



THE IMPACT OF CONTROL VARIABLES ON ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS AMONG EMPLOYED PERSONS

Predrag Mali, Bogdan Kuzmanović, Milan Nikolić, Edit Tarek Stojanović*

University of Novi Sad,
Technical faculty 'Mihajlo Pupin',
Novi Sad, Serbia

Abstract:

The paper presents the results of the study of individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, depending on seven variables: the respondents' gender, their age, the educational level of the respondents, the ownership structure of the enterprises, the respondents' previous experience in entrepreneurship, their perceived job performance, and their perceived finances. The specificity of the research is that the respondents are employed persons. The sample included 540 respondents from 72 organizations in Serbia. Data analysis was performed via a t-test. A statistically significant difference in the influence of the observed variables exists in most cases, except for the variable - the respondents' level of education. Thus, four of the seven hypotheses were fully confirmed, two were partially confirmed, while one hypothesis was rejected. The profile of an employed person who, potentially, has the greatest chances of becoming an entrepreneur is the following: a younger man with a high school diploma (a degree does not have such a significant impact), who is employed in a private company, has previous entrepreneurial experience, is successful at work and has adequate finances.

Article info:

Received: January 5, 2021

Correction: Jul 31, 2021

Accepted: August 25, 2021

Keywords:

Individual entrepreneurial orientation, the theory of planned behavior, entrepreneurial intentions, employed persons, Serbia.

INTRODUCTION

There is a significant number of studies addressing entrepreneurial intentions among students, for example (Kwong & Thompson, 2016; Espiritu-Olmos & Sastre-Castillo, 2015; Altinay, Madanoglu, Daniele, & Lashley, 2012; Shinnar, Giacomini, & Janssen, 2012; Siu & Lo, 2013). Likewise, there is a large body of research indicating the importance of corporate entrepreneurship and its role in contemporary business (Mohedano-Suanes & Benitez, 2018; Hornsby, Peña-Legazque, & Guerrero, 2013; Gawke, Gorgievski, & Bakker, 2017; Wei & Ling, 2015).

*E-mail: terekedita@gmail.com





However, to date, the external entrepreneurial intentions of employed persons (the intentions of employed persons to leave their current job, undertake an entrepreneurial venture and start their own business) have largely remained outside the focus of researchers. Some researchers (Hormiga, Hancock, & Valls-Pasola, 2013; Marshall & Gigliotti, 2018), point out this problem, as well as the need for its deeper study.

According to some authors (Hormiga *et al.*, 2013; Miralles, Giones, & Riverola, 2016; Saraf, 2015), employed persons are actually more likely to succeed in an entrepreneurial venture. The reasons for this are logical: employed persons have much more experience, practical knowledge, better knowledge of the situation in their industry, and especially knowledge about any deficiencies in the field in which they work, which leaves room for defining the idea of the type of future enterprise. Finally, employees often have more financial opportunities to start their own business (they have been making money for a while).

Here, the question of the expediency of researching entrepreneurial intentions among people who already have a job may be raised. However, the benefits of an employed person starting a new business are obvious: jobs will be created in that new business as well as within the organization left by the (new) entrepreneur.

This paper examines individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions of employed persons. In doing so, these dimensions are observed depending on seven variables: the respondents' gender, their age, the educational level of the respondents, the ownership structure of enterprises, the respondents' previous experience in entrepreneurship, their perceived success at work, and their perceived finances. The research was conducted in organizations in Serbia. Detecting and understanding the significant differences of the observed dimensions, depending on the given variables, has both theoretical and practical significance. The theoretical significance is reflected in the extension of knowledge in an area that has not been sufficiently researched. The practical importance derives from the identification of the entrepreneurial orientation, motivation, attitudes and intentions of employed persons, depending on the control variables, thus creating a theoretical basis for the proper functioning of state structures in the sphere of promoting and developing entrepreneurship.

THEORY AND HYPOTHESIS

In research dealing with detecting and explaining the effects on entrepreneurial intentions, variables such as gender, age, type of education, type and characteristics of previous work experience, the existence of entrepreneur parents, etc. are often considered. Such studies most often seek to identify the categories and groups in the general population that are most prone to starting their own businesses. As mentioned, unemployed persons or employed persons in the sense of internal entrepreneurship are usually considered.

Gender

When it comes to the gender of entrepreneurs and potential entrepreneurs, there are also some typical research questions here which capture the attention of researchers in the field of entrepreneurship. One group of references deals with the level of the participation of women and men in entrepreneurial activities.



According to Hisrich, Peters, and Shepherd (2008), there has been a recent increase in self-employment among women, who are now more likely to start new entrepreneurial ventures than men, and in the US women start up twice as many businesses as men and stay in business longer. The researchers (Poggesi, Mari, & De Vita, 2016) highlight the very significant role and representation of women in entrepreneurship globally. It is difficult to make a general, objective assessment of the distribution of entrepreneurial activities among men and women. Nevertheless, there seems to be a balance in that men no longer dominate entrepreneurship, and women are increasingly involved in this type of occupation.

Furthermore, some studies address the strength of entrepreneurial intentions among women and men. One group of references shows a uniformity of intensity of entrepreneurial intentions in both genders, while another group shows that entrepreneurial intentions are higher for men. Thus, according to Saraf (2015), entrepreneurial intentions are similar for men and women, as is motivation for starting a business (Knorr, Garzón, & Martinez, 2011). However, Leppel (2016) found that men nevertheless have a greater tendency to become entrepreneurs than women. According to Santos, Roomi, and Liñán (2016), there are similarities in entrepreneurial intentions among men and women, although they are somewhat greater for men. This is due to the fact that in society men are more encouraged towards self-employment, which makes women feel that entrepreneurship is not an acceptable career choice for them. Male students in Turkey and Norway show significantly higher levels of entrepreneurial intentions than female students (Shneor, Metin Camgöz, & Bayhan Karapinar, 2013).

The next group of studies deals with the success rate of male and female entrepreneurs, as well as certain differences between them (degree of satisfaction, goals, career orientation). There are numerous similarities between male and female entrepreneurs (Jayawarna, Jones, & Marlow, 2015), thus eliminating prejudices about women's disadvantages in the role of entrepreneurs. Also, according to Conroy and Weiler (2016), there are no differences in the economic performance of firms and the growth of business volume depending on whether the business owners are men or women.

Differences exist in some "soft" parameters. Thus, female entrepreneurs show higher levels of job satisfaction than their male counterparts (Bender & Roche, 2016). Another study (Hechavarria, Terjesen, Ingram, Renko, Justo, & Elam, 2017) shows that female entrepreneurs pay more attention than men to goals that are focused on social values, and less attention to those that are fundamentally economic.

