

1. Introduction

According to Carlsson et al. (2013) and Meyer et al. (2014) on entrepreneurship, the theme of 'region' in entrepreneurship research area was not elucidated as an independent area of research. In the study of Carlsson et al. (2013), 'region' is described as one of socio-economic environmental variables. In the entrepreneurship studies, 'region' has been included in 'miscellaneous' clusters that lie outside the so-called core research area in the scholarship on entrepreneurship that centers around technology transfer, entrepreneurial university, globalization, and family business (Meyer et al., 2014). In other words, it would be appropriate to view that research topics on 'regionality' in the 'entrepreneurship' research field or topics on 'entrepreneurship' in 'regional studies' research field are not independently coherent as a discipline (or field of scholarship), but rather that such topics form a single research theme that addresses entrepreneurship and regionality at the same time. Of course, there exist scholarly journals dealing with entrepreneurship and regional development such as "Entrepreneurship and Regional Development", but it is nevertheless difficult to view this field as a concentrated research area.

The concept of 'region' in which 'entrepreneurship' is expressed can be quite broad and ambiguous according to spatial scale and location. The various concepts used in the context of 'regional', such as local, regional, rural, urban, innovation district, and innovation space, etc. are quite diverse but generally refer to an area of smaller range than a nation. For instance, if we say that the 'local' refers to a community or small town, the 'regional' as a concept would be somewhere between the local and the nation-state (Baumgartner et al., 2013). Therefore, the regional base of business establishment or entrepreneurship can be classified under the following categories: Urban core, Suburban, Small city, Rural metropolitan, Rural non-

metropolitan (Renski, 2008). The center-periphery dichotomy centered on functional relationships, or the more traditional urban-rural dichotomy based on different environments, may be useful analytical concepts (Baumgartner et al., 2013). The factors affecting an individual's decision to start a business vary widely, but the cultural, social, political and financial environment of the 'region' are very important (Wagner and Sternberg, 2004).

Müller (2016) analyzes the various research topics covered in 'regional entrepreneurship' through the content analysis of 170 academic papers on regional entrepreneurship. Müller (2016) concludes that most research topics on regional entrepreneurship either 1) study the effect of regional structures, context, and spatial characteristics on entrepreneurial activity or entrepreneurship (R->E); or 2) study the relationship between entrepreneurs who lead the way to regional development and the development process of newly established businesses (E->RD). These two areas accounted for 52% and 40% of the total research, respectively.

Müller (2016) argues that the study of regional entrepreneurship is largely dealt with in three main academic disciplines through the analysis of the authors of the studies. Of the 170 papers that were analyzed, 65 were published in the discipline of regional economics, 55 in sociology and management, and 28 in economic geography. The following table shows the differences between the regional contexts that affect entrepreneurship and the role of entrepreneurship in regional development in these three areas. On the other hand, Pato and Teixeira (2016) classified eight research topics on 'rural entrepreneurship', and according to their findings, the number of studies on rural entrepreneurship among all studies on entrepreneurship tends to decrease over time.

2. Comparison of entrepreneurship in metropolitan vs non-metropolitan areas

The analysis is based on data of 12,038 collected by ‘2018 Entrepreneurship Real Condition Survey’ in Korea. Effective samples were weighed in the basic statistical analysis conducted by Korea Enterprise Data so that population distribution ratio could be in equilibrium. This paper examines the characteristics of individual entrepreneurship level by region by comparing the regional differences of each category and elements in the entrepreneurship status survey. In addition, we will analyze the strengths and weaknesses of entrepreneurship in each region to suggest ways to foster regional entrepreneurial orientation. In this paper, we divide the country into such as metropolitan areas and non-metropolitan areas, and then calculate the scores for each element in individual entrepreneurship, then compare these numbers with the regional levels to assess the level of entrepreneurship in each region. We shall compare the level of entrepreneurship based on these groups as well and assess the characteristics of each group.

In Korea, more than half of the population is concentrated in Seoul, Gyeonggi, and Incheon, and other Seoul-centered metropolitan areas, and more than half of total companies are concentrated in the Greater Seoul Metropolitan area. It is necessary to examine whether the economic gap between the metropolitan area and non-metropolitan areas affects the level of entrepreneurship between the two groups.

