Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review

2022, Vol. 10, No. 2

10.15678/EBER.2022.100212

The entrepreneurial motivation, Covid-19, and the new normal

Cristina Blanco González-Tejero, Klaus Ulrich, Agustín Carrilero

ABSTRACT

Objective: The main objective of the article is to show how the influence of Covid-19 affects entrepreneurial motivation through the variables of creativity, leadership, and communication, understood as information available and transferable within the environment.

Research Design & Methods: The study was performed by means of an email survey questionnaire conducted on 63 employees in Madrid (Spain). The propositions and the research model were tested with fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA).

Findings: The results illustrate that employees who aspire to become entrepreneurs evidence specific configurations in relation to the variables proposed before the Covid-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, these configurations in the new normal are only determinant for the absence of entrepreneurial decision.

Implications & Recommendations: Background affects the link between the variables of creativity, communication, leadership, and entrepreneurial motivation. Thus, the uncertainty derived from Covid-19 influences entrepreneurial development, and consequently, it is recommended to consider these aspects in government policies that encourage support to potential entrepreneurs.

Contribution & Value Added: Through a comprehensive assessment, this research contributes to the literature on entrepreneurship by addressing the gap related to entrepreneurial motivation and the impact of the new normal in the face of Covid-19.

Article type: research article

Keywords: entrepreneurship; Covid-19; entrepreneurial motivation; skills; competencies

JEL codes: L26

Received: 28 December 2021 Revised: 24 January 2022 Accepted: 7 February 2022

Suggested citation:

González-Tejero, C.B., Ulrich, K., & Carrilero, A. (2022). The entrepreneurial motivation, Covid-19, and the new normal. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review,* 10(2), 205-217. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2022.100212

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship is an extremely important issue in the twenty-first century (Soriano, 2010) and entrepreneurial motivation plays a decisive role in the development of entrepreneurship (Cervelló-Royo *et al.*, 2020). Entrepreneurs, opportunities, and entrepreneurial behaviours are key elements in entrepreneurship theory (Kusa *et al.*, 2021). The Covid-19 pandemic poses an unprecedented challenge in many respects (Belitski *et al.*, 2022), however, it takes on special relevance in economic development. Considering that the entrepreneurial individual's work is not guided by any manual, they must contemplate different perspectives and implications (Dobón & Soriano, 2008) to overcome the market dynamism that has led to the need for entrepreneurs to adapt, in order to achieve business sustainability. New aspects related to the entrepreneur role in society in crisis situations become relevant. Consequently, uncertainty has affected entrepreneurial development, so the study of the variables involved in entrepreneurial motivation before and during the pandemic situation takes on special relevance.

Over the years, many scholars have investigated entrepreneurial motivations (Liñán & Chen, 2009), thus providing insights into the perceived strengths and weaknesses in shaping personal attitudes towards entrepreneurship. To succeed in the global business environment, it is necessary to identify

opportunities, since entrepreneurship requires non-routine innovative activity to be developed, which involves the development of instincts, intuition and inspirations (Sharma, 2019). The aim of this research work is to show how the influence of Covid-19 affects entrepreneurial motivation. Ultimately, the skills and abilities to undertake a business should be considered (Fernández-Pérez *et al*., 2019). Hence, the goal of the research is the analysis of creativity, a variable highlighted in the research of Capella-Peris *et al*. (2020); Rueda Barrios *et al*. (2021); Biswas and Verma (2021); communication and relevance of information referred to by Capella-Peris *et al*. (2019) and Eliyana *et al*. (2020), and finally leadership considered in research by Biswas and Verma (2021) and Eliyana *et al*. (2020).

To respond to the analysed variables, the study of factors related to entrepreneurial motivation was carried out to explain the motivational effect of individuals in pursuing entrepreneurial career options. Different market shocks have been experienced over the years, directly hitting the economy and more specifically financial services (Piñeiro-Chousa *et al*., 2019a). In turn, the influence of Covid-19 on entrepreneurial motivation and drive was considered. For this purpose, the research has been developed through a survey sent to 100 employees and potential entrepreneurs in 2019 and in 2021. For the collection of information, the survey was sent via Microsoft Forms. The answers considered valid were filled out by 33 employees and potential entrepreneurs in 2019 (before the pandemic) and another 30 in 2021 (the new normal). The following research questions are posed:

RQ1: Does creative awareness act as an influential variable on entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial motivation before and/or during Covid-19?

RQ2: Does communication become relevant in the development of entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial motivation and influence entrepreneurial motivation before and/or during Covid-19?

RQ3: Is awareness of leadership ability significantly associated with the motivation to undertake or participate in an intrapreneurial initiative before and/or during Covid-19?

Consequently, in this research, entrepreneurial motivation will be considered as the starting point of entrepreneurial development (Elfving *et al*., 2009). These issues have been addressed through an exhaustive evaluation of the proposed variables using fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA).

The article is organized as follows. The following section presents the hypotheses that were considered in the light of the literature review. The study continues by describing the data set and the research method. Subsequently, results are presented and discussed, and finally the conclusions of the study are presented, the limitations of the research are highlighted, and new lines of research are outlined.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Entrepreneurship has been considered from different perspectives, referring to the entrepreneurial factor, function, initiative and behaviour, which has made it possible to consider the entrepreneurial 'spirit' (Cuervo & Ribeiro, 2007). Motivation represents the amount of effort a person will invest to achieve a specific goal (Lawler & Suttle, 1973), in this case, to launch a business initiative. In this way, goals and motivations act to connect entrepreneurial intentions with actual entrepreneurial behaviours (Vallerie, 2014).

