# GLOSERV

ADVANCES IN GLOBAL SERVICES AND RETAIL MANAGEMENT

Editors

**Dr. Cihan Cobanoglu**

**Dr. Valentina Della Corte**

*Co-Editors*

**Dr. Cihan Cobanoglu,** University of South Florida, USA
**Dr. Valentina Della Corte,** University of Naples Federico II, Italy

ADVANCES IN GLOBAL SERVICES AND RETAIL MANAGEMENT: VOLUME 2

*\*Authors are fully responsible for corrections of any typographical, copyrighted materials, technical and content errors.*

# Determination of Students' Characteristics and Perspectives About Social Entrepreneurship: A Case of Anadolu University

Muhammed Kavak, İpek Itır Can, and Emre Ozan Aksöz

Faculty of Tourism
Anadolu University, Turkey

## Abstract

Social entrepreneurship enables stakeholders to take innovative and inclusive approaches to social, environmental, and economic problems and to produce solutions to eliminate social injustice. It is not only self-sufficient by providing an economic return, but also offers people the opportunity for a more sustainable common world. Considering that, training of tourism faculty students to develop both entrepreneurial and social entrepreneur characteristics will bring the tourism industry to the forefront and lead to the increase of social, sectoral, and public benefits. Thus, the aim of this study is to examine the social entrepreneurship characteristics and perspectives of students taking tourism higher education. In the study, the Social Entrepreneurship Scale developed by Konaklı and Göğüş (2013), and the questionnaire form was applied to 203 students from Anadolu University, Faculty of Tourism in January 2020. According to the results of the study, there is a statistically significant difference between the grade factor and the self-confidence dimension. Accordingly, the relationship between the self-confidence dimension of the first graders and the second graders is significant and this relation is in favor of the first graders. Also, there are moderate and positive correlations between risk-taking and self-confidence, risk-taking and personal creativity, and self-confidence and personal creativity dimensions. In addition to these, the most common words that come to students' minds about entrepreneurship are listed as "risk, money-capital, business, self-confidence, idea". On the other hand, the words related to social entrepreneurship are listed as "society, communication, social media, self-confidence, humanity."

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship, social entrepreneurship, tourism, tourism education

## Introduction

From the invention of the vaccine against the Covid-19 Pandemic, which is one of the biggest health problems in the world, by entrepreneurial organizations, to the establishment of the world's largest companies by entrepreneurs, the entrepreneurial spirit is always in the background of the process. In this respect, the 21st century can be defined as the age of entrepreneurship (Pınar, 2015: 23). In the face of the problems caused by population growth and industrialization, various quests have been pursued to eliminate the existing social problems with the spread of information and communication technologies and globalization. At this point, social entrepreneurship, which ensures that stakeholders who experience this problem and produce solutions for the elimination of social injustice with innovative and inclusive

approaches, both provide an economic return and to have the power to be self-sufficient, offers opportunities for our more sustainable common world.

Although social entrepreneurship is a new concept or approach, it is becoming widespread globally. Dees (1998), who first used this concept, defined the social entrepreneur based on the features of *value creation, innovation and change agents, pursuit of opportunity and resourcefulness* that are used to define entrepreneur by the leading names in the entrepreneurship field (Jean Baptiste Say, Joseph Schumpeter, Peter Drucker and Howard Stevenson), created the concept of social entrepreneurs. Defining social entrepreneurs as "a rare breed", Dees (1998) made a definition based on the following roles of social entrepreneurs: Social entrepreneurs are change agents in the social sector, by *adopting a mission to create and sustain social value*, *pursuing new opportunities*, eng*aging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation, and learning, acting boldly without being limited*, and *exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served and for the outcomes created.* As it is seen, the definition studies for the concept of "social entrepreneur", which is the subject of social entrepreneurship, is made by adding features such as empathy and social responsibility, based on the characteristics of the entrepreneurial personality (Ernst, 2012). Social entrepreneurs, which can also be defined as social entrepreneurial leaders or civic entrepreneurs, are ordinary people who do extraordinary things (Mair and Noboa, 2012: 122).

Bill Drayton, the founder of the Ashoka organization, which played an important role in the spread of the concept of social entrepreneurship and revealed the first example of social entrepreneurship, emphasized that the core is personality in the definition of social entrepreneurs (Ernst, 2012: 55). The concept of personality can be defined as the consistent behavior patterns and intra-personal processes arising from the individual (Burger, 2016: 23). It is seen that personality traits (Brandstätter, 2011), which are defined as innate traits that affect individuals' abilities, motives, attitudes and temperaments, are also used to determine entrepreneurial personality in the literature (Zhao et al., 2010). This situation is also drawn attention in the studies conducted to reveal the characteristics of social entrepreneurship. In the studies, personality models are generally used, as well as to reveal the social entrepreneurship intentions of individuals by using different variables (Nga & Shamuganathan, 2010; Wood, 2012; Konaklı & Göğüş, 2013; İrengün & Arıkboğa, 2015; Çavdar et al., 2018; Biçer & Başer, 2019; Hsu & Wang 2019). However, among these studies, there is no study comparing the entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship perspectives of students who receive higher education in tourism. This situation reveals the originality of the study. Concordantly, the aim of this study is to examine the social entrepreneurship characteristics and perspectives of students taking tourism higher education.

**Literature Review**

In this section, the concept of social entrepreneurship, which forms the theoretical basis of the study, and related studies will be discussed and the importance of social entrepreneurship education at higher education level will be mentioned. Besides, the concept of social entrepreneurship in the tourism industry and education will be discussed with different dimensions.

