SOCIAL FACTORS´ IMPACT ON THE QUALITY OF BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT IN THE SME SEGMENT

Ludmila Kozubíková, Ján Dvorský, Aleksandr Ključnikov

Abstract: *The article aims to identify and quantify significant social factors that determine the quality of the business environment (QBE) of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The case study was carried out through a questionnaire that was completed by 641 SMEs. To evaluate the questionnaire multiple linear regression models (MLRs) were applied. The results of the case study showed that the social factor, such as the family environment, has the greatest impact on the QBE in Slovakia. In the Czech Republic, the most important social factors are society, politicians, entrepreneurs and role models. Also, the influence of the media and communication environment is perceived by entrepreneurs as an important determining factor of QBE.*

Keywords: *Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises, Quality of Business Environment, Social Factors.*

JEL Classification: *M10, M20, L26.*

Introduction

Entrepreneurial intentions and final decision on setting up a business are directly influenced by different factors such as economic, social, socio-economic, technological, psychological, etc. (Krueger et al., 2000).

Environment and society are the main factors for entrepreneurs who should perfectly analyze society for being beneficial to others. Today´s business world needs coordination between personal issues and social issues while acting entrepreneurially (Kapusuz et al., 2018). Good governance is an important factor in a business environment and is central to creating and sustaining suitable conditions. (Sharafeddine, 2017). On the other hand, interaction is mutual. The internal factors of a company affecting the environment, such as the level of liquidity or innovation, is growing recently (Bazo et al., 2019).

Social factors influencing entrepreneurs at the beginning when thinking of setting up a business and during its realization include a wide range such as family environment especially, educational institutions, the general public, politicians, and others. (Urban & Kujinga, 2017; Kamaraj & Kathiravan, 2015)

The paper contributes to the knowledge of the Czech and Slovak business environment in the SME sector and to a better understanding of social factors influencing this environment by presenting the results of the empirical research of these social factors. The structure of the paper is as follows. At first, the theoretical background related to the business environment and influencing social factors are introduced. Secondly, the data and methodology used in the study are described. The next part contains the results of the multiple linear regression analysis together with the discussion of the results, limits of the study and future directions of the research.

1 Statement of a problem

The entrepreneurial environment in the Czech Republic changes dynamically, especially towards SMEs (Fialová et al., 2017). These dynamic changes relate not only to the Czech environment; they can be observed across the whole European Union (EU), including Slovakia. The EU needs more and capable entrepreneurs, especially in the field of SMEs (Hitka et al., 2018; Hamplova & Provaznikova, 2015).

Based on Mishchuk et al. (2018) and Termosa (2017) the family environment and close friends of entrepreneurs, quality of the educational system in the field of entrepreneurship, cultural environment, society´s perception are the most important factors that can be classified as social factors of a business environment.

1.1 Family environment as an important social factor

Based on many authors (e. g. Herman, 2019; Bretones & Radrigan, 2018; Boruc, 2018; Hudáková & Masár, 2018; Yildirim et al., 2016; Sorenson, 2015) future entrepreneurial intentions can be significantly influenced by family environment as one of the social factors of the business environment. The family environment in which the entrepreneur grew up fundamentally determines his personality both in terms of starting and running his own business and in terms of continuing to lead or co-lead family businesses.

In families running a business for generations, business traditions naturally combine with a system of values, among which respect for work and the other person is in the foreground. The duality of relations between the family and the business it runs is the key factor. The uniqueness of these entities results from the combination of the need to realize profits with the long-term perspective of building the enterprises´ value and maintaining its functioning despite changing generations of the owners. (Marjanski & Sulkowski, 2019)

Boruc (2018) states that being part of an entrepreneurial family and being surrounded by entrepreneurial friends are important for becoming an entrepreneur.

The positive influence of entrepreneurial family background and entrepreneurial personality traits on entrepreneurial intentions was also proved by Herman (2019), similarly Campopiano et al. (2016) and also Holienka et al. (2013) in Slovakia.

Compared to Carvalho et al. (2019), the presence of entrepreneurs in the family did not show any direct effect on the entrepreneurial potential, although there was a significant indirect effect with the desire for self-employment and starting a business as mediators.

1.2 Educational environment as an important social factor

The formation of the entrepreneurial personality can be undoubtedly also influenced during the educational process.

