



The Effect of Demographic Factors on Entrepreneurship Tendency: The Case of Aksaray University and Uşak University¹

Demografik Faktörlerin Girişimcilik Eğilimi Üzerine Etkisi: Aksaray Üniversitesi ve Uşak Üniversitesi Örneği

Elif Hasret Kumcu² ve Makbule Hürmet Çetinel³

¹The abstract of the article was presented as an oral presentation at the 5th International Scientific Studies Congress (Ubcak) in Turkey.

²Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Aksaray Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler MYO, Büro Hizmetleri ve Sekreterlik Bölümü, elifhasretkumcu@aksaray.edu.tr, Orcid ID: 0000-0003-2732-7006

³Dr. Öğretim Üyesi, Uşak Üniversitesi, Uygulamalı Bilimler Fakültesi, Lojistik Yönetimi Bölümü, hurmet.cetinel@usak.edu.tr, Orcid ID: 0000-0003-3260-7432

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords

*Entrepreneurship,
Entrepreneurship Tendency,
Demographic Factors,*

Article History:

Received: 16 Mayıs 2021

Accepted: 5 Ekim 2022

MAKALE BİLGİSİ

Anahtar Kelimeler

*Girişimcilik,
Girişimcilik Eğilimi,
Demografik Faktörler*

Makale Geçmişi:

Geliş Tarihi: 16 Mayıs 2021

Kabul Tarihi: 5 Ekim 2022

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship is influenced by the desire to achieve psychologically rather than economic motivations. (Yılmaz, Sünbül, 2009: 197) Entrepreneurship spirit and entrepreneurship tendencies are affected by many factors. In this study, the responses of students to the entrepreneurial tendency scale were examined in terms of demographic characteristics. It was observed that there was no significant difference between the two universities in terms of student's creativity, their working methods and personal satisfaction, which are the three sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship tendency. There was no significant difference among the genders in terms of working method and personal satisfaction. However, there was a significant difference between the genders in terms of creativity. We found that there was a significant difference between the first year and the second year of study among the creativity and personal satisfaction sub-dimensions. This could be cause that the students are better adapted to the university life and they could develop better ideas about business life with realistic plans. No significant difference was found among the income groups in terms of entrepreneurship tendency. This might be caused by the proximity of the income groups.

ÖZET

Girişimcilik, ekonomik motivasyonlardan ziyade psikolojik olarak başarıya arzusundan etkilenir. (Yılmaz, Sünbül, 2009: 197) Girişimcilik ruhu ve girişimcilik eğilimleri birçok faktöre bağlıdır. Bu çalışmada öğrencilerin girişimcilik eğilimi ölçeğine verdikleri yanıtlar demografik özellikler açısından incelenmiştir. Girişimcilik eğiliminin üç alt boyutu olan öğrencilerin yaratıcılıkları, çalışma yöntemleri ve kişisel doyumları açısından iki üniversite öğrencileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olmadığı görülmüştür. Çalışma yöntemi ve kişisel tatmin açısından cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmamaktadır. Ancak yaratıcılık açısından cinsiyetler arasında anlamlı bir fark bulunmuştur. Yaratıcılık ve kişisel tatmin alt boyutları açısından üniversite birinci sınıf ile ikinci sınıf öğrencileri arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğu görülmüştür. Bunun nedeni 2. Sınıf öğrencilerinin üniversite hayatına daha iyi adapte olmaları ve gerçekçi planlarla iş hayatı hakkında daha iyi fikirler geliştirebilmeleri olabilir. Yaş grupları arasında girişimcilik eğilimleri açısından anlamlı bir fark yoktur. Bu durum, gelir gruplarının yakınlığından kaynaklanıyor olabilir şeklinde değerlendirilmiştir.