*The Concept of Social Entrepreneurship*

Although the concept of social entrepreneurship emerged after the establishment of Ashoka which is the world's first and largest social entrepreneurship platform in 1980, it started to take place in academic studies in the 1990s (García-Jurado, Pérez-Barea, & Nova, 2021). Today, there is still no consensus on the definition of the concept of social entrepreneurship. The earliest and most comprehensive definition of social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneur concepts belongs to Dees (1998). The concepts of social entrepreneurship, social entrepreneur and social enterprise are defined by Wu, Wu, and Sharpe (2020: 2610) as follows:

> Social entrepreneurship, which refers to the process of identifying opportunities, stimulating innovations, and exploiting and allocating resources, is adopted by individuals and organizations through social enterprises to address social needs, create social value, and achieve sustainable social benefits in communities or wider regions. Social entrepreneurs are actors who exhibit innovative, efficient, and risk-taking behaviors to identify opportunities, create new ventures, adopt business processes, and use scarce resources to become and remain sustainable in their efforts to deliver social value. Social enterprises are for-profit, nonprofit, or hybrid organizations that serve as vehicles for social engagement aiming to create and sustain social value by conducting a set of activities, which are intended to exploit resources and business and innovative approaches.

It is stated that the concept of social entrepreneurship has five main dimensions. These dimensions that emerge in the formation of this concept are listed as social mission, social innovation, social change, entrepreneurial spirit and personality (Praszkier & Nowak, 2012: 29). According to García-Jurado, Pérez-Barea, & Nova (2021) social entrepreneurship has emerged from two parallel currents within the organization management field: The non-governmental organization and voluntary tradition and, the world of business ethics and corporate social responsibility. "Social entrepreneurs are among us, although they are rare; they are exceptionally successful in solving social problems, combining passion and visionary thinking with down-to-earth planning and strategizing; they merge social passion and business acumen" (Praszkier & Nowak, 2012: 26). Social entrepreneur is defined by Rennie (2006) as a person trying to create value to improve social conditions. According to Zahra et al. (2009), social entrepreneurs are people who make important and various aids for the benefit of their communities.

*The Importance of Social Entrepreneurship in Higher Education of Tourism*

Providing education about social entrepreneurship in higher education plays a key role in educating the entrepreneurs of the future by presenting them a perspective about solving social problems and needs and thus contributing to sustainable development. According to García-González and Ramírez-Montoya (2020: 1), "currently, university systems are challenged to generate knowledge that positively impacts society through education that is creative and innovative and promotes social awareness." Roslan et al. (2020) revealed the problems encountered in the implementation of social entrepreneurship education in higher education as follows; design of curricula, financial and funding problems, lack of professionals to teach social entrepreneurship courses and prohibitive social and university environment issues. To solve these problems, they proposed the following: more awareness programs, university management involvement in solving funding problems, social entrepreneurship coaching professionals and university-industry relationship and collaboration. There is a positive relationship between providing social entrepreneurship education to students at higher education level and their orientation to a social enterprise (Hockerts, 2018).

Social entrepreneurship courses are a much newer field in higher education institutions compared to entrepreneurship courses. While the history of entrepreneurship courses dates to the 1970s, social entrepreneurship courses still appear as an area open to development. Social entrepreneurs who develop creative solutions to the social problems of the society, bring together the appropriate resources to implement these solutions, implement the solution developed by taking risks, and increase the social benefit by ensuring its continuity seem very important for the development and integrity of societies (Eratlı Şirin, Bilir & Öz, 2018). The extent to which young people are sensitive and attentive to various issues that will provide social benefit to society can be regarded as one of the indicators of the social future of the countries. In other words, it is not wrong to say that a society with young people who are sensitive to social issues and who have high social entrepreneurship characteristics will develop socially in the long term.

It is an undeniable fact that tourism, which is the third largest industry in the World (UNWO, 2020), is a social phenomenon because it places people at its center and affects societies both economical and sociocultural ways (Page, 2016). On the other hand, it is possible to say that while the tendency towards social entrepreneurship is high especially in the field of education and other business-related fields, this is a very rare approach in tourism. Today, tourism is still at the forefront with initiatives in which profit is at the forefront. However, tourism is an industry that can influence many different cultures, people and produce solutions to social problems (reducing imbalances in income distribution, eliminating regional imbalances, increasing employment, meeting the needs of disabled or disadvantaged individuals such as resting, relaxation, entertainment, etc.). In such an industry, it is beneficial to have educated individuals who are more sensitive to social facts. Considering the effect of education on the society and the individual, the realization of this depends largely on tourism education. Because "the DNA of entrepreneurship exists in all people" (Yunus & Webber, 2019: 35). Educational institutions that train future tourism professionals play a critical role at this point. The training of tourism students in entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship is a catalytic factor that will enable tourism workers to live in more sustainable conditions and reduce backwardness. In this direction, it is considered important to reveal tourism students' perspectives on social entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship characteristics.

### *Related Studies on Students' Social Entrepreneurship Perceptions*

According to the findings of the study conducted by Iancu, Popescu and Popescu (2020), factors that affect students' social entrepreneurship intentions can be considered in two categories as positive and negative factors. The negative factors are "lack of necessary funds, fear of failure, lack of experience and involvement in social projects and activities", while positive factors comprise "knowledge of the concept of social entrepreneurship and social problems in the studied region that can be solved through entrepreneurial initiatives".

Within the scope of social entrepreneurship competency in higher education, features of the social entrepreneurship competency were revealed by the study conducted by Capella-Peris et al. (2020), features of social entrepreneurship that were revealed are "leadership, goal-oriented motivation, confidence, organisation, responsibility, creativity, initiative, resilience, tolerance, social awareness, belonging to well-informed social networks, offering help and cooperation and values of commitment", coherence, coexistence and respect for public affairs, along with the

abilities to identify opportunities, to take risks, to create ideas, to change and to learn and evolve."

