

Factors Influencing Entrepreneurial Intentions among Hospitality Students

Pankaj Misra: Assistant Professor,
Department of Hotel Management, Bhagat Phool Singh Mahila Vishwavidyalaya, Haryana, India,

Abstract: The growing numbers of hospitality professionals are entering into the labor market every year that create force on academic institutions to redesign their curricula, inculcate right kind of skills & qualifications in hospitality professionals and reconcile the gap between educational programs and demand of labor market. In today's scenario, job creation is the biggest challenges by the Indian Government; hence, entrepreneurial intention has been a dynamic field of study. Most of hospitality graduates entered in the labor market by getting positions in government or private sectors, some of them move to allied fields like retail, call centers, marketing, etc and few turn towards entrepreneurship. The present study tried to explore the factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions among hospitality students in the academic institutions of Haryana State. The questionnaire was used to collect the data from 180 hospitality students. The findings revealed that the respondents were considering and interested towards entrepreneurship although pull and push factors were affecting their entrepreneurial intentions. The finding of the study also depicted that by providing quality education, hospitality professionals may inspire to be an entrepreneur.

Key word: Entrepreneurship, Hospitality Students, Intentions, Push Factors and Pull Factors.

I. Introduction:

The term entrepreneurship was coined over 300 years ago in the business context (Dees 1998). Entrepreneurship is considered an important mechanism for economic development through employment, innovation, and welfare. Entrepreneurship may be defined as a dynamic interaction of entrepreneurial attitudes, entrepreneurial activity, and entrepreneurial aspiration that vary across stages of economic development. Interest in entrepreneurship education has increased in from few decades, particularly within business oriented schools. Today's students are potential entrepreneurs of future. As, entrepreneurship education is another career option for the upcoming hospitality professionals. Henceforth, academic institutions have faced increased pressure to become more oriented toward producing entrepreneurs (Basu and Virick, 2008; Kennedy, Drennan, Renfrow, & Watson, 2003; Matlay and Westhead, 2005).

Education is a key factor in economic-development as the number of entrepreneurs and potential entrepreneurs are influenced by the quality and quantity of education said Beyers, Johnson, and Stanahan (1987). Entrepreneurship education said that academic institutions of higher learning are positioned to provide greater impact as its technological era and these technologies are essential for international competitive economies (McMullan & Long, 1987). Researches also were with the opinion that entrepreneurship education influences culture and builds entrepreneurial economies (Matlay, H. 2008).

The study aimed to explore the accessibility for entrepreneurship among hospitality professionals and factors affecting their entrepreneurial intentions of various academic institutions of Haryana.

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- To explore job preferences among hospitality professionals.
- To explore entrepreneurial intentions of hospitality professionals.
- To assess students' perception of the effect of their education on their entrepreneurial intentions.
- Assess the push- pull factors affecting students' entrepreneurship intentions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Development of entrepreneurship is one of the reasons of development of any economy (Startiene and Remeikiene, 2008). Barron and Shane, 2008 also discussed the contribution of entrepreneurs towards economic development and they named entrepreneur as “Engines of economic growth”. Entrepreneurship word is originated from the French word “Entrepreneur”. Entrepreneurs are also known as self-employed people. People of different fields defined differently to entrepreneurs (Lee, Lim, Lim, Ng, & Wong 2012). Some people believed entrepreneurs are born, not made. Many studies supported that entrepreneurs can be made and not genetically inherited. (Barringer and Ireland, 2010). A study conducted by Koe, Sa’ari, Majid and Ismail, 2012 by extending the Ajzens (1991) theory of planned behaviour (TPB) to study the intention of millennial generation. Knowledge, experience and ties were independent variables attitude, social norms, perceived behavioral control and personal traits act as a mediating variable in identification of entrepreneurial intention.

Various terminology were also used in intentions and motivations towards entrepreneurship such as “push” and “ pull” entrepreneurship factors (Amit and Muller, 1994; Gilad and Levinie, 1986; Mueller and Thomas, 2000). It is derived from the various literature that four keys of entrepreneurial motivation exist (Kirkwood,2009; McClelland,Swail and Bell and Ibbotson, 2005; Segal, Borgia and Schoenfeld,2005;):

- Desire for independence (Pull factor).
- Monetary motivations (Pull factors).
- Work related motivations (Push factors).
- Family related factors (Push factors).

