

Assessment of the Entrepreneurship Level of the University Students at the Sports Management Departments

Ilker Özmutlu [1] Fatih Yildirim [2] Serkan Naktiyok [2]

[1] Kafkas University,
Sarıkamış School of
Physical Education and
Sports

ilkerozmutlu@gmail.com

[2] Kafkas University,
Sarıkamış Vocational
School

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to analyse in terms of several varieties the level of entrepreneurship of the students studying Sport Management at Physical Education and Sport Collage. The research group of the study done by the relational screening model constitutes a total of 266 students including 142 men and 124 women from Kafkas University Department of Physical Education in Sarıkamış and from the Sport Management Department of the Sport Collage in the 2012/2013 academic year. The “Scale of Entrepreneurship of the University Students “ was applied as the data collection tool. It was developed by Yilmaz and Sümbül (2009) with the Personal Information Form. In the analysis of the data the SPSS 14 package was used and the data was interpreted by using T Test, One Way ANOVA according to the structure of the study and Tukey Test in order to determine the differences between the groups.

As the result of the study shows that there are significant differences between the findings related to the level of entrepreneurship of the students in the Department of Sport Management on the gender variable and the level of entrepreneurship on variable of high school types from which the students graduated, there were not found significant differences in the relation between the level of entrepreneurship of the class variable, living variable and the educational variable.

Keywords: Sport Management, Student, Entrepreneurship.

INTRODUCTION

The constant renewal of communication in today’s world, the occurring developments in communication and technology, globalization and all that they bring along cannot make the changes suppressed. This change is the cause of differentiating the living conditions, changing the habits of the society, shortly feeling the change in all the cells. Therefore, now the basic condition of success the exchange of people should reflect through all their lives. As the time forces to take the necessary precautions by feeling the change in society, to dominate the change and to adopt the differentiations of the surrounding area actively. The road to success could be reached by being creative, thinking opportunity orientated, dynamism briefly through being entrepreneurial.

Entrepreneurship is a term that is often used whether in daily life, in economic or in administrative areas. Indeed, the literature of entrepreneurship occurred from many disciplines (economics, sociology, management and organizations, psychology, anthropology etc.). This shows that there is not a single definition about entrepreneurship and that entrepreneurship is a constantly changing phenomenon.

If we were to look at a few definitions of entrepreneurship; “ it is a process of setting up a new business or enlargement and of creating goods or services in order to create value or profit” (Bird, 1989). Entrepreneurship, “ is a value creation process for finding new products, services, resource technology and market by using creative skills and making innovation” (Coulter, 2001). According to the definition of Mueller and Thomas entrepreneurship “ is an activity to create an organization in order to perceive an opportunity and to seize that opportunity” (Mueller and

Thomas, 2001). In other definition entrepreneurship “ is a process of the discovery of new things and an estimate of risk and gain” (Kinicki, 2003). According to the recognition made by Loundbury “entrepreneurship is the art of providing optimization by examining alternative production processes and to highlight the inequalities in order to obtain the opportunity (Naktiyok, 2004).

The factors that are especially noticeable and generally accepted in entrepreneurship among the varieties of these definitions are to innovate, to be unique, to create value on society, to set up a new business or to develop it, to be focused on opportunity and to behave flexible and dynamic.

As for the definition of entrepreneur; he/she is the person who produces goods, services and ideas needed by the society and offers them, aims to profit in this direction, sets up business, makes research, planning, organizing so on works in order to realize his business idea and as a result of these he/she brings the inputs such as necessary knowledge, skills, workplace, personnel, equipment and the financial resources together (Bozkurt, 2000).

Besides, entrepreneur should obtain sustainable competitive advantage over the competitors by focusing on more rational and efficient innovations constantly while managing an economic activity by performing it. As a result of this he/she is a person who turns to new markets, develops unique products and places them on the market, provides rationality, implements new technologies and undertakes more important and difficult tasks such as mobilizing greater capital (Şenocak, 1992).

The entrepreneurs are those who take the power generation function of a country’s progress and development in today’s modern world that we just call “information society” where continuous changes occur with the impact of globalization and development in information and communication technologies. For this reason nowadays as a result of changes the importance of entrepreneurs has increased. In our age’s global and regional development undeniable degree of important duties will be dropped on the entrepreneurs.

Individuals should be trained according to business life and the requirements of the community on the basis of both global and regional development. At the same time in line with the education they conducted to have an entrepreneurial spirit by being employed in their own professional fields has a critical and great importance economically. In this respect, one of the most important factors in the development of the entrepreneurial spirit is to develop the entrepreneurial characteristics of the people by expanding the education on this issue (Çetinkaya, Bozkurt 2011).

