Examination of Hitit University Faculty of Sports students' entrepreneurship tendencies

Çisem Ünlü[1]*, Emrah Cerit[1], Gül Yağar[1], Ferdi Bodur, Meltem Evli[2] and Aynur Canaydın[3]

[1]Department of Physical Education and Sports, Faculty of Sports Sciences, Hitit University, Çorum, Turkey.
[2]Osmancık Ömer Derindere Vocational School, Hitit University, Çorum, Turkey.
[3]Suluova Vocational School, Amasya University, Amasya, Turkey.

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurship is an action process that becomes more and more important, integrates with the support provided, and as a result, contributes directly to the economy. Entrepreneurship increases its importance in the process from past to present. The contribution of the individual to the national economy continues to be important in terms of creating new employment areas. In a developing and diverse world, entrepreneurial individuals are needed in every field. Entrepreneurial individuals have a significant role in ensuring social development, solving employment problems, increasing social welfare, and improving competition. As universities have started to play an important role in entrepreneurship, it has become very significant to determine the trends of students in this field. Especially in university education, there is a need for students to improve their entrepreneurial characteristics. In this regard, this study aims to reveal the current situation by examining the entrepreneurial tendency levels of the students of Hitit University Faculty of Sport Sciences. The universe of the study consists of students studying at Hitit University Faculty of Sport Sciences in the 2019-2020 academic year. The sample group consists of 500 students, 164 female, 336 male, selected by random sampling method. The questionnaire form used as a data collection tool in the study consists of two sections. "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researchers constitute the first section of the questionnaire. "University Students Entrepreneurship Scale" designed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2009), consisting of 36 expressions, formed the second section of the questionnaire. Frequency distributions, "Independent Sample T-Test", "one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)" were used as statistical analysis techniques. The results of the analysis of the socio-demographic characteristics of the students are given on average, standard deviation, and percentages. The data were processed and analyzed using SPSS 21 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). As a result of the study, it was determined that there was no significant difference between the variables according to demographic information (gender, age, class, education, department, sports), and students had a "high entrepreneurship" feature.

Keywords: Student, entrepreneurship, tendencies.

*Corresponding author. E-mail: cisemunlu@hotmail.com.

INTRODUCTION

The conceptual development of interventional thinking is quite complex. The historical process created by chronological factors has become significant in the development of interventional thinking. For example, revolutions, civil wars, world wars, urban developments in cities are among the important historical events that affect the conceptual development of interventional thinking (Murphy et al., 2006:14). Conceptually, entrepreneurship dates back to centuries before Christ. Since the early ages, Human beings have met their needs throughout history, despite the adverse conditions, to survive. Historical periods from the existence of humankind to this time, are innovation processes that they put forward with an entrepreneurial spirit and taking risks (Durukan, 2007:25). In addition to maintaining human life in the first age, they engaged in

entrepreneurship activities for trade. In the middle ages, they engaged in entrepreneurship activities to manage their wide-ranging projects without major risks (Wingham, 2004:2). The development of entrepreneurship has continued from medieval times to the present day. In these comprehensive production projects, human beings take no risks and manage the resources provided (Hisrich and Peters, 2001). In the 21st century, entrepreneurship has become a concept that we encounter in every aspect of our lives. New job opportunities and various sectors have emerged while information is renewed and developed in Today. Entrepreneurship, which has existed from the past to the present, has evolved in line with the development of information and easier access to information.

In the literature research, entrepreneurship has been defined from different aspects by many researchers. Entrepreneurship is derived from the French word "entreprendre". Entrepreneurship was used as a term by Richard Cantillon (Arikan, 2002). In the folk language, "acting, starting to do a job," is described as an initiative, while the person in this situation is called an "entrepreneur" (Aytaç and İlhan, 2007:107). Entrepreneurs are also known as businessmen, traders, managers, directors, who try to create their own business (Küçük, 2005:26). Entrepreneurship is an exceptional field that shapes socially with success, which takes a civil form with the roles such as model, trust, and image, which first appeared through mental perception and intuition, and psychologically, conscious emotionality integrated with the characteristics of the entrepreneur (Top, 2006:7). Based on all the definitions made about the concept, the conclusion is that entrepreneurship is considered as a process where different factors come together (Dündar and Ağca, 2007:124).