Table 1. Entrepreneurship by Metropolitan vs non-Metropolitan in Korea

Type	Metropolitan	Non-metropolitan
Entrepreneurial Orientation	46.32	45.17
Innovation	47.04	44.74
Risk sensitivity	45.22	43.07
Market leadership	45.43	45.01
Autonomy	46.94	46.85
Competitive drive	45.30	42.63
Desire for accomplishment	47.98	48.73
Entrepreneurial competence	46.02	46.04
Cognitive competence	43.85	43.72
Interpersonal competence	48.39	50.36

Commercialization competence	45.83	44.05
Entrepreneurial attitude and perception	48.30	46.02
Response method	50.39	51.27
Global mindset	41.35	44.02
Realization of public interest	49.56	45.54
Personal perception	44.08	37.17
Social perception	56.11	52.12

As a result, it was found that entrepreneurial orientation of the metropolitan area was generally higher than the entrepreneurial orientation of the non-metropolitan area at the individual level. Entrepreneurial characteristics as well as entrepreneurial attitudes and perceptions showed a large gap between the two groups. This is because the level of awareness in realization of public interest, individual perception, and social perception in the individual dimension of the metropolitan area was much higher than that of the non-metropolitan area. The high personal perception means that the opportunities and projections about starting as business felt by individuals in the metropolitan area and their willingness to start a business are much more optimistic than those in the non-metropolitan area. The high entrepreneurial attitude and perception level of the metropolitan area were connected to excellent entrepreneurial performance. The metropolitan area is superior to the non - capital region in both terms of internal and practical aspects of entrepreneurial spirit on the individual level.

3. Results

Entrepreneurial competence did not show a significant difference in the individual entrepreneurship between the metropolitan area and the non-metropolitan area. In other words, the entrepreneurial characteristics of the metropolitan area are higher than those of non - metropolitan areas. On the other hand, the deviations between the metropolitan area and non-metropolitan area in the entrepreneurial attitude and perception were even greater. In terms of

entrepreneurial characteristics, the metropolitan area recorded a much higher level than the non - metropolitan area in terms of innovation, risk sensitivity, and competitive drive, but the desire for achievement was higher in non - metropolitan areas. In the case of entrepreneurial attitudes and perceptions, the non-metropolitan area scored higher in terms of response methods and global mindset, while the metropolitan area scored higher in terms of realization of public interest, personal perception, and social perception.

A closer look at the entrepreneurial attitudes and perceptions, which have the greatest gap between the metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, reveals that there is a significant difference between the two regions in terms of personal perception and social perception. In other words, the opportunities and capabilities for entrepreneurship felt by individuals in the metropolitan area, and the willingness to engage in entrepreneurship are much larger than those in non-metropolitan areas. This is due to the excellent start-up infrastructure, business-friendly environment, cultural and social atmosphere of the Seoul metropolitan area influence individual decision-making on business start-up.

As a result, the high entrepreneurial attitude and perception level of the metropolitan area (practical entrepreneurship) shows excellent entrepreneurial performance in combination with high entrepreneurial orientation (internal entrepreneurship). The proportion of individuals who are entrepreneurs and the proportion of individuals who plan to start a business are higher in the Seoul metropolitan area than in the non - metropolitan area. Especially, the difference between the metropolitan area and the non - metropolitan area was pronounced more in entrepreneurial plans than the entrepreneurial experience. Therefore, it is considered that the metropolitan area has more potential and performance than the non-metropolitan region.

Acknowledgements We are grateful to two anonymous referees for their valuable comments and suggestions. The authors acknowledge the data support from Korea Entrepreneurship Foundation, and the research funds for Science & Technology Policy Institute.

References

Carlsson, B. et al.(2013), The evolving domain of entrepreneurship research, *Small Business Economics*, 41, pp. 913-930.

Meyer, M. et al.(2014), Origin and emergence of entrepreneurship as a research field, *Scientometrics*, 98(1), pp. 473-485.

Renski, H.(2008), New Firm Entry, Survival, and Growth in the United States: A comparison of Urban, Suburban, and Rural Areas, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 75(1), pp. 60-77.

Wagner, J. & Sternberg, R.(2004), Start-up activities, individual characteristics, and the regional milieu: Lessons for entrepreneurship support policies from German micro data, *The Annals of Regional Science*, 38(2), pp. 219-240.

Müller, S.(2016), A progress review of entrepreneurship and regional development: What are the remaining gaps?. *European Planning Studies*, 24(6), pp. 1133-1158.