INTRODUCTION

The importance of studying the social identity and identification of entrepreneurs and leaders (executives) is associated with understanding how social identity is related to entrepreneurial thinking (KORTE, 2018), what impact it has on an entrepreneur’s management of the firm, and business performance (ALSOS, CLAUSEN, HYTTI, & SOLVOLL, 2016, DE LA CRUZ, VERDU JOVER, & GOMEZ GRAS, 2018, GRUBER, & FAUCHART, 2011). Researchers relying on the social identity theory note that the types of identity, for example, the Darwinians, Communitarians, and Missionaries, affect the process of making key decisions in creating new companies. In an effort to answer calls to study why effectual or causal behavior is chosen and constructed (PERRY, CHANDLER, & MARKOVA, 2012), researchers distinguish the types of people characterized by causal or effectual behavior (ALSOS, CLAUSEN, HYTTI, U. & SOLVOLL, 2016). The results of a different study demonstrate the effect of identity on the choice of social entrepreneurship (KO & KIM, 2020).

Some researchers indicate that in the study of identity, the emphasis is often put on individual identity (ELLEMRS, SPEARS, & DOOSIE, 2002) with little attention being paid to social identification. There is currently not a lot of research examining the place of socio-professional identity in the structure of identities of entrepreneurs and leaders and the degree of awareness of socio-professional identification. The issues of the self and identity are typically conceptualized at the level of the personal “Self” where the importance of social roles and interactions for understanding who is who is highlighted (BANAJI, & PRENTICE, 1994, BAUMEISTER, 1998). These categories are predominantly viewed within the framework of interindividual processes, in terms of how reflected evaluations of others contribute to defining oneself (SWANN, MILTON, & POLZER, 2000) or can help satisfy the common need to manifest a sense of belonging (BAUMEISTER, & LEARY, 1995, LEARY, & BAUMEISTER, 2000).

The study aims to examine the degree of awareness of socio-professional identification of entrepreneurs and managers, its impact on their intentions and behavior as the representatives of a socio-professional group, their decision-making, and performance using social identity theory (TAJFEL, 1978, TAIFEL, H., & TURNER, 1979) and self-categorization theory (TURNER, 1987, TURNER, 1999). The specifics of thinking and identification of socio-professional groups are determined through a comparative analysis of social identity, specifically the socio-professional identity of entrepreneurs and leaders. We assume that different degrees of awareness do play a certain role and influence the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses of entrepreneurs and leaders. In this study, we propose the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: The general trend in social identification is the prevalence of self-identification through the “social self” and “personal identity”. In self-identification through the “social self”, family-and-kinship and socio-professional identification are predominant. The socio-professional identification (“socio-professional self”) manifests in entrepreneurs more often compared to in managers.
Hypothesis 2. The higher is the self-assessment of the level of one’s financial state, the stronger the identification and the higher the awareness of types. Respondents assessing their financial situation as prosperous lead an active search for identity including within the professional community.

Hypothesis 3. There is a correlation between the depth of identification with the socio-professional group and readiness to change one’s professional activity.

Hypothesis 4. Superficial entrepreneurs and leaders are overall less satisfied with how their lives have turned compared to conscious entrepreneurs and leaders.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
Socio-professional identification reflects not only the personal and cultural characteristics of an individual but also the social patterns of the development of society. Social identity theory (TAIFEL, 1978, TAIFEL, H., & TURNER, 1979) and self-categorization theory (TURNER, 1987) “emphasize the interplay between social identity as a perceptual factor that implicates different aspects of self (or different social selves) and social contextual factors that either enhance or diminish the significance of both personal and social identities”. According to H. Tajfel’s social identity theory, the higher individuals assess the status of their professional group compared to others, the more they want to identify with it (TAIFEL, H., & TURNER, 1979).