Individual competencies, referring to knowledge, skills and abilities, are necessary for personal and business development and differentiation. In the entrepreneurial environment, Bos-Brouwers (2010) considers personal motivation while Jahanshahi *et al.* (2018) the individual's attitude as key elements. Likewise, Rindova *et al*. (2009) propose self-actualization and self-esteem as elements that enable development towards personal achievement, which significantly influences entrepreneurial behaviour. Williams *et al*. (2013) point out attributes such as flexibility, motivation, perseverance. and optimism as attributes that characterize entrepreneurs. Consequently, entrepreneurial motivation is considered to boost a series of behaviours developed by entrepreneurs in the idea management process (Baum & Locke, 2014).

From the cognitive perspective, entrepreneurial activity has been focused on the theory of planned behaviour linked to psychology (Ajzen, 1991), which allows entrepreneurial behaviour to be considered as highly intentional. The relationships between self-identity, commitments, motivations, and individual actions are analysed from different perspectives, considering their link with social psychology

(Metallo *et al*., 2021). Accordingly, entrepreneurial intentions are linked to the attitudes of the individual towards entrepreneurship, which enables factors that influence entrepreneurial motivations to be understood (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994). Therefore, entrepreneurial intentions play a crucial role in the individual's motivation to start a new business, as these intentions precede the action of starting a business idea and, consequently, help in the development of the entrepreneurial process and making decisions (Krueger *et al*., 2000). Entrepreneurial decision-making has been approached from different domains, such as gender, age, education or entrepreneurial confidence (Dvouletý & Orel, 2020). Moreover, other variables, such as gender, have long been a disputed issue in the entrepreneurial environment and influential in entrepreneurial orientation (Goktan & Gupta, 2015), so it becomes relevant to consider whether it has an influence on entrepreneurial motivation.

Due to the current situation that society is going through and the uncertainty it is facing, the entrepreneurial spirit is deemed. Hence, situational factors and context influence entrepreneurial intentions (Boyd & Vozikis, 1994; Morales-Gualdrón & Roig, 2005). The analysis considers entrepreneurial motivation to be the motivation existing in individuals that allows them to detect opportunities based on present needs, thus giving rise to entrepreneurial or intra-entrepreneurial actions. Consequently, researchers assume that particular motivations are needed: the commitment to implement the idea and the actual effort to start a new venture (McMullen & Shepherd, 2006).

The Covid-19 pandemic has dramatically changed society and disrupted current business practices, requiring new approaches that influence entrepreneurial thinking. Psychological responses to the Covid-19 pandemic have been explored by scholars such as Xie *et al.* (2020), because during this time, many people have received different information insights that have influenced their personal and professional decisions. As has become evident over the last two years, Covid-19 has had a global impact, affecting all countries regardless of their level of development. However, the extent of the pandemic in terms of economic impact and business sustainability has been altered depending on the set of government policies and measures proposed to mitigate it. Therefore, it is necessary to analyse the effect of Covid-19 on entrepreneurial intention by analysing the influence of different motivational antecedents. Consequently, the different entrepreneurial motivations are addressed, understood as variables that refer to the internal drives or desires that push the individual to become an entrepreneur. Thus, internal motivations are analysed, which are related to the desire for self-fulfilment or achievement (Sivarajah & Achchuthan, 2013) or gender issues, as proposed by Davidsson and Reynolds (2005). Similarly, researchers consider the relationship of entrepreneurial potential and its motivations in the context of the pandemic as there are not enough studies in this field at present.

Creativity

At the individual level, people need to be creative to solve problems encountered at work and in everyday life (Sternberg & Lubart, 1996). Thus, individual creativity is considered crucial and influential on factors such as personality, motivation, knowledge, and cognitive skills (Dimov, 2007).

Creativity, as analysed by Chen *et al.* (2018), highlights the ability of organizational founders to produce goods that show some degree of novelty, originality, and uniqueness. Additionally, taking into account creativity as a variable object of study, Oldham and Cummings (1996) relate it to work, considering that it refers to the ability to develop ideas as a solution to the problems posed. Therefore, Chua *et al.* (2015) examine its relationship by understanding that the lack of valuation by the environment of personal initiative would negatively impact the generation and development of the idea. In turn, this leads to a lower perception of creative capacity, which originates a reduced use of creative development in organizations (Hormiga *et al*., 2013). Likewise, the positive relationship between creativity and business development through the capture of intangible value by applying creative, technological and innovation knowledge is related by Hearn (2020).

New entrepreneurial educational practices are required to contribute to the management of change due to the uncertainty caused by Covid-19 (Ratten & Jones, 2021). Creativity has been studied since educational stages as an influential variable in entrepreneurial development (Capella-Peris *et al.*, 2019; Rueda Barrios *et al.*, 2021). Meanwhile, Biswas and Verma (2021) argue that in entrepreneurial development, innovation is a personality trait, in which creativity plays a key role as it allows the cre-

ative development of innovative ideas. Hence, it is relevant to consider initiative and imagination in entrepreneurial development, as it gives way to new business opportunities (Cuervo & Ribeiro, 2007). To this end, it is of key importance to analyse the impact of the individual's creative awareness in response to the new social needs that have developed in the pandemic situation.