Age

Other researchers have tried to answer the question as to what motivates older people to start a private business later in life. Research in Australia (Perenyi, Zolin, & Maritz, 2018), has shown that older entrepreneurs start their own businesses, first and foremost, because they are given the right opportunity, and not out of necessity. Also, internal motives are primary. According to Kean, Van Zandt, and Maupin (2008), entrepreneurship is gaining increasing importance among elderly persons primarily because older people often have low incomes. The success of older entrepreneurs is linked to the desire for autonomy and independence, confidence, personal effectiveness and intergenerational support.

Other studies found that entrepreneurial intentions decline with age. Thus, the desire for entrepreneurial endeavours, as well as perceived feasibility, culminates in early adulthood, and declines considerably with age (Minola, Criaco, & Obschonka, 2016). Similarly, researchers (Tsai *et al.*, 2016) found that age negatively affected perceived chances and entrepreneurial intentions. Research in France (Sahut, Gharbi, & Mili, 2015) found that there was a negative relationship between the respondents' age and entrepreneurial intentions.



Also, it is very important for older respondents to have the competencies and resources they need. This indicates greater caution for older respondents and lower risk preference. Among employed people in Australia (Hatak, Harms, & Fink, 2015), entrepreneurial intentions are found to decline with age.

The survey, in which the respondents were entrepreneurs and internal entrepreneurs (Jain & Ali, 2012) found that younger entrepreneurs were more proactive than others, while middle-aged entrepreneurs exhibited a higher locus of control and risk preference. According to Miralles, Giones, and Gozun (2017), individuals currently engaged in entrepreneurial behaviors and activities logically have stronger intentions to start a new venture, whereby this connection is reinforced in older individuals.

Education

One of the common questions that arises when it comes to the link between education and entrepreneurship is how educated entrepreneurs are. Entrepreneurs are often believed to be less educated than the rest of the general population, however, according to Hisrich *et al.* (2008), research shows that this is not true. In fact, education is very important for the development of entrepreneurs as it helps them to cope with the problems they encounter. On the other hand, formal education is not so important in the start-up phase. Also, there are cases where successful entrepreneurs have only a high school diploma.

The next question is whether there is a link between entrepreneurship education, some form of training and entrepreneurship education, and the subsequent development of entrepreneurial intentions. According to Hoppe (2016), the introduction of entrepreneurship education in the Swedish education system has significant effects. The researchers (Bergmann, Hundt, & Sternberg, 2016), state that when students attend some form of entrepreneurial education, this may encourage actions to open their own businesses.

However, in the study of do Paço, *et al.* (2015), a comparison of entrepreneurial intentions was made between girls attending business school and boys attending sports school. It was shown that boys have stronger intentions to start their own businesses even though they do not actually receive any entrepreneurial education at school. There does not seem to be a clear answer to this question either: special entrepreneurship education is important, but in some cases it may not have a decisive influence.

An interesting study conducted among Romanian students (Luca, Cazan, & Tomulescu, 2013) found that students who are aware of their entrepreneurial potential are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial training. Also, such training will have greater effects on such students. Perhaps these results are an indicator that entrepreneurial training and education should be selectively applied to students who show certain preferences and the desire for entrepreneurship, and thus the effects of these actions will be greater.

Previous experience (work and life)

For most entrepreneurs their most significant entrepreneurial venture was not their first (Hisrich *et al.*, 2008). Namely, entrepreneurs constantly find new ideas and opportunities, and thus start more ventures throughout their careers. Previous experience helps them to gain a better understanding of the circumstances, to improve their assessment of risks and opportunities, to better anticipate certain possible situations, and make comparisons with previous jobs. In these circumstances, it is clear that previous entrepreneurial experience helps the entrepreneur and increases the chances of the venture's success.



According to Hatak *et al.* (2015), previous entrepreneurial experience has an influence on entrepreneurial intentions. Employees who were previously entrepreneurs have higher entrepreneurial intentions than other employees (Hsu *et al.*, 2017). That desire is greater if they have been entrepreneurs for the longer part of their careers. In the study of Miralles *et al.* (2016) it was also found that individuals with entrepreneurial knowledge and previous entrepreneurial experience have stronger entrepreneurial intentions. Previous experience with social problems predicts entrepreneurial intentions in the field of social entrepreneurship (Hockerts, 2017).

In terms of the impact of work experience and, in particular, previous entrepreneurial experience on entrepreneurial intentions and success, there appears to be a consistency in the research findings as well as the authors' agreement that this impact is positive.

Based on the previous considerations, as well as the fact that the analysis is performed according to seven control variables, in this paper, seven hypotheses are posed:

- H1: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to gender of employed persons.
- H2: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to age of employed persons.
- H3: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to level of education of employed persons.
- H4: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to ownership structure of the respondents' enterprise.
- H5: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to previous experience in entrepreneurship of employed persons.
- H6: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to perceived job performance of employed persons.
- H7: There are significant differences in the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, according to perceived finances of employed persons.



METHOD

Survey instruments (measures)

The Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation (IEO) instrument was used to measure individual entrepreneurial orientation (Bolton & Lane 2012). The questionnaire contains 3 dimensions, consisting of 10 items: 1. Risk-taking, 2. Innovativeness and 3. Proactiveness. The respondents evaluated them on a seven-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's alpha values are: $a=0,798$ (risk-taking), $a=0,848$ (innovativeness) and $a=0,820$ (proactiveness).

The need for achievement was measured by means of the achievement dimension of the Attitude Toward Enterprise (ATE) Test (Athayde, 2009). This dimension consists of 4 items. The respondents rated them using a seven-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's alpha value for achievement is $a=0,866$.

The Entrepreneurial Intention Questionnaire (EIQ) instrument was used to measure the dimensions of the Theory of Planned Behavior (Liñán & Chen 2009). The questionnaire includes 4 dimensions which are made up of 20 items: 1. Personal Attitude, 2. Subjective Norm, 3. Perceived Behavioral Control and 4. Entrepreneurial Intention. The respondents evaluated them on a seven-point Likert scale. The Cronbach's alpha values are: $a=0,906$ (personal attitude), $a=0,807$ (subjective norm), $a=0,898$ (perceived behavioral control) and $a=0,954$ (entrepreneurial intention).

Participants and data collection

The research was conducted in companies in Serbia. The survey covered medium and large enterprises, and according to the type of activity, production, service and public companies were included. The respondents were employed in these enterprises, and were of mixed gender, age, level of education (minimum secondary school) and position in the organization. In most of the companies surveyed, several questionnaires were distributed. The respondents then filled in the questionnaires. The sample includes 540 people and the survey included 72 companies.