Dvorsky et al. (2019) tried to define and quantify significant factors shaping the entrepreneurial propensity of university students in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland and created the Entrepreneurial Propensity Index. It was found out that the Index in the Czech Republic was higher than in Slovakia and Poland. Polish students considered the social environment and business advantages to be more important than the students from Czech Republic and Slovakia.

Belas et al. (2017) during the study of the entrepreneurial motives of Czech and Slovak university students found that a high-quality educational structure of the alma mater university is also a very important factor influencing entrepreneurial motives.

Bretones and Radrigan (2018) studied the variables influencing university students in Chile and Spain to start a business. In the Chilean sample, the data showed a positive correlation with the intention of starting a business in comparison with negative relation in the Spanish sample. It was also found out since the students did not perceive support from family, friends or government, this lack was compensated for by the perceived support from the university. Thus, the university played a key role in the advancement and support of the entrepreneurial activity.

1.3 Entrepreneurial motives and emotional stance

Entrepreneurs need to be perceived as a personality, as a sum of psychic phenomena in him/her, and, at the same time, determining his/her difference and uniqueness. His/her personality is formed by the combination of biological, psychological and social aspects and formed by relationships between people, the environment and society, and the personality manifests itself as a complex of these aspects (e. g. Yildirim et al., 2016; Krueger et al., 2000).

Krueger et al. (2000) argue that promoting entrepreneurial intentions by promoting public perceptions of feasibility and desirability is not just desirable; promoting entrepreneurial intentions is also thoroughly feasible. Bacq et al. (2018) demonstrate that the effect of one's perceived ability to become an entrepreneur on the intention to engage in such behavior is contingent upon the perception of an environment rich in entrepreneurial munificence.

1.4 Other social factors influencing QBE

One of the aspects that could negatively influence entrepreneurial activity and the willingness to start the own business is the phenomena of corruption. More authors research the correlation between corruption and various macroeconomic elements these days. Yildirim et al. (2016) found that both attitudes towards behavior (autonomy, financial performance, personal quality of life) and social norms construct (family and friends' attitude to entrepreneurial activity) significantly influence entrepreneurial intentions.

The world is increasingly governed not by force but by the information that moves markets and affects reputations. Wielding comparative information using simple rankings is designed to alter shared information, affect third-party beliefs and opinions, and ultimately convince targets that their reputation or relative status is at stake, potentially with material and/or social consequences. The social pressure of this kind is evident in the area of business (de)regulation. (Doshi et al., 2019)

Based on Tajudeen et al. (2018), social media enables open communication, which helps organizations to understand customer needs and motivates them to respond proactively and efficiently to those needs. The authors revealed that relative advantage is positively associated with organizational usage of social media. According to Telnova and Bykova (2019), including the scientist's expert commentary into, the current media agenda have a profound effect on the digital business environment.

2 Aim, methodology and methods

The article aims to identify and quantify significant social factors that determine the QBE in SMEs separately for the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

To fulfill the main aim, statistical hypotheses (SH) were formulated:

SH: Social factor, views and evaluation of entrepreneurs in the social environment (SH1); family environment (SH2); media and communication environment (SH3); social attitudes of entrepreneurs (SH4) and emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs (SH5) are statistically significant factors and determine the QBE in the CR (SH1a, SH2a, SH3a, SH4a, SH5a) and SR (SH1b, SH2b, SH3b, SH4b, SH5b).

2.1 Research sample and data

The perception and assessment of social factors and their impact on the quality of the QBE in SMEs was part of an extensive project focusing on the business environment and the factors that determine it. The scientific project was realized at Tomas Bata University in Zlín. Data from SMEs were collected in the calendar year 2018. The sum of 17 200 SMEs (more than 5% of all SMEs in the selected countries) was contacted to request an online questionnaire via e-mail. 9400 from Slovakia (SR) and 7800 from the Czech Republic (CR) were addressed. The manager of the SME (the respondent) was a statistical unit. SMEs were randomly selected from the database with Bisnode Albertina (Czech Republic) and Cribis (Slovakia).

The following procedure was used to select companies from the database randomly: (i) creating a core set of SMEs - number of employees of the enterprise from 1 to 250; from all records in designated Czech and Slovak company databases; (ii) alphabetically sorting the enterprises and assigning a serial number to each SME by region (region where it has the most revenue); (iii) generate random numbers using the mathematical function "Randbetween" (range of functions: smallest value - 1, highest value - total number of SMEs in the region); (iv) assigning a randomly generated number to the serial number of an SME (specific to each region); (v) contacting the selected SME by e-mail asking for a questionnaire reply.

