

<https://doi.org/10.38190/ope.10.2.14>

Izvorni znanstveni članak / Original scientific paper

ENTREPRENEURIAL MYTHS (OR REALITIES) AND ENTREPRENEURIAL INTENTIONS

Davor Širola, PhD, College professor
Polytechnik of Rijeka
Address: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka
e-mail: davor.sirola@veleri.hr

Robert Strahinja, MSc, Lecturer
Polytechnik of Rijeka
Address: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka
e-mail: robert.strahinja@veleri.hr

Nikola Novosel, BSc, student
Polytechnik of Rijeka
Address: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka
e-mail: nnovosel@veleri.hr

ABSTRACT

The development of modern entrepreneurship research began some 50 years ago. In the meantime, various definitions of entrepreneurship led to different interpretations of its scope, and subsequently, the entrepreneurial myths emerged. This topic was studied quite intensively in the 1980s and 1990s, and numerous results succeeded in demystifying most of the entrepreneurial myths. Despite that, the entrepreneurial myths persist and regularly appear on the web portals, media, and bloggers' articles. On the other side, contemporary entrepreneurship textbooks include entrepreneurial myths as a lesson which could eliminate some obstacles for the nascent entrepreneurs. This study revealed that the entrepreneurial myths are somewhat present among younger examinees, non-entrepreneurs in Croatia, who have a low or medium level of education. Still, not even these demographic groups view those myths as realities. Further analysis pointed out that there is a statistically significant, although negative and weak correlation between the perception of entrepreneurial myths as myths (not as realities) and a higher level of entrepreneurial intentions.

Keywords: entrepreneurship; entrepreneurial myths; entrepreneurial intentions

1. INTRODUCTION

The link between entrepreneurship and multifold economic and social benefits was discovered long ago. For instance, the impact of entrepreneurial ventures on economic growth has been repeatedly confirmed in numerous studies (e.g. Birch and McGracken, 1982; Reynolds, 1986; Stevenson and Sahlmen, 1986, cited in Morris and Sexton, 1996, 5) as responsible for nearly 85% of the US employment growth. The connections between entrepreneurship and economic and employment growth, innovation and technological advance were thoroughly studied and confirmed from numerous authors (for instance, the Contemporary entrepreneurship overview by Bögenhold et al., 2016).

Apart from the research studies, the value of entrepreneurship concept was certified by entering the European Union's prime list of eight key competences fundamental for each individual in a knowledge-based society (European Council, 2006). Nowadays, entrepreneurial thinking and acting are seen as one of the 21st century meta-capabilities, which young generations should be instructed (WEF, 2009, 61). These entrepreneurial skills apply not only to youth entrepreneurship, but also to intrapreneurship and social entrepreneurship (Obschonka et al., 2017, 488).

Given this multilayered relevance of the entrepreneurship for the economic and individual development, company and personal success, a multitude of interest for entrepreneurial topics from scholars, practitioners, educators and professionals is self-evident. However, the comprehension of the concept of entrepreneurship and an entrepreneur *per se* remains somewhat vague. That is why some scholars introduced the notion of entrepreneurial myths while considering some general perceptions in the field of entrepreneurship (e.g. Morris, 1998, cited in Sightler, 2000, 119-120; Timmons and Spinelli, 2007, Corman and Lussier, 2001, Steyn, 1998, Bekker and Staude, 1988, cited in Merwe and de Swardt, 2008, 451).

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the level of the perseverance of various entrepreneurial myths among the younger population in Croatia, considering their entrepreneurial status and other hypothesized demographic variables. Furthermore, empirical research encompasses the impact of the entrepreneurial myths perception on entrepreneurial intentions of the respondents. The article is comprised of five sections. The introductory part is followed by the literature review, which includes the hypothesis development and methodology. Finally, the empirical results section is accompanied by closing remarks which cover the discussion part.