According to the study conducted by Hassan (2020), there are four main factors affecting students' intention towards social entrepreneurship. These include entrepreneurial self-efficacy, entrepreneurial education, perceived university support and entrepreneurial network. In the study conducted by Hockerts (2018), it was revealed that students' self-efficacy, perceived social support and social entrepreneurship intentions increased after providing experiential social entrepreneurship education. In the study conducted by Nga and Shamuganathan (2010) that examine the relationship between students' personality traits and social entrepreneurship intentions. It was revealed that peacefulness which is one of the personality traits affected all dimensions of social entrepreneurship positively, whereas the dimension of openness positively affected social vision, innovation, and financial returns.

When the studies in the literature are examined, it can be said that there is an increase in the number of studies on social entrepreneurship characteristics and perceptions of students, quantitative studies are in the foreground in studies especially for students as well as conceptual studies, the dimensions that form the concept are associated with personality dimensions, and finally, social entrepreneurship is discussed with its educational dimension.

**Methods**

The study was done through descriptive research method based on scanning model. These are studies that examine the perspectives and attitudes of individuals in a particular group about a phenomenon or event and try to describe the relevant phenomenon or event accordingly (Karakaya, 2012). In the study, first, a measurement tool was prepared to collect data. The questionnaire form consists of three stages. The first is the personal information form that aims to measure the demographic characteristics of the participants. The second is the part consisting of 21 expressions in the Social Entrepreneurship Scale developed by Konaklı and Göğüş (2013).

And the third is open-ended interview questions in which students are trying to understand how they view entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship. The relevant scale was used in the study with the permission of the authors. The Social Entrepreneurship Scale developed by Konaklı and Göğüş (2013) consists of three sub-dimensions: Risk-taking (7 items), self-confidence (8 items), and personal creativity (6 items). It is measured with a 5-point Likert. Also, the questions asked to measure the entrepreneurship and social entrepreneurship perceptions of the participants were determined as (1) Write down the first three words that come to mind when you think of entrepreneurship. and (2) Write down the first three words that come to mind when you think of social entrepreneurship.

The questionnaire form was applied to Anadolu University Tourism Faculty students (tourism management, gastronomy, and culinary arts, tourism guidance departments) in January 2020. Participants were determined by a simple random sampling method, the questionnaire form was picked up from 235 students in person, and 203 forms were evaluated. 32 of the questionnaire forms collected created a feeling that they were not read at all, because they were incomplete and / or all options were filled in the same way. Therefore, these forms were not included in the study. The demographic information and social entrepreneurship characteristics of the

participants were tested by SPSS 24.0 using the quantitative analysis method. Accordingly, factor analysis, T-test, one-way analysis of variance (One Way ANOVA), regression, and correlation analysis were applied.

**Findings**

Firstly, the demographic characteristics of the participants were examined. It was seen that 68.5% of the participants are in the 18-22 age range, while 31.5% of them are 23 years old and above. Also, 58.1% are male and 41.9% are female. Besides, 40.4% of the participants study in tourism guiding, 36.5% in gastronomy and culinary arts, and 23.2% in tourism management. Most of the participants (39.4%) are fourth-grade students. 24.1% are in second grade, 19.7% are in third grade, 12.8% are in first grade and 3.9% are in fifth grade and above. While 78.8% of the participants did not take the entrepreneurship course, 21.2% did. The findings regarding the demographic characteristics of the participants are shown in Table 1 below.

**Table 1.** The Demographic Characteristics of the Participants

| Demographic characteristics | Frequency (N) | Percent (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | |
| 18-22 | 139 | 68.5 |
| 23 and above | 64 | 31.5 |
| Total | 203 | 100.0 |
| **Gender** | | |
| Female | 85 | 41.9 |
| Male | 118 | 58.1 |
| Total | 203 | 100.0 |
| **Program** | | |
| Tourism Management | 47 | 23.2 |
| Tourism Guiding | 82 | 40.4 |
| Gastronomy and Culinary Arts | 74 | 36.5 |
| Total | 203 | 100.0 |
| **Grade** | | |
| First Grade | 26 | 12.8 |
| Second Grade | 49 | 24.1 |
| Third Grade | 40 | 19.7 |
| Fourth Grade | 80 | 39.4 |
| Fifth Grade and Above | 8 | 3.9 |
| Total | 203 | 100.0 |
| **Taking an entrepreneurship course** | | |
| Yes | 43 | 21.2 |
| No | 160 | 78.8 |
| Total | 203 | 100.0 |

In the process of analyzing the questionnaires in the study, firstly, the Reliability Test was made. The main analysis used for reliability analysis is finding the Cronbach's Alpha (α) value. Cronbach Alpha is expected to be greater than 0.7. A value lower than this indicates that the questionnaire has poor reliability. On the other hand, if Cronbach Alpha is greater than 0.8, it shows that the questionnaire has high reliability. In this study, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be 0.810. This situation indicates that the answers given to the questionnaire expressions are consistent and that the analysis can be done healthily. Afterward, Normality Test was conducted to test the normality of the data. Significant (sig.) values of the Kolmogorov-

Smirnov test were found to be greater than 0.05 in all groups and it was accepted that the data were normally distributed at a 95% confidence interval (p>0.05).

**Table 2.** Normality Test

| | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | |
|---|---|---|
| | df | Sig. |
| **Risk-taking** | 203 | .069 |
| **Self-confidence** | 203 | .086 |
| **Personal creativity** | 203 | .085 |

Then, before testing the confirmatory factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test was examined to see if the data were suitable for this analysis. It is interpreted that if the value obtained because of this test is less than 0.5, factor analysis cannot be continued, and if it is high, there is a data set suitable for factor analysis. In the study, the KMO value was determined as 0.798 and confirmatory factor analysis was performed accordingly.