The sample of respondents was 641 SMEs (51.3% from SR a 48.7% from CR). The structure of the sample according to the size of an enterprise was as follows (CR - 312 SMEs/SR 329): 82.7%/71.1% micro, 13.8%/21.6% small and 3.5%/7.3% medium companies. The questionnaires were filled out by 75.6%/76.3% men and 24.4%/23.7% women. The structure of the respondents according to the length of company's doing business was as follows: most of the respondents' businesses were in operation for more than 10 years (66.7%/44.7%), 15.4%/23.7% of the entrepreneurs were in business from 5 to 10 years, and the rest of the respondents (17.9%/31.6%) had operated their business for less than 5 years. The structure regarding the level of education was as follows: university education 40.7%/68.1%, secondary education 43.3%/28.9% and secondary education without graduation 16.0%/3.0%. The questionnaires were filled out by the entrepreneurs from the different sectors of the economy, including the service (34.9%/37.1%), commercial (23.4%/21.0%), manufacturing (17.0%/15.5%), construction (9.3%/11.9%), transportation (6.1%/11.9%), agriculture companies (2.9%/6.1%), and other (industry sector not mentioned in the questionnaire) companies.

2.2 Research design

The questionnaire contained 82 statements (indicators) on which the respondent could comment. The questionnaire was created in two versions according to the country of business.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts: (i) socio-demographic characteristics - enterprise address, economic sector and size of enterprise; gender, age and educational level of the entrepreneur; (ii) business environment factors - macroeconomic environment, political factors, technological factors, social and competitive environment; (iii) business environment quality indicators (QBEs). To fulfill the objective of the article, 21 indicators (25.6% of all) were evaluated. The percentage of completed questionnaires that contained positive feedback responses reached 3.7% (641 out of 17,000 SMEs). The questions in the questionnaire were randomly assigned. The questionnaire also contained a control question to prevent it from being automatically filled by a computer. The responses to the indicators below were formulated as a Likert five-point scale: from 1 'totally disagree' to 5 'totally agree' with the statement. The social factors and their selected indicators were formulated:

Entrepreneurs' views and evaluation of the social environment (SF1): Our society appreciates entrepreneurs (SF11); Politicians and the public correctly understand how entrepreneurs contribute to the society (SF12); My close environment (family, friends, acquaintances) support me in doing business (SF13); Good business practices help shape the quality of business environment (SF14). **Family environment (SF2):** The family environment motivates people to start a business (SF21); It is easier to do business if close relatives are in business (SF22); I acquired many skills in my family that help me in my business (SF23); My family helps me in my business (SF24). **Media and communication environment (SF3):** Media (television, broadcast, and other media) truthfully inform about entrepreneurship (SF31); Media help shape the quality of business environment using presentations of goof business practices (SF32); Media adequately inform about the business environment (SF33); Media support entrepreneurs' communication with the public (SF34). **Entrepreneurs' social stance (SF4):** The advantages of doing business outnumber the disadvantages (SF41); An entrepreneur is wealthier and has a higher social status (SF42); Entrepreneurship enables a better career growth and leads to interesting work opportunities (SF43); Conducting business allows for a full utilization of one's skills (SF44). **Entrepreneurs' emotional stance (SF5):** If I were to decide whether to start a business today, I would do it again (SF51); I am able to bear the risk associated with entrepreneurship in a normal way (SF52); I feel that the society appreciates me and my work (SF53); I feel inner satisfaction with the fact that I am conducting business (SF54). **Quality of Business environment** (QBE): The business environment of my country is of good quality and convenient for starting a business.

2.3 Research methods

The multiple linear regression (MLR) was used to quantify the relationship between the variables and to verify the hypotheses. There was not an ambition to forecast the values of the variables in the research. The linear regression analysis is one of the appropriate statistical methods for factors evaluation because the dependent variable (QBE) and the independent variables (SF1, SF2, SF3, SF4, SF5) are metrics. The independent variables must satisfy the assumptions of linearity and a normal

distribution of data. We have verified the assumption of normality by the testing of the descriptive characteristics (skewness and kurtosis) using the z-test. If the value of the skewness or kurtosis of the z-test was greater than <-2; 2>, the assumption was rejected. The assumption of homoscedasticity (constant variance) of the errors was verified by Bartlett´s test. This assumption was accepted when Bartlett´s statistics values were lower than the critical value (CV). We used a coefficient correlation (R) to verify the dependence between the QBE and SF or between SF and his indicators. We used the T-test to verify the significance of the coefficients in the regression model. The Durbin-Watson test (D-W test) was used to verify the violations of independence (Test of autocorrelation). The autocorrelation is rejected that the D-W Statistics (Stat.) is in interval <dU; 4-dU>. The upper critical values (dU) of D-W Stat. were 1.628 (CR) and 1.608 (SR). The Shapiro-Wilk test (S-W test) was used to verify the normality distribution of errors. The normality distribution of errors is accepted when the p-value of S-W statistics is greater than the level of significance. The basic MLR models that define the relationship between variables, have the following forms:

