TURIZAM
Volume 23, Issue 1
1–16 (2019)
ORIGINAL
SCIENTIFIC PAPER

General Entrepreneurial Aspects of University Students: A Research Among Turkish Universities

Aksu Akin[A], Demir Ayşegül[B], İnak Aydın[C], Mutlu Hayriye[D], Mutlu Yasemin[D]

Received: February 2019 | Accepted: May 2019
DOI: 10.5937/turizam23-18149

Abstract

When general aspects of entrepreneurs were taken into consideration, it can be said that they are close to action, ready to take risk, target oriented, desire of owning his/her own firm and not satisfied with salary-based payments. Generally speaking, entrepreneurs should have basic skills like business management (developing of mission, vision, setting goals, sharing values and motivating people) and human resource management skills. Simply, realizing all human resource management related functions, starting from recruitment of the right person to evaluating personal performance. Despite the fact that universities or academia in general, potentially have huge power in orienting graduates to be entrepreneurs, minimal research results can be found in the related written literature. Still in entrepreneurship education and career development, very little information exists, especially regarding motivation levels, behaviors or characteristics of students or graduates. Thusly, in this study, the general entrepreneurial aspects of university students were investigated by using innovativeness, determination, desire for achievement, ingenuity, independence and self-confidence entrepreneurial dimensions. The sample consisted of totally 1512 university students from 8 different universities in Turkey.

Key words: *Entrepreneurship, University Students, Antalya, Turkey*

Introduction

The developing aspect of world economy (except crises) year by year, the meaning of international/national activities by owners, while managing their businesses, in other words (entrepreneurship) (Nazri et al., 2016) increases. According to Mohamad et al., (2014)entrepreneurship involves all trade related risks while trying to reach a profit. Citing Abu-Saifan (2012), Alsharief, El-Gohary (2016) mentioned Schumpeter's (1934) definion as: entrepreneur is an innovator who carries out entrepreneurial change.

[A] Akdeniz University Faculty of Tourism, Antalya, Turkey, Corresponding Author, e-mail:aaksu@akdeniz.edu.tr
[B] Akdeniz University Social Sciences Institute, Antalya, Turkey
[C] Nevşehir HBV University Social Sciences Institute Nevşehir, Turkey
[D] Erciyes University Social Sciences Institute Kayseri, Turkey

Not only individuals or academicians, goverments are also trying to increase and understand the increasing numbers of entrepreneurs in the world. The main reason behind this attempt is entrepreneurship means creation of new jobs and opportunities for communities and supports economical (Lim et al., 2012) and social development. A possible positive relationship between entrepreneurship and economic growth was underlined by Paladan (2015). Citing Behave (1994), Uddin, Bose (2012) who stated that with the help of entrepreneurship, it is possible for new markets and industries to emerge. Even universities and academic institutions (Zaman, 2013) give their full support to the increase in the total number of entrepreneurs by availing them of entrepreneurship related courses.

Understanding, the greater importance of human resources over unstructured activities, communities and goverments started to focus on entreprenurial related education that supports human beings (Gilaninia et al., 2013). Nowadays, goverments give lots of different kinds of support to entrepreneurs, ranging from financial aid, to tax breaks (Lim et al., 2012). In other words, entreprenuership can be named as one of the most important strategies fostering the economic growth of countries (Paladan, 2015).

When the general aspects of entrepreneurs are taken into consideration,it can be said that, they are close to the action, ready to take risk, target oriented (Kumara, Sahasranam, 2009), desire owning his/her own firm and not satisfied with salary-based payments (Wu, Wu, 2008). In fact, entrepreneurial aspects can be classified as individual and functional qualifications, as well as the social and economic conditions of countries. Being proactive rather than reactive and close to innovation are some examples of individual qualificiations. Giving effort towards goals and level of vision sharing with the team members can be evaluated within functional qualifications (Paladan, 2015). According to the results of Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Research, there is a correlation between economical indicators (country growth rate etc.) and entrepreneurial attempts (Wu, Wu, 2008).

In general, entrepreneurs should have basic skills, like business management (developing a mission, vision, setting goals, sharing values and motivating people) and human resource management skills (Lim et al., 2012). Simply, realizing all human resource management related functions, starting from recruitment of the right person for the job, to evaluating personal performance. Besides having the relevant skills, demographic characteristics of entrepreneurs (age, gender, education levels, sectorial experience etc.) also should be taken into consideration (Sajilan et al., 2015). Entrepreneurs mostly realize original things. In a way they convert their dreams and ideas into real goods/ services (Arasteh et al., 2012).

According to some research results, childhood periods of people, also play an important role in entreprenuerial tendencies. For example, citing Dyer (1992), Ishiguro (2015) self-employed parents are more likely to orient their children to be entrepreneuers. In a way, receiving home education by parents towards being an entrepreneur forms career plans of children (Lee et al., 2006).

