

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP TRAINING: KUSEM EXAMPLE

Latif ÖZTÜRK

Doç .Dr.Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kırıkkale,
latifozturk6@yahoo.com

Seda BAYRAKDAR

Dr.Arş.Gor.Kırıkkale University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Kırıkkale,
sedabayrakdar@hotmail.com

Ertuğrul KARAKAYA

Yrd Doç.Dr.Kırıkkale University, Fatma Şenses Social Sciences Vocational Schools. Kırıkkale,
erkara@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

The historical development and definition of entrepreneurship training and studies related this subject in Turkey and worldwide have been examined in this study. The people, who were certified after receiving entrepreneurship training at Kırıkkale University Continuing Education Center (KUSEM-KUCEC), were regarded as the population, 356 persons have been contacted by systematic sampling method. These persons' profiles have been examined and it has been concluded that, the persons, who were more efficient regarding entrepreneurship, were between 26-35 years old high-school graduates and craftsmen were more successful. These persons have been asked if they made an attempt on making a project and applying to KOSGEB (Small and Medium Enterprises Development Organization) after receiving certificate. The application rate to KOSGEB with a project has been found 9,3%. They have then been asked to evaluate the entrepreneurship training, they got from KUSEM and the evaluation results have been analyzed.

Keywords: Entrepreneurship training, KOSGEB, Training Efficiency, Kırıkkale University, Variance Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The origin of "Entrepreneur" is based on thirteenth century and the word is originated from the French verb "entreprendre". This word means to make something or to undertake. It has become a noun as "entrepreneur" to describe "business venture" on the 16.th century and it has first been used by Richard Cantillon academically on 1730. Cantillon has emphasized that, being the risk taker has been the entrepreneur's significant characteristic. At the beginning of 1800s Jean-Baptiste Say and John Stuart Mill have made the academic usage of the word entrepreneur even more famous. Say remarks the entrepreneur's duty of creating value by moving the resources from less profitable areas to the more profitable ones. But Mill describes the word entrepreneur as the one, who both takes risk and also runs the business in his popular book, Principles of Political Economy on 1848. In this way, the difference between "entrepreneur" and "business owners" has been revealed more clearly owing to Mill. Joseph Schumpeter and Israel Kirzner, two important economists of the twentieth century, have given a more refined meaning to the term entrepreneur academically. While Schumpeter emphasizes the innovatory role of the entrepreneur, he explains the innovative entrepreneur as the one, who puts a new goods and production method into economical practice. Moreover, while Schumpeter emphasizes the benefit of creative destruction period, he describes the entrepreneur as a maelstrom. But the entrepreneur type, described by Kirzner is the one, who explores the profit opportunities, unnoticed before (Sobel).

1. ENTREPRENEURSHIP TRAINING

Increased globalization appears both as decreased importance of the countries' earmarks, but also as gaining some advantages, which could be created in competition. For example, qualified workforce, one of the key determinants of competition, is one of the possibly created differences, where its novelty-generation capacity is domestic based (Bayrakdar (a), 2011). Competitive capacity means contribution to the economic development - economic growth by producing qualitative goods and services. By means of competition, production of more varied, qualitative and cheaper goods is provided. Entrepreneurs are the most important way to ensure continuity (Güner and Korkmaz, 2011). Since the growing competitive effects of globalization make itself evident on the labor market, the individuals have been forced into improving themselves and adapting themselves to novelties consistently. One of the methods, used in this adaptation period is entrepreneurship trainings.

Regarding entrepreneurship, "does a man become entrepreneur is he born as one?" has been discussed for a long while. The answer of this question will be clarified pursuant to the results of entrepreneurship trainings according to their sense and meaning. Nowadays beside the innate entrepreneurship characteristics, various psychological-social-economical external factors, such as family support, access to financial resources, training, state supports, are regarded as effective in the appearance of these characteristics. Thus it is thought that, entrepreneurship trainings will give positive support for promoting the healthy development of small businesses and for the perception of entrepreneurship as a career. It is thought that, qualities such as will to succeed, taking the opportunities and resolution, can be taught to the entrepreneur candidates by suitable trainings. In this sense, it is stated that, entrepreneurship trainings may be effective in revealing the entrepreneurial spirit in individuals and proper use of it (Balaban and Ozdemir, 2008). The characteristics, which the entrepreneur can gain and develop afterwards, must be determined properly in the entrepreneurship trainings based on the truth of teach ability of entrepreneurship, concentrating education in these fields is regarded as significant (Yumuk, 2013:102).