Proposition 1: Creative awareness acts as an influential variable in entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial motivation before and/or during Covid-19.

Leadership

The Covid-19 crisis makes leadership a valued quality for policymakers (Ratten, 2021). Leadership, creativity, entrepreneurial mindset, entrepreneurial culture, and strategic management of resources have been key factors for the creation of distinctive value in business organizations (Ireland *et al.*, 2003). Capella-Peris *et al.* (2019) analyse the ability to coordinate people and cope with different situations from higher education, with the aim of assessing entrepreneurial competencies. Consequently, from an early age, leadership acquires relevance as a factor in the decision about becoming entrepreneur.

The entrepreneur is considered a leader by authors such as Baron (2002). Hunt (2004) refers to the leader as the person who has the ability to influence others. On many occasions, this capacity appears naturally within social systems and leaders can influence the decisions and make people follow strategies. In addition, the motivation of the members of the organization, support and learning are also aspects that are influenced by leaders (Yukl, 2002). Thus, the leader is a key element in the organization generating visionary scenarios (Gupta *et al.*, 2004).

The capacity to lead has been linked with other traits such as creativity, which implies considering leaders as individuals with the ability to guide the team towards results through collaboration and creative decisions (Soriano & Martinez, 2007). Biswas and Verma (2021) analyse variables linked to the management as well as the handling of difficult problems and persuasion in business tasks.

Bearing in mind Covid-19 and the uncertainty it poses in business decisions and strategies, it becomes relevant to understand the influence of the leader's profile on business motivation and management.

Proposition 2: Leadership ability is significantly associated with the decision to undertake or participate in an intrapreneurial initiative before and/or during Covid-19.

Communication

Communication is a characteristic that allows individuals to generate understanding, give meaning, and provide identity to the different relationships in the environment, thus, interpersonal communication refers to the process of interaction in the environment involving individuals, and is represented through the behaviour of verbal and nonverbal messages (Baxter & Braithwaite, 2008). Within information management in the entrepreneurial environment, cooperation is another relevant factor to consider, since it enables coordination among participants and the improvement and implementation of coordination in the processes through which knowledge and skills/abilities are shared, facilitating communication (Del Mar Benavides-Espinosa & Ribeiro, 2014). Therefore, it becomes a characteristic of analysis in the entrepreneurial environment, as it influences the relationships that arise in that environment.

Capella-Peris *et al.* (2019) analyse the access to information required for entrepreneurship or the dialogue to solve problems. Aligned with the previous aforementioned research, Eliyana *et al.* (2020) consider the socialization between individuals relevant in entrepreneurship. Thus, it becomes relevant to consider communication as a variable, since communication theories can be an interesting asset for the study of entrepreneurial behaviour.

During the pandemic, information has evolved rapidly, making it relevant to consider the impact on business development and motivation. As Obrenovic *et al.* (2020) point out, the development of effective communication techniques during Covid-19 has led to improved performance and mental support among individuals.

Proposition 3: Awareness of the existence of communication and information becomes relevant in the development of entrepreneurial or intrapreneurial motivation and influences before and/or during Covid-19.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) is a research methodology based on the mathematical set theory. QCA analyses the influence of the combination of causal conditions on the outcome (De Crescenzo *et al*., 2021; Misangyi *et al*., 2017; Ribeiro-Navarrete *et al*., 2021b). Qualitative comparative studies have a configurational approach (Fainshmidt *et al*., 2020; Lassala *et al*., 2021; Ribeiro-Navarrete *et al*., 2021a), in that the relevance of the methodology relies more on the configuration/combination of conditions, more than the behaviour of an individual condition on the outcome. Therefore, the fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis (fsQCA) method has gained relevance nowadays, as it has been proven to be a highly valid alternative method or complementary to other methodological analyses (Piñeiro-Chousa *et al*., 2019b).

Sampling and data collection

Data comes from the 2019 annual survey of a group of 33 employees and potential entrepreneurs and the 2021 survey on 30 employees and potential entrepreneurs. Thus, the final sample included information from 63 Spanish potential entrepreneurs.

The strengths of motivational factors, perceived success factors and problems were measured using a five-point Likert scale. The statements analysed were:

a) I am frequently surprised with innovative ideas as a solution to the problems posed (CRT);
b) I understand that there is adequate information that favours communication (COM); and
c) I like to lead initiatives and teams (LEA).

In turn, two dichotomous variables were considered: the first, the decision to undertake in the next three years, or to be at the forefront of the development of, a business idea within the organization (potential entrepreneur); and the second, gender (male or female).

Table 1. Calibration data 2019

Calibration	CRT	COM	LEA
full membership (90th percentile)	5	5	5
crossover point (median)	4	4	4
full non-membership (10th percentile)	1.4	2	2.4

Source: own study.

Table 2. Calibration data 2021-2022

Calibration	CRT	COM	LEA
full membership (90th percentile)	5	3.9	5
crossover point (median)	3	2	3
full non-membership (10th percentile)	2	1	2

Source: own study.

