

THE ATTITUDE OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS TOWARDS THE STATE SUPPORT OF THE ENTREPRENEURIAL ECOSYSTEM

Martina Jakubčinová

E-mail: martina.jakubcinova@tnuni.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0423-8624>

Affiliation: Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, Slovakia

ROR: <https://ror.org/02v1jf797>

Karol Krajčo

E-mail: karol.krajco@tnuni.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4680-3884>

Affiliation: Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, Slovakia

ROR: <https://ror.org/02v1jf797>

Alexandra Hotková

E-mail: alexandra.hotkova@tnuni.sk

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0553-3274>

Affiliation: Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Alexander Dubček University of Trenčín, Slovakia

ROR: <https://ror.org/02v1jf797>

Armenia Androniceanu

E-mail: armenia.androniceanu@man.ase.ro

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0111-3340>

Affiliation: Faculty of Administration and Public Management, Bucharest University of Economic Studies, Romania

ROR: <https://ror.org/00f2tj092>

Annotation. The aim of this article is to quantify and explore the differences in the attitudes of university students towards the issue of government support for the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Attitudes are examined among students with active entrepreneurial status. The starting point for the fulfilment of the objective was empirical research conducted in Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Poland (March 2024). The research sample consisted of a total of 1 783 respondents (SK: 576, CZ: 612, and PL: 595) from 42 universities (SK: 16, CZ: 11, and PL: 15). Correlation analysis was used to test and evaluate the formulated hypotheses at the significance level $\alpha = 5\%$. The main results of the research are that the state creates an atmosphere of uncertainty through its business support instruments. Respondents express concern about the quality of the conditions needed to start a business. The financial support for entrepreneurs does not meet the expectations of young people and the administrative burden reinforces the negative impression of entering the business environment. In the context of influencing attitudes, the state will need to pay more attention to the entrepreneurship support area. Minimising the administrative burden can make a significant contribution to growth and competitiveness not only of young entrepreneurs but also of the economy as a whole.

Keywords: university students, entrepreneurship, state support for entrepreneurship, administrative burden, financial support.

JEL classification: G38, H25.

Introduction

State support for entrepreneurship is an important instrument to support the development and competitiveness of enterprises in the country. Economic growth, stimulating innovative activity, reducing regional disparities and assisting entrepreneurs are key initiatives through which the state seeks to ensure sustainable and inclusive

development. In the framework of academic studies dealing with the issue of state support, various aspects and approaches have been identified. In particular, the specific features of state support for entrepreneurship taking into account factors such as the economic situation, political priorities, social needs and legislative frameworks. Several authors point to the close link between these factors. Also, different methods of assessing the effectiveness and impact of state support vary depending on the target groups and sectors.

The present article presents the students' opinions of higher education institutions in selected Visegrad Four (V4) countries: Slovakia (SK), the Czech Republic (CZ), and Poland (PL), in the area of state support for entrepreneurship. The research compares the student attitudes with the status of active entrepreneurial activity. The research results can provide suggestive conclusions for further discussion in state support for entrepreneurship, in particular, support for youth entrepreneurship. There is a need for entrepreneurs to have opportunities to enable them to do business and the state to create favourable environment conditions for entrepreneurship.

The article is divided into sections as follows. The theoretical part presents the views of the professional sphere in the area of state support for entrepreneurship, analysing relevant theoretical approaches and existing literature sources. The methodological part presents the objectives, methods, and description of the data used to empirically test the hypotheses, as well as to analyse the results obtained during the research. In the empirical section, the research results are presented and interpreted, followed by a discussion related to the findings. Finally, the main results of the research are formulated in an aggregated form providing an overview of the main findings and possible recommendations for further research and policy in the area of state support for entrepreneurship.

1. Theoretical Background

The business environment is perceived as a complex system of a set of factors and conditions that influence the functioning and development of entrepreneurial activities. Its dynamics are shaped by a number of factors, among which government policy, economic trends, socio-cultural factors, technological innovations, and legal regulations dominate. In addition, about the significance of youth entrepreneurship lies in how much their future depends on the environment in which they seek to develop their skills and ideas.

The state has a fundamental influence on its characteristics. It creates the conditions for entrepreneurial activity and is important in the promotion of entrepreneurship. In addition to creating legislative and regulatory frameworks, it implements policies that are aimed at fostering entrepreneurial innovation, strengthening competitiveness, and ensuring access to finance. The transparency and predictability of government measures speed up the decision-making process and reduce uncertainty. This in turn leads to increased business confidence in the economic environment and the development of the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of the private sector.

A key role of the state is not only to develop measures to ensure financial stability and fiscal consolidation and to take steps to stimulate growth, competitiveness and employment, but also to create a favourable business environment. An efficient and productive state can be a driver of economic growth, with a particularly important role being the creation of an enabling environment for small businesses and young start-ups (Chen *et al.*, 2021, Novakovic *et al.*, 2022, Dvorsky and Belas, 2023, Metzker *et al.*, 2023, Sitnicki *et al.*, 2024, Smetanova, 2024). Governments thereby demonstrate their maturity and interest in achieving high creditworthiness of their citizens (Body *et al.*, 2024). Governments encouraging active participation in entrepreneurial activities have developed a number of assistance programmes to support new business start-ups, and the increase in new

businesses is naturally reflected in the growth and development of the economy (Carvalho *et al.*, 2021, Yusoff *et al.*, 2021, Chung *et al.*, 2024).

In their analyses, Lehene and Nistor (2025) stress the importance of government incentives and support for entrepreneurs. Their research reveals that regulation of the economy is significantly and positively correlated with appropriate business conditions. This was particularly evident for productivity ($r = 0.548$), innovation ($r = 0.667$), and competition ($r = 0.760$). Government subsidies also significantly increase firm resilience and improve the short-term survival ability of companies (Audretsch *et al.*, 2020; Zhao *et al.*, 2024).

According to Najib *et al.* (2021), Vol. and *et al.* (2022), and Starchenko *et al.* (2024), government incentives can increase positive perceptions of business support. The nature of incentives and support mechanisms can take different forms, with administrative-legislative and financial measures being the most common. Administrative-legislative measures usually focus on simplifying processes and reducing bureaucracy. Financial measures (e.g. subsidies, grants or tax breaks) strengthen entrepreneurial activity and encourage new entrepreneurs to enter the market.