The concept of “social identification” is used to refer to both the content of identity and the degree of association with a given social category. It should be noted that content and the degree of association are different components of social identity which, although related, can operate relatively independently of each other (JACKSON, 2002, SMITH, MURPHY, & COATS, 1999). We use the term “social identity” referring to the content of a specific identity and the term “identification” to indicate the strength of a person’s connection (the degree of awareness) with a particular social group. Some authors note that this differentiation of categories contributes to understanding that the “strength of commitment” (the degree of awareness) may not change despite the fact that the object of identification may lose attractiveness on the part of others (ELLEMRS, SPEARS, & DOOSIE, 2002). In our view, an important point in the study of social identity is that a deeper understanding of the influence of social groups on how entrepreneurs and leaders perceive themselves and others calls for a consideration of a wider social context in which they function.

Socio-professional identification as a type of social identification is understood as a process created as a result of “social interaction between workers, the organization, and society according to the formula ‘from expectations to responsibilities’ and ‘from responsibilities to expectations’” (SHLIAKOV, 2008). Socio-professional identification is the process of identifying oneself with a professional group in the social space through the social interaction of the employee, the organization, the socio-professional group, and society, as well as the acceptance of the reflected assessments of others. Socio-professional identification can change under the influence of socio-economic, socio-cultural, and socio-psychological conditions. It is determined by the assessment of the image of the profession and professional group in terms of status positions and the quality of activity of the professional group, its role in the functioning of society, as well as the degree to which the ideal image of the profession corresponds to the real activity of the individual.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
To study the degree of awareness of the socio-professional identity of entrepreneurs and leaders, we used a projective method for self-identifications, namely the Twenty-Self Statement-Test (TST) developed by M. Kuhn and T. McPartland. This method assumes that the indication of objective positions (woman, entrepreneur) is a sign of self-identification with a social position (KUHN, & MCPARTLAND, 1954). On the contrary, the indication of traits or states (honest, kind) demonstrates the absence of social self-identification. In using the Twenty-Self Statement-Test (TST), we considered two methodological problems: the problem of situationality and context including the influence of the researcher and the problem of coding. Several authors point to these methodological problems: Alm, Carroll, Tucker, Welty (ALM, CARROLL, & WELTY, 1972, TUCKER, 1972).
The choice was made in favor of the open-ended “Who am I?” question in an effort to reduce bias in the results due to the possibility that the formulation of a closed-ended question or answer options can push for a certain answer and limit the choice of answers. We have to understand what stands behind the answers to the “Who am I?” question. M. Kuhn and T. McPartland note that the “Who am I?” question is logically linked to what a person identifies with, i.e. their social status and the traits associated with it (KUHN, & MCPARTLAND, 1954). We tend to believe that respondents’ answers are the result of categorizing the social world. P. Berger and T. Luckmann argue that to understand themselves and interpret “others”, a person resorts to typification schemes. In the framework of the phenomenological approach, a social structure comprises the general sum of typifications and repeating interactions (BERGER, & LUCKMANN, 1967). H. Garfinkel notes that individuals’ practical actions in specific situations and the meanings used in interpretation construct “a social reality of their own” (ALM, CARROLL, & WELTY, 1972). The world of social interconnections and relations takes on different “meanings”, meanings for different individuals. In other words, each person has “their own” social world refracted through the prism of meanings they ascribe to it. Various meanings construct a context, a connection with a place and time including the influence of the researcher and recording certain answers of respondents which we must consider.

The study deploys a combined survey method (a mobile survey with an independently completed electronic form and a survey by the method of independently completed hand-out questionnaires) which also reduces the researcher’s influence on the obtained results. On the one hand, a study conducted by Ronnie M. Alm, W. Carroll, and G. Welty demonstrates that the problem of coding is associated with the presence of a significant inter-coder variation both between the researchers as coders and between them and the subjects as coders (ALM, CARROLL, & WELTY, 1972). On the other hand, J. Swain views coding as a process involving the integration of a priori codes (based on the original goals and research question in the project) and a posteriori codes (inductively derived from a close reading of interview transcripts) (SWAIN, 2018). Coding can be viewed as an “integrative process”, as “switching between what was expected to be found and what was found” (HAMMOND, & WELLINGTON, 2020). To solve this problem, we first generalized the respondents’ answers into first-order constructs, i.e. into the basic concepts that were given operational designations present in the spoken language. Next, highlighting the common grounds, we combined the concepts into second-order constructs - formatted and idealized categories.

