

# Regional Science Inquiry



Regional Science Inquiry

June 2013 Volume V Number 1

# Regional Science Inquiry

THE JOURNAL OF THE  
Hellenic Association of Regional Scientists

December 2013

Volume V  
Number 2



RSI J  
FOUNDATION YEAR 2008

English Edition  
ISSN: 1791-5961 Print  
ISSN: 1791-7735 On line

**Editorial Board 2013**

**The Board of the HELLENIC  
ASSOCIATION OF REGIONAL  
SCIENTISTS H.A.R.S. 2013**

*[H.A.R.S. is a Think Tank of groups of people with multidisciplinary work in the fields of Regional Science, which occurs with the selfless contribution of participants who offer their work to the global scientific community]*

**President and Chair, Journals Management  
Committee  
(RSI J – KIIE – R ICR – ZRW – GGGR)**

**Dr Christos Ap. Ladias**

**Advisors**

Associate Professor Georgios Korres, Associate Professor Stephanos Karagiannis, Dr Apostolos Parpairis, Dr Nikolaos Chasanagas, Artemisia Georgiadou-Kypraiou, Nikolaos Zacharias, Dimitrios Kouzas, Esaías Pappioannou

**Legal Committee**

Lukas Apostolidis, Assistant Professor Panagiotis Kribas, Dr Leandros Lefakis, Dr Angelika Kallia, Dr Evaggelos Mallios, Athanasios Papathanasis, Elias Giatsios

**Chief Executive**

Vilelmini Psarrianou

**Conference Co-ordinator**

Dr Stylianos Alexiadis

**International Relations Coordinators**

Dr Aikaterini Kokkinou, Antonia Obaidou

**Student Observer**

Eleonora Stavrakaki

**Website Administrators**

Dimitrios Kouzas, Vilelmini Psarrianou, Apostolos Ladias

**Secretariat**

Dr Chrisa Balomenou, Dr Nikolaos Karachalis, Dr Panagiota Karametou, Chrisoula Kouza, Maria Botsari, Victor Atoun, Iosif Atoun, Maria Rigaki, Konstantina Mantzavinou, Konstantina Georgiou, Nikolaos Alampanos, Emmanouela Grigoras, Elektra Katsiantoni, Dora Kyriazopoulou, Anna Maria Giallousi De-Boorder, Eleni Koursari, Eleni Hinopoulou, Aggeliki Koursari, Elena Stournara, Dimitrios Ladias, Maria Oikonomou, Christos Morres, Socratis Chitas, Maria Karagianni, Nikolaos Motsios, Apostolos Tsapalas, Victoria Frizi, Leonardos Tsaousis, Apostolos Ladias, Vasiliki Petrou, Areti Zioga, Nikoleta Giesil, Kyriakos Katsaros, Filippos Rountzos, Katerina Kotsiopoulou, Nilos Kotsiopoulos, Dimitra Tsetsoni, Maria Kousantaki, Chaim Kapetas, Aggela Trikali, Eleni Zioga, Loukia Tsana, Andriana Katsantoni, Efrosini Makri, Katerina Spanou, Sophia Trikali

**Regional Science Inquiry Journal**

**Hon. Managing Editor**

EMERITUS PROFESSOR PETER NIJKAMP  
Free University Faculty of Economics and Business  
Administration, Department of Spatial Economics  
Amsterdam, the Netherlands

**Hon. Managing Editor**

EMERITUS PROFESSOR NIKOLAOS  
KONSOLAS  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
School of Sciences of Economy and Public  
Administration, Panteion University of Social and  
Political Sciences, Athens Greece

**Managing Editor**

PROFESSOR CHARALAMPOS BOTSARIS  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
School of Sciences of Economy and Public  
Administration, Panteion University of Social and  
Political Sciences, Athens Greece

**Editors**

RECTOR-PROFESSOR GRIGORIOS TSALTAS  
Department of European International and Area  
Studies, School of Culture and International  
Communication Studies, Panteion University of  
Social and Political Sciences Athens Greece

RECTOR-PROFESSOR PARIS TSARTAS  
Department of Business Administration  
University of the Aegean, Mitilene, Greece

PROFESSOR EMMANUEL MARMARAS  
Department of Architecture  
Technical University of Crete, Greece

PROFESSOR PANAGIOTIS REPPAS  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
Panteion University, Greece

PROFESSOR JOSE ANTONIO PORFIRIO  
Departamento de Ciencias Sociais de Gestao  
Universidade Aberta, Lisboa, Portugal

PROFESSOR PAOLO MALANIMA  
Department of Economic History and Economics  
Magna Graecia University in Catanzaro, Italy

PROFESSOR RADOVAN STOJANOVIC  
Faculty of Electrical Engineering  
University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

PROFESSOR RUDIGER HAMM  
Department of Business Administration  
and Economics Niederrhein  
University of Applied Sciences, Germany

PROFESSOR GEORGE KARRAS  
Department of Economics  
University of Illinois, Chicago, USA

PROFESSOR IOANNIS YFANTOPOULOS  
Faculty of Political Science & Public  
Administration National & Kapodistrian University  
of Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DANIEL  
FELSENSTEIN  
Department of Geography,  
Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

PROFESSOR PETROS KIOXOS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Piraeus, Greece

PROFESSOR MINAS AGGELIDIS  
Department of Architecture,  
National Technical University of Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR JOSE VARGAS HERNANDEZ  
Department de Mercadotecnia y Negocios  
Internacionales, Universidad de Guadalajara, Mexico

PROFESSOR PANAGIOTIS LIARGOVAS  
Department of Economics  
University of Peloponnese, Greece

PROFESSOR THEODORE PELAGIDIS  
Department of Maritime Studies  
University of Piraeus, Greece

PROFESSOR EFSTATHIOS TSACHALIDIS  
Department of Forestry and Environmental  
Management Democritus University of Thrace,  
Greece

PROFESSOR MOH'D AHMAD AL-NIMR  
Mechanical Engineering Department  
Jordan University of Science and Technology,  
Irbid – Jordan

PROFESSOR IOANNIS MAZIS  
Department of Turkish and Modern Asian Studies  
National and Kapodistrian  
University of Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR SPYROS VLIAMOS  
Department of Philosophy and History of Science  
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
Greece