General predictive model:

$$QBE = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \times SF1 + \beta_2 \times SF2 + \beta_3 \times SF3 + \beta_4 \times SF_4 + \beta_5 \times SF_5 + \varepsilon_t, \tag{1}$$

where: QBE – the dependent variable; β_0 – constant, $\beta_{1; \ldots;} \beta_5$– coefficients of independent variables SF_i; SF_i – independent variables (SF_1 –opinions and evaluation of entrepreneurs in the social environment, SF_2 –family environment, SF_3 –media and communication environment, SF_4 –Social attitudes of entrepreneurs, SF_5 –emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs); ε_t – error term.

Partial models:

$$SFi = \beta_0 + \beta_{i,1} \times SFi,1 + \beta_2 \times SFi,2 + \beta_3 \times SFi,3 + \beta_4 \times SFi,4 + \beta_5 \times SFi,5 + \varepsilon t \tag{2}$$

where: SFi– the selected social factor (i=1,..5); β_0 – constant, $\beta_{i,1}; \ldots \beta_{i,5}$ – coefficients of independent variables SFi; SFi,j– independent indicators; εt– error term.

The coefficient of determination (R2) gives the percentage of the explained variability of the dependent variable by the chosen regression model. The F-test verified the significance of the whole regression model. The presence of dependence between independent variables (multicollinearity) was verified using the Inflationary Variation Factor (VIF test). If the value of the VIF test for the independent variable is less than 5, then we note that the coefficient is not affected by multicollinearity. The level of significance when applying the above tests is 0.05. The calculations were performed using the SPSS Statistics software.

3 Problem solving

Linear trends between a dependent variable (QBE) and an independent variable (SF_i; i = 1, …,5) can be seen in results of graphical analysis (scatter plot). The results of the assumption of linearity and normal data distribution are given in Tab. 1.

Tab. 1: Verification of the assumptions of partial models

Type of model	The assumption of regression analysis	Verification Tool	Independent variables							
			Czech Republic				Slovakia			
Indicators of SFi			SFi1	SFi2	SFi3	SFi4	SFi1	SFi2	SFi3	SFi4
PM 1	Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	3.12	4.18	2.54	2.73	3.07	3.17	3.18	3.09
	NDSS	Z- score	0.59	0.65	0.27	0.69	1.17	1.28	1.89	1.96
PM 2	Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	4.12	1.37	0.63	2.73	4.47	3.78	3.26	2.64
	NDSS	Z- score	1.07	1.78	1.29	1.96	2.07	0.23	0.84	2.67
PM 3	Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	2.12	4.55	3.56	2.73	3.57	3.81	3.47	3.23
	NDSS	Z- score	0.67	0.98	2.10	2.17	1.04	0.96	0.74	2.81
PM 4	Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	3.52	4.47	1.40	2.73	3.97	3.88	3.28	4.10
	NDSS	Z- score	0.51	0.59	0.77	0.64	0.82	0.36	1.05	1.09
PM 5	Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	3.19	2.08	2.58	2.73	1.91	2.87	3.39	3.19
	NDSS	Z- score	0.13	2.84	0.87	0.91	0.98	1.07	1.87	1.62

Notes: NDDS – Normal distribution of data set; PM1 – partial model for SF1; …; PM 5 – partial model for SF5; CV of Bartlett´s test is 7.8; Level of significance is 0.05.

Source: (own processing)

The assumption of linearity was verified by the graphical analysis of data using the scatter plot. The linearity is confirmed for each indicator (SF11, …, SF54). Indicators, as is SF33, SF34, SF52 (CR) and SF24, SF34(SR) do not meet the prerequisite for normal data distribution.

Due to a large number of respondents in CR (312) and in SR, it is possible to continue statistical testing with these indices (sample size is more than 100 respondents). The following Tab. 2 summarizes the results of verifying the dependence between variables as well as verifying the statistical significance of the estimated PMs coefficients.