A sample structure according to the observed variables

According to the observed variables (gender of respondents, years of respondents, level of education, ownership structure of the company, previous experience in entrepreneurship, perceived success at work, their perceived finances), the structure of the 540 respondents sample is as follows:

1. There were $NM = 285$ men and $NF = 255$ women in the sample.
2. The sample was represented by employees between 20 and 64 years of age. By age, respondents are divided into those between 20 and 42 years of age (younger respondents) and those between 43 and 64 years of age (older respondents). Thus, the younger respondents were $NY = 273$ and the older respondents were $NO = 267$.
3. In the sample there were 90 respondents with secondary education, 59 respondents with tertiary education and 391 respondents with higher education. The respondents with tertiary education are added to the respondents with secondary education. Thus, in the sample there were $NHS = 149$ respondents with secondary and tertiary education and $NFAC = 391$ respondents with higher education.



4. According to the ownership structure, there were NST = 350 state-owned enterprises and NPR = 190 private enterprises in the sample.
5. According to the previous entrepreneurial experience of the respondents, the sample included NYEX = 141 respondents with entrepreneurial experience and NNEX = 399 respondents with no entrepreneurial experience.
6. Perceptions of their own performance at work were rated by the respondents with a score of 1 to 7. In group 1 - 1 was very unsuccessful, in group 2 - 7 were unsuccessful, in group 3 - slightly unsuccessful (3), 4 - averagely successful (74), 5 - mildly successful (49), 6 - successful (266) and 7 - very successful (140). Because the respondents perceived their performance as relatively high, according to this variable, the sample was divided into those who expressed their performance at work with grades 1 to 5 (low performance) and those who showed their performance at work with grades 6 and 7 (high performance). Thus, in the sample, there were NLSUC = 134 low performance at work and NHSUC = 406 high performance.
7. The perceptions of owning finances for starting a private business were rated by the respondents from 1 to 7. In group 1 - very low was 203 respondents, in group 2 - low was 80 respondents, in group 3 - slightly low (32) , 4 - average (131), 5 - slightly high (38), 6 - high (35) and 7 - very high (21). Given that respondents perceived their own finances to start their own business as relatively low, according to this variable, the sample was divided into those who expressed their financial possession with grades 1 to 3 (low financial ownership) and those who expressed their financial ownership with grades 4 to 7 (high financial ownership). Thus, the sample had NLFIN = 315 respondents with low financial ownership to start an own business and NHFIN = 225 respondents with high financial ownership to start their own business.

RESULTS

Above average scores of individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions, t-test was performed. In doing so, the variables were:

1. Gender of the respondents (GEN).
2. Age of the respondents (YEA).
3. Level of education of the respondents (level of education - EDU).
4. Ownership structure of the respondents' organization (OWN).
5. Previous experience in entrepreneurship (EEX).
6. Perceived performance at work (SUC).
7. Perceived possession of finances of the respondent (FIN).

The results of the t-test are presented in Tables 1 to 7. The aim of this analysis is to determine if there are statistically significant differences in the average ratings of individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, need for achievement, and theory of planned behavior, depending on the variables indicated. Also, the goal is to determine the directions of these differences, that is, in which conditions the observed dimensions have higher. In Tables 1 to 7, the average scores with a statistically significant difference are shown in bold font and shaded fields.



Table 1. T-test with the average scores for men (M) and women (F)

| | GEN | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | M | 285 | 4.646784 | 1.4663660 | 0.0868600 | 0.146 | 0.702 | 0.842 | 538 | 0.400 | 0.1082215 |
| | F | 255 | 4.538562 | 1.5189582 | 0.0951209 | | | 0.840 | 526.682 | 0.401 | |
| IN | M | 285 | 4.868421 | 1.2668801 | 0.0750435 | 0.834 | 0.362 | -0.002 | 538 | 0.999 | -0.0002064 |
| | F | 255 | 4.868627 | 1.3575380 | 0.0850123 | | | -0.002 | 521.093 | 0.999 | |
| PR | M | 285 | 5.804678 | 1.1460526 | 0.0678863 | 0.086 | 0.769 | 0.755 | 538 | 0.451 | 0.0739594 |
| | F | 255 | 5.730719 | 1.1254598 | 0.0704790 | | | 0.756 | 533.350 | 0.450 | |
| ACH | M | 285 | 5.275439 | 1.1633761 | 0.0689125 | 1.877 | 0.171 | 1.213 | 538 | 0.226 | 0.1244582 |
| | F | 255 | 5.150980 | 1.2200140 | 0.0764002 | | | 1.210 | 524.768 | 0.227 | |
| PA | M | 285 | 4.760702 | 1.3832497 | 0.0819366 | 0.230 | 0.632 | 3.568 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.4320743 |
| | F | 255 | 4.328627 | 1.4288658 | 0.0894790 | | | 3.561 | 527.098 | 0.000 | |
| SN | M | 285 | 5.097076 | 1.3013818 | 0.0770872 | 0.020 | 0.888 | 0.431 | 538 | 0.666 | 0.0487100 |
| | F | 255 | 5.048366 | 1.3190892 | 0.0826046 | | | 0.431 | 529.726 | 0.667 | |
| PBC | M | 285 | 4.347368 | 1.3072560 | 0.0774352 | 0.000 | 0.999 | 2.107 | 538 | 0.036 | 0.2401789 |
| | F | 255 | 4.107190 | 1.3389206 | 0.0838465 | | | 2.104 | 528.321 | 0.036 | |
| EI | M | 285 | 3.477778 | 1.5593041 | 0.0923652 | 5.514 | 0.019 | 2.351 | 538 | 0.019 | 0.3267974 |
| | F | 255 | 3.150980 | 1.6700013 | 0.1045795 | | | 2.342 | 521.188 | 0.020 | |

Table 2. T-test with the average scores for younger (Y) and older (O) respondents

| | YEA | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | Y | 273 | 4.859585 | 1.3377007 | 0.0809613 | 10.660 | 0.001 | 4.223 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.5337422 |
| | O | 267 | 4.325843 | 1.5907346 | 0.0973514 | | | 4.215 | 518.591 | 0.000 | |
| IN | Y | 273 | 5.090659 | 1.1904085 | 0.0720468 | 4.596 | 0.032 | 4.043 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.4492736 |
| | O | 267 | 4.641386 | 1.3863258 | 0.0848418 | | | 4.036 | 522.332 | 0.000 | |
| PR | Y | 273 | 5.766789 | 1.0773534 | 0.0652044 | 5.063 | 0.025 | -0.061 | 538 | 0.951 | -0.0059953 |
| | O | 267 | 5.772784 | 1.1948686 | 0.0731248 | | | -0.061 | 529.684 | 0.951 | |
| ACH | Y | 273 | 5.276557 | 1.1280514 | 0.0682728 | 3.540 | 0.060 | 1.182 | 538 | 0.238 | 0.1211261 |
| | O | 267 | 5.155431 | 1.2512019 | 0.0765723 | | | 1.181 | 529.673 | 0.238 | |
| PA | Y | 273 | 4.738462 | 1.3274342 | 0.0803400 | 2.052 | 0.153 | 3.031 | 538 | 0.003 | 0.3676750 |
| | O | 267 | 4.370787 | 1.4887702 | 0.0911113 | | | 3.027 | 528.185 | 0.003 | |
| SN | Y | 273 | 5.347985 | 1.1299316 | 0.0683866 | 12.523 | 0.000 | 5.027 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.5539779 |
| | O | 267 | 4.794007 | 1.4176112 | 0.0867564 | | | 5.015 | 507.604 | 0.000 | |
| PBC | Y | 273 | 4.368742 | 1.2346971 | 0.0747273 | 1.979 | 0.160 | 2.398 | 538 | 0.017 | 0.2726125 |
| | O | 267 | 4.096130 | 1.4032118 | 0.0858752 | | | 2.395 | 526.266 | 0.017 | |
| EI | Y | 273 | 3.600122 | 1.6175192 | 0.0978967 | 0.073 | 0.787 | 4.072 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.5595478 |
| | O | 267 | 3.040574 | 1.5744267 | 0.0963534 | | | 4.074 | 537.988 | 0.000 | |

