entrepreneurship? The impact of regulations and corruption on firm entry", Working Paper No. 2013, ETH Zurich, Zurich, June.
- Earle, J. and Sakova, Z. (1999), "Entrepreneurship from scratch: lessons on the entry decision into self-employment from transition economies", IZA Discussion Paper No. 79, IZA, Bonn, December.
- Enste, D.H. (2003), "Shadow economy and institutional change in transition countries", in Belev, B. (Ed.), *The Informal Economy in the EU Assessment Countries: Size, Scope, Trends and Challenges of the Process of EU-Enlargement*, Center for Study of Democracy, Sofia, pp. 81-114.
- Estrin, S. and Mickiewicz, T. (2011), "Entrepreneurship in transition economies; the role of institutions and generational change", in Minniti, M. (Ed.), *The Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Activity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 293-338.
- Estrin, S., Meyer, K. and Bytchova, M. (2006), "Entrepreneurship in transition economies", in Casson, M. Basu, A., Yeung, B. and Wadesdon N. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 693-725.
- Freytag, A. and Thurik, A.R. (2007), "Entrepreneurship and its determinants in a cross-country setting", *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, Vol. 17 No. 2, pp. 117-131.
- Fu-Lai Yu, T. (2000), "Hong Kong's entrepreneurship: behaviours and determinants", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, Vol. 12 No. 3, pp. 179-194.
- Glas, M. and Petrin, T. (1998), "Entrepreneurship: new challenges for Slovene women", Working Paper No. 74, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana.
- Greene, W.H. (2003), *Econometric Analysis*, 2nd ed., Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Griffiths, D.M., Kickul, J. and Carsrud, L.A. (2009), "Government bureaucracy, transactional impediments, and entrepreneurial intentions", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 5, pp. 626-645.



- Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2006), "Entrepreneurship in the old and new Europe", in Santarelli, E. (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship, Growth, and Innovation: The Dynamics of Firms and Industries*, Springer, New York, NY, pp. 75-103.
- Hair, J., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. and Black, W. (1998), *Multivariate Data Analysis with Readings*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hashi, I. and Krasniqi, B.A. (2011), "Entrepreneurship and SME growth: evidence from advanced and laggard transition economies", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 17 No. 5, pp. 456-487.
- Henriquez, C., Verheul, I., Geest, I. and Bischoff, C. (2002), "Determinants of entrepreneurship in France", in Audretsch, D., Thurik, A.R., Verheul, I. and Wennekers, S. (Eds), *Entrepreneurship: Determinants and Policy in a European-US Comparison*, Springer, New York, NY, pp. 83-120.
- Knaack, R. and Jager, H. (2003), "The costs and benefits of EU accession", working paper, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.
- Krasniqi, B.A. (2007), "Barriers to entrepreneurship and SME growth in transition: the case of Kosova", *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 71-94.
- Krasniqi, B.A. (2009), "Personal, household and business environmental determinants of entrepreneurship", *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 146-166.
- Masuda, T. (2006), "The determinants of latent entrepreneurship in Japan", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 227-240.
- Mathews, C.H. and Moser, S.B. (1995), "Family background and gender: implications for interest in small firm ownership", *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development: An International Journal*, Vol. 7 No. 4, pp. 365-378.
- Nicolaou, N., Shane, S., Cherkas, L., Hunkin, J. and Spector, T.D. (2008), "Is the tendency to engage in entrepreneurship genetic?", *Management Science*, Vol. 54 No. 1, pp. 167-179.
- Ovaska, T. and Sobel, R.S. (2005), "Entrepreneurship in post-socialist economies", *Journal of Private Enterprise*, Vol. 21 No. 1, pp. 8-28.
- Parker, S.C. (2004), *The Economics of Self-Employment and Entrepreneurship*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pennings, J.M. (1982), "The urban quality of life and entrepreneurship", *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 63-79.
- Peterman, N.E. and Kennedy, J. (2003), "Enterprise education: influencing students? Perceptions of entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 28 No. 2, pp. 129-144.
- Pinto, R. (2005), "Challenges for public policy in promoting entrepreneurship in Southeastern Europe", *Local Economy*, Vol. 20 No. 1, pp. 111-117.
- Pissarides, F. (1999), "Is lack of funds the main obstacle for growth? EBRD's experience with small and medium-sized businesses in Central and Eastern Europe", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 14 Nos 5/6, pp. 519-539.
- Pissarides, F., Singer, M. and Svejnar, J. (2003), "Objectives and constraints of entrepreneurs: evidence from small and medium size firms in Russia and Bulgaria", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 503-531.
- Roberts, K., Clark, S., Fagan, C. and Tholen, J. (2000), *Surviving Post-Communist. Young People in the Former Soviet Union*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Roper, S. and Scott, M.J. (2009), "Perceived financial barriers and the start-up decision. An econometric analysis of gender differences using GEM data", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 27 No. 2, pp. 149-171.