Tab. 2: Verification of the significance of the estimated coefficient and correlation

Type of model	Regression equation	Independent variables							
		Czech Republic				Slovakia			
Indicators of SFi		SFi1	SFi2	SFi3	SFi4	SFi1	SFi2	SFi3	SFi4
PM 1	Correlation (R)	0.49	0.51	0.08	0.13	0.40	0.44	0.03	0.06
	SEC (t-test)	5.48	6.82	1.24	1.45	4.99	6.43	0.38	-0.06
PM 2	Correlation (R)	0.26	0.13	0.09	0.04	0.12	0.02	0.01	0.01
	SEC (t-test)	4.49	1.38	1.36	-1,98	2.17	0.16	0.06	-0.57
PM 3	Correlation (R)	0.33	0.23	0.22	0.26	0.21	0.21	0.22	0.22
	SEC (t-test)	3.54	1.62	-0.06	1.57	1.92	1.64	1.21	1.08
PM 4	Correlation (R)	0.42	0.27	0.17	0.06	0.20	0.18	0.07	0.01
	SEC (t-test)	6.64	2.66	0.59	-1.02	2.96	2.45	0.30	-1.31
PM 5	Correlation (R)	0.45	0.16	0.31	0.17	0.12	0.07	0.30	0.11
	SEC (t-test)	7.79	0.96	4.15	-2.29	0.41	0.36	0.71	5.04

Notes: R – coefficient of correlation; SEC – Significance of the estimate coefficient; PM1 – partial model for SF1; …; PM 5 – partial model for SF5.

Source: (own processing)

The estimated coefficient of the independent variable is statistically significant if the value of the student´s statistics (t-test) is greater than 1.985 (SR - variable) and greater than 1.957 (CR - variable). The following Tab. 3 shows the results of testing (according to MLR) the statistical significance of the thus designed partial models (PM1, …, PM5).

Tab. 3: Characteristics of multiple linear regression of partial models

Characteristics of the regression models	Type of partial model according selected countries									
	Czech Republic					Slovakia				
	PM1	PM2	PM3	PM4	PM5	PM1	PM2	PM3	PM4	PM5
MCC	0.589	0.294	0.360	0.446	0.507	0.506	0.362	0.279	0.247	0.300
R^2	0.347	0.09	0.129	0.199	0.257	0.256	0.130	0.078	0.061	0.08
F-test (p-value)	2E-27	1.3E-5	1.3E-8	5E-14	6E-19	6E-20	1.2E-5	2.7E-5	0.001	3.6E-6
Type of model	MLR equation									
PM1	$SF_1 = 0.28*SF_{11}+0.41*SF_{12}$					$SF_1 = 0.25*SF_{11}+0.37*SF_{12}$				
PM2	$SF_2 = 0.27*SF_{21}$					$SF_2 = 0.15*SF_{23}$				
PM3	$SF_3 = 0.25*SF_{31}$					$SF_3 = 0.12*SF_{31}$				
PM4	$SF_4 = 0.35*SF_{41}+0.14*SF_{42}$					$SF_4 = 0.18*SF_{41}+0.14*SF_{42}$				
PM5	$SF_5 = 0.38*SF_{51}+0.21*SF_{53}-0.16*SF_{54}$					$SF_5 = 0.29*SF_{53}$				

Note: MCC – Multiple correlation coefficient; R^2 – Coefficient of determination; PM1 – partial model for SF1; …; PM 5 – partial model for SF5.

Source: (own processing)

Tab. 3 shows interesting results. Each of multiple linear regression models is statistically significant. Multicollinearity in PM5 (CR) is rejected because of the value VIF = 3.845. The autocorrelation was rejected in all PMs (both countries). The normality of distributed errors was accepted for each PM. The results of testing the significance of the thus designed general predictive model QBE are shown in Tab. 4.