A study conducted by Atef and Al- Balushi (2014) in Sultanate of Oman to identified the responses of students of tourism department towards entrepreneurship and factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions. Findings revealed that most of the students were interested in entrepreneurship. Various pull and Push factors were influenced them and shaped their entrepreneurial intention. The top three push factors were bank support procedures, lack of startup capital, and entrepreneurial experience. The least important push factors were entrepreneurial skills, family opposition and education

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire was used to gather data and measure the objectives of the study. Questions were developed with the help of numerous study related to entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial intentions like Atef, and Al-Balushi (2015), Samuel , Ernst and Awuah. (2013) and others (Basu and Virick, 2008; Kennedy, Drennan, Renfrow, & Watson, 2003; Kirkwood, 2009; Turker and Selcuk, 2009), which provided the framework for the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into six sections. In the first section, some general information of respondents were gathered and in second section, entrepreneurial intentions of the respondents were measured by rate their levels of agreement with the mentioned statements on a five-point Likert scale (1 strongly disagree to 5 strongly agree). The third section measured respondents’ job preference. The fourth section measured respondents’ perception of education effect on entrepreneurial intentions. The fifth section measured entrepreneurship pull factors and last section which is sixth section measured entrepreneurship push factors. The research tool was distributed to the hospitality professionals within the various universities and institute of Hospitality and Tourism department of Haryana state (India) i.e. Department of Hotel and Tourism, Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra, Institute of Tourism and Hotel Management, (M.D .University Rohtak), Department of Hotel Management (Bhagat Phool Singh Women University, Khanpur Kalan, Sonapat), Institute of Hotel Management Panipat, Department of Hotel Management (Maharishi Markendeshwar University, Ambala) and Institute Hotel Management, Rohtak who were pursuing their final year of the programme. The total 220 questionnaires were distributed among the students of various institutions in their respective class rooms and 180 were received back, duly filled questionnaires with the response rate of 81.815%. The gathered data were tested for normality of distribution, mean, standard deviations and ranking were used for data description.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results of Descriptive study

Table 4.1: Demographic Factors

Specialization	Gender		
	Male	Female	Total %
Hospitality Management	85	22	107 (59.44)
Tourism Management	60	13	73(40.56)
Total %	145 (80.56 %)	35 (19.44)	180 (100%)

Source: *Primary Data*

Table 4.1 depicted that the sample consisted 107 hospitality professional and 73 tourism management professional who were studying in their final year of their courses. Among 180 professionals 145 were male and 35 were female.

Table 4.2: Entrepreneurial Intentions of Hospitality Professional

		Ultimate goal of my career is to start my own business	Shall start my own business immediate after by education	Shall start my own business after some time in the future.
Hospitality Management	Mean	3.55	3.78	4.20
	SD	1.40	1.14	0.75
	N	107	107	107
Tourism Management	Mean	3.65	3.70	3.85
	SD	1.57	1.28	1.35
	N	73	73	73
Total	Mean	3.60	3.74	4.02
	SD	1.48	1.21	1.04
	N	180	180	180

Source: *Primary Data*

In table 4.2, the researcher made an attempt to know the perception of entrepreneurial intentions of hospitality professional as an executable career goal. Three statements were used to assess entrepreneurial intentions among hospitality professional. Analysis of the respondents' answers depicted that entrepreneurship is a long-term goal rather than a short- or medium-term goal. Tourism management professional reported higher mean scores than hospitality professional respondents.

Table 4.3: General Job preference of Hospitality Professionals

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
I prefer self- employment to public sector employment	55 (30.55%)	48 (26.67%)	40 (22.22%)	20 (11.11%)	17 (9.45%)	180 (100%)
I prefer self- employment to private sector employment	50 (27.78)	45 (25%)	35 (19.44%)	28 (15.56%)	22 (12.22%)	180 (100%)

Source: *Primary Data*

Table 4.3, showed that majority of hospitality professionals (57.22%) were disagreed with the statement that they prefer self employment to public sector employment and 52.78% of hospitality professionals were also disagreed with the statement that they prefer self- employment to private sector employment accord with the

literature in that graduates join the labor market in either government (public) sector or private sector, few of them head towards entrepreneurship (self-employment). This could be explained by the fact that graduates are faced with several push and pull factors that affect their choice to be self-employed. The findings accord with the literature in that graduates join the labor market in either government (public) sector or private sector, few of them head towards entrepreneurship (self-employment), although entrepreneurship offers significant opportunities for individuals and economies by decreasing job seekers' figures. This could be explained by the fact that graduates are faced with several push and pull factors that affect their desire to be self-employed.