The study identified the “social self”, “communicative self”, “material self”, “physical self”, “active self”, “perspective self”, “reflexive self”, the problem identity, and the situational state (RUMIANTSEVA, 2006). The “socio-professional self” was also allocated for this study. The “social self” included gender categories (man, woman, girl, boy), family affiliation (husband, wife, mother, father, daughter, etc.), educational and role positions (student), ideological (confessional, political affiliation), ethnic and regional identity (ethnic and local identity), and group affiliation. To meet the established goal and objectives of the study, within the “social self”, we additionally separately identified the “socio-professional self” comprising the designation of a professional role, personal qualities necessary for a leader and an entrepreneur, affiliation with a socio-professional group, and self-assessment as an entrepreneur or a leader.

The article analyzes the results of a study conducted in 2019-2020 in the city of Perm. The sample consisted of 120 entrepreneurs and 120 managers, men and women were equally represented in these groups. Thus, the parameters controlled in the sample were the socio-professional and gender structures. Characterizing the sample, we can note that the leaders were slightly older (at the average age of 37 while the average age of entrepreneurs was 34 years old). The majority of entrepreneurs and managers have higher education or incomplete higher education (72% and 84%, respectively), thus, the respondents’ level of education is quite high. The analysis of the survey data on the respondents’ financial state shows that more than half of entrepreneurs (58%) and managers (58%) generally have enough money and tend to refer themselves to the middle class in terms of income. Entrepreneurs are more likely than managers to point out extreme positions in their financial situation: living from paycheck to paycheck (13% versus 8%) and being able to not deny themselves anything (8% versus 6%). More entrepreneurs considered their income to be the lowest than the entrepreneurs able to...
not deny themselves anything (13% versus 8%). It should be noted that the financial state was assessed through respondents’ self-assessment, therefore, their real economic situation may be different due to differences in their value systems. Thus, the analysis of the sample shows that all the information collected in the course of the sociological survey on the respondents’ socio-professional affiliation can be analyzed in accordance with the purpose and objectives of the study. Based on the study data, we constructed four types of socio-professional identification:

- “conscious entrepreneur” characterizes themselves as an entrepreneur and also uses associations when answering the question “Who am I?”: businessman, entrepreneur, other similar terms.
- “superficial entrepreneur” characterizes themselves as an entrepreneur but does not use associations when answering the question “Who am I?”: businessman, entrepreneur, other similar terms.
- “conscious leader” characterizes themselves as a leader and uses associations when answering the question “Who am I?”: leader, boss, manager, etc.
- “superficial leader” characterizes themselves as a leader but does not use associations when answering the question “Who am I?”: leader, boss, manager, etc.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The study results show that the entrepreneurs and leaders most often self-identify through the “social self” and the “reflexive self”. In their self-descriptions, leaders use the concepts of the “social self” more often compared to entrepreneurs. The most common components of the “social self” are family affiliation (son, father, husband, etc.) and the “socio-professional self”. We should also note that in self-identification through family roles, horizontal nuclear family ties are found more often than the ties of intergenerational extended family relations. Thus, “socio-professional categories, along with family affiliation, play an important role in people’s lives” (SELETKOVA, 2015). The results of our study are consistent with the results of a study using various methods that showed that “the tendency of family-related identification, as well as identification with groups of everyday communication”, manifests most clearly (IADOV, 1993). At the same time, family identification, “judging by the studies of value systems in the past decades, has always been the leading group identification” (IADOV, 1993). Nevertheless, socio-professional identification is highly relevant to modern society and manifests itself in the point of non-coincidence between the “outside viewpoint” and “the inside viewpoint on oneself”. G.G. Diligenskii notes that “for most respondents, the decisive criteria for social self-determination are the professional position, the performed work” (DILIGENSKII, 2002). Entrepreneurs more often view themselves as workers and designate their profession, managers also assess themselves as workers and indicate their profession but also often indicate a specific position. It is the position that unites leaders and their functional responsibilities are essentially similar regardless of the profession. What is important for an entrepreneur is the professional side comprising effective activity with constant assessment of oneself as a worker. G.G. Diligenskii suggests that “different aspects of the individual and professional situation can be accentuated, brought to the foreground, and function in various combinations. In some cases, the accepted decisive stratification criterion is the formal job status (for example, head of a hospital department). However, much more often priority is given to the content of the work, its creative nature, the level of qualifications, the self-realization opportunities, the use of knowledge, and the disclosure of human abilities that it provides, its social significance, and usefulness” (DILIGENSKII, 2002).