**Table 3.** Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | | .798 |
|---|---|---|
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approx. Chi-Square | 1228.107 |
| | df | 210 |
| | Sig. | .000 |

As a result of the factor analysis, it was determined that there are three components with an eigenvalue value above 1. This value is confirming the Social Entrepreneurship Scale of Konaklı and Göğüş (2013). The first component explains 42.910% of the feature tried to be measured with this scale, while the second component explains 8.673% and the third component 7.751%, respectively. In total, this scale can explain 59,334% of the feature that is tried to be measured. Accordingly, the statements 2nd, 3rd, 5th, 6th, 11th, 18th, and 21st represent the "risk-taking" dimension; statements 1st, 4th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 12th, 13th, and 14th represent the "self-confidence" dimension; and statements 9th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 19th, and 20th represent the dimension of "personal creativity".

In the study, Independent Sample T-Test was applied to test the relationships between risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions and the age factor. Group Statistics for the age factor can be seen in the Table 4 below. According to table, the dimensions from the highest average to the lowest average are personal creativity, self-confidence, and risk-taking, respectively.

**Table 4.** Group Statistics for the Age Factor

| | Age | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | 18-22 | 3.8823 | .55751 | .04729 |
| | 23 and above | 3.8497 | .50383 | .06298 |
| **Self-confidence** | 18-22 | 3.9317 | .55886 | .04740 |
| | 23 and above | 3.8094 | .57304 | .07163 |
| **Personal creativity** | 18-22 | 4.0245 | .58751 | .04983 |
| | 23 and above | 4.0609 | .51409 | .06426 |

The independent samples test was applied for the age factor. If the Sig. value is less than 0.05, it means that the variances are not homogeneous. However, if the Sig. value is greater than 0.05, it is decided that the variances are homogeneous. According to the test results, all significant (sig.)

values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .381; self-confidence = .922; personal creativity = .490*). In other words, variances are homogeneous. Besides, in this test, the Sig. (2-tailed) value indicates whether there is a difference between the groups. If this value is less than 0.05, it is decided that there is a difference between the groups. But, if this value is greater than 0.05, it is decided that there is no significant difference between the groups compared. When the test results are examined, it is seen that all Sig. (2-tailed) values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .690; self-confidence = .152; personal creativity = .670*). Accordingly, it can be said that there is not a statistically significant difference between age and risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity

When all values are taken into consideration, the risk-taking dimension is higher in the 18-22 age group (mean= 3.88) than in the 23 years and above (mean= 3.85). Similarly, the self-confidence dimension is higher in the 18-22 age group (mean= 3.93) than in the 23 and over age group (mean = 3.80). In contrast to these, it is seen that the dimension of personal creativity is lower in the 18-22 age group (mean= 4.02) than in the 23 years and above (mean= 4.06). Although there is a difference according to the averages, this difference is not statistically significant.

Independent Sample T-Test was conducted to understand whether the gender factor made a significant difference on three dimensions. Group Statistics for the gender factor can be seen in the Table 5 below. According to table, the dimensions from the highest average to the lowest average are personal creativity, self-confidence, and risk-taking, respectively.

**Table 5.** Group Statistics for the Gender Factor

|  | Age | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | Female | 3.8353 | .52145 | .05656 |
|  | Male | 3.8985 | .55388 | .05099 |
| **Self-confidence** | Female | 3.8609 | .55275 | .05995 |
|  | Male | 3.9163 | .57458 | .05289 |
| **Personal creativity** | Female | 4.0714 | .54109 | .05869 |
|  | Male | 4.0105 | .58151 | .05353 |

The independent samples test was applied for the gender factor. According to the test results, all sig. values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .388; self-confidence = .530; personal creativity = .295*) and this means that the variances are homogeneous. Also, all Sig. (2-tailed) values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .412; self-confidence = .492; personal creativity = .449*). So, it is possible to say that gender doesn't create a statistically significant difference for all three dimensions. In the dimensions of risk taking and self-confidence, the averages of males were found to be higher than females. In contrast, females have higher average values for personal creativity than males. Despite these values, no statistically significant difference was found between the three dimensions related to gender.

The relationship between the program that the students in the tourism faculty and the risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions was measured by One Way ANOVA. In Table 6 below, the mean, standard deviation, and standard error values related to the dimensions in each program are given. In the risk-taking dimension, gastronomy and culinary arts students have a higher average (mean=3.95) than other program students, while tourism management students have a higher average value in the self-confidence (mean=3.91) and personal creativity

(mean=4.06) dimension. In general, the dimensions from the highest average to the lowest average are personal creativity, self-confidence, and risk-taking, respectively.

**Table 6**. Descriptive Statistics for the University Programs

| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | Tourism Management | 3.8445 | .49626 | .07239 |
| | Tourism Guiding | 3.8208 | .55497 | .06129 |
| | Gastronomy and Culinary Arts | 3.9463 | .54894 | .06381 |
| | Total | 3.8720 | .54013 | .03791 |
| **Self-confidence** | Tourism Management | 3.9122 | .43840 | .06395 |
| | Tourism Guiding | 3.8955 | .65210 | .07201 |
| | Gastronomy and Culinary Arts | 3.8784 | .53793 | .06253 |
| | Total | 3.8931 | .56482 | .03964 |
| **Personal creativity** | Tourism Management | 4.0617 | .51283 | .07480 |
| | Tourism Guiding | 4.0008 | .63876 | .07054 |
| | Gastronomy and Culinary Arts | 4.0586 | .51049 | .05934 |
| | Total | 4.0360 | .56437 | .03961 |

When ANOVA test for the university programs is examined, it is seen that the significant (Sig.) value is greater than 0.05 for all dimensions (*risk taking = .325; self-confidence = .949; personal creativity = .767*). Accordingly, there is no statistically significant difference between university programs and the risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions examined in the study.

The relationship between students' grades and the dimensions of risk-taking, self-confidence and personal creativity was measured by One Way ANOVA and these relationships are shown in Table 7 below.

