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Abstract
The present paper makes an attempt to highlight the concept of entrepreneurship behaviour as a new way of employment patterns among hospitality seekers. Nowadays the hospitality graduates find themselves facing the public and private sector challenges. Work vacant places in both the Egyptian public and private sector are seldom to get it due to many problems such as nepotism, lack of salaries fairness, government legislation and privatization. Entrepreneurial behaviour has been a vibrant field of study because of the advantages of its career creation for those who need a career opportunity in their own potential companies.

The main aim of this comparative research is to understand undergraduate student behaviour for entrepreneurship and the factors affecting entrepreneurial behaviour in the tourism and hospitality faculties in two different samples of universities in Egypt. One is private Pharos University in Alexandria and the other is public Fayoum University in Fayoum.

Self-administered questionnaires were distributed to a convenient sample of 130 students based in Fayoum and 60 students from the private one. Results revealed that respondents are considering entrepreneurship and interested in it especially in case of tourism crises that has been appeared after Egypt revolution and the inflation decision of the Egyptian central bank 2016.

This research hypothesised that different personality traits, and education influence and shape the hospitality graduates entrepreneurial intentions. Some implications for practice are discussed and the research conceptual model contribution is recommended.
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Introduction
The fact that we live in an entrepreneurial era is true. According to Zacharakis et al. (2016) there are more than half a billion entrepreneurs over the globe either were actively involved in trying to start a new project or were owner-managers of a new venture. In America, there are more than one thousand five hundred new businesses are born every hour of every day.

Entrepreneurs are persons who driving a revolution by converting and refurbishing economies over the globe. Entrepreneurship is the essence of free enterprise because the birth of new businesses gives a market economy its strength. New and emerging businesses create a very large proportion of the innovative services and products that transform the way we work and live (Li, 2008; Barringer and Ireland, 2015).

There has never been a better time to practice the magic of entrepreneurship. The economist Joseph Schumpeter, defined an entrepreneur ‘a person who destroys the existing economic order by introducing new products and services, by introducing new methods of production, by creating new forms of organization, or by exploiting new raw materials’ (Schumpeter, 1951). An entrepreneur’s new business might be the revolutionary sort that rearranges the global economic order, such as Walmart, FedEx, Microsoft, Amazon.com, eBay, and Google. However, it is much more likely to be of the incremental kind that enters an existing market.

According to this piece of research, the researcher adopts a broader definition of entrepreneurship in the hospitality industry in which incorporates everyone who starts a new business. The hospitality entrepreneur is the person who perceives an opportunity related to the customer and creates an organization to pursue it.
The hospitality industry is considered a great potential for entrepreneurial business. Ray Kroc’s McDonald’s, J.W. Marriott’s, Four Seasons and Conrad Hilton’s hotels are just a few classic entrepreneurial brands in the world. Driven by an inner need to succeed and to make a difference in some way, these truly successful entrepreneurs focused on their opportunities and pursued them with great dedication and courage in the face of setbacks. All of these entrepreneurial leaders have left their names and businesses in the history of the hospitality (Andringa et al., 2016). Entrepreneurship research is a relatively new. Davidsson et al. (2001) argued that it is in its young age; others argued that it is still need more research (Busenitz et al., 2003; Zacharakis et al., 2016).

Entrepreneurship study in the field of hospitality and tourism in Egypt has begun to gather some momentum in recent years especially after incorporating it in the curriculum for students. The hotel industry is considered a labour-intensive sector in Egypt. Although it provides large numbers of employment opportunities to the potential hospitality students, entrepreneurship intentions of these students has become one of the issues needed more investigations and research.

The literature considered the entrepreneurship concept, in a simple way, is starting one’s own potential business. Literature reported the concept of entrepreneurship by the new entry synonym, which refers to the intentions to start a business. The hospitality entrepreneur is any individual who starts-up, runs and possibly grows any new business venture (Oly Ndubisi, 2014; Atef and Al-Balushi, 2015; Schwarzkopf, 2016). Considering today’s students of the tourism and hospitality are tomorrow’s potential entrepreneurs. The development of any business is highly based on the development of entrepreneurship (Remeikiene et al., 2013).

Researchers and hospitality experts have increasingly acknowledged the role of entrepreneurs in the economic development and wellbeing of societies especially in case of tourism crises that has been appeared after Egypt revolution and the inflation decision of the Egyptian central bank 2016. This has stimulated interest in understanding who entrepreneurs are and the factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions in the tourism and hospitality faculties based in Egypt.

Review of Related Literature

This literature review discusses: first, the entrepreneurship concept; second, the relationship between (entrepreneurship education; service orientation; emotional intelligence; gender variation) in one hand and student entrepreneurial behaviour on the other hand; finally, it presents a conceptual model of entrepreneurship in the hospitality industry.

Entrepreneurship Concept

The concept of entrepreneurship goes back to the non-fiscal exchange era systems. Entrepreneurship entered the economic sciences in the eighteenth century, but due to the lack of consensus on the definition of entrepreneurship and the role of entrepreneurs, and because Marxist ideology linked it closely to capitalism, the concept was neglected in the economic sciences. Instead it made its way into the social sciences for its leadership characteristics (Schumpeter, 1951). Finally in the 20th century, the term once again came under the radar of economic sciences and was discussed in economic development theories (Sabri, 2015).