PROFESSOR NAPOLEON MARAVEGIAS  
Department of Political Science and Public  
Administration National and Kapodistrian University  
of Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR PANTELIS SKAYANNIS  
Department of Planning and Regional Development  
University of Thessaly, Greece

PROFESSOR ELENI KAPETANAKI-BRIASOULI  
Department of Geography  
University of the Aegean, Greece

PROFESSOR GEORGE CHIOTIS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
Athens University of Economics and Business,  
Greece

PROFESSOR DIMITRIOS DIONISIOU  
Department of Senior Mathematics  
Hellenic Air Force Academy, Greece

PROFESSOR ANTIGONI LYMPERAKI  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
Panteion University, Greece

PROFESSOR YUZARU MIYATA  
Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering  
Toyohashi University of Technology, Japan

PROFESSOR GEORGIOS MERGOS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
Greece

PROFESSOR DANIELA L. CONSTANTIN  
of the Research Centre for Macroeconomic  
and Regional Forecasting (PROMAR)  
Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania

PROFESSOR LOIS LAMPRIANIDIS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Macedonia, Greece

PROFESSOR NIKOLAOS KYRIAZIS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Thessaly,  
Volos, Greece

PROFESSOR VIRON KOTZAMANIS  
Department of Sociology  
University of Thessaly, Greece

PROFESSOR FATMIR MEMA  
Faculty of Economics  
University of Tirana, Albania

Dr. ANNE MARGARIAN  
Institute of Rural Studies,  
Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry  
and Fisheries, Braunschweig, Germany

PROFESSOR EVANTHIA MAKRI - BOTSARI  
Department of Pedagogy, High School of  
Pedagogical  
and Technological Education, Greece

PROFESSOR MIRA VUKCEVIC  
Faculty of Metallurgy and Chemical Technology  
University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

Vis. PROFESSOR KONSTANTINA ZERVA  
Dept de Economia y Facultad de Turismo  
Universidad de Girona, Espania

Dr EVAGGELOS PANOU  
Department of European International and Area  
Studies  
School of Culture and International Communication  
Studies, Panteion University of Social and Political  
Sciences Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OLGA GIOTI-  
PAPADAKI  
School of Sciences of Economy and Public  
Administration, Panteion University of Social and  
Political Sciences Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR GEORGE KORRES  
Department of Geography  
University of the Aegean, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
STEFANOS KARAGIANNIS  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
School of Sciences of Economy and Public  
Administration, Panteion University of Social and  
Political Sciences Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR DARCIN AKIN  
Department of City and Regional Planning  
Gebze Institute of Technology, Turkey

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR JAN SUCHACEK  
Department of Regional and Environmental  
Economics  
Technical University of Ostrava, Czech Republic

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR MIHAIL XLETOS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Ioannina, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR ANASTASIA  
STRATIGEA  
Department of Geography and Regional Planning  
National Technical University of Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR ELIAS PLASKOVITIS  
Department of Economic and Regional  
Development, Panteion University, Athens,  
Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
HELEN THEODOROPOULOU  
Department of Home Economics Ecology,  
Harokopion University, Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR PANTELIS SKLIAS  
Faculty of Social Sciences  
University of Peloponnese, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
EVANGELIA GEORGITSOYANNI  
Department of Home Economics Ecology,  
Harokopion University, Athens, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
GEORGIA KAPLANOGLOU  
Department of Economic Sciences  
National and Kapodistrian University of Athens,  
Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
KONSTANTINOS TSAMADIAS  
Department of Home Economics and Ecology  
Harokopion University, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR TRIFON  
KOSTOPOULOS  
Department of Sociology,  
Panteion University, Athens, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
BENIAMINO MURGANTE  
Department of Laboratory of Urban and Territorial  
Systems, University of Basilicata, Italy

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
MARIUSZ SOKOLOWICZ  
Faculty of Economics and Sociology  
University of Lodz, Podgorica, Poland

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR JOAO MARQUES  
Department of Social and Political Sciences  
University of Aveiro, Portugal

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
GEORGIOS SIDIROPOULOS  
Department of Geography  
University of the Aegean, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
ELENI PAPADOPOULOU  
School of Urban-Regional Planning &  
Development Engineering,  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
GEORGIOS XANTHOS  
Department of Sciences, Technological  
Educational Institute of Crete, Greece

LECTURER ASPASIA EFTHIMIADOU  
Master Program of Environmental Studies  
Open University of Cyprus, Cyprus

LECTURER MAARUF ALI  
Department of Computer Science & Electronic  
Engineering  
Oxford Brookes University, United Kingdom

LECTURER NIKOLAOS MPENOS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Ioannina, Greece

LECTURER NETA ARSENI POLO  
Department of Economics  
University "Egrem Cabej", Albania

LECTURER ALEXANDROS MANDHLA  
RAS Department of Economics, University  
Of Surrey, United Kingdom

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
GEORGE P. MALINDRETOS  
Harokopion University, Athens, Greece

RESEARCH FELLOW PARK JONG - SOON  
Development Institute of Local Government  
of South Korea

Dr KATERINA KOKKINOU  
Department of Economics  
Glasgow University, G. Britain

Dr STILIANOS ALEXIADIS  
RSI Journal

Dr MICHAEL ALDERSON  
Director Project Development  
University of Szent Istvan, Hungary

Dr PEDRO RAMOS  
Facudade de Economia, Universidade  
de Coimbra, Portugal

Dr NIKOLAOS HASANAGAS  
Faculty of Forestry and Natural Environment  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Dr CHRISTOS LADIAS  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
School of Sciences of Economy and Public  
Administration, Panteion University of Social and  
Political Sciences ,Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR IOANNIS MOURMOURIS  
Department of International Economic Relations and  
Development, Democritus University of Thrace,  
Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
STELLA KYVELOU  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
Panteion University, Greece

PROFESSOR LYDIA SAPOUNAKI – DRAKAKI  
Department of Economic and Regional Development  
Panteion University, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
HIROYUKI SHIBUSAWA  
Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering  
Toyohashi University of Technology, Japan

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
CHRISTOS STAIKOURAS  
Department of Accounting and Finance  
Athens University of Economics and Business,  
Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
ZACHAROULA ANDREOPOULOU  
Lab. Of Informatics  
Faculty of Forestry and Natural Environment  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