Sometimes, the number of entreprenuers and type differences in countries may shape future entrepreneurs (Lee et al., 2006) or the cultural values of countries may have an effect on entrepreneurial attempts (Being closer to risk taking or not) (Pruett et al., 2009). Oftenly cited in written literature; need for achievement, locus of control, risk taking, tolerance of ambiguity, self-confidence and innovativeness are the most effective psychological factors affecting entrepreneurs (Lim et al., 2012). Related is a need of achievement, it can be stated that having a high level of desire to be successful may orient people to be an entrepreneur in the future (Koh,1996). Citing Strauser et al., (2002), Sesen (2013) has underlined that locus of control means the beliefs of people regarding the factors controlling their life. In addition to these,

naturally it is expected from entrepreneurs to be ready in taking more risks while managing their firms. While most of the people want to have enough information and clear work environments, entrepreneurs have more tolerance of ambiguities (Güney, Nurmakhamatuly, 2007). At the same time, it will be normal to see enough self-confidence and a more proactive and innovative thinking style in entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurial Tendencies of University Students

In recent years, there is increasing interest among students in being entrepreneurs instead of receiving routine monthly wages (Schwarz et al., 2009). In this context, while transfering applicable knowledge, universities and academia play important roles in orienting students or graduates towards entrepreneuership. Without transfering needed knowledge (Soleimanpour et al., (2014), it is not possible to see more entrepreneurs around. In order to decrease unemployment rates of post-graduates, academia are urged to give applicable entrepreneur related courses to their students (Fard et al., 2013). Despite the popularity of American Universities regarding entrepreneurship education in the world, the pionnering university is Kobe University (Keat et al., 2011).

Students or graduates, in other words, young people like more indepence and more prone to take risks than older ones(Izedonmi, Okafor, 2010).In addition to this, the help of right orientation coming from academia will increase their entrepreneurial behavior (Davey et al.,2011). Citing, Franke, Lüthje (2004), Sesen (2013) stated that inadequate support of academia decreases entrepreneurship tendencies of students or graduates. In fact, with prompt and positive support coming from academia, in addition to, right skills and motivation, students and graduates will easily realize productive results (Mohamad et al., 2014).

The quality and quantity of programmes offered at universities becomes important and especially entrepreneurship related knowledge must adjust to sectorial realities. Citing Heinonen, Poikkijoki (2006), Paladan (2015) mentioned the importance of offering right teaching techniques to students, covering knowledge starting from discovery to evaluation of apparent opportunities. Besides, Mahajar, Yunus (2012) underlined the possible positive support of universities in increasing the positive image of entrepreneurship, when planning the student's future.

Despite the fact that universities and academia in general, potentially have huge power in orienting graduates to be entrepreneurs, minimal research results can be found in the related literature. Still, in entrepreneurship education and career relations, very little information exists, especially regarding motivation levels, behaviors or characteristics of students or graduates (Duval-Couetil et al., 2014). Prior studies mostly concentrated on broader factors than education and career selection (Wu, Wu, 2008). Citing Shinnar et al., (2009), Duval-Couetil et al., (2014) they stated that a research on the potential demand of 317 undergraduate students, showed that more than half of nonbusiness majors, had an interest in taking an entrepreneurship course and only 8 per cent had plan to start up a business. Referencing Henderson, Robertson(2000), Mohamad et al., (2014) mentioned that effective entrepreneurship education should orient students towards an entreprenurship related career. Citing Babaee et al. (2010), Soleimanpour et al., (2014) stated that according to a study in Distance Education University and girl students in Iran, the family's, specificly the mother's, higher education levels, orient their dauughters more towards entrepreneurship. In addition to these, Omar, Nazri (2016) underlined OECD Report, which is showing entrepreneurship tendency differences among differ-

ent countries, after receiving entrepreneurship related education. Besides, existence of financial support is also important for students. Referencing Akpomi (2008), Asuamah et al., (2013) underlined that a research among 500 final year business/management students in Nigeria, showed that only 12.4% of them want to open their own companies because of a lack of capital.

Research Methodology

As it can be seen from written literature, regarding general entrepreneurship aspects or tendencies of students, the number of academic studies are too limited. Due to this limitation, in this study, the general entrepreneurial aspects of university students were investigated by using innovativeness, determination, desire for achievement, ingenuity, independence and self-confidence entrepreneurship dimensions. The scale which was used in this study was taken from the Solmaz et al., (2014) study. The sample consisted of a total of 1512 university students from 8 different universities in Turkey. In order to keep the names secret, all sampled universities were coded starting from A to H.In other words; A symbolized the university in Antalya, B symbolized the university in Ankara, Csymbolized the university in Sakarya, Dsymbolized the university in Mersin, Esymbolized the university in Antep, F symbolized the university in Samsun, G symbolized the university in Konya and H symbolized the university in Nevşehir.

For validity of the scale, factor analysis and for reliability, Cronbach Alpha values were taken into consideration. Additionally, arithmetic mean and standard deviation values of entrepreneurship scale and dimensions were given in tables. Lastly, t-test and Anova tests were done in order to show the diffferences of entrepreneurship levels of university students. A simple random sampling technique was used for the sample. The research was conducted between April and May 2017.

Findings and Discussion

When the distribution of the university students participating in the research is examined (See Table: 1), it is seen that 50.9% (n = 769) of the 1512 undergraduate students are male and 49.1% (n = 743) of the students are female. When the distribution of the university students by their age is considered, it is seen that most of them are between the ages of 20 - 22 (n = 863; 57.1%). At the same time, 22.8% (n = 344) of the students who participated in the research were between the ages of 23 - 25; 15.7% (n = 237) were between 17 and 19 years of age; and 4.5% (n = 68) were over 26 years of age. When the distribution of the students according to the departments they read was examined, it was seen that 58.6% (n = 886) of the majority of the students were composed of the students in the Tourism Management Department. 21.2% (n = 321) Gastronomy and Culinary Arts; 13.1% (n = 198) of Tourism Guidance; 7.1% (n = 107) were composed of Recreation Management students. When the data on the classes of the participants were examined, it was seen that most of them were composed of 3rd grade students (n = 541, 35.8%). 22.0% (n = 332) 2nd grade; 20.2% (n = 306) 4th grade; and 16.9% (n = 256) were the first year students. In addition, it is seen that a considerable amount of students (n = 77; 5.1%) did not finish their faculties in normal time and extended their faculties.