**Table 3.** T-test with the average scores for respondents with secondary (HS) and higher (FAC) education

| | EDU | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | HS | 149 | 4.655481 | 1.4474873 | 0.1185828 | 0.207 | 0.649 | 0.575 | 538 | 0.566 | 0.0825910 |
| | FAC | 391 | 4.572890 | 1.5084807 | 0.0762871 | | | 0.586 | 277.797 | 0.559 | |
| IN | HS | 149 | 4.894295 | 1.2758083 | 0.1045183 | 0.412 | 0.521 | 0.282 | 538 | 0.778 | 0.0355996 |
| | FAC | 391 | 4.858696 | 1.3232443 | 0.0669193 | | | 0.287 | 276.575 | 0.774 | |
| PR | HS | 149 | 5.677852 | 1.2504750 | 0.1024429 | 2.895 | 0.089 | -1.161 | 538 | 0.246 | -0.1269217 |
| | FAC | 391 | 5.804774 | 1.0887772 | 0.0550618 | | | -1.091 | 238.317 | 0.276 | |
| ACH | HS | 149 | 5.087248 | 1.2476079 | 0.1022080 | 0.002 | 0.965 | -1.561 | 538 | 0.119 | -0.1787363 |
| | FAC | 391 | 5.265985 | 1.1665340 | 0.0589942 | | | -1.515 | 252.410 | 0.131 | |
| PA | HS | 149 | 4.719463 | 1.4753688 | 0.1208669 | 1.826 | 0.177 | 1.647 | 538 | 0.100 | 0.2248339 |
| | FAC | 391 | 4.494629 | 1.3955044 | 0.0705737 | | | 1.606 | 254.877 | 0.109 | |
| SN | HS | 149 | 5.174497 | 1.3006027 | 0.1065495 | 0.067 | 0.795 | 1.101 | 538 | 0.271 | 0.1386910 |
| | FAC | 391 | 5.035806 | 1.3115190 | 0.0663264 | | | 1.105 | 269.562 | 0.270 | |
| PBC | HS | 149 | 4.209172 | 1.3595611 | 0.1113796 | 0.677 | 0.411 | -0.268 | 538 | 0.789 | -0.0342207 |
| | FAC | 391 | 4.243393 | 1.3153470 | 0.0665200 | | | -0.264 | 259.864 | 0.792 | |
| EI | HS | 149 | 3.418345 | 1.6555505 | 0.1356280 | 0.014 | 0.907 | 0.840 | 538 | 0.401 | 0.1310470 |
| | FAC | 391 | 3.150980 | 1.6700013 | 0.1045795 | | | 2.342 | 521.188 | 0.020 | |

Table 4. T-test with the average scores for respondents employed in state (ST) and private (PR) enterprises

| | OWN | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | ST | 350 | 4.393333 | 1.5011043 | 0.0802374 | 1.109 | 0.293 | -4.351 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.5750877 |
| | PR | 190 | 4.968421 | 1.4013294 | 0.1016631 | | | -4.440 | 411.358 | 0.000 | |
| IN | ST | 350 | 4.700000 | 1.3026862 | 0.0696315 | 0.001 | 0.980 | -4.119 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.4789474 |
| | PR | 190 | 5.178947 | 1.2670338 | 0.0919203 | | | -4.153 | 397.298 | 0.000 | |
| PR | ST | 350 | 5.701905 | 1.1556773 | 0.0617736 | 3.502 | 0.062 | -1.888 | 538 | 0.060 | -0.1928321 |
| | PR | 190 | 5.894737 | 1.0905647 | 0.0791179 | | | -1.921 | 407.634 | 0.055 | |
| ACH | ST | 350 | 5.148571 | 1.1856947 | 0.0633780 | 1.130 | 0.288 | -1.807 | 538 | 0.071 | -0.1935338 |
| | PR | 190 | 5.342105 | 1.1935966 | 0.0865926 | | | -1.804 | 385.777 | 0.072 | |
| PA | ST | 350 | 4.353143 | 1.3691144 | 0.0731822 | 2.329 | 0.128 | -4.604 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.5784361 |
| | PR | 190 | 4.931579 | 1.4396328 | 0.1044419 | | | -4.536 | 371.635 | 0.000 | |
| SN | ST | 350 | 4.824762 | 1.2547609 | 0.0670698 | 0.028 | 0.868 | -6.214 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.7085714 |
| | PR | 190 | 5.533333 | 1.2847406 | 0.0932049 | | | -6.171 | 380.204 | 0.000 | |
| PBC | ST | 350 | 4.149048 | 1.3117004 | 0.0701133 | 0.948 | 0.331 | -2.024 | 538 | 0.043 | -0.2413033 |
| | PR | 190 | 4.390351 | 1.3428214 | 0.0974185 | | | -2.010 | 380.257 | 0.045 | |
| EI | ST | 350 | 3.091905 | 1.4788269 | 0.0790466 | 5.741 | 0.017 | -4.593 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.6580952 |
| | PR | 190 | 3.750000 | 1.7768475 | 0.1289061 | | | -4.352 | 332.409 | 0.000 | |



