ABSTRACT

Paper aims to explore characteristics of students needed to be fostered for development of future entrepreneurs. The emphasis is on the educational part of the entrepreneurial carrier. It is discussed what is expected from the educational system concerning the preparation of the future graduates that will decide to follow up their business ideas and dare to test their strength on the market. Significant connection was found in all categories believed to be characteristics of the entrepreneurs and the measured intention itself. Additional results confirmed the relationship linking the entrepreneurial intention and demand for this type of education. Sample size is 403 graduate students from the Republic of Croatia.
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INTRODUCTION

When discussing entrepreneurship more than one definition of the phenomena is used to describe the underlying idea. Two most common approaches would distinct in emphasizing the ideology of entrepreneurship and the other in practical effects on the economics. For example in its work Gartner, 1988 observes entrepreneurship as tools involving the creation or discovery of opportunities and their enactment. It is said that the person who is considered to be an entrepreneur can causes new things to emerge (McCarthy, 2000; Ogbor, 2000; and Sorensen, 2008). Entrepreneurship is viewed as a cure for the economic employment, growth, and technological breakthrough. As Birley, 1986 and Zahra, 2005 described: it as a process of economic revitalization and a job creation instrument. Also it is considered to be a determinant shaper of the global cultures (Gudeman, 1992; Inglehart & Baker, 2000). Minniti and Lévesque, 2008 say it has the ability to fuel the economic development. Tang & Koveos, 2004; Robinson & Sexton, 1994 identified entrepreneurship and venture creation as having a significant impact on the economic growth as well. Wennekers and Thurik, 1999 articulate that entrepreneurs can link the national institutions to the economic outcomes at the macro level, acting as agents. Indeed there is some empirical evidence for this positive linkage between the economic growth and innovation. (Van Praag and Versloot, 2007; Reynolds et al., Schumpeter (1911) recognize this link. Entrepreneurs are ought to identify new solutions that will undermine the existing and through their innovations cause new order to apply. Based on 1994; Sheshinski et al., 2007; Audretsch and Fritsch, 2002, Sternberg and Wennekers, 2005; Stel et al., 2005; Wong et al., 2005; Acs and Szerb, 2007). Even the classics as in Schumpeterian model and the theory of creative destruction of Aghion and Howitt, 1998 developed a theory of growth where entrepreneur phenomena play a vital part. As
Aldrich, 2005 reported only in States since 1992 until 1996 11.2 million jobs were created with the foundation of new organizations. However some authors are very careful with accepting this general attitude and argue that entrepreneurship may not create growth in industrialized countries (Graevenitz et al. 2010). Nevertheless, approach considering entrepreneurship to be of great importance is widely accepted among policymakers through the Europe and States (Oosterbeek et al. 2009) and even the World Bank. However it should be noted that entrepreneurship development is not the same throughout the countries. This was highlighted in the work of Acs, 2006; Audretsch and Thurik, 2000; Rees and Shah, 1986 and Blanchflower, 2000.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