It is seen that most of the students who participated in the research were 44.4% (n = 671) of the professions they wanted to work in after they graduated and they wanted to work in the private sector. In addition to this, 29% (n = 439) of university students stated that they will be

self-employed, 24.4% (n = 368) will work in public sector and 2.2% (n = 34) will work in family business. When research statistics is considered, it is seen that 36.5% (n = 552) of the fathers of the university students were working in the private sector. This is followed by 27%, 7 (n = 419) the fathers of students are self-employed, 19.1% (n=289) whose fathers work in the public sector and then 16.7% (n=252) fathers who are retired or do not actively work. In addition to this, when the occupation of the mothers of university students are examined, the results show that 73.1% (n = 1105) the majority of mothers who are retired or do not actively work any other business. The other mothers 11.7% (n = 177) in the private sector, followed by 8.7% (n = 132) in the public sector, and then 6.5% (n = 98) are working in their own workplace.

When the monthly income of the families of the university students participating in the research is examined, the income of the families is 45% (n = 680) mostly between 2001 - 4000 TL. Besides the monthly income of the families 28% (n = 424) 0 - 2000 TL, 19.6% (n = 296) were between 4001-6000 TL and 7.4% (n = 112) are more than 6001 TL. When the monthly expenditures of related university students are examined, while 33.1% of the students (n = 500) spend between 501 - 750 TL, 26.9% (n = 406) between 0 - 500 TL, 22.6% (n = 341) between 751-1000 TL and 17.5% (n = 265) spend 1001 TL and over. Research subject university students, question about whether there are any other entrepreneurs in their families, 72% (n = 1088) while a clear majority stated that there was no other entrepreneur in their families, 28% (n = 424) stated that they had another entrepreneur in their family.

The majority of the participants in the research consist of "A" university students 21.5% (n=325) and "H" university students 18.1% (n = 274). Besides, the students 12.3% (n = 186) participated in research from "G" university, 11.6% (n = 175) were from "D" university, 9.7% (n = 147) were from "F" university, 9.3 (n = 140) from "C" university, 8.9% (n = 135) from "B" university and 8.6% (n = 130) from "E" university.

Table 1. *The Demographic Characteristics of Students Attending the Research*

	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	769	50,9
Female	743	49,1
Total	1512	100
Age		
17-19	237	15,7
20-22	863	57,1
23-25	344	22,8
26 and above	68	4,5
Total	1512	100
Department		
Tourism Management	886	58,6
Tourism Guidance	198	13,1
Gastronomy and Culinary Arts	321	21,2
Recreation Management	107	7,1
Total	1512	100
Class		
1. Class	256	16,9
2. Class	332	22,0
3. Class	541	35,8
4. Class	306	20,2
4+ Class	77	5,1
Total	1512	100

	Number (n)	Percentage (%)
Occupational Group where Students like to Work after Graduation		
Public Sector	368	24,4
Private Sector	671	44,4
Family Business	34	2,2
Self-employed	439	29,0
Total	1512	100
The Occupation of Father		
Not Working / Retired	252	16,7
Has Self-Owned Workplace	419	27,7
Working in the Public Sector	289	19,1
Working in Private Sector	552	36,5
Total	1512	100
The Occupation of Mother		
Not Working / Retired	1105	73,1
Has Self-Owned Workplace	98	6,5
Working in the Public Sector	132	8,7
Working in Private Sector	177	11,7
Total	1512	100
Monthly Family Income (TL)		
0-2000	424	28,0
2001-4000	680	45,0
4001-6000	296	19,6
6001 and above	112	7,4
Total	1512	100
Monthly Expense Amount (TL)		
0-500	406	26,9
501-750	500	33,1
751-1000	341	22,6
1001 and above	265	17,5
Total	1512	100
Another Entrepreneur in Family		
Yes	424	28,0
No	1088	72,0
Total	1512	100
The Name of Universities		
"A" University	325	21,5
"B" University	135	8,9
"C" University	140	9,3
"D" University	175	11,6
"E" University	130	8,6
"F" University	147	9,7
"G" University	186	12,3
"H" University	274	18,1
Total	1512	100

When the answers of the students regarding the desire for achievement dimension of entrepreneurship is examined (See Table 2), generally high averages are encountered (mean= 4,02; std. deviation= 0,71). Besides university students have participated in these issues at a high level; *I do not like to be defeated, never give up* (mean= 4,10), *while racing I always think of winning* (mean=4,17), *I try to do my best in all works* (mean= 4,16), *competing with others reflects my style* (mean=3,43) *and since I feel achievement happiness very intensive in my inside, I do my work with heart and soul* (mean=4,23).

When the answers given by the students concerning the determination dimension of entrepreneurship is considered, there is again a high average in general (mean=4,30; std. deviation=0,63).To measure the level of determination presented to students such statements; *I like to help people* (mean=4,43), *I like to socialize with people* (mean=4,13), *I will never leave the work I started, I will follow it to the end* (mean =4,16), *if I promise to do something, I will definitely do it* (ort=4,44) *and if I decide to do something and if I have the opportunity to do it, I never stop, do it immediately* (mean=4,37) students joined at a high level. That is to say, the students stated that they are intent on about entrepreneurship.