Table 5. T-test with the average scores for respondents with prior entrepreneurial experience (YEX) and respondents with no previous entrepreneurial experience (NEX)

| | EEX | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | YEX | 141 | 4.758865 | 1.4075231 | 0.1185348 | 0.675 | 0.412 | 1.514 | 538 | 0.131 | 0.2208536 |
| | NEX | 399 | 4.538012 | 1.5169397 | 0.0759420 | | | 1.569 | 262.934 | 0.118 | |
| IN | YEX | 141 | 4.902482 | 1.2623579 | 0.1063097 | 0.217 | 0.642 | 0.358 | 538 | 0.720 | 0.0459660 |
| | NEX | 399 | 4.856516 | 1.3267617 | 0.0664212 | | | 0.367 | 256.866 | 0.714 | |
| PR | YEX | 141 | 5.825059 | 1.1605838 | 0.0977388 | 0.253 | 0.616 | 0.672 | 538 | 0.502 | 0.0748502 |
| | NEX | 399 | 5.750209 | 1.1279082 | 0.0564660 | | | 0.663 | 239.659 | 0.508 | |
| ACH | YEX | 141 | 5.363475 | 1.1867856 | 0.0999454 | 0.195 | 0.659 | 1.706 | 538 | 0.089 | 0.1986882 |
| | NEX | 399 | 5.164787 | 1.1895987 | 0.0595544 | | | 1.708 | 246.151 | 0.089 | |
| PA | YEX | 141 | 4.870922 | 1.3380444 | 0.1126837 | 0.138 | 0.710 | 3.081 | 538 | 0.002 | 0.4253080 |
| | NEX | 399 | 4.445614 | 1.4332816 | 0.0717538 | | | 3.184 | 261.432 | 0.002 | |
| SN | YEX | 141 | 5.234043 | 1.2766180 | 0.1075106 | 0.143 | 0.705 | 1.691 | 538 | 0.091 | 0.2164987 |
| | NEX | 399 | 5.017544 | 1.3168893 | 0.0659269 | | | 1.717 | 252.524 | 0.087 | |
| PBC | YEX | 141 | 4.723404 | 1.2425699 | 0.1046433 | 0.005 | 0.946 | 5.220 | 538 | 0.000 | 0.6624185 |
| | NEX | 399 | 4.060986 | 1.3134132 | 0.0657529 | | | 5.360 | 258.217 | 0.000 | |
| EI | YEX | 141 | 3.693853 | 1.5940893 | 0.1342465 | 0.665 | 0.415 | 3.187 | 538 | 0.002 | 0.5012887 |
| | NEX | 399 | 3.192565 | 1.6097563 | 0.0805886 | | | 3.202 | 247.765 | 0.002 | |

Table 6. T-test with the average scores for respondents who perceive their job performance as low (LSUC) and high (HSUC)

| | SUC | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|------|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | LSUC | 134 | 4.176617 | 1.3913987 | 0.1201985 | 0.727 | 0.394 | -3.799 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.5573732 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 4.733990 | 1.4985533 | 0.0743720 | | | -3.943 | 242.650 | 0.000 | |
| IN | LSUC | 134 | 4.526119 | 1.2263816 | 0.1059432 | 0.330 | 0.566 | -3.528 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.4554077 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 4.981527 | 1.3174859 | 0.0653857 | | | -3.658 | 242.084 | 0.000 | |
| PR | LSUC | 134 | 5.291045 | 1.2380906 | 0.1069547 | 8.776 | 0.003 | -5.794 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.6367056 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 5.927750 | 1.0549935 | 0.0523584 | | | -5.347 | 200.601 | 0.000 | |
| ACH | LSUC | 134 | 4.565299 | 1.1495051 | 0.0993021 | 0.051 | 0.822 | -7.685 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.8663517 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 5.431650 | 1.1256447 | 0.0558648 | | | -7.604 | 223.167 | 0.000 | |
| PA | LSUC | 134 | 4.092537 | 1.3946529 | 0.1204797 | 0.322 | 0.571 | -4.438 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.6173149 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 4.709852 | 1.3966632 | 0.0693152 | | | -4.441 | 227.435 | 0.000 | |
| SN | LSUC | 134 | 4.644279 | 1.2500277 | 0.1079859 | 0.252 | 0.616 | -4.460 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.5716491 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 5.215928 | 1.2981609 | 0.0644266 | | | -4.546 | 234.768 | 0.000 | |
| PBC | LSUC | 134 | 3.723881 | 1.1945477 | 0.1031932 | 2.331 | 0.127 | -5.259 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.6784183 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 4.402299 | 1.3261763 | 0.0658170 | | | -5.543 | 249.649 | 0.000 | |
| EI | LSUC | 134 | 2.941542 | 1.4061058 | 0.1214690 | 3.233 | 0.073 | -3.175 | 538 | 0.002 | -0.5079651 |
| | HSUC | 406 | 3.449507 | 1.6661673 | 0.0826905 | | | -3.457 | 266.070 | 0.001 | |



Table 7. T-test with the average scores for respondents who perceive their finances as low (LFIN) and high (HFIN)

| | FIN | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | |
|-----|------|-----|----------|----------------|-----------------|---|-------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | | | | | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference |
| RT | LFIN | 315 | 4.431746 | 1.5111689 | 0.0851447 | 1.068 | 0.302 | -3.046 | 538 | 0.002 | -0.3934392 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 4.825185 | 1.4344326 | 0.0956288 | | | -3.073 | 497.076 | 0.002 | |
| IN | LFIN | 315 | 4.752381 | 1.3484312 | 0.0759755 | 3.084 | 0.080 | -2.450 | 538 | 0.015 | -0.2787302 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 5.031111 | 1.2370440 | 0.0824696 | | | -2.486 | 505.711 | 0.013 | |
| PR | LFIN | 315 | 5.761905 | 1.1180001 | 0.0629922 | 0.000 | 0.988 | -0.190 | 538 | 0.850 | -0.0188360 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 5.780741 | 1.1629722 | 0.0775315 | | | -0.189 | 470.944 | 0.851 | |
| ACH | LFIN | 315 | 5.166667 | 1.1642567 | 0.0655984 | 0.610 | 0.435 | -1.155 | 538 | 0.249 | -0.1200000 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 5.286667 | 1.2265843 | 0.0817723 | | | -1.145 | 467.080 | 0.253 | |
| PA | LFIN | 315 | 4.401270 | 1.4663090 | 0.0826172 | 1.733 | 0.189 | -3.031 | 538 | 0.003 | -0.3729524 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 4.774222 | 1.3257924 | 0.0883862 | | | -3.083 | 509.151 | 0.002 | |
| SN | LFIN | 315 | 4.987302 | 1.3295518 | 0.0749118 | 0.693 | 0.406 | -1.827 | 538 | 0.068 | -0.2082540 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 5.195556 | 1.2721373 | 0.0848092 | | | -1.840 | 494.955 | 0.066 | |
| PBC | LFIN | 315 | 3.907407 | 1.3027876 | 0.0734038 | 0.251 | 0.617 | -7.069 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.7837037 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 4.691111 | 1.2227263 | 0.0815151 | | | -7.144 | 500.021 | 0.000 | |
| EI | LFIN | 315 | 3.004762 | 1.6588122 | 0.0934635 | 14.297 | 0.000 | -5.560 | 538 | 0.000 | -0.7648677 |
| | HFIN | 225 | 3.769630 | 1.4523316 | 0.0968221 | | | -5.684 | 516.207 | 0.000 | |

DISCUSSION

The respondents' gender (GEN)

According to Table 1, statistically significant differences in the average scores occur in three dimensions: PA - Attitude Towards Entrepreneurship, PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control, and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. These dimensions have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among men. Thus, men have a more pronounced attitude toward entrepreneurship, perceived behavioral control, and entrepreneurial intentions than women. This is most prominent for the PA dimension - Attitude Towards Entrepreneurship. It is yet to be noted that the difference in the mean scores between attitude and intention is greater for men than for women. Therefore, women have more specific entrepreneurial thinking: if they have a positive attitude towards entrepreneurship, they are more likely to have entrepreneurial intentions. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H1 is partially confirmed.