Countries tailor policies to support the entrepreneurial sector based on endogenous and exogenous circumstances, conditions and priorities, demonstrating the diversity of approaches to promoting entrepreneurship. Direct state support is prevalent in the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, and Austria. Conversely, indirect government support through tax incentives is prevalent in the Netherlands, Ireland and France (Olsanova *et al.*, 2021, Sitnicki *et al.*, 2024).

The effectiveness of government policies to support entrepreneurship has been discussed by Luma and Ademi (2023). They conclude that the effectiveness of business support policies is related to the level of corruption in a country. In an environment with lower levels of corruption, government incentives and support measures are able to counter difficulties more effectively, thus contributing to the development of entrepreneurship. The positive impact of government support for entrepreneurship is therefore stronger in countries with low level of corruption.

In his study, Moore (2021) points out that political structures can influence investment uncertainties arising from political volatility, imposing (or not imposing) liability constraints to minimise sudden or excessive rent-seeking behaviour from government structures. These factors are often intertwined with issues of gender inequality in the business environment. In this regard, the finding that women tend to apply for government funding significantly less than men is noted (Crawford *et al.*, 2024).

Carvalho *et al.* (2021), on the other hand, identify a number of factors that can inhibit the development of entrepreneurship and hinder its effective functioning. They highlight that inefficient government bureaucracy, inappropriate regulation and tax burdens, as well as political instability, are the main barriers to the dynamism of economic growth and development. These factors have a negative impact not only on the entrepreneurial ambitions of established entrepreneurs in the market environment, but also on the ambitions of young people, which can lead to significant disruptions in the economy.

Young entrepreneurs play a vital role in the dynamism of the national economy, contributing to innovation, job creation and increased competitiveness. The study by Riaz *et al.* (2022) shows that start-ups are essential to the economy, and their success is closely related to the quality of the entrepreneurial ecosystem and the level of institutional transparency. The state has a key role to play in this area, not only through legislation but also through the implementation of practical and transparent policies.

The success of budding entrepreneurs is determined by multifactorial access to different forms of capital, including economic, human and social capital. A frequent characteristic of these entrepreneurs is their lack of knowledge of the market and business processes. Start-up entrepreneurs usually exhibit high commitment and failure rates because they are exposed to a number of challenges such as high risk of failure and lack of skills related to achieving a stable market position (Trautwein, 2021, Onesti *et al.*, 2022, Fichter *et al.*, 2023, van Niekerk *et al.*, 2024, Doga-Mirzac *et al.*, 2024).

Government intervention can effectively mitigate the structural barriers that constrain the development of these new entrants, thereby strengthening market dynamics and preventing failures. Targeted government policies aimed at overcoming the challenges faced by the entrepreneurial sector, especially at key stages of its growth, contribute to the creation of a robust entrepreneurial ecosystem. Within this ecosystem, entrepreneurs have access to important resources such as investment, expert advice, technology, and market information (Choi *et al.*, 2021).

The flourishing of the young entrepreneur ecosystem is also occurring in the context of the challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic. Whereas at the time of COVID-19 most support measures were focused on supporting existing companies (Block *et al.*, 2022), current support policies focus on stimulating entrepreneurship among young companies. Obvious measures include reducing regulations affecting the entry of new companies and entrepreneurs, government bank guarantees for young companies and start-ups, special start-up subsidies, reduction of social security contributions for start-up workers, and reduction of corporate income taxes. Aid is generally targeted at business models whose proposed idea has great economic and innovative value. Although there is a risk that existing companies may try to benefit from these policies by restructuring and monitoring the beneficiaries of these benefits, they are important for policy evaluation (Cullen and De Angelis, 2021, Karimov and Konings, 2021, Vasilopoulos and Tsitsakis, 2023).

Fostering an efficient and dynamic entrepreneurial environment is a necessary condition for achieving economic growth (Krupets *et al.*, 2021, Soana *et al.*, 2024). Countries striving for sustainable economic growth (Khan *et al.*, 2023; Krisciukaitiene and Bathaei, 2024; Ali *et al.*, 2025) create a comprehensive system of support for entrepreneurship. A vulnerable group of entrepreneurs, represented by young entrepreneurs, has the opportunity to benefit from a diverse range of instruments, measures and programmes related to the promotion and establishment of entrepreneurship. The system includes assistance whose purpose is financial and non-financial support (Rachmawati *et al.*, 2021, Ivasciuc and Ispas, 2023, OECD, 2023, Janáková *et al.*, 2024).

Access to the required capital is the most difficult challenge for start-up entrepreneurs and businesses (Alshebami, 2022). To overcome this barrier, public policy makers provide financial resources through microfinance networks, namely direct capital payments. In terms of financial support, the most commonly applied support from the government is in the form of tax breaks, loans for young entrepreneurs, and grants for start-ups and subsidies (Cowling and Dvoulety, 2024)

Policies, programmes and rules for financial support for entrepreneurship are unique to a particular country. The behaviour of actors in a given environment is also unique, which is in line with the conditions and opportunities for institutional support for private sector development. Economically developed countries with strong support mechanisms for entrepreneurs tend to offer more options and instruments for financing entrepreneurship, such as the Netherlands, France, Denmark, and Belgium. Support for start-up entrepreneurs is also strong in the Baltic countries such as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (World Bank Group, 2021). Countries with lower levels of economic development, such as Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Moldova, offer

limited opportunities and face a higher risk of not having the necessary financial resources and insufficient support infrastructure (World Bank Group, 2021).

Recently, there has been a significant increase in annual government spending on start-up incentive programmes in several EU countries. The European Union has shifted its strategic orientation, moving from traditional labour market policies to an integrated approach focused on promoting entrepreneurship (Glavan *et al.*, 2024). The programmes mainly provide guarantees for start-ups and facilitative financing mechanisms (European Commission, 2025, EU Startups, 2025), which are also intended to be less burdensome in terms of bureaucracy.

