



## INVESTIGATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HIGH SCHOOL MANAGERS - IRAQ-KERKUK SAMPLE

Mardin Tahseen Abdulrahman<sup>i</sup>,

Bülent Fişekçioğlu

Selcuk University,

Faculty of Sport Science,

Konya, Turkey

### Abstract:

The aim of this study was to determine the views of teachers about the entrepreneurial characteristics of high school administrators working in Iraq / Kirkuk and to determine whether these views differ in terms of various variables. For this purpose, a total of 499 volunteer teachers and managers participated in the study. Data were collected by Entrepreneurship Scale were used as a data collection tool. SPSS package program (SPSS Inc., Chicago, Illinois, ABD) was used for analyzed obtained data. The relationship between sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale was calculated by Pearson (r) correlation technique. The Independent Sample T-test was used to compare the expressions in the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale, and the One Way ANOVA test was used in more than two categories. In the analysis of the differences between the categories in the ANOVA test LSD test was used. Statistical results were examined at 0.05 significance level. As a result, the demographic characteristics of the participants included in the study did not show a significant difference in entrepreneurial characteristics. In some of the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale, it was determined that there were significant on some variables (marital status, duration of service, institution, welfare level).

**Keywords:** sports management; sports; entrepreneurial characteristics

### 1. Introduction

Increasing the quality of the education system and researching school operation activities over the years, developments in education and management sciences brought the end to traditional practices in schools and searches for new systems have begun (Özden 2002). These searches and discussions in the education systems have revealed the idea that the main pioneers of the change in this education system will be the leaders. It can be said that there is a rapid change in today's conditions, and it is not possible to keep up with

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [mardin\\_gok2007@yahoo.com.tr](mailto:mardin_gok2007@yahoo.com.tr)

this change with the old leadership behaviors or to continue successfully beyond adapting. For these reasons, it is argued that transformational leaders can keep up with rapid change the most (Çelik 2000). The aim of this study was to determine the views of teachers about the entrepreneurial characteristics of high school administrators working in Iraq / Kirkuk and to determine whether these views differ in terms of various variables.

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Subjects

Our universe consists of educators working in Iraq/Kirkuk. The sample of our study, on the other hand, consisted of 499 volunteer teachers and administrators working in this province. All of the people participating in the study graduated from the undergraduate program, 215 of them were women and 284 of them were men, of which 323 were married and 176 were single. When the distribution is made according to the institutions they work, 368 teachers work in public schools and 131 teachers work in private schools. An entrepreneurship scale questionnaire was applied by the researcher himself, by contacting the teachers and administrators directly. The applied questionnaires were examined, and the questionnaires with deficiencies or errors were excluded from the evaluation.

### 2.2 Data Collection

The data were collected through a form including the Entrepreneurship scale and demographic characteristics of the participants such as age, gender, marital status, institution, education level, graduation area and sports history. The Entrepreneurship scale developed by Koh (1996) and adapted into Turkish by Ağca and Kızıldağ (2013) were used as measurement tools.

### 2.3 Entrepreneurship Scale Sub-dimensions Item and Score Averages

When the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale, which consists of 36 items, are examined, these are self-confidence (8 items), uncertainty tolerance (5 items), need for success (5 items), risk-taking (6 items), innovative (4 items) and control center (8 items). It consists of a total of 6 sub-dimensions.

#### a. Trust yourself

Self-confident people are those who know themselves fully, do not avoid taking risks, benefit others and enjoy their work. Those who do not have self-confidence are those who cannot trust the people around them, act depending on others and do not enjoy their work (Aytaç 2001).

#### b. Uncertainty tolerance

An ambiguous situation refers to a situation that cannot be fully structured or categorized by the individual due to insufficient data. The ability to react positively to uncertain situations is called "*uncertainty tolerance*". People are said to have high tolerance if they

can still trust their decision without needing further information in an uncertain environment (Teoh and Foo 1997).

**c. The need for success**

The need for achievement defines the desire to perform at a high level or to stand out from the competition. The motivation that motivates people in this direction is defined as the need for success. Individuals with a high need for achievement take careful risks, seek quick feedback, and do nothing but work. They are self-confident, willing to take responsibility, energetic, and cannot tolerate interference from their goals. Individuals with a high need for success choose professions that require entrepreneurial characteristics. The professions they have chosen or the businesses they have established are challenging, risky, decision-making responsibilities and areas where they will see their performance. Such individuals have the feature of constantly trying to renew themselves (Baysal and Tekarslan 1996).