2. LITERATURE OVERVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Entrepreneurial myths

The entrepreneurship as a phenomenon has been attracting scholarly interest for a very long time. The first contributions were registered in the 18th century, but a more systematic entrepreneurship research only began in the 1970s and 1980s. However, the quest for determining the domain of research on entrepreneurship continues from the 2000s onward. (Landström and Benner, 2010, 15-16). Despite the importance and pervasive-

ness of the entrepreneurship at that time, there were still disagreements or misconceptions about what exactly constitutes entrepreneurship. The entrepreneurial descriptions were applied to issues like competitive strategy, leadership, or performance potential in children (Sightler, 2000, 118). In the field of entrepreneurship, bold claims presented as absolute facts continuously appear (Rehn et al., 2013, 544): “entrepreneurship has been identified as a key driver of economic growth”; “high growth entrepreneurship is one of the most central issues for a healthy economy”; etc. Some of those myths have been revoked, for instance, the belief of the policymakers that start-up companies are the growth creators. Shane (2009, 141) found that, on average, the start-ups were job destructors, so public subsidies, tax exemptions or transfer payments to any new business (instead of those with growth potential) were futile.

The entrepreneurial myths about the entrepreneurs as individuals provoke even greater tendency to become generally adopted as universal truths. Most of them were successfully challenged by respectable authors, like Morris (1998, 1-11, cited in Sightler, 2000, 119-120), Timmons and Spinelli (2004, 67-68), Barringer and Ireland (2012, 15-17), but they still persist. Various scholars like Timmons and Spinelli (2007, 18-20); Corman and Lussier (2001, 1/12); Sightler (2001, 13-32); Steyn (1998: 11, 12); Morris (1998, 1-11); Bekker and Staude (1988, 2-4), argued that certain general perceptions of entrepreneurial myths might be even harmful to policymakers’ decisions, and discouraging for prospective or nascent entrepreneurs (cited in Merwe and Swardt, 2011, 451). However, the necessity to confirm the evidence about entrepreneurial myths and realities, encourages some new studies to emerge (e.g. Entrepreneurship & Regional Development journal special issue: *The Myths of Entrepreneurship?* in 2013, or the book *Illusions of Entrepreneurship – The Costly Myths That Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live by*, devoted to the existence of 67 entrepreneurial myths, Shane, 2008).

Well-known entrepreneurial myths include the following statements: Entrepreneurs are born, not made; Entrepreneurs are gamblers; Entrepreneurship is all about luck; Entrepreneurship is all about greed; Most entrepreneurial ventures fail; Entrepreneurs are motivated primarily by money; Money is the most important start-up ingredient; If an entrepreneur has enough money, he or she cannot fail; If an entrepreneur is talented, success should happen in a year or two; Entrepreneurs are their own bosses and completely independent; Entrepreneurs work longer and harder than managers in large companies; Entrepreneurs experience a great deal of stress and pay a high price; Starting a business is risky and often ends in failure; Entrepreneurs should be young and energetic.

These myths appertain to the typical scope of entrepreneurship courses on different educational levels (e.g. textbooks of Kuratko, 2014, 5-8; Timmons and Spinelli, 2004, 67-68, Barringer and Ireland, 2012, 15-17). However, a broad spectrum of prospective entrepreneurs does not get a chance to study these myths or even basic entrepreneurship postulates. That includes some of the students of economic science in Croatia. Concurrently, general media, web portals and bloggers on social media, repeatedly emphasize these assumptions as realities (not myths), which might affect the perceptions of the prospective or nascent entrepreneurs (and the process of entrepreneurial intentions development). The influence of these perceptions onto diverse respondents (students in particular), were hypothesized as follows:

- H₁ There are significant differences in the perception of the entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions, regarding demographic variables.
- H₂ There are significant differences in the perception of the entrepreneurial myths among entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs.

2.2. Entrepreneurial intentions

Entrepreneurial intention indicates the effort that the person will make to carry out entrepreneurial behaviour (Linan and Chen, 2006: 4). As opposed to scant attention devoted to the investigation of entrepreneurial myths, the research of entrepreneurial intentions comprehends a vast number of studies. For example, meta-analysis of Haus et al. (2013, 145) included 30 studies with an overall sample size of 52.367 individuals; Schlaegel and Koenig (2014, 307) meta-analysed 98 studies with 123 samples, while Linan and Fayolle (2015, 911-914), analyzed 409 studies of entrepreneurial intentions between 2004 and 2013, in their meta-analysis.