These results can be interpreted by the fact that in society, men are often more encouraged to start an entrepreneurial venture, and women are less likely to think that owning a business is an acceptable career option. These results are in line with previous research that shows that entrepreneurial intentions are higher among men than women (Leppel, 2016; Santos *et al.*, 2016; Shneor *et al.*, 2013).



The respondents' age (YEA)

According to Table 2, a statistically significant difference in the average scores occurs across most dimensions: RT - Risk Taking, IN - Innovation, PA - Attitude Towards Entrepreneurship, SN - Subjective Norm, PBC – Perceived Behavioral Control and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. These dimensions have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among the younger subjects. Thus, the younger respondents have a more pronounced preference for risk, innovation, attitude toward entrepreneurship, support from the environment, perceived behavioral control and entrepreneurial intentions than their older counterparts. This is strongly expressed in all dimensions where there is a statistically significant difference. The older respondents can match the younger ones only when it comes to PR - Proactivity and ACH - Need for Achievement. It should also be noted that the difference in the mean scores between attitude and intentions is smaller in the younger respondents. Therefore, the younger respondents are more specific and realistic in their entrepreneurial thinking: if they have a positive attitude towards entrepreneurship, they are more likely to have entrepreneurial intentions. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H2 is confirmed.

Such results can be interpreted in light of the fact that the younger respondents have more energy, willpower, courage and confidence to start an entrepreneurial venture and are readier to take risks. It is possible that in the process of starting a business, younger people are more able to count on the help of their parents, especially for financial support. In addition, younger people always have time to try again. Based on the above, this research can be categorized as a reference that shows that entrepreneurial intentions are higher among younger people than older people, for example (Minola *et al.*, 2016; Tsai *et al.*, 2016; Sahut *et al.*, 2015; Hatak *et al.*, 2015).

The respondents' education level (EDU)

Table 3 shows no statistically significant differences in the mean ratings for the observed dimensions. However, there are certain tendencies that are not statistically significant but may deserve to be listed. Thus, the respondents who have completed higher education have a slightly higher average score for the dimensions PR - Proactivity and ACH - Need for Achievement, while those with secondary education have a slightly higher average score for the PA dimensions - Attitude Toward Entrepreneurship and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. The respondents with higher education are somewhat more proactive and in greater need of achievement, as confirmed through education. Those with secondary education see a greater chance to succeed in entrepreneurship, probably because without a higher education diploma it is difficult to achieve some of their ambitions in another way. However, it should be concluded here that the degree of the observed dimensions of entrepreneurial performance does not depend significantly on the level of education. Based on these results, it can be concluded that hypothesis H3 has not been confirmed.

The issues related to entrepreneurship education are discussed in the theoretical part of the paper. However, the existing literature does not provide a clear answer to the following questions: what is the level of entrepreneurship education, how important is education for entrepreneurship, and does education increase the chances of starting an entrepreneurial venture and the subsequent success of that business? There are practical examples that give different answers to these questions. It can be concluded here that education is not so important in the initial stage of starting an entrepreneurial



venture, but it is important in the stage of running and maintaining a business. The results obtained here somehow confirm the previous findings and the rather hesitant results of previous research on this topic (Hoppe, 2016; Bergmann *et al.*, 2016; do Paço *et al.*, 2015; Luca *et al.*, 2013).

The ownership structure of the respondents' organizations (OWN)

According to Table 4, a statistically significant difference in the average scores occurs across most dimensions: RT - Risk Taking, IN - Innovation, PA - Attitude Towards Entrepreneurship, SN - Subjective Norm, PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. These dimensions have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among the respondents employed in private companies. Thus, the respondents employed in private enterprises have a greater preference for risk, innovation, attitude toward entrepreneurship, support from the environment, perceived behavioral control, and entrepreneurial intentions than their counterparts who work in state-owned enterprises. This is very pronounced for all the dimensions where there is a statistically significant difference, with the exception of the PBC dimension - Perceived Behavioral Control. Although there is no statistically significant difference in the average grades for the dimensions PR - Proactivity and ACH - Need For Achievement, employees in private companies also have higher scores in these two cases. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H4 is confirmed.

Such results can be interpreted (generally speaking) as a job in a private company is not as secure as one in a state-owned company. Private enterprise employees are aware that any mistakes and / or poor performance can place them in the position where they may lose their job. Consequently, they take on more risk (accustomed to risk), and are forced to be innovative and proactive. In addition, employees in private companies have a director who is an entrepreneur, they are accustomed to such an environment, and may be convinced from the immediate vicinity of the benefits of an entrepreneurial call and have the knowledge and skills to start and run their own private business. As a result, the observed dimensions have a higher average rating for those respondents employed in private companies. These results cannot be compared with other studies, because there is very little research which addresses the entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions of employees, especially as a function of the ownership structure of an organization.

The previous experience in entrepreneurship (EEX)

According to Table 5, a statistically significant difference in the average scores occurs for three dimensions: PA - Attitude Towards Entrepreneurship, PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control, and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. These dimensions have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among those respondents with previous entrepreneurial experience. Thus, the respondents with previous entrepreneurial experience have a more pronounced attitude towards entrepreneurship, perceived behavioral control and entrepreneurial intentions than the respondents without previous entrepreneurial experience. This is very strongly expressed in all dimensions where there is a statistically significant difference. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H5 is partially confirmed.

Such results are easy to understand: respondents who have previous experience in entrepreneurship are far more experienced in this regard, know what to expect, are more able to recognize their strengths and weaknesses for the job, know where they have gone wrong and what they are able to resolve.



In addition, they have already shown that they have an entrepreneurial spirit and are prone to starting a private business. Existing references (Hatak *et al.*, 2015; Hsu, Shinnar, Powell, & Coffey, 2017; Miralles, Giones, & Riverola, 2016), confirm that previous experience in entrepreneurship has a positive impact on entrepreneurial intentions.

The respondents' perceived performance (SUC)

According to Table 6, a statistically significant difference in the average scores occurs across all dimensions: RT - Risk Taking, IN - Innovation, PR - Proactivity, ACH - Need for Achievement, PA - Attitude Toward Entrepreneurship, SN - Subjective Norm, PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. All of these dimensions have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among those respondents who perceive their job performance as high. This is very strongly expressed for all dimensions where there is a statistically significant difference. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H6 is confirmed.