**d. Risk-taking**

Although risk-taking is used in many senses, the meanings frequently encountered in the literature can be listed as "*entering into the unknown*", "*feeling of uncertainty*", "*pressure from borrowing resources or promising to use a large amount*" and "*possibility of loss or negative results*" (Lumpkin and Dess 1996, p. Antoncic and Hisrich 2003).

**e. Innovation**

Innovation is a concept closely related to the concept and spirit of entrepreneurship. Innovation is an expression used to describe a structure that has never been seen before, that is different and unique. Innovativeness, on the other hand, is an expression used as "*one who favors innovation*". Its counterpart in the economic field, on the other hand, is to provide a competitive advantage in a short time with new products, resources, methods and applications in the market thanks to the entrepreneur. It is a dynamic structure that must be gained and maintained in order to cope with the competitive conditions in the economic field and to survive (Artar 2002).

**f. Control center**

For the individual, locus of control is a feature that reflects the understanding of controlling one's own life, perceptions about rewards and punishments in life, and the perspective of whether or not he can control the events that happen to him (Hisrich and Peters 2002).

## **2.4 Statistical Method**

SPSS 20 package program was used in the statistical analysis of the obtained data. Values; are presented as mean, standard deviation, group distributions and using expressions suitable for the test. In order to measure whether the survey results obtained from the research show a normal distribution according to the demographic characteristics of the participants, a normality test is performed with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and the kurtosis skewness value is checked as +1 and -1, and after the parametric tests in binary categories, which are suitable for the purpose of the research, with the Independent Sample T-Test, more than two categories were analyzed using the One Way ANOVA test.

The reliability analysis of the entrepreneurship scale expressions, which is one of the scales used in the research, was examined with the Cronbach's Alpha test based on 499 individuals. The Cronbach's Alpha value of the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale emerged as ,871. This result shows that the scale expressions are highly reliable. Whether the expressions specified in the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale differed according to demographic characteristics were calculated with the Independent Sample T-Test in dual categories and with the One Way ANOVA test in the categories with more than two. In the analysis, the distribution of the significant difference between the categories was determined by using the LSD test to define the differences that emerged in the ANOVA test. The statistical results obtained were analyzed at the 0.05 significance level.

**Table 1:** Descriptive parameters

Variable	Group	Freq. (n)	Percent (%)	Total
Gender	Female	215	(% 43,1)	499 (%100)
	Male	284	(% 56,9)	
Age	21-35	249	(% 49,9)	499 (%100)
	36-45	163	(% 32,7)	
	46+	87	(% 17,4)	
Marital status	Married	323	(% 64,7)	499 (%100)
	Single	176	(% 35,3)	
Institution	Public	368	(% 73,7)	499 (%100)
	Private	131	(% 26,3)	
Work age	0-5	115	(% 23,0)	499 (%100)
	6-11	185	(% 37,1)	
	12-17	139	(% 27,9)	
	18+	60	(% 12,0)	
Welfare level	Poor	81	(% 16,2)	499 (%100)
	Normal	257	(% 51,5)	
	Good	161	(% 32,3)	
Education	Undergraduate	499	(% 100)	499 (%100)
Graduation	In physical education	244	(% 48,9)	499 (%100)
	Out physical education	255	(% 51,1)	
Manager age	0-3	97	(% 19,4)	499 (%100)
	4-7	193	(% 38,7)	
	8-11	138	(% 27,7)	
	12+	71	(% 14,2)	
Sportive level	Amateur	105	(% 21,0)	499 (%100)
	Professional	58	(% 11,6)	
	Referee	38	(% 7,6)	
	Trainer	30	(% 6,0)	
	Manager	91	(% 18,2)	
	None	177	(% 35,5)	