The theory of planned behaviour has become the 'reference' theory of entrepreneurial intentions research (Linan and Fayolle, 2015, 909). Numerous studies confirmed the relation between attitudes and intentions. For instance, Armitage and Conner (2001, 481) conducted a meta-analysis of 115 studies and determined an average (medium) correlation of 0.49. The similar correlation ($r = 0.46$) was found in Macedonia (Tomovska Misoska et al., 2016, 1069). The research of Rajh et al. (2016, 14) established regression coefficient (β) of 0.44 in four Southeast European countries (including Croatia). Somewhat lower levels of correlation were found for the subjective norm and entrepreneurial abilities as predictors of entrepreneurial intentions. Although, extensive previous research about the influence of the perception of entrepreneurial myths on entrepreneurial intentions has not yet been found. The purpose of this study was to verify if the perceptions (attitudes) of entrepreneurial myths affect the process of entrepreneurial intentions development. Consequently, the following hypothesis was proposed:

- H₃ The perceptions of the entrepreneurial myths influence the entrepreneurial intentions of the respondents.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND RESULTS

3.1. Research instrument and sample description

Scant previous research of entrepreneurial myths probably caused various lists of myths and consequently no agreement from scholars about consistent measurement instrument. Hence, the empirical research in this study followed prior lists of entrepreneurial myths drawn up mostly by Michael H. Morris (1998, cited in Sightler, 2000, 119-120), Timmons and Spinelli (2004, 67-68), Barringer and Ireland (2012, 15-17). Eventually, 22 entrepreneurial myths were recognized and analyzed. Additional five statements covered the areas specific for entrepreneurial implementation in Croatian environment (e.g. the existence of the entrepreneurial mindset in the public realm or the image and tendencies of Croatian entrepreneurs).

Despite the extensive research opus in the scope of the entrepreneurial intentions, measurement scale development did not receive equal attention. Linan and Chen (2009: 612) recognized this shortage and proposed a scale which has been broadly cited and used. In this study, the original Linan and Chen instrument was supplemented with some statements previously tested by Kibler (2013, 323), Pejić Bach et al. (2018, 1462), Dohse and Walter (2012, 892).

The questionnaire employed (named “Do entrepreneurial myths exist in Croatia”), contains 36 statements for both variables (entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions), plus six demographic (control) variables (sex, age, profession, education level, employment status and industry). For all variables (except demographic) a five-point Likert-type scale (from 1: “totally disagree” to 5: “totally agree”) was applied. The questionnaire was arranged via the LimeSurvey tool and distributed to over 1.660 e-mail addresses of students, ex-students and employees of Polytechnic of Rijeka, and high school pupils in Karlovac. Between May, 11th and June, 05th 2020., 278 complete responses were collected (approx. 17% response rate). The characteristics of the sample are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample descriptive statistics

Characteristics	N	%	Characteristics	N	%
<i>Sex</i>	278		<i>Age (years)</i>	278	
Female	179	65.46	< 18	7	2.53
Male	99	34.54	19 - 23	74	26.71
<i>Education level</i>	278		24 - 29	41	26.3
Lower	6	2.16	30 - 39	71	14.80
High school graduate	129	46.40	40 - 49	62	25.63
Bachelor's degree	61	21.94	50 - 59	17	6.14
Master's degree or higher	82	29.50	> 60	5	1.81
<i>Employment status</i>	278		<i>Profession</i>	278	
Employed in the profit sector	45	16.19	Economy/business/tourism	116	41.73
Employed in the public sector	21	7.55	Engineering (traffic/mach./electro.)	40	14.39
Unemployed	11	3.96	Informatics/computing	26	9.35
Entrepreneur	112	40.29	Law	6	2.16
Student / pupil	64	23.02	Medicine / biotechnology	24	8.63
Retiree	1	0.36	Other	67	24.10
Start-up incubator attendee	5	1.80	<i>Company owners</i>	278	
Other	19	6.83	All industries	147	52.90

Source: Author's research

3.2. The reliability test

The internal consistency of the instrument was evaluated using the Cronbach alpha. Table 2 contains a summary of the results.

Table 2. Cronbach alpha coefficient values

<i>Variable (concept)</i>	<i>No. of items</i>	<i>Cronbach α coefficient</i>
Entrepreneurial myths	27	0.80
Entrepreneurial Intentions	9	0.90

Source: Author's research

The reliability analysis shows that the values of the Cronbach alpha vary between 0.80 and 0.90, which is within the referential limits of reliability.

4. RESEARCH FINDINGS

The analysis of the collected empirical data was performed with the statistical tool GNU PSPP Statistical Analysis Software (Release 0.9.0-g3a3d58, version 2014). The methods of descriptive and inferential statistics were employed here. A comparison of the results regarding control variables was conducted with t-test for independent samples and ANOVA. Table 3 contains only statistically significant differences between the concept results.