### Members

STAVROS RODOKANAKIS  
Department of Social and Policy Sciences  
University of Bath Clarendon Down, England

PROFESSOR PETROS KOTSIOPOULOS  
Department of Senior Mathematics  
Hellenic Air Force Academy, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
GEORGE TSOBANOGLOU  
Department of Sociology  
University of the Aegean,  
Mitolini, Greece

PROFESSOR DIMITRIOS MAVRIDIS  
Department of Technological Educational  
Institute of Western Macedonia, Greece

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
ALBERT QARRI  
Vlora University, Albania

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  
GEORGE GANTZIAS  
Department of Cultural Technology &  
Communication University of the Aegean, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
DIMITRIOS LALOUMIS  
Department of Technological Education  
Institute of Athens, Greece

LECTURER APOSTOLOS KIOXOS  
Department of International and European Studies,  
University of Macedonia, Greece

LECTURER VICKY KATSONI  
Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management  
Technological Educational,  
Athens, Greece

PROFESSOR  
ANASTASIA ATHANASOULA-REPPA  
Department of Pedagogy, High School of  
Pedagogical and Technological Education, Greece

PROFESSOR GEORGE POLICHRONOPOULOS  
School of Business Administration and  
Economics, Technological Educational Institute of  
Athens, Greece

Dr DAMIANOS SAKKAS  
University of Peloponnese, Greece

Dr MICHEL DUQUESNOY  
Universidad de los Lagos, CEDER  
Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo,  
ICSHu-AAHA, Chile

Dr SOTIRIOS MILIONIS  
RSI Journal

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
VASSILIS KEFIS  
Department of Public Administration  
Panteion University, Athens, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
ELECTRA PITOSKA  
Technological Institute of Florina, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
THEODOROS IOSIFIDIS  
Department of Geography  
University of the Aegean, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
DIMITRIOS SKIADAS  
Department of International and European Studies  
University of Macedonia, Greece

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
GEORGIOS EXARCHOS  
Technological Institute of Serres, Greece

LECTURER EVIS KUSHI  
Faculty of Economy, University of Elbasan, Albania

LECTURER ELENI GAKI  
Department of Business Administration  
University of the Aegean, Greece

LECTURER MANTHOS DELIS  
Department of Economic Sciences  
University of Ioannina, Greece

LECTURER ROSA AISA  
Departamento de Analisis Economico  
University of Zaragoza, Spain

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR  
AMALIA KOTSAKI  
Department of Architectural Engineering  
Technical University of Crete

Dr KIRIAKI NIKOLAIDOU  
Faculty of Political Science & Public  
Administration, National & Kapodistrian  
University of Athens, Greece

Dr GEORGIOS-ALEXANDROS SGOUROS  
National and Kapodistrian  
University of Athens, Greece

Dr BULENT ACMA  
Department of Economics, Anadolu  
University,  
Unit of Southeastern Anatolia, Turkey

Dr DRITA KRUIA  
Faculty of Economics  
Shkodra University, Albania

Dr LAMPROS PYRGIOTIS  
RSI Journal

Dr KONSTANTINOS IKONOMOU  
Department of Regional and Economic  
Development, University of Central Greece

Dr KATERINA PARPAIRI  
RSI Journal

Dr KHACHATRYAN NUNE  
Head of the scientific research unit  
University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart

Dr ANDREW FIELDSEND  
Research Institut of Agriculture Economics,  
Budapest, Hungary

Dr CRISTINA LINCARU  
National Scientific Research Institut for Labor  
and Social Protection, Bucharest, Romania

EFTERPI GERAGA  
Department of Regional and Economic  
Development, University of Central Greece  
Livadeia, Greece

#### Critical Surveys Editors

Lecturer Aspasia Efthimiadou, Dr Sotirios Milionis,  
Dr Georgios-Alexandros Sgouros, Dr Stavros  
Ntegiannakis, Dr Anastasia Biska, Dr Christos  
Genitsaropoulos, Dr Loukas Tzachilas

#### Book Review Editors

Dr Katerina Kokkinou, Dr Stilianos Alexiadis, Dr  
Elias Grammatikogiannis, Dr Maria Mavragani,  
Dimitrios Kouzas, Vilemini Psarrianiou, Helga  
Stefansson, Chrisoula Giannikopoulou, Antonia  
Obaidou

#### Copy Editors

Associate Professor Georgios Korres, Assistant  
Professor Panagiotis Krimpas, Dr Stylianos  
Alexiadis, Dimitrios Kouzas

#### Publisher-Manager

Dr Christos Ladias

#### Κείμενα Περιφερειακής Επιστήμης (Kimena Periferiakis Epistimis)

#### Managing Editor

Associate Professor  
Georgios Korres

#### Hon. Managing Editor

Professor Charalampos Botsaris

#### Copy Editor

Dr Aikaterini Kokkinou

#### Editorial Assistant

Associate Professor  
Stefanos Karagiannis

#### Publisher-Manager

Dr Christos Ladias

#### Members

Lecturer Fotis Kitsios, Assistant Professor Eleni  
Papadopoulou, Vilemini Psarrianiou

#### Investigación en Ciencia Regional

#### Managing Editor

Lecturer Nela Filimon

#### Hon. Managing Editor

Professor José Vargas-Hernández

#### Copy Editor

Vis. Professor Konstantina Zerva

#### Editorial Assistant

Professor Cristiano Cechela

#### Publisher-Manager

Dr Christos Ladias

#### Members

Professor Ana Cristina Limongi Franca, Associate  
Professor Francisco Diniz, Assistant Professor Eloína  
Maria Ávila Monteiro, Dr Michel Duquesnoy

#### Zeitschrift für die Regionale Wissenschaft

#### Managing Editor

Associate Professor Trifonas Kostopoulos

#### Hon. Managing Editor

Professor Rudiger Hamm

#### Copy Editor

Assistant Professor  
Panagiotis Kribas

#### Editorial Assistant

Associate Professor  
Stefanos Karagiannis

#### Publisher-Manager

Dr Christos Ladias

#### Members

Dr Khachatryan Nune, Dr Nikolaos Chasanagas,  
Dr Anne Margarian, Dr Lambros Sdrolias