During the calibration process (Tables 1 and 2), all the causal conditions were calibrated, except the crisp conditions (binomial conditions that only can adopt the values 0 or 1). In the calibration, all the fuzzy sets were converted into values ranged between 0 and 1 (Ragin, 2009; Ragin, 2008).

According to prior studies of Pappas and Woodside (2021), we set as thresholds different percentiles in order to determine the membership of the fuzzy set. In this sense, we fixed percentile 90 for full membership, percentile 10 for full non-membership and percentile 50 for the crossover point. In order to avoid difficulties in determining to what particular set a case belongs to, we followed Ragin's (2008) recommendations and we subtracted 0.01 from the membership scores for all the calibrated conditions below full membership (Miranda *et al*., 2018; Fiss, 2011).

The causal condition CRT, which represents the innovation ability to solve problems, was calibrated for the 2019 data with the thresholds 5, 3.99, 1.4, and for 2021: 5, 2.99, 2. The causal condition COM, which represents the belief that the existent information encourages communication, was calibrated with the following thresholds for the 2019 data: 5, 3.99, and 2, and for 2021: 3.9, 2, 1. LEA, that is a

causal condition which represents the preference to lead level of employees, was calibrated in 2019 with the thresholds 5, 3.9, and 2, and for the 2021 data: 5, 2.99, and 2.

Moreover, the causal condition GEN, which represents the gender, is considered as a binomial condition, in fsQCA terminology, a crisp condition that is not calibrated (Thiem, 2014). Value 1 represents male and 0 female. In the case of ENT, which represents that the aim of the employee is to become an entrepreneur, it is also a crisp condition, which adopts the value 1 in the case that the aim of the employee is to be an entrepreneur in the future, and value 0 if that is not the case.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Necessary Conditions

In fsQCA studies, we elaborated an analysis to determine which conditions could be considered necessary for the occurring of the expected outcome (Table 3). In social sciences, the phenomena overlap and reinforce one another (Gligor & Bozkurt, 2020), thus to study the joint influence of conditions this approach enhances the classic correlation models that study the net effect, based on the ceteris paribus principle of dependent variables on the independent variable (Oana *et al*., 2021; Skarmeas *et al*., 2014). Necessary conditions are those that are so important for the outcome that they cannot occur in its absence. In the elaboration of the necessity analysis, we focused on two main indicators, *i.e.* consistency and coverage. Consistency measures the ratio of cases that have both condition and the outcome among all that present the expected outcome. Coverage measures the proportion of cases in which the condition and the outcome appear, among all that show the condition. According to prior studies of Schneider and Wagemann (2012), conditions can be considered necessary if they reach consistency scores above 0.9.

Table 3. Necessary conditions

Causal conditions	PRESENCE OF THE OUTCOME IN 2019		ABSENCE OF THE OUTCOME IN 2021	
	Consistency	Coverage	Consistency	Coverage
GEN	0.667	0.6000	0.636	0.778
~GEN	0.333	0.462	0.364	0.803
CRT	0.715	0.817	0.396	0.543
~CRT	0.285	0.297	0.604	0.953
COM	0.607	0.657	0.499	0.671
~COM	0.392	0.431	0.500	0.809
LEA	0.593	0.748	0.507	0.700
~LEA	0.407	0.391	0.493	0.771

Source: own study.

As it can be concluded from this study, no condition can be considered as necessary, since they do not reach the 0.9 consistency score.

Analysis of Sufficient Conditions

In order to elaborate the sufficiency analysis, we constructed a truth table through the fsQCA 3.0 software in order to determine the conditions that lead to the presence (Table 4) or absence (Table 5) of the outcome (Park *et al*., 2020). In the analysis of sufficient conditions, we analysed four main indicators: the consistency of the solution, which explained how many cases are explained by the presented solution; the coverage of the solution, which analysed how many interest cases are covered by the solution; the raw coverage, which represented the proportion of interest cases explained by the configuration; and the unique coverage, which explained the ratio of cases with the expected outcome explained uniquely by one configuration.

Table 4. Sufficiency analysis for the presence of the outcome in 2019

Criteria	PRESENCE OF THE OUTCOME (ENT) IN 2019		
	1	2	3
GEN	●	•	
CRT	●	●	●
COM	●		•
LEA		●	●
Raw coverage	0.334	0.377	0.392
Unique coverage	0.070	0.113	0.128
Consistency	0.864	0.919	0.880
Solution coverage	0.575		
Consistency	0.876		

Source: own study.

Table 5. Sufficiency analysis for the absence of the outcome in 2021

Criteria	ABSENCE OF THE OUTCOME (ENT) IN 2021-2022	
	4	5
GEN		⚬
CRT	⚬	⚬
COM	◯	◯
LEA	⚬	
Raw coverage	0.334	0.377
Unique coverage	0.070	0.113
Consistency	0.864	0.919
Solution coverage	0.575	
Consistency	0.876	

Note: According to the Fiss (2011), the solutions provided should be considered from different perspectives, black circles denote the presence of the condition and white circles show the absence of the condition. In relation to the size, the large circles refer to the central condition which appears in both the parsimonious and the intermediate solution, and the small circles indicate the presence of the condition only in the intermediate solution.
Source: own study.