**Table 7.** ANOVA for the Grade

| | | Sig. |
|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | Between Groups | .077 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| **Self-confidence** | Between Groups | .035 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |
| **Personal creativity** | Between Groups | .346 |
| | Within Groups | |
| | Total | |

The significant (Sig.) value is greater than 0.05 in the dimensions of risk-taking and personal creativity, so there is no statistically significant difference between these dimensions and the grades of students. However, the sigma value is less than 0.05 in the self-confidence dimension (Sig.=0.035). This value shows that there is a statistically significant difference between students' grades and their self-confidence. For this reason, Tukey test, one of the Post-Hoc tests, was applied to see the direction of the difference. In Table 8, the results of multiple comparisons made for the grade variable related to the self-confidence dimension using the Tukey test are given.

**Table 8.** Tukey Test for the Self-Confidence Dimension and Grade Factor

| Dependent Variable | (I) Grade | (J) Grade | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Self-confidence   Tukey HSD | First Grade | Second Grade | .40807* | .13488 | .023 |
| | | Third Grade | .21514 | .14004 | .540 |
| | | Fourth Grade | .29572 | .12549 | .132 |
| | | Fifth Grade and Above | .44952 | .22475 | .270 |
| | Second Grade | First Grade | -.40807* | .13488 | .023 |
| | | Third Grade | -.19292 | .11846 | .481 |
| | | Fourth Grade | -.11234 | .10084 | .799 |
| | | Fifth Grade and Above | .04145 | .21198 | 1.000 |
| | Third Grade | First Grade | -.21514 | .14004 | .540 |
| | | Second Grade | .19292 | .11846 | .481 |
| | | Fourth Grade | .08058 | .10765 | .945 |
| | | Fifth Grade and Above | .23438 | .21530 | .812 |
| | Fourth Grade | First Grade | -.29572 | .12549 | .132 |
| | | Second Grade | .11234 | .10084 | .799 |
| | | Third Grade | -.08058 | .10765 | .945 |
| | | Fifth Grade and Above | .15379 | .20613 | .945 |
| | Fifth Grade and Above | First Grade | -.44952 | .22475 | .270 |
| | | Second Grade | -.04145 | .21198 | 1.000 |
| | | Third Grade | -.23438 | .21530 | .812 |
| | | Fourth Grade | -.15379 | .20613 | .945 |

Post-hoc Tukey test was applied to determine among which subgroups the self-confidence dimension differs according to the grade variable. As a result of the test, a statistically significant difference was found between the first and second grade students in favor of the first-year students (sig. <0.05). This situation reveals that first-grade students are more self-confident than second-grade students. Apart from this, no statistically significant difference was found between the other sub-dimensions (sig.> 0.05).

Also, Independent Sample T-Test was applied to test the relationships between risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions and the situation of taking an entrepreneurship course. Group Statistics for the situation of taking an entrepreneurship course factor can be seen in the Table 9 below. According to table, the dimensions from the highest average to the lowest average are personal creativity, self-confidence, and risk-taking, respectively. Self-confidence and personal creativity of those who take entrepreneurship course are higher. Ever then, the risk-taking averages of those who take the course and those who do not take the course are almost equal.

**Table 9.** Group Statistics for the Situation of Taking an Entrepreneurship Course Factor

| | Taking an Entrepreneurship Course | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | Yes | 3.8765 | .48127 | .07339 |
| | No | 3.8708 | .55628 | .04398 |
| **Self-confidence** | Yes | 3.9518 | .44210 | .06742 |
| | No | 3.8773 | .59371 | .04694 |
| **Personal creativity** | Yes | 4.1178 | .56547 | .08623 |
| | No | 4.0140 | .56382 | .04457 |

The independent samples test was applied for the situation of taking an entrepreneurship course factor and it has been seen that all significant (sig.) values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .438; self-confidence = .610; personal creativity = .860*). and this means that the variances are homogeneous. Furthermore, all Sig. (2-tailed) values are greater than 0.05 (*risk taking = .951; self-confidence = .444; personal creativity = .285*). So, it is possible to say that the situation of taking an entrepreneurship course doesn't create a statistically significant difference for risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions.

Up to this point, it has been tested whether the dependent variable shows a significant difference between groups. After this information, the relationship status will be analyzed by the correlation method instead of the difference. Correlation is basically used to show the relationship between two or more variables. In the study, multiple correlation analysis (Pearson's correlation coefficient) was used because the variables were obtained by proportional/intermittent scales and conformed to normal distribution. The multiple correlation analysis between risk taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity dimensions is shown in Table 10 below.

**Table 10**. Correlations

|  |  | **Risk-taking** | **Self-confidence** | **Personal creativity** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Risk-taking** | Pearson Correlation | 1 | **.585**[**] | **.664**[**] |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) |  | .000 | .000 |
|  | N | 203 | 203 | 203 |
| **Self-confidence** | Pearson Correlation | .585[**] | 1 | **.518**[**] |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 |  | .000 |
|  | N | 203 | 203 | 203 |
| **Personal creativity** | Pearson Correlation | **.664**[**] | **.518**[**] | 1 |
|  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 |  |
|  | N | 203 | 203 | 203 |

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The Pearson correlation coefficient between risk-taking and self-confidence dimensions was found to be r = .585. Accordingly, it can be said that there is a positive, moderate (0.5 <r ≤0.9) correlation between risk-taking and self-confidence dimensions. Also, the Pearson correlation coefficient between risk-taking and personal creativity dimensions was calculated as r = .664. Similarly, there is a positive, moderate (0.5 <r ≤ 0.9) correlation between risk-taking and personal creativity dimensions. Furthermore, there is a positive and moderate (0.5 <r ≤ 0.9) correlation between self-confidence and personal creativity dimensions (r = .518). When the correlations between dimensions are examined, it is seen that the Sig. (2-tailed) values to be used in the significance test are obtained as .000. Since these values are less than 0.05, it is possible to say that the values calculated between correlations are significant.