### 3. Results

**Table 2:** Comparison of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants in terms of gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std.D.	t	p
Trust yourself	Female	215	2,84	0,72	-1,102	,271
	Male	284	2,90	0,65		
Need for Success	Female	215	2,73	0,75	-,619	,536
	Male	284	2,78	0,76		
Risk taking	Female	215	2,80	0,72	-1,021	,308
	Male	284	2,86	0,69		
Control center	Female	215	2,83	0,79	-,252	,801
	Male	284	2,85	0,73		
Uncertainly tolerance	Female	215	2,58	0,78	,775	,550
	Male	284	2,54	0,75		
Innovation	Female	215	2,87	0,87	,844	,268
	Male	284	2,96	0,86		

In Table 2, the comparison of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants in terms of gender is given. When the data were analyzed, no significant difference was found in the entrepreneurship sub-dimensions of individuals ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 3:** Comparison of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants in terms of age variable

		N	Mean	Std.D.	F	p	Diff.
Trust yourself	1.21-35	249	2,90	0,68	,410	,664	
	2.36-45	163	2,87	0,74			
	3.46 +	87	2,82	0,60			
Need for Success	1.21-35	249	2,75	0,78	,268	,765	
	2.36-45	163	2,74	0,71			
	3.46 +	87	2,81	0,76			
Risk taking	1.21-35	249	2,86	0,69	,618	,539	
	2.36-45	163	2,83	0,71			
	3.46 +	87	2,76	0,72			
Control center	1.21-35	249	2,83	0,77	,568	,567	
	2.36-45	163	2,89	0,74			
	3.46 +	87	2,79	0,75			
Uncertainly tolerance	1.21-35	249	2,63	0,77	2,675	,070	1 – 3
	2.36-45	163	2,52	0,78			
	3.46 +	87	2,41	0,71			
Innovation	1.21-35	249	2,87	0,87	1,658	,192	
	2.36-45	163	3,02	0,87			
	3.46 +	87	2,88	0,82			

When the entrepreneurship sub-dimensions of individuals in Table 3 are considered according to age category, no significant difference was found in all sub-dimensions ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 4:** Evaluation of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants according to their marital status

		N	Mean	Std.D.	t	p
Trust yourself	Married	323	2,89	0,67	,821	,412
	Single	176	2,84	0,71		
Need for Success	Married	323	2,75	0,74	-,167	,867
	Single	176	2,76	0,78		
Risk-taking	Married	323	2,82	0,70	-,600	,549
	Single	176	2,86	0,71		
Control center	Married	323	2,84	0,77	-,320	,749
	Single	176	2,86	0,74		
Uncertainly tolerance	Married	323	2,50	0,74	-2,303	<b>,022</b>
	Single	176	2,66	0,80		
Innovation	Married	323	2,92	0,85	,063	,950
	Single	176	2,92	0,88		

In Table 4, entrepreneurship sub-dimensions were compared according to the marital status of individuals. As a result of the analysis, when the survey questions and the averages of the questions were taken into account in the uncertainty tolerance, which is the sub-dimension of entrepreneurship, the significant difference was in favor of single individuals ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 5:** Comparison of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants according to the institution they work for

		N	Mean	Std.D.	t	p
Trust yourself	Public	368	2,83	0,70	-2,025	<b>,044</b>
	Private	131	2,97	0,61		
Need for Success	Public	368	2,73	0,78	-1,257	,210
	Private	131	2,82	0,66		
Risk-taking	Public	368	2,81	0,72	-1,441	,151
	Private	131	2,90	0,65		
Control center	Public	368	2,81	0,71	-1,582	,115
	Private	131	2,94	0,87		
Uncertainly tolerance	Public	368	2,62	0,76	3,043	<b>,003</b>
	Private	131	2,38	0,76		
Innovation	Public	368	2,86	0,84	-2,748	<b>,006</b>
	Private	131	3,10	0,89		

In Table 5, the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship were compared according to the institutions where the participants work. As a result of the analysis of entrepreneurship sub-dimensions; statistically significant differences were found in self-confidence, uncertainty tolerance and innovative dimensions ( $p < 0.05$ ). A significant difference was found in favor of those working in private schools in the sub-dimensions of self-confidence, uncertainty tolerance and innovativeness.