The other dimension of entrepreneurship is the ingenuity dimension related answers still have a high average (mean= 4,07; std. deviation= 0,64). Besides this, university students such matters; *I can produce original opinion and thoughts that can solve the existing problems* (mean=4,06), *I can design new product and services for future customer trends* (mean=3,80), *I have the ability to capture opportunities for the future* (mean=3,95) *and if I were a boss in a workplace, I listen to my employees who have new ideas and projects* (mean=4,46) they have a high average and they expressed that they are ingenious.

When the responses of the students as to the innovation dimension of entrepreneurship is examined as it is generally found in other dimensions, there are also high averages at this dimension (mean = 4,41; std. deviation = 0,64). *People should create a synthesis by listening to different ideas* (mean = 4,36), *humans should be open to all ideas* (mean=4,41), *I should gain new experiences in life* (mean = 4,51) *and for the birth of new ideas, there is needed to be involved* (mean = 4,37) at such topics students have high averages. In other words, the students expressed that they are innovative about entrepreneurship.

When the answers of the students respecting the final dimension of entrepreneurship, independence and self-confidence dimension is considered, in general again a high average is encountered (mean=4,04; std. deviation= 0,71). Students, I do not refrain from being different (mean=4,19), *if I really believe in a work I do, I do it without hearing the words around me* (mean=4,23), *I cannot admit that someone plays a leading role in my life* (ort=3,87) *and if the people around me tell I'm up to empty something, I don't listen to them* (mean=3,88) gave answers with high averages at this matters. They indicated that they could be independent and had a high level of self-confidence.

The answers to the questions directed to the students to measure the general entrepreneurship (mean=4,17; std. deviation= 0,50) characteristics of university students have high averages. Namely, we can say that the students who are subject to research have high desire for achievement, high determination, ingenuity, innovativeness, independence and self-confidence and that these students have high spirit of entrepreneurship.

Table 2. *Arithmetic Mean and Standard Deviation Values of Entrepreneurship Scale and Dimensions*

	Arithmetic Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation (Sd)
GENERAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP	4,17	0,50
Desire of Achievement	4,02	0,71
1. I do not like to be defeated, never give up.	4,10	0,99
2. While racing I always think of winning.	4,17	0,91
3. I try to do my best in all works.	4,16	0,89
4. Competing with others reflects my style.	3,43	1,13
5. Since I feel achievement happiness very intensive in my inside, I do my work with heart and soul.	4,23	0,87

	Arithmetic Mean ($\bar{X}$)	Standard Deviation (Sd)
Determination	4,30	0,63
6. I like to help people.	4,43	0,81
7. I like to socialize with people.	4,13	0,94
8. I will never leave the work I started, I will follow it to the end.	4,16	0,89
9. If I promise to do something, I will definitely do it.	4,44	0,79
10. If I decide to do something and if I have the opportunity to do it, I never stop, do it immediately.	4,37	0,82
Ingenuity	4,07	0,64
11. I can produce original opinion and thoughts that can solve the existing problems.	4,06	0,83
12. I can design new product and services for future customer trends.	3,80	0,93
13. I have the ability to capture opportunities for the future.	3,95	0,85
14. If I were a boss in a workplace, I listen to my employees who have new ideas and projects.	4,46	0,76
Innovativeness	4,41	0,64
15. People should create a synthesis by listening to different ideas.	4,36	0,82
16. Human should be open to all ideas.	4,41	0,86
17. I should gain new experiences in life.	4,51	0,74
18. For the birth of new ideas, there is needed to be involved.	4,37	0,79
Independence and Self-confidence	4,04	0,71
19. I do not refrain from being different.	4,19	0,91
20. If I really believe in a work I do, I do it without hearing the words around me.	4,23	0,93
21. I cannot admit that someone plays a leading role in my life.	3,87	1,07
22. If the people around me tell I'm up to empty something, I don't listen to them.	3,88	1,06

When the entrepreneurship level factor table (Table 3) is examined, it is seen that the factor with the highest explanatory power is "innovativeness" and the factor with the lowest explanatory power is "independence and self-confidence". Table 3 also shows the reliability analysis results of the entrepreneurial level scale. In this context, for the scale of entrepreneurship level created within the research a reliability analysis was conducted. Accordingly, the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship level scale, reliability coefficient of innovativeness, Alpha (α)=0,81; reliability coefficient of determination, Alpha (α)=0,79; reliability coefficient of desire for achievement, Alpha (α)=0,73; reliability coefficient of ingenuity, Alpha(α)= 0,75; reliability coefficient of independence and self-confidence is Alpha (α)= 0,68. The reliability coefficient of the general entrepreneurship level scale is identified as Alpha (α) = 0.89.

