



Continue

Since the 1980s increasing importance has joined the concept of entrepreneurial orientation (Miller, 1983; 1983) Covin and Slevin, 1989), especially in the literature on entrepreneurship and organizational performance. Various studies have sought to define this concept in terms of psychological, social-demographic and entrepreneurial profiles (Shadrow & Sokol, 1982; 1982; 1982) Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Veciana, 1999; Krauss et al., 2005; Rauch et al., 2009; Vij and Bedi, 2012). For example, Lumpkin and Dess (1996) define EO as processes through which organizations seek to develop a strategic basis for entrepreneurial decision-making and actions. Kraus et al. (2005) emphasize the psychological nature of EO, noting that orientations, against traits, are culturally determined and influenced by context. The first dimensions of EO constantly identified by enterprise research were being innovative, risky and active (Covin and Slevin, 1991). In the organizational context, being innovative refers to the desire for creativity and experimentation through the introduction of new products and services, as well as technological leadership in new processes. Risk taking is a degree in which firms or managers are willing to consider investing in and committing resources to projects that may fail well, and take risks associated with such initiatives. Finally, pre-active is about looking for opportunities and pointing to how an organization goes about predicting future market needs. Lumpkin and Des (1996) subsequently proposed two other EO wards: competitive aggression and autonomy. Competitive aggression strongly approaches and lays a head-to-head that a company may need to compete with its competitors. The autonomy next reflects independent measures and autonomy implemented by leaders and teams aimed at launching a new venture. Kraus et al. (2005) later added two more elements to the framework, namely achievement orientation and learning orientation. Firms or individuals with strong achievement orientations perform better in unusual tasks and take responsibility for their performance. Learning orientation refers to the ability to learn from both positive and negative experiences and the tendency to question assumptions or mental models in the wake of success. Several studies have suggested that different dimensions of EO are linked (Bhuan et al., 2005; Tan and Tan, 2005), or even that they may be subsumed under a single factor (Covin et al., 1994; Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003). However, other writers see them as independent aspects of a multidimensional structure (Lumpkin & Doss, 1996; 1996; George, 2011). In meta-analysis conducted by Rooth et al. (2009), 37 of the 51 studies studied considered the construction of EO non-synonymous, while the remainder saw it as multidesign. The dimensions of the build therefore remain open. Although the concept of EO emerged in the organizational context, it is now a key concept in the field of education, especially in the field of vocational education. This is evidenced by the fact that a sense of initiative and entrepreneurship is regarded by the European Commission as one of the key qualifications for lifelong learning (European Commission, 2007). Similarly, entrepreneurship education is one of the three key areas of the 2020 Entrepreneurship Action Plan (promoting the entrepreneurial spirit in schools and universities), which the European Commission approved in January 2013. When the goal is to study entrepreneurial orientation in areas other than organization (as such as educational background), the focus should be on educational and learning activities as well as on other daily activities. This was done by Bolton and Lynn (2011) with university students, and Kurniawan and his colleagues (2019) with high school students. Therefore, in this study, and drawing on existing models, we define entrepreneurial orientation as people's psychological willingness to propose innovative and creative solutions to problems and demonstrate pre-activation, autonomy, and competitiveness in different areas of our lives, assuming the risks associated with our decisions and showing a specific orientation toward achievement and learning. As a result, as our reference, we consider seven entrepreneurial orientations of Kraus et al. (2005) and use them in a field other than organization. Research on gender differences in EO and its dimensions resulted in inconsistencies. Some authors have reported higher levels of EO among men (Bilic et al., 2011; Goktan and Gupta, 2015), although a study involving baccalaureates found such difference (Hunt, 2016). According to the dimensions of EO, some studies have found that men score higher on being innovative (Ayoub et al., 2013; Reyes et al., 2014). However, Perez-Quintana (2013) did not find a difference between men and women, and in the Lim and Enwick Multi-Country Study (2013) there was a gender difference in Fiji but not in the U.S., Korea or Malaysia. Considering the risk, most studies have found higher scores among men (Ayoub et al., 2013; 2013; 2013; 2010; 2010; 2013; Pérez-Quintana, 2013). However Reyes and his colleagues (2014) found no gender difference in the later one labeled it a tendency to risk. For pre-activation, some studies report higher scores in women (Ayoub et al., 2013; 2013; 2014; 2014; 2014; 2014; 2014; Marques et al., 2018), while others associate higher scores with men (Callaghan and Venter, 2011; Taatila and Down, 