The question of whether it is possible to educate entrepreneurial individuals or not has been mentioned more. It has been found that, the graduates of entrepreneurship training have stronger tendency to launch a company in comparison with the other graduates. Rasmussen and Sorheim, who quoted from Peterman and Kennedy, have stated that, entrepreneurship trainings changed the participants' entrepreneurial tendencies dramatically (Rasmussen and Sorheim, 2006:186).

It is seen that, the given entrepreneurship trainings are concentrated in the primary and secondary education in USA and Europe, on the other hand they are concentrated mostly at the universities in Turkey. Current issues, such as competition theories, globalization, business and product development, nanotechnology, are given a place in these training programs, given at the world universities (Bozkurt and Alparslan, 2013).

Entrepreneurship trainings are trainings, which entrepreneur trainees' demand on the purpose of developing their enterprises. The desired benefit of the trainings is related with how much the trainee's feelings about entrepreneurship are changed. OECD has indicated a positive relationship between entrepreneurship trainings and further development of entrepreneurship and stated that, the entrepreneurship trainings should be given at early ages (Duran, Buber & Gumustekin, 2013). Ozgen (2011), states that, in order to achieve success in entrepreneurship training, the existing potential should be identified and used in high school years. In this way, a more effective process can be followed about creation, innovation and launching a business. Because the trainees make their career choices in a wider perspective at this period. It is known that, career choices are identified during the adolescence and gained knowledge about entrepreneurship at this period enhances the entrepreneurial activities.

Entrepreneurship: It is a process of taking success-oriented risks, planning and managing innovative motives, in accordance with the individual's ability to put his/her idea and talent into practice. Every kind of entrepreneurship training to be given is important to develop the entrepreneurship concept. Entrepreneurship trainings shouldn't be confused with trainings such as economics or business management. The main purpose of entrepreneurship trainings is to enhance the self-employment idea, creativity and innovation.

The benefits of entrepreneurship trainings are not limited to these. By these trainings, it is ensured to enhance the individuals' specialization, development of their analytical thinking abilities, their confidence, leadership and communicative competences (Bayrakdar (b), 2011).

One of the pioneers of entrepreneurship training is Shigeru Fijii. Fijii has started to work about entrepreneurship trainings at The Kobe University in Japan in 1938. Small business management courses have appeared in 1940's. The first course has been started at Harvard Business School in 1947 by Myles Mace's introduction. After a half century, entrepreneurship phenomena has found more global acceptance (Alberti, Salvatore & Poli, 2004). Katz (2003:284) has studied the entrepreneurship trainings, given in U.S.A, the books about entrepreneurship and supplemental infrastructures chronologically between 1876 and 1999 and he has supposed that, more than 120.000 students got entrepreneurship training and small business courses in 1994 and at the beginning of the millennium this number increased to the rate of 50 %. He has predicted that, more than 2200 courses occurred at more than 1600 schools since the first class, established in 1947.

Entrepreneurship trainings have been being hold increasingly at the universities nowadays. Entrepreneurship lessons are given at many universities in Turkey, in addition to this, it is known that, some universities have Entrepreneurship Research Centers.

2. EMPIRIC STUDIES, MADE ABOUT ENTREPRENEURSHIP TRAINING IN TURKEY

Empiric studies, which are made for evaluating to what extent entrepreneurship trainings, given in Turkey, effect the trainees' entrepreneurship tendencies have been given a place in this part of the study. Ulukoy, Dereli and Kahya (2013) have evaluated the effect of entrepreneurship trainings, which are hold by KOSGEB (Small And Medium Industry Development Organization) on the entrepreneurship potential of the participants in their study, they have prepared 200 questionnaires, they have been able to get answer to 82 of them, since 4 of them were left out of assessment, 78 questionnaire forms have been analyzed. As a result, it has been estimated that, entrepreneurship training's contribution on the

entrepreneurship awareness was positive; but the entrepreneurship training's level of achievement was low.

Oktem, Aydin and Ekinci (2007) have partly confirmed the idea of entrepreneurship trainings made qualitatively important contributions compared to the other trainings, given to entrepreneurship trainees, as a result of the study, in which they have studied the activities of KOSGEB, as one of the chief organizations, which perform services to develop entrepreneurship in Turkey. Survey results have showed that, only 2 out of 12 questions, which were asked to 21 entrepreneurship trainees, were answered negatively; the other 10 questions were answered positively. It has been stated that, the negative answers were about subjects, such as the insufficient announcements for KOSGEB training programs and not being informed regularly about entrepreneurship trainings.