According to a study by Torres and Godinho (2022), there is a parallel between the quality and quantity of entrepreneurship and the quality and quantity of a country's bureaucratic mechanism. Public policy and its mechanisms stimulate entrepreneurial activity and economic growth. Favourable market conditions reducing financial barriers and simplifying administrative processes (Fuentelsaz *et al.*, 2021) play a key role in the growth and development of entrepreneurial activities. Complex and enormous bureaucratic barriers lead to disruption of the dynamism of the business environment and its innovation. Governments are faced with the creation of effective institutional conditions to foster high-growth innovation, which will contribute to achieving a positive economic impact.

Recent studies suggest that the implementation of entrepreneurship programmes can increase the level of sophistication and support for entrepreneurs, which in turn promotes innovation processes (Cho *et al.*, 2022; Wurth *et al.*, 2022). Improving institutional conditions is essential to reduce not only financial barriers, but also to eliminate institutional blind spots, as suggested by Webb *et al.* (2020). Formal institutional conditions leading to a reduction in the level of bureaucracy can act as a catalyst for young entrepreneurs (Chung *et al.*, 2024; Audretsch *et al.*, 2022; Dvorsky *et al.*, 2023).

Greater flexibility, a pro-client approach and the openness of the state are essential for the entry of new companies. Creating an enabling business environment that positively impacts economic growth and business opportunities should be a government priority (Gomez *et al.*, 2023). A justified reduction of bureaucratic barriers is therefore a key step towards fostering entrepreneurial dynamism and innovation at the national level.

2. Aim, Methodology, and Data

The main objective of the article is to find out the significance of university students' attitudes towards the entrepreneurial activities in Slovakia (SK), the Czech Republic (CZ), and Poland (PL), depending on their perception of state support for entrepreneurship. First, the relationships between the dependent variable, which is students' attitudes towards entrepreneurship, and the independent variables: perception and evaluation of the effectiveness of state support, the quality of conditions for starting a business, financial support from the state, and the adequacy of the administrative burden, are identified.

The empirical research was oriented towards identifying the attitudes of university students towards the issue of state support in SK, CZ, and PL. The research was conducted from March to June 2024. For each country, a language version of the questionnaire was prepared. Data collection was carried out using Google Forms in cooperation with universities in these countries. The target group was university students. The questions aimed at identifying attitudes related to the issue of state support for entrepreneurship were defined in a 5-point response scale: "strongly agree", "agree", "do not take a position", "disagree", "strongly disagree". This research takes into account the attitudes of university students who are already engaged in entrepreneurship. The total number of respondents was 351 (SK: 115, CZ: 173, PL: 63). The survey was conducted at 16 Slovakian, 11 Czech, and 15 Polish universities.

In this study, the attitudes of university students towards these statements were investigated:

Dependent variables:

Y - I am currently engaged in entrepreneurial activities.

Independent variables:

X1 - The government supports entrepreneurship through its instruments.

X2 - The state creates good conditions for starting a business.

X3 - The state supports entrepreneurship financially.

X4 - The administrative burden on entrepreneurs in my country is reasonable.

Several hypotheses were formulated in the study:

H1. Factor X1 has an impact on current entrepreneurial activities.

H2. Factor X2 has an impact on current entrepreneurial activities.

H3. Factor X3 has an impact on current entrepreneurial activities.

H4. Factor X4 has an impact on current entrepreneurial activities.

Correlation analysis was employed to test and evaluate the formulated hypotheses. Regression analysis method was applied to test the hypotheses at the significance level $\alpha = 5\%$. Linear regression modeling (LRM) was used to linearly scale the responses in the quantitative research (Likert scale with values 1–5). Positive responses to the independent variables (X1–X4) should lead to positive perceptions of the dependent variable (Y). Verification of the dependence of the independent and dependent variables is to be applied in the three selected countries.

The chosen methodological approach allows to thoroughly investigate the diverse factors influencing the attitudes of university students towards the issue of state support for entrepreneurship. The results of this study contribute to a better understanding of students' attitudes towards the issue under study in the context of entrepreneurship in different countries.

3. Results

The following tables present the results of descriptive statistics and the results of statistical calculations of the dependence of selected areas of state entrepreneurial support and the current entrepreneurial activity of university students in Slovakia (SK), the Czech Republic (CZ), and Poland (PL). *Table 1* presents the results of descriptive statistic in Slovakia, the Czech Republic, and Poland.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics: SK, CZ, and PL

SK	X1	X2	X3	X4	Y
Mean	3.465277	3.67014	3.39236	3.44965	3.75521
Standard Error	0.04268	0.03975	0.04065	0.04486	0.04983
Standard Deviation	1.02432	0.95401	0.97564	1.07666	1.196
Kurtosis	-1.0549	-0.3459	-0.7557	-1.0327	-0.26
Skewness	-0.2957	-0.6019	-0.3214	-0.2468	-0.8656
CZ	X1	X2	X3	X4	Y
Mean	3.05229	3.06209	3.13072	3.1732	3.33987
Standard Error	0.0406	0.04058	0.03784	0.04213	0.04985
Standard Deviation	1.00435	1.00379	0.93622	1.04219	1.23327
Kurtosis	-1.1588	-0.9285	-0.8131	-1.0163	-0.9401
Skewness	0.0409	0.04087	-0.1548	0.0493	-0.3323
PL	X1	X2	X3	X4	Y
Mean	3.23866	3.42857	3.17143	3.54454	4.13613
Standard Error	0.03829	0.0416	0.03845	0.0366	0.04412
Standard Deviation	0.93394	1.0148	0.9379	0.89289	1.0762
Kurtosis	-0.8143	-0.8107	-0.921	-0.375	0.72497
Skewness	-0.1556	-0.2753	-0.0404	-0.2698	-1.2244

Source: own calculations.

The data in *Table 1* confirmed that the highest level of agreement among the four statements examined in SK was for statement X3 that the government financially supports entrepreneurship. Among all the values, the most compact responses were for statements X2 and X3. The values of skewness took values within the specified range (-2–2), which means that all the variables under study are considered relevant and suitable for further research. The assumption of normal distribution is satisfied.