The question remains what are the key differences between the countries having the entrepreneurship growing and others that don’t. This might be contributed to the entrepreneurial education, institutional development, and social differences or misbalanced opportunities regarding the stage of economic development. This paper will have more emphasis on the social and educational factors that might be the cause for difference in the levels of entrepreneurship development. European Commission in 2006 stated that entrepreneurship should be stimulated by having more entrepreneurial education and the means for it should be incorporating this type of agenda in the curriculum which was adopted by many EU member states (Oosterbeek et al. 2009). Similar policy actions were performed in the States as well (Kuratko, 2005). The question yet arises. Is it like being a writer? It is argued that even with certain amount of writing talent there is more to be learned. It is similar with teaching entrepreneurship. When a person has the ability of recognizing the opportunities to create some new value on the market it is just a first step of becoming and staying a successful entrepreneur. Many scholars have confirmed the relationship between the general education and entrepreneurial success (Van der Sluis et al., 2006; Van der Sluis and Van Praag, 2007) as well as the effectiveness of business training (Karlan and Valdivia, 2006). This paper argues whether entrepreneurial education could influence students’ attitudes toward entrepreneurship. Is it possible to teach an individual how to be an entrepreneur? That question has been and will continue to create debate among academics and practitioners. Those who believed there is something to be taught started rapidly changing their curriculum increasing the number of endowed position in entrepreneurship and schools that were offering this type of education (Florin, Karri & Rossiter, 2007). Having States as an example of an entrepreneurial country it is interesting that their first entrepreneurship course was developed 63 years ago by a Myles Mace and it was held at Harvard’s Business school in February 1947, having 188 second year MBA students (Katz, 2003). Number of students taking entrepreneurship classes rose quickly. By the 1994 there were more than 120,000 students only in America that were having some sort of entrepreneurial education (Katz, 1994). This number increased by 50% until the end of a new millennium without producing any new studies other than those who already existed. Trend preceded reaching more than 2200 courses, over 1600 schools, 277 endowed positions and more than 100 entrepreneurial centers (Katz, 1994). The question is how exactly does the entrepreneurial education helps fostering entrepreneurial awareness and the intention of starting a new business. Some argue that attitudes of students are largely influenced by the educational actions, but there is a lack of precise knowledge about the role of the entrepreneurial education specifically (Donckels, 1991; Krueger and Brazeal, 1994). It is considered important to assess and develop entrepreneurial mindset among students. One of the reasons for the increasing demand toward entrepreneurial education might be explained with high personal costs of failing when starting and doing a private business (Florin, Karri & Rossiter, 2007). In the work of Oosterbeek et al. 2009 authors tried to investigate on the effects of the most common educational program in States and Europe called Achievement Young Enterprise. This program was designed in a way for students to get the experience of running a mini company (SMC program). More than 40 countries and 2 million students participated only in Europe in 2005/2006. Students participating where not selected according to their entrepreneurial intention and each project company was given an advisor with real life experience. They found that the program had none of the intending effects; students self assessed entrepreneurial skills didn’t increase and there was a slightly negative effect on the entrepreneurial intention. On the other hand there are many papers confirming the positive impact of the entrepreneurial education on the entrepreneurial intention, perceived attractiveness and feasibility of new venture initiation or even actual startups (Tkachev and Kolvereid, 1999; Peterman and Kennedy, 2003; Fayolle et al., 2006; Souitaris et al., 2007, Dainow, 1986; Gorman et al., 1997). This effect is also found for some entrepreneurship programs as well (McMullan et al., 2002).
Argument of those who propose positive effects of the entrepreneurial education is that the experiment done with the general public in the work of Oosterbeek et al. 2009 yielded such a result due to the characteristics of students participating in the project, implying that if students lacked entrepreneurial tendencies their attitudes would even strengthen over the period of the project. It is argued that this is ethically more acceptable. Testing entrepreneurial characteristics in the school might save many resources for those who will better develop their carriers not working as entrepreneurs. Conversely Peterman and Kennedy (2003) found differential effects; where students with the priory high intentions received less intensive positive treatment effect than those with priory lower intentions. Nevertheless it is argued that the research confirming the effects of a specific education is often methodologically limited.

In his work Baron, 2004 explains the importance of entrepreneurial experience prior to the starting a new venture. He says that one of the crucial factors influencing his personal decision of becoming an entrepreneur was his contact to the real life entrepreneurs, directly or through the media. Even through lectures that he used for his students he said to have learned a lot about the role of an entrepreneur, which in his view was influential in making his decision.

Specific emphasis concerning the entrepreneurial education is put on the university students. Finally there is some consensus about the importance of teaching entrepreneurship at the university level. Entrepreneurs that originate from the university are likely to employ more people (Dietrich, 1999) and to make higher investments (Reynolds et al., 1994) in comparison with their nonacademic counterparts. Harhoff, 1999 and Shane 2004, found that university startups have the spillover effects on the regional economy and do better off than others (Shane, 2004). Thus it is apparent why many efforts are aimed toward providing entrepreneurial education especially on the level of higher education and many resources are spent to provide better infrastructure for the university spinoffs (Gibb, 2002; Peterman & Kennedy, 2003).