Table 4.4: Hospitality Professionals Perception of Education Effect on Entrepreneurial Intentions

	Mean	SD
My education provides sufficient motivation and knowledge about entrepreneurship	2.76	1.20
My education inculcate sufficient entrepreneurial skills and abilities	3.15	0.90

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Source: Primary Data

Table 4.4 showed the respondents perception of education effect on entrepreneurial intentions. Results showed that respondents agreed that education provided them with the necessary knowledge about entrepreneurship (M= 2.76). During education respondents were agreed that the education were develop their entrepreneurial skill and abilities (M=3.15). Results of the study emphasized that the education providers redesign their curricula.

Previous studies stated that people have various motivations to become entrepreneurs. These motivations are classified into two categories of push and pull factors (Kirkwood, 2009). As shown in Table 4.5, the three most important pull factors for entrepreneurship reported by respondents were: freedom, income and social status. Respondents reported the least important pull factors as being: family support, role model, and sense of adventure. The top motivator among Hospitality Management students was as job stability while the least motivator factor was family support. The top motivator among the Tourism Management students was income whereas the lowest motivator was ranked as sense of adventure.

Table 4.5: Pull Factors Ranking on the Basis of Specialization

	Hospitality Management		Tourism Management		Overall	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Freedom	4.13	2	4.45	1	4.29	1
Income	4.21	1	4.25	2	4.23	2
Social status	4.12	3	3.85	5	3.98	3
Education	4.08	4	3.80	4	3.94	4
Investment environment	3.45	9	4.12	3	3.78	5
Job stability	3.80	6	3.70	6	3.75	6
Availability of fund	3.67	7	3.45	7	3.56	7
Sense of adventure	3.60	8	3.50	8	3.55	8
Role model	4.0	5	2.75	10	3.37	9
Family support	3.32	10	2.80	9	3.06	10

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Source: Primary Data

Table 4.6: Entrepreneurship Push Factors

	Hospitality Management		Tourism Management		Overall	
	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank	Mean	Rank
Lack of startup capital	3.86	1	3.89	1	3.87	1
Bank support procedure	3.84	2	3.87	2	3.85	2
Entrepreneurial experience	3.68	4	3.76	3	3.72	3
Fear of failure	3.75	3	3.68	4	3.71	4
Governmental support	3.56	5	3.35	7	3.45	5
Family opposition	3.35	7	3.48	6	3.41	6
Entrepreneurial skills	3.04	9	3.55	5	3.29	7
Partnership	3.40	6	3.17	9	3.28	8
Startup regulation and procedure	3.28	8	3.29	8	3.28	8
Education	2.95	10	3.15	10	3.05	9

Note: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

Source: Primary Data

As shown in Table 4.6, as overall the top three push factors were *lack of startup capital*, *back support procedure* and *entrepreneurial experience* and the least important factors reported by respondents were *education*, *start up regulation, procedure*, and *partnership*.

Table 4.7: Push vs. Pull Factors

Push factors (Bottom ranked)	Pull factors (top ranked)
Education	Freedom
Startup regulation and procedure	Income
Partnership	Social status

Source: Primary Data

The top push factor reported by both the programmes was lack of startup capital and the least important push factor as education.

The table 4.7 represented that the top ranked pull factors were freedom, income and social status whereas the bottom ranked push factors were education, startup regulation and procedure and partnership. The study depicted that there is dire need to focus upon the bottom ranked push factors by all the stakeholders so that the hospitality professionals may motivate and keen to be an entrepreneur instead of looking to be a job seeker.

V. CONCLUSION

The study intended to explore the accessibility for entrepreneurship and factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions among hospitality and tourism students of the various academic institutions of the Haryana state. The findings presented that in general, entrepreneurship offers significant opportunities for individuals and they are interested in entrepreneurship but there are various pull and push factors which affect their entrepreneurship intentions. For respondents, entrepreneurship is a long-term goal rather than a short- or medium-term goal. Respondents also reported that both the departments did not provide sufficient and necessary knowledge about entrepreneurship; moreover, they help to develop their entrepreneurial skills and abilities among the professionals. The top three pull factors as mentioned by respondents were freedom, income and social status. The bottom three push factors as mentioned by respondents were education; start up regulation and procedure and partnership.

VI. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is also full of limitations like sample is limited only to hospitality and tourism sector students of Haryana state. The results of the study may not represent true picture of other groups so future research could improve the study by exploring multiple groups and multiple factors which may pull and push the entrepreneurial intention of the people.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Following are the recommendation to the institute for encouraging entrepreneurship among the students.