Tab. 4: Characteristics of QBE of general predictive model

Verification of the assumptions											
Countries		Czech Republic					Slovakia				
Selected factors of QBE		SF1	SF2	SF3	SF4	SF5	SF1	SF2	SF3	SF4	SF5
Homoscedasticity	Bartlett´s test	3.42	1.64	1.27	1.33	1.58	4.15	6.01	2.01	3.76	4.26
NDSS	Z- score	1.57	1.39	1.08	1.47	1.61	1.97	1.82	0.97	0.28	1.19
Verification of the significance of the estimated coefficient and correlation											
Correlation	R	0.53	0.19	0.34	0.37	0.42	0.42	0.03	0.31	0.16	0.17
SEC	t- test	7.29	-1.94	2.17	1.89	2.56	6.96	-3.42	3.68	0.01	0.01
Characteristics of the regression GPMs											
General predictive model (GPM)		GPM for Czech Republic					GPM for Slovakia				
Multiple correlation coefficient		0.588					0.483				
Coefficient of determination		0.339					0.234				
F-test (p-value)		32.452 (1.6E-26)					19.731 (3.6E-17)				
MLR equation (GPM)		QBE = 0.19*SF1+0.04*SF3-0.06*SF5					QBE =0.16*SF1+0.06*SF2+0.05*SF3				

Notes: NDDS – Normal distribution of data set; R- coefficient of correlation; SEC – Significance of the estimate coefficient.

Source: (own processing)

Tab. 4 shows that the preconditions for applying MLRs are met in both countries. Statistically insignificant factors are SF2, SF4 in CR and SF4, SF5 in SR. The above GPMs are statistically significant (CR: P-value = 1.6E-26; SR: P-value = 3.6E-17). Multicollinearity does not negatively affect the results of estimated regression coefficients (CR: VIF = 4.241; SR: VIF = 2.138). Selected factors explain 33.9% variability of entrepreneurs' responses to QBE in the CR and 23.4% variability of entrepreneurs' responses to QBE in SR. The normality of distributed errors was accepted for GPM (CR: S-W test = 0.11; SR: S-W test = 0.17). The autocorrelation was rejected in GPMs (CR: D-W Stat = 2,078; SR: S-W test = 2,299). We accept the hypotheses SH1a, SH3a, SH5a, SH1b, SH2b, SH3b. We reject the hypotheses SH2a, SH4a, SH4b, and SH5b.

4 Discussion

Besides economic criteria, also social, educational, cultural, and other factors play an essential role in creating a suitable business environment of SMEs. (Ključnikov et al., 2016).

As can be seen from a comparison of PMs in CR and SR, there are common and different features of the perception of social indicators. A common feature is that entrepreneurs in both countries consider politicians, public opinion and society itself as important indicators that influence QBE.

The results obtained also correspond to the findings of Ključnikov et al. (2016). In that survey, entrepreneurs indicated a relatively high level of support of their entrepreneurial activities by the immediate surrounding (if society and politicians appreciate entrepreneurs; if family and close friends support an entrepreneur, etc.). Unfortunately, society´s perception of entrepreneurs is still quite negative. Based on these results, it is necessary to pay attention to ways to improve the public perception of entrepreneurs. The findings support e. g. Urban and Kujinga (2017), Sharafeddine (2017) or Kamaraj and Kathiravan (2015).

Individuals, firms, government live in a period of an important influence of social media. The firm´s life is not „hidden" as it used to be thirty or twenty years ago. The enormous speed of information dissemination is indisputable, which can serve as an advantage, but also as a disadvantage. Results of this study show the significant importance of the social media´s role in affecting QBE and support opinions of e. g. Doshi et al. (2019) or Tajudeen et al. (2019).

QBE is most influenced by the views and assessments of entrepreneurs in the social environment (ERC): CR: ERC = 0.19; SR: ERC = 0.19) in both countries. The media and communication environment is also an important factor affecting QBE (CR: ERC = 0.06; SR: ERC = 0.05). The differences between entrepreneurs are particularly evident when assessing the social and emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs. The emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs are a significant factor in tourism, but not in Slovakia. Social attitudes of entrepreneurs (career growth, more money, social status, use of their own abilities) do not determine the QBE in both countries.

Although most findings regarding the impact of the family environment including the growing up in an entrepreneurial family on QBE and entrepreneurial intentions, consider the great and positive significance of this factor, findings of this study confirmed these only for SR. Concluded, opinions and findings of e. g. Mishchuk et al. (2018), Termosa (2017), Sorenson (2015), Holienka et al. (2013), Bretones and Radrigan (2018) or Yildirim et al. (2016) cannot be supported. Findings in CR confirmes the findings of Carvalho et al.

Despite the fact that many authors emphasize the necessity to see an entrepreneur's personality with his/her motives, character´s features in background of entrepreneurial intentions and behavior, results of this study showed that social stance of entrepreneurs is not significant for both studied countries and at the same time the emotional stance of an entrepreneur did not show to be significant for SR. Based on these results, the findings of e. g. Krueger et al. (2000) cannot be supported.