Table 3. *Validity and Reliability Analysis Results of Entrepreneurship Scale*

Factor 1: Innovativeness	
Alpha (α)= 0,81 %; Variance: 15,038	Factor Loading
People should create a synthesis by listening to different ideas.	0,769
Humans should be open to all ideas.	0,768
I should gain new experiences in life.	0,706
For the birth of new ideas, there is a need to be involved.	0,639
Factor 2: Determination	
Alpha (α)= 0,79 %; Variance: 13,720	Factor Loading
I will never leave the work I started, I will follow it to the end.	0,701
If I promise to do something, I will definitely do it.	0,679
I like to help people.	0,635
If I decide to do something and if I can do it, I never stop, to do it immediately.	0,629
I like to socialize with people.	0,625
Factor 3: Desire for Achievement	
Alpha (α)= 0,73 %; Variance: 12,129	Factor Loading
While racing I always think of winning.	0,753
Competing with others reflects my style.	0,742
I do not like to be defeated, never give up.	0,699
I try to do my best in all works.	0,697
Since I feel achievement happiness very intensive in my inside, I do my work with heart and soul.	0,493
Factor 4: Ingenuity	
Alpha (α)= 0,75 %; Variance: 10,049	Factor Loading
I can design new product and services for future customer trends.	0,806
I can produce original opinion and thoughts that can solve the existing problems.	0,736
I have the ability to capture opportunities for the future.	0,730
If I were a boss in a workplace, I listen to my employees who have new ideas and projects.	0,691
Factor 5: Independence and Self-confidence	
Alpha (α)= 0,68 %; Variance: 8,971	Factor Loading
I cannot admit that someone plays a leading role in my life.	0,776
If the people around me negate my ideas, I don't listen to them.	0,707
If I really believe in a work I do, I do it without hearing the words around me.	0,646
I do not refrain from being different.	0,404
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy: ,924 Approx. Chi-Square : 11973,788 df : 231 Sig.: ,000	
General Entrepreneurship Scale Alpha (α)= 0,89	

The level of entrepreneurship measured by 22 expressions in the survey form was subjected to factor analysis. As a result of the analysis,5 factors with 59,907 % explanatory variables were reached. The first factor explains 15,038 % of the total variance, the second factor 13,720 % of the total variance, the third factor 12,129 % of the total variance, the fourth factor 10,049 % of the total variance and the fifth factor 8,971 % of the total variance. Factors obtained:

- FACTOR 1: Innovativeness

- FACTOR 2: Determination
- FACTOR 3: Desire for Achievement
- FACTOR 4: Ingenuity
- FACTOR 5: Independence and Self-confidence

As seen in Table 4, 'T' test was implemented to determine whether the arithmetic mean of the dimensions of entrepreneurship level showed a significant difference by the gender of the university students. Because of the independent group 't' test, the difference between need for achievement (t= 5,134; p<.05) and ingenuity (t=2,448; p<.05) dimensions by the gender of the university students was found to be statistically significant.

Table 4. *The t-Test and Results of the Differences of Entrepreneurship Levels of University Students by Gender Variable*

Demographic Feature	Dependent Variable	Groups	Art. Mean	Std. Dev.	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t	df	Sig.
						F	Sig.			
Gender	Entrepreneurship	Male Female	4,19 4,14	,536 ,480	Equal Not equal	1,447	,229	1,781 1,784	1510 1501,501	0,075
	Desire for Achievement	Male Female	4,1 3,92	,736 ,678	Equal Not equal	1,021	,313	5,127 5,134	1510 1506,598	0,000
	Determination	Male Female	4,31 4,30	,636 ,627	Equal Not equal	0,650	,420	0,157 0,157	1510 1509,382	0,876
	Innovativeness	Male Female	4,38 4,44	,663 ,626	Equal Not equal	2,045	,153	-1,946 -1,948	1510 1508,131	0,052
	Ingenuity	Male Female	4,11 4,03	,673 ,605	Equal Not equal	2,996	,084	2,444 2,448	1510 1501,023	0,014
	Independence and Self-confidence	Male Female	4,04 4,04	,734 ,693	Equal Not equal	2,146	,143	-0,008 -0,008	1510 1506,102	0,994

As can be seen in Table 5, because of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether the entrepreneurship levels of university students show a meaningful difference by the variable of the occupational group to be studied after graduation, it is found that the level of entrepreneurship ($F_{3\text{-}1508}$= 3,446; p<05) differs in terms of occupation group preferred after graduation. After this process, it is necessary to determine which selected profession group resulted in a significant difference determined after ANOVA. To decide which multiple comparison technique should be used after the ANOVA analysis, the hypothesis was that the variances of the group distributions are homogeneous. When the Levene's test was run the (variances (p<.05) were not homogeneous) information was revealed. For this reason Taman's T2 multiple comparison test was preferred. According to the test results, the differences between the entrepreneurship levels of the university students and the preferences of the professional group to be worked after graduation are meaningful (p<.05). Students who want to work in the family business after graduation ($\bar{x}$=3,92) can be said to have a lower entrepreneurship level than the students, who wanted to work in the public sector ($\bar{x}$=4,17), the private sector ($\bar{x}$=4,16) and who wanted to set up their own business ($\bar{x}$=4,20).