It should be borne in mind that most of the respondents rated their performance as very high (on a scale of 1 to 7, as many as 406 respondents rated this variable with grades 6 and 7). The respondents who rated their performance low are obviously people who do not have high ambitions, do not make particularly great efforts at work, and who seem to accept this situation relatively easily. Such people certainly have low ratings for the observed dimensions of individual entrepreneurial performance. A similar result can be seen in the previous research (Dechawatanapaisal, 2018), where it was shown that respondents who have a high degree of self-efficacy show greater intentions to leave the organization in the event of adverse circumstances within the organization.

The respondents' perceived finances (FIN)

According to Table 7, a statistically significant difference in the average scores occurs across most of the dimensions: RT - Risk Aversion, IN - Innovation, PA - Attitude Toward Entrepreneurship, PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. The dimensions mentioned above have higher average scores (statistically significantly higher) among the respondents who perceive their financial situation as high. Thus, respondents who perceive their finances as high have a greater risk appetite, greater innovation, a better attitude toward entrepreneurship, and stronger perceived behavioral control and entrepreneurial intentions than those respondents who perceive their financial situation as low. This is very strongly expressed for all of the dimensions, but especially for PBC - Perceived Behavioral Control and EI - Entrepreneurial Intentions. Also, the difference in the average scores between attitude and intentions is smaller for the respondents who perceive their financial standing as high. Accordingly, respondents who perceive their own finances as high are significantly more prepared and determined to concretize their positive attitudes towards entrepreneurship through entrepreneurial intentions. Based on these results, it can be said that hypothesis H7 is confirmed.

This situation is understandable, since the perception of a good financial position certainly gives an individual more security, greater confidence, and more room for risk taking, and, finally, having finances makes it easier to cope with the costs at the very beginning of an entrepreneurial venture. Some existing research has shown that having finances can be important for starting an entrepreneurial venture (Iakovleva, Kolvereid, Gorgievski, & Sørhaug, 2014; Kim, Longest, & Aldrich, 2013; Rajković,



Nikolić, Čočkalović, Terek, & Božić, 2020), and that potential financial difficulties significantly prevent individuals from leaving their current jobs (Virick, Basu, & Rogers, 2015).

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the t-test and previous analyses of all seven observed variables, the profile of the employee who, potentially, has the greatest chances of becoming an entrepreneur emerges. The profile is as follows: a younger man with a high school degree (education does not have such a significant impact), who is employed in a private company, has previous entrepreneurial experience, is successful in his job and has the appropriate finances. Theoretically speaking, such a defined profile may serve to quickly check one's entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions: the greater the number of characteristics which coincide with the characteristics of an "ideal" profile a person has, the more likely that person is to have entrepreneurial intentions. Note that this applies to employees.

From the seven hypotheses posed, four were confirmed, two were partially confirmed, while one hypothesis was rejected. Taking into account the previous presentations, a general conclusion can be drawn: a statistically significant difference in the influence of the observed control variables (the respondents' gender, their age, the respondents' level of education, the ownership structure of the company, the respondents' previous experience in entrepreneurship, their perceived success at work, and their perceived finances) on the level of the individual entrepreneurial orientation dimensions, the achievement dimension and the theory of planned behavior dimensions among employed persons, exists in most cases, with the exception of the respondents' level of education.

As the research was carried out in organizations in Serbia, this fact can be considered as a limitation of this research. Specifically, the results obtained apply primarily to organizations in this country. However, it is assumed with a high degree of certainty that similar results could be obtained in some other countries. This is especially true of countries in the region, as well as other countries in transition.

The theoretical significance of this research stems from the fact that there is an insufficient number of papers dealing with the entrepreneurial intentions of employed persons, and especially the effects of the control variables observed here under such conditions. The practical significance of this research is that it shows that employees should be considered as potential entrepreneurs. Also, the survey indicated which groups, among employed persons, have the highest chances of becoming entrepreneurs. This should certainly be kept in mind when defining future state-level entrepreneurship promotion strategies and programs, as well as when directing entrepreneurial training and deciding on financial support for employed persons with entrepreneurial intentions.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This paper was supported by the Provincial Secretariat for Science and Technological Development, Autonomous Province of Vojvodina, project number: 142-451-2139/2019-01.



REFERENCES

- Altınay, L., Madanoğlu, M., Daniele, R., & Lashley, C. (2012). The influence of family tradition and psychological traits on entrepreneurial intention. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31(2), 489-499.
- Athayde, R. (2009). Measuring Enterprise Potential in Young People. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(2), 481-500.
- Bender, K.A., & Roche, K. (2016). Self-employment and the paradox of the contented female worker. *Small Business Economics*, 47(2), 421-435.
- Bergmann, H., Hundt, C., & Sternberg, R. (2016). What makes student entrepreneurs? On the relevance (and irrelevance) of the university and the regional context for student start-ups. *Small Business Economics*, 47(1), 53-76.
- Bolton, D.L., & Lane, M.D. (2012). Individual Entrepreneurial Orientation: development of a measurement instrument. *Education + Training*, 54(2/3), 219-233.
- Conroy, T., & Weiler, S. (2016). Does gender matter for job creation? Business ownership and employment growth. *Small Business Economics*, 47(2), 397-419.
- Dechawatanapaisal, D. (2018). The moderating effects of demographic characteristics and certain psychological factors on the job embeddedness – turnover relationship among Thai health-care employees. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 26(1), 43-62.
- do Paço, A., Matos Ferreira, J., Raposo, M., Gouveia Rodrigues, R., & Dinis, A. (2015). Entrepreneurial intentions: is education enough? *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(1), 57-75.
- Espíritu-Olmos, R., & Sastre-Castillo, M.A. (2015). Personality traits versus work values: Comparing psychological theories on entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(7), 1595-1598.
- Gawke, J.C., Gorgievski, M.J., & Bakker, A.B. (2017). Employee intrapreneurship and work engagement: A latent change score approach. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 100, 88-100.
- Hatak, I., Harms, R., & Fink, M. (2015). Age, job identification, and entrepreneurial intention. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(1), 38-53.
- Hechavarria, D.M., Terjesen, S.A., Ingram, A.E., Renko, M., Justo, R., & Elam, A. (2017). Taking care of business: the impact of culture and gender on entrepreneurs' blended value creation goals. *Small Business Economics*, 48(1), 225-157.
- Hisrich, R.D., Peters, M.P., & Shepherd, D.A. (2008). *Entrepreneurship* (7th ed.). Zagreb: Mate (in Croatian).
- Hockerts, K. (2017). Determinants of Social Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 41(1), 105-130.
- Hoppe, M. (2016). Policy and entrepreneurship education. *Small Business Economics*, 46(1), 13-29.
- Hormiga, E., Hancock, C., & Valls-Pasola, J. (2013). The relationship between employee propensity to innovate and their decision to create a company. *Management Decision*, 51(5), 938-953.
- Hornsby, J., Peña-Legazque, I., & Guerrero, M. (2013). Guest editorial: the role of corporate entrepreneurship in the current organizational and economic landscape. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 9(3), 295-305.
- Hsu, D.K., Shinnar, R.S., Powell, B.C., & Coffey, B.S. (2017). Intentions to reenter venture creation: The effect of entrepreneurial experience and organizational climate. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 35(8), 928-948.
- Iakovleva, T.A., Kolvereid, L., Gorgievski, M.J., & Sørhaug, Ø. (2014). Comparison of perceived barriers to entrepreneurship in Eastern and Western European countries. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship & Innovation Management*, 18(2/3), 115-133.
- Jain, R., & Ali, S.W. (2012). Personal Characteristics of Indian Entrepreneurs and Intrapreneurs An Empirical Study. *Management and Labour Studies*, 37(4), 295-322.