Today, with the acceleration of the effect of globalization, the change and transformation processes experienced in the markets make it necessary to produce different products and services. Establishment of businesses that produce various goods and services to meet human needs increases the importance of entrepreneurship. The entrepreneur meets the needs

of the society with the goods and services it offers to the market and at the same time provides added value to the country's economy by creating employment. The importance of entrepreneurship has been increasing more and more in recent years. By innovating, developing creative ideas, and taking risks, an entrepreneur can seize opportunities. Thus, it creates a value that will contribute to the welfare of the society. Entrepreneurship tendency refers to the individual's orientation towards entrepreneurship. It is necessary to reveal the entrepreneurial characteristics and potentials of individuals and to determine the tendencies in this direction. Individuals with entrepreneurial tendencies reveal innovation in the creation of new ideas and resources. In this context, countries should create the necessary environment for innovation and support entrepreneurs. Individuals with entrepreneurial tendencies reveal innovation in the creation of new ideas and resources. In this context, countries should create the necessary environment for innovation and support entrepreneurs. Sustainable economic growth can be achieved by providing support to entrepreneurs with the necessary training and development activities, together with the determination of entrepreneurship tendencies. In this context, the research examines the tendencies towards entrepreneurship of university students studying at different universities and different departments in terms of demographic factors. The effect of demographic variables in revealing entrepreneurial tendencies rather than who can be an entrepreneur has been examined.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

The importance of entrepreneurship is increasing day by day. In this context, the defined importance of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship tendency is mentioned in this section of the study. Then, current studies on entrepreneurship tendency are included.

1.1. Entrepreneurship

The etymological origin of the French word "entreprendre," which means "to do something," is the concept of entrepreneur. It was first employed in the economic meaning in the literature in the 18th century by Richard Cantillon, an Irishman who worked as a banker in Paris. In his essay "Essai sur la nature du commerce en général," published in 1755, Cantillon emphasized the risk-taking nature of the entrepreneur. The French economist Jean Baptiste Say also used the term "entrepreneur." According to Say Cantillon's definition, an entrepreneur must be capable of taking risks, coordinating, and managing production elements (Hisrich and Peters, 1995: 6).

With the publication of John Stuart Mill's "Principles of Political Economy" in 1848, the concept of entrepreneurship became widely accepted in English literature. According to Mill, the entrepreneur's duty also includes management responsibilities. The entrepreneur must have a specific level of intellectual knowledge and success. According to Schumpeter (1934), "entrepreneurs seek to radically change and revolutionize the way of production by using an innovation or, more generally, by enabling an untried technology". Entrepreneurship, according to Schumpeter (1934), comprises of tasks that are not performed as part of a regular work routine. It recognizes that entrepreneurs play an important role in economic development and that they are the driving force behind innovation and liberal capitalism development (Sciascia ve De vita, 2004: 5-6). Schumpeter defined entrepreneurship as establishing new organizations, finding new markets, developing new products, finding sources of supply, and developing new processes (Aidis, 2003: 4). Entrepreneurial people are known for their desire to reach high levels of success, as well as their ability to be innovative and self-assured. Individuals who are entrepreneurs are receptive to new ideas and dislike monotonous works (Öğüt at al., 2006: 432).

Enterprises provide economic development in the global economy. Entrepreneurs play an important role for the economy of each country. Entrepreneurs have an adventurous and innovative nature. Accordingly, entrepreneurship has two dimensions. These are the spirit of adventure and the spirit of innovation. Entrepreneurs can take risks and they create innovations (Gu & Zheng, 2021: 613-615). Entrepreneurs create new organizations and they look for new opportunities (Hausmann & Heinze, 2016: 7). Entrepreneurship improves the economy by supporting the local private sector, creating new jobs and new enterprises (Mahmoud et al., 2017: 2). Entrepreneurship is not only important for the global economy but for creating a sustainable economy (Udimal et al, 2020: 1, Dhahri et al, 2021: 10). Entrepreneurs take risks to accomplish their ideas by investing their time and money for new ventures. They utilize innovative and creative thinking in this process. Naturally, the degree of risk varies for each business venture (Ratten & Jones, 2020: 2).

Entrepreneurship can also be defined as the notion of undertaking a venture. Entrepreneurs develop business ideas, collect the information for the target market, make strategic decisions and implement the business ideas. Entrepreneurs make many strategic decisions. Entrepreneurs have a crucial role for the economy (Smit, 2004:168). Entrepreneurship is also important in reducing poverty (Bannor et al, 2021: 1).