Table 3. Statistically significant differences regarding control variables

Sex	Female (N = 179)		Male (N = 99)		t	Sig.
<i>Variable</i>	A.M.	Std. Dev.	A.M.	Std. Dev.		
Entrepreneurial intentions	3.41	0.99	3.70	0.92	-2.39	0.018*
Age	≤ 29 y. (N=122)		≥ 30 ≤ 49 y. (N=133)		≥ 50 y. (N = 22)	
<i>Variable</i>	A.M.	Std. Dev.	A.M.	Std. Dev.	A.M.	Std. Dev.
Entrepreneurial myths	2.71	0.35	2.44	0.41	2.41	0.27
Entrepreneurial intentions	3.09	0.94	3.85	0.88	3.84	0.86
					F	Sig.
					18.46	0.000**
					23.67	0.000**
Education level	Lower & Middle (N=135)		Bachelor & Master (N=143)		t	Sig.
<i>Variable</i>	A.M.	Std. Dev.	A.M.	Std. Dev.		
Entrepreneurial myths	2.63	0.40	2.48	0.41	-3.06	0.002**
Entrepreneurs vs Non-entrepreneurs	Non-entrepreneurs (N = 146)		Entrepreneurs (N = 132)		t	Sig.
<i>Variable</i>	A.M.	Std. Dev.	A.M.	Std. Dev.		
Entrepreneurial myths	2.43	0.43	2.68	0.34	-5.23	0.000**
Entrepreneurial intentions	4.09	0.61	2.88	0.91	13.21	0.000**

Continuation of Table 3

Employed in the profit sector vs the public sector	Employed in the profit sector (N = 45)		Employed in the public sector (N = 21)		t	Sig.
Entrepreneurial intentions	3.39	0.87	2.58	0.95	3.43	0.001**

Notes: A.M. = arithmetic mean; Std. Dev. = standard deviation; Sig. = significance; **significance level at 0.01; *significance level at 0.05

Source: Author's research

The results in Table 3 indicate that younger respondents (≤ 29) consider the entrepreneurial myths more as realities, but all age groups have results below the neutral value (three). Consequently, all respondents may be classified as 'non-believers' regarding entrepreneurial myths. The same conclusion goes for the respondents with 'lower' and 'middle' education level, that express more propensity to the existence of entrepreneurial myths. However, the average results remain below the neutral level three on the 1-5 scale, which is viewed as a threshold. Eventually, the entrepreneurs demonstrate a moderately higher level of perception of entrepreneurial myths (compared to non-entrepreneurs), but also below the value of three.

The average entrepreneurial myth scale score of 2,55 indicates that the respondents somewhat disagree with the statements, i.e. that they perceived the myths as untrue. Only five myths (out of 22) have average values above three. The highest mean refers to the myth that "entrepreneurs work longer hours and harder than managers in big companies" (A.M. = 3.63, St. Dev. = 1.01). It may be considered that respondents tend to accept the following myths: "entrepreneurs experience a great deal of stress and pay a high price to the detriment of their health" (A.M. = 3.54, St. Dev. = 1.03); "anyone can start a business" (A.M. = 3.45, St. Dev. = 1.20); "starting a business is risky, and often ends in failure" (A.M. = 3.19, St. Dev. = 0.99); "any entrepreneur with a good idea can raise venture capital" (A.M. = 3.09, St. Dev. = 1.09); "if an entrepreneur is talented, success will happen in a year or two" (A.M. = 3.03, St. Dev. = 1.02). On the other side, the respondents mostly rejected to believe the myths: "the entrepreneurship is the predominantly male domain" (A.M. = 1.39, St. Dev. = 0.70); "entrepreneurs are lonesome and cannot work well with others" (A.M. = 1.78, St. Dev. = 0.75); "if an entrepreneur fails, he or she will not be able to find the capital for the new venture" (A.M. = 1.85, St. Dev. = 0.85).

The analysis of the entrepreneurial intentions displayed the statistically significant differences regarding sex, age and employment status of the respondents. Males, older respondents (above 30 years), together with (as expected) non-entrepreneurs and profit sector employees demonstrated a higher level of entrepreneurial intentions.

The analysis pointed out that there are significant differences concerning four out of six demographic variables (sex, age, education level and employment status). The results indicate that hypothesis H_1 should be accepted, i.e. that "there are significant differences in the perception of the entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions, regarding demographic variables". The same analysis confirmed the second hypothesis (H_2), which suggested that "there are significant differences in the perception of the entrepreneurial myths among entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs".

