

A Survey of Entrepreneurial Tendencies Candidate Young Entrepreneurs: Foundation University Sample

Dr. Hidayet TİFTİK (Corresponding author)

Turgut Özal University, Gazze cd. No: 7

Etlik - Keçiören / Ankara, Turkey

E-mail: htiftik@turgutozal.edu.tr

Assist. Prof Dr. Mustafa ZİNCİRKIRAN

Dicle University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Department of Health Management, Main Campus, Diyarbakır, Turkey

E-mail: mustafa.zincirkiran@dicle.edu.tr

Received: March 8, 2013 Accepted: March 21, 2014 Published: April 1, 2014

doi:10.5296/jmr.v6i2.5444

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jmr.v6i2.5444>

Abstract

The survey has been conducted amongst students studying in the field of Economics and Administrative Sciences at a foundation university. The purpose of the survey is to show the entrepreneurial tendencies and entrepreneurship levels of the university students who are young entrepreneur candidates. The aim is also to test the validity and reliability of the entrepreneurship scale developed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008) and examines the structure of factors.

At the end of the survey, it was determined that the scale was valid and reliable. Furthermore, contrary to the previous surveys conducted for the students in state universities, it was seen that the students of foundation universities had higher levels of entrepreneurial tendencies.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship, Young entrepreneurs, Entrepreneurship tendencies, Factor analysis, Foundation universities

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship entered into economy literature during the eighteenth century. It has shown its influence upon the implementation of technological developments. Its contribution towards development experiences in the fields of liberty and democracy is just as important as the innovations. Today, the countercyclical problems faced by national economies transform quickly into structural problems. In order to make the general balance of the economy sustainable, eliminate unemployment, and decrease foreign trade and budget gaps, the contribution of entrepreneurs is required. Qualified entrepreneurship is possible particularly with education and the support of economic and social conditions. The biggest problem for developing countries is increasing foreign trade gaps. Competitive power needs to be enhanced in order to eliminate this problem. Competitive power depends upon the capacity for creating innovation. Creating innovation is a part of the formation of entrepreneurship (Kınay, 2006).

Entrepreneurship is, firstly, a mentality. It defines the capacity and motivation to insist-upon an opportunity to achieve economic success, create a new value or define an opportunity by a person either independently or within an organization. The entrepreneur benefits from the innovativeness or innovations to enter into the current market, compete, change the market in question, or create a new market. Leading a new idea to success in the business world requires the ability to integrate the creativity or innovations with a reliable management system and customize the development of an organization by optimizing it at every stage of the life cycle. It requires setting goals and determining a strategy for the organization beyond the daily management activities.

There is a large amount of research in the literature about entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial tendencies. In general, it was undertaken within the concepts of occupational preferences, motivational values, familial factors, cultural environments, cultural differences, entrepreneurial values, organizational citizenship, was taken with the concept of creative thinking, etc. in research conducted for youth entrepreneurship (Lorrain & Raymond 1991; Roberts & Tholen, 1998; Kazmi, 1999; Emsen et al., 2001; Nasser et al., 2003; Ersoy, 2010; Akşit, 2003; Turner & Nguyen, 2005; Gözek, 2006; Yener & Aykol, 2009; Naktiyok & Timuroğlu, 2009; Tiftik & Zincirkıran, 2014). In addition, entrepreneurship research trends to measure the university students' are also included (Young, 2000; Korkmaz, 2000; Henderson & Robertson, 2000; Gürol & Atsan, 2006; Yılmaz & Sünbül, 2008; Avşar, 2007; Örucü et al., 2007; Cansız, 2007; Karabulut, 2009; Akyüz et al., 2010)

The survey considered in this context was conducted for the purposes of evaluating the entrepreneurship potential of the young entrepreneur candidates, and determining the entrepreneurial qualities and tendencies of young university students. When the entrepreneurship surveys conducted in our country are taken into consideration, the large majority of state universities attract attention. Foundation university students were preferred, as fewer samples were used from these universities during the surveys. The young entrepreneur candidates included in the survey were determined from those students taking an entrepreneurship course in the department of economy and administrative sciences. The

survey was generally conducted in the relevant course and the students were motivated to enable them to concentrate on the survey scale. It was thought that this positively influenced the results of the survey.

2. The Literature Related to Entrepreneurship

“Entrepreneurship” has become a buzzword in public debate during recent years. It is extensively referred to by policy-makers as one of the roads to future prosperity, and cross-country comparisons of entrepreneurial activity have become increasingly popular. However, the concept of entrepreneurship is often used without a precise definition, and it may not always be completely clear what the different measures are actually assessing” (Iverson et al., 2008).

In the literature, a number of authors have presented rather different definitions of the entrepreneur since the first ideas on entrepreneurship were formulated by Cantillon in the middle of the 18th century. Although 250 years have passed since then, a coherent definition has not yet been agreed upon. While this is bound to complicate theoretical discussions on these issues, the empirical studies also suffer from the lack of a clear theoretically-founded definition. Thus, in the empirical literature, numerous different measures of entrepreneurial activity are used, and the relationships to the theoretical ideas are not always obvious” (Iverson et al., 2008).

There are a great number of different definitions related to entrepreneurship. Some of these definitions are given below:

According to Dinçer and Fidan, the purpose of entrepreneurship is to make investments in order to produce or serve. The production factors required in this respect are collected and realized (Dinçer & Fidan, 2000).

According to another definition, entrepreneurship exists to provide or produce the products and services likely to be in demand. The entrepreneur takes risks with labor and capital for a business that he or she has considered economic and enters into the market (Fidan & Yılmaz, 2001).

According to Mucuk, the purpose of entrepreneurship is to find and bring the production factors of labor, capital and nature together in a way to satisfy the requirements of people, produce products and services. Generally, the risk is borne and the purpose is to make profit (Mucuk, 2001).

According to Müftüoğlu, its purpose is to observe the environment continuously and catch the demand deficits; create new demands; realize the changes in time demand; establish production facilities by providing resources and those interested in entrepreneurship and competition, and recognizing their importance; not being reluctant to take risks or responsibility, and having entrepreneurial and creative abilities (Müftüoğlu, 2000).