In CZ, the highest level of agreement among the examined statements is for the statement X1 that the state supports entrepreneurship through its instruments. Based on the standard deviation values, the responses to the variables under study can be evaluated as coherent. Among all, the most coherent responses were recorded for the variable X3 that the state financially supports entrepreneurship. The skewness of values confirms that the assumption of normal distribution is satisfied.

In the sample of PL respondents, the highest level of agreement is detected for the variable X3 that the state financially supports entrepreneurship. The standard deviation values indicate that the responses are compact. The most coherent responses were recorded for variable X4 that the administrative burden on entrepreneurs in my country is adequate. The skewness took values in the interval from -2 to 2, so the assumption of normal distribution is satisfied.

The data in Table 2 confirmed that none of the independent variables examined is statistically significant. No dependence was found between the independent variables and the dependent variable. Based on the correlation matrix, it was evaluated that there is a light direct dependence between the independent variables. In addition, the model shows a very low level of variability (0.0012). The result of ANOVA test confirms the previous findings that the model is not statistically significant.

The last part of the table is the regression analysis which reveals the individual significance of the independent variables to the dependent variable. Based on p-values, it was evaluated that none of the variables under study has a statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable.

Table 2. Regression and Correlation Analysis: SK

<i>Correlation</i>	X1	X2	X3	X4	Y
X1	1				
X2	0.5631	1			
X3	0.5096	0.512991	1		
X4	0.190012	0.195449	0.129766	1	
Y	-0.05	-0.002	-0.034	0.0573	1
<i>Regression Statistics</i>					
Multiple R	0.0904				
R Square	0.0082				
Adjusted R Square	0.0012				
Standard Error	1.1953				
Observations	576				
<i>ANOVA</i>					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	4	6.7254	1.6814	1.1769	0.3199
Residual	571	815.76	1.4286		
Total	575	822.48			
<i>Regression Coefficients</i>					
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	
Intercept	3.71982	0.25116	14.8103	3.1E-42	
X1	-0.0832	0.06223	-1.3362	0.18201	
X2	0.0475	0.06703	0.70867	0.47882	
X3	-0.0314	0.06263	-0.5011	0.61648	
X4	0.07411	0.04744	1.56218	0.1188	

Source: own calculations.

The given regression model is constructed from the following variables:

$$y = 3.7198 - 0.0832 X_1 + 0.0475 X_2 - 0.0314 X_3 + 0.0741 X_4$$

Table 3. Regression and Correlation Analysis: CZ

Correlation	X1	X2	X3	X4	Y
X1	1				
X2	0.45296	1			
X3	0.43657	0.34489	1		
X4	0.25558	0.25566	0.11095	1	
Y	-0.1016	-0.0792	-0.1052	-0.1083	1
Regression Statistics					
Multiple R	0.149242				
R Square	0.022273				
Adjusted R Square	0.01583				
Standard Error	1.223472				
Observations	612				
ANOVA					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	4	20.69861	5.174653	3.45695	0.008334
Residual	607	908.6086	1.496884		
Total	611	929.3072			
Regression					
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	
Intercept	4.169803	0.232291	17.95075	4.09E-58	
X1	-0.05136	0.059466	-0.86365	0.38812	
X2	-0.01613	0.057048	-0.28277	0.777453	
X3	-0.09592	0.059808	-1.60385	0.109268	
X4	-0.10194	0.049809	-2.04658	0.041129	

Source: own calculations.

The results presented in *Table 3* confirm a mean positive correlation between the independent variables X1 and X2, X1 and X3, and X2 and X3. There is a light correlation between the other pairwise coefficients. The independent variables X1–X3 are not statistically significant. The independent variable X4 is statistically significant and also has a significant relationship with the dependent variable Y. The value of the adjusted coefficient of determination is at 0.01583, so the model shows a low level of variability. Based on the ANOVA test, the model was found to be statistically significant.

The last test implemented is regression analysis. Based on the values of the test, it was evaluated that among all the independent variables, the variable X4 has the greatest influence. The relationship is characterised by negative influence.

The given regression model is constructed from the following variables:

$$y = 4.1698 - 0.0514 X_1 - 0.0161 X_2 - 0.0959 X_3 - 0.1019 X_4$$

Table 4. Regression and Correlation Analysis: PL

<i>Correlation</i>	<i>X1</i>	<i>X2</i>	<i>X3</i>	<i>X4</i>	<i>Y</i>
X1	1				
X2	0.53847	1			
X3	0.433699	0.458622	1		
X4	0.340525	0.392293	0.262257	1	
Y	0.111667	0.157672	0.075245	0.18727	1
<i>Regression Statistics</i>					
Multiple R	0.209056				
R Square	0.043704				
Adjusted R Square	0.037221				
Standard Error	1.05598				
Observations	595				
<i>ANOVA</i>					
	<i>df</i>	<i>SS</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Significance F</i>
Regression	4	30.06736	7.51684	6.740989	2.62E-05
Residual	590	657.9058	1.115094		
Total	594	687.9731			
<i>Regression Coefficients</i>					
	<i>Coefficients</i>	<i>Standard Error</i>	<i>t Stat</i>	<i>P-value</i>	
Intercept	3.146835	0.216961	14.50412	5.43E-41	
X1	0.0171	0.057477	0.297505	0.766186	
X2	0.104778	0.0546	1.919013	0.055465	
X3	-0.01741	0.053785	-0.32361	0.746349	
X4	0.177705	0.053606	3.315026	0.000973	

Source: own calculations.

The independent variables X1–X3 were assessed as statistically insignificant at the 0.05 level of significance. However, the pairwise coefficients are statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance. Based on the correlation matrix values, it was evaluated that there is a moderate positive relationship between the independent variables X1 and X2 and X1 and X3. A similar evaluation holds for the pairwise coefficients of X2 and X3, where a light to moderate strong positive relationship was detected. The overall variability of the model is at 3.7221%. Based on the ANOVA test, the model was shown to be statistically significant.

Based on the regression analysis, the relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable Y were detected. The independent variables X1–X3 have no statistically significant relationship with the dependent variable. The independent variable X4 has a significant positive effect on the dependent variable Y.