In correlation analysis, the direction and intensity of the relationships between variables are calculated, and in regression analysis, the cause-effect relationship between variables is determined. In the study, in addition to correlation analysis, multiple regression analysis was made to reveal the cause-effect relationship of the relationships between variables. In multiple regression, the collective effect of more than one independent variable on the dependent variable is investigated. The results of the multiple regression analysis performed within the scope of the study are given in Table 11 below. In the first model (Model 1), the risk-taking dimension is the dependent variable, and the self-confidence and personal creativity dimensions are the independent variables. In the second model (Model 2), the self-confidence dimension is the

dependent variable, and the risk-taking and personal creativity dimensions are the independent variables. Finally, in the third model (Model 3), personal creativity dimension is dependent variable, risk-taking and self-confidence dimensions are independent variables.

**Table 11**. Regressions

| Model | F | Sig. | R | $R^2$ | Adjusted $R^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Regression (Model 1) | 108.666 | .000[b] | .722[a] | .521 | .516 |
| Regression (Model 2) | 59.314 | .000[d] | .610[c] | .372 | .366 |
| Regression (Model 3) | 87.361 | .000[f] | .683[e] | .466 | .461 |

a. Dependent Variable: Risk-taking
b. Predictors: (Constant), Personal creativity, self-confident
c. Dependent Variable: Self-confident
d. Predictors: (Constant), Risk-taking, personal creativity
e. Dependent Variable: Personal creativity
f. Predictors: (Constant), Self-confident, risk-taking

When Table 11 is examined, it is seen that the significance values (sig.) for all models are less than 0.05. In this direction, it can be said that the regression equation established is statistically significant. In other words, the regression equation created to investigate the effects of three variables on each other is statistically significant. $R^2$ is the square of the correlation value (R). $R^2$ must be between 0 and 1. If the value of $R^2$ is close to 1, it is concluded that the goodness of fit is appropriate. It gives information about how effective the independent variable has on the dependent variable. As the $R^2$ value increases, the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable increases. Based on this, it is possible to say that all variables are interrelated. In this study, the effect of the risk-taking dimension on the self-confidence and personal creativity dimensions is higher than the others ($R^2 = .521$).

**Table 12.** Standardized Coefficients Beta Results

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .738 | .215 | | 3.435 | .001 |
| | Self-confident | .316 | .055 | .330 | 5.769 | .000 |
| | Personal creativity | .472 | .055 | .493 | 8.623 | .000 |
| 2 | (Constant) | 1.212 | .250 | | 4.840 | .000 |
| | Personal creativity | .231 | .075 | .230 | 3.076 | .002 |
| | Risk-taking | .452 | .078 | .432 | 5.769 | .000 |
| 3 | (Constant) | 1.051 | .232 | | 4.525 | .000 |
| | Risk-taking | .574 | .067 | .549 | 8.623 | .000 |
| | Self-confident | .196 | .064 | .196 | 3.076 | .002 |

According to the Table 12, when Model 1 (*dependent variable: risk-taking*) is examined, it is seen that significance (Sig.) values are less than 0.05. Therefore, the risk-taking variable has a significant effect on both self-confidence and personal creativity. Also, Standardized Coefficients Beta value was calculated as .330 and .493, respectively. So, risk-taking has a positive effect on both self-confidence and personal creativity. When Model 2 (*dependent variable: self-confidence*) is examined, it is seen that significance (Sig.) values are less than 0.05. Also, Standardized Coefficients Beta value was calculated as .230 and .432, respectively. That is why, it can be said that self-confidence has a positive effect on both personal creativity and risk-taking. Finally, when Model 3 (*dependent variable: personal creativity*) is analyzed, it was found that the significance value (Sig.), similarly, was less than 0.05 and the Standardized Coefficients

Beta was .549 and .196, respectively. Accordingly, personal creativity has a positive effect on both risk-taking and self-confidence

In addition, two open-ended questions were asked in the study to learn about students' perspectives on social entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship: (1) Write down the first three words that come to mind when you define the entrepreneurship, and (2) Write down the first three words that come to mind when you define the social entrepreneurship. The most common words that come to students' minds about entrepreneurship are listed as "risk (39 students)", "money (29) and capital (25)", "business (29), "self-confidence (25)" and "idea (23)." On the other hand, the words related to social entrepreneurship are listed as "society (23)", "communication (20)" "social media (20)", "self-confidence (17)", "human(ity) (14)" and "social(ness) (14)." It can be said that the answers to the open-ended questions are similar to the definitions of these concepts. While students prioritize the concepts of risk and money related to entrepreneurship, when it comes to social entrepreneurship, they prioritize the concepts of society and communication. Besides, considering the concept of social media when it comes to social entrepreneurship, it displays that a significant portion of the students do not have a clear knowledge about social entrepreneurship yet. In addition, it is understood that they have a similar opinion for both definitions in terms of self-confidence.

**Conclusions**

In this study, the social entrepreneurship characteristics and perspectives of students taking tourism higher education was examined. While studies on the social entrepreneurship characteristics of students at higher education level are widely encountered in the literature, it is observed that research on this subject related to students receiving tourism education is limited. The originality of this research is being the first study which was conducted for students with higher education of tourism in Turkey. The most important limitation of this study is that it covers a faculty of a single university and the sample size is limited by only students who come to the school actively.

In the study, it was observed that there was no statistically significant difference between the three dimensions (risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity) with age, gender, university program and the situation of taking an entrepreneurship course. However, a statistically significant difference was found between the grade factor and the self-confidence dimension. Accordingly, the relationship between the self-confidence dimension of the first graders and the second graders is significant and this relation is in favor of the first graders. Furthermore, it was found that there are moderate and positive correlations between risk-taking and self-confidence, risk-taking and personal creativity, and self-confidence and personal creativity dimensions. Also, when the three dimensions (risk-taking, self-confidence, and personal creativity) discussed in the study were examined, it was seen that each dimension had a positive cause-effect relationship on the other two dimensions.