Schumpeter, who is called the founder of the idea of entrepreneurship, defined it as the generation of new compositions, and specified that this was the basis of economic development. Generation of new compositions is an extraordinary success that can only be

achieved by entrepreneurs. Schumpeter expresses the possible compositions necessary to create entrepreneurial activities as the generation of new products or services, new production methods, new markets, new supply sources and new organizational forms (Schumpeter, 1978).

Entrepreneurs form the most effective and powerful army of the global world. They change society not through their armor but by their products and services. They are the new alchemists of today's world (Gürdoğan, 2010).

According to Floss and Klein, it means the implementation of an idea and attempting. It is a name for all processes performed by entrepreneurs, such as taking risk, seeking opportunities, implementation and innovation (Foss & Klein, 2002).

2.1 Entrepreneurial Tendencies

When the surveys conducted until now are considered, it is seen that the entrepreneurial tendencies change according to many factors. The entrepreneurship qualities or tendencies change based upon factors such as education, family, culture, social environment, technological environment etc.

In this context, the idea of establishing a new business is based on the inspiration given to the person by the culture of his or her society, its sub-cultures, and his or her friends, family and teachers. A culture appreciating a person's establishing a new business and becoming successful would pave the way for the establishment of more business in comparison with those which do not appreciate a person in this respect. If the values forming the general framework of entrepreneurship such as being own boss, individualism, being successful and earning money are given prominence in a culture, it means that the entrepreneurship is being substantially supported (Demirel & Tikici, 2004).

According to the survey being conducted, social factors such as the family and close friends of the individual and their support have a positive influence upon his or her entrepreneurship. For instance, the successful entrepreneurs in the USA indicated that they were directed and encouraged by their parents to establish a business. In the survey conducted in Australia with 784 Australians between the ages of 15-24 from the Department of Education, Training and Youth Studies, it has been seen that the biggest factor directing them towards entrepreneurship was their parents, other family members, friends and their teachers. So, the social support may motivate the individual to tolerate the uncertainty and take risk. For this reason, it can be said that the structure of the society in which the individual lives is very important. The more the structure and culture of the society support entrepreneurship, the more people are likely to become an entrepreneur in that society (Çalışkan et al., 2012).

The entrepreneurs have a high level of achievement motivation and a tendency to take personal responsibility and risk to bring their business to a conclusion (Moorhead and Griffin, 1989). The entrepreneurs have the characteristics of interpreting the events without being influenced by their biases and changing attitudes, making decisions and taking action in a shorter time without being afraid of probable risks (Hinterhuber et al., 1992)

The entrepreneur is the person starting any innovation and sustaining and developing it as a result of his or her decisions and applications. The social and economic characteristics of previous occupations and these individuals' educational levels, individual characteristics and behaviours will also be effective in the formation of the entrepreneurial culture and mentality directing such applications.

The desire for independence may be the most important factor expressing why the entrepreneur prefers entrepreneurship as a means of earning income, rather than the many other ways available for doing this. The entrepreneur acts with the desires not to be dependent upon others in terms of current capital stock, energy and health and social status; not taking order from the others while taking decisions and applying them; not sharing the success and failure; not reporting to anyone, and realizing only his or her own potential (Keskin & Zehir, 2002).

The most meaningful and important factors effective upon the phenomenon of entrepreneurship are social and. Many factors related to entrepreneurship are determined through the contribution given to it by the social environment. Entrepreneurship is a social phenomenon and has social characteristics. It influences social events for this reason. Entrepreneurship can become widespread thanks to the generally accepted entrepreneurial characteristics in the society – the approval and even encouragement of entrepreneurship values and behaviors (Shane, 2002). Accordingly, the value judgments, life philosophy, religion, culture of the society are effective in entrepreneurship (Börü, 2006).

In addition to all these, it is can be seen that the family, which is considered to be a social and cultural element, has a special influence upon entrepreneurship. The perspective of the individual and the family raising him or her upon life, their social values, educational background, beliefs and other positive and negative aspects in terms of self-confidence, underlie the idea of being an entrepreneur (Bozgeyik, 2006).

Generation of the entrepreneurship tendency, encouraging the process of decision making for entrepreneurship, is considered as a serious and integrative study. Encouragement of entrepreneurs, especially in underdeveloped countries, is considered to be a way of supporting economic development (Mueller & Thomas, 2000).

The entrepreneurship decision related to the fact that the individual establishes and runs his or her business is a complicated process influenced by many other factors. These determinative factors may be divided into two general groups: situational and individual factors. The situational factors include job switching, dismissals or previous job experiences. The individual factors include those such as success needs and taking control (Chen et al., 1998: 301).

The studies conducted on entrepreneurship show that situational factors have an important role. Some individuals who have set up their own business after either being dismissed from their jobs or leaving voluntarily to set up their own business as they realize a new opportunity in the market can be given as examples of situational factors (Greenberger & Sexton, 1988: 3).

Various researches conducted in this respect shown that the tendency to establish a new enterprise results from the situational push and pull factors, including elements such as the current life style, childhood, family, education, age, job experience and support networks. Some individuals are pushed towards the entrepreneurial tendency due to the negative developments in their career plan, his or her dissatisfaction with his or her work or lack of employment. Some empirical studies support this view and classify the entrepreneurs into three groups: a) those working in the wrong position, b) those excluded from society and c) job switches. On the other hand, some individuals are directed towards the entrepreneurship tendency by positive factors such as the search for various education and job opportunities (Mueller & Thomas, 2000).

The entrepreneurial tendency is primarily a composition of the individual and environmental factors and represents the desire and determination of the individuals for running his or her own business. It is a part of the entrepreneurial behavior and constitutes the whole of it along with fundamental processes such as self-determination, creating innovations, taking risk, proactivity and a competitive structure (Okudan & Rzasa, 2006: 197).

Gartner states that establishment of a new enterprise depends upon the interaction between the individual factors (personal characteristics), environmental factors (competitive penetration strategies), organizational factors (push-pull factors) and processes (the activities performed by the entrepreneur to maintain the enterprise). He emphasizes the importance of the fact that the individuals desire and are determined to exhibit the entrepreneurial-behaviors (Gartner, 1994).

Shane and Venkatraman's study specified that the presence of the entrepreneurial individuals depends upon the social, cultural, economic, demographic and personal factors as well as their desire for and tendencies towards entrepreneurship. They defined entrepreneurship as a bond between two elements: the presence of profitable opportunities and the presence of entrepreneurial individuals (Shane & Venkatraman, 2000).