Table 5. Summary of Regression Analyses for Y

Country	Regression models for Y.
SK	$Y = 3.7198 - 0.0832 X1 + 0.0475 X2 - 0.0314 X3 + 0.0741 X4$
CZ	$Y = 4.1698 - 0.0514 X1 - 0.0161 X2 - 0.0959 X3 - 0.1019 X4$
PL	$Y = 3.1468 + 0.0171 X1 + 0.1048 X2 - 0.0174 X3 + 0.1777 X4$

Source: own calculations.

The assumptions for the use of linear regression were met. Based on the use of Likert scale, autocorrelation was not confirmed, which means that the respondents' answers are independent. It was also found that

multicollinearity is not present in the models, which points to the independent variables not having influence over each other.

Table 5 presents the linear functions of the examined models in the three selected countries (SK, CZ, and PL). Based on the above linear functions, it was evaluated that in the Czech Republic and Poland the administrative burden of entrepreneurs has the greatest impact on current entrepreneurial activities.

On the basis that the significances of the individual models were not evaluated as statistically significant, the present article does not provide an interpretation of the impact of the individual independent variables.

Table 6. Hypothesis Evaluation

	H1	H2	H3	H4
SK	R	R	R	R
CZ	R	R	R	C
PL	R	R	R	C

Note: C: confirmed, R: rejected.

Source: own calculations.

Based on the data presented in Table 6, it was evaluated that the factors X1 (the state supports entrepreneurship through its instruments), X2 (the state creates quality conditions for starting a business), and X3 (the state supports entrepreneurship financially) are not statistically significant in any of the countries under study. Government support does not have the impact on business that would be expected. The validity of H1, H2, and H3 was rejected in all countries. The independent variable X4 (administrative burden in my country is adequate) is statistically significant in only two of the three countries. On this basis, hypothesis H4 is evaluated as confirmed. However, the demonstrated effect of administrative burden (X4) on students' entrepreneurial activities shows weak dependence. This may imply that although administrative burden affects entrepreneurial activities, its effect is not strong enough to create a significant difference.

4. Discussion

The young generation, as a potential engine of future economic growth, requires attention and a proactive approach on the part of state institutions to support young entrepreneurs. Based on the results of descriptive statistics and regression analysis, it is concluded that students' attitudes in all three countries do not show statistically significant influence of state support instruments such as entrepreneurship support, quality of conditions, and financial support. Some of the independent variables show weak, but positive correlation, indicating that they are potentially related. The hypotheses for all countries under study are therefore rejected.

As in other theoretical analyses (Biru *et al.*, 2020, Carvalho *et al.*, 2021, Prasannath *et al.*, 2024, Schou, 2024), our work shows that the existing state support mechanisms in the field of entrepreneurship in SK, CZ and PL are not effective enough for young entrepreneurs to feel real support in their entrepreneurial activities. The results reflect the fact that students feel insufficient support in their entrepreneurial activities. The present study confirmed that the importance of young entrepreneurs as a potential engine of future economic growth requires not only attention but also a proactive approach from government institutions. A more thorough analysis of the effectiveness of government policies reveals the challenges that include the improvement of the support system and the implementation of more ambitious strategies to promote entrepreneurship that should be addressed by governments. Gaps in the perception of government support among students may lead to a reduction in entrepreneurial activity among the younger generation, which is an undesirable trend.

Despite the conclusions reported by Chen *et al.* (2021), Novakovich *et al.* (2022), and Sitnicki *et al.* (2024), our empirical findings suggest that states are failing to meet the needs of entrepreneurs. The key role of governments in the creation of a conducive business environment is currently not being fulfilled. Since the hypotheses on the impact of state support, such as instruments to promote entrepreneurship (X1), quality of conditions for entrepreneurship (X2), and financial support (X3), were rejected in all countries examined in the present study, it is concluded that government policies do not create the right conditions for young entrepreneurs and the failure of the government.

The results regarding financial support for entrepreneurship suggest that the financial instruments provided are inappropriately designed or perceived as inaccessible, which can be identified as a problem. A response to this result may be to review and optimise the financing of entrepreneurial projects.

There is a consensus on the theoretical concepts relating to administrative burdens. The assumption that administrative burdens (X4) have a negative impact on entrepreneurial activities (Lehene and Nistor, 2025; Carvalho *et al.*, 2021) is confirmed by our research. This burden has been shown to be statistically significant in the Czech Republic and Poland, and to constitute a barrier to entrepreneurial initiative. This fact, also confirmed theoretically, points to the need to reform administrative processes in order to reduce bureaucratic obstacles, which turn out to be a significant factor discouraging young entrepreneurs from developing their activities. Excessive bureaucracy is a significant obstacle that can discourage potential entrepreneurs and slow down the overall growth of the business sector. This result is regarded as a warning signal. Students interested in entrepreneurship face a disproportionate administrative burden. If the state wants to guarantee more attractive entrepreneurship, it is important to minimise administrative obstacles.

Legislative and administrative measures must be designed to respond to the current needs of young entrepreneurs and take into account their requirements. The results of this study suggest an urgent need to rethink and optimise current government policies to support entrepreneurship in order to guarantee their relevance and effectiveness. The implementation of effective policies and process simplification measures (Najib *et al.*, 2021; Vol.anda *et al.*, 2022) often leads to an increase in entrepreneurial activity. Minimising administrative burdens can contribute significantly to the growth and competitiveness of not only young entrepreneurs but also the whole economy.

In line with the theory on the dynamics of the entrepreneurial environment (Trautwein, 2021; Onesti *et al.*, 2022), it can be concluded that the young generation deserves better conditions to develop their entrepreneurial ambitions.

Conclusions

The main objective of the article was to find out the significance of university students' attitudes towards the entrepreneurial activities in Slovakia (SK), the Czech Republic (CZ), and Poland (PL), depending on their perception of state support for entrepreneurship. The key was to discover students' attitudes towards four important aspects, namely whether the state supports entrepreneurship through its instruments, creates quality conditions for starting a business, supports entrepreneurship financially, and whether the administrative burden on entrepreneurs is adequate.