According to the findings of this research, it can be said that the social entrepreneurship tendency levels of tourism students are at a high level. When we look at the literature, there are studies that are mainly used for pre-service teachers and use the Social Entrepreneurship Scale (Akkan & Süygün, 2016; Biçer & Başer, 2019; Çavdar, Cumhur, Yasemin & Doymuş, 2018; Eroglu &

Eroglu, 2020; Kubilay, Uslu & Arık, 2016; Özbilen, Canbulat & Çekiç, 2020; Şirin, Bilir & Öz, 2018), which is the scale of this study and developed by Konaklı & Göğüş (2013).

When the literature is examined, there are studies similar to the findings obtained in this study as well as studies that differ. In this study, similar to the study conducted by Eroglu & Eroglu (2020), there was no significant difference in the age variable, while the study conducted by Biçer & Başer (2019) for pre-service teachers showed that there was a significant difference in the age variable when the whole social entrepreneurship scale was considered and this showed a significant difference in favor of the group aged 23 and over. In terms of gender variable, similar to the findings of the studies conducted by Biçer and Başer, (2019), Çavdar et al. (2018) and Kubilay et al. (2016), it was found that there was no significant difference. A similar situation was found in this study. In this study, no significant difference was found in terms of the department variable. This situation is similar to the study conducted by Eroglu and Eroglu (2020). However, Biçer and Başer, (2019), Çavdar et al. (2018), Şirin et al. (2018) found that there were significant differences in terms of the department variable. When analyzed in terms of grade variable, significant differences were found in this study. A similar situation was also determined in the studies conducted by Biçer and Başer (2019), Çavdar et al. (2018) and Kubilay et al. (2016). While significant differences were revealed in favor of fourth grader in the three studies listed, a significant difference was found between the self-confidence levels of the first and second graders in favor of the first graders in this study. The reason for the higher self-confidence level of the first graders can be explained by their enthusiastic stepping into the university from high school. However, with the second grade, self-confidence may decrease due to the awareness of uncertainties in the tourism sector and the increase in job and career pressure.

Theoretically, this study contributes to our understanding of the social entrepreneurship characteristics and perspectives of students studying tourism at higher education level. Practically, it is thought that revealing the social entrepreneurship characteristics of students studying tourism at the undergraduate level will be effective in planning the education curriculum in the field of tourism. Because "receiving education towards their goals of individuals, who want to be social entrepreneurs, will be an important factor affecting their advancement in their careers and becoming successful social entrepreneurs" (Kümbül-Güler, 2008). The inclusion of only "entrepreneurship" courses in undergraduate tourism education does not allow students to gain knowledge about "social entrepreneurship". It is understood that social entrepreneurship is not covered enough in entrepreneurship lessons and therefore students' perceptions in this direction are not mature enough. As can be seen in the findings, students associate social entrepreneurship with the concepts of "communication, social media or internet". This situation shows the lack of knowledge about social entrepreneurship and it is thought that the subject is associated with "socialization or new media technologies" only due to the concept of "social" at the beginning. In order to correct this situation, it is suggested that "social entrepreneurship" courses should be added to the undergraduate tourism curriculum in addition to the "entrepreneurship" courses. By giving this course as a compulsory course, it will be possible for students to be more conscious about social problems, to increase their desire for social benefits and to be more sensitive to the sustainability of tourism. Thus, students -when they come to decision-making positions- will be able to take part in the tourism sector as entrepreneurs who will provide social benefit with their social entrepreneurship characters rather than act as money-focused and risk-taking people with only their entrepreneurial knowledge.

It is recommended that social entrepreneurship practices that offer an effective solution to social problems for decision makers and provide equal opportunities for all segments of society should be included more in the field of higher education. In future studies, it is recommended to apply the same scale to students after the Covid-19 pandemic. It is estimated that the pandemic has increased the social benefit on individuals and this situation may create variability in the social entrepreneurship characteristics of the students. It is also recommended to compare students in tourism higher education with students from different fields.

## References

Akkan, E, Süygün, M. (2016). Lisans Öğrencilerinin Özyeterlik Algıları ve Başarma Güdülerinin Sosyal Girişimcilik Eğilimlerine Etkilerinin İncelenmesi. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 18(2), 35-63. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/akuiibfd/issue/26566/519574

Biçer, B., & Başer, E. H. (2019). Öğretmen Adaylarının Empatik Eğilimlerinin Sosyal Girişimcilik Özelliklerini Yordama Gücü ve Empatik Eğilim ile Sosyal Girişimcilik Özelliklerini Etkileyen Faktörler. Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 7(5), 235-243.

Brandstätter, H., & Opp, K. (2014). Personality Traits ("Big Five") and the Propensity to Political Protest: Alternative Models. Political Psychology, 35(4): 515-537.

Burger, J. M. (2016). Kişilik. (Çev. İ. D. Erguvan Sarıoğlu). İstanbul: Kaknüs Yayınları.

Capella-Peris, C., Gil-Gómez, J., Martí-Puig, M. & Paola RuízBernardo (2020) Development and Validation of a Scale to Assess Social Entrepreneurship Competency in Higher Education, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 11:1, 23-39, DOI:10.1080/19420676.2018.1545686

Çavdar, O., Cumhur, F., Yasemin, K. O. Ç., & Doymuş, K. (2018). Öğretmen adaylarının sosyal girişimcilik özelliklerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. Anemon Muş Alparslan Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi, 6, 27-33.