Entrepreneurship includes the process of awareness and evaluation of existing opportunities. Entrepreneurship forms the basis of the economy. The concept of entrepreneurship was interesting as it increased both individual and social welfare. Hence, it has taken its place in the literature as a research area. Therefore, countries have started to show the required importance and focus on entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship is the most effective way to reveal unused potential and create new business areas. Therefore, entrepreneurship activities form an economic whole in the development of the region and countries (Korkmaz, 2012:211-212). While entrepreneurship creates new job opportunities, it also contributes significantly to the solution of the unemployment problem in the economy. Therefore, the entrepreneurs have a great responsibility in the development of the places we live in. Also, new products and opportunities are offered to the public, thanks to entrepreneurs with different strategies and thinking powers (Akyüz, 2013:81). An entrepreneur is expressed as an individual, who meets human needs such as products and services, by combining capital, resources, and workforce. We may define the entrepreneur as an individual who uses, evaluates, and takes responsibility for all the factors of production activities to meet human needs (Mucuk, 2013:5-8).

Today, entrepreneurship has gained considerable importance. It is essential to identify people with an entrepreneurial character and to train them properly by institutions such as universities. Universities have several duties for entrepreneurship education to be planned and implemented to meet the needs of the economic sectors (Lekoko et al., 2012). It is essential to analyze the entrepreneurship characteristics of students, especially those who are trained in faculties of sports sciences, and make the necessary situation analysis. Considering the students who graduated from the faculties of sports sciences, entrepreneurship tendencies are considered to be at a high level. Based on all these theoretical knowledge and findings, it is essential to examine entrepreneurship tendencies of university students.

METHODOLOGY

Research pattern

"General screening model', one of the descriptive scanning methods, was used in this study. General screening model; It is a method that tries to describe the situation of the assets and groups and explain all the features to reveal the existing situation. To reach a general judgment in large groups, the whole conditions of the universe or a sample is taken from it and tried to be determined by describing the existing conditions (Cohen et al., 1997).

Aim of the study

The study aims to reveal the current situation by examining the entrepreneurial tendency levels of Hitit University Faculty of Sports Sciences students.

The universe and the sample of the study

The universe of the study consists of students studying at Hitit University Faculty of Sport Sciences in the 2019-2020 academic year. The sample group consists of 500 students, 164 female, 336 male, selected by random sampling method.

Data gathering

The questionnaire form used as a data collection tool in the study consists of two sections. "Personal Information Form" prepared by the researchers constitute the first section of the questionnaire. "University Students Entrepreneurship Scale" designed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2009), consisting of 36 expressions, formed the second

section of the questionnaire.

This scale consists of 36 items on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*). The lowest score obtained from the scale was 36, and the highest score was 180. Scoring and evaluating students' entrepreneurship levels were determined by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2009) (Table 1).

The reliability of the data collection tool was tested by calculating the Cronbach Alpha coefficient based on the alpha value. The overall internal consistency coefficient of the scale was 0.98. In order for the scale to have a high level of reliability, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient must be 0.80 and above (Kayış, 2010:405). As can be seen, the coefficient is above acceptable limits. This shows that the items in the questionnaire are consistent and reliable.

Data analysis

Frequency distributions, "Independent Sample T-Test", "one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA)" were used as statistical analysis techniques. The results of the analysis of the socio-demographic characteristics of the students are given on average, standard deviation, and percentages. The data were processed and analyzed using SPSS 21 (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

Table 1. Evaluation of entrepreneurship scores.

Score	Entrepreneurship level
36-64	Very low entrepreneurship
65-92	Low entrepreneurship
93-123	Moderate entrepreneurship
124-151	High entrepreneurship
152-180	Very high entrepreneurship

FINDINGS

As can be seen in Table 2, there are 500 participants (67.2% male and 32.8% female) in total. The highest participation in terms of age range was 218 with 21-23 age range, the highest in terms of the grade was with 174 people in 1st Classes, the highest in terms of the department was 202 with Sports Management department, the highest in terms of the curriculum was 295 with normal education appears to be. In addition, 53.4% of the participants not doing sports.

As can be seen in Table 3, the entrepreneurship score of the research group was determined as an average of 140.00 points with a standard deviation of 20.47. This score is 124 to 151, according to the Evaluation of Entrepreneurship Scale developed by Yılmaz and Sünbül (2009) and shows that the research group has high entrepreneurship.