Akyuz (2013) has found as result of survey study between the students of Usak University (137 students), who took applied entrepreneurship lesson, given in cooperation with The Higher Education Council and KOSGEB, that 56,9 % of the students wanted to become public officer after graduation. Besides 75% of the respondents have stated that, there were differences between the spirit of entrepreneurship in the world and the spirit of entrepreneurship in Turkey.

Mutlu (2014) has studied the positive factors of the trainees' desires to become entrepreneur or the negative factors, seen as obstacles for entrepreneurship in the study, which he investigated the change in entrepreneurship perception of trainees as a result of the applied entrepreneurship training, they got from KOSGEB. At the end of the face to face survey, made with 117 out of 180 participants of these courses, it has been found that, these courses, hold by KOSGEB promote entrepreneurship.

Duran, Buber and Gumustekin (2013) have conducted 86 questionnaires as a part of the study, they made on the students, who got and who didn't get entrepreneurship training at the Kutahya Vocational High School and they have used the random sampling method. It has been found that, second class students' (students, which take entrepreneurship training) entrepreneurship feelings were less than which of the first class students. The result is that, the

given entrepreneurship trainings don't have positive effect on the entrepreneurship feelings.

Bozkurt, Aslan and Goral (2011) have found the effect of entrepreneurship training on the entrepreneurship tendency as 16% in the regression analysis, they made in order to evaluate the effect of entrepreneurship training on the entrepreneurship tendency and they have found the correlation between these two variables statistically meaningful.

Yumuk (2013) has stated that, there was seen no change in the entrepreneurship tendencies of Trakya University students, who took entrepreneurship training, in comparison with the ones, who didn't take the training and also that, according to the regression analysis result, the factors of entrepreneurship training effected the factors of entrepreneurship tendency even restrictedly.

3. METHOD OF THE STUDY

400 persons have been selected by the systematic sampling¹ method out of 1700 persons, who took entrepreneurship training at KUSEM and 356 persons out of 400 have been contacted and they have been interviewed by phone. The aim of these interviews is to determine whether the persons did a project for KOSGEB after receiving entrepreneurship certificate or not, if any, the reasons of not being able to realize the project, they intended to and their motives to receive this certificate, their satisfaction regarding entrepreneurship training and whether their ideas with regard to entrepreneurship have been changed or not following the training. Whether the persons, who make a project or intend to make one, differ by various the categorical variables are analyzed by t-test and Variance Analysis (ANOVA) methods.

¹ Systematic Sampling: It is a sampling method, which can be applied when there is an ordered list of the population of the study. After the sample size is determined, a value such as $k=N/n$ ($1700/400$) $\cong 4$ is specified. A random number such as r is selected between this specified value and zero, which is generally taken as $r= k/2=4/2=2$, k 's multiples are added to this selected number at every turn, by this way the sequence numbers are obtained and the units, which correspond to those sequence numbers, are included in the sampling.

4. THE DEFINITIONAL INFORMATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

First of all, when analyzed according to age groups, 20.2% of the respondents consist of persons aged 17-25, 37.9% of them 26-35, 24.7% of them 36-45 and 17.1% of them consist of persons over 46. 45,5% of the respondents are female, while 54,5% of them are male. When examining their marital status, 64,0% of them are married, 34,0% are single, 1,7% are divorced and 0,3% are widow persons. The respondents' educational status are respectively, 12,1% primary school, 12,4% secondary school, 35,1% high school graduates, 23,6% of them have bachelor's degree and 4,8% of them are postgraduates. 7,9% of the respondents' fathers' occupation is tradesman, 15,7% is worker, 13,2% is civil servant, 6,5% is farmer, 36,0% is pensioner, 0,6% is unemployed and 20,2% of them consist of other occupational groups. When they were asked, which occupation they had by the time of survey, it has been seen that, 22,5% of the respondents were unemployed, 14,3% were civil servants, 25,6% were private sector employees, 3,7% were pensioners, 18,0% were tradesmen, 10,7% were house-wives and 5,3% were students. In the sorting of the respondents' number in the family as a child, it has been stated that, 23,8% of them were the first child of the family, 29,9% were the second, 24,9% were the third, 10,1% were the fourth and 11,3% were the fifth or more.