Hypothesis H_3 assumed that “the perceptions of entrepreneurial myths influence the entrepreneurial intentions of the respondents”. A correlation analysis was performed for examining this hypothesis. Table 4 displays the results for the statistically different results regarding demographic variables.

Table 4. Correlation analysis (abbreviated form)

<i>Hypothesis</i>	<i>Pearson correlation</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>
EM ↔ EI	- 0.28	0.000**
EM ↔ EI – female	- 0.26	0.000**
EM ↔ EI – male	- 0.17	0.087
EM ↔ EI – respondents ≤ 29 y.	- 0.14	0.119
EM ↔ EI – respondents > 30 < 49 y.	- 0.07	0.413
EM ↔ EI – respondents > 50 y.	- 0.18	0.412
EM ↔ EI – lower and middle education level	- 0.30	0.000**
EM ↔ EI – bachelor and master education level	- 0.16	0.050*
EM ↔ EI – employed in the profit sector	- 0.29	0.056
EM ↔ EI – employed in the public sector	- 0.20	0.388
EM ↔ EI – entrepreneurs	- 0.06	0.491
EM ↔ EI – non-entrepreneurs	- 0.07	0.400

Legend: EM = the perception of entrepreneurial myths; EI = entrepreneurial intentions

Sig. = significance; **significance level at 0.01; *significance level at 0.05

Source: Author’s research

The correlation analysis results indicate statistically significant but weak,¹ negative relations between the perception of entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions ($r = - 0.28$, at $p < 0.01$). The results confirm the hypothesis H_3 , i.e. that the respondents who do not accept the existence of the entrepreneurial myths express higher levels of entrepreneurial intentions. The statistically significant (weak) negative relations, were established between the perception of entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions of females ($r = - 0.26$, at $p < 0.01$), respondents with lower and middle education level ($r = - 0.30$, at $p < 0.01$), and those with bachelor and master degree ($r = - 0.16$, at $p < 0.05$). These results additionally corroborate the first hypothesis (H_1), i.e. that “there are significant differences in the perception of the entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions, regarding demographic variables”.

¹ Correlation coefficients (r) are interpreted based on the recommendations of Cohen and Holliday (1982, cited in Bryman & Cramer, 2005, p. 219): very low level of correlation < 0.19 , low correlation $\geq 0.20 < 0.39$, medium level $\geq 0.40 < 0.69$, high level $\geq 0.70 < 0.89$ and very high-level ≥ 0.90 .

Regression analysis was performed to determine the intensity of the relation between the perception of entrepreneurial myths as predictors of entrepreneurial intentions. The distribution normality test demonstrated that all skewness coefficients are within the acceptable referential limits for normal distribution (0,32 for entrepreneurial myths, and $-0,72$ for entrepreneurial intentions). The results of the regression analysis are in tables 5 and 6.

Table 5. Correlation coefficients in the regression model

R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Standard error of the estimate
0.23	0.05	0.05	0.95

Source: Authors' research

The correlation coefficient R (0.23), implies that there is a low level² of the correlation between entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions. The determination coefficient ($R^2 = 0.05$) indicates that 5% of the variance (information) of entrepreneurial intentions may be predicted (explained) with the perception of entrepreneurial myths variable. The analysis of variance determined statistically significant results, $F(1, 277) = 15.91$, $p < 0.01$. It shows that the perception of entrepreneurial myths can successfully account for entrepreneurial intentions. Table 6 presents the regression coefficients and their significance in the regression model.

Table 6. Regression coefficients in the regression model

Model	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Standard error	β		
(Constant)	4,93	0.36	0.00	13.73	0.000
Entrepreneurial myths perception	-0.55	0.14	-0.23	-3.99	0.000

Source: Authors' research

The B coefficients values (Table 6) indicate that the increase of results on the scale of the entrepreneurial myth by one point (i.e. more belief that the myths are true) is associated with the average decrease of results on the scale of entrepreneurial intentions by 0.55 point. The values of t-test imply that entrepreneurial myths perception variable significantly ($p < 0.01$) negatively contribute to entrepreneurial intentions. Furthermore, the value of β coefficient for the entrepreneurial myths perception variable is -0.23 , which means that it has a substantial (negative) influence on entrepreneurial intentions. The regression analysis additionally confirmed the hypothesis H₃, that "the perceptions of the entrepreneurial myths (as true) negatively influence the entrepreneurial intentions of the respondents".