As can be seen in Table 4, there were 500 participants (336 male and 164 female) in total. According to the gender variable t-test results, there is no significant difference between entrepreneurship and gender variable ($P > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 5, the highest average ($\overline{X} = 140.55$) with the age variable of the participants was 24 years and older. ANOVA results made by age variable showed that there was no significant difference between entrepreneurship and age variable ($P > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 6, the highest average ($\overline{X} = 140.49$) of the participants was determined in the coaching department. ANOVA results made by department variable showed that there was no significant difference between entrepreneurship and department variable ($P > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 7, the highest average ($\overline{X} = 141.86$) of the participants was determined in the 4th-Grade. ANOVA results made by grade variable showed that there was no significant difference between entrepreneurship and grade variable ($P > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 8, the participants ($\overline{X} = 295$) were at normal education. No significant difference was found between the data obtained from the t-test results according to the schooling variable and the level of entrepreneurship ($p > 0.05$).

As can be seen in Table 9, 267 of the participants were not doing sports. No significant difference was found between the data obtained from the t-test results made according to the sports situation variable and the level of entrepreneurship ($p > 0.05$).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study aims to examine entrepreneurship tendency levels of students of sports sciences. As can be understood from the results that emerged according to the findings, there was no significant difference between some variables (age, gender, class, department, program, sports status) and entrepreneurship level. When we examine the studies conducted by age variable, Mirza and Dağdeviren (2016) stated that there was no significant relationship between students' entrepreneurship characteristics and age and gender. In their study on entrepreneurship, Türkmen and Dağdeviren (2015) stated that no significant difference was found between age and entrepreneurship level. Other studies in the field reveal that there is no significant difference between age and entrepreneurship level (Cengiz et al., 2016).

Previous studies in the literature show that there was no significant difference in terms of gender variables with participants' entrepreneurship characteristics. In their study on 474 students studying in different departments of Selçuk University, Yılmaz and Sünbül (2009) concluded that there was no significant difference in

Table 2. Socio-demographic distribution of students.

Parameter		n	%
Gender	Male	336	67.2
	Female	164	32.8
Age	18-20 years	199	39.8
	21-23 years	218	43.6
	24 years and older	83	16.6
Grade	1st-Grade	174	34.8
	2nd-Grade	133	26.6
	3rd-Grade	110	22.0
	4th-Grade	83	16.6
Department	Physical Education and Sports	87	17.4
	Coaching	173	34.6
	Sports Management	202	40.4
	Recreation	38	7.6
Schooling	Normal Education	295	59.0
	Secondary education	205	41.0
Doing sports	Yes	233	46.6
	No	267	53.4

Table 3. Averages of students' entrepreneurship tendencies.

n	Mean.	Sd.
500	140.00	20.47

Table 4. Independent group t-test results according to the gender variable of entrepreneurship scale scores.

Gender	Groups	N	$\overline{X}$	SS	t-test t	Df	p
Entrepreneurship	Male	336	138.78	20.74	-1.91	498	0.06
	Female	164	142.50	19.73	-1.95		

$p < 0.05$.

Table 5. One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results of entrepreneurship scale scores according to age variable.

f. $\overline{X}$ and SS Values					ANOVA results					
	Group	N	$\overline{X}$	SS	Var. K.	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
Entrepreneurship	18-20 age	218	139.61	16.25	Inter-group	99.60	2	49.800		
	21-23 age	83	139.70	17.40	In-group	208892.40	497	420.307	0.18	0.90
	24 age and above	199	140.55	18.45	Total	208992.00	499			

$p < 0.05$.

Table 6. One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results of entrepreneurship scale scores according to department variable.

$f . \overline{x} \& ss$ Values					ANOVA Results					
	Group	N	x̄	ss	Var. K.	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
Entrepreneur ship	Recreation	38	137.82	14.27	Inter-group	290.92	3	96.97		
	Physical Education and Sports	87	139.25	12.38	In-group	208701.08	496	420.77	1.805	0.87
	Sports Management	202	140.32	15.71		208992.00				
	Coaching	173	140.49	14.88	Total		499			

p < 0.05.

Table 7. One-way variance analysis (ANOVA) results of entrepreneurship scale scores according to class variable.