As a way of better understanding entrepreneurial drive, paper tries to explore social characteristic of students with high degree of entrepreneurial intention. Bird, 1988; Crant, 1996; Shapero, 1982; Zahara and Bogner, 2000 argue that such social and economical facilitators are very important in its influence to the entrepreneurial development. Furthermore Baron and Shane et al. in press said that factors as motives, traits, skills and abilities also contribute to the decisions of starting a new venture.

If understanding these social factors policy makers would have more effective tools in facilitating the entrepreneurial process and ensuring entrepreneurial atmosphere. One of the most common characteristic that is associated with the entrepreneurs is the tendency towards risk (Stewart & Roth, 2001; Stewart & Roth, 2004; Brockhaus, 1980). Richard Cantillon as early as 1732 described entrepreneurship to be the readiness of individuals to create arbitrage relating the financial risk of a new business (Minniti & Levesque, 2008). It is well known that the chances of succeeding as staying successful as an entrepreneur are quite small. Most of the startups fail in the first year and still entrepreneurs believe they will escape the odds. Otherwise it would be unlikely for them to risk their reputation, money and invested efforts if not having this bias. As Shepperd et al., 1996 said they see the probabilities of succeeding to be much higher than the actual data suggests. According to Kahneman and Lovallo, 1994 they are not less risk averse than others. Yet they have the tendency to underestimate the amount of risk and suffer from the inflated illusion of control (Simon et al., 2000). This is known as an occurring human bias. If focusing on gains people are more risk averse and more risk tolerant when focusing on losses (Baron, 2004). This is often illustrated with the example of people rather having 50% chance of losing a certain amount of money than a certain loss of double as less. When the focus is on the gains the decision is reversed. This type of a cognitive error that is found with the entrepreneurs is likely to influence their decisions to start new ventures (Baron, 1998; Busenitz and Barney, 1997; Simon et al., 2000). Entrepreneurs are considered as people facing the future and dueling about the past is considered as a waste of time (Baron, 2000). Other authors describe necessary qualities for the entrepreneur to be novelty, creativity (Gilad, 1984; Whiting, 1988; Bolin, 1997; Mumfordet al., 2002b), sensibility and imagination emphasizing the ethics of the entrepreneurial carrier (Xu and Ruef, 2004). Buchholz & Rosenthal 2005; Herman et al., 2007 said that students’ creativity and proactivity are connected to the self-measured perception of desirability and entrepreneurial drive what is consistent with the theory that certain characteristics are the roots of entrepreneurship. Having the ability to innovate and to recognize opportunities is just stepping in to the entrepreneurial process. In order to startup businesses, materialize ideas and actually satisfying a certain need on the market some capital investments are required. In order to secure this funds entrepreneurs usually have to present their projects to business angels or partners convincing them the innovation they have come up with is profitable. This requires some persuasiveness and therefore it is a characteristic of great importance to the entrepreneur (Gartner et al., 1992).
Additionally, having entrepreneurial background is considered to be helpful or encouraging when deciding about entrepreneurial carrier. It is argued that students’ attitudes are under environmental influence, background and education (Ede & Panigrahi, 1998). One of the paper’s tasks is to verify this connection. This connection may be due to the exposure to the real life entrepreneurial experience. This finding may be important for the curriculum adjustment in order to insure the same stimulus for the students not having the entrepreneurial background. Entrepreneurial background is also found influential in the work of Zampetakis, 2008: saying that for the students having entrepreneurial background only creativity influences perceived desirability and desirability of students without the entrepreneurial background is influenced only by proactivity. Moreover some other authors explored the traits of entrepreneurs. For example Begley & Boyd, 1987; Stewart, Watson, Carland, & Carland, 1999 speak of entrepreneurs as people with need for achievement, Chen, Greene, & Crick, 1998 as highly self-efficient and Alvarez & Busenitz, 2001 describe them as those how recognize opportunities where others do not. Markman et al. 2001, constituted that probability of starting a new venture increases with the self-efficacy of the patent holder. Similarly Baum, 1994 concluded that the self-efficacy is the best predictor of the company growth.