Conclusion

The paper aimed to identify and quantify important social factors determining the QBE of SMEs in CR and SR. It was assumed that social factor views and evaluations of entrepreneurs in the social environment; family environment; media and communication environment; social attitudes of entrepreneurs and emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs are statistically significant factors determining the QBE in CR and SR.

The results showed that QBE is most influenced by the social factor of the opinions and assessments of entrepreneurs in the social environment in both evaluated countries. The media and communication environment have also been identified as important factors. Statistically significant differences can be seen mainly in the evaluation of social and emotional attitudes of entrepreneurs, which were identified as a significant social factor affecting QBE in CR, but not in SR. The factor of social attitudes of entrepreneurs (career growth, more money, social status, use of own abilities) was not found statistically significant in QBE determination in both countries.

The authors are aware of certain limits of this study, especially the regional character of the study, using only a MLR model. Despite this fact, the results can serve mainly for extending information about factors influencing QBE usable by politicians or professional institutions when creating rules for SMEs, rules for the educational process to improve the business environment for existing and future entrepreneurs. Future research will continue in examining other factors of the QBE in the SME sector to provide information for it´s improving.

References

Bacq, S., Ofstein, L. S., Kickul, J. R., & Gundry, L. K. (2018). Perceived entrepreneurial munificence and entrepreneurial intentions: A social cognitive perspective. *International Small Business Journal-Researching Entrepreneurship,* 35(5), pp. 639-659. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0266242616658943

Bazo, L., Cukanova, m., Markovicova, L., Steinhauser, D. (2019). The Impact of Institutional Environment on Slovak Enterprises and the Institutional Hysteresis Effect. *Journal of Competitiveness,* 11(3), pp. 35-52. https://doi.org/10.7441/joc.2019.03.03

Belas, J., Gavurova, B., Schonfeld, J., Zvarikova, K., Kacerauskas, T. (2017). Social and economic factors affecting the entrepreneurial intention of university students. *Trasformations in Business & Economics,* 16(3), pp. 220-239.

Boruc, W. (2018). Family, Friends, and Money-What makes and Entrepreneur? Analysis of Data from Poland, 1993-2013. *Polish Sociological Review,* 201, pp. 47-60.

Bretones, F. D., Radrigan, M. (2018). Attitudes to Entrepreneurship: The case of Chilean and Spanish university students. *Ciriec-EspanaRevista De EconomiaPublica Social Y Cooperativa,* 94, pp. 11-30. http://dx.doi.org/10.7203/CIRIEC-E.-94.12668

Campopiano, G., Minola, T., Sainaghi, R. (2016). Students climbing the entrepreneurial ladder Family social capital and environment-related motives in hospitality and tourism. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 28(6), pp. 1115-1136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-05-2014-0236.

Carvalho, C., Monico, L. D. M., Silva, I. M., &Parreira, P. M. D. S. (2019). The influence of family entrepreneurs on students´ entrepreneurial potential. *Psychologica,* 62(1), pp. 207-231. http://dx.doi.org/10.14195/1647-8606_62-1_11

Doshi, R., Kelley, J. G., Simmons, B. A. (2019). The Power of Ranking: The Ease of Doing Business Indicator and Global Regulatory Behavior. *International Organization,* 73(3), pp. 611-643. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0020818319000158

Dvorsky, J., Petrakova, Z., Zapletalikova, E., Rozsa, Z. (2019). Entrepreneurial propensity index of university students. The case study from the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland. *Oeconomia Copernicana,* 10(1), 173-192. http://dx.doi.org/10.24136/oc.2019.009

Fialová, V., Kolková, A., Folvarčná, A., Maňák, R. (2017). The impact of selected changes in business environment on small enterprises in the Czech Republic. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference Inovation Management, Entrepreneurship and Sustainability (IMES 2017)*, Prague, Czech Republic, pp. 220-230.

Hamplova, E., Provaznikova, K. (2015). Opinion and Attitudes of Entrepreneurs of Small and Medium-Sized Business in the Czech Republic Conditions. *Procedia Economics and Finance,* 23(2015), pp. 942-947.