#### Géographies, Géopolitiques et Géostratégies Régionales

#### Managing Editor

Professor Ioannis Mazis

#### Hon. Managing Editor

Professor Charilaos Kephaliakos

#### Copy Editor

Vilemini G. Psarrianiou

#### Editorial Assistant

Dimitrios K. Kouzas

#### Publisher-Manager

Dr Christos Ap. Ladias

#### Members

Professor Grigorios Tsalts, Professor Lydia  
Sapounaki-Drakaki, Associate Professor Olga Gioti-  
Papadaki, Dr Maria-Luisa Moatsou



## Contents

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Editorial</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Articles</b>	
<b>1</b> Economic Analysis of the Impact of Carbon Tax on the Economy of Makassar City, Indonesia, <i>Yuzuru Miyata, Any Wahyuni and Hiroyuki Shibusawa</i>	<b>15</b>
<b>2</b> Location Conditions of Energy-Intensive Enterprises, <i>Rüdiger Hamm</i>	<b>33</b>
<b>3</b> A Theoretical and Methodological Approach of «Fragile» Areas: The Cases of Greek Regions Crossed by the Egnatia Road, <i>Lamara Hadjou and Marie Noëlle Duquenne</i>	<b>45</b>
<b>4</b> The Relation Between Industrial And Socio-Economic Fundamentals In German Districts, <i>Anne Margarian</i>	<b>59</b>
<b>5</b> Propensity for entrepreneurship among college undergraduates: the case of a public university in north-eastern Portugal, <i>Maria Isabel Barreiro Ribeiro, António José Gonçalves Fernandes, and Francisco José Lopes de Sousa Diniz</i>	<b>75</b>
<b>6</b> Estimating Brazilian FDI Motivations In Portugal By Structural Equations Model (SEM), <i>Cristiano Cechella</i>	<b>87</b>
<b>7</b> The System of Contributions for Health Insurance Scheme in Albania - Performance and Main Challenges, <i>Enkelejda Avdi</i>	<b>99</b>
<b>8</b> The Crossroad of Housing Loans Financing - Case of Albania, <i>Iris Shahini and Orfea Dhuci</i>	<b>111</b>
<b>9</b> A geopolitical analysis of the activation of the Shiite geopolitical factor within the Syrian conflict geo-system, <i>Ioannis Th. Mazis and Michalis Sarlis</i>	<b>125</b>
<b>10</b> Interpreting Overall Inequality in China: The Roles of Physical Capital, Human Capital and Social Human, <i>Yuheng Li and Hans Westlund</i>	<b>145</b>
<b>11</b> The Services of General Interest in Romania: Insights Into Legal And Institutional Issues At National And Territorial Level, <i>Daniela-Luminița Constantin, Alina Elena Iosif, Alina Georgiana Profiroiu and Raluca Mariana Grosu</i>	<b>151</b>
<b>12</b> Local Actors and Leadership in Rural Destinations: Exploring the Role of Gastronomic Confraternities, <i>Bernard De Myttenaere</i>	<b>163</b>
<b>Announcements, Conferences, News</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>Academic profiles</b>	<b>181</b>
<b>Book reviews</b>	<b>185</b>
<b>Author Instructions</b>	<b>189</b>

*The articles published in RSI Journal are in accordance with the approving dates by the anonymous reviewers.*

## **PROPENSITY FOR ENTREPRENEURSHIP AMONG COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATES: THE CASE OF A PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN NORTH-EASTERN PORTUGAL**

**Maria Isabel BARREIRO RIBEIRO**

Bragança Polytechnic Institute, Bragança  
Centre for Transdisciplinary Development Studies, Vila Real  
Research Unit for Inland Development, Guarda  
Portugal  
xilote@ipb.pt

**António José GONÇALVES FERNANDES (corresponding author)**

Bragança Polytechnic Institute, Bragança  
Centre for Transdisciplinary Development Studies, Vila Real  
Portugal  
toze@ipb.pt

**Francisco José Lopes de SOUSA DINIZ**

University of Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Vila Real  
Centre for Transdisciplinary Development Studies, Vila Real  
Portugal  
fdiniz@utad.pt

Corresponding author address:  
Instituto Politécnico de Bragança  
Escola Superior Agrária  
Campus de Santa Apolónia  
5300-855 Bragança, Portugal

Tlm. +351 965057246  
Tel. +351 273303280  
Fax +351 273325405

### **Abstract**

This study looked into the entrepreneurial ability of the students of a public university in Bragança (Portugal) to identify differentiation factors of their entrepreneurial potential. A quantitative, transversal, and observational analysis was conducted involving 598 student participants. Data gathering took place between November and December 2012 and used the *Entrepreneurial Potential Indicator* questionnaire. The respondents were mostly female (61.0%), between 18 and 21 years old (53.8%), corresponding to an average of 22.6 years of age ( $\pm 4.59$ ), studied under an ordinary regime (82.6%), were from the northern region (83.9%), lived in an urban centre (53.8%) and attended the first study cycle (92.8%) of two scientific areas, namely Education Sciences (28.4%) and Technology and Management (28.4%). Over half of the respondents showed entrepreneurial skills (72.4%). Of all the human capital factors considered, the attendance regime was the only one which had no influence on the entrepreneurial potential. In fact, all the others, namely the course's scientific area and the study cycle have proven to be relevant for reinforcing or developing the students' entrepreneurial skills. None of the socio-demographic factors that were taken into consideration had any influence on entrepreneurial potential differentiation. Binary logistic regression (*logit* model) revealed a cause and effect relationship between all the characteristics and the entrepreneurial tendency.

**Key-words:** Higher Education; Entrepreneurial potential; Trás-os-Montes; Portugal

**JEL Classification:** D21, D24

## Introduction

According to Bronosky [1], Higher Education Institutions have been feeling the need to motivate their students and give them the necessary skills to take entrepreneurial initiatives capable of generating employment and economic development. In Hull's *et al* [2] view identifying and subsequently using their entrepreneurial potential will, no doubt, be beneficial for society. Socio-demographic variables (such as gender, age, residing area, among others) and human capital variables (like the course) are pinpointed by Teixeira and Davey [3], as differentiating factors of the entrepreneurial potential.