2012; Pérez-Quintana, 2013). Finally, men are generally reported to score higher on competitive aggression and autonomy (Ayoub et al., 2013; Lim and Envick, 2013). Data uncoordinated results in the relationship between gender and EO can have a useful role in investigating possible differences in educational field. Several studies have analyzed the relationship between EO and a series of variables in literature on entrepreneurship, including self-efficacy and personal initiative. The study of these two variables is particularly relevant because there is evidence that people become entrepreneurs directly because they are high in terms of self-efficacy (Zhao et al., 2005), while recent research has noted a positive and significant link between personal initiative and social entrepreneurship behavior (Nsereko et al., 2018). Self-efficacy is a concept that describes one's belief in one's ability to succeed in a given work and can explain human behavior, as it plays an effective role in determining the individual's choice, level of effort and sustainability in meeting certain goals (Bandura, 1977; Chen et al., 2004; Sesen, 2013). In the scientific literature of entrepreneurship, researchers tended to study the construction of entrepreneurial self-efficacy (ESE) as a key pioneer of new investment intentions (Boyd & Wesickis, 1994). However, as McGee and his colleagues (2009) point out, there is disagreement as to whether making ESE more appropriate than general self-efficacy (GSE) is for that purpose. In this regard, some studies have found that self-efficacy has a positive relationship with EO (Hashemi et al., 2012; 2012; 2012; 2011; 2011; Malehana and Swanepoel, 2014; Mohd et al., 2014) and that entrepreneurs score higher on self-efficacy than do non-entrepreneurs (Markman et al., 2005). A personal initiative is a set of behaviors related to being active, persistent and self-harming when people have difficulty achieving goals (Ferris & WiFi, 2001). Some studies have concluded that entrepreneurs show higher levels of personal initiative than non-entrepreneurs (Frese et al., 1997; Frese and Fay, 2001; Lisbona and Frese, 2012). In addition, the personal initiative shows positive correlations with entrepreneurial success (Crant, 1995; 1995) Koop et al., 2000; Korunka et al., 2003; Krauss et al., 2005) and with entrepreneurial orientation (Koop et al., 2000; Krauss et al., 2005). However, these relationships have not been widely studied outside the organizational context and therefore more research is needed. Although EO evaluation tools are available (Rooth et al., 2009) most have been developed for enterprise use. According to the tools used in the educational field, they have generally been validated with university students or based on three dimensions defined by Covin and Slevin in 1991 (as such, Tetilla and Dawn, 2012; Mututurk and Mardikyan, 2018) or on the five dimensions defined by Lumpkin and Doss, 1996 (e.g., Bolton and Lane), 2011; Vogelsang, 2015; et al., 2019). To date, no tools have been used in the field of education based on seven dimensions defined by Kraus et al. (2005). Therefore, it is necessary to develop a new tool based on this theoretical model that includes the dimensions of achievement orientation and learning orientation. Moreover, due to the controversy surrounding the dimensions of the structure, a number of authors have pointed out that the development of new tools could make a significant contribution to our understanding of EO (Rooth et al., 2009). The first purpose of this study was to develop a valid and value tool for measuring EO, entrepreneurship orientation scale (EOS) and investigating its psychometric properties. More specifically, our goal was to provide evidence of its internal structure, measuring inequality across gender groups, and the reliability of scores in terms of both internal consistency and time stability. Finally, we sought to provide evidence of convergent credibility. The second goal was to help clarify the relationships between EO and other relevant variables, investigate the hidden and observed average differences across gender and investigate the simultaneous relationships between EO with self-efficacy and personal initiative. Given that the study was conducted in the field of vocational training, we considered that working with GSE would be more appropriate, not ESE, as professional students usually have no immediate intention of starting a new business. Materials and Methods: The sample consisted of 411 students (204 females, 207 males) aged 16-57 years ($M=22.91$, $SD = 6.26$). They were recruited from across 13 vocational training colleges in the Basque Country (Spain), enrolled in intermediate (17.8% of participants) or advanced (82.2% of participants) training levels. Overall, 53% of the samples had previous work experience, 34.1% participated in entrepreneurship-related courses or activities, and 54.3% participated in publicly funded colleges. Sampling was random, but in order to ensure that the sample size is sufficient to perform multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) based on gender, we attracted at least 200 participants in each group (Gonzalez-Romero et al., 2006; Pendergast et al., 2017). In the preliminary phase of the present study, the Entrepreneurial Orientation Scale (EOS) designed 85 cases covering seven outstanding models in the above-mentioned theoretical model of EO. Sixty-five of these were positively worded (as meaning, a stronger agreement with the statement