Presence of the Outcome

Configuration 1 showed that employees who have to aim to become entrepreneurs are usually males, who usually surprise themselves with innovative ideas to solve problems and believe that the existent information is enough and encourage communication. This configuration registered the raw coverage of 0.334, which meant that this configuration explains 33.4% of cases and had a consistency score of 0.864.

Configuration 2 suggested that employees with leadership capabilities, a creative mindset to solve problems and whose gender was male usually develop entrepreneurial goals for their future. This solution registered the highest consistency level (0.919) and had a raw coverage of 0.377.

Configuration 3 showed that in order to have entrepreneurial future goals, employees had to show innovative ideas in the solution setting processes, were likely to lead teams and projects, and believed they have enough information to communicate. Configuration 3 had a raw coverage of 0.392, which meant that it explained 39.2% of cases that gathered the expected output with a consistency level of 0.880.

Absence of the Outcome

Configuration 4 indicated that employees who believe they do not have enough information to encourage communication, who usually did not have innovative and creative ideas and did not like to lead teams or initiatives, did not want to become entrepreneurs in the future. This configuration had a consistency score of 0.864 and a raw coverage of 0.334.

Configuration 5 showed that employees who did not have entrepreneurial objectives did not believe that they have enough information to communicate, did not have innovative or creative ideas to solve problems, and were of female gender. Configuration 5 registered a consistency level of 0.919 and a raw coverage score of 0.377.

Discussion

The impact of the media during Covid-19 in the dissemination of information meant a change in the behaviour of individuals (Al-Omoush *et al*., 2020). Doanh *et al.* (2021) revealed that the fear and anxiety generated by Covid-19 have decreased entrepreneurial self-efficacy and the intention to create own business, therefore understanding its impact is relevant.

The variables proposed in the research are not necessary conditions for entrepreneurial motivation, neither in the pre-pandemic situation nor in the new normal, since no variable exceeded the consistency of 0.9. In this way, the analysis of the combination of conditions becomes relevant. Therefore, considering market shocks and high competitiveness, economic motives on their own do not clarify why entrepreneurs will make sustained efforts over time under high uncertainty and uncertain future revenues (Reynolds, 2012).

The results obtained for the new normal (year 2021) evidence an absence of the condition. Thus, uncertainty does not motivate employees to be entrepreneurial as the information in the market is not clear. The results obtained for 2019 show presence of the condition of being entrepreneurial when there are innovative ideas and good communication, considering that there is enough information in the market. In addition, it should be noted that creativity and leadership are influential variables in men to develop entrepreneurship. In this sense, other scholars, such as Reissová *et al.* (2020) also highlight the characteristic of creativity for the start of an entrepreneurial career. Therefore, it is worth considering that just as fear of failure and uncertainty act as personal barriers, awareness of individual knowledge and skills can be driving variables of entrepreneurial motivation.

CONCLUSIONS

The research examined how the variables of creativity, communication, and leadership influence the decision to become an entrepreneur in a pre-pandemic situation and in the current situation (new normal). Entrepreneurial motivation has been defined as being influenced by uncertainty and these variables do not represent the presence of potential entrepreneurs in the new normal, although they did before Covid-19. Therefore, in our analysis, we placed special emphasis on the relationship between competencies as determining and influential elements in the decision to become an entrepreneur. To arrive at the results, a sample of self-reported data collected through a survey from 63 employees was analysed, which allowed for an in-depth analysis.

Entrepreneurial motivation is essential for the development of entrepreneurship, so it is worth knowing which variables have a positive influence on this trend. By analysing the conditions related to entrepreneurial motivation, the study contributes to the debate on the influence of different variables on the start-up of a business initiative. The configurations leading to employee motivation were identified using the fsQCA. The results of this empirical study show the importance of certain variables related to creativity, communication and leadership and the relevance of context. The theory presented in this article helps to answer the research questions posed above.

Based on this research and as pointed out by other previously mentioned investigations (Hearn, 2020; Capella-Peris *et al*., 2019; Eliyana *et al*., 2020), the variables creativity, communication, and leadership were addressed and shown to acquire special relevance considering their impact on the economic environment, so as a result of different configurations they have the ability to link with entrepreneurial motivation. Moreover, the context should be borne in mind as a key factor as proposed by Boyd and Vozikis (1994) and Morales-Gualdrón and Roig (2005). Furthermore, it should be considered that people who identify new opportunities, have a proactive character, and are able to take risks find it attractive to become an entrepreneur (Żur *et al*., 2015).

Regarding possible directions for future research, our sample can be expanded by taking into account variables such as skills training, since entrepreneurship education and culture play an essential

role in the intention to become an entrepreneur (Wardana *et al.*, 2021). This research might be replicated considering a different timeline, with the aim to analyse whether elements such as vaccinations or new information disseminated contribute to entrepreneurial confidence and motivate entrepreneurship again. As Hassan *et al.* (2021) argue, the ability to take risks, creativity, and innovation act as characteristics that can be enhanced through empowerment. Therefore, it is suggested that empowerment be considered as a method of development and work on the variables proposed in the research. Moreover, it is relevant that these factors are considered by business leaders, employees, potential entrepreneurs, educators, and policymakers in order to support entrepreneurial development and consequently contribute to the economy.