Herman, E. (2019). Entrepreneurial Intention among Engineerging Students and Its Main Determinants. In *Proceedings of 12th International Conference Interdisciplinarity in Engineering,* TirguMures, Romania, *32*, 318-324. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.promfg.2019.02.220

Hitka, M., Lorincova, S., Bartakova, G. P., Lizbetinova, L., Starchon, P., Chenguang, L., Zaborova, E., Markova, T., Schmidtova, J., Mura, L. (2018). Strategic Tool of Human Resource Management for Operation of SMEs in the Wood-processing Industry. *Bioresource,* 13(2), pp. 2759-2774.

Holienka, M., Mrva, M., Marcin, P. (2013). Role of Family Entrepreneurial Role Models in Determining Students´ Preferences Towards Entrepreneurship. In *Proceedings of 6th International Conference of Education, Research and Innovation*, Seville, Spain, pp. 3722-3730.

Hudáková, M., Masár, M. (2018). The assessment of key business risks for SMEs in slovakia and their comparison with other EU countries. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review,* 6(4), pp. 145-160. http://dx.doi.org/10.15678/EBER.2018.060408

Kamaraj, K., Kathiravan, C. (2015). Entrepreneurial Environments in the business city of Sivakasi. *International Multidisciplinary Research Journal,* 4(8), pp. 1-5. ISSN 2231-5063

Kapusuz, A. G., Cavus, M. F., Pekkan, N. U. (2018). Perceived Social Support and Social Entrepreneurship: Gender Perspective from Turkey. *Knowledge, Learning and Innovation: Research Insights on Cross-Sector Collaborations, Book Chapter,* pp. 75-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-592-82-4_6

Ključnikov, A., Belás, J., Kozubíková, L., Paseková, P. (2016). The Entrepreneurial Perception of SME Business Environment Quality in the Czech Republic. Journal of Competitiveness, 8(1), pp. 66-78. http://dx.doi.org/10.7441/joc.2016.01.05

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

Marjanski, A., Sulkowski, L. (2019). The Evolution of Family Entrepreneurship in Poland: Main Findings Based on Surveys and Interviews from 2009-2018. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review,* 7(1), pp. 95-116. http://dx.doi.org/10.15678.EBER.2019.070106

Mishchuk, H., Samoliuk, N., Bilan, Y., Streimikiene, D. (2018). Income inequality and its consequences within the framework of social justice. *Problemy Ekorozwoju*, 13(2), pp. 131- 138.

Sharafeddine, R. I. (2017). Good governance and economic reforms for entrepreneurial activity. Economic and Social Development. In: *Proceeding Paper of International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development.* Melbourne, pp. 435-448.

Sorenson, R. (2015). The Family Way: How Entrepreneurial Values Help Businesses Thrive Over Generations. *Entrepreneur & Innovation Exchange* [online]. http://dx.doi.org/10.17919/X9PP43

Tajudeen, F. P., Jaafar, N. I., Ainin, S. (2018). Understanding the impact of social media usage among organizations. *Information & Management,* 55(3), pp. 308-321. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2017.08.004

Telnova, I. N., Bykova, E. V. (2019). The Scientist´s Activity in Business Media. The Effect of Publicity. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE Communication Strategies in Digital Society Seminar (2019 COMSDS)*. St. Petersburg, Russia, pp. 111-116.

Termosa, I. (2017). The ways of forming the sustainable development of rural areas of Ukraine. *Economics, Management and Sustainability,* 2(1), pp. 76-82. https://doi.org/10.14254/10.14254/jems.2017.2-1.7

Urban, B., Kujinga, L. (2017). The institutional environment and social entrepreneurship intentions. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour& Behavior,* 23(4), pp. 638-655. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEBR-07-2016-0218

Yildirim, N., Cakir, O., Askun, O. B. (2016). Ready to Dare? A Case Study on the Entrepreneurial Intentions of Business and Engineering Students in Turkey. In: *Proceedings of 5th International Conference on Leadership, Technology, Innovation and Business Management,* Instanbul, Turkey, pp. 277-288. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.138

Contact Address

Ing. Ludmila Kozubíková, Ph.D.
Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Faculty of Management and Economics, Department of Business Administration
Mostní 5139, 760 01, Zlín, Czech Republic
Email: kozubikova@utb.cz

Ing. Ján Dvorský, Ph.D.
Tomas Bata University in Zlín, Faculty of Management and Economics, Department of Business Administration
Mostní 5139, 760 01, Zlín, Czech Republic
Email: j1dvorsky@utb.cz

doc. Ing. Aleksandr Ključnikov, Ph.D.
University of Entrepreneurship and Law
Vltavská 585/14, 150 00, Praha, Czech Republic
Email: kljucnikov@gmail.com