5. ANALYSIS OF THE RESPONDENTS' PERFORMANCES REGARDING MAKING A PROJECT

When the respondents were asked if they had applied to KOSGEB after having the entrepreneurship certificate, it has been seen that, only 9,3% of them (33 persons) took steps in that direction, but 90,7% of them (323 persons) didn't make a project and apply to KOSGEB. They answered the question "Did you think to make a project after receiving the certificate?" as 39,3% yes, 60,7% no. When this 39,3% part has been asked why they hadn't made a project, even if they intended to do that, the answers have been such as: they didn't make a project, 2,0% as they thought to get a negative result, 15,2% because of not having capital, 1,4% because they were students, 7,0% because it was at the preparation phase, 10,1% because of various negativities of the environment, 64,3% of them haven't stated a reason.

When the mentioned questions are tested for differing with regard to the categorical variables, as these the categorical variables consist of age, gender, marital status, education, father's occupation, present occupation, which number in the family as a child.

Our essential hypotheses in this part are respectively;

H₁: The persons, who made a project and applied to KOSGEB differ by the categorical variables.

The differences according to the categorical variables except gender have been tested by ANOVA and whether there was a difference between genders have been tested by t-test.

Table 1. Results of ANOVA according to the categorical variables and t-tests for those, who applied to KOSGEB

The categorical variable	p	The categorical variable	p
Age	0,782	Father's occupation	0,940
Gender	0,068	Job status	0,000
Marital status	0,893	What number in the family	0,519
Level of education	0,568		

When examined at 5% significance level, null hypothesis is rejected only for job status and it shows that, at least one of them differs according to the jobs, done by the applicants for KOSGEB. When examined at 10% significance level, it may be concluded that, there is also a difference according to the gender. When between which jobholders this difference was found by using Scheffé test as one of the multiple comparison tests, it has been concluded that, there was seen a difference only between tradesmen and other jobholders, except pensioners.

Table 2. Results of multiple comparison Scheffé test according to the categorical variables for those, who applied to KOSGEB

	Category	p
Tradesman	Unemployed	,000
	Public officer	,001
	Private sector employee	,000
	Pensioner	,238
	House-wife	,000
	Student	,004

H₁: The ones, who think to make a project, differ by the categorical variables.

According to the results, there isn't seen any statistically significant difference between the categorical variables except age.

Table 3. Results of ANOVA according to the categorical variables and t-tests for those, who thinks to make a project

The categorical variable	p	The categorical variable	p
Age	0,016	Father's occupation	0,920
Gender	0,182	Job status	0,136
Marital status	0,602	What number in the family	0,739
Level of education	0,124		

Here the significant difference has been examined at 5% significance level and statistically significant difference has been seen between the respondents aged 26-35 and the respondents over 46, as seen in the table below

Table 4. Results of multiple comparison Scheffé test according to the categorical variables for those, who thinks to make a project

	Category	p
Aged 26-35	Aged 17-25	0,054
	Aged 26-35	0,534
	Over 46	0,035

H₁: The reasons for not making a project differ by the categorical variables.

When we examined H₁ hypothesis according to the categorical variables, no statistically significant difference has been seen between all the categorical variables.

When the second group of questions' descriptive data has been examined; 82,4% of those, who applied to KOSGEB with a project, were accepted, but 17,6% of them had negative results. While the ones, whose project was accepted, have started a business and maintained it, only 3,6% of them have been seen to not be able to maintain it. While the rate of the ones, who maintain their business for over one year, is 78,6%, the rate of the ones, who maintain their business for less than one year, is 21,4%. 75,0% of the unaccepted projects result from higher cost and 25,0% of them result from other reasons.

H_{1A}: Project application results' being positive/negative differs by the categorical variables.

H_{1B}: The ones, who maintain their business after establishing it, differ by the categorical variables.

H_{1C}: The reason of the project's not being accepted differs by the categorical variables.

When we examined H_{1A}, H_{1B} and H_{1C} hypotheses again according to the categorical variables, no statistically significant difference has been seen according to the categorical variables.

6. RESPONDENTS' EVALUATION OF THE GIVEN TRAINING

The following results have been obtained both by the descriptive statistics of whether the received entrepreneurship training was sufficient or not, whether the respondents felt any change in themselves after receiving the certificate or not and by the questions of whether they differ by the categorical variables or not.