The main goals of this study involved analysing the students' entrepreneurial skills in a public Higher Education institution in north-eastern Portugal and trying to ascertain whether there are significant differences in the students' entrepreneurial potential, taking into consideration socio-demographic as well as human capital factors. 598 students participated in the study which was quantitative, transversal, analytical and observational. Data were collected between November and December 2012 through the application of the *Entrepreneurial Potential Indicator* questionnaire validated for Portugal by Ferreira *et al.* [4].

This paper is structured into five sections: introduction, literature review, methodology, results and discussion and final remarks. The present section provides an explanation of the subject in question and presents both the aims and the structure of the paper. Section two does a literature review in order to give a theoretical Framework of the subject under study. The third section consists of the description of the methodology that was used to conduct this research, depicting the participants, the materials and procedures. In the fourth section, results of the statistical analysis are presented. Finally, in the last section, results are discussed and final considerations offered.

## Literature Review

In Koh's [5] opinion, there is little consensus as to what entrepreneurship means or an entrepreneur does.

Cunningham and Lischeron [6] have identified six currents of thought on the subject and provide a different view of what it is to be an entrepreneur. The *Great Person School* defines the entrepreneur as someone who is born with intuition, stamina, vigor, persistence and self-esteem; on the other hand, the *Classical School* recognises the entrepreneur's innovative and discovery skills and creativity; for the *Management School*, the entrepreneur organizes, manages and takes risks; whereas the *Leadership School* sees him/her as the person who motivates, advises and leads; the *Intrapreneurship School* conceives the entrepreneur as the skillful manager of big organisations; and finally, the *Psychological Characteristics School* associates the entrepreneur with both unique values and attitudes and distinct needs.

Deo [7] claims the entrepreneur can be seen both from the economist's and the psychologist's perspective. According to Rwigema and Venter [8], the economist considers the entrepreneur as someone who is prone to innovate, to become an agent of change, to create wealth and add value to resources and other assets while introducing changes to the economy. In this context, Acs *et al.* [9] refer they generate employment and innovation and strength competitiveness. Filion [10] posits the entrepreneur is often someone who is able to identify business opportunities, market niches and therefore bring about progress.

On the other hand, Deo [7] thinks that from the psychologist's viewpoint, an entrepreneur is driven by the need to obtain or achieve something, to try and accomplish new things. Alves and Bornia [11] for instance defend that an entrepreneur has some characteristics and displays personality traits that are distinct compared to the rest of the population and that is the key to a successful entrepreneurship. As for Brockhaus and Horwitz [12], they consider that one of the basic prerequisites to entrepreneurial potential is the intention to do things and survive. Despite intensive research, it is still very difficult and challenging to define entrepreneurship, according to Mitton [13]. Departing from the *Psychological Characteristics School* and based on all the characteristics likely to potentiate entrepreneurship reported in the literature, several models have been developed and tested in order to identify entrepreneurial potential; all of them pinpoint such characteristics as the need for achievement, self-control, risk-taking propensity, ambiguity tolerance, self-confidence and

innovativeness. Therefore, these are also the characteristics addressed in the present research, seeing as Mitton [13], Markman and Baron [14] and Curral *et al.* [15] claim, that individuals who display them are more likely to become entrepreneurs in the future.

## Methodology

In order to conduct this study, the authors adopted a quantitative, analytical, transversal and observational methodology. The study focused on analysing the entrepreneurial potential in a sample of students from a Higher Education Institution located in Trás-os-Montes in northeastern Portugal. The aim was to identify the students' entrepreneurial potential and decide which of the socio-demographic and human capital factors considered were likely to differentiate entrepreneurial potential.

A representative sample of the universe under study was randomly collected, consisting of 598 students. The collection of data occurred in the period between November and December 2012, using the *Entrepreneurial Potential Indicator* validated for Portugal by Ferreira *et al.* [4]. The questionnaire was created on *Google Docs* and directly administered by the students online. The questionnaire in question focus on six entrepreneurial features (Table 1) referred by Ferreira *et al.* [4] and Koh [5] and result from a set of 15 attitudes assessed with recourse to a 1 to 5 *Likert* scale discriminated as follows:

- 1- totally disagree;
- 2 - disagree;
- 3 – neither agree nor disagree;
- 4 - agree; and,
- 5 – totally agree.

The features to be assessed are in Table 1 and, according to Ferreira *et al.* [4] and Koh [5], may be described as follows:

- The need for achievement can be found in individuals with a strong desire to succeed who are consequently more prone to entrepreneurial attitudes.
- Self-control is linked to the individuals' ability to conduct their own lives. Therefore, individuals who have self-control believe they are capable of controlling their own lives, unlike those who do not display such characteristic who believe that what happens in their lives like luck or misfortune, are always the result of external factors.
- Risk-taking propensity is typical of individuals whose attitudes are oriented towards making decisions in an uncertainty context. It should be noted that the risk involved is controlled.
- Ambiguity tolerance is at the basis of ambiguous situations for which there is not enough information. Individuals capable of understanding such situations and of organizing the available information prior to acting usually have this characteristic.
- Self-confidence is related to the individual's positive and confident perception about him/herself and his/her skills and abilities.
- Innovativeness has to do with seeking and developing new activities or ways of developing them.

**Table 1 – Entrepreneurial features and attitudes**

Features	Attitudes
Risk-taking propensity	I could describe myself as a gambler
	I believe I take higher risks than most people
	I do not engage in anything without coming up with an action plan first
	I always keep an eye on my money
	I always make rational decisions
Need for achievement	I have a strong need to do independent work
	I succeed at facing challenges and getting over problems

	Once I start a project I see it through until the end
	I believe failures are but learning opportunities
Self-control	I have a strong need to do independent work
	I clearly separate work from leisure
	I believe we make our own luck
Self-confidence	I have a strong need to do independent work
	I often follow my intuition
	I succeed at facing challenges and getting over problems
	I believe failures are but learning opportunities
Innovativeness	I'm a person of new and different ideas and solutions
Tolerance to uncertainty	I give up easily when things do not work out my way
	I do not engage in anything without coming up with an action plan first
	I'm good at dealing with ambiguous situations
	I always make rational decisions

The data collected were treated using SPSS 20.0 (*Statistical Package for Social Sciences*). Their statistical treatment was descriptive so as to characterise the sample. Thus, according to Maroco [16] and Pestana and Gageiro [17] absolute and relative frequencies were calculated whenever variables were nominal; similarly, the mean (measures of central tendency) and the standard deviation (measures of dispersion) were also calculated whenever variables were ordinal or superior. Because this was an analytical study, several statistical tests were applied, such as: localisation tests to determine whether there were significant statistical differences between the samples; association tests to find out how the entrepreneurial potential correlated with the entrepreneurial features considered; and multivariate analysis to estimate a binary logistic regression model that could identify which characteristics go hand in hand with the students' entrepreneurial skills, while understanding their explanatory power.