The study results show that answers associated with personal identity are found in entrepreneurs more often than in leaders. Leaders’ personal identity is less pronounced. Entrepreneurs are more inclined to individual self-perception than other groups. Leaders more often touch upon social categories and write about their official status. As a result of the study, we found that the defining criterion of socio-professional identification for leaders is job status while for entrepreneurs it is professional status and skillfulness (self-assessment as a worker). Thus, we can conclude that Hypothesis 1 is confirmed. The general trend in social identification is the prevalence of self-description through the “social self” and “personal identity”. Within
self-determination through the “social self”, family-related and socio-professional identifications prevail. Socio-professional identification (“socio-professional self”) is more pronounced among entrepreneurs than in leaders.

T.Z. Nazarov indicates a high degree of social identification with their environment in small entrepreneurs, however, it is mostly associated not with the “awareness of the commonality of the socio-economic conditions of their professional activities but rather with the circumstances reflecting the specifics of each individual’s personal status” (NAZAROV, 2005). According to the data provided by the Perm National Research Polytechnic University, in 2008, each fourth person identified as an owner, every second identified with the middle class, and every sixth identified with the poor or the new poor (RAZINSKII, 2010). Although self-identification as an owner is quite relevant to the social status of an entrepreneur, this self-identification is characteristic of a small proportion of respondents. Therefore, most surveyed entrepreneurs identify with the middle class but the share of entrepreneurs who consider themselves poor is high and the proportion of respondents identifying themselves as owners is low. This finding can be associated with the fact that the majority of the surveyed entrepreneurs are individual entrepreneurs who did not form a legal entity, as well as with the peculiarities of the external environment. The respondents’ consciousness and value priorities reflect the present social reality. Analyzing the quality of the respondents’ identification with various social roles, we can conclude that the situation is quite contradictory and it should be considered that the study was conducted 12 years ago.

In our study, 196 people (82%) were classified as certain types. The rest of the respondents have mixed characteristics and do not belong to any of the types (44 people). Both “conscious entrepreneurs” (28% - 66 people) and “conscious leaders” (27% - 64 people), as well as “superficial entrepreneurs” (14.2% - 34 people) and “superficial leaders” (13.3% - 32 people) are represented equally. Several factors were found to influence the types of socio-professional identification (Table 1).

Table 1. The influence of different factors on the types of socio-professional identification (in % of the number of respondents in each group by factors)

| Factors                                      | Conscious entrepreneur | Superficial entrepreneur | Conscious leader | Superficial leader |
|----------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| The characteristic of the financial situation|                        |                          |                  |                    |
| Live from paycheck to paycheck, often have to borrow money for basic necessities, savings are out of the question. | 26                     | 37                       | 26                | 11                 |
| There is enough money for daily expenses but buying clothes is already difficult, there is a need to borrow money or save on purpose for this | 33                     | 10                       | 39                | 18                 |
| For the most part, there is enough money and some savings are possible. | 34                     | 17                       | 32                | 17                 |
| Are able to deny themselves practically nothing | 43                     | 21                       | 21                | 15                 |
| The presence of readiness to change one’s professional field |                        |                          |                  |                    |
| Yes                                          | 34                     | 17                       | 31                | 18                 |
| No                                           | 33                     | 16                       | 42                | 9                  |
| Difficult to answer                          | 37                     | 21                       | 21                | 21                 |

Source: Search data.