Parnell, et al., (1995) regard the entrepreneurial tendency as a function comprising three factors closely related to each other (Parnell et al., 1995). These factors are:

- ✓ The entrepreneurship education taken by the individual, his or her level of knowledge and capability to take new risks,
- ✓ The beliefs of the individual regarding the entrepreneurship opportunities (opportunities) ,
- ✓ The self-confidence felt by the individual to realize and evaluate the current opportunities.

It is also emphasized that the governments are expected to apply some strategies as a support mechanism, in order to increase the entrepreneurship tendency. Bunlar (Mok, 2005):

- ✓ Making the necessary investments in terms of physical, human and technological structure,

- ✓ Creating a business world suitable for technological developments and innovations;
- ✓ Providing political supports and encouragement;
- ✓ Coordinating industries and business ventures;
- ✓ Providing the financial support where necessary.

Everything, from the educational background of the entrepreneur and his or her capability to utilize his or her knowledge, to his or her opportunities and workload in his or her family and society, has become the starting point for the entrepreneur. The education is one of the biggest factors effective upon the generation of entrepreneurial attitudes and behaviors. The importance of the education is understood as a necessity in terms of the development of potential entrepreneurs, thanks to the influence of education on the desires and dreams of the young people about the future. The characteristics of the individuals who have entrepreneurial potential are described as being open to innovations, risk bearing, creative, talented and opportunity-oriented. The individuals having these characteristics are called "potential entrepreneurs". It is required to direct the potential entrepreneurs who have education in this field and wish to be an entrepreneur in order to have successful entrepreneurs and increase their number within society (İşçan & Kaygın, 2011).

There have been researches conducted upon different segments of society concerning the entrepreneurship in our country (students, academicians, businessmen, young people, women etc). In these researches, different approaches come up with regard to the current entrepreneurs and Turkey's potential entrepreneur candidates (Emsen, 2001; Akyüz et al., 2006; Börü, 2006; Büte, 2006; Kınay, 2006; Cansız, 2007; Çetin & Köseoğlu, 2007; Kuvan, 2007; Özden et al., 2008; Karabulut, 2009; Naktiyok & Timuroğlu, 2009; Çarıkçı and Koyuncu, 2010; Demirel & Tikici, 2010; Dura, 2011; Arslan, 2011, İşçan & Kaygın, 2011, Korkmaz, 2012; Bozkurt & Alparlan, 2013). In this respect, lack of education in entrepreneurship; insufficient government promotions; problems in financing; technological inadequacy; lack of labour force, and knowledge of the research and development process; weaknesses of personal abilities, and psychological factors have been considered to be negative conditions (Tiftik & Zincirkıran, 2014).

3. Research Method

3.1 The Research Universe and the Sample

The study consisted of university students. The sample of the study comprised foundation university students. The purpose of choosing this sample is that there are low levels of research regarding foundation university students in the existing literature.

3.2 The Purpose of the Research

The purpose of the research is to determine the characteristics and levels of entrepreneurship or the entrepreneurial tendencies of the young entrepreneur candidate university student the additional aim of this survey is that the validity and reliability of the entrepreneurship scale developed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008) is tested and the structure of factors is examined.

3.3 Data Collection Method

This scale was developed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008) for the purpose of determining the entrepreneurship characteristics of the university students. These sentences in a Likert typeface are prepared in a scale of: “Very often” (5) “Often” (4) “Sometimes” (3), “Seldom” (2), “Never” (1). Cronbach Alpha reliability analyses and factor analysis (Reliability Analysis) have been applied on the data obtained as a result of the test. It has been seen that the factors gather in seven dimensions, different to the research of Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008), as a result of the factor analysis applied with Principal Components Analysis. As a result of the reliability analyses, the Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale has been calculated as 0.91.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data obtained from questionnaire used in the survey was transferred to electronic environment and analyzed using SPSS 16.0 package program. Since Cronbach Alpha value considered as 0,91 in the reliability test conducted to determine the reliability and validity of the data, it can be said that the reliability level of the data is sufficient. The initial condition for the validity of a questionnaire is its reliability. Therefore, the top limit to be reached for validity is equal to the square root of the multiplier of reliability. From here, the validity value is $\sqrt{0,67}= 0,95$. Although reliability brings a top limit for validity, it can never guarantee validity (Karagöz et. al, 2010:10 trans. Zincirkıran, 2014).

First of all, the frequency and ratios of the data was obtained from the questionnaires conducted within the scope of the study. Then, factor analysis was conducted on the scale, including 34 items for the entrepreneurship properties of the students and the seven factors were determined.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Findings

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Samples

Demographic Characteristic	Value	Number
Description of the line item		
Month and year of survey	January -February 2014	
Sample size	392	
Gender		
Female	% 65,8	258
Male	% 34,2	134
Age		
15-20	% 47,4	186
21-30	% 49,5	194
31-40	% 1,5	6
40 and over	% 1,5	6
Income Level		
500-1000TL	% 26	102
1100-2000 TL	% 9,7	38
2100-2500 TL	% 9,7	38
2600-3000	% 9,6	36
3100 and over	% 45,4	178
Education status		
Vocational Edu.	% 76,5	300
Bachelor	% 20,4	80
Master	% 1,5	6
PhD	% 0,5	2
Others	% 1,0	4
Class Level		
Class 1	% 40,3	158
Class 2	% 58,2	228
Class 4	% 1,5	6

The study was conducted between January and February, 2014. As seen in Table 1, 258 (65,8%) of the total 392 students participating into the study were female and 134 (34,2%) were male. 186 (47,7%) of the participants were within the 15-20 age group, 194 (49,5%) were within the 21-30 age group, 6 (1,5%) were within the 31-40 age group and 6 (1,5%) were within the 40+ age group. There were 102 (26,2%) students with an income between 500 - 1000 TL, 38 (9,7%) students with an income between 1100 - 2000 TL, 38 (9,7%) students with an income between 2100 - 2500 TL, 36 (9,6%) students with an income between 2600 - 3000 TL and 178 (45,4%) students with an income between 3100 and more. 300 (76,5%) of the participants were students with an associate degree, 80 (20,4%) of them were undergraduate students, 6 (1,5%) of them were graduate students, 2 (0,5%) of them

were postgraduate students and the remaining 6 (1,5%) were students with different education levels. 158 (40%) of the students were in the first academic year, 228 (58,2%) of them were in the second academic year, and the remaining 6 (1,5%) of them were in the fourth academic year.