The results of the research do not bear signs of a positive perception of the state environment to support entrepreneurial activities. The obtained results indicate that the state support mechanisms do not currently achieve the required efficiency and effectiveness, which is reflected in the interest of young university-educated people to enter the entrepreneurial environment. This situation does not act in a sufficiently favourable manner for the development of youth entrepreneurial activities, which is an inappropriate condition. The analysis of

students' attitudes revealed that state instruments of entrepreneurship support, including the quality of business conditions and financial assistance, do not have a statistically significant impact on youth entrepreneurial activities. The result suggests that the current policies and instruments to support entrepreneurs are not effective enough and do not meet the expectations of young entrepreneurs. This also leads to the need to reflect on the revision and the improvement of the existing policy measures to support youth entrepreneurship. It can also be assumed that the weight of the importance of factors is crucial for the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

The research also shows that the entrepreneurial system is sensitive to the burden on entrepreneurs in terms of administrative duties and tasks. The support mechanisms of the state do not currently achieve the required efficiency. The analysis of students' attitudes indicated that state instruments of entrepreneurship support, including the quality of business conditions and financial support, do not have a statistically significant impact on youth entrepreneurial activities. This result suggests that current policies and instruments to support entrepreneurs are not effective enough and do not meet the expectations of young entrepreneurs.

Based on the findings, government institutions should adopt and apply a proactive approach taking into account the current needs of young entrepreneurs. It is necessary to review and optimise government policies and to introduce more ambitious and effective strategic measures. Improving business conditions, adequate financial and legislative instruments, and reducing the administrative burden are key to the increase of the entrepreneurial activity of the young generation and the support of their entrepreneurial ambitions.

It should be emphasised that the necessary state support for the entrepreneurial ambitions of the younger generation and the motivation leading to entrepreneurship are important for the growth of the economy. The new generation of young entrepreneurs requires incentives that do not discourage them from taking entrepreneurial initiative. State policy mechanisms to promote entrepreneurship should reflect the current challenges. Simultaneously, they should lead to the prevention of future problems that could hinder the development of entrepreneurship and economic growth.

However, these conclusions may not be fully generalisable to other geographic areas, as the research was regionally confined (SK, CZ, and PL). A broader qualitative-quantitative nature of the research is what is planned to approach in further research activities. In future research, we intend to explore broader demographic aspects, including age groups and gender perspectives of respondents, to provide a more comprehensive analysis of students' attitudes and their relationship to entrepreneurial activity. This approach should contribute to a better understanding of issues in the state's entrepreneurial ecosystem.

Literature

Alshebami, A.S. (2022), "Crowdfunding Platforms as a Substitute Financing Source for Young Saudi Entrepreneurs: Empirical Evidence", *Sage journal*, Vol. 12, No 3. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221126511>.

Ali, R., Ahmed, A., Nasir, F., Haider, S. (2025), „Mediation of Supply Chain Operations on the Relationship between Lean Manufacturing and Firm Profitability“, *Transformations and Sustainability*, Vol. 1, No 2, pp.100-117. <https://doi.org/10.63775/hsfgga88>.

Audretsch, D.B., Belitski, M., Chowdhury, F., Desai, S. (2022), "Necessity or opportunity? Government size, tax policy, corruption, and implications for entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 58, No 4, pp.2025–2042. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00497-2>.

Audretsch, D., Colombelli, A., Grilli, L., Minola, T., Rasmussen, E. (2020), "Innovative start-ups and policy initiatives", *Research Policy*, Vol. 49, No 10, 104027. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.104027>.

Biru, A., Bilbert, D., Arenius, P. (2020). "Unhelpful help: The state of support programmes and the dynamics of entrepreneurship ecosystems in Ethiopia", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 33, No 3, pp.1-23. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08985626.2020.1734267>.