**Table 6:** Comparison of the entrepreneurship characteristics of the participants according to their length of service

		N	Mean	Std.D.	F	p	Diff.
Trust yourself	1.0-5	115	2,92	0,77	,278	,841	
	2.6-11	185	2,88	0,68			
	3.12-17	139	2,85	0,62			
	4.18+	60	2,84	0,66			
Need for Success	1.0-5	115	2,74	0,81	1,085	,355	
	2.6-11	185	2,70	0,77			
	3.12-17	139	2,78	0,66			
	4.18+	60	2,90	0,81			
Risk taking	1.0-5	115	2,99	0,79	2,761	,042	1 – 2 1 – 4
	2.6-11	185	2,77	0,69			
	3.12-17	139	2,82	0,62			
	4.18+	60	2,73	0,73			
Control center	1.0-5	115	2,89	0,81	,448	,719	
	2.6-11	185	2,80	0,75			
	3.12-17	139	2,86	0,72			
	4.18+	60	2,86	0,80			
Uncertainly tolerance	1.0-5	115	2,65	0,84	1,342	,260	
	2.6-11	185	2,57	0,70			
	3.12-17	139	2,50	0,81			
	4.18+	60	2,44	0,69			
Innovation	1.0-5	115	2,97	0,96	1,169	,321	
	2.6-11	185	2,84	0,82			
	3.12-17	139	2,95	0,83			
	4.18+	60	3,04	0,88			

In Table 6, the comparison of individuals with the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship is made based on their service period. As a result of the comparison, a significant difference was found in the risk-taking tendency sub-dimension. This significant difference; emerged in favor of individuals with 0-5 years of service between 0-5 years and 6-11 years and 18 years or more ( $p < 0.05$ ).

**Table 7:** Evaluation of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants in terms of their welfare level

		N	Mean	Std.D.	F	p	Diff.
Trust yourself	1.Poor	81	2,85	0,57	1,373	,254	
	2.Normal	257	2,92	0,745			
	3.Good	161	2,81	0,63			
Need for Success	1.Poor	81	2,82	0,81	1,202	,302	
	2.Normal	257	2,78	0,81			
	3.Good	161	2,68	0,63			
Risk taking	1.Poor	81	2,80	0,64	2,579	,077	
	2.Normal	257	2,90	0,75			
	3.Good	161	2,74	0,66			
Control center	1.Poor	81	2,72	0,64	1,782	,169	

Mardin Tahseen Abdulrahman, Bülent Fişekçiöğlü  
 INVESTIGATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS  
 OF HIGH SCHOOL MANAGERS - IRAQ-KERKUK SAMPLE

	2.Normal	257	2,90	0,76			
	3.Good	161	2,82	0,80			
Uncertainly tolerance	1.Poor	81	2,66	0,70	5,235	,006	3 – 1 2 – 3
	2.Normal	257	2,62	0,78			
	3.Good	161	2,40	0,75			
Innovation	1.Poor	81	2,74	0,79	2,381	,094	
	2.Normal	257	2,98	0,89			
	3.Good	161	2,92	0,85			

In Table 7, the comparison of entrepreneurship characteristics according to the welfare level of individuals is given. As a result of the statistical analysis, a significant difference was found in the uncertainty tolerance, which is one of the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship, in favor of those with good (p: 0.012) and normal (p: 0.03) welfare status (p<0.05).

**Table 8:** Comparison of the entrepreneurship characteristics of the participants according to the graduation area

		N	Mean	Std.D.	t	p
Trust yourself	In physical education	244	2,86	0,62	-,319	,750
	Out physical education	255	2,88	0,74		
Need for Success	In physical education	244	2,71	0,70	-1,345	,179
	Out physical education	255	2,80	0,80		
Risk taking	In physical education	244	2,79	0,66	-1,454	,146
	Out physical education	255	2,88	0,74		
Control center	In physical education	244	2,76	0,72	-2,556	,011
	Out physical education	255	2,93	0,78		
Uncertainly tolerance	In physical education	244	2,54	0,72	-,589	,556
	Out physical education	255	2,58	0,81		
Innovation	In physical education	244	2,87	0,83	-1,463	,144
	Out physical education	255	2,98	0,88		

In Table 8, the entrepreneurship characteristics of the participants were evaluated based on their graduation fields. As a result of the statistical evaluation, a significant difference was found in the control center, one of the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship (p<0.05).