² Correlation coefficients (R) are interpreted similarly to correlation coefficients (r), i.e. low level of correlation ($R \geq 0.14 < 0.36$; medium level ($R \geq 0.36 < 0.51$; high level ($R \geq 0.51 < 0.70$ and very high level ($R \geq 0.7$ according to Leech, Baret & Morgan, 2005, 56.

The research included some statements specific to Croatian environment. The respondents evaluated the “perception of the image of Croatian entrepreneurs” as relatively low (A.M. = 2.27, St. Dev. = 0.92); while the “tendency of Croatian entrepreneurs to misuse the laws for their own benefits” somewhat divided the opinions (A.M. = 2.96, St. Dev. = 1.12). Eventually, the respondents on average disagreed with the statement that “the entrepreneurial mindset cannot occur in the public sector” (A.M. = 2.65, St. Dev. = 1.16).

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The entrepreneurial myths were recognized and researched by respectable authors in the last decades. Although most of those assumptions were disapproved and the evidence was provided in several widely accepted entrepreneurship textbooks, the popular media, web portals, and bloggers hold on to them. The scholars in the entrepreneurship field argue that it can be harmful to the prospective or nascent entrepreneurs. This study verified the negative influence of the entrepreneurial myths perception on entrepreneurial intentions. However, the average entrepreneurial myth scale score of 2,55 in this research, indicate that the respondents somewhat disagree with the statements, i.e. that they perceive the myths as untrue. These results are comparable with the average result of 2,80 determined in Merwe and de Swardt research of 12 entrepreneurial myths among 307 entrepreneurs (2008, 454-455).

This study confirmed the hypothesized differences between the perception of entrepreneurial myths and entrepreneurial intentions regarding demographic variables (H_1 and H_2). The statistically significant differences in entrepreneurial myths perception were revealed among younger respondents (≤ 29 years), and those with ‘lower’ and ‘middle’ education level which express higher levels of agreement with proposed statements, than other groups. However, all groups have results below the neutral value (three), meaning that all respondents may be classified as ‘non-believers’ regarding entrepreneurial myths. The analysis of entrepreneurial intentions also displayed statistically significant differences regarding demographic variables. Males, respondents above 30 years of age, non-entrepreneurs and profit sector employees demonstrated a higher level of entrepreneurial intentions.

Eventually, the correlation and regression analysis corroborated that entrepreneurial myths perception has a statistically significant, weak and negative impact on entrepreneurial intentions (H_3). That means the respondents which (on average) tend to approve the entrepreneurial myths more (i.e. consider them as truths), will express a lower level of entrepreneurial intentions. Considering that only five myths registered above neutral average results (above three), the negative influence will affect a relatively small proportion of the respondents. However, the importance of further popularization and incentives toward entrepreneurial thinking and acting in Croatia should take into account these results, and emphasize the value of entrepreneurship education which covers the issues of entrepreneurial myths, as well.

PODUZETNIČKI MITOVI (ILI STVARNOSTI) I PODUZETNIČKE NAMJERE

dr. sc. **Davor Širola**, prof. v. š.

Veleučilište u Rijeci

Adresa: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka

e-mail: davor.sirola@veleri.hr

mr. sc. **Robert Strahinja**, predavač

Veleučilište u Rijeci

Adresa: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka

e-mail: robert.strahinja@veleri.hr

Nikola Novosel, struč. oec., student

Veleučilište u Rijeci

Adresa: Vukovarska 58, 51000 Rijeka

e-mail: nnovosel@veleri.hr

SAŽETAK

Razvoj suvremenih istraživanja u području poduzetništva započeo je prije pedesetak godina. U međuvremenu, ponuđene su različite definicije poduzetništva koje su dovele do raznolikih interpretacija obuhvata poduzetništva te naposljetku do nastanka poduzetničkih mitova. Ova tema je intenzivno istraživana 1980-ih i 1990-ih te su brojni rezultati uspješno demistificirali većinu poduzetničkih mitova. Usprkos tome, poduzetnički mitovi opstaju i redovito se pojavljuju na web portalima, u medijima i člancima blogera. S druge strane suvremeni udžbenici poduzetništva uključuju poduzetničke mitove kao lekciju koja može eliminirati neke prepreke za nove poduzetnike. Ovim istraživanjem utvrđeno je da su poduzetnički mitovi ponešto prisutni među mlađim, niže obrazovanim, ispitanicima ne-poduzetnicima u Hrvatskoj. Ipak, niti ove skupine ispitanika u prosjeku ne drže poduzetničke mitove, realnošću. Daljnja analiza je istaknula da postoji statistički značajna, ali slaba i negativna povezanost između percepcije poduzetničkih mitova kao mitova (ne kao realnosti) i više razine poduzetničkih namjera.