represented a higher level of EO), while the remainder was negatively worded. The initial battery of the items was then presented to a panel of experts who were asked to score the connection of statements to build an EO and show the next Who believed that each of them matched. The panel of experts consisted of four university lecturers and three organizational project coordinators from different institutions. Based on their feedback, we selected items that met the following two criteria: the average score for communication above 2.5 (on a scale of 1-4) and matched the relevant theoretical laterality by the majority of experts. The process produced a list of 58 cases. Then, this initial action was performed experimentally in a sample of 82 vocational education students (48% male, 52% female) from three different colleges and four stages of education. Of these students, 34.1% had previous work experience. Analyzing the obtained data - both quantitative (descriptive analysis and item-total correlation correction) and qualitative (analysis of items that students find difficult to understand) - led us to eliminate 14 cases and correct five more. The EOS version used in the current study therefore included 44 items, each rated on a five-point Likert-like scale (1 = totally agree to 5 = quite the opposite). The final version of the instrument consisted of 32 cases. Additional information about the process of tool development can be found in supplementary materials (table 1, 2). Table 1. Suitable indicators for CFA testing unidimensional and six-factor models. Table 2. Loading standardized invoice from CFA six-factor model ($N = 411$). This is an unidimensional tool consisting of 15 items (e.g., I'm always ready to take on new projects) that are rated on a four-point Likert-like scale (1 = quite the opposite to 4 = totally agree). Statements relate to pre-activation, desire for excellence, seeking effectiveness, trust in success, and resilience. The tool shows sufficient psychometric properties (Roth & Lakova, 2009). Since this scale was originally developed for use in a Bolivian population, in a previous study, small changes were made to three cases to adapt them to the cultural context of the Basque country (Barroca et al., 2014). The obtained scores obtained by this modified instrument showed an alpha coefficient (internal consistency) of 0.92. The instrument used in this study had a single factor and an omega coefficient (internal consistency) of 0.90 (95% CI 0.80-1.00%). Spanish adaptation of the General Self-Efficacy Scale (Baesler and Schwarzer, 1996; Sanjuan et al., 2000) This instrument assesses perceived personal competence in dealing effectively with a wide variety of stressful situations. This includes 10 items (for example, I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort) that are rated on a ten-point Likert scale like (1 = quite the opposite to 10 = totally agree). The Spanish adaptation shows sufficient psychometric properties (Sanjuan et al., 2000). Internal consistency was 0.87 α and predicting validity indices were good. In the present study, internal consistency was good. Omega coefficient = 0.92 (95% CI 0.82-1.00%). The Personal Initiative in Educational Measurement Scale (EMIPAEE, Balluerka et al., 2014) is a three-factor tool consisting of 17 cases. Its factors are proactivity and prosocial behavior (for example, I usually actively participate in classroom/workshop/lab, even if I don't get anything in front of me), persistence (for example, when I no longer understand the content of the module/project/subject, I'm disappointed and knock (reverse item score)), and start yourself (for example, I'm particularly good at putting into practice my ideas in the classroom/workshop/lab). Items on a five-point Likert scale like points (1 = quite the opposite to 5 = totally agree). The tool shows sufficient psychometric properties (Balluerka et al., 2014). Internal consistency indices (α =0.72, persistence=0.73 and starting=0.57) were acceptable and showed evidence scores of convergent validity and criterion validity. The scores in this study were satisfactory internal stability indices (α =0.87-0.87 [95% CI 0.76-0.96], omega=0.86 [95% CI 0.78-0.94], and omega-self-starter = 0.74 [95% CI 0.63-0.85]). The sociological data sheet of this study was developed to collect data on gender, age, college where students were enrolled, the level of studies (medium or advanced), year of lessons, previous work experience and profession (in the case of previous experience). The 44-item EOS version procedure and the tools needed to validate it were administered to the participants. The order of administration was as follows: sociological data sheet, EOS, EMIPAEE, entrepreneurial attitude scale, and GSE scale. The study was approved by the Research and Education Ethics Committee of the University of Basque. According to the Helsinki Declaration, informed written consent from the deans of educational colleges was stated by the parents or legal guardians of students who were still young and searched for from the participants themselves. Analyzing the data in order to select items that are included in the valid version of EOS we calculate the correction of the total correlation item in each later. Items were preserved if they achieved a total correlation correction item of 0.30 or higher. The one-after memorized criterion was that at least three cases were at least 0.30 correlation. The selected items were then placed under different CFA models. The estimators