1.2. Entrepreneurial Tendency

Entrepreneurial tendency explains the individual's intention to be an entrepreneur. People with entrepreneurial tendencies can create new ventures to take risks, combining production factors and planning to establish ventures. The entrepreneurial

tendency is the first step for the entrepreneur to realize his/her ideas and vision. The processes of business plan development, reaching goals and objectives begins with this trend. Entrepreneurship starts with the entrepreneurial tendency (Karabulut, 2016: 17).

The entrepreneurial tendency is necessary for the start of entrepreneurial activities (Smith et al., 2015: 265). Entrepreneurship tendency is directed by individual entrepreneurial behavior. In other words, this tendency describes the mental state which leads the individual's experience and actions towards a business idea (Bird, 1988: 442). The degree to which an individual displays such entrepreneurial behaviors and tendencies might reveal whether the person will be an entrepreneur or not. The entrepreneurial tendency can be exhibited not only among entrepreneurs, but also by individuals such as employees, managers and students. Entrepreneurial tendency is characterised by the individual's behaviors and this tendency provides self-motivation (Ahmetoglu et al., 2020: 130).

According to Aldrich & Cliff (2003), when individuals are surrounded by successful entrepreneurs, these individuals tend to have higher entrepreneurship tendencies. These tendencies emerge stronger by social interaction with other entrepreneurs. Hisrich & Peters (2002) emphasized that entrepreneurship is affected by factors such as family, education, individual values, age, work experience and role model. Yuan (2018) suggested that the dimensions of entrepreneurial tendencies are the entrepreneurial quality, the entrepreneurial experience and the entrepreneurial environment. He analyzed the entrepreneurial tendencies of college students and found that entrepreneurship knowledge and entrepreneurship environments are more effective on the students than the other dimensions. Walley et al. (2019) examined the enterprising tendency of Chinese university students. The students have an overall medium level of enterprising tendency. The results showed that entrepreneurship tendency is related to gender, family business, hometown and entrepreneurship education. In another study with Chinese university students, Yao (2015) conducted a research on the effect of the perceived entrepreneurial environment on their entrepreneurial tendency. The research results have shown that the social environment and the economic environment have a positive influence on the university students' entrepreneurial tendency. A similar study by Estelami (2019) on a business program in a Northeastern American university indicated that entrepreneurial tendency is associated with the age and the risk-taking skills of the entrepreneurs.

Ahmetoğlu et al (2020) examined the relationship between entrepreneurial tendencies and the job performance. The results revealed that the entrepreneurship tendency has a positive relationship with the locus of control and performance. Marcu et al. (2012) investigated the effect of the psychological factors and the economic environment on entrepreneurial tendencies. Their research suggests that the economic environment and the internal locus of control in crisis affects the entrepreneurial tendency.

Many studies indicate that the entrepreneurial tendency is clearly affected by different factors. These factors are effective in the emergence of entrepreneurs. Thus, the factors affecting entrepreneurship tendencies obviously play an important role for the economic development of any country.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Model

The research was created on the basis of measuring the entrepreneurship tendencies of the students studying at Aksaray University and Uşak University and examining the differences according to the demographic characteristics of the students.

2.2. Research Universe and Sample

Aksaray University and Uşak University students constitute the main body of our research. As of 2020, there are a total of 24,000 students at Aksaray University and 33,000 students at Uşak University. 180 students were reached by random sampling. Ethics committee permission has been obtained for this ethical research committee permission. The ethics committee approval required for the study was approved by the Aksaray University Human Research Ethics Committee with the research permission decision with the protocol number 2020/13-57 in the meeting number 13, decision number 2020/01-106 dated 18/12/2020.

2.3. Data Collection

The question form consists of two parts. The first part consists of demographic questions (8 questions), while the second part includes the entrepreneurial tendencies scale (41 questions). The scales used for data collection in the study; Demirel (2003), Demirel and Tikici (2004), Demirel et al. (2007), Demirel and Tikici (2010) and Demirel (2013).