Among the representatives of the lowest income level (those who “live from paycheck to paycheck...”), the “superficial entrepreneur” type is predominant (37%). The next group in terms of income (those who “have enough money for daily expenses but buying clothes is already difficult”) is dominated by “conscious leaders” (39%). In the group with a higher financial status, “conscious leaders” and “conscious entrepreneurs” are represented equally (32 and 34%, respectively). Among the respondents with the best financial situation (“able to deny themselves practically nothing”), the type of conscious entrepreneurs appears almost two times more often than other types. There appears to be a direct relationship: the higher the financial status, the greater the proportion of the “conscious entrepreneur” type. The study results confirm hypothesis 2: the higher is the self-assessment of financial situation, the more
pronounced is the socio-professional identification and the higher is the awareness within the types.

We can assume that the reason for such a relationship is the correspondence to the ideal-typical image of an entrepreneur with a high financial status (serving as one of the major criteria of the ideal type of an entrepreneur) enhancing the level of identification with the socio-professional group. This same condition underlies the prevalence of the “superficial entrepreneur” type among the respondents with the lowest income. This pattern can be interpreted as a reflection of motivation in which willingness to engage in entrepreneurship is associated with the desire to increase the level of financial well-being while the inconsistency with this ideal-typical criterion violates social and professional identity. Readiness to change one’s professional sphere only affects the types of leaders doubling the share of “superficial leaders” (from 9 to 18%) and reducing the share of “conscious leaders” (from 42 to 31%) with the prevalence of those confused by the question about their attitude to changing the sphere of professional activity remaining unchanged (21% in both cases). This appears quite logical: fewer people identify with the position of a leader among those willing to change their professional sphere (compared to those not ready for professional mobility). Thus, hypothesis 3 is confirmed partially only for leaders.

Surprisingly, this factor does not affect the types of entrepreneurs’ identification. We can speculate that the reason for this lack of relationship is the specifics of the social portrait of an entrepreneur potentially characterized by an inclination towards mobility and readiness to change their professional field that actualizes with an increase in dissatisfaction with the current situation or the field of activity. Thus, the fact of the proportions of entrepreneurs’ identification types in the groups of those having and lacking the focus on changing the professional sphere being equal is presumably associated with a difference in the degree to which the current situation, as well as the sphere of activity, correspond to an individual’s ideas (expectations).

Let us examine the types separately. Respondents of the “conscious entrepreneur” type demonstrate a set of interrelated assessments of status positions: the financial status of the professional group, its prestige, the social significance of the activity, and professional authority. As a result of the study, we can highlight that in “conscious leaders”, income serves as a criterion of the success of the activity, specifically its prestige and significance for society. In this group, the group prestige status is primarily associated with the self-assessment of their financial status (Pearson’s $r = 0.76$) and a bit less – with the status in terms of the importance of their activity for society (Pearson’s $r = 0.75$) and professional authority (Pearson’s $r = 0.73$). Meanwhile, the assessments of the latter status positions are also linked to the financial status (Pearson’s $r = 0.71$). This implies that the lower they assess their financial situation, the higher they perceive the prestige status of their professional group and the level of its professional authority.