Table 5. *One-Way ANOVA Test and Results Showing the Difference of Entrepreneurship Levels of University Students by the Variable of the Occupational Group Wanted to Work After Graduation*

Entrepreneurship Level			Descriptive Statistics			
			Occupation	N	Mean	s.s.
			Public Sector Private Sector Family Business Self-employed	368 671 34 439	4,17 4,16 3,92 4,20	0,45 0,50 0,72 0,54
Entrepreneurship Level	Variance Source	s.d.	Sum of Squares	Squares Mean	F	Sig.
	Intergroup	3	2,673	,891	3,446	**0,016**
	In-group	1508	389,903	,259		
	Total	1511	392,576			
Multiple Comparisons Entrepreneurship Level Tamhane's T2 Test						
Public Sector			Private Sector Family Business Self-employed		0,01596 0,24792* -0,03135	0,963 **0,033** 0,819
Private Sector			Public Sector Family Business Self-employed		-0,01596 0,23196* -0,04731	0,963 **0,047** 0,428
Family Business			Public Sector Private Sector Self-employed		-0,24792* -0,23196* -0,27926*	**0,033** **0,047** **0,011**
Self-employed			Public Sector Private Sector Family Business		0,03135 0,04731 0,27926*	0,819 0,428 **0,011**

As seen in Table 6, T-test was conducted to determine whether the university students' entrepreneurship levels showed a significant difference from the arithmetic mean of their families in terms of whether they had other entrepreneur family members. Because of the independent group 't' test, it was found that the level of entrepreneurship (t = 2,680; p <.05) was different in terms of the presence of other entrepreneurs in their families.

Table 6. *The t-Test and Results of the Differences of Entrepreneurship Levels of University Students by Another Entrepreneur Variable in the Family*

Demographic Feature	Dependent Variable	Groups	Art. Mean	Std. Dev.	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t	df	Sig.
						F	Sig.			
Another Entrepreneur in Family	Entrepreneurship Level	Yes No	4,22 4,15	,500 ,512	Equal Not equal	,720	,396	2,652 2,680	1510 788,052	0,008

As can be seen in Table 7,because of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to determine whether the entrepreneurship levels of university students show a meaningful difference by the variable of the university where they studied, it is found that the level of entrepreneurship ($F_{7\text{-}1507}$= 7,646; p<05) differs in terms of the university where they studied. After this process, it is necessary to determine which selected university group resulted with a significant difference, determined after Novato decide which multiple comparison technique should be used after the ANOVA analysis, the hypothesis that the variances of the group dis-

tributions are homogeneous with the Levene's test was tested and (variances (p<.05) were not homogeneous) information discovered. For this reason Taman's T2 multiple comparison test was preferred.

According to the test results, the differences between the entrepreneurship levels of the university students and the preferences of the university where they studied are meaningful (p<.05). According to the analysis results the most remarkable high point is that "F" university students ($\bar{x}$=4,35) should have a higher level of entrepreneurship than "A" university ($\bar{x}$=4,16), "E" university ($\bar{x}$=4,14), "D" university ($\bar{x}$=4,10), "B" university ($\bar{x}$=4,09) and "G" university ($\bar{x}$=4,01) students.

Because of the analysis the other results are as follows; The entrepreneurship level of the students of "A" university ($\bar{x}$ = 4,16) was lower than the students of "F" university ($\bar{x}$ = 4,35) but higher than "G" university students ($\bar{x}$ = 4,01).The entrepreneurship level of "B" university students ($\bar{x}$= 4,09) and "D" university students ($\bar{x}$ = 4,10) was lower than "H" university students ($\bar{x}$ = 4,25) and "F" university students ($\bar{x}$ = 4,35). It is seen that the level of entrepreneurship of the students of "C" university ($\bar{x}$ = 4,21) is higher than the students of "G" university ($\bar{x}$ = 4,01). It is seen that "E" university students ($\bar{x}$ = 4,14) have a lower level of entrepreneurship than "F" University students ($\bar{x}$= 4.35). It is seen that the level of entrepreneurship of the students of "G" University ($\bar{x}$=4,01) is lower than the students of "F" university ($\bar{x}$=4,35), "H" university ($\bar{x}$=4,25), "C" university ($\bar{x}$=4,21) and "A" university ($\bar{x}$=4,16). Finally, it can be said that "H" university students ($\bar{x}$=4,25) have a higher level of entrepreneurship than "D" university students ($\bar{x}$=4,10), "B" university students ($\bar{x}$=4,09) and "G" university students ($\bar{x}$=4,01).

Table 7. *One-Way ANOVA Test and Results Showing the Difference of Entrepreneurship Levels of University Students by the Variable of the University where They Studied*

Entrepreneurship Level			Descriptive Statistics			
			University	N	Mean	s.s.
			"A" University	325	4,16	0,49
			"B" University	135	4,09	0,65
			"C" University	140	4,21	0,52
			"D" University	175	4,10	0,59
			"E" University	130	4,14	0,40
			"F" University	147	4,35	0,44
			"G" University	186	4,01	0,52
			"H" University	274	4,25	0,39
Entrepreneurship Level	Variance Source	s.d.	Sum of Squares	Squares Mean	F	Sig.
	Intergroup	7	13,490	1,927	7,646	**0,000**
	In-group	1507	379,086	,252		
	Total	1511	392,576			