2.4. Statistical Methods Used for Data Analysis

Statistical Package for Social Science for Windows (SPSS) 23.0 package program was used to evaluate the data obtained in the study. Descriptive statistical analysis mean, standard deviation values and frequency distributions were used to measure

students' entrepreneurial tendencies attitudes. Whether entrepreneurship tendencies differ significantly according to the students' university, college status and gender was measured by independent t test. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether there was a significant difference among other socio-demographic characteristics in the questionnaire in terms of age and students' education field and class, as well as monthly income units. Tukey - HSD tests were used to determine between which groups the difference occurred in more than two groups with differences.

3. FINDINGS AND EVALUATION

3.1. Normality Test

Skewness Measure of the symmetry of a distribution can be studied by making a comparison to normal distribution. A distribution which has relatively large values and tails off the right can be considered as a positively skewed distribution. On the other hand, negatively skewed distribution is characterised by few small values and tails off to the left. The values falling outside the range of -1 to +1 indicate that the distribution is substantially skewed (Hair, Black, Babin & Anderson (2013).

Table 1. Normality Test

	Parameter	Statistic	Std. Error
Creativity	Skewness	-,404	,181
	Kurtosis	-,590	,360
Working Method	Skewness	-,882	,181
	Kurtosis	-,208	,360
Personal Satisfaction	Skewness	-,922	,181
	Kurtosis	,163	,360

Our data is distributed normally.

3.2. Demographic Features

In this study; the gender, age, monthly income of the students, which university they studied at, their departments, the year in their college, whether they were in vocational school or faculty were taken into consideration as demographic factors.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
University	Aksaray University	116	64,4	64,4	64,4
	Uşak University	64	35,6	35,6	100
	Total	180	100	100	
Department	Office Management	59	32,8	32,8	32,8
	International Logistics and Transportation	32	17,8	17,8	50,6
	Accounting	34	18,9	18,9	69,4
	Other	55	30,6	30,6	100
College status	Associate degree	111	61,7	61,7	61,7
	Undergraduate	69	38,3	38,3	100
Year in University	1st Year	52	28,9	28,9	28,9
	2nd Year	71	39,4	39,4	68,3
	3rd Year	5	2,8	2,8	71,1
	4th Year	52	28,9	28,9	100
Gender	Female	114	63,3	63,3	63,3
	Male	66	36,7	36,7	100
Age	18-20 years old	65	36,1	36,1	36,1
	21-23 years old	92	51,1	51,1	87,2
	24 and over	23	12,8	12,8	100
Monthly Income	2500 TL and below	94	52,2	52,2	52,2
	2501-4500 TL	56	31,1	31,1	83,3
	4501-6500 TL	20	11,1	11,1	94,4
	6501 TL and over	10	5,6	5,6	100

TL: Turkish Liras

In this study, 64% of the students participating in the research are Aksaray University students, 36% are students of Uşak University. 33% of the participants are from Office Management, 18% from Logistics department, 19% from Accounting department and 31% from other department students. 62% of the students study associate degree, 38% study undergraduate. Most of the students (39%) are second year students. 63% of the participants are female students and 37% are male students. 51% of the students are between the ages of 21-23. In addition, the majority of the participants (52%) are low-income.

3.3. Descriptive Analysis

In the study, it was investigated whether there is a differentiation according to demographic factors in terms of creativity, working method and personal satisfaction, which are sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship tendency, with independent samples tests, Anova tests and Post- Hoc Tests.

3.3.1. Independent Samples Tests

Table 3. Independent Sample Test for University Factor

Levene's Test for Equality of		Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Creativity	Equal variances assumed	,000	1,000	-,028	178	,977
	Equal variances not assumed			-,028	126,022	,978
Working Method	Equal variances assumed	2,621	,107	-1,134	178	,258
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,177	144,768	,241
Personal Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	,771	,381	-1,462	178	,146
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,483	135,475	,140

Sig. > 0,05.

It does not differ significantly from university in terms of creativity, study method and personal satisfaction.

Table 4. Independent Samples Test for College Status

Levene's Test for Equality of		Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Creativity	Equal variances assumed	,259	,611	,630	178	,530
	Equal variances not assumed			,618	135,836	,537
Working Method	Equal variances assumed	1,252	,265	-,361	178	,719
	Equal variances not assumed			-,366	151,816	,715
Personal Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	,079	,779	-,604	178	,547
	Equal variances not assumed			-,597	139,303	,551

Sig. > 0,05.