REFERENCES

Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational behavior and human decision processes, *50*(2), 179-211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T

Al-Omoush, K. S., Simón-Moya, V., & Sendra-García, J. (2020). The impact of social capital and collaborative knowledge creation on e-business proactiveness and organizational agility in responding to the Covid-19 crisis. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *5*(4), 279-288. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2020.10.002

Baron, R. A. (2002). OB and entrepreneurship: The reciprocal benefits of closer conceptual links. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *24*, 225-269.https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(02)24007-1

Baum, J. R., & Locke, E. A. (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*(4), 587. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.4.587

Baxter, L.A., & Braithwaite, D.O. (2008). Relational dialectics theory: Crafting meaning from competing discourses. In L.A. Baxter & D.O. Braithwaite (Eds.), Engaging theories in interpersonal communication (pp. 349362). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Belitski, M., Guenther, C., Kritikos, A. S., & Thurik, R. (2022). Economic effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on entrepreneurship and small businesses. *Small Business Economics*, *58*(2), 593-609. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00544-y

Biswas, A., & Verma, R. K. (2021). Attitude and alertness in personality traits: a pathway to building entrepreneurial intentions among university students. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, *30*(2), 367-396. https://doi.org/10.1177/09713557211025656

Bos-Brouwers, H. E. J. (2010). Corporate sustainability and innovation in SMEs: evidence of themes and activities in practice. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, *19*(7), 417-435. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.652

Boyd, N. G., & Vozikis, G. S. (1994). The influence of self-efficacy on the development of entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *18*(4), 63-77. https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879401800404

Capella-Peris, C., Gil-Gómez, J., Martí-Puig, M., & Ruíz-Bernardo, P. (2020). Development and validation of a scale to assess social entrepreneurship competency in higher education. *Journal of Social Entrepreneurship*, *11*(1), 23-39. https://doi.org/10.1080/19420676.2018.1545686

Cervelló-Royo, R., Moya-Clemente, I., Perelló-Marín, M. R., & Ribes-Giner, G. (2020). Sustainable development, economic and financial factors that influence the opportunity-driven entrepreneurship. An fsQCA approach. *Journal of Business Research*, *115*, 393-402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.10.031

Chen, M. H., Chang, Y. Y., & Pan, J. Y. (2018). Typology of creative entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial success. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*,*12*(5), 632-656. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-07-2017-0041

Chua, R. Y., Roth, Y., & Lemoine, J. F. (2015). The impact of culture on creativity: How cultural tightness and cultural distance affect global innovation crowdsourcing work. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *60*(2), 189-227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839214563595

Cuervo, Á., Ribeiro, D., & Roig, S. (2007). Entrepreneurship: concepts, theory and perspective. Introduction. In: *Cuervo, Á., Ribeiro, D., Roig, S.* (Eds.) Entrepreneurship. Springer, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-48543-8.

Davidsson, P. (2005). Paul D. Reynolds: Entrepreneurship research innovator, coordinator, and disseminator. *Small Business Economics*, *24*(4), 351-358. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-005-0690-z

De Crescenzo, V., Monfort, A., Felício, J. A., & Ribeiro-Navarrete, S. (2021). Communication and the role of third-party endorsement in social crowdfunding. *The Service Industries Journal*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2021.1963437

Del Mar Benavides-Espinosa, M., & Ribeiro-Soriano, D. (2014). Cooperative learning in creating and managing joint ventures. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(4), 648-655. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2012.12.017

Dimov, D. (2007). Beyond the single-person, single-insight attribution in understanding entrepreneurial opportunities. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *31*(5), 713-731. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2007.00196.x

Doanh, D. C., Thang, H. N., Nga, N. T. V., Van, P. T., & Hoa, P. T. (2021). Entrepreneurial behaviour: The effects of the fear and anxiety of Covid-19 and business opportunity recognition. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *9*(3), 7-23. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2021.090301

Dobón, S. R., & Soriano, D. R. (2008). Exploring alternative approaches in service industries: The role of entrepreneurship. *The Service Industries Journal*, *28*(7), 877-882. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642060701846879

Dvouletý, O., & Orel, M. (2020). Individual determinants of entrepreneurship in Visegrád countries: Reflection on GEM data from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *8*(4), 123-137. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2020.080407

Elfving, J., Brännback, M., & Carsrud, A. (2009). Toward A Contextual Model of Entrepreneurial Intentions. In: *Carsrud, A., Brännback, M*. (Eds) Understanding the Entrepreneurial Mind. International Studies in Entrepreneurship, vol 24. Springer, New York, NY. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0443-0_2

Eliyana, A., Musta'in, A. R. S., & Aviantari, N. (2020). Linking Self Efficacy on Motivation and Entrepreneurial Achievements. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, *11*(8), 328-334.