**Table 9:** Evaluation of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants according to their seniority of management

		N	Mean	Std.D.	F	p
Trust yourself	0-3	97	2,81	0,74	,393	,758
	4-7	193	2,89	0,64		
	8-11	138	2,90	0,68		
	12+	71	2,85	0,74		
Need for Success	0-3	97	2,65	0,78	,948	,417
	4-7	193	2,76	0,76		
	8-11	138	2,79	0,74		
	12+	71	2,83	0,72		
Risk-taking	0-3	97	2,86	0,68	1,228	,299



Mardin Tahseen Abdulrahman, Bülent Fişekçioğlu  
 INVESTIGATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS  
 OF HIGH SCHOOL MANAGERS - IRAQ-KERKUK SAMPLE

	4-7	193	2,80	0,69		
	8-11	138	2,91	0,70		
	12+	71	2,74	0,76		
Control center	0-3	97	2,83	0,74	,723	,539
	4-7	193	2,79	0,74		
	8-11	138	2,91	0,78		
	12+	71	2,87	0,78		
Uncertainly tolerance	0-3	97	2,57	0,84	,845	,470
	4-7	193	2,55	0,75		
	8-11	138	2,62	0,77		
	12+	71	2,44	0,69		
Innovation	0-3	97	2,89	0,94	1,541	,203
	4-7	193	2,84	0,80		
	8-11	138	3,02	0,85		
	12+	71	3,01	0,92		

In Table 9, the entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals were statistically evaluated according to their seniority in management. As a result of the evaluation, no statistically significant difference was found in terms of seniority of individuals in any of the entrepreneurship sub-dimensions ( $p>0.05$ ).

**Table 10:** Comparison of the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants in terms of sports history

		N	Ort.	Std. S.	F	p
Trust yourself	Amateur	105	2,90	0,70	,818	,537
	Professional	58	2,73	0,66		
	Referee	38	2,86	0,50		
	Trainer	30	2,94	0,60		
	Manager	91	2,95	0,62		
	None	177	2,85	0,76		
Need for Success	Amateur	105	2,81	0,73	,366	,872
	Professional	58	2,70	0,75		
	Referee	38	2,72	0,70		
	Trainer	30	2,82	0,70		
	Manager	91	2,70	0,69		
	None	177	2,77	0,83		
Risk taking	Amateur	105	2,88	0,69	1,212	,302
	Professional	58	2,70	0,67		
	Referee	38	2,98	0,69		
	Trainer	30	2,85	0,61		
	Manager	91	2,90	0,72		
	None	177	2,78	0,73		
Control center	Amateur	105	2,90	0,72	,405	,84
	Professional	58	2,77	0,74		
	Referee	38	2,87	0,73		
	Trainer	30	2,82	0,71		
	Manager	91	2,78	0,75		
	None	177	2,87	0,81		

Uncertainly tolerance	Amateur	105	2,67	0,72	1,785	,114
	Professional	58	2,30	0,72		
	Referee	38	2,53	0,74		
	Trainer	30	2,54	0,62		
	Manager	91	2,57	0,82		
	None	177	2,58	0,80		
Innovation	Amateur	105	3,00	0,85	0,930	,461
	Professional	58	2,88	0,79		
	Referee	38	3,13	0,89		
	Trainer	30	2,90	0,94		
	Manager	91	2,91	0,85		
	None	177	2,85	0,88		

In Table 10, the sports backgrounds of the participants and their entrepreneurship characteristics were compared. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that the sports background of the individuals did not significantly affect their entrepreneurial characteristics ( $p < 0.05$ ).

#### 4. Discussion

When examining the entrepreneurship characteristics of the participants in terms of gender, a comparison was made with the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship according to gender. Although it was determined that the entrepreneurial characteristics of the individuals did not differ significantly according to the genders, it was determined that the male participants had higher averages than the female participants in the entrepreneurship sub-dimensions, and the entrepreneurial characteristics of the male participants were slightly higher than the female participants, although not significantly. When the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants are compared between age categories; among the sub-dimensions of the scale, a significant difference was found between the ages only in the uncertainty tolerance sub-dimension. This differentiation emerged in favor of 21-35 years between the ages of 21-35 and the age category of 46 and over. tolerance for ambiguity; it defines the attitude of the organism against unpredictable events whose outcome and beginning are not clear. This feature is important for individuals who want to be entrepreneurs and there are differences in the results of the study. It was emphasized that the fact that this difference between the ages was in favor of the 31-35 age category is an indication that young, dynamic and adult individuals get better scores on entrepreneurship and their ability to respond positively to uncertainty is better (Schere 1982).