- Block, J., Kritikos, A.S., Priem, M., Stiel, Ca. (2022), "Emergency-aid for self-employed in the Covid-19 pandemic: A flash in the pan?", *Journal of Economic Psychology*, Vol. 93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joep.2022.102567>.
- Body, S., Hunkova, L., Haviernikova, K. (2024), "Impact of Human Resource Management Organizations' Performance: Empirical Evidence from Small and Medium-sized Enterprises in the Slovak Republic", *Entrepreneurship and Sustainability Issues*, Vol. 12, No 2, pp.473-483. <http://doi.org/10.9770/q2282422868>.
- Carvalho, L., Mavlutova, I., Lesinskis, K., Dias, R. (2021), "Entrepreneurial perceptions of students regarding business professional career: The study on gender differences in Latvia", *Economics & Sociology*, Vol. 14, pp.220–241. <https://doi.org/10.14254/2071-789X.2021/14-3/12>.
- Chen, C.-L., Lin, Y.-C., Chen, W.-H., Chao, C.-F., Pandia, H. (2021), "Role of Government to Enhance Digital Transformation in Small Service Business", *Sustainability*, Vol. 13, No 3, 1028. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13031028>.
- Cho, D.S., Ryan, P., Buciuni, G. (2022), "Evolutionary entrepreneurial ecosystems: A research pathway", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 58, No 4, pp.1865–1883. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00487-4>.
- Choi, S.-K., Han, S., Kwak, K.-T. (2021), "Innovation Capabilities and the Performance of Start-Ups in Korea: The Role of Government Support Policies", *Sustainability*, Vol. 13, No 11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13116009>.
- Chung, B., Franses, P.H., Pennings, E. (2024), "Conditions that make ventures thrive: from individual entrepreneur to innovation impact", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 62, No 3, pp.1177-1200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-023-00800-3>.
- Cowling, M., Dvoulety, O. (2024), "When a non-gendered start-up policy delivers for female entrepreneurs: Evidence from the UK start-up loan scheme", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 20, No 2, pp.1089-1109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-023-00934-6>.
- Crawford, J., Cui, Z.-Y.A., Kewley, D. (2024), "Government finance, loans, and guarantees for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) (2000-2021): A systematic review", *Journal of Small Business Management*, Vol. 62, No 5, pp.2607-2637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2023.2246061>.
- Cullen, U., De Angelis, R. (2021), "Circular entrepreneurship: a business model perspective", *Resources Conservation and Recycling*, Vol. 168, pp.1-32, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105300>.
- Doga-Mirzac, M., Ataman, V., Mirzac, V. (2024), "Model Scheme for Incubating Entrepreneurs for the Formation of a Viable Business in the Republic of Moldova", *Scientific Papers-Servie Management Economic Engineering in Agriculture and Rural development*, Vol. 24, No 4, pp.261-272.
- Dvorsky, J., Belas, J. (2023), *Faktory determinujúce malé a stredné podnikanie*, Zilina, Zilinska univerzita, [Factors determining small and medium-sized businesses, in Slovak].
- Dvorsky, J., Petrakova, Z., Hudakova, M., Bednarz, J. (2023), "National support and legislative change in the business environment of V4 countries: Business sectors view", *Journal of Business Sectors*, Vol. 1, No 1, pp.42-52. <https://doi.org/10.62222/EQDP3972>.
- European Commission (2025), *Startup Europe*, available at, <https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/policies/startup-europe>, referred on 01/03/2025.
- EU Startups. (2025), *Startup Database*, available at, www.eu-startups.com, referred on 01/03/2025.
- Fuentelsaz, L., González, C., Maicas, J. P. (2021), "High-growth aspiration entrepreneurship and exit: The contingent role of market-supporting institutions", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 57, No 1, pp.473–492. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-020-00320-4>.
- Fichter, K., Lüdeke-Freund, F., Schaltegger, S., Schillebeeckx, S.J.D. (2023), "Sustainability impact assessment of new ventures: an emerging field of research", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, Vol. 384. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.135452>.
- Glavan, B., Iordache, A.M.M., Anghel, F., Grigorescu, I.G., Ionescu, A., Nechita, R. (2024), "Government-Funded Businesses: An Empirical Study of Romanian Start-Ups", *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics*, Vol. 35, No 1, pp.45-64. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.35.1.32034>.
- Gomes, S., Ferreira, J.J., Lopes, J.M. (2023), "Entrepreneurial conditions and economic growth in entrepreneurial ecosystems: Evidence from OECD countries", *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, Vol. 26, No 4, pp.315-333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14657503231156340>.
- Ivasciuc, I.-S., Ispas, A. (2023), "Exploring the Motivations, Abilities and Opportunities of Young Entrepreneurs to Engage in Sustainable Tourism Business in the Mountain Area", *Sustainability*, Vol. 15, No 3, <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15031956>.
- Janáková Sujová, A., Kupčák, V. (2024), "Changes in SME Business Due to COVID-19—Survey in Slovakia and the Czech Republic", *Economies*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp.17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies12010017>.

- Karimov, S., Konings, J. (2021), "How lockdown causes a missing generation of start-ups and jobs", *International Economics and Economic Policy*, Vol. 18, No 3, pp.457-473. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10368-021-00513-6>.
- Khan, K.A., Akhtar, M.A., Vishwakarma, R.K., Hoang, H.C. (2023), "A sectoral perspective on the sustainable growth of SMEs. Empirical research in the V4 countries", *Journal of Business Sectors*, Vol. 1, No 1, pp.10-21. <https://doi.org/10.62222/CVFW6962>.
- Krisciukaiiene, I., Bathaei, A. (2024), „Developing a tailored sustainable supply chain framework for dairy SMEs in Lithuania using Best-Worst Method“, *Transformations and Sustainability*, Vol. 1, No 1, pp.43-62. <https://doi.org/10.63775/sv982x31>
- Krupets, Y., Maiboroda, M., Kuziner, E. (2021), "If you are small nobody care!: Young Creative Entrepreneurs of St. Petersburg and their Relations with the State", *Journal of Social Policy Studies*, Vol. 19, No 3, pp.405-420. <https://doi.org/10.17323/727-0634-2021-19-3-405-420>.
- Lehene, C.F., Nistor, R.L. (2025), "Business executives' evaluation of the impact of local authorities' regulations on the local business environment", *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 74E, pp.46-65. <https://doi.org/10.24193/tras.74E.3>.
- Luma, Z.B., Ademi, R. (2023), "Government Support During COVID-19 and Corruption", *Economics and Business*, Vol. 70, No 3, pp.473-497. <https://doi.org/10.47743/saeb-2023-0029>.
- Metzker, Z., Zvarikova, K., Slepecky, J., Dvorsky, J. (2023), "The Perception of CSR from the Point of View of the Environmental Pillar of V4 SMEs", *Transformations in Business & Economics*, Vol. 22, No 3(60), pp.485-500.
- Moore, R.J. (2021), "Emerging from war: Public policy and patterns of foreign direct investment recovery in postwar environments", *Journal of International Business Policy*, Vol. 4, No 4, pp.455-475. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s42214-020-00084-4>.
- Najib, M., Abdul Rahman, A.A., Fahma, F. (2021), "Business Survival of Small and Medium-Sized Restaurants through a Crisis: The Role of Government Support and Innovation", *Sustainability*, Vol. 13, No 19, 10535. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su131910535>.
- van Niekerk, L., Claassens, N., Fish, J., Foiret, C., Franckeiss, J., Thesnaar, L. (2024), "Support factors contributing to successful start-up businesses by young entrepreneurs in South Africa", *Work-a Journal of Prevention Assessment & Rehabilitation*, Vol. 79, No 1, pp.339-350. <https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-230527>.
- Novakovic, V., Aleksić, M., Milovanovic, M. (2022), "Own Revenues in the Public Sector", *Casopis za ekonomiju i trzisne komunikacije*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp.126-135. <https://doi.org/10.7251/EMC2201126N>.
- OECD. (2023), "Framework for the Evaluation of SME and Entrepreneurship Policies and Programmes 2023", OECD Studies on SMEs and Entrepreneurship, OECD Publishing, Paris. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a4c818d1-en>.
- Olsanova, K., Krenkova, E., Hnat, P., Vilikus, O. (2021), "State-Business Relations from the Perspective of the Companies' Preparedness for the Changes Related to Industry 4.0: A Case of the Czech Republic", *Central European Business review*, Vol. 10, No 5, pp.53-79. <https://doi.org/10.18267/j.cebr.273>.
- Onesti, G., Monaco, E., Palumbo, R. (2022), "Assessing the Italian Innovative Start-Ups Performance with a Composite Index", *Administrative Sciences*, Vol. 12, No 4. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12040189>.
- Prasannath, V., Adhikari, R.P., Gronum, S., Miles, M.P., (2024), "Impact of government support policies on entrepreneurial orientation and SME performance", *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, Vol. 20, No 3, pp.1533-1595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-024-00993-3>.
- Rachmawati, R., Anindya, Kriswanto, H.D. (2022), "Analysis of Financial Management on Business of Entrepreneur Students Faculty of Engineering UNNES. ICE-BEES 2021", *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Economics, Business and Economic Education Science*, ICE-BEES 2021, pp.27-28, July 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.27-7-2021.2316900>.
- Riaz, M.F., Leitao, J., Cantner, U. (2022), "Measuring the efficiency of an entrepreneurial ecosystem at municipality level: does institutional transparency play a moderating role?", *Eurasian Business Review*, Vol. 12, No 1, pp.151-176. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40821-021-00194-w>.
- Schou, P.K. (2024), "Unpacking the myth of the entrepreneurial state", *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, Vol. 21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2024.e00454>.
- Sitnicki, M.W., Horbas, I., Derkach, O., Flowers, A., Wielewska, I., Tucki, K., Zuzek, D.K., Pimenov, S. (2024), "Development and Support of Ukrainian Domestic Entrepreneurship in the Knowledge Economy", *Sustainability*, Vol. 16, No 13, 5682. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16135682>.
- Smetanova, E. (2024), "Key Determinants of Job Satisfaction in Higher Education", *Social and Economics Review*, Vol. 22, No 1, pp.22-32. <https://doi.org/10.52665/ser20240103>.