1. Institute take initiative to promote the knowledge about the entrepreneurship by the changing in their curriculum or introduce as compulsory subject so the students may understand it well.
2. Institute may organize some seminar, conference and workshop on the topic of entrepreneurship so students may aware about the present scenario of entrepreneurship in the country.
3. Arrange some expert talk with the real heroes or entrepreneur so the students may get actual information regarding the practical problems of starting business and fruits of the business.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Ajzen, I. (1987). Attitudes, traits, and actions: Dispositional prediction of behavior in personality and social psychology. In *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 20, pp. 1-63). Academic Press.
- Ajzen, I. (1988) *Attitudes, Personality, and Behaviour* (Chicago, Dorsey Press)
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the attitude-behavior relation: Reasoned and automatic processes. *European review of social psychology*, 11(1), 1-33.
- Amit.R., & Muller, E., (1994) Push and pull entrepreneurship. In: *Frontiers in Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College, pp. 137-151.
- Atef, T. M., & Al-Balushi, M. (2015). Entrepreneurship as a means for restructuring employment patterns. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 15(2), 73-90.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall*.
- Baringer, B.R., & Ireland, R.D., 2010. *Entrepreneurship: Successfully Launching New Ventures*, 3rd. Edition, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Baron, R. A., Shane, S. A., & Entrepreneurship, A. (2008). a process perspective, 2Ed. Mason, OH: Thomson South-Western.
- Basu, A., & Virick, M. (2008). Assessing entrepreneurial intentions amongst students: A comparative study. In *VentureWell. Proceedings of Open, the Annual Conference* (p. 79). National Collegiate Inventors & Innovators Alliance.
- Beyers, W., Johnson, E., & Stanahan, H. (1987). Education and economic development. *Economic Development Commentary*, 11, 14-17.
- Dees, J. G. (1998). Enterprising nonprofits. *Harvard business review*, 76, 54-69.
- Eijdenberg, E. L., & Masurel, E. (2013). Entrepreneurial motivation in a least developed country: Push factors and pull factors among MSEs in Uganda. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 21(01), 19-43.
- Gilad, B., & Levine, P. (1986). A behavioral model of entrepreneurial supply. *Journal of small business management*, 24, 45.

- Kennedy, J., Drennan, J., Renfrow, P., & Watson, B. (2003). Situational factors and entrepreneurial intentions. In *Proceedings of SEAAZ 2003 Conference*. University of Ballarat (Online).
- Kennedy, P. (2003). *A guide to econometrics*. MIT press.
- Kirkwood, J. (2009). Motivational factors in a push-pull theory of entrepreneurship. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, 24(5), 346-364.
- Koe, W. L., Sa'ari, J. R., Majid, I. A., & Ismail, K. (2012). Determinants of entrepreneurial intention among millennial generation. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 197-208.
- Lee, W. N., Lim, B. P., Lim, L. Y., Ng, H. S., & Wong, J. L. (2012). *Entrepreneurial intention: A study among students of higher learning institution* (Doctoral dissertation, UTAR).
- Matlay, H. (2008). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurial outcomes. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*, 15(2), 382-396.
- Matlay, H., & Westhead, P. (2005). Virtual teams and the rise of e-entrepreneurship in Europe. *International Small Business Journal*, 23(3), 279-302.
- McClelland, E., Swail, J., Bell, J., & Ibbotson, P. (2005). Following the pathway of female entrepreneurs: A six-country investigation. *International journal of entrepreneurial behavior & research*, 11(2), 84-107.
- McMullan, W. E., & Long, W. A. (1987). Entrepreneurship education in the nineties. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2(3), 261-275.
- Misra, P. & Pandey, A. (2019). Entrepreneurial Intention among female students in higher education: A study. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research*, 6(5), 537- 543.
- Mueller, S. L., & Thomas, A. S. (2001). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. *Journal of business venturing*, 16(1), 51-75.
- Reitan, B. (1997, June). Where do we learn that entrepreneurship is feasible, desirable, and/or profitable. In *ICSB World Conference* (pp. 21-24).
- Samuel, Y. A., Ernest, K., & Awuah, J. B. (2013). An assessment of entrepreneurship intention among Sunyani Polytechnic Marketing students. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 3(1), 37-49.
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., & Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur. *International journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & research*, 11(1), 42-57.
- Shapero, A., & Sokol, L. (1982). The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, 72-90 .
- Startienė, G., & Remeikienė, R. (2008). Gender gap in entrepreneurship. *Engineering economics*, 60(5).
- Turker, D., & Sonmez Selçuk, S. (2009). Which factors affect entrepreneurial intention of university students? *Journal of European industrial training*, 33(2), 142-159.