In accordance with this idea today’s universities try to adapt to the global information age with the pressure brought by the complex, multivariate and intense change and transformation. Therefore, structural changes take place at the universities and it can be seen that renovations are needed for the universities (Odabaşı, 2005). The reasons that put the universities into such changes can be listed as follows:

- From global approach , the higher educational system needs to reach the international standards,
- From the national perspective, factors such as the universities requesting of taking an active role in regional development, increasing the willingness to take education in every segment of the citizen in a growing percentage, the inadequacies in the production factors, the increasing population, efficiency and industrialization,
- When we approach the subject from industrial view, it is possible to sort the factors as the academic staff’s desire to educate and work in better conditions, the increase of pressure for universities in various circles etc.

Such pressures on the institutes and organizations of higher education are felt in intensities that increase its impact. Therefore in our country the strategic thinking of the universities for the future and the performing of transformation are looked for ways by going beyond the daily activities of the administrators especially in state but in all of the universities (Odabaşı, 2005). The universities moving with such a mind-set trying to integrate the structure of change and transformation are aimed to increase the student’s entrepreneurial orientation with the entrepreneurship education they give. Universities will guide the young people who want to employ themselves by developing creative ideas and finding new business opportunities with their entrepreneurship education (Yüzüak, 2010).

From this point the aim of the study is to identify the trends in entrepreneurship for the higher education students who are potential entrepreneurs, to determine the factors that affect these trends and to investigate whether these factors show any differences between the faculties. In this way the investigation of the aspects of the students' entrepreneurship will contribute to the development of entrepreneurship.

METHOD

Research model

Relational screening model was referred in this process of the research. According to Karasar (2009) "Relational Screening model" is a type of model which aims to determine the degree or the mutual alteration circumstance of two or more variables. Screening models were defined as approaches which aim to describe an occasion obviously that was occurred in the past and is still present. The person or the object that were subjected to the research was described authentically in their own conditions and it was emphasized that the effort to change or influence them was not tried. Research Group: the Research Group was populated by 266 students of which 142 were boys and 124 were girls who were studying sport management at Kafkas University, Department of Physical Education and Sports Collage. A number of eight questionnaire forms were excluded from the total number which of 274, because of failure or incomplete fulfilling.

Data Collection

In the process of collecting data after having told the students about the questionnaire and its context, questionnaire consisted of two parts was delivered. The first part called personal information questionnaire was to determine the demographic features of the students and the second part had entrepreneurial scale which was developed to determine the entrepreneurship level of the students.

Data Collection Tool

Entrepreneurship scale was developed by Yılmaz and Sümbül (2009) applied to students. This scale was developed by researchers to determine the entrepreneurial features of the students. Likert type was formed out by 36 items and designed through 5 (very often) to 1 (never) rate form. Cronbach alfa reliability and validity analyses were involved to collected data after trial application. It was found out that all the items were gathered up one size as a result of the validity analyses which was involved with basic components analysis. Within the result of the reliability analysis Cronbach alfa reliability coefficient was found as 0.90 (Yılmaz and Sümbül, 2009).

Data Analysis

In data analysing and explicating, research data was determined whether the research data had features of normal distribution or not. Before the entrepreneurship level of the students of Department of Sport Management was tested according to variables by using the one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (see Table 1.). As shown in the Table, the samples were drawn from the same distribution. After this test (One sample KS test), T test, OneWayAnova and Tukey Test were used in order to determine the difference between the groups.

Table 1. One sample KS Test showing entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department

	Entrepreneurship level
N	266
Mean	137,3684
Std. Deviation	18,0339
Kolmogorov-Smirnov	0,804
P	0,537

In Table 1, it is seen that ($p > 0.05$) these proves that the data is suitable to normal distribution.

Table 2. the test results about entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department according to gender variable.

	n	Mean	SD	T	p
Male	142	139,5352	16,9005	2,111	0,036
Female	124	134,8871	19,0166		

In Table 2, it is determined that the difference between the entrepreneurship levels of the students of Sport Management Department according to gender variable is meaningful. [T value = 2.111, $p=0.036 < 0.05$] The average values; entrepreneurship level of male students ($x=139.5352$), entrepreneurship level of female students ($x=134.8871$).

Table 3. OneWayAnova test results showing entrepreneurship level of students of Sport Management Department according to class variable.