Soana, M.G., Cucinelli, D., Ronchini, B. (2024), "Advisors for micro-entrepreneurs: is one as good as another in accessing alternative finance?", *Small Business Economics*. Vol. 64, No.1, pp.989-1033. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-024-00942-y>.

Starchenko, G., Ostrovska, N., Garbzhii, K., Kotelevets, D., Nykoniuk, K., Amirkhanian, H. (2024), "Tools of the State Business Support in the Context of Sustainable Development", *Management theory and studies for rural business and infrastructure development*. Vol. 46, No 1, pp.15-22. <https://doi.org/10.15544/mts.2024.02>.

Torres, P., Godinho, P. (2022), "Levels of necessity of entrepreneurial ecosystems elements", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 59, No 1, pp.29–45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00515-3>.

Trautwein, C. (2021), "Sustainability impact assessment of start-ups – key insights on relevant assessment challenges and approaches based on an inclusive, systematic literature review", *Journal of Cleaner Product*, Vol. 281. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.125330>.

Voland, N., Saad, M.M., Eicker, U. (2022), "Public Policy and Incentives for Socially Responsible New Business Models in Market-Driven Real Estate to Build Green Projects", *Sustainability*, Vol. 14, No 12, 7071. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14127071>.

Webb, J.W., Khoury, T.A., Hitt, M.A. (2020), "The influence of formal and informal institutional voids on entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 44, No 3, pp.504–526. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719830310>.

World Bank Group (2021). *Ease of Doing Business scores*, available at, <https://archive.doingbusiness.org/en/scores?topic=starting-a-business>, referred on 29/01/2025.

Wurth, B., Stam, E., Spigel, B. (2022), "Toward an entrepreneurial ecosystem research program", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol. 46, No 3, pp.729–778. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258721998948>.

Yusoff, M.N.H.B., Zainol, F.A., Ismail, M., Redzuan, R.H., Abdul Rahim Merican, R.M., Razik, M.A., Afthanorhan, A. (2021), "The Role of Government Financial Support Programmes, Risk-Taking Propensity, and Self-Confidence on Propensity in Business Ventures ", *Sustainability*, Vol. 13, No 1, p.380. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13010380>.

Zhao, Q., Zhang, C., Li, Z. (2024), "Government Subsidies and Business Resilience of Chinese Electric Vehicle Enterprises: The Roles of ESG and Technological Capability", *Energies*, Vol. 17, No 22, 5569. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en17225569>.

Acknowledgements: The paper is an output of the project VEGA: 1/0109/25; The theoretical model of ESG in the SME segment in the V4 countries.

UNIVERSITETŲ STUDENTŲ POŽIŪRIS Į VALSTYBĖS PARAMĄ VERSLUMO EKOSISTEMAI

Martina Jakubčinová, Karol Krajčo, Alexandra Hot'ková, Armenia Androniceanu

Santrauka. Šiuo straipsniu siekiama kiekybiškai įvertinti ir ištirti universitetų studentų požiūrį į valstybės paramą verslumo ekosistemai. Tyrime dalyvavo aktyviai verslu užsiimančios studentai. Tyrimo tikslas įgyvendinimo atspirties taškas – 2024 m. kovą Slovakijoje, Čekijoje ir Lenkijoje atliktas empirinis tyrimas. Tyrimo imtis – 1 783 respondentai (SK: 576, CZ: 612, PL: 595) iš 42 universitetų (SK: 16, CZ: 11, PL: 15). Suformuluotoms hipotezėms patikrinti ir įvertinti $\alpha = 5\%$ reikšmingumo lygiu taikyta koreliacijos analizė. Pagrindiniai rezultatai atskleidė, kad valstybė verslo rėmimo priemonėmis sukuria neapibrėžtumo atmosferą. Respondentai išreiškė susirūpinimą dėl verslo steigimui reikalingų sąlygų kokybės. Finansinė parama verslininkams neatitinka jaunimo lūkesčių, o administracinė našta sustiprina neigiamą įspūdį apie įsitraukimą į verslą. Norėdama paveikti nuomones valstybė turi skirti daugiau dėmesio verslo paramai. Administracinės naštos mažinimas gali reikšmingai prisidėti ne tik prie jaunųjų verslininkų, bet ir visos ekonomikos augimo ir konkurencingumo didinimo.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: universitetų studentai; verslumas; valstybės parama verslui; administracinė našta; finansinė parama.