Ključne riječi: poduzetništvo; poduzetnički mitovi; poduzetničke namjere

LITERATURE

1. Armitage, C. J. and Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: A meta-analytic review, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol 40, p. 471-499
2. Bögenhold, D., Bonnet, J., Dejardin, M., Pérez de Lema, D.G. (2016). *Contemporary Entrepreneurship: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Innovation and Growth*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing
3. Bryman, A. and Cramer, D. (2005). *Quantitative Data Analysis with SPSS 12 and 13: A Guide for Social Scientists*. London, New York: Routledge
4. Dohse, D. and Walter, S. G. (2012). Knowledge context and entrepreneurial intentions among students. *Small Business Economics*, 39(4), p. 877–895
5. European Council (2006). *Recommendation of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 on key competences for lifelong learning*.
6. Haus, I., Steinmetz, H., Isidor, R., Kabst, R. (2013). Gender Effects on Entrepreneurial Intention: A Meta-Analytical Structural Equation Model. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 5(2), p. 130-156
7. Kibler, E. (2013). Formation of Entrepreneurial Intentions in a Regional Context. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 25(2-3), p. 293-323
8. Kuratko, D. F. (2014). *Entrepreneurship: Theory, Process, and Practice* (9th. Ed.). Bloomington: The Kelley School of Business, Indiana University.
9. Landström, H. and Benner, M. (2010). Entrepreneurship research: a history of scholarly migration in: *Historical foundations of entrepreneurship research*, edited by H. Landström and Franz Lohrke, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 448 p.
10. Leech, N. L., Baret, K. C., Morgan, G. A. (2005). *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics: Use and Interpretation* (2nd Ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
11. Linan, F. and Chen, Y.-W. (2006). Testing the Entrepreneurial Intention Model on a Two-Country Sample, Documents de Treball, *Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Departament d'Economia de l'Empresa*
12. Linan, F. and Chen, Y-W. (2009). Development and Cross-Cultural Application of a Specific Instrument to Measure Entrepreneurial Intentions, *Entrepreneurship Theory&Practice*, Vol. 33, p. 593-617
13. Linan, F. and Fayolle, A. (2015). A systematic literature review on entrepreneurial intentions: citation, thematic analyses, and research agenda, *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 11(4), p. 907-933
14. Merwe, S. V. D. and de Swardt, G. D. (2011). Small-business owner-managers' perceptions of entrepreneurship in the Emfuleni district, *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, Vol. 11, p. 449-464
15. Obschonka, M., Hakkarainen, K., Lonka, K. (2017). Entrepreneurship as a twenty-first-century skill: entrepreneurial alertness and intention in the transition to adulthood, *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 48, p. 487–501
16. Pejić Bach, M., Aleksić, A., Merkač-Skok, M. (2018). Examining determinants of entrepreneurial intentions in Slovenia: applying the theory of planned behaviour and an innovative cognitive style, *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 31(1), p. 1453-1471
17. Rehn, A., Brännback, M., Carsrud, A. & Lindahl, M. (2013). Challenging the myths of entrepreneurship?, *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 25(7-8), p. 543-551

18. Schlaegel, C. and Koenig, M. (2014). Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intent: A Meta-Analytic Test and Integration of Competing Models, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 38(2), p. 291-332
19. Shane, S. (2008). *The Illusions of Entrepreneurship – The Costly Myths That Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live by*, London: Yale University Press
20. Shane, S. (2009). Why Encouraging More People to Become Entrepreneurs is Bad Public Policy, *Small Business Economics*, 33(2), p. 141–149
21. Sigtler, K.W. (2000). Are the Common Myths of Entrepreneurship All That Common? A Test of Entrepreneurs and Non-Entrepreneurs, *The Entrepreneurial Executive*, Vol. 5, p. 117-134.
22. Tomovska Misoska, A., Dimitrova, M., Mrsik, J. (2016). Drivers of entrepreneurial intentions among business students in Macedonia, *Economic research - Ekonomska istraživanja*, 29(1), p. 1062-1074