It does not differ significantly from college status in terms of creativity, study method and personal satisfaction.

Table 5. Independent Samples Test for Gender

Levene's Test for Equality of		Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Creativity	Equal variances assumed	,362	,548	-2,113	178	,036
	Equal variances not assumed			-2,116	136,430	,036
Working Method	Equal variances assumed	,328	,567	-,820	178	,413
	Equal variances not assumed			-,825	138,124	,411
Personal Satisfaction	Equal variances assumed	2,777	,097	,916	178	,361
	Equal variances not assumed			,881	120,722	,380

Creativity factor, Sig. (2-tailed) 0,036 < 0,05.

A statistically significant difference was found in terms of the gender of the participants in the study in terms of the creativity sub-dimension, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurial tendency scale (t: -2,113; p: 0,036 < 0,05).

3.3.2. One –Way Anova

Creativity and working method variances are homogeneously distributed for departments. However, personal satisfaction variance is not distributed homogeneously.

Table 6. One-Way Anova Test for Departments

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Creativity	Between Groups	,145	3	,048	,164	,920
	Within Groups	51,663	176	,294		
Working Method	Between Groups	,921	3	,307		
	Within Groups	57,627	176	,327	,938	,424
Personal Satisfaction	Between Groups	1,342	3			
	Within Groups	39,525	176	,447		
Total		40,867	179	,225	1,992	,117

Sig > 0,05.

There is no difference among students in terms of creativity, study method and personal satisfaction according to the department they studied at the university.

Creativity, working method and personal satisfaction variances are homogeneously distributed for year in university.

Table 7. One-Way Anova Test for year in University

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Creativity	Between Groups	3,057	3	1,019	3,678	,013
	Within Groups	48,751	176	,277		
	Total	51,808	179			
Working Method	Between Groups	2,183	3	,728	2,272	,082
	Within Groups	56,365	176	,320		
	Total	58,548	179			
Personal Satisfaction	Between Groups	2,125	3	,708	3,218	,024
	Within Groups	38,742	176	,220		
	Total	40,867	179			

Creativity significance $0,013 < 0,05$. Personal satisfaction significance $0,024 < 0,0$.

Creativity and personal satisfaction dimensions differ in terms of students' classes. As their variances distributed homogenously, we can make post-hoc test of Tukey.