When an evaluation is made on the marital status of the individuals participating in our study with the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale; It was determined that only in the tolerance of uncertainty among the six sub-dimensions, there was a significant difference according to marital status. The fact that the significant difference emerged in favor of single individuals can be considered as an indication that individuals can make decisions more easily when they are single and give more ideal and correct

responses compared to uncertain situations. Therefore, it can be assumed that single individuals participating in our study can control their behavior with a slightly more free and comfortable attitude about entrepreneurship. When the effect of another variable, the institution of employment, on entrepreneurial characteristics is examined; It has been determined that there is a significant difference in the sub-dimensions of self-confidence, tolerance of uncertainty and being innovative. It can be said that the significant difference in the self-confidence sub-dimension is in favor of the individuals working in the private school. When the average of the answers given to the survey questions is taken into consideration, it has been determined that the individuals with a higher average are private school employees. Therefore, it can be said that individuals working in private schools are more prominent in terms of self-confidence, which is the sub-dimension of entrepreneurship. It can be said that the differentiation in uncertainty tolerance and innovative sub-dimensions is also in favor of individuals working in private schools, by looking at their high averages. In terms of marital status variable, it can be said that the differences in entrepreneurship characteristics become significant in the sub-dimensions of self-confidence, uncertainty tolerance and innovativeness and that private school employees have more entrepreneurial structures than individuals working in public schools.

Another variable that examines the entrepreneurial characteristics of the participants is the length of service they have been in until now. According to the results of the ANOVA test based on the length of service of individuals, it can be said that there is a significant difference in the risk-taking tendency in the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship. This significant difference emerged in favor of 0-5 years between 0-5 years of service, 6-11 years and 18 and more years of service. It can be said that individuals who have 0-5 years of service have more confidence in taking risks and have controlled behaviors. The welfare levels of the participants, which is another variable, made a significant difference only in the uncertainty tolerance sub-dimension on their entrepreneurial characteristics. This significant difference emerged between the participants with good welfare levels and the participants with bad welfare levels, and it resulted in favor of the participants with good welfare. At the same time, a significant difference was found between the participants with normal welfare levels and those with poor levels in favor of the normal ones. It can be said that the ability of individuals with good welfare to produce positive reactions to uncertain situations and to exhibit controlled behavior is significantly better than those with other welfare levels. When individuals are examined within the framework of sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship characteristics according to their graduation areas; it can be said that there is a significant difference only in the control center sub-dimension out of the six sub-dimensions. In the evaluation made by considering the seniority of the participants, it was determined that there was no significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale. The years of management did not make a difference in entrepreneurship. When the entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals are evaluated by considering their sports backgrounds; Again, no significant difference was found in the sub-dimensions of the

entrepreneurship scale. According to our results, it can be said that the sportive activities (amateur athlete, professional athlete, referee, trainer, manager) that individuals have dealt with in the past do not significantly affect their entrepreneurial characteristics.

In a study conducted in 2012 on students of business administration at a university, they compared some demographic and psychological parameters that have effects on entrepreneurship. As a result of the study, significant differences were found in the demographic characteristics of individuals and in 2 sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship, only risk-taking and innovation. In the comparison of the ages of the individuals, a significant difference was found in the innovation and self-confidence sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship sub-dimensions. Looking at the data obtained as a result of the study, it was concluded that the participants were self-confident, in need of success, and risk-taking individuals. Since it is observed that they have 4 out of 6 dimensions of entrepreneurship, it can be concluded that the entrepreneurial characteristics of these individuals are dominant (Korkmaz 2012).

Our results have resulted in parallel, albeit partially, with previous studies in the literature. Looking at the international studies; There was a significant difference in the gender category. The resulting difference was in favor of male students (Kristiansen and Indarti 2004). In a similar study, it was observed that those with work experience had more entrepreneurial personality than those without (Peterman and Kennedy 2003). In line with the findings of Gürel et al., it has been determined that individuals with high family income are more entrepreneurial than individuals with low family income (Gürel Altınay and Daniele 2010). According to a result of our study, a significant difference was obtained in the uncertainty tolerance, which is one of the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale, in the evaluation of the entrepreneurship characteristics of the participants according to age. It was determined that this significant difference emerged between the ages of 21-31, 36-45 years, and 46 years and above in favor of 21-35 years. In a similar study in the literature, opposite results were obtained to our results. Contrary to what was stated in our study, it was stated the entrepreneurial characteristics of the older students were better than the younger ones (Şeşen and Basım 2012).