Multiple Comparisons Entrepreneurship Level Tamhane's T2 Test			
"A" University	"B" University	0,07036	0,871
	"C" University	-0,05243	0,969
	"D" University	0,06378	0,877
	"E" University	0,02453	1,000
	"F" University	-0,18918*	**0,004**
	"G" University	0,15014*	**0,026**
	"H" University	-0,09034	0,356
"B" University	"A" University	-0,07036	0,871
	"C" University	-0,12279	0,463
	"D" University	-0,00659	1,000
	"E" University	-0,04583	0,996
	"F" University	-0,25955*	**0,000**
	"G" University	0,07978	0,855
	"H" University	-0,16070*	**0,049**
"C" University	"A" University	0,05243	0,969
	"B" University	0,12279	0,463
	"D" University	0,11621	0,454
	"E" University	0,07696	0,914
	"F" University	-0,13675	0,291
	"G" University	0,20258*	**0,008**
	"H" University	-0,03791	0,996
"D" University	"A" University	-0,06378	0,877
	"B" University	0,00659	1,000
	"C" University	-0,11621	0,454
	"E" University	-0,03925	0,998
	"F" University	-0,25296*	**0,000**
	"G" University	0,08637	0,730
	"H" University	-0,15411*	**0,033**
"E" University	"A" University	-0,02453	1,000
	"B" University	0,04583	0,996
	"C" University	-0,07696	0,914
	"D" University	0,03925	0,998
	"F" University	-0,21371*	**0,010**
	"G" University	0,12562	0,359
	"H" University	-0,11487	0,384
"F" University	"A" University	0,18918*	**0,004**
	"B" University	0,25955*	**0,000**
	"C" University	0,13675	0,291
	"D" University	0,25296*	**0,000**
	"E" University	0,21371*	**0,010**
	"G" University	0,33933*	**0,000**
	"H" University	0,098885	0,533
"G" University	"A" University	-0,15014*	**0,026**
	"B" University	-0,07978	0,855
	"C" University	-0,20258*	**0,008**
	"D" University	-0,08637	0,730
	"E" University	-0,12562	0,359
	"F" University	-0,33933*	**0,000**
	"H" University	-0,24048*	**0,000**
"H" University	"A" University	0,09034	0,356
	"B" University	0,16070*	**0,049**
	"C" University	0,03791	0,996
	"D" University	0,15411*	**0,033**
	"E" University	0,11487	0,384
	"F" University	-0,09885	0,533
	"G" University	0,24048*	**0,000**

Conclusions and Suggestions

Regarding the entrepreneurial dimensions, sampled university students have high averages for desire for achievement, determination, ingenuity, innovativeness, independence and self-confidence dimensions. In this context, sampled universities must support their students by enabling right programmes, conditions and orientations.

According to entrepreneurship level factor table (Table 3), the factor with the highest explanatory power is "innovativeness" and the lowest is "independence and self-confidence". This result parallels Turkey's conditions. Being innovative is okey but, sampled university students (may be because of their culture) need orientation and coaching during and after their graduation periods. This result must be taken into consideration by both university and sector representatives and goverment. Without needed precautions, sampled university students may face problems in the near future.

As a result of an independent group's 't' test, their findings revealed that male students have more will to succeed and ingenuity than female students. The reason for this is thought to be, that men, as it related to their business life, feel pressured by the absolute success expectations of their family and society. Especially in Turkish Culture, more success and effort is expected from males than females.

According to the results of the analysis, it can be said that the students who have other entrepreneurs in their family ($\overline{x}$ = 4.22) have a greater entrepreneurship level than the students who do not have other entrepreneurs in the family ($\overline{x}$ = 4.15). In a way, it can be stated that the existence of other entrepreneurs in a family may act as a role model for their offspring.

When the distribution of the sample university students according to the departments was examined, it was seen that 58.6% (n = 886) of the majority of the students were composed of the Tourism Management Department. In other words, the research results mostly reflect their paradigm.

Limitations of the Research

Like all research, this research has some limitations. First, despite the sizeable sample capacity (1512 university students), future studies could be carried out with greater samples. Second, all results were based on replies from sampled university students, with no other verification.

References

Abu-Saifan, S. 2012. Social Entrepreneurship: Definition and Boundaries. *Technology Innovation Management Review* 2 (2), found at www.timreview.ca/article/523: (6.2.2016).

Akpomi, E.M. 2008. Entrepreneurship Among Graduates-to-be of Business/Management Faculties and Economic Development in Nigeria., *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences* 14, 52-60.

Alsharief, R.Y., El-Gohary, H. 2016.Entrepreneurship Education and Employability of Arab HE Business Students: An Attempt for a Primary Investigation. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 7(2), 52-72.

Arastech, H., Enayati, T., Zameni, F., Khademloo, A. 2012. Entrepreneurial Personality Characteristics of University Students: A Case Study. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences* 46, 5736-5740.

Asuamah, S.Y., Kwarteng, E., Awuah, J.B. 2013. An Assessment of Entrepreneurship Intention Among Sunyani Polytechnic Marketing Students. *International Review of Management and Marketing* 3(1), 37-49.

Babaee, E., Kamarzarin, H., Fathi, K. 2010. A Study on Relationship Between Individual Profile of Entrepreneuership and Personal Profile Among the Girl Students in Distance Education Universities (P.N.U.) in Iran. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 8(1), 25-27.

Behave, M.P. 1994. A Process Model of Entrepreneurial Venture Creation. Journal of Business Venturing 9, 223-249.

Davey, T., Plewa, C., Struwig, M. 2011. Entrepreneurship Perceptions and Career Intentions of International Students. *Education + Training* 53(5), 335-352.

Dyer, W.G.Jr. 1992. *The Entrepreneurial Experience: Confronting Career Dilemmas of the Start-Up Executive,* CA: Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.

Duval-Couetil, N., Gotch, C., Yi, S. 2014. The Characteristics and Motivations of Contemporary Entreprenuership Students., *Journal of Education For Business* 89, 441-449.

Fard, F.M., Dehghan, S.A., Lotfian, A., Salehi, L. 2013. Analysis of Factors Affecting the Development of an Entrepreneurial Student. *International Journal of Advanced Biological and Biomedical Research* 1(3), 246-259.