3.3.3. Post- Hoc Tests

Table 8. Tukey HSD Test for year in University

Multiple Comparisons				Mean	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
Dependent Variable				Difference (I-J)			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Creativity	1st Year	2. Grade		-,31118*	0,09606	0,008	-0,5603	-0,062
		3. Grade		-0,35121	0,24643	0,485	-0,9904	0,288
		4. Grade		-0,17105	0,10322	0,35	-0,4388	0,0967
	2nd Year	1st Year		,31118*	0,09606	0,008	0,062	0,5603
		3. Grade		-0,04003	0,24352	0,998	-0,6716	0,5916
		4. Grade		0,14013	0,09606	0,465	-0,109	0,3893
	3rd Year	1st Year		0,35121	0,24643	0,485	-0,288	0,9904
		2. Grade		0,04003	0,24352	0,998	-0,5916	0,6716
		4. Grade		0,18016	0,24643	0,884	-0,459	0,8193
	4th Year	1st Year		0,17105	0,10322	0,35	-0,0967	0,4388
		2. Grade		-0,14013	0,09606	0,465	-0,3893	0,109
		3. Grade		-0,18016	0,24643	0,884	-0,8193	0,459
Working Method	1st Year	2. Grade		-0,26198	0,10329	0,058	-0,5299	0,0059
		3. Grade		-0,22189	0,26497	0,837	-0,9092	0,4654
		4. Grade		-0,20562	0,11098	0,252	-0,4935	0,0822
	2nd Year	1st Year		0,26198	0,10329	0,058	-0,0059	0,5299
		3. Grade		0,04009	0,26184	0,999	-0,6391	0,7192
		4. Grade		0,05636	0,10329	0,948	-0,2116	0,3243
	3rd Year	1st Year		0,22189	0,26497	0,837	-0,4654	0,9092
		2. Grade		-0,04009	0,26184	0,999	-0,7192	0,6391
		4. Grade		0,01627	0,26497	1	-0,671	0,7035
	4th Year	1st Year		0,20562	0,11098	0,252	-0,0822	0,4935
		2. Grade		-0,05636	0,10329	0,948	-0,3243	0,2116
		3. Grade		-0,01627	0,26497	1	-0,7035	0,671
Personal Satisfaction	1st Year	2. Grade		-,23995*	0,08564	0,029	-0,4621	-0,0178
		3. Grade		-0,02179	0,21968	1	-0,5916	0,548
		4. Grade		-0,22863	0,09201	0,066	-0,4673	0,01
	2nd Year	1. Grade		,23995*	0,08564	0,029	0,0178	0,4621
		3. Grade		0,21815	0,21708	0,747	-0,3449	0,7812
		4. Grade		0,01132	0,08564	0,999	-0,2108	0,2334
	3rd Year	1. Grade		0,02179	0,21968	1	-0,548	0,5916
		2. Grade		-0,21815	0,21708	0,747	-0,7812	0,3449
		4. Grade		-0,20684	0,21968	0,782	-0,7766	0,363
	4th Year	1. Grade		0,22863	0,09201	0,066	-0,01	0,4673
		2. Grade		-0,01132	0,08564	0,999	-0,2334	0,2108
		3. Grade		0,20684	0,21968	0,782	-0,363	0,7766

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

There is a significant difference between first and second year students in terms of creativity and personal satisfaction. Creativity, working method and personal satisfaction variances are homogeneously distributed for age.

Table 9. One-Way Anova Test for Age

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Creativity	Between Groups	1,477	2	,738	2,597	,077
	Within Groups	50,331	177	,284		
	Total	51,808	179			
Working Method	Between Groups	1,333	2	,667	2,063	,130
	Within Groups	57,214	177	,323		
	Total	58,548	179			
Personal Satisfaction	Between Groups	,235	2	,117	,511	,601
	Within Groups	40,633	177	,230		
	Total	40,867	179			

There is no difference among students in terms of creativity, study method and personal satisfaction according to their age. Creativity, working method and personal satisfaction variances are homogeneously distributed for monthly income.

Table 10. One –Way Anova Test for Monthly Income

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Creativity	Between Groups	,580	3	,193	,664	,575
	Within Groups	51,228	176	,291		
	Total	51,808	179			
Working Method	Between Groups	1,280	3	,427	1,312	,272
	Within Groups	57,268	176	,325		
	Total	58,548	179			
Personal Satisfaction	Between Groups	,194	3	,065	,280	,840
	Within Groups	40,673	176	,231		
	Total	40,867	179			

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this research, the entrepreneurial tendency was examined in terms of creativity, working method, and personal satisfaction. Students studying in different departments at Aksaray University and Uşak University were asked questions about their entrepreneurial tendency and the answers were evaluated according to their demographic characteristics. In our study, in terms of gender variables among demographic factors; A significant difference was found between female and male students in terms of creativity. It shows parallelism with the findings of Büyükyılmaz et al.'s (2016) study. They revealed that women entrepreneurs are more open and willing to develop innovative and new ideas. In addition, Seçgin (2020) revealed in his study that the gender factor differed significantly in terms of entrepreneurial tendency. Ozguner et al. (2017) revealed that the gender variable differed significantly in their study. In this sense, the results seem to be compatible with the literature. In addition, it was observed that there was a significant difference between the first-year university students and the second-year students in terms of creativity and personal satisfaction. It is thought that students who have just started university differ from other classes in terms of creativity and personal satisfaction because they are more excited and their imaginations are more unlimited.