The order of the factors used in the factor analysis carried out within the scope of the study is given in Table 2. Seven factors which were obtained from the study were named by considering the previous studies.

Table 2. Factor Orders

Factors	
Factor 1 Items	
19.	I like to challenge-the old ideas and applications and seek better ones.
27.	I am looking for suitable methods and techniques to provide success.
28.	I can evaluate the opportunities I encounter.
29.	I can transform the sources I have into efficiency.
30.	I have a characteristic open to the innovations coming up during my business and studies.
31.	I do my job fondly and determinedly.
34.	I am not afraid of acting as a leader in a business or during activities.
36.	My motivation and tendency to different businesses are strong.
Factor 2 Items	
8.	I can cement good relations with different people.
9.	I am not afraid of trying those I haven't tried until now.
10.	I feel the energy in myself to do different businesses.
11.	I talk to my friends about my different business projects.
16.	I am a risk bearer.
17.	I can make preparations for the future.
18.	I like to work on the projects which give the opportunity of new experiences.
Factor 3 Items	
23.	I generally trust myself to be able to carry out my plans.
24.	I have problem with orientating myself to a new environment or applications.
25.	I am not afraid of making a mistake in a subject upon which I am working.
26.	Any job has a risk in it. I can bear any risk in my job.
Factor 4 Items	
1.	I try to do better than my previous performance in my job.
2.	I try to do my best when the business is very challenging.
6.	When I have to leave the job compulsorily, I can create new options for myself.
7.	I can create alternatives under difficult conditions.
Factor 5 Items	
4.	My decisions are effective in my work.
13.	I don't hesitate to participate in some projects which come from my friends.
14.	I do not leave my life to external factors.
15.	I think I can form my life thanks to my decisions.

Factor 6 Items	
20.	I engage in projects and businesses which provide a new perspective.
21.	I try new methods which have never been used by anyone else during my works.
22.	I can eliminate any problem with sufficient effort.
Factor 7 Items	
5.	I can set up my own business.
35.	I can take effective decisions regarding business in the future.

The 3rd and 32nd items prepared by Yılmaz and Sünbül have been excluded from the scale as their internal consistencies are low. The factor analysis has been carried out with 34 items. While the factor analysis is being carried out, 33rd and 12th items are excluded from the scale, as those with factor values under 0.40 have not been evaluated. The last factor order has been shown on the Table 3 with 32 items.

As a result of the factor analysis, the factor loads and Eigen values regarding the factorial dimensions are shown in the table below. Eigen value shows the total of the inter-group squares and the total of in-group squares ratio. The matrix obtained has been analyzed through the principle components. Each element of the matrixes formed in the factor analysis is the factor weights showing the correlation between each variation and each factor (Zincirkiran, 2014).

The analysis carried out through factor analyzing is required to be evaluated with the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) test as well. The values equal to 0,5 and over in KMO test show that the sample has lack of measurement and the analysis can be applied to the factors. In the same way, the significance level of the Bartlett test is required to be less than 0.05 (Hutcheson & Sofroniou 1999, trans. Zincirkiran and Tiftik, 2014).

The average, standard variation and factor loads of the factor 7 are given below in Table 3.

Table 3. Rotated Component Matrix

Component	X(Mean)	Std.Deviation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Fact. 1									
VAR00019	3,6990	1,01960	0,472						
VAR00027	3,7041	0,94568	0,534						
VAR00028	3,8980	0,90455	0,671						
VAR00029	3,7194	0,90344	0,645						
VAR00030	3,6582	0,92174	0,642						
VAR00031	4,0408	0,93161	0,602						
VAR00034	3,8469	1,11582	0,555						
VAR00036	3,9235	1,03606	0,642						

Fact.2

VAR0008	3,7908	1,12271	0,700
VAR0009	3,6684	1,03505	0,657
VAR00010	3,8316	1,06429	0,482
VAR00011	3,2959	1,15064	0,623
VAR00016	3,6480	1,08160	0,573
VAR00017	3,5663	1,05146	0,444
VAR00018	3,5663	0,98619	0,472

Fact.3

VAR00023	3,7755	0,92181	0,655
VAR00024	3,6378	0,99431	0,694
VAR00025	3,4745	1,05324	0,517
VAR00026	3,3163	1,05207	0,530

Fact.4

VAR0001	3,9949	0,91309	0,754
VAR0002	4,0816	0,84833	0,726
VAR0006	3,6071	0,99808	0,549
VAR0007	3,8367	0,96691	0,460

Fact.5

VAR0003	3,8980	0,86996	0,613
VAR00013	3,5306	1,00845	0,570
VAR00014	3,5102	1,05350	0,678
VAR00015	4,0459	0,94500	0,526

Fact.6.

VAR00020	3,6020	1,01890	0,419
VAR00021	3,3980	1,03879	0,777
VAR00022	3,6378	0,91947	0,523

Fact.7

VAR0005	3,6480	1,11422	0,460
VAR00035	4,1071	3,03665	0,602

Factor 1: factor loads change between 0.472 (item 19) and 0.642 (item 36). Rotation values account for 12.525% of the total variance. Eigen value is 4.079. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor 1 and referring to the previous researches, this factor can be called “*Self-confidence*” (Robinson et al., 1991; Ho & Koh, 1992; İşcan & Kaygın, 2011).

Factor 2: factor loads change between 0.700 (item 8) and 0.472 (item 18) Rotation values account for 11.527 % of the total variance. Eigen value is 3.919. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor, this factor can be called “*Utilizing the Opportunities*”.

Factor 3: factor loads change between 0.655 (item 23) and 0.530 (item 26). Rotation values account for 8.486% of the total variance. Eigen value is 2.885. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor 3 and referring to the previous researches, this factor can be called “*Bearing Risk*” (Ahmed, 1985; Koh, 1986; Korunka et al., 2003; Pearson & Chatterje, 2001)

Factor 4: factor loads change between 0.754 (item 1) and 0.460 (item 7). Rotation values account for 8.308% of the total variance. Eigen value is 2.825. Considering the contents of the sub-items in the Factor, it can be called “*Control Oriented*” (Hisrich & Peter, 2002; Dündar & Ağca, 2007)

Factor 5: factor loads change between 0.613 (item 3) and 0.526 (item 15). Rotation values account for 6.842% of the total variance. Eigen value is 2.326. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor 5 and referring to the previous researches, this factor can be called “*Determination*” (Hisrich & Peters, 2002).