Dees, J. G. (1998). The Meaning of Social Entrepreneurship (Revised 2001). Retrieved from https://centers.fuqua.duke.edu/case/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2015/03/Article_Dees_MeaningofSocialEntrepreneurship_2001.pdf

Ernst, K. (2012). Social entrepreneurs and their personality. Social entrepreneurship and social business, 51-64. In Volkmann, C. K., Tokarski, K. O. and Ernst, K. (Ed.) (2012). Social Entrepreneurship and Social Business: An Introdusction and Discussion with Case Studies. Springer Gabler: Wiesbaden.

Eroglu, E., & Eroglu, S. Y. (2020). The Necessity of Social Entrepreneurship Levels of Teacher Candidates: Physical Education and Sports. African Educational Research Journal, 8(2), 233-238.

García-González, A., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2020). Social entrepreneurship competency in higher education: an analysis using mixed methods. Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 1-19.

Halıcı, A., & Delil, Y. (2003). Büro Yönetimi Öğrencilerinin Mesleki Algılamalarının Belirlenmesine Yönelik Bir Uygulama. Gazi Üniversitesi Ticaret ve Turizm Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (1), 22-37.

Hassan, H. K. (2020). Intention towards social entrepreneurship of university students in an emerging economy: the influence of entrepreneurial self-efficacy and entrepreneurship education. On the Horizon. 28(3) , pp. 133-151. https://doi.org/10.1108/OTH-04-2020-0012

Hockerts, K. (2018) The Effect of Experiential Social Entrepreneurship Education on Intention Formation in Students, Journal of Social Entrepreneurship, 9(3), 234-256, DOI: 10.1080/19420676.2018.1498377

Hsu, C. Y., & Wang, S. M. (2019). Social entrepreneurial intentions and its influential factors: A comparison of students in Taiwan and Hong Kong. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 56(3), 385-395.

Iancu, A., Popescu, L., & Popescu, V. (2020). Factors influencing social entrepreneurship intentions in Romania. Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1820358

İrengün, O., & Arıkboğa, Ş. (2015). The effect of personality traits on social entrepreneurship intentions: A field research. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 195, 1186-1195.

Karakaya, İ. (2012). Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. A. Tanrıöğen (Edt.) Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri. Ankara: Anı.

Konaklı, T., & Göğüş, N. (2013). Aday Öğretmenlerin Sosyal Girişimcilik Özellikleri Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. Gazi University Journal of Gazi Educational Faculty (GUJGEF), 33(2).

Kubilay Yazıcı, Salih Uslu & Soner Arık. (2016) The investigation of the social entrepreneurship characteristics of social studies pre-service teachers, Cogent Education, 3:1, 1141455.

Kümbül-Güler, B. (2008). Sosyal Girişimciliği Etkileyen Faktörlerin Analizi. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi, İzmir.

Mair, J. ve Noboa, E. (2006). Social Entrepreneurship: How İntentions to Create a Socila Venture are Formed. 121-135. In Mair, J., Robinson, J. ve Hockerts, K. (Ed.) (2006). Social Entrepreneurship. Palgrave Macmillan: Great Britain.

Nga, J. K. H., & Shamuganathan, G. (2010). The influence of personality traits and demographic factors on social entrepreneurship start up intentions. Journal of business ethics, 95(2), 259-282.

Özbilen, F, Canbulat, T, Çekiç, O. (2020). Sınıf Öğretmeni Adaylarının Özyeterlik ve Sosyal Girişimcilik Düzeylerinin Değerlendirilmesi. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Buca Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, (50), 274-297.

Page, S. J. (2016). Turizm İşletmeciliği (Tourism Management). (Çev. Ed. Z. Öter). (Fifth edition). Ankara: Nobel Yayıncılık.

Pınar, A. H. (2015). 21. Yüzyılda Girişimcilik. Bakan, İ. (2015). (Ed.). Girişimcilik ve Girişimcilikte Seçme Konular. İçinde. 23-48. Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi.

Praszkier, R. & Andrzej N. (2012). Social Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice. Cambridge University Press, New York, USA.

Rennie, H.G. (2006), "Social Entrepreneurship and Regional Economic Development: A Conceptual Framework", Enterprising Worlds, Vol:86, pp.257-270.

Roslan, M. H. H., Hamid, S., Ijab, M. T., Yusop, F. D. & Norman, A. A. (2020) Social entrepreneurship in higher education: challenges and opportunities, Asia Pacific Journal of Education.

Şirin, Y. E., Bilir, F. P., & Öz, G. (2018). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Sosyal Girişimcilik Eğilimleri: Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Yüksek Okul Örneği. Gaziantep Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 3(3), 35-47.

UNWTO. (2020). International tourism highlights 2020 edition. Retrieved from: https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/pdf/10.18111/9789284422456

Wood, S. (2012). Prone to progress: Using personality to identify supporters of innovative social entrepreneurship. Journal of Public Policy & Marketing, 31(1), 129-141.

Wu, Y. J., Wu, T., & Sharpe, J. (2020). Consensus on the definition of social entrepreneurship: a content analysis approach. Management Decision. 58(12), pp. 2593-2619. DOI 10.1108/MD-11-2016-0791

Yunus, M. & Webber, K. (2019). Üç Sıfırlı Dünya: Sıfır Yoksulluk, Sıfır İşsizlik, Sıfır Karbon Emisyonunun Yeni Ekonomisi (Çev. B. Çorakçı Dişbudak). İstanbul: Alfa Yayıncılık.

Zahra, S.A., Gedajlovic, E., Neubaum, D.O., Shulman, J.M. (2009), "A Typology of Social Entrepreneurs: Motives, Search Processes and Ethical Challenges", Journal of Business Venturing, 24(5), pp.519- 532.

Zhao, H., Seibert, S., & Lumpkin, G.T. (2010). The Relationship of Personality to Entrepreneurial Intentions and Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. Journal of Management, 36(2): 381- 404.