Source of varyans	KT	Sd	KO	F	P	Dif.
Between groups	623,888	3	207,963	0,637	0,592	-
In-groups	85560,007	262	326,565			

In Table 3, it is determined that the difference between the entrepreneurship level of the students of Sport Management Department is not meaningful according to class variable. [f value = 0.6371 $p=0.592 > 0.05$]

Table 4. OneWay Anova results showing entrepreneurship levels of student of Sport Management Department according to their residence variable

Source of varyans	KT	Sd	KO	F	P	Dif.
Between groups	1524,560	6	254,093	0,777	0,588	-
In-groups	84659,335	259	326,870			

In Table 4, it is determined that the difference between the entrepreneurship levels of the students of Sport Management Department is not meaningful according to their residence [f value = 0.777 $p=0.588 > 0.05$]

Table 5. T Test results showing entrepreneurship levels of student of Sport Management Department according to their education type variable

	n	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	p
I. Education	146	138,4795	18,0846	1,109	0,269
II. Education	120	136,0167	17,9547		

In Table 5, it is determined that the difference between the entrepreneurship levels of the students of Sport Management Department is not meaningful according to their education type variable [t value = 1,109 $p=0.269 > 0.05$]

Table 6. OneWayAnnova results showing entrepreneurship levels of student of Sport Management Department according to their high school type variable from which they graduated

Source of varyans	KT	Sd	KO	F	P	Dif.
Between groups	4502,981	6	750,497	2,380	0,030	4-7
In-groups	81680,913	259	315,370			

In Table 6., it is determined that the difference between the entrepreneurship levels of the students of Sport Management Department is meaningful according to their graduated high school variable [f value= 2.380 p= 0.30 <0.05

Table 7. Tukey Test results showing entrepreneurship levels of student of Sport Management Department according to their high school type variable from which they graduated

Type of School	Graduate	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. De.	p
	General High School	11,5093	6,4024	0,550
Anatolian High School	Vocational High Lisesi	13,7936	6,8378	0,404
	Sport High School	30,3750	12,0227	0,150
	Science High School	7,3750	12,0227	0,996
	Open Education High School	11,7750	10,1240	0,908
	Foreign Language Intensified High school	38,3750	12,0227	0,024*
Foreign Language Intensified High school	General High School	-26,8657	10,3292	0,126
	Vocational High Lisesi	-24,5814	10,6046	0,235
	Sport High School	-8,0000	14,4999	0,998
	Anatolian High School	-38,3750	12,0227	0,024*
	Science High School	-31,0000	14,4999	0,330
	Open Education High School	-26,6000	12,9691	0,382

*p<0.5 in Table 7., the entrepreneurship levels of the students who graduated from Anatolian High School is higher than of the students who graduated from Foreign Language Intensified High school

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

It is determined that the difference between entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department according to their gender variable is meaningful. According to this result, it could be thought that the disposition of male students for establishing their own business is higher than that of female students. Today however the term men –women equality is mentioned, within the effect of cultural structure in our society, boys search for work in different sectors rather than girls and girls intent to entrepreneur in certain sectors. Therefore, this intent provides the mentioned results. When the similar researches are examined, it is noticed that the study results of Örucü and his friends (2007), İbicioğlu and his friends (2009), Avşar (2007) and Crant (1996) and Abdullaeva (2007) are similar to each other. But the results of Arslan (2002) and Aktürk (2012) are not similar to each other. This could be because of sample group variables.

According to class variable, it is determined that the difference between entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department is not meaningful. This shows that the classes that they study do not have effect on their entrepreneurship levels. It could be thought that the result above mentioned is caused because of having the same education in the course of 4 years licence degree besides during these 4 years they do not have

entrepreneurship lessons and other parallel lessons to entrepreneurship lessons such that lack of these lessons makes students unaware of their entrepreneurship which they own potentially. When similar studies are examined it is seen that our study result is similar to those of Kılıç's (2012) and Abdullaeva's (2007). Yet it is different from Kormaz's (2012) study results. This study states that the entrepreneurship levels of 4th grade students are higher than of 1st grade students. As for the cause of this difference it could be told that both two sample groups have different content of licence program.

According to residence unit (place) it is determined that the difference between entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department is meaningful. According to this result it is found out that the residence unit where the students live do not have effect on their entrepreneurship levels. It is because that the majority of these students are those who live in Eastern-Anatolian Region, South-eastern Anatolian Region. It could be thought that these regions do not provide enough opportunities to students in means of entrepreneurship. Özman (2013) made a similar research whose result supports our study results.

According to the education type variable it is determined that the difference between entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department is not meaningful. This result states that the education type variable of students do not have relation with the entrepreneurship levels. This could be caused by the insufficient employment provided by the region where the students study and the majority of them are from the same region and the same content of education. When the similar studies are examined these result is different from the result of Kormaz's study (2012). According to the result of Korkmaz's study the entrepreneurship of evening class students are higher. The cause of the difference between these two studies could be told that evening class students have more free time and also they are stimulated by the willingness to earn their education costs so this willingness motivates them in means of entrepreneurship.