Table 5. The range of answers, given by the respondents regarding the specialists, who gave the training, were sufficiently beneficial

	Frequency	%
Yes	320	89,9
No	9	2,5
Partially	27	7,6
Total	356	100,0

When these answers of the respondents were examined for whether they differed between the categorical variables or not; statistically significant difference has only been seen between genders ($p=0,023$). It has been seen that, women averagely found the specialists less beneficial in comparison with men. Our hypothesis here is;

H₁: It is as, beneficialness of the specialists, who gave the training, differs according to the respondents.

Table 6. The range of answers, given to the question, has the syllabus of the training, you got, been sufficient

	Frequency	%
Yes	280	78,7
No	20	5,6
Partially	56	15,7
Total	356	100,0

H₁: When we examined the hypothesis of, sufficiency of the training's syllabus differ according to the respondents, it has been found that, there was a difference between the age groups ($p=0,036$). According to the results of multiple comparison test, this difference is between 36-45 age group and age group 45 and over ($p=0,042$).

Table 7. The range of reasons to attend the entrepreneurship course

	Frequency	%
To be entrepreneur	232	65,2
To learn to write a project	93	26,1
To get course fee	9	2,5
Other	22	6,2
Total	356	100,0

H₁: When the hypothesis, the reasons of attending the entrepreneurship course differ according to the respondents, was examined; no statistically significant difference has been seen with regard to the mentioned the categorical variables.

Table 8. The range of answers, the respondents gave to the question, where did you get the information of the course's opening

	Frequency	%
From internet	30	8,4
From my friends	174	48,9
İŞKUR (Turkish Employment Agency)	75	21,1
KOSGEB	46	12,9
KUSEM	16	4,5
Other	15	4,2
Total	356	100,0

H₁: The method of accession to the information of attending the course differs according to the categorical variables. At the end of examining this hypothesis, no significant difference has been seen as the previous hypothesis.

Table 9. The range of answers that the respondents gave to the question "did you feel any positive change in yourself after the course?"

	Frequency	%
Yes	275	77,2
No	27	7,6
Partially	54	15,2
Total	356	100,0

H₁: By examining the hypothesis, as the state of feeling positive change after the course differ according to the various characteristics of the respondents, no statistically significant difference has been found according to the categorical variables, which represent the respondents' various characteristics.

7. RESULT AND EVALUATION

Entrepreneurship is a concept, which has a rising importance in Turkish economy, as well as in the world economy especially recently. SME's (Small and Medium Sized Enterprises), which are an indicator of entrepreneurship, constitute more than half of the total employment, total added-value, turnover, total investments and total export. Therefore, increasing the quality and quantity of entrepreneurs, who constitute SME's, is one of the factors, which strengthen Turkish economy in international competition. Thus the example of Kırıkkale has been examined in Turkey with reference to the entrepreneurship trainings have positive effect on the entrepreneurship activities.

The following results have been obtained by analyzing the descriptive information of 356 persons' opinions, which have been accessed through systematic sampling method, out of the persons, who were given entrepreneurship certificate by KUSEM. The participants of the entrepreneurship training consist mostly of private sector employees or unemployed persons, who are high school graduates aged between 26-35

years. When the participants' gender is evaluated, there is not seen a big difference between women and men. It has been found that, the ones, who received certificate after the training and applied to KOSGEB with a project, were mostly tradesmen and they differ from others significantly. Only 9,3% of the certificated trainees have been understood to attempt an enterprise, while the others didn't have any idea or business concern. It has been understood that, most of the persons, who applied to KOSGEB with a project, were accepted and they started and maintained a business. It has been found that, the entrepreneurship mindset was generally more intensified between the age range of 26-35, and also the ones, who received a certificate at earlier ages or with increasing age, were far from the mindset of making a project and starting a business. It has been found that, the participants found the entrepreneurship training's content and hours sufficient with a high percentage and also they felt a positive change in themselves after the training. Therefore, it has been found that, age group, occupation and education of the candidates must be considered important for a more efficient entrepreneurship training.