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned before the first part addresses the categories believed to be defying marks of future entrepreneurs. Creativity, (e.g. How creative I am?), leadership of others: colleagues and friends (e.g. Team work), intuitive problem solving (e.g. Willingness to take risks in problem solving), achievement in project work (e.g. Problem perception and taking pride in their own project work), personal control concerning the future carrier (e.g. Am I in control?), and attitudes towards financial risks (Willingness to take risks in order to achieve bigger rewards). With the intention of verifying reliability of items measuring the six concepts Cronbach alpha was calculated. Prior to testing some items needed to be recoded. Value of Cronbach’s alpha for the items measuring creativity equals 0,568. Since it would increase only insignificantly with the deletion of the first item all variables were retained. This could be interpreted as medium strength reliability. Value of Cronbach’s alpha for the leadership of others: colleagues and friends were 0,593 and all the variables were retained. Intuitive problem solving had a value of 0,473 which would increase to a 0,543 with the deletion of seventh variable “If I am not familiar with all the facts concerning the problem, it is not possible to find its’ solution.” This increase was significant and previous value of alpha was low so this variable was expelled. Achievement in project work reached a value of 0,724 which is a sign of high strength reliance. Personal control concerning the future carrier had a Cronabachs’ alpha 0,667 and again all the variables were retained. Finally 0,697 was the value for the attitude towards financial risks, again proving these items to be a
reliable representation of the measure of tendency toward financial risk. One of the paper’s interests was the relationship between each of these concepts and the intention of becoming an entrepreneur. Each concept was measured by adding and deducting the score for related individual items. The intention itself was measured with Likert scale with the same level of precision ranging from 1 to 7, one being very unlikely and 7 very likely to become an entrepreneur. This positive relationship was confirmed with all the variables except one. There was a lack of positive or negative connection between the success in project work and the intention of being an entrepreneur. This might be due to the lack of exclusive attachment of project work to the entrepreneur’s carrier. Students having the intention of working for somebody else still might have had high scores due to the importance of project success and willingness to work hard on a particular project ($r=0.002; p=0.949$). For all the variables whose relationships were confirmed 5% level significance was used. Creativity ($r=0.145; p=0.000$), leadership of others ($r=0.122; p=0.001$) intuitive problem solving ($r=0.151; p=0.000$), personal control concerning the future carrier ($r=0.179; p=0.000$) and attitudes towards financial risks ($r=0.238 p=0.000$) are all significantly positively correlated with the intention of becoming an entrepreneur. This indicates that students who prefer the creative approach: like tasks that develop their imagination, professors that innovate in their teaching and consider imagination to be important are likely to become entrepreneurs. For the leadership of others the best approximation of the ability was the self-perception. Thus the results show that students who are successful in persuading others, encourage people on to the group work, like to be in the center of attention, take responsibility and motivate others are also likely to become entrepreneurs. Those who believe mistakes to be a good way of learning, believe in their judgment, instinct and are dedicated to the solution search have stronger tendency to start their own business. Students with the firm belief to have the high control of the course of their carrier development have stronger intention of starting their own businesses. This could be due to the higher confidence in shaping the direction of personal carriers. This might be the sign of being more confident in having influence on personal results. Finally the strongest correlation among these variables belongs to financial risk. It is of common knowledge that the entrepreneurs are ought to be more incline to the financial risk that with certainty will arise when starting a new business. This is definitely one of the most distinctive characteristics of the entrepreneurs. More precise results are given in Table 1.