$f . \overline{x} \& ss$ Values					ANOVA Results					
	Group	N	x̄	ss	Var. K.	KT	Sd	KO	F	p
Entrepreneur ship	1st-Grade	174	138.86	16.28	Inter-group	800.77	3	266.92	0.64	0.59
	2nd-Grade	110	139.12	15.32	In-group	208191.23	496	419.74		
	3rd-Grade	83	140.59	13.70		208992.00				
	4th-Grade	133	141.86	11.66	Total		499			

p < 0.05.

Table 8. Independent group t-test results according to the schooling variable of entrepreneurship scale scores.

Schooling	Groups	N	x̄	ss	t Test		
					t	df	p
Entrepreneurship	Normal education	295	138.98	20.74	-1.33	499	0.51
	Secondary education	205	141.46	19.73	-1.34		

Table 9. Independent group t-test results according to the doing sports variable of entrepreneurship scale scores.

Doing sports	Groups	N	x̄	ss	t-test		
					t	df	p
Entrepreneurship	Yes	233	141.61	20.11	1.65	499	0.10
	No	267	138.60	20.71	1.66		

p < 0.05.

terms of gender variable with the level of entrepreneurship tendency. These results support the results of the present study.

The data obtained from the study reveals that there was no significant difference between the class variable and the level of entrepreneurship. When we look at similar studies, Nas and Temel (2018) showed that the class variable was significantly influential on the level of entrepreneurship in their research. This result is not in line with this study. In their study, Duran et al. (2013) did not find a significant difference between the class variable and the level of entrepreneurship. The result of their study is similar to the result of the present study. Also, the study of Doğaner and Altunoğlu (2010) supports the present study.

As can be seen in Table 6, there was no significant difference between entrepreneurship and department variable. On the other hand, Nas and Temel (2018) concluded that there was a significant difference between the department variable and the level of entrepreneurship

in their study. This result is not in line with the present study. In their similar study, Pan and Akay (2015) did not find a significant difference between the education level and the level of entrepreneurship. This conclusion reached by Pan and Akay (2015) supports the present study.

When the relationship between the education type variable and the level of entrepreneurship tendency were examined, the result did not differ significantly. The results obtained from another study conducted by Aydeniz and Akkus (2017) at Munzur University on the subject are similar to the present study.

The relationship between the sports situation variable and the level of entrepreneurship was determined non-significant. However, in the literature review conducted on the subject, Alptekin et al. (2019) revealed a significant difference between the state of doing sports and the level of entrepreneurship in their study on 240 individuals with special needs. This result is not in line with the present study.

Another conclusion from the study; the level of entrepreneurship tendency of the students of the faculty of sports science is at the 'high entrepreneurship' level. It may be concluded that students' high self-esteem and tendency to take risks, cause their entrepreneurship levels to be high. On the other hand, Bilge and Bal (2012), in their study on university students, revealed that students' interest in entrepreneurship was low in general. This result is not in line with the present study. In the study conducted by Akçakanat et al. (2014) with 380 students at Süleyman Demirel University, it was concluded that students' entrepreneurship levels were high. In a similar study conducted by Nas and Temel (2018), at the School of Physical Education and Sports, they found supportive findings with the present study, concluding that the participants had a 'high entrepreneurship' level. In another study, Honça and Çetinkaya (2019) gathered supportive findings for the present study. In their study at Ahi Evran University School of Physical Training and Sports, they concluded that students have a 'high entrepreneurship' level.

As a result, the students of Hitit University Faculty of Sport Sciences have a high entrepreneurship tendency. If these students are supported with applied entrepreneurship training, they may be able to activate their current potential. Today, although it is a bit difficult for the public and private sector to host and employ such educated and graduated students, steps can be taken to increase employment by taking the necessary measures to create future entrepreneurs and determining the education policy for this. Based on all these findings, we should state that the present study contains some limitations. Therefore, studies that will keep the research group larger may benefit in terms of obtaining more valid results. In addition, with the increasing number of courses that may direct students studying in faculties of sports science to entrepreneurship, these students may be encouraged, and their skills may be improved.

REFERENCES

Akçakanat, T., Mücevher, M. H., and Çarıkçı İ. H. (**2014**). Sözel, Sayisal ve Eşit Ağirlik Bölümlerinde Okuyan Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerinin Bazi Demografik Değişkenler Açisindan İncelenmesi: SDÜ Örneği. AKÜ İİBF Dergisi, 16 (2): 137-153.