Factor 6: factor loads change between 0.419 (item 20) ile 0.523 (item 22) Rotation values account for 6.216 % of the total variance. Eigen value is 2.113. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor, this factor can be called “*Innovativeness*” (Schumpeter,1934; Mitton, 1989).

Factor 7: factor loads are between 0.460 (item 5) and 0.602 (item 35). Rotation values account for 4.474 % of the total variance. Eigen value is 1.521. Considering the contents of the sub items in Factor, it can be called “*Will to Succeed*” (McClelland’s, 1961; Shaver & Scott, 1991; Koh, 1935).

Table 4. Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial			Extraction Sums of Squared					
	Eigenvalues			Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	Variance	Cumulative %	Total	Variance	Cumulative %	Total	Variance	Cumulative %
1	11,945	35,133	35,133	11,945	35,133	35,133	4,259	12,525	12,525
2	1,576	4,634	39,767	1,576	4,634	39,767	3,919	11,527	24,052
3	1,507	4,432	44,199	1,507	4,432	44,199	2,885	8,486	32,538
4	1,356	3,987	48,186	1,356	3,987	48,186	2,825	8,308	40,846
5	1,237	3,637	51,823	1,237	3,637	51,823	2,326	6,842	47,688
6	1,182	3,477	55,300	1,182	3,477	55,300	2,113	6,216	53,904
7	1,047	3,078	58,378	1,047	3,078	58,378	1,521	4,474	58,378
8	0,949	2,791	61,170						
9	0,934	2,748	63,918						
10	0,891	2,622	66,540						

11	0,852	2,505	69,045
12	0,838	2,463	71,509
13	0,791	2,326	73,834
14	0,763	2,244	76,079
15	0,719	2,113	78,192
16	0,673	1,978	80,170
17	0,600	1,763	81,934
18	0,569	1,673	83,606
19	0,546	1,605	85,212
20	0,521	1,532	86,744
21	0,477	1,404	88,147
22	0,452	1,329	89,477
23	0,426	1,254	90,730
24	0,400	1,176	91,906
25	0,392	1,152	93,059
26	0,344	1,010	94,069
27	0,310	0,911	94,980
28	0,294	0,865	95,844
29	0,288	0,847	96,692
30	0,274	0,806	97,498
31	0,243	0,714	98,212
32	0,234	0,688	98,900
33	0,195	0,574	99,474
34	0,179	0,526	100,000

The Eigen values of the relevant items concerning the entrepreneurship are shown in Table 4 above. The Eigen values are found as 7 factors over 1. The first factor accounts for 13% of the variance, the 2nd factor for 12%, the 3rd factor for 8%, the 4th factor for 8%, the 5th factor for 7%, the 6th factor for 6% and the 7th factor accounts for 4% of the variance. 7 factors account for more than a half of total variance 58'(%). This result is different according to the single-factor research of Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008).

Table 5. KMO and Barlett's Test.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sample Adequacy		0,916
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6,263E3
	df	561
	Sig.	0,000

The result of the KMO test carried out for the adequacy of the size of the sample used in the research is 0.916, as can be seen in the Table 4 above. This result shows that the data can be used in factor analysis. (It is good if the result is between 0,7-0,8, normal if the result is between 0,5-0,7. It should be a minimum of 0,5. If it is under 0,5 more data required.). The Bartlett test specific correlation matrix is the same as the identity matrix (all correlation coefficients are zero); tests the null hypothesis (?). This test is required to be significant. Otherwise, it means there is no relation between the variations. (Tonta, 2008: 30). As can be seen in the table above, this value is found to be zero (0.000), so the reason is accepted as significant. According to all findings obtained from the tables above, it can be said that "the Entrepreneurship Scale" is valid and reliable.

Table 6. The Mean of the Participants' Answers to the Items

Descriptive Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
1) I try to do better than my previous performance in my job.	3,9949	0,91309	392
2)I try to do my best when the business is very challenging.	4,0816	0,84833	392
3)My decisions are effective in my works.	3,8980	0,86996	392
4)I can set up my own business.	3,6480	1,11422	392
5)When I have to leave the job compulsorily, I can create new options for myself.	3,6071	0,99808	392
6)I can create alternatives under difficult conditions.	3,8367	0,96691	392
7)I can cement good relations with different people.	3,7908	1,12271	392
8)I am not afraid of trying those things I haven't tried until now.	3,6684	1,03505	392
9)I feel the energy to do different businesses.	3,8316	1,06429	392
10)I talk to my friends about my different business projects.	3,2959	1,15064	392
11) I create environments to use my abilities.	3,5816	1,01067	392
12)I don't hesitate to participate in projects coming from my friends.	3,5306	1,00845	392
13)I do not leave my life to external factors.	3,5102	1,05350	392
14)I think I can form my life thanks to my decisions.	4,0459	0,94500	392

15)I am a risk bearer.	3,6480	1,08160	392
16)I can make preparations for the future.	3,5663	1,05146	392
17)I like to work on which give the opportunity of new experiences.	3,5663	0,98619	392
18)I like to challenge the old ideas and applications and seek better ones.	3,6990	1,01960	392
19)I engage in the project and businesses which provide a new perspective.	3,6020	1,01890	392
20)I try new methods which have never been used by someone else in my works.	3,3980	1,03879	392
21)I can eliminate any problem with sufficient effort.	3,6378	0,91947	392
22)I generally trust myself to carry out my plans.	3,7755	0,92181	392
23)I have no problem orientating myself to a new environment or applications.	3,6378	0,99431	392
24)I am not afraid of making a mistake in a subject upon which I am working.	3,4745	1,05324	392
25)Any job has a risk in it. I can bear any risk in my job.	3,3163	1,05207	392
26)I am looking for suitable methods and techniques to provide success.	3,7041	0,94568	392
27)I can evaluate the opportunities I encounter.	3,8980	0,90455	392
28)I can transform the sources I have into efficiency.	3,7194	0,90344	392
29)I have a characteristic open to the innovations coming up during my business and studies.	3,6582	0,92174	392
30) I do my job fondly and determinedly.	4,0408	0,93161	392
31)I can work together with a person or a team.	4,1327	3,76724	392
32)I am not afraid of acting as a leader in a business or during activities.	3,8469	1,11582	392
33)I can take effective decisions regarding business in the future.	4,1071	3,03665	392
34)My motivation and tendency towards different businesses are strong.	3,9235	1,03606	392

Source: Yılmaz & Sünbül, 2008 (The scale of “Entrepreneurship”)

An average of the responses given by the participants concerning the statements in the scale is shown in Table 6. These sentences turned into a Likert typeface are prepared in a scale as “Very often” (5) “Often” (4) “Sometimes” (3), “Seldom” (2), “Never” (1). The average of the responses to the statements given by the participants is 3,7256. This result means that the entrepreneurial tendencies of the students joining the research are high, as the statements related to the entrepreneurship generally respond as (4) “Very often”.