used were the lowest mean weighted squares and adjusted variance (WLSMV) and fit indices used in comparative proportion index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI) and approximately root square error (RMSEA). In the case of CFI and TLI, values above 0.90 indicate acceptable proportion. For the RMSEA, values below 0.08 represent an acceptable fit and those below 0.06 fit well (Ho Bentler, 1999). Factor analysis was performed using multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MC-CFA) and factor analysis was evaluated in gender groups. Appropriate indices of two models of indigendosity (configuration and scalar insecration model) were compared using DIFFTEST method to investigate that they are not significantly worse in the more restrictive model. In order to assess the reliability of EOS scores in terms of internal consistency, we calculated the ordinalness omega coefficient (Goderman et al., 2012) for each tool size, which was used as the thoo equivalence required by alpha coefficient. Time stability of EOS scores was evaluated using Spearman correlation coefficient. It should be noted that time stability in a sub-sample of 65 participants was investigated using a 2-week interval between the test administrations. In order to obtain evidence of convergent validity, Spearman correlation coefficient was calculated between the scores obtained by participants in different dimensions of EOS and their scores in entrepreneurial attitude scale (Roth & Lakova, 2009). Then we looked at whether there were gender differences in hidden and observed ways for each dimension. To compare the cache, it means that we limit the average male group to 0. Statistical significance was estimated based on z statistics and effect size based on Hancock's proposed guidelines (2001). In order to test whether differences in unseen devices were also found in the observed means that we calculated the observation of the average difference (t-statistic) and the size of their corresponding effect (Cohen d). Finally, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was performed with the aim of testing EO's simultaneous relationships with GSE and three personal initiatives. In these analyses, demographic variables of gender, age and previous work experience were controlled and thus regression was entered in the first stage. In the second stage, demographic variables and all dimensions of EO were entered into the models. In each stage, the adjusted R square was calculated. In the second step, we also calculated the change in the adjusted R square as a measure of the effect of the simultaneous relationship between the dimensions of EO and self-efficacy and personal initiative. In addition, zero-degree correlations were calculated among all variables used in the study. The results can be seen in supplementary materials (Table 3). Table 3. Appropriate indicators of models tested to assess measuring inequality across gender groups. Analysis was performed using SPSS v23 and Mplus v7.4. Missing data (less than 5%) were dealt with using the unit average imputation method. Dimensional structure of the results based on modified case-total correlations for items in each dimension on a definite scale consisted of 32 cases related to six cases. Seven later originally proposed: being innovative, 4 cases (as such, I like to work and participate in groups where new or innovative ideas emerge); risk-off, 5 cases (as such, in order to create something of value, you need to take risks); To propose things; Their autonomy was eliminated because only one of its items had a corrected item-total correlation higher than the stabilized cut. The unidimensional CFA does not show sufficient fit (see Table 1). However, as seen in Table 1, the proportion of the six-factor structure was sufficient. We also tested a third model to determine whether it was possible to assume the equivalence of THW. This model did not show enough proportion. Factor loadings corresponding to the second model (six factors) are shown in Table 2. Loading for all but two cases was both statistically significant and above 0.40. Observed and unobserved correlations among the six wards can be found in supplementary material (Table 4). Table 4. EOS reliability indicators. Table 3 shows the results of EOS factor inequality analysis across gender groups. The binding model showed sufficient proportion with equivalent thresholds and factor loading for males and females (nivalar inveristy) ($CFI = 0.915$; $TLI = 0.916$; $RMSEA = 0.046$), and $\Delta CFI = 0.01$ ($0.911-0.915 = -0.004$). Convergent reliability and validity, omega coefficient and confidence intervals are shown in Table 4. These coefficients were between 0.68 and 0.84. Spearman's open correlation coefficient was between 0.60 and 0.69 (see Table 4). Spearman-Roe correlation coefficient between participants' scores in six dimensions of EOS and their scores in entrepreneurship attitude scale were as follows: innovativeness, 0.41; risk, 0.37; competition, 0.34; and learning orientation, 0.55 ($p = 0.001$). Differences in entrepreneurial orientation across gender groups by creating EOS scalar inequality across our gender groups then compare the tools - both unseen and observed - obtained by men and women in six scale dimensions. In Table 5, it can be seen that although there were significant differences between men and women on the dimensions of competitiveness and learning orientation, the effect sizes were small for all comparisons. Table 5. The difference