No significant difference was found in terms of other demographic factors examined. It has been observed that the entrepreneurship tendencies of the students studying at state universities, in the same generation, and in the same low-income group, do not differ according to demographic factors. In Seçgin's (2020) study, similar to our study, no significant difference was found except for the gender variable. Buyukyılmaz et al. (2016) found no differentiating effect on the entrepreneurial tendency in terms of other dimensions of entrepreneurship. In her study, Korkmaz (2012) determined that the income status showed a significant difference in terms of entrepreneurial tendency, but the low-income level of the majority of the participants in our study is thought to be the reason why there was no significant difference. When these results were compared with some studies in the literature, it was concluded that these results were compatible with the literature. This study contributes to the correct orientation of university students by determining their entrepreneurial tendencies in terms of different dimensions of entrepreneurship. It is thought that this contribution is important in terms of increasing entrepreneurial employment and thus serving the development of the country's economy by reducing unemployment. Future studies can be conducted among different age groups, different occupational groups, and different income groups in order to explain the demographic factors that affect the entrepreneurial tendency.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Declarations of Research and Publication Ethics: This study has been prepared in accordance with scientific research and publication ethics.

Authors' Contributions: The authors contributed equally to the study

Statement of Interest: There is no conflict of interest for the authors or third parties arising from the study.

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee permission has been obtained for this ethical research committee permission. The ethics committee approval required for the study was approved by the Aksaray University Human Research Ethics Committee with the research permission decision with the protocol number 2020/13-57 in the meeting number 13, decision number 2020/01-106 dated 18/12/2020.

REFERENCES

- Ahmetoglu, G., Scarlett, L., Codreanu, S. C., & Chamorro-Premuzi, T. (2020). The impact of organizational structure and work autonomy in fostering entrepreneurial tendencies and job performance. *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship*, 8 (1), 128-143. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBHRM-11-2018-0070>.
- Aidis, R. (2003). Entrepreneurship and economic transition. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Cliff, J. E. (2003). The pervasive effects of family on entrepreneurship: toward a family embeddedness perspective. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18, 5, 573-596. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026\(03\)00011-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-9026(03)00011-9).
- Bannor, R. K., Ros-Tonen, M. A. F., Mensah, P. O., Derkyi, M., & Nassah, V. F. (2021). Entrepreneurial behaviour among non-timber forest product-growing farmers in Ghana: an analysis in support of a reforestation policy. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 122 (2021) 102331.
- Bird, B. (1988). Implementing entrepreneurial ideas: the case for intention. *The Academy of Management Review*, 13(3), 442-453.
- Büyükyılmaz, O.; Karakaya, A. & Yıldırım, C. (2016). Girişimcilik eğitimi alan bireylerin demografik özellikleri açısından girişimcilik eğilimleri arasındaki farklar, *Jed / Gkd* 10:2, 105-125.
- Demirel, E. T. & Tikici, M. (2004). Kültürün girişimciliğe etkileri, *Fırat Üniversitesi Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları Dergisi /Fırat University, Journal of Eastern Anatolian Region Research*. 2(3), 49 – 58.
- Demirel, E. T. (2003). Girişimcilik kültürü. Malatya: İnönü Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İşletme Ana Bilim Dalı, Yönetim ve Organizasyon Bilim Dalı, Yüksek Lisans Tezi /Malatya, İnönü University, Social Sciences Institute, Business Administration, Management and Organisation, Post Graduate Dissertation.
- Demirel, E. T. (2013). Yaşam amaçlarının girişimcilik düşüncesini biçimlendirmesi. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi /Journal of Elektronical Social Sciences*, 12(45), 123 – 143.
- Demirel, E. T., & Tikici, M. (2010). Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin beyin baskınlık analizi ile değerlendirilmesi: İnönü Üniversitesi İ.İ.B.F. işletme bölümü örneği. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi /Journal of Elektronical Social Sciences*, <http://www.esosder.com>. 9(32), 250 - 283.
- Demirel, E. T., Tikici, M., Türk, M. & Akbiyık, N. (2007). Kültürün girişimciliğe etkileri: Malatya örneği. Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım (Nobel Publication).
- Dhahri, S., Sana Slimani, S., & Omri, A. (2021). Behavioral entrepreneurship for achieving the sustainable development goals. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 165 (2021) 120561. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120561>.
- Estelami, H. (2019). The effects of need for cognition, gender, risk preferences and marketing education on entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Research in Marketing and Entrepreneurship*, 22 (1), 93-109.
- Gu, W., & Zheng, X. (2021). An empirical study on the impact of sustainable entrepreneurship: based on the environmental Kuznets model. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 613–624. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.10.011>.
- Gürbüz, Sait. (2015). Kuşak farklılıkları: mit mi, gerçek mi? generational differences: a myth or reality? *İş ve İnsan Dergisi / The Journal of Human and Work*, April, Cilt-Sayı / Volume-Issue: 2 (1) ss | pp: 39-57.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2013). *Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hausmann, A., & Heinze, A. (2016). Entrepreneurship in the cultural and creative industries: insights from an emergent field. *A Journal of Entrepreneurship in the Arts*, 5 (2),7-22.
- Hirsch, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (1995). *Entrepreneurship—starting developing and managing a new enterprise*, Richard D, Irwin. INC, USA.
- Hirsch, R. D., & Peters, M. P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship*. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Karabulut, A. T. (2016). Personality Traits on entrepreneurial intention. *5th International Conference on Leadership, Technology, Innovation and Business Management . Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 229 (2016) 12 – 21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.07.109>.
- Korkmaz, O. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik eğilimlerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma: Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi örneği, *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İibf Dergisi (C.Xiv, S İI)* 209-222.
- Mahmoud, Y., Makoond, A., & Naik, A. (2017). *Entrepreneurship for sustaining peace*, International Peace Institute, 1-6.
- Öğüt, A., Şendoğdu, A., & Yılmaz, N. (2006). Principles of information management in terms of informatics entrepreneurship typology. *International Entrepreneurship Congress. Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University Faculty of Economics and Administrative Units*, 25-27 May. 431-436, Bışkek.
- Özgüner, Z.; Özgüner, M. & Özdemir, A. (2017). Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik eğilimlerinin çeşitli demografik değişkenler bağlamında değerlendirilmesi, *Proceedings Book Of 2nd International Scientific Researches Congress On Humanities And Social Sciences (Ibad-2017)*, April 20-23, Istanbul-Turkey, 391-403.
- Ratten, V. & Jones, P. (2020). Entrepreneurship and management education: exploring trends and gaps. *The International Journal of Management Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2020.100431>.