The criteria in the table 7 are taken into consideration for the assessment of the entrepreneurship scores.

Table 7. Entrepreneurship Level Scale Table

36-64	Very low entrepreneurship
65-92	Low entrepreneurship
93-123	Medium entrepreneurship
124-151	High entrepreneurship
152-180	Very high entrepreneurship

Source: Yılmaz and Sünbül, 2008:198

According to the responses of the university students participating in the research to the statements in the scale, the resulting entrepreneurship level has been given in Table 8.

Table 8. Entrepreneurship Tendency Levels of the Students Attending the Research

	-n-	A.Average	D.Deviation
Entrepreneurship Level	392	126,67	38,80

The entrepreneurship scores of the students are seen in Table 8. The average entrepreneurship tendency score of the students is 126,67. It is seen that the entrepreneurship tendency score average of the students is in the high entrepreneurship range, as the value is between 124-151.

In the paper, t-Test (independent sample test) was also applied to detect differences according to demographic characteristics of the participants, except for factor analysis. The significant differences are shown in the table only. Insignificant results are not shown in the table. The significant differences according to gender are shown in Table 9.

Table 9. Comparison of the Entrepreneurship Characteristics with the Gender

Entrepreneurship Statements	Demographic Characteristics					
	Gender	n	Aver.	SD	t	P
I do not leave my life to external factors.	Female	256	3,5312	0,96964	0,411	0,001
	Male	132	3,4848	1,20105		
I engage in the project and businesses providing a new perspective.	Female	256	3,5156	0,92871	-2,229	0,000
	Male	132	3,7526	1,15990		
I try new methods which have never been used by someone else in my work.	Female	256	3,2734	0,98391	-3,165	0,047
	Male	132	3,6212	1,10191		
I can eliminate any problem with sufficient effort.	Female	256	3,5703	0,95123	-1,911	0,005
	Male	132	3,7576	0,83913		
I can take effective decisions regarding business in the future.	Female	256	3,7812	1,02470	-2,921	0,043
	Male	132	4,7273	4,98715		

The item “*I do not leave my life to the external factors*” shows statistically significant difference according to gender ($p < 0,05$). The difference results from the female students. This result corresponds to the result found by Ari, (1989) in his research.

The items “*I engage in the project and businesses providing a new perspective.*”, “*I try new methods e never been used by someone else during my works.*”, “*I can eliminate any problem with sufficient effort.*” show statistically significant difference according to gender ($p < 0,05$). The difference results from the male students.

The item of “*I can take effective decisions regarding the business in future*” shows statistically significant difference according to gender ($p < 0,05$). The difference results from the male students. The result obtained with regard to the males corresponds to the result of the research conducted by Bilge and Bal (2012).

Conclusion and Discussion

As a result of the study, it has been determined that the “Entrepreneurship Scale” developed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2008) is valid and reliable. However, the result of the factor analysis applied on the scale has shown seven factor aspects which contrast to the study of Yılmaz and Sünbül. These factors, by considering the previous studies and comments on the issue, have been named as “*Self-confidence, Benefiting from an Opportunity, Innovativeness, Control-Oriented, Will to Succeed, Risk Bearing and Decisiveness*”.

It has been determined as a result of the study that the young entrepreneur candidates considered as a sample have entrepreneurial tendencies. The students who participated in the study are those studying in the Faculty of Economics Administrative and Social Sciences of a Foundation University. The results differ from the study conducted among the students studying in a government university (Bilge & Bal, 2012, Özden et. al, 2008). This situation may be due to the fact that these students have the financial potential to actualize their business ideas after graduation. It can be said that this situation positively affects their personality in different aspects such as self-confidence, risk bearing and will to success.

Within the scope of the study, research has been carried out as to whether entrepreneurship properties show differences depending upon gender, and in terms of several factors, significant differences has been determined between male and female students in the sub-issues of “*Will to Success and Innovativeness*”. The result obtained with regard to the males corresponds to the result of the research conducted by Bilge and Bal (2012).

However, in terms of decisiveness, more significant differences have been seen among female students compared to male students. This result corresponds to the result found by Ari, (1989) in his research.

As a result, it can be said that the entrepreneurship potentials of the young entrepreneur candidates participating in the study are sufficient. However, by using different scales related to the issue, the entrepreneurship properties and tendency of the students can be evaluated in terms of different variables such as family, socio-economic environment, cultural environment, etc. In addition, with a study to be conducted, the reasons for the

differentiating thoughts between foundation and government universities can be demonstrated more clearly.