Franke N., Lüthje,C. 2004. Entrepreneurial Intentions of Business Students: A Benchmarking Study. *International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management* 1(3), 269-288.

Gilaninia, S., Reza, H.A., Yaghoub, T. 2013. Effective Factors on Students' Entrepreneurial Intent of Islamic Azad University of Rasht Branch. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 5(5), 317-331.

Güney, S, Nurmakhamatuly, A. 2007. Enterprise and A Cross-Cultural Research Upon University Students of Kazakhstan and Turkey With Regards to Their Enterprising Capabilities. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* 10(18), 62-86.

Heinonen,J. Poikkijoki, S. 2006. An Entrepreneurial-Directed Approach to Entrepreneurship Education: Mission Impossible? *Journal of Management Development* 25(1), 80-94.

Henderson,R., Robertson,M. 2000. Who Wants To Be An Entrepreneur? Young Adult Attitudes to Entrepreneurship As A Career. *Career Development International* 5(6), 279-287.

Ishiguro, J.2015. What Influences Entrepreneurial Career Choice?: An Exploratory Analysis of the Sally Caird's Get 2 for Japanese High School Students. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal* 21(1), 44-57.

Izedonmi, P.F., Okafor,C. 2010. The Effect of Entrepreneurship education on Students' Entrepreneurial Intentions. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research* 10(6), 49-60.

Keat, O.Y., Selvarajah, C., Meyer, D. 2011. Inclination Towards Entrepreneurship Among University Students: An Empirical Study of Malaysian University Students. *International Journal of Business and Social Science* 2(4), 206-220.

Koh, H.C. 1996. Testing Hypottheses of Entrepreneurial Characteristics. *Journal of Managerial Psychology* 11(3), 12-25.

Kumara, S.A.V, Sahasranam,C. 2009. Entrepreneurial Characteristics Among Business Management Students: An Empirical Study. *The Icfaian Journal of Management Research* 8(6), 7-29.

Lee, S.M., Lim, S-B., Pathak, R.D., Chang, D., Li, W. 2006.Influences on Students Attitudes Toward Entrepreneurship: A Multi-Country Study. *Entrepreneurship Mgt* 2, 351-366.

Lim, Y.M., Lee, T.H., Cheng, B.L. 2012.Entrepreneurial Inclination Among Business Students A Malaysian Study. *The South East Asian Journal of Management* 6(2), 113-127.

Mahajar, A.J.B.,Yunus, J.B.M. 2012. Inclination Towards Entrepreneurship Among Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris Students. *The Journal of Global Business Management* 8(2), 248-256.

Mohamad, N., Lim, H-E., Yusof, N., Kassim, M. Abdullah, H. 2014. Estimating the Choice of Entrepreneurship as a Career: The Case of University Utara Malaysia. *International Journal of Business and Society* 15(1), 65-80.

Omar, N.A., Nazri, M.A. 2016. Examination Factors Affecting Youths' Entrepreneurial Intention: A Cross-Sectional Study. *Information Management and Business Review* 8(5), 14-24.

Paladan, N. 2015. Business University Student Entrepreneurial Competencies: Towards Readiness for Globalization. *Proceedings of the second European Academic Research Conference on Global Business, Economics, Finance and Banking* (EAR15Swiss Conference) Zrich-Switzerland, 1-14.

Pruett, M., Shinnar, R., Toney, B., Llopis, F., Fox, J. 2009. Explaining Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students: A Cross-Cultural Study. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior&Research* 15(6), 571-594.

Sajilan, S., Hadi, N.U., Tehseen, S. 2015. Impact of Entrepreneur's Demographic Characteristics and Personal Characteristics on Firm's Performance Under the Mediating Role of Entrepreneur Orientation. *Review of Integrative Business & Economics Research* 4(2), 36-52.

Schwarz, E.J., Malgorzata, W., Daniela, A.A-J., Breitenecker, R.J. 2009. The Effects of Attitudes and Perceived Environment Conditions on Students' Entrepreneurial Intent: An Austrian Perspective. *Education + Training* 51(4), 272-291.

Sesen,H. 2013. Personality or Environment? A Comprehensive Study on the Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students. *Education + Training* 55(7), 624-640.

Schumpeter, J.A. 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development.* Harvard University, Cambridge.

Shinnar, R.S., Pruett, M., Toney, B. 2009. Entrepreneurship Education: Attitudes Across Campus. *Journal of Education for Business* 84, 151-159.

Solmaz, S.A., Aksoy, Ö., Şengül, S., Sarıışık, M. 2014. Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimci Kişilik Özelliklerinin Belirlenmesi: Turizm Lisans ve Ön Lisans Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Alan Araştırması. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi* 16(26), 41-55.

Strauser, D.R., Ketz, K., Keim, J. 2002. The Relationship Between Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control and Work Personality. *Journal of Rehabilitation* 68(1), 20-26.

Uddin, Md.R., Bose, T.K. 2012. Determinants of Entrepreneurial Intention of Business Students in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Business and Management* 7(24), 128-137.

Wu, S., Wu, L. 2008. The Impact of Higher Education on Entrepreneurial Intentions of University Students in China. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 15(4), 752-774.

Zaman, M. 2013. Entrepreneurial Characteristics Among University Students: Implications for Entrepreneurship Education and Training in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management* 7(39), 4053-4058.