In the “conscious entrepreneur” type, an important characteristic in evaluating the development of their socio-professional and personal qualities is courage. The assessments of personal courage strongly correlate with the assessments of initiative (Pearson’s $r = 0.80$), self-confidence (Pearson’s $r = 0.70$), quick-wittedness (Pearson’s $r = 0.72$), ability to act in conditions of risk (Pearson’s $r = 0.74$), and the general assessment of the development of one’s socio-professional qualities (Pearson’s $r = 0.76$). In the examined type, the self-assessed initiative is also related to the assessment of one’s ability to find a common language with other people (Pearson’s $r = 0.72$) which, in turn, correlates with the ability to persuade others (Pearson’s $r = 0.75$). The self-assessed ability to persuade others is related to the assessments of one’s self-confidence (Pearson’s $r = 0.71$) and quick-wittedness (Pearson’s $r = 0.73$) while the latter is associated with the assessment of the ability to organize one’s work (Pearson’s $r = 0.72$). At the same time, the respondents’ self-assessments of this type of the general level of development of their professional qualities correlate with the assessment of the level of their courage (Pearson’s $r = 0.76$) and the ability to act in conditions of risk (Pearson’s $r = 0.79$) meaning that volitional and cognitive characteristics prevail.

What is observed in the answers of the second type of respondents – “superficial entrepreneurs” – is a strong correlation between self-assessed self-confidence and self-organization (Pearson’s $r = 0.86$), as well as between self-confidence and the ability to persuade others (Pearson’s $r = 0.86$). The second block of interrelated assessments includes
the correlation of the evaluation of one’s ability to act in conditions of risk with initiative (Pearson’s r = 0.82) and quick-wittedness (Pearson’s r = 0.82). Self-confidence also appears often in the correlations of characteristics found in this type of respondents. A bit weaker is the association of entrepreneurs’ self-confidence with the ability to organize one’s work (Pearson’s r = 0.76), initiative (Pearson’s r = 0.75), the ability to act in conditions of risk (Pearson’s r = 0.73), and goal-orientedness (Pearson’s r = 0.71).

If we visualize the interrelated personal characteristics of “superficial entrepreneurs”, we will get a disk of a wheel, the center of which is self-confidence connected by the “spokes” with self-organization, the ability to persuade others, goal-orientedness, the ability to organize one’s work, initiative, and the ability to act in conditions of risk. We should emphasize that the common feature of the first and second types of the respondents’ self-identification is the correlation between the scores of two qualities of entrepreneurs: self-confidence and the ability to persuade others. In the respondents of the third type of socio-professional self-identification – “conscious leaders” – the key personal characteristic is the ability to organize one’s work. It can also be envisioned as a center of a wheel. However, while in the case of “superficial entrepreneurs” all the “spokes of the wheel” represented strong correlations, here they are not so uniform. The ability to organize one’s work as a trait of “conscious entrepreneurs” has a strong correlation with self-assessed hardworkingness (Pearson’s r = 0.74) and the ability to find a common language with others (Pearson’s r = 0.72), as well as a medium correlation with the assessments of self-organization (Pearson’s r = 0.68), self-confidence (Pearson’s r = 0.66), the ability to manage others (Pearson’s r = 0.61), and the ability to plan, stimulate, and control at the strategic, tactical, and situational levels (Pearson’s r = 0.60).

The results obtained in the representatives of the fourth type of respondents (“superficial leaders”) contain not one but three personal characteristics linked to other traits but not to one another. Following the suggested analogy, we can see these characteristics as “the centers of three wheels” with a small number of “spokes”. The first of these characteristics is the ability to manage others demonstrating a direct correlation with self-assessed self-confidence (Pearson’s r = 0.72), the ability to plan, stimulate, and control (Pearson’s r = 0.62), and professional qualification (Pearson’s r = 0.61). The second one is courage associated with the ability to act in conditions of risk (Pearson’s r = 0.70), initiative (Pearson’s r = 0.63), and diligence (Pearson’s r = 0.62). The third one is the ability to organize one’s work, the assessment of which correlates (although weakly) with self-assessed initiative (Pearson’s r = 0.64), the ability to persuade others (Pearson’s r = 0.61), and the overall level of development of professional qualities (Pearson’s r = 0.61).