References

- Ahmed, S.U. (1985). nAch, risk-Taking propensity, locus of control and Entrepreneurship. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6(6), 781-782. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(85\)90092-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(85)90092-3)
- Akşit, G. (2003). Farklı kültürlerde girişimcilik niyeti ve üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. *Yayımlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.*
- Akyüz, K. C., Gedik, T., Akyüz, İ., & Yıldırım, İ. (2010). Rize İlindeki Lise ve Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Yeteneklerinin İncelenmesi, *İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi/Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences*, 20(1).
- Arı, R. (1989). Üniversite öğrencilerinin baskın ben durumları ile bazı özlük niteliklerinin ben durumlarına, atılganlık ve uyum düzeylerine etkisi. *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi. Ankara: H.Ü. Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.*
- Arslan, K. (2011). Üniversiteli gençlerde mesleki tercihler ve girişimcilik Eğilimleri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, 3(2), 1-11.
- Avşar, M. (2007). Yüksek Öğretimde Öğrencilerin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerinin Araştırılması, Çukurova Üniversitesinde Bir Uygulama. *Yayımlanmış Yüksek Lisans Tezi*
- Bilge, H., & Bal V. (2012). Girişimcilik Eğilimi: Cela Bayar Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Journal of Süleyman Demirel University Institute of Social Sciences*, Year 2.16
- Bozgeyik, A. (2006). Kriz Dönemlerinde Girişimcilik Niçin Daha Önemli, http://www.bilgiyonetimi.org/cm/pages/mkl_gos.php?nt=577, Erişim: 08.01.2006.
- Bozkurt, Ö. Ç., Alparlan, A.M. (2013).Girişimcilerde Bulunması Gereken Özellikler İle Girişimcilik Eğitimi: Girişimci ve Öğrenci Görüşleri, *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi. Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development*, 8(1).
- Börü, D. (2006). Girişimcilik eğilimi: Marmara Üniversitesi İşletme Bölümü Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Marmara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Yayını*, 6, İstanbul.
- Büte, M. (2006). Trabzon İlinde Girişimcilik Özellikleri Araştırması, *Uluslararası Girişimcilik Kongresi Bildirileri Kitapçığı*, Bişkek
- Cansız, E. (2007). Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin belirlenmesi: Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi öğrencileri üzerine bir çalışma, Doctoral dissertation, Sosyal Bilimler

Chen, C. C., Grene, G. P. & Crick, A. (1998). Does Entrepreneurial Self-Efficacy Distinguish Entrepreneurs From Managers?. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13295-316. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(97\)00029-3](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(97)00029-3)

Çalışkan, İ., Uzman, E., & Işık, H.(2012). Meslek Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Düzeylerini Farklı Kaynaklardan Algıladıkları Sosyal Desteğin Yordaması. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 7(1).

Çarıkçı, İ.H., & Koyuncu O. (2010). Bireyci-toplumcu kültür ve girişimcilik eğilimi arasındaki ilişkiyi belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma, *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 3, 1-18.

Çetin, B., & Köseoğlu M.A.(2007). Aile İşletmecilik Kültürünün Girişimcilik Eğilimine Etkileri ve Bir Alan Araştırması. *Karamanoğlu Mehmet Bey Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, Yıl:9, Sayı:13, Aralık 2007

Demirel, Erhan. T. ve Tikici, Mehmet. (2004). Kültürün Girişimciliğe Etkileri. *Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları*, 2(3), 49-58.

Dinçer, Ö. ve Fidan, Y. (2000). *İşletme Yönetimine Giriş*, Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım AŞ., İstanbul 2000,

Drucker, P.F. (1986). *The Frontiers of Management: Where Tomorrow's Decisions Are Being Shaped Today*, Harper&Row, New York, 1986.

Dura, İ. (2011). Girişimciliği Etkileyen Çevresel Faktörlerle İlgili Girişimcilerin Tutumları: Bir Alan Araştırması, *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 9.2 s.191.

Dündar S.& Ağca V. (2007). Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Lisans Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Özelliklerinin İncelenmesine İlişkin Bir Çalışma, *H.Ü. İİBF Dergisi*, Cilt 25, Sayı 1, s. 121-142.

Emsen, Ö., Yılmaz, Ö., & Çınar, S. (2001). Genç Nesilde Mesleki Eğilimler ve Girişimcilik: Ampirik Bir Çalışma. *Milli Produktivite Merkezi, Verimlilik Dergisi*, 1, 153-176.

Ersoy, H. (2010). Kültürel Çevrenin Girişimcilik Tercihine Etkisi, *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 2(1), 71-77.

Fidan, M. & Yılmaz, Ş. (2001). *Müteşebbislik*, Tutubay Yayınları, Ankara 2001, s.10

Gartner, B. W., Shaver, K. G., Gatewood, E. ve Katz, J. A. (1994). Finding the Entrepreneur in Entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Spring, 1-9.

Gözek, S. (2006). Girişimci Adayının Özellikleri, Girişimcilik Eğilimleri ve Girişimci Adaylarına Sağlanan Destekler. Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Tarık Ekonomisi Anabilim Dalı, *Yüksek lisans Tezi*.

Greenberger, B. D. ve Sexton, L. D. (1988). An Interactive Model of New Venture In Initiation, *Journal of Small Business Management*, July, 1-7.

Gürdoğan, N.(2010). *Girişim ve Girişimcilik Kültürü*, İgiad Yayınları, İstanbul.

- Gürol, Y., & Atsan, N. (2006). Entrepreneurial characteristics amongst university students: some insights for entrepreneurship education and training in Turkey. *Education+ Training*, 48(1), 25-38. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00400910610645716>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13620430010373755>
- Hinterhuber, Hans H., & Wolfgang Popp. (1992). Are You A Strategist or Just A Manager? *Harvard Business Review*, January-February 1992, s.105-113
- Hisrich, R.D., & Peters M.P. (2002), *Entrepreneurship*, (5th ed.) New-York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin. s.10.
- Ho, T.S., & Koh, H.C. (1992). Differences in psychological characteristics between entrepreneurially inclined and non-entrepreneurially inclined accounting graduates in Singapore. *Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Change: An International Journal*, 1, 243-54.
- Hutcheson, G., & Sofroniou, N. (1999). *The Multivariate Social Scientist: Introductory statistic using generalized linear models*. Sage Publications, London.
- Iversen, J., Jorgensen, R., & Malchow-Moller, N. (2008). *Defining and measuring entrepreneurship*. Now Publishers Inc.
- İşcan, Ö. F., & Kaygın, E. (2011). Potansiyel Girişimciler Olarak Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 275-286.
- Karabulut, A. T. (2009). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Özelliklerini ve Eğilimlerini Belirlemeye Yönelik Bir Araştırma, *Marmara Üniversitesi, İ.İ.B.F Dergisi*, Cilt 26 Sayı 1
- Karagöz Y., Çatı K. & Koçoğlu, C.M. (2010). Cep Telefonu Ve Operatör Tercihinde Etkili Olabilecek Faktörlerin Demografik Özelliklere Bağlı Olarak İrdelenmesi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt Sayı 23, s.7-24
- Kazmi, A. (1999). What Young Entrepreneurs Think and Do: A Study of Second-Generation Business Entrepreneurs. *Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 8(1), 67-77. [10.1177/097135579900800104](http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/097135579900800104)
- Keskin H. A., L.Zehir. (2002). Girişimcilik Hisleriyle Girişimcilik Potansiyeli Arasındaki İlişki: Gebze ve Civarındaki Girişimciler Üzerine Bir Saha Araştırması, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi 21.Yüzyılda Kobiler: *Sorunlar, Fırsatlar ve Çözüm Önerileri Sempozyum Bildirileri*, Ocak 2002, s.120
- Kınay, H. F. (2007). *Girişimcilik, Kalkınma ve Rekabet İlişkisi, Kütahya'da KOBİ'lerin Girişimcilik Profili*, TOBB Yayınları, Ankara
- Koh, H.C. (1995). Factor Associated with Entrepreneurial Inclination: An Empirical Study of Business Undergraduates in Hong Kong. *Journal of Small Business Entrepreneurship*, 12(2), 29-41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08276331.1995.10600487>