- Jayawarna, D., Jones, O., & Marlow, S. (2015). The influence of gender upon social networks and bootstrapping behaviours. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 31(3), 316-329.
- Kean, R.C., Van Zandt, S., & Maupin, W. (2008). Successful Aging: The Older Entrepreneur. *Journal of Women & Aging*, 5(1), 25-42.
- Kim, P.H., Longest, K.C., & Aldrich, H.E. (2013). Can You Lend Me a Hand? Task-Role Alignment of Social Support for Aspiring Business Owners. *Work and Occupations*, 40(3), 213-249.
- Knorr, H., Garzón, D., & Martinez, D. (2011). Motivations and differences upon reconciling professional and personal life: an empirical study of businesswomen and businessmen in the Valencian Community. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(3), 391-412.
- Kwong, C., & Thompson, P. (2016). The When and Why: Student Entrepreneurial Aspirations. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(1), 299-318.
- Leppel, K. (2016). The incidence of self-employment by sexual orientation. *Small Business Economics*, 46(3), 347-363.
- Liñán, F., & Chen, Y.W. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intention. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 593-617.
- Luca, M.R., Cazan, A.M., & Tomulescu, D. (2013). Entrepreneurial personality in higher education. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 84, 1045-1049.
- Marshall, D.R., & Gigliotti, R. (2018). Bound for entrepreneurship? A career-theoretical perspective on entrepreneurial intentions. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 16(1), 287-303.
- Minola, T., Criaco, G., & Obschonka, M. (2016). Age, culture, and self-employment motivation. *Small Business Economics*, 46(2), 187-213.
- Miralles, F., Giones, F., & Riverola, C. (2016). Evaluating the impact of prior experience in entrepreneurial intention. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(3), 791-813.
- Miralles, F., Giones, F., & Gozun, B. (2017). Does direct experience matter? Examining the consequences of current entrepreneurial behavior on entrepreneurial intention. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(3), 881-903.
- Mohedano-Suanes, A., & Benitez, D.G. (2018). Intrapreneurs: Characteristics and Behavior. In Tur Porcar A., Ribeiro Soriano D. (Eds.), *Inside the Mind of the Entrepreneur*. (pp. 109-119). Cham: Springer.
- Perenyi, A., Zolin, R., & Maritz, A. (2018). The perceptions of Australian senior entrepreneurs on the drivers of their entrepreneurial activity. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 24(1), 81-103.
- Poggesi, S., Mari, M., & De Vita, L. (2016). What's new in female entrepreneurship research? Answers from the literature. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(3), 735-764.
- Rajković, J., Nikolić, M., Čočkalović, D., Terek, E., Božić, S. (2020). National culture and the entrepreneurial intentions of students in Serbia. *Journal for East European Management Studies*, 25(1), 105-141.
- Sahut, J.M., Gharbi, S., & Mili, M. (2015). Identifying factors key to encouraging entrepreneurial intentions among seniors. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 32(4), 252-264.
- Santos, F.J., Roomi, M.A., & Liñán, F. (2016). About Gender Differences and the Social Environment in the Development of Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 54(1), 49-66.
- Saraf, N. (2015). What Determines Entrepreneurial Intention in India? *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation in Emerging Economies*, 1(1), 39-55.
- Shinnar, R.S., Giacomini, O., & Janssen, F. (2012). Entrepreneurial Perceptions and Intentions: The Role of Gender and Culture. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 36(3), 465-493.
- Shneor, R., Metin Camgöz, S., & Bayhan Karapinar, P. (2013). The interaction between culture and sex in the formation of entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development An International Journal*, 25(9-10), 781-803.
- Siu, W., & Lo, E.S. (2013). Cultural Contingency in the Cognitive Model of Entrepreneurial Intention. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 37(2), 147-173.



- Tsai, K.H., Chang, H.C., & Peng, C.Y. (2016). Refining the linkage between perceived capability and entrepreneurial intention: roles of perceived opportunity, fear of failure, and gender. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 12(4), 1127-1145.
- Virick, M., Basu, A., & Rogers, A. (2015). Antecedents of Entrepreneurial Intention among Laid-Off Individuals: A Cognitive Appraisal Approach. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 53(2), 450-468.
- Wei, L.Q., & Ling, Y. (2015). CEO characteristics and corporate entrepreneurship in transition economies: Evidence from China. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(6), 1157-1165.



UTICAJ KONTROLNIH VARIJABLI NA PREDUZETNIČKE NAMERE MEĐU ZAPOSLENIM LICIMA

Rezime:

U radu su prikazani rezultati proučavanja dimenzija individualne preduzetničke orijentacije, dimenzije postignuća i teorije dimenzija planiranog ponašanja, u zavisnosti od sedam varijabli: pola ispitanika, njihove starosti, obrazovnog nivoa ispitanika, vlasničke strukture preduzeća, prethodnog iskustva ispitanika u preduzetništvu, njihove pretpostavljene performanse posla i njihove percepcije finansija. Specifičnost istraživanja je da su ispitanici zaposlene osobe. Uzorak je obuhvatio 540 ispitanika iz 72 organizacije u Srbiji. Analiza podataka je izvršena putem t-testa. Statistički značajna razlika u uticaju posmatranih varijabli postoji u većini slučajeva, osim varijable - nivo obrazovanja ispitanika. Tako su četiri od sedam hipoteza u potpunosti potvrđene, dve delimično potvrđene, dok je jedna hipoteza odbačena. Profil zaposlene osobe koja potencijalno ima najveće šanse da postane preduzetnik je sledeći: mlađi muškarac sa srednjom stručnom spremom (diploma nema tako značajan uticaj), koji je zaposlen u privatnoj kompaniji, ima prethodno preduzetničko iskustvo, uspešan je na poslu i ima odgovarajuće finansije.

Ključne reči:

individualna preduzetnička orijentacija, teorija planiranog ponašanja, preduzetničke namere, zaposlene osobe, Srbija.