According to the graduated high school type variable the entrepreneurship levels of the students who are graduated from Anatolian High School are higher than of the students who are graduated from Foreign Language Intensified High School. By looking at this result it could be told that the students who are graduated from Anatolian High School are more entrepreneurial in means of producing and improving new thoughts and projects, when compared with the students who are graduated from Foreign Language Intensified High School. This is because that Foreign Language Intensified Schools leads students to specific professions yet Anatolian High Schools lead students to professions which require more technique and capability.

As a result of the study which was carried out about the entrepreneurship levels of students of Sport Management Department, various findings are gained about the entrepreneurship levels of the students. According to these findings it is pointed out that the gender of the students are directly related to entrepreneurship levels and boys are more entrepreneurial than the girls. Besides, meaningful differences are found about the graduated high school type variable. The entrepreneurship level of students who graduated from Anatolian High School are higher than of the Foreign Language Intensified High School students. The other findings show that education type variable, class variable and residence variable where the students live do not have relation with the entrepreneurship levels of the students.

REFERENCES

- Abdullaeva, F (2007). Entrepreneurship Characteristics and Work Values of Students: A Comparison of Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Azerbaijan and Turkey. Master Thesis. Sakarya University, Institute of Social Sciences. Sakarya.
- Aktürk, E (2012). Trends of Personality Characteristics of University Students on the Effect of Entrepreneurship: A Research at Düzce University. Master Thesis, Düzce University, Institute of Social Sciences. Düzce.
- Arslan, K (2002). The Tendencies of Professional Preferences and Entrepreneurship Among Undergraduate Students. *Doğuş University Journal*. 3(2), 1-11.
- Avşar, M (2007). To Determine Entrepreneurs Intentions of University Students, Study on Çukurova University Students. Master Thesis. Çukurova University, Department of Business Administrations. Adana.

- Barbara, J.B (1989). Entrepreneurial Behavior. Foresman and Company, Illinois.
- Bozkurt, Ö (2011). Dünyada ve Türkiye’de Girişimcilik Eğitimi: Başarılı Girişimciler ve Öğretim Üyelerinden Öneriler. Ankara, Detay Yay.
- Bozkurt, R (2000). Girişimci ve Rol Bilinci. İş Fikirleri Dergisi, Aralık, 2000/12.
- Coulter, M (2001). Entrepreneurship in Action, Prentice Hall Inc. New Jersey.
- Crant, J.M (1996). The Proactive Personality Scale as a Predictor of Entrepreneurial Intentions. Journal of Small Business Management, July, s.42-49.
- İbicioğlu H, Özdaşlı K, Alparslan A.M (2009). Girişimci Özellikler ve Girişimcilik Türü Tercihi Üzerinde Ebeveyn Etkisi: Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Araştırması. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Meslek Yüksek Okulu Dergisi. 12(1-2), 521-538.
- Karasar, N (2009). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi. Ankara: Nobel Yayınevi.
- Kılıç R, Keklik B, Çalış N (2012). A Study On Entrepreneurship Tendency Of University Students : Example Of Bandırma Department Of Business Administration Suleyman Demirel University The Journal of Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences. 17(2), 423-435.
- Kınıckı, A, Williams, B.K. (2003). Management, A Practical Introduction, New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Korkmaz, O (2012). A research on Determining the Entrepreneurialism Inclination of University Students: Bülent Ecevit University Example. Afyon Kocatepe University Journal Of Economics And Administrative Sciences. 14 (2), 209-226.
- Mueller, S, Thomas, A.S (2001). Culture and Entrepreneurial Potential: A Nine Country Study of Locus of Control and Innovativeness. Florida International University, Miami, National Academy of Management, Journal of Business Venturing, 16 (1), 51-75.
- Naktiyok, A (2004). İç Girişimcilik. İstanbul, Beta Yayınevi.
- Odabaşı, Y (2006). Entrepreneurial University as a Tool of Change and Transformation. Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development 1 (1), 87-104.
- Örücü, E, Kılıç, R, Özer Y (2007). Familial Factors in Entrepreneurial Impact of Trends of University Students'.Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development. 2 (2), 27-47.
- Özman, C (2013). Assessment of the Entrepreneurship level of the University Students at the Sports Management Departments. Master Thesis. Marmara University, Institute of Health Sciences. İstanbul.
- Şenocak, B (1992). 2000’li Yılların Girişimcilik Modeli., 3. İzmir İktisat Kongresi, İzmir. 181-186.
- Yılmaz E, Sünbül M.Y (2009). Developing Scale Of University Students Entrepreneurship. Selçuk University the Journal of Institute of Social Sciences. 21, 195-203.
- Yüzüak, E (2010). The Factors Effect on Entrepreneurial Intentions of Female Students in the Universities: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University Biga I.I.B.F. Sample. Master Thesis. 18 Mart University, Institute of Social Sciences, Çanakkale.