- Koh, H.C. (1996). Testing Hypotheses of Entrepreneurial Characteristics: A Study of Hong Kong MBA Students. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 12-25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683949610113566>
- Korkmaz, S. (2000). Girişimcilik ve üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir araştırma. *HÜİİ BF Dergisi*, 18, 163-169.
- Korunka, C. et al. (2003). The Entrepreneurial Personality in the Context of Resources, Environment, and the Startup Process- A Configurational Approach. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28(1), 23-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1540-8520.00030>
- Kuvan, H. (2007). Türk Girişimcilerinin Yaşam ve Çalışma Değerleri:Malatya'lı Girişimciler Üzerine Bir Araştırma, *Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta
- Lorrain, J., & Raymond, L. (1991). Young and older entrepreneurs: an empirical study of difference. *Journal of Small Business & Entrepreneurship*, 8(4), 51-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08276331.1991.10600384>
- McClelland, D. C. (1967). *Achieving society*. Simon and Schuster.
- Mitton, D.G. (1989). The complete entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 13, 9-19.
- Mok, K. H. (2005). Fostering entrepreneurship: Changing Role of Government and Higher Education Governance in Hong Kong. *Research Policy*, 34, 537-554. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2005.03.003>
- Moorhead, G, & Griffin, Rick W. (1989). *Organizational Behavior*, Houghton Mifflin Company, Texas 1989, s.20
- Mucuk, İ. (2001). *Modern İşletmecilik*, Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul 2001, s.6
- Mueller, L. S., & Thomas, S. A. (2000). Culture and Entrepreneurial Potential: A Nine Country Study of Locus of Control and Innovativeness, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 51-75. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(99\)00039-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(99)00039-7)
- Müftüoğlu, T.(2000). Kobi ve Girişimcilik, *KOSGEB Sanayicinin Sesi*, Aralık 2000, Sayı 1, s.10-11
- Naktiyok, A., & Timuroğlu, M. K. (2009). Öğrencilerin motivasyonel değerlerinin girişimcilik niyetleri üzerine etkisi ve bir uygulama. *Atatürk Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 23(3), 85-103.
- Nasser, M. E., Du Preez, J., & Herrmann, K. (2003). Flight of the young flamingoes: alternative futures for young entrepreneurs in South Africa. *Futures*, 35(4), 393-401. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287\(02\)00088-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0016-3287(02)00088-5)
- Okudan, E. G., & Rzasa, E. S. (2006). A project-based approach to entrepreneurial leadership education, *Technovation*, 26, 195-210. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2004.10.012>

Örücü, E., Kılıç, R., & Yılmaz, Ö. (2007). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerinde Ailesel Faktörlerin Etkisi Üzerine Bir Uygulama. *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 2(2), 27-47.

Özden, K., Temurlenk, M. S., & Başar, S. (2008). Girişimcilik Eğilimi: Kırgızistan-Türkiye Manas Üniversitesi ve Atatürk Üniversitesi Öğrencileri üzerine bir Araştırma. *Review of Social, Economic & Business Studies*.

Parnell, A. J., Crandall, W., & Menefee, M. (1995) Examining the Impact of Culture on Entrepreneurial Propensity: An Empirical Study of Prospective American and Egyptian Entrepreneurs. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 1(1), 39-53.

Pearson C. A., & Chatterjee, S. R. (2001). Differences and similarities of entrepreneurial characteristics in a diverse social setting-evidence from Australian and Singaporean managers. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 9(03), 273-289. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S0218495801000158>

Roberts, K., & Tholen, J. (1998). Young Entrepreneurs in East-Central Europe and the Former Soviet Union 1. *IDS Bulletin*, 29(3), 59-64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.1998.mp29003008.x>

Robinson, P.B., Huefner, J.C., & Hunt, H.K. (1991). Entrepreneurial research on student subjects does not generalize to real world entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 29, 42-50

Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development, *Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1934*.

Shane, S. (2002). Prior Knowledge and The Discovery of Entrepreneurial Opportunities, *Organization Science*, 11, 448-469. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.4.448.14602>

Shane, S., & Venkatraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 217-226. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2000.2791611>

Tiftik, H., & Zincirkiran, M. (2014). “Angel Investors” in Entrepreneurship: An Assessment on Turkey Model, İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi. *Journal of Business Research-Türk*, 6(1), 2014

Tonta, Y. (2008). Faktör Analizi Sunusu, <http://yunus.hacettepe.edu.tr/~tonta/courses/spring2008/bby208-12-faktör-analizi.ppt> (Son erişim tarihi:20.07.2009)

Turner, S., & Nguyen, P. A. (2005). Young entrepreneurs, social capital and Doi Moi in Hanoi, Vietnam. *Urban Studies*, 42(10), 1693-1710. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00420980500231563>

Yener, M., & Aykol, S. E. (2009). Girişimcilik Değerleri ve Örgütsel Vatandaşlık Davranışı Üzerine Bir Araştırma. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 14(1), 255-271.

Yılmaz, E., & Sünbül, A. M. (2008). Üniversite Öğrencilerine Yönelik Girişimcilik Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi. *Selcuk University Social Sciences Institute Journal*, 21.

Young, J. E. (2000). Entrepreneurship education and learning for university students and practicing entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship*, 215, 238.

Zincirkıran, Mustafa. (2014). Workaholism Research On Junior Administrative Police Officers In The Police Department. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i3/727>

Zincirkıran, M., & Tiftik, H. (2014). Innovation or Technological Madness? A Research on the Students of Business Administration for Their Preferences of Innovation and Technology. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 320-336. <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i2/651>