Examining the level of satisfaction of the typological groups with their lives (Table 2), we should note that superficial entrepreneurs and leaders report that they have achieved what they were striving for more rarely (7% and 16%, respectively) and are more often say they have achieved little from what they had planned (16% and 3%, respectively). Conscious entrepreneurs and leaders generally evaluate how their lives turned out more positively. Thus, we can note that hypothesis 4 is confirmed. The degree of awareness in one’s self-identification does affect the perception of success in life. Superficial entrepreneurs and leaders are less satisfied with the overall course of their lives than conscious entrepreneurs and leaders.

Table 2. Distribution of respondents by the level of satisfaction with their lives depending on the type of socio-professional identification (in % of the number of respondents in each group by type)

| The characteristics of how one’s life turned out | Conscious entrepreneur | Superficial entrepreneur | Conscious leader | Superficial leader |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Achieved what they aimed for                     | 24                     | 7                        | 28              | 16                |
| Something was realized and something was not    | 73                     | 77                       | 72              | 81                |
| Not much has been accomplished from what was planned | 3                      | 16                       | 0               | 3                 |

Source: Search data.
CONCLUSIONS
The study provides an answer to the question about the place of socio-professional identity in the structure of identities of entrepreneurs and leaders. Socio-professional identification changes under the influence of macro- and micro-factors, socio-economic, socio-cultural, and socio-psychological influences. There is a mutual influence of personality, profession, and work. The varying levels of awareness among workers affect the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses of entrepreneurs and leaders. It was found that leaders use the concepts of the “social self” more often than entrepreneurs. The most common components of the “social self” were family affiliations and the “socio-professional self”. For leaders, it is the position and not just the professional affiliation that is important. For entrepreneurs, professionalism comes to the fore with the constant assessment of oneself as a worker.

According to the study results, personal identity is more pronounced in entrepreneurs compared to leaders. It was determined that the defining criterion of socio-professional identification in workers, employees, and specialists is their professional status while for leaders, it is job status and for entrepreneurs, it is professional status and the level of skills. The formation of the socio-professional identification of leaders is predominantly associated with self-identification as a leader-entrepreneur and in entrepreneurs, it is connected to self-identification as a leader-entrepreneur. For small entrepreneurs, the specifics of personal status play an important role. Thus, hypothesis 1 is confirmed: the general trend in self-identification is the prevalence of identification through the “social self” and “personal identity”. Within self-identification through the “social self”, family-related and socio-professional identifications prevail. The socio-professional identification (“socio-professional self”) is more pronounced among entrepreneurs compared to leaders.

With an increase in the level of income (profit), a rise in the awareness of oneself as an entrepreneur (higher prevalence of the “conscious entrepreneur” type) is observed. A high level of financial well-being is one of the most significant criteria for the ideal type of entrepreneur. The obtained results confirm hypothesis 2: the higher is the self-assessed financial status, the more pronounced is the identification. Belonging to the type of “perceived entrepreneur” is affected by the low level of education, as well as the presence of secondary employment. The higher the level of education, the greater is one’s work experience and the stronger the tendency to belong to the type of “conscious leader”. The older the respondents are, the more likely they are to classify themselves as an entrepreneurial type. The absence of an official marriage affects belonging to the “superficial leader” type.

Membership in professional organizations is associated with a reduction in the conscious types. Readiness to change one’s profession affects the types of leaders (since it increases the instability of one’s state which is undesirable for leaders) doubling the share of “superficial leaders” and reducing the proportion of “conscious leaders”. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is confirmed partially and only in leaders. Satisfaction with the results of one’s activity, interest in work, the importance of work, and the realization of competencies (knowledge, abilities, skills) increase the share of conscious types, and these respondents also demonstrate terminal labor motivation. The typological groups lacking stable socio-professional identification see their work as a source of income showing instrumental labor motivation. A negative attitude to the market is most typical for the representatives of the “superficial leader” type while a positive one is characteristic of the “conscious entrepreneur” type, however, the latter type still tends to use any means to achieve their goals.