Fainshmidt, S., Witt, M. A., Aguilera, R. V., & Verbeke, A. (2020). The contributions of qualitative comparative analysis (QCA) to international business research. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *51*(4), 455-466. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41267-020-00313-1

Fernández-Pérez, V., Montes-Merino, A., Rodríguez-Ariza, L., & Galicia, P. E. A. (2019). Emotional competencies and cognitive antecedents in shaping student's entrepreneurial intention: the moderating role of entrepreneurship education. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *15*(1), 281-305. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-017-0438-7

Fiss, P. C. (2011). Building better causal theories: A fuzzy set approach to typologies in organization research. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*(2), 393-420. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.60263120

Gligor, D., & Bozkurt, S. (2020). FsQCA versus regression: The context of customer engagement. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, *52*, 101929. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101929

Goktan, A. B., & Gupta, V. K. (2015). Sex, gender, and individual entrepreneurial orientation: evidence from four countries. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *11*(1), 95-112. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-013-0278-z

Gupta, V., MacMillan, I. C., & Surie, G. (2004). Entrepreneurial leadership: developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct. Journal of Business Venturing, 19(2), 241-260. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00040-5

Hassan, Z., Lashari, M. K., & Basit, A. (2021). Cultivating entrepreneurial culture among students in Malaysia. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *9*(1), 119-136. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2021.090108

Hearn, G. (2020). The future of creative work: Creativity and digital disruption. In The future of creative work. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Hormiga, E., Hancock, C., & Valls-Pasola, J. (2013). The relationship between employee propensity to innovate and their decision to create a company. *Management Decision*, *51*(5), 938-953. https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-08-2012-0591

Hunt, J. G. (J.). (2004). What is leadership?. J. Antonakis, A.T. Cianciolo, R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The nature of leadership* (pp. 19-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Ireland, R. D., Hitt, M. A., & Sirmon, D. G. (2003). A model of strategic entrepreneurship: The construct and its dimensions. *Journal of Management*, *29*(6), 963-989. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00086-2

Jahanshahi, A. A., Nawaser, K., & Brem, A. (2018). Corporate entrepreneurship strategy: an analysis of top management teams in SMEs. *Baltic Journal of Management*, *13*(4), 528-543. https://doi.org/10.1108/BJM-12-2017-0397

Krueger Jr, N. F., Reilly, M. D., & Carsrud, A. L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, *15*(5-6), 411-432. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(98)00033-0

Kusa, R., Duda, J., & Suder, M. (2021). Explaining SME performance with fsQCA: The role of entrepreneurial orientation, entrepreneur motivation, and opportunity perception. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *6*(4), 234-245. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2021.06.001

Lassala, C., Orero-Blat, M., & Ribeiro-Navarrete, S. (2021). The financial performance of listed companies in pursuit of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, *34*(1), 427-449. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2021.1877167

Lawler III, E. E., & Suttle, J. L. (1973). Expectancy theory and job behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *9*(3), 482-503. https://doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(73)90066-4

Liñán, F., & Chen, Y. W. (2009). Development and cross–cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, *33*(3), 593-617. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6520.2009.00318.x

McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(1), 132-152. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2006.19379628

Metallo, C., Agrifoglio, R., Briganti, P., Mercurio, L., & Ferrara, M. (2021). Entrepreneurial behaviour and new venture creation: the psychoanalytic perspective. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *6*(1), 35-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2020.02.001

Miranda, S., Tavares, P., & Queiró, R. (2018). Perceived service quality and customer satisfaction: A fuzzy set QCA approach in the railway sector. *Journal of Business Research*, *89*, 371-377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2019.101929

Misangyi, V. F., Greckhamer, T., Furnari, S., Fiss, P. C., Crilly, D., & Aguilera, R. (2017). Embracing causal complexity: The emergence of a neo-configurational perspective. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 255-282. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206316679252

Morales-Gualdrón, S. T., & Roig, S. (2005). The new venture decision: An analysis based on the GEM project database. *The International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, *1*(4), 479-499.

Oana, I. E., Schneider, C. Q., & Thomann, E. (2021). *Qualitative comparative analysis using R: a beginner's guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Obrenovic, B., Du, J., Godinic, D., Tsoy, D., Khan, M. A. S., & Jakhongirov, I. (2020). Sustaining enterprise operations and productivity during the Covid-19 pandemic:"Enterprise Effectiveness and Sustainability Model". *Sustainability*, *12*(15), 5981. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155981

Oldham, G. R., & Cummings, A. (1996). Employee creativity: Personal and contextual factors at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *39*(3), 607-634. https://doi.org/10.5465/256657

Pappas, I. O., & Woodside, A. G. (2021). Fuzzy-set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA): Guidelines for research practice in Information Systems and marketing. *International Journal of Information Management, 58*, 102310.

Park, Y., Fiss, P. C., & El Sawy, O. A. (2020). Theorizing the Multiplicity of Digital Phenomena: The Ecology of Configurations, Causal Recipes, and Guidelines for Applying QCA. *MIS Quarterly*, *44*(4).

Piñeiro-Chousa, J., Romero-Castro, N., & Vizcaíno-González, M. (2019a). Inclusions in and exclusions from the S&P 500 environmental and socially responsible index: a fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis. *Sustainability, 11*(4), 1211. https://doi.org/10.3390/su11041211

Piñeiro-Chousa, J., Vizcaíno-González, M., & Ribeiro-Navarrete, S. (2019b). Using voting decisions to identify shocks in the financial services industry. *Service Business*, *13*(2), 419-431. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-018-00389-8

Ragin, C. C. (2009). Qualitative comparative analysis using fuzzy sets (fsQCA). *Configurational comparative methods: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and Related Techniques*, *51*, 87-121. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452226569.n5

Ragin, C. C. (2008). *Redesigning social inquiry: Fuzzy sets and beyond*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Ratten, V., & Jones, P. (2021). Covid-19 and entrepreneurship education: Implications for advancing research and practice. *The International Journal of Management Education*, *19*(1), 100432. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100432

Ratten, V. (2021). COVID-19 and entrepreneurship: Future research directions. *Strategic Change*, *30*(2), 91-98. https://doi.org/10.1002/jsc.2392

Reissová, A., Šimsová, J., Sonntag, R., & Kučerová, K. (2020). The influence of personal characteristics on entrepreneurial intentions: International comparison. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *8*(4), 29-46. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2020.080402

Reynolds, P. D. (2012). Entrepreneurship in developing economies: The bottom billions and business creation. *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, *8*(3), 141-277.