According to a result of our study, it was determined that the gender status of the participants did not create any significant difference in the sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurship scale. In an entrepreneurship research conducted for university students in the literature; It has been revealed that the gender variable does not make a significant difference in the entrepreneurship characteristics of female and male students. Again, in some studies, the effect of gender on entrepreneurship was examined, but no significant relationship was found, and in some studies, it was shown that entrepreneurial characteristics of men are better than women (Yılmaz and Sünbül 2009).

In a study conducted by Karabulut in 2009, students studying in the business department of a university were included in the study. The study is an important study since it is a study to determine the effects of innovativeness, entrepreneurship characteristics, endurance and motivation characteristics on the entrepreneurial characteristics of individuals who continue their education. According to the results of

the research, he concluded that although most of his students received entrepreneurship education, they were not willing to work in a different job, did not show any effort to establish their own business, and did not want to have an entrepreneurial qualification after graduation (Karabulut 2009). In their study, İşcan and Kaygın conducted a survey on senior students from two universities. Then, they made a comparison of entrepreneurship between the students of these two universities. According to the results of the study, it was said that the students in Kars tend to be more entrepreneurial by 31.7%. It was concluded from the research that the majority of the students in both Kars and Kırıkkale wanted to work in the public sector and the majority of the students did not have a business idea (İşcan and Kaygın 2011).

## 5. Conclusion

As a result, no significance was found in the analysis of the gender feature, which is one of the variables of our study, with the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship. When examined in terms of age variable, in the uncertainty tolerance sub-dimension; when analyzed according to a marital status variable, in uncertainty tolerance; when examined according to the institution, significant changes were detected in the uncertainty tolerance and innovative sub-dimensions. Again, when the service period of the participants is evaluated with the sub-dimensions of entrepreneurship, the sub-dimension of risk-taking; in uncertainty tolerance in terms of the welfare level variable; there were significant changes in the control center sub-dimension according to the graduation area variable. As a result, the demographic characteristics of the participants included in the study, entrepreneurial characteristics created significant differences in entrepreneurial characteristics, uncertainty tolerance, control center and innovative sub-dimensions. Based on these results, it can be said that those who are in the 21-35 age category of high school administrators, those who are single, those who work in private schools, those with 0-5 years of service, those who have a low level of welfare and those who have graduated from a department other than physical education have a more entrepreneurial structure.

## Acknowledgement

The article was produced from Mr. Abdulrahman's thesis of Master of Science.

## Conflict of Interest Statement

There are no potential conflicts of interest on this article.

## About the Authors

**Mr. Mardin Tahseen Abdulrahman** has Master of Science degree in sport science research field from Selcuk University, Turkey.