REFERENCES

- Akyüz, Y., (2013). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin KOSGEB Desteklerine Bakış Açıları ve Girişimcilik Eğilimleri Üzerine Bir Araştırma: Uşak Üniversitesi Örneği, *Uşak Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 9(4), 80-98.
- Balaban, Ö., Özdemir, Y.,(2008). Girişimcilik Eğitiminin Girişimcilik Eğilimi Üzerindeki Etkisi: Sakarya Üniversitesi İİBF Örneği, *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 3(2), 133-147.
- Bayrakdar, S., (2011). Avrupa Birliği Mesleki Eğitim Programlarında Girişimcilik Eğitimlerinin Ekonomik Kalkınmadaki Önemi, *C.Ü. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*,12(1), 245-264.
- Bayrakdar, S., (2011). Rekabet gücünü Arttırmada Girişimcilik Faktörünün Yeri: Türkiye'nin Durumu, 3.Uluslararası İstanbul İktisatçılar Zirvesi, *Girişimcilik Inovasyon & Ekonomik Kalkınma*, İstanbul, 10-12.
- Bozkurt, Ç., Ö., Alparslan, A., M., (2013). Girişimcilerde Bulunması Gereken Özellikler ile Girişimcilik Eğitimi: Girişimci ve Öğrenci Görüşleri", *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development*, 8(1), 7-28.
- Bozkurt, Ö., Aslan, Z., Göral, M., (2011). Yüksek Öğretimde Verilen Girişimcilik Eğitiminin Öğrencilerin Girişimcilik Eğilimine Etkisi: Teknik Program ve Sosyal Program Karşılaştırmalı Bir Araştırma, Uluslararası Yükseköğretim Kongresi: Yeni Yönelişler ve Sorunlar (UYK-2011) 2(8), 822-833.
- Cengiz, D., Büber, H., Gümüştekin, G., E., (2013). Girişimcilik Hislerine Eğitimin Katkısı: Kütahya Meslek Yüksek Okulu Makine Programı Örneği, *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 8(2), 33-56.

- Fernando, A., Sciascia, S., Poli, A., (2004). Entrepreneurship Education: Notes on an Ongoing Debate, 14th Annual Int Entrepreneurial Conference, University of Napoli Federico II (Italy), 4-7.
- Güner, H. Korkmaz, A., (2011). İstihdamın Arttırılmasında Girişimciliğin Önemi: Girişimcilik Destekleme Modeli Olarak İŞGEM'LER, *Çalışma İlişkileri Dergisi*, 2(2), 42-65.
<http://kosgeb.gov.tr/Pages/UI/Destekler.aspx?ref=8>, Erişim Tarihi : 20.08.2016
<http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2012/11/20121104-11.htm> Erişim Tarihi: 21.08.2016
http://www.kosgeb.gov.tr/UserFiles/Media/EKatalogTanitim/e_katalog/e-katalog.htm Erişim Tarihi:19.08.2016
<http://www.kosgeb.gov.tr/Pages/UI/Destekler.aspx?Ref> Erişim Tarihi: 21.08.2016
- Katz, J.,A., (2003). The Chronology and Intellectual Trajectory Of American Entrepreneurship Education 1876–1999, *Journal Of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 283-300.
- Öktem, M., K., Aydın., M., D., Ekinci, S., (2007), Türkiye’de Girişimciliğin Geliştirilmesinde KOSGEB’in Rolü ve Önemi: Uygulamalı Bir Çalışma, *Sosyo-Ekonomi Dergisi*, 5(5), 47-76
- Özgen, D., (2011). Girişimcilik Eğitiminde Yeni Yaklaşımlar: Bütüncül Eğitim Modeli, 3.Uluslararası İstanbul İktisatçılar Zirvesi, Girişimcilik Inovasyon& Ekonomik Kalkınma, İstanbul, 10-12.
- T.C. Sanayi ve Ticaret Bakanlığı, (2011). KOBİ Stratejisi ve Eylem Planı 2011-2013, Ankara.
- Rasmussen Einar, A., Sorheim, R., (2006). Action-Based Entrepreneurship Education, *Technovation*, 26(2), 185-194.
- Russel, S., S., (2016). Entrepreneurship, <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/Entrepreneurship.html> Erişim Tarihi: 21.08.2016
- Uluköy, M., Dereli, C., Kahya, V., (2013). KOSGEB Girişimcilik Eğitimi Kurslarına Katılan Katılımcıların Girişimcilik Profiline Yönelik Bir Alan Araştırması, *Girişimcilik ve Kalkınma Dergisi*, 8(2), 79-96.
- Yumuk, G., (2013). Turizm Bölümü Öğrencilerinin Girişimcilik Eğitimlerinin Girişimcilik Eğilimlerine Etkisi, *Trakya Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi E-Dergi*, 2(2), 96-120.