Following the methodology suggested by Maroco [16] and Pestana and Gageiro [17], non-parametric tests were applied to compare the entrepreneurial potential, since the necessary conditions for using parametric tests were not fulfilled. As a matter-of-fact, when data normality was tested using the *Kolmogorov-Smirnov* test with the *Lilliefors* correction ( $N \geq 30$ ) or *Shapiro-Wilk* test ( $N < 30$ ), it stood out that at least one of the conditions was violated; the same occurred regarding the homogeneity of variance when the *Levene* test was applied. In view of the reasons that have already been mentioned, the *Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon* test was used alternatively to *T-Student* for independent samples whenever comparisons involved only two samples (gender, age, residing area, attendance regime). The *Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon* test allows us to test whether the null hypothesis of the medians is equal ( $H_0: \eta_1 = \eta_2$ ) against the alternative one of their being different ( $H_1: \eta_1 \neq \eta_2$ ), where  $\eta$  is the median.

Still according to the methodology suggested by Maroco [16] and Pestana and Gageiro [17], the *Kruskal-Wallis* was used as an alternative to *ANOVA One Way* whenever the comparison involved more than two ( $k$ ) independent samples (area of origin, study cycle attended and course's scientific area). The *Kruskal-Wallis* test allows us to test the null hypothesis of the equality of medians ( $H_0: \eta_1 = \eta_2 = \dots = \eta_k$ ) against the alternative one that they are not all equal ( $H_1: \exists i, j: \eta_i \neq \eta_j$ ).

Similarly, in order to study how entrepreneurial potential correlates to entrepreneurship-related features the *r - Pearson* test was discarded, since the condition for the application of such a test (data normality) was not fulfilled. Instead, the *Spearman* ordinal correlation test was used to measure the intensity of the relation between ordinal variables. It uses, instead of the observed values, the observations order. Thus, this coefficient is not sensitive neither to asymmetries in distribution nor to the presence of *outliers*, which means

that data do not have to be originating from Normal populations. It tests the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ : Variables are not correlated) against the alternative one ( $H_1$ : Variables are correlated).

Regression analysis is an econometric technique used to shape and analyse the cause and effect relationship between variables. Therefore, it is particularly useful in studying the relationship between entrepreneurial potential and the students' entrepreneurial characteristics so as to establish whether those characteristics have any influence or not on their tendency toward entrepreneurship. Since the dependant variable (entrepreneurial potential) was transformed into a *dummy* one (yes = 1/no = 0), regression must be based on a linear probability model which uses non-linear functions that delimits the estimation scale. In this study, the estimation scale was delimited with recourse to one of the most frequently used distribution functions: the logistic function or *logit* model (Figure 1), as suggested by Cramer [18]. The logit function is an approximation where  $E(Y_i)$  tends to 0 when  $X_i$  tends to  $-\infty$  and  $E(Y_i)$  tends to 1 when  $X_i$  tends to  $+\infty$ . The function values vary between 0 and 1 and are interpreted as the possibility that the phenomenon that is being studied may occur. In fact, as it can be seen in Figure 1,  $M_i$  is the element's probability of belonging to group 1, that is, the probability that the phenomenon that is being studied (being entrepreneurial) may occur and  $(1-M_i)$  the probability that the element belongs to group 0 (not being entrepreneurial).




Figure 1 – Logit function configuration.

Source: Cramer [18].

Variables were chosen using the *stepwise method*, a process which is frequently used in situations in which the relationships or associations between the explanatory variables and the dependent variable are not known. Of the variants within the *stepwise method*, the *forward stepwise* was chosen because it departs from an original model without any explanatory variable, only the constant term, to which the most significant variables are then continually added until the “best model” is obtained. According to Pestana and Gageiro [17], this method has the advantage of eliminating any likely multicollinearity-related problems which usually question the significance of the estimated coefficients.

One of the commonest methods to assess the model's overall quality is the “likelihood ratio” which allows us to test the null hypothesis of the coefficients being null ( $H_0: \beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_k = 0$ ) against the alternative one of there being at least one that is unequal to zero ( $H_1: \exists i, j: \beta_i \neq \beta_j$ ). The critical approximate value is obtained in the chi-square distribution tables with a number of degrees of freedom which equals the number of restrictions considered in the null-hypothesis Cramer [18].

According to Pestana and Gageiro [17], the test to the model's overall quality allows us only to conclude that is explanatory power is greater than that of the model with only one independent term, in which case it is not possible to draw any conclusions as to the individual significance of each of the estimated coefficients. To do so, the *Wald* test should be used for it tests the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_j = 0$  against the alternative  $H_1: \beta_j \neq 0$ . Once the model's validity as regards each estimator and the whole set of estimators is tested, the adjustment quality should also be tested. Pestana and Gageiro [17] suggest the use of *Nagelkerke*  $R^2$ .


As it can be seen in Table 2, most participants were female (61.0%); between 18 and 21 years old (53.8%) corresponding to an average of 22.6 years of age ( $\pm 4.59$ ); studied under an ordinary regime (82.6%); were from Portugal northern region (83.9%), lived in an urban centre (53.8%); attended the first study cycle (92.8%); and had chosen either technological and managerial courses or science education ones, each with 28.4%.