- Sciascia, S., & De Vita, R. (2004). The development of entrepreneurship research, *Liuc Papers*, 146, Serie Economia Aziendale 19.
- Seçgin, Y. (2020). The effect of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship tender: a research on university students. *Business & Management Studies: An International Journal*, 8(1), 803-827.
- Smit, A. B., (2004). Changing external conditions require high levels of entrepreneurship in agriculture. *Acta Horti*, 655, 167-173. <https://doi.org/10.17660/ActaHortic.2004.655.21>.
- Smith, R. M., Sardeshmukh, S.R., & Combs, G.M. (2015). Understanding gender, creativity, and entrepreneurial intentions. *Education + Training*, 58(3), 263-282, doi. 10.1108/ET-06-2015-0044.
- Tiantian Liu, T., Walley, K., Pugh, G., & Adkins, P. (2019). Entrepreneurship education in china evidence from a preliminary scoping study of enterprising tendency in Chinese University students. *Journal of Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies*, 12(2), 305-326. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-01-20190006>.
- Udimal, T. B., Luo, M., Liu, E., & Mensah, N. O. (2020). How has formal institutions influenced opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship? the case of brics economies. *Heliyon*, 6 (2020) e04931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2020.e04931>.
- Yao, X., Wu, X. & Long, D. (2015). University students' entrepreneurial tendency in china effect of students' perceived entrepreneurial environment. *Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 60-81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEEE-03-2015-0021>.
- Yılmaz, E., & Sünbül, A. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik girişimcilik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi, *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi/ Journal of Selçuk University Social Sciences Institute*, v.21, p.195-203.
- Yuan, Z. (2018). Research on the influencing factors of traditional entrepreneurial curriculum on college students' entrepreneurial tendency. 2018 4th International Conference on Education, Management and Information Technology (ICEMIT 2018), 519-522.