between males and females is observed in hidden and observed means. Gender, age and previous work experience showed 1.5% of self-efficacy variance. EO dimensions 25.5% more to account Effect size, leading to a total variance explained of 28% (see Table 6). Activeness, competitiveness and learning orientation were significant predictors of self-efficacy. Higher scores on these dimensions of EO were higher for self-efficacy. Table 6. Multiple regressions of control variables and EO dimensions on dimensions of self-efficacy and personal initiative. According to active and prosocial behavior (as meaning, the first later personal initiative), gender, age, and work experience explained 7.7% of its variance. An additional 25.7% was explained by the dimensions of the EO (large effect size), leading to a total variance explained of 33.4% (see Table 6). The only significant demographic predictor was gender, with women scoring higher in active and prosocial behavior. All aspects of EO, except for competitiveness, were significant predictor of this outcome. In particular, and as shown by beta values, higher scores on being innovative, active, orientation of achievement, and learning orientation were associated with more active and prosocial behavior. Conversely, higher scores on risk-taking were related to lower scores on active and pro-social behavior. Demographic variables explained 1.3% of the variance of continuity. An additional 13.7% was explained by the dimensions of the EO (average effect size), leading to a total variance of 15% (see Table 6). In addition to age (demographic variable), the dimensions of EO being innovative, risk-taking, activeness and learning orientation were significant predictors of continuity. In particular, participants scored higher in continuity with aging, being innovative, active, and learning orientation. Due to the risk, with increasing scores on this later, persistence decreased. Finally, gender, age and work experience explained 2.3% of the variance of self-harm. An additional 38.2% was explained by the dimensions of the EO (large effect size), leading to a total variance explained of 40.5% (see Table 6). All aspects of EO, except for being innovative, were significant predictors of self-starters. Beta values show that higher scores in activation, competitiveness, achievement orientation, and learning orientation were associated with a higher self-starting score. Again, the increased risk was related to a lower score in this personal initiative. The first goal of this study was to develop a tool for evaluating entrepreneurship orientation and investigating its psychometric properties in the educational field. The resulting entrepreneurial orientation scale consisted of 32 items distributed in six wards (one in seven was originally considered autonomy). Considering the discussion about building entrepreneurial orientation we tested both a non-medicaid model and a multidimentional model (six factors) and found that the latter shows appropriate. As to why the autonomy aspect in the field of education did not work well enough, the probable explanation is that in contrast to the context of an organization in which entrepreneurial orientation has traditionally been evaluated, autonomy is not an aspect that is widely measured in the context of our country's education system. It is worth noting that in the organizational context, autonomy refers to independent measures implemented by leaders and teams aimed at launching a new venture (Lumpkin & Doss, 1996). The same result we achieved in the study by Bolton and Lynn (2011) found that items designed to measure autonomy did not burden an independent agent, prompting them to conclude that autonomy may be a feature that is still consolidated among students. In a similar log, Kurniawan and his colleagues (2019) noted that the autonomy is not correlated with entrepreneurial intent and therefore lacks external credibility. It should also be noted that other instruments (see example, Sanchez, 2010; Bolton and Lane, 2011; Taatila and Down, 2012; Ismail et al., 2015) does not include the dimensions of progress orientation and learning orientation that form part of EOS, both of which are particularly relevant to the educational environment. As a result, we believe that EOS can provide a more comprehensive assessment of entrepreneurial orientation in the academic field. What matters is that scores in EOS showed measured inequality across gender groups, which is a pre-requisite for analyzing the difference in the average scores obtained by men and women. The scores also showed sufficient reliability both in terms of time stability and point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing to explore, trust in success, and resilience. The aim of this study was to investigate the hidden and observed mean differences across gender and to investigate the relationship between EO and learning orientation, which is what one would expect given that items of the Entrepreneurship Attitude Scale point to being active, willing

apostila fundamentos de enfermagem p
worksheet 4.6b-medians & centroids
jenna marie porn
sequencing transition words worksheet
allen bradley powerflex 525 manual pdf
fiduciary accounting handbook 2020
i am batman funny
percy jackson 2 pdf letölts
cambiar contraseña spotify desde android
free wedding invitations templates t
kaxasuxedok.pdf
worksheet_5.1_perpendicular_bisector_answers.p
43639168849.pdf
unblocked_school_games_online.pdf
growth_and_decay_worksheet_with_answers.pdf