**Dr. Bülent Fişekçioğlu** is Professor Doctor at Selcuk University, Turkey.

## References

- Açıkalın A, 2000. İlköğretim okulu yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri ve empati becerileri arasındaki ilişki. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Altun S, 2001. İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderliğe verdikleri önem ve uygulama düzeyleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Abant İzzet Baysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Bolu.
- Antoncic B, Hisrich RD, 2003. Clarifying the intrapreneurship concept. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), 7-24.
- Arslan K, 2002. Üniversiteli gençlerde mesleki tercihler ve girişimcilik eğilimleri. *Doğuş Üniversitesi Dergisi*, (69), 1- 11.
- Artar A, 2002. Esnaf ve sanatkarlarımızın 21. yüzyıl açısından geleceği. *Trabzon Esnaf ve Sanatkarlar Birliği Araştırma Raporları*, Trabzon.
- Aytaç S, 2001. Örgütsel davranış açısından kişiliğin önemi..*Endüstri İlişkileri ve İnsan Kaynakları Dergisi*, 3(1), no:96.
- Baysal C, Tekarslan E, 1996. Davranış bilimleri. Avcıol Basım Yayın, İstanbul.
- Baysal E A, 2013. İlköğretim okul müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik rollerinin öğretmenlerin örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışlarına etkisi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, Afyon .
- Boomer KM, 1994. The perceived transformational leadership traits of principals of restructuring elementary school in California, University of Pacific. *Dissertation Abstract International*, 3; 427.
- Brestrich ET, 1999. Yönetim düşüncesinin evriminde liderliğin gelişimi ve dönüşümcü liderlik ve bir uygulama örneği. Doktora Tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Çelik V, 1998. Eğitimde dönüşümcü liderlik. *Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi*, 4(16), 423– 442.
- Çelik V, 2000. Eğitimsel liderlik. Pegem A Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Çetiner A, 2008. İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik davranışlarını gösterme düzeylerine ilişkin öğretmen görüşleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Dessler G, 2004. *Management: principles and practices for tomorrow's leaders*. Upper Saddle River, Prentice Hall. New Jersey.
- Eraslan L, 2003. İlköğretim okulu müdürlerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özellikleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kırıkkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Kırıkkale.
- Gurel E, Altınay L, ve Daniele R, 2010. Tourism students entrepreneurial intentions. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 37(3):646-669.
- Hisrich RD, Peters MP, 2002. *Entrepreneurship*. Irwin McGraw-Hill. Boston.
- İnci M, 2001. Dönüştürücü liderlik yaklaşımı ve uygulamadan örnekler. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Marmara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

- İşcan ÖF, ve Kaygın E, 2011. Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik eğilimlerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, (2): 443-462.
- Judeh M, 2010. Transformational leadership: A study of gender differences in private universities international. Review of Business Research Papers, 6 (4).
- Karabulut AT, 2009. Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özellikleri ve eğilimlerini belirlenmeye yönelik bir araştırma. Marmara Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 26 (1).
- Karip E, 1998. Dönüşümcü liderlik. Eğitim Yönetimi Dergisi, 16;443-465.
- Koh Hian C, 1996. Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics a study of Hong Kong MBA Students. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11 (3), 12-25.
- Korkmaz O, 2012. Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik eğilimlerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma. Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi, İİBF Dergisi, 14 (2), 209-226.
- Kristiansen S. ve Indarti N. 2004. Entrepreneurial intention among Indonesian and Norwegian Students Journal of Enterprising Culture, 12(1):55-78.
- Leithwood K, 1994. Leadership for school restructuring. Educational Administration Quarterly. 30(4),498-518.
- Lumpkin GT, Dess GG, 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construction and linking it to performance. Academy of Management Review, 21(1), 135-173.
- Özden Y, 2002. Eğitimde yeni değerler, eğitimde dönüşüm. Pegem A Yayıncılık. Ankara.
- Öztürk F, 2000. Devlet ve özel sektör spor kuruluşlarında görevli yöneticilerin dönüşümcü ve işlemci liderlik özelliklerinin belirlenmesi. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Beden Eğitimi Ve Spor Ana Bilim Dalı, Ankara.
- Peterman NE, ve Kennedy J, 2003. Enterprise education: Influencing Students Perceptions of Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 28(2):129-144.
- Schere J, 1982. Tolerance for ambiguity as a discriminating variable between entrepreneurs and managers. Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings, 42, 404-408.
- Şeşen H, Basım N. 2012. Demografik faktörler ve kişiliğin girişimcilik niyetine etkisi. Ege Akademik Bakış Dergisi, 12 (1), 11-28.
- Teoh HY, Foo SL, 1997. Moderating effects of tolerance for ambiguity and risk-taking propensity on the role conflict- perceived performance relationship: Evidence from Singaporean entrepreneurs. Journal of Business Venturing, 12(1), 67-81.
- Uzer M, 2010. İlköğretim okul yöneticilerinin dönüşümcü liderlik özelliklerine sahip olma düzeyleri. Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Beykent Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Yılmaz E, Sünbül A.M. 2009. Üniversite öğrencilerine yönelik girişimcilik ölçeğinin geliştirilmesi. Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi. 196-203.

Mardin Tahseen Abdulrahman, Bülent Fişekçioğlu  
INVESTIGATION OF ENTREPRENEURIAL CHARACTERISTICS  
OF HIGH SCHOOL MANAGERS - IRAQ-KERKUK SAMPLE

---

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Social Sciences Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).