Aiming to reveal even more about the underlying foundation, triggers of the entrepreneurial drive, survey examines the social influence. One of the facilitators considered to be of great importance is the entrepreneurial background. This refers to the carriers of parents and other family member’s. Students were asked about their entrepreneurial background. The score would add up as more members have engaged in their own businesses and the weight of the score would decrease as the family members would become less closer, meaning for example: uncles would have less impact than parents. This score was put against the intention of becoming an entrepreneur. The correlation coefficient was found significant ($r=0.239; p=0.000$) on the level of 5%. This result indicates that those students having the entrepreneurial background would start their business more easily than their counterparts. The reason may be due to having the first hand entrepreneurship experience and being convinced that entrepreneurship is more feasible (Dabic at al 2009). If true, the question is could the first hand experience be replaced with the lecture having the entrepreneurial experience? Either way this finding certainly reaches for a debate. As mentioned previously there is still some discussion about the importance of entrepreneurial education at the University. Some argue that it is not necessary to teach it, under the assumption that there is nothing to teach, saying that really good ideas will find their way eventually. But the question remains, will some ideas that are actually good fail as a consequence of lacking this sort of knowledge of what to do with them. Still our research cannot answer these questions in detail due to the normative character of the issues at hand, but may offer some insights on the students’ perspective.

They were asked if they think that University should have an entrepreneurship class and to rate their preference from 1 being strongly disagree and 7 strongly agree. The results are displayed in Table 2. Average answer was 5.53 and median 6, meaning that 50% (n=186) of students said they strongly agree with entrepreneurship being the University class. The cumulative number of those who disagreed in some extent with the previous statement was less than 15% (this percentage includes Likert scale 1,2,3). Also it is observed that gender didn’t make any difference concerning the attitudes on entrepreneurial behavior ($p=0.486$), but those student who had more of entrepreneurial background were positively correlated with the affirmation of entrepreneurial education ($r=0.087; p=0.033$). This might be explained due to the better insights of what is necessary to succeed as an entrepreneur and being convinced that should be learned on the University.
CONCLUSION

If we define entrepreneurial drive as an “individual’s perception of the desirability and feasibility to proactively pursue opportunities and creatively respond to challenges tasks, needs, and obstacles in innovative ways,” and we find it important to produce students with this specific drive, then it is clear that just teaching skills and forming students’ attitudes is not going to be enough. Development of different area related initiatives throughout the business program and fostering students’ attitudes and intentions would be valuable. This research was done to observe the attitudes of university students toward entrepreneurial education, learn about the characteristics associated with entrepreneurship and to understand the role of entrepreneurial background. The questionnaire was anonymous and consisted of two parts, first being connected to six concepts considered to be defining characteristics of the students having the strong entrepreneurial drive to start their own businesses and the second part was aiming to explore the social background that could be inhibiting or fostering entrepreneurial inclination. Our findings imply that students who prefer creative approach are likely to become entrepreneurs. For the leadership of others the best approximation of the ability was the self-perception. Research results show that students who are successful in persuading others, encourage people on to the group work, like to be in the center of attention, take responsibility and motivate others are also likely to become entrepreneurs. Those who believe mistakes to be a good way of learning, believe in their judgment, instinct and are dedicated to the solution search have stronger tendency to start their own business. Students with the firm belief to have the high control of the course of their carrier development have stronger intention of starting their own businesses. Our survey continues to examine the social influence. One of the factors, that is considered to be of great importance is the entrepreneurial background. Students were asked about their entrepreneurial background. The result would get higher as more family members have engaged in their own businesses and the score would decrease as there were less of those who had entrepreneurial experience. This was put against the intention of becoming an entrepreneur. It indicated that those students having more entrepreneurial background would start their business more easily than their counterparts. What is the causality underlying this connection could be the questions for some further research.
Appendix

Behavioral characteristics

1. Perception of creativity in school
2. Self-perception of leadership ability
3. Intuition in problem solving
4. Orientation/direction of achievement/success in project work
5. Perceived control toward personal carrier
6. Attitudes toward financial risk

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>g</th>
<th>ob</th>
<th>eb</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>pw</th>
<th>cc</th>
<th>fr</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eb</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eb</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ssvd</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ospup</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.949</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pokp</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pspf</td>
<td></td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.156</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iurb</td>
<td></td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.

Do you think it is necessary to include entrepreneurship as college course?
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