**Table 2 – Characteristics of the Participants**

Variable	Categories	Frequencies	
		%	N
Gender (N = 597)	Male	39.0	233
	Female	<b>61.0</b>	364
Age group (N = 598)	18 to 21years old	<b>53.8</b>	322
	$\geq 22$ years of age	46.2	276
Attendance Regime (N = 598)	Ordinary	<b>82.6</b>	494
	Student worker	17.4	104
Region of origin (N = 598)	North	<b>83.9</b>	502
	Centre	11.4	68
	South	1.8	11
	Madeira and Azores	1.6	10
	Other	1.2	7
Residing area (N = 598)	Rural	46.2	276
	Urban	<b>53.8</b>	322
Study cycle (N = 596)	Technological Courses	1.5	9
	Specialization	<b>92.8</b>	553
	Licentiate	5.7	34
Scientific area (N = 598)	Post graduation/Master's	9.4	56
	Agrarian Sciences	<b>28.4</b>	170
	Education Sciences	20.1	120
	Health Sciences	<b>28.4</b>	170
	Technology and Management	13.7	82
	Administration and Tourism		

## Results

As seen in Figure 2, more than half of the respondents showed entrepreneurial skills (72.4%). Risk-taking propensity stands out positively (90.8%). It is possible to conclude, then, that these students are capable of making risky decisions but based on well-founded, previously conceived action plans. Contrarily, innovativeness proved to be a weak point (39.7%) that can be solved, though, with proper training in creativity techniques in the workplace. As for the other features, namely self-control, self-confidence, ambiguity tolerance and especially the need for achievement there is, obviously, room for improvement.



**Figure 2 – Students’ characteristics and entrepreneurial skills (%)**

The averages registered for risk-taking propensity, innovativeness, self-confidence, self-control, need for achievement and ambiguity tolerance hover around a value of 3, which is considered satisfactory (Table 3). Furthermore, the *Spearman* test allowed us to observe that at the 1% significance level, the entrepreneurial features that contributed most to developing entrepreneurial potential were, by order of importance, self-confidence ( $\rho = 0.757$ ), need for achievement ( $\rho = 0.750$ ), Innovativeness ( $\rho = 0.699$ ), Risk-taking propensity ( $\rho = 0.678$ ), self-control ( $\rho = 0.668$ ) and ambiguity tolerance ( $\rho = 0.627$ ).

**Table 3 - Correlation of features with entrepreneurial skills**

Features	$\rho$	Mean	Standard deviation
Risk-taking propensity	0.678*	3.12	0.615
Innovativeness	0.699*	3.27	0.932
Self-confidence	0.757*	3.22	0.738
Self-control	0.668*	3.26	0.849
Need for achievement	0.750*	3.19	0.779
Ambiguity tolerance	0.627*	3.22	0.632

\* Meaningful correlations at 0.01 significance level.

The *Kruskal-Wallis* test allowed us to verify with 99% confidence level that there are significant differences in the entrepreneurial potential ( $p$ -value = 0.000) as regards the study cycle where the first cycle (licentiate) stands out as having the largest potential ( $Mean\ rank = 309.04$ ) (see Table 4). Similarly, through the *Kruskal-Wallis* test it was possible to identify significant differences in the entrepreneurial potential ( $p$ -value = 0.002) bearing in mind the course’s scientific area. Science Education students are potentially more entrepreneurial ( $Mean\ rank = 334.55$ ).

Table 4 presents the results obtained after the *Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon* test had been applied which showed the entrepreneurial potential does not vary according to the attendance regime ( $p$ -value = 0.757).

**Table 4 – Entrepreneurial Potential according to some human capital factors**

Factor	Categories	N	Mean rank	p-value
Attendance regime (N = 598)	Ordinary	494	300.47	0.757
	Student worker	104	294.88	
Study Cycle (N = 596)	Technological Specialization Courses	9	227.17	0.000*
	Licentiate	553	<b>309.04</b>	
	Post graduation/master's	34	145.99	
Scientific area (N = 598)	Agrarian Sciences	56	258.95	0.002*
	Education Sciences	170	<b>334.55</b>	
	Health Sciences	120	265.74	
	Technology and Management	170	293.83	
	Administration and Tourism	82	315.70	

\* Significant differences at 0.01 significance level.

The *Mann-Whitney-Wilcoxon* test allowed us to establish that no significant differences were observed when socio-demographic factors, such as gender ( $p$ -value = 0.052) and age ( $p$ -value = 0.476), were taken into consideration. Likewise, the *Kruskal-Wallis* test showed that the region where the students came from ( $p$ -value = 0.191) and their residing area ( $p$ -value = 0.696) do not differentiate the students' entrepreneurial potential (Table 5).

**Table 5 – Entrepreneurial potential according to some socio-demographic factors**

Factor	Categories	N	Mean rank	p-value
Gender (N = 597)	Male	233	315.62	0.052
	Female	264	288.36	
Age group (N = 598)	18 to 21 years old	322	304.02	0.476
	≥ 22 years of age	276	294.23	
Region of origin (N = 598)	North	502	293.72	0.191
	Centre	68	315.20	
	South	11	380.41	
	Madeira and Azores	10	330.00	
	Other	7	389.21	
Residing Area (N = 598)	Rural	276	296.61	0.696
	Urban	322	301.98	

The *Nagelkerke*  $R^2$  registered an 89.5% value (see Table 6). Therefore it is possible to say that proneness to entrepreneurship is 89.5% accounted for by independent variables, that is to say, by the students' entrepreneurial characteristics. On the other hand, the analysis of logistic regression results reveals a well adjusted model, since  $p$ -value = 0.000.

The binary logistic regression proved there is a cause and effect relationship between all the entrepreneurial features but the ambiguity tolerance and the entrepreneurial potential, with a 99% confidence level. The confidence level for the ambiguity tolerance was only 95%.

Coefficients' positive signs indicate that those who are more prone to being entrepreneurial are also more innovative, more ambiguity tolerant, more willing to take risks, more self-controlled and self-confident and have a greater need for achievement.

**Table 6 – Binary logistic regression model**

Independent variables	Proneness to entrepreneurship		
	$\beta$	Standard deviation	<i>p-value</i>
Self-confidence	0.693	0,145	0.004*
Risk-taking propensity	0.551	0.135	0.000*
Self-control	0.691	0.240	0.000*
Innovativeness	1.512	0.169	0.000*
Need for achievement	0.849	0.238	0.000*
Ambiguity tolerance	0.340	0.359	0.012**
Constant	-39.846	5.180	0.000*
N = 598 $R^2$ Nagelkerke = 0.895 $\chi^2 = LR = 577.77$ ; GL= 6 <i>p-value</i> to reject $H_0$ : 0.000			

\* Significant parameters at 0.01 significance level.

\*\* Significant parameters at 0.05 significance level.