- Saar, E. and Unt, M. (2008), "Selective mobility into self-employment in post-socialist transition. Early birds, later entrants, quitters and shuttles", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 26 No. 3, pp. 323-349.
- Schleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W. (1993), "Corruption", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 108 No. 3, pp. 599-617.
- Smallbone, D. and Piasecki, B. (1995), "Supporting SME development in Poland: what lessons can be learned from the Western Experience?", *SME Development Policy in Transition Economies*, Russian and Eastern European Research Centre, University of Wolverhampton.
- Smallbone, D. and Welter, F. (2001), "The distinctiveness of entrepreneurship in transition economies", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 249-262.
- Stam, E., Thurik, A.R. and van der Zwan, P. (2010), "Entrepreneurial exit in real and imagined markets", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 1109-1139.
- Tamásy, C. (2006), "Determinants of regional entrepreneurship dynamics in contemporary Germany: a conceptual and empirical analysis", *Regional Studies*, Vol. 40 No. 4, pp. 365-384.
- Thurik, A.R., Carree, M.A., van Stel, A. and Audretsch, D.B. (2008), "Does self-employment reduce unemployment?", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 23 No. 6, pp. 673-686.
- van der Sluis, J., van Praag, M. and Vijverberg, W. (2005), "Entrepreneurship selection and performance: a meta-analysis of the impact of education in developing economies", *World Bank Economic Review*, Vol. 19 No. 2, pp. 225-261.
- van der Zwan, P., Thurik, A.R. and Grilo, I. (2010), "The entrepreneurial ladder and its determinants", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 42 No. 17, pp. 2183-2191.
- Verbeek, M. (2006), *A Guide to Modern Econometrics*, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons Ltd, West Sussex.
- Verheul, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2001), "Start-up capital: does gender matter?", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 16 No. 4, pp. 329-345.
- Verheul, I., Bosmaa, N., van der Nol, F. and Wong, T. (2002), "Determinants of entrepreneurship in the United States of America", in Audretsch, D., Thurik, A.R., Verheul, I. and Wennekers, S. (Eds), *Economics of Science, Technology and Innovation*, Springer, New York, NY, pp. 209-245.
- Wennekers, S. and Thurik, A.R. (1999), "Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 27-56.

### Further reading

- Bartlett, W. (2001), "SME development policies in different stages of transition", *MOCT-MOST. Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 197-204.
- McMillan, J. and Woodruff, C. (2002), "The central role of entrepreneurs in transition economies", *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 16 No. 3, pp. 153-170.
- Scase, R. (1997), "The role of small businesses in the economic transformation of Eastern Europe: real but relatively unimportant?", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 13-21.
- Targetti, F. (2005), "Nicholas Kaldor: key contributions to development economics", *Development and Change*, Vol. 36 No. 6, pp. 1185-1199.
- Wachtel, P. (1999), "Entrepreneurship in the transition economies of Central and Eastern Europe", *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol. 14 Nos 5/6, pp. 417-425.

Woodward, R. (2001), "SME support in Post-Communist countries: moving from individual to cooperative approaches", *MOCT-MOST. Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 275-294.

**About the author**

Dr Georgios K. Batsakis is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Kent. He holds a PhD in International Business and Strategic Management from the Brunel University. His research focuses on internationalisation of multinational enterprises' R&D activities, international business strategy of world-leading retailers, and international entrepreneurship. Dr Georgios K. Batsakis can be contacted at: [G.Batsakis@kent.ac.uk](mailto:G.Batsakis@kent.ac.uk)