Akyüz, Y. (**2013**). A study on university students' perspectives on KOSGEB supports and entrepreneurship tendencies: The case of Uşak University. Uşak University Journal of Social Sciences, 6(3): 80-98.

Alptekin, H., Eliöz, M., and Demir, A. Z. (**2019**). Engel Türünün Ve Spor Yapma Alişkanliğinin Girişimcilik Üzerine Etkilerinin İncelenmesi, Turkish Studies Social Sciences, 14(1): 1-19.

Arıkan, S. (**2002**). Entrepreneurship. Ankara: Siyasal Publishing House.

Aydeniz, N. and **Akkuş,** B. (**2017**). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Araştirma: Munzur Üniversitesi Örneği. Dicle Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 7(13): 162-177.

Aytaç, Ö., and **İlhan,** S. (**2007**). Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Culture: A Sociological Perspective. Selcuk University Journal of Social Sciences, 1(18): 101-120.

Bilge, H., and Bal, V. (**2012**). Girişimcilik Eğilimi: Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Öğrencileri Üzerine Bir Araştirma. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 16: 131-148.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (**1997**). Methodology of educational research. Athens: Ekfrasi.

Doğaner, M., and **Altunoğlu,** A. E. (**2010**). Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Nazilli İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi İşletme Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimleri. Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi, 2(2):103-110.

Dündar, S., and **Ağca,** V. (**2007**). An empirical study on the investigation of entrepreneurship features of Afyon Kocatepe University undergraduate students. H.Ü. Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 25(1): 121-142.

Duran, C., Büber, H., and Gümüştekin, G. E. (**2013**). Girişimcilik Hislerine Eğitimin Katkisi: Kütahya Meslek Yüksek Okulu Makine Programi Örneği. Girişimcilik ve Kalkinma Dergisi, 8(2): 33-56.

Durukan, T. (**2007**). Entrepreneurship from past to present and the importance of entrepreneurship in the 21st century. Entrepreneurship and Development Journal, 1(2): 25-37.

Hisrich, R. D., and **Peters,** M. P. (**2001**). Entrepreneurship. 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill Higher, s.9.

Honça, A. A., and **Çetinkaya,** T. (**2019**). A Research for Determining Entrepreneurship Levels of University Students. Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi, 10(17).

Kayiş, A. (**2010**). SPSS Applied Multivariate Statistical Techniques. Şeref Kalayci, Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağitim.

Korkmaz, O. (**2012**). A research on determining entrepreneurship tendencies of university students: The case of Bülent Ecevit University. Afyon Kocatepe University Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 6(2): 209-226.

Küçük, O. (**2005**), Entrepreneurship and Small Business Management, (2. Edition). Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık.

Lekoko, M., Rankhumise, E. M., and Ras, P. (**2012**). The effectiveness of entrepreneurship education: What matters most? African Journal of Business Management, 6(51): 12023–12033.

Mirza, Ş., and **Dağdeviren,** H. İ. (**2016**). Meslek Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerinin Belirlenmesine Yönelik Eşme Meslek Yüksekokulunda Bir Araştirma, Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 9(5): 82-105.

Mucuk, İ. (**2013**). Modern Business. Türkmen Kitabevi, İstanbul.

Murphy, P. J., Liao, J., and Welsch, H. P. (**2006**). A Conceptual History of Entrepreneurial Thought. Journal of Management History, 12(1): 12-35.

Nas, K., and **Temel,** V. (**2018**). Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksekokulu Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Düzeyleri, Atatürk Üniversitesi Bede Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 20(3): 134-144.

Pan, V. and **Akay,** C. (**2015**). Eğitim Fakültesi Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Düzeylerinin Çeşitli Değişkenler Açisindan İncelenmesi. Education Sciences, 10(2): 125-138.

Top, S. (**2006**). Entrepreneurship Discovery Process (1. Edition), İstanbul: Beta Yayinlari.

Wingham, D. W. (**2004**). Entrepreneurship Through The Ages. http://www.crcnetbase.com/doi/abs/10.4324/9780203356821.ch3, (Date of access: 05.08.2016).

Yılmaz, E., and Sünbül, A.M. (**2009**). Üniversite Öğrencilerine Yönelik Girişimcilik Ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (21), 195-203.