### Discussion and final remarks

This study allowed its authors to conclude that most of the students who were interviewed had entrepreneurial skills. Self-confidence, need for achievement and innovativeness were identified as the features which contribute the most to the students' entrepreneurial potential. As to ambiguity tolerance, it was referred as the feature which contributes least for entrepreneurial potential. This situation may be improved through training seminars which will help students develop skills at the level of planning and decision-making. Thus, they will be able to draw up action plans and make rational decisions while acquiring the necessary skills to handle ambiguous situations and the setbacks that are always part of any entrepreneurial process. Kyro [19] posits that some entrepreneurial skills may be innate, whereas others are acquired, developed or potentiated through education and training. According to Minuzzi *et al.* [20], the development of entrepreneurship has been the concern of several institutions, namely Higher Education institutions, which deem the spreading of culture important for the progress of a nation. In Keogh's and Galloway's [21] view, education in general and Higher Education in particular have been playing an essential role in transmitting and adapting teaching methodologies in the field of entrepreneurship to the students' needs and circumstances and to the demands of future jobs in the context of the present economy. Academic entrepreneurship is currently considered to be a fundamental means of creating new businesses and generating wealth. Therefore, according to Filion [10], Higher Education institutions must focus on developing the concept and achieving *know-how* and not only on simply spreading knowledge.

The results of this research have shown that human capital factors, such as the course's scientific area (Education Sciences) and the study cycle (licentiate) differentiate the entrepreneurial potential. As regards human capital factors, only when the attendance regime was taken into consideration were there no significant differences between the two regimes studied.

Also, none of the socio-demographic factors proved to be differentiating in terms of the entrepreneurial potential. In fact, such factors as gender, age, region of origin and residing area have no influence on the students' entrepreneurial potential. Moreover, the results obtained in the course of this research for gender and age are consistent with Koh's [5].

Finally, the estimated binary logistic regression showed that features, such as innovativeness capacity, ambiguity tolerance, risk-taking propensity, need for achievement, self-control and self-confidence were determinant for proneness to entrepreneurship. These results are well in accordance with the *Psychological Characteristics School* which ascribes

unique values and attitudes and distinct needs to entrepreneurship. The results of the *logit* model are also concurrent with those obtained by Koh [5] and Gartner [22].

## Bibliography

- [1] Bronosky, M., A intenção empreendedora no ambiente universitário: caso unicentro, *Revista Capital Científico*, Vol. 6, nº. 1, 2008, pp. 245-260.
- [2] Hull, D., Bosley, J. and Udell, G., Renewing the hunt for the heffalump: identifying potential entrepreneurs by personality characteristics, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 18, nº. 1, 1980, pp.:11-18.
- [3] Teixeira, A. and Davey, T., Attitudes of Higher Education students to new venture creation: a preliminary approach to the Portuguese case, *Industry and Higher Education*, Vol. 24, nº. 5, 2010, pp. 323-341.
- [4] Ferreira, A., Fonseca, L. and Santos, L. “Serão os ‘estudantes empreendedores’ os empreendedores do futuro? O contributo das empresas juniores para o empreendedorismo”, Faculdade de Economia do Porto Working Papers, 2009, nº. 333.
- [5] Koh, H., Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics: A study of Hong Kong MBA students, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 11, nº. 3, 1996, pp. 12-25.
- [6] Cunningham, J. and Lischeron, J., Defining entrepreneurship, *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 29, 1991, pp. 45-61.
- [7] Deo, S., “Challenges for small business entrepreneurs: A study in the Walka Region of New Zealand”, Small Business Advancement National Centre, University of Arkansas, 2005.
- [8] Rwigema, H. and Venter, R., *Advanced entrepreneurship*, Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- [9] Acs, Z., Desai, S. and Klapper, L., What does Entrepreneurship data really show? A comparison of the global entrepreneurship monitor and the Work Bank Group Datasets, World Bank, *Policy Research Working paper Series 4467*, 2008.
- [10] Fillion, J., Empreendedorismo e gerenciamento: processos distintos, porém complementares, *Revista de Administração de Empresas Light*, Vol. 7, nº. 3, 2000, pp. 2-7.
- [11] Alves, L. and Bornia, A., Desenvolvimento de uma escala para medir o potencial empreendedor utilizando a Teoria da Resposta ao Item (TRI), *Gestão & Produção*, Vol. 18, nº.4, 2011, pp. 775-790 .
- [12] Brockhaus, R. and Horwitz, P., “The psychology of the entrepreneur”, In Sexton, D. and Smilor, R. (Eds), *The Art and Science of Entrepreneurship*, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA, 1986, pp. 25-48.
- [13] Mitton, D., The complete entrepreneur, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 13, 1989, pp. 9-19.
- [14] Markham, G. and Baron, R., Person-entrepreneurship fit: Why some people are more successful as entrepreneurs than others, *Human Resource Management Review*, Vol. 13, nº. 2, 2004, pp. 281-301.
- [15] Curral, L., Caetano, A. and Santos, S., Atitude dos estudantes universitários face ao empreendedorismo. Como identificar o potencial empreendedor? *Revista Portuguesa e Brasileira de Gestão*, Vol. 9, nº. 4, 2010, pp. 2-14.
- [16] Maroco, J., *Análise Estatística com utilização do SPSS*, Lisboa: Edições Sílabo, 2003.
- [17] Pestana, M. and Gageiro, J., *Análise de Dados para Ciências Sociais: A complementaridade do SPSS*, Lisboa: Edições Sílabo, 2002.
- [18] Cramer, J., *The Origins and Development of the Logit Model*, Cambridge: Cambridge Publishers, 2003.

- [19] Kyro, P., "Entrepreneurship Education and Finnish Society", *Working Papers in Economics*, 2006, n°. 21.
- [20] Minuzzi, J., Santos, P., Lezana, A. and Filho, N., Intenção empreendedora em alunos de Engenharia de Produção: Uma análise com uso de regressão logística *In Actas do XXVII ENEGEP*, 2007.
- [21] Keogh, W. and Galloway, L., Teaching enterprise in vocational disciplines: reflecting on positive experience, *Management Decision*, Vol. 42, n°. 3/4 , 2004, pp. 531-541.
- [22] Gartner, W., Some suggestions for research on entrepreneurial traits and characteristics, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 14, 1989, pp. 27-37.