Ribeiro-Navarrete, S., Botella-Carrubi, D., Palacios-Marqués, D., & Orero-Blat, M. (2021a). The effect of digitalization on business performance: An applied study of KIBS. *Journal of Business Research*, 126, 319-326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.12.065

Ribeiro-Navarrete, S., Palacios-Marqués, D., Lassala, C., & Ulrich, K. (2021b). Key factors of information management for crowdfunding investor satisfaction. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102354. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102354

Rindova, V., Barry, D., & Ketchen Jr, D. J. (2009). Entrepreneuring as emancipation. *Academy of Management Review*, *34*(3), 477-491. https://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2009.40632647

Rueda Barrios, G. E., Rodriguez, J. F. R., Plaza, A. V., Vélez Zapata, C. P., & Zuluaga, M. E. G. (2021). Entrepreneurial intentions of university students in Colombia: Exploration based on the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Education for Business*, *97*(3), 176-185. https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2021.1918615

Schneider, C. Q., & Wagemann, C. (2012). *Set-theoretic methods for the social sciences: A guide to qualitative comparative analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharma, L. (2019). A systematic review of the concept of entrepreneurial alertness. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, *11*(2), 217-233. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-05-2018-0049

Sivarajah, K., & Achchuthan, S. (2013). Entrepreneurial Intention among Undergraduates: Review of Literature. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(5), 172-186.

Skarmeas, D., Leonidou, C. N., & Saridakis, C. (2014). Examining the role of CSR skepticism using fuzzy-set qualitative comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(9), 1796-1805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.12.010

Soriano, D. R. (2010). Management factors affecting the performance of technology firms. *Journal of Business Research*, *63*(5), 463-470. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2009.04.003

Soriano, D. R., & Martínez, J. M. C. (2007). Transmitting the entrepreneurial spirit to the work team in SMEs: the importance of leadership. *Management Decision*, *45*(7), 1102-1122. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740710773934

Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1996). Investing in creativity. *American Psychologist*, *51*(7), 677. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.51.7.677

Thiem., A. (2014). Unifying Configurational Comparative Methods Generalized-Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*, *43*(2), 313-337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124113500481

Valliere, D. (2014). Culture, values and entrepreneurial motivation in Bhutan. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, *8*(2), 126-146. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-02-2013-0002

Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Saraswati, T. T., & Indriani, R. (2021). Drivers of entrepreneurial intention among economics students in Indonesia. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *9*(1), 61-74. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2021.090104

Williams, N., Vorley, T., & Ketikidis, P. H. (2013). Economic resilience and entrepreneurship: A case study of the Thessaloniki City Region. *Local Economy*, *28*(4), 399-415. https://doi.org/10.1177/0269094213475993

Xie, X., Zang, Z., & Ponzoa, J. M. (2020). The information impact of network media, the psychological reaction to the Covid-19 pandemic, and online knowledge acquisition: Evidence from Chinese college students. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *5*(4), 297-305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2020.10.005

Yukl, G., Gordon, A., & Taber, T. (2002). A hierarchical taxonomy of leadership behavior: Integrating a half century of behavior research. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9(1*), 15-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900102

Żur, A. (2015). Opportunity Identification and Creation as Factors of Firm Internationalisation. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *3*(2), 25-39. https://doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2015.030203

Authors

The contribution share of authors is equal (33,33%).

Cristina Blanco González-Tejero
Cristina Blanco is a PhD candidate and researcher at the Department of Economics and Business Administration at the University of Alcalá. She has previous experience in marketing in different companies. Her main lines of research are the development and implementation of Soft Skills, social networks, agile methodologies and the impact in entrepreneurial and economic activity.
Correspondence to: School of Economics, Business and Tourism, University of Alcalá, Madrid, Spain, e-mail: cristina.blancog@uah.es
ORCID http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4039-2278

Klaus Ulrich
Professor and researcher at ESIC Business & Marketing School and ESIC University. His lines of research focus on entrepreneurship, blockchain and finance.
Correspondence to: ESIC Business & Marketing School, Valencia, Spain, e-mail: klausjurgen.ulrich@esic.edu
ORCID http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1003-0847

Agustín Carrilero
He holds a PhD in Integration of New Technologies in the business organization by the Polytechnic University of Valencia. He is part of the teaching staff of undergraduate and postgraduate ESIC Valencia and he is the campus director. In the field of research, he has focused on customer relationship management and marketing.
Correspondence to: ESIC Business & Marketing School, Valencia, Spain, e-mail: agustin.carrilero@esic.edu
ORCID http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7499-7884

Acknowledgements and Financial Disclosure

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright and License

Published by Cracow University of Economics – Krakow, Poland