The most paternalistic-minded type that hopes for help from the state are of the “conscious entrepreneur” type which is characteristic of Russian entrepreneurship. The “conscious leader” type relies more on their own strengths. For “conscious entrepreneurs”, an important characteristic in evaluating the development of one’s socio-professional and personal qualities is courage, while in “superficial entrepreneurs” it is self-confidence, and “conscious leaders” focus more on the ability to organize work. In the “superficial leader” type, the characteristics are combined in a more complex way, although the ability to manage others should be noted especially. We can conclude that hypothesis 4 is confirmed. The respondents’ typological affiliation does affect their perception of success in life. Superficial entrepreneurs and leaders are less satisfied with the overall course of their lives compared to conscious entrepreneurs and leaders.
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A identificação socio-profissional de empreendedores e líderes

La identificación socio-profesional de emprendedores y líderes

Resumo
O artigo é dedicado ao estudo das especificidades e tipos de identificação socioprofissional. A base da pesquisa é formada pelo estudo realizado na cidade de Perm utilizando o método “Quem sou eu?” método que envolveu levantamento de grupos socioprofissionais de empresários e lideranças. Constatou-se que empreendedores e líderes tipicamente se autoidentificam por meio do “self social” e do “self reflexivo”. Comum aos dois tipos de empreendedores em termos de autoidentificação (ter e não ter uma identificação profunda com seu grupo socioprofissional) é a correlação de autoconfiança e capacidade de persuadir os outros. Em líderes com autoidentificação profunda com seu grupo socioprofissional, a autoconfiança se correlaciona com a capacidade de organizar o trabalho, enquanto em líderes sem essa autoidentificação, a autoconfiança se correlaciona com a capacidade de falar com as pessoas. É testado se a autoavaliação da situação financeira de alguém e a pronetão para mudar a esfera de sua atividade influenciam o grau de consciência da identificação socioprofissional e se a identificação socioprofissional afeta a percepção de sucesso na vida.

Palavras-chave: Identidade social. Identificação socio-profissional. Auto-categorização. Empresário. Líder.

Abstract
The article is devoted to the study of the specifics and types of socio-professional identification. The basis for the research is formed by the study conducted in the city of Perm using the “Who am I?” method that involved surveying the socio-professional groups of entrepreneurs and leaders. It was found that entrepreneurs and leaders typically self-identify through the “social self” and “reflexive self”. Common to the two types of entrepreneurs in terms of self-identification (having and not having an in-depth identification with their socio-professional group) is the correlation of self-confidence and the ability to persuade others. In leaders with in-depth self-identification with their socio-professional group, self-confidence correlates with the ability to organize work while in leaders lacking such self-identification, self-confidence correlates with the ability to talk to people. It is tested whether the self-evaluation of one’s financial status and readiness to change the sphere of one’s activity influence the degree of awareness of socio-professional identification and whether socio-professional identification affects the perception of success in life.

Keywords: Social identity. Socio-professional identification. Self-categorization. Entrepreneur. Leader.

Resumen
El artículo está dedicado al estudio de los detalles y tipos de identificación socio-profesional. La base de la investigación está formada por el estudio realizado en la ciudad de Perm utilizando el método “¿Quién soy yo?” que implicó la encuesta a los grupos socio-profesionales de empresarios y líderes. Se encontró que los empresarios y líderes típicamente se autoidentifican a través del “yo social” y el “yo reflexivo”. Común a los dos tipos de emprendedores en términos de autoidentificación (tener y no tener una identificación en profundidad con su grupo socio-profesional) es la correlación de la confianza en sí mismos y la capacidad de persuadir a los demás. En los líderes con autoidentificación profunda con su grupo socio-profesional, la confianza en sí mismo se correlaciona con la capacidad de organizar el trabajo, mientras que en los líderes que carecen de tal autoidentificación, la confianza en sí mismo se correlaciona con la capacidad de hablar con las personas.

Palabras-clave: Identidad social. Identificación socio-profesional. Autocategorización. Empresario. Líder.