The word entrepreneur originated from the French words ‘entre’, meaning “between,” and ‘prendre’, meaning “to take.” The word was originally used to describe persons who “take on the risk” between sellers and buyers or who “undertake” a task such as starting a new business (Busenitz et al., 2003; Chell, 2007). Barringer and Ireland (2015) differentiated between
inventors and entrepreneurs. An inventor creates something new. While, an entrepreneur compiles and then integrates all the resources needed (e.g. the money, the people, the business model, the strategy, and the risk-bearing ability) to transform the innovation into a viable business.

Simply stated, entrepreneurship is starting one’s own business, while an entrepreneur is any individual who starts-up, runs and possibly grows a new business venture (Schumpeter, 1951; Humbert and Drew, 2010). The first definition of the famous economist Schumpeter was concentrated on persons who have innovative capabilities and innovative ideas. In essence, an entrepreneur’s behaviour finds him or her trying to identify opportunities and putting useful ideas into practice. The tasks called for by this behaviour can be accomplished by either an individual or a group and typically require creativity, drive, and a willingness to take risks (Barringer and Ireland, 2015). Chernyshenko et al. (2013) posited that the entrepreneur was an exceptional individual, capable of developing new product combinations, attributes or innovations. Moreover, the entrepreneur has to realistically calculate risks and future market opportunities for the venture, based on past experiences, and then transform his or her ideas into a profitable outcome.

Barringer and Ireland (2015) highlighted three reasons that people become entrepreneurs and start their own firms are to be their own boss, pursue their own ideas, and realize financial rewards. They further declared that although much behaviour have been attributed to entrepreneurs, several are common to those who are successful. Those in new ventures and those who are already part of an entrepreneurial business share these characteristics, which are shown in Figure 1. Successful entrepreneurship requires a certain mix of factors such as the entrepreneur’s personality traits, gender, age, education and training, and experience; current social and economic conditions; and basic law and order, among other things (Samuel et al., 2013; Barringer and Ireland, 2015). However, there are personality traits and characteristics commonly associated with entrepreneurs. These traits are developed over time and evolve from an individual’s social context.

Figure 5: Primary characteristics of successful entrepreneurs

(Source: Barringer and Ireland, 2015).

There is strong evidence that hospitality entrepreneurial behaviour has a substantial effect on economic stability and strength. The areas in which entrepreneurial firms contribute the most are innovation and job creation. Entrepreneurial behaviour also has a dramatic impact on society. It’s easy to think of new products and services that have helped make our lives easier that have made us more productive at work, that have improved our health, and that have entertained us in new ways. In addition, entrepreneurial firms have a positive impact on the effectiveness of larger firms. There are many entrepreneurial firms that have built their entire business models around producing products and services that help larger firms increase their efficiency and effectiveness.
The four distinct elements of the entrepreneurial process, pictured by Barringer and Ireland (2015) were deciding to become an entrepreneur, developing successful business ideas, moving from an idea to establishing an entrepreneurial firm, and managing and growing an entrepreneurial firm.

As with the case of Entrepreneurship Intention (EI), According to Akmaliah and Hisyamuddin (2009) intention is a power of mind that directs a person attention, experience and then his or her action to a particular goal or action to achieve it as it should be. EI can therefore be seen as a terminology used to describe the willingness to become an entrepreneur (Samuel et al., 2013; Atef and Al-Balushi, 2015; Maas and Jones, 2015).

Literature of (Chen et al., 1998; Busenitz et al., 2003; Akmaliah and Hisyamuddin, 2009; Remeikiene et al., 2013) reported many theories that interpret the EI such as:

- Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1977).
- Social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001).
- Model of intention in entrepreneurial situations (Shapero and Sokol, 1982).
- A combination of planned behaviour model and the model of intention in entrepreneurial situations (Reitan, 1997).

To wrap up, many authors found significant relationships between EI and many affecting factors such as: (number of management courses taken among students (Chen et al., 1998); education and training (Atef and Al-Balushi, 2015); personality traits (Chernyshenko et al., 2013); gender (Humbert and Drew, 2010; Ramos-Rodríguez et al., 2012); happiness (Maas and Jones, 2015) socio demographic factors (Kaijage and Wheeler, 2013)).

EI in this research refers to students’ readiness and plans to engage in self-employment before completing their final graduation courses in the Faculty of Tourism and Hotels based in Egypt either those who from the public sector or others from the private sector. Many of those students has involved in an internship, which provides a great opportunity for prospective employees to gain experience in a particular field or industry, to determine if they have an interest in a particular career as well as to create a network of contacts, or gain university module credits. Interns may also have the possibility of putting themselves forward for forthcoming opportunities for paid work, during their internship. As the focus of this study is on the influence of four independent factors (Figure 2) of education, service orientation, emotional intelligence and gender variation on EI among hospitality schools’ graduates, the determinants of each factor will be briefly discussed in the following sections.

Figure 6: The theoretical model of the factors shaping students entrepreneurship intentions
The next section will demonstrate the importance of entrepreneurship education.

**Entrepreneurship Education**

Recently a remarkable growth in entrepreneurship education within universities has been highlighted globally due to its economic, potential, social and educational benefits (Jones et al., 2011). However, Maas and Jones (2015) ascertained a longstanding debate in universities regarding the entrepreneurship education effectiveness, and further evidence is needed to confirm both best practice and its actual impact in terms of enabling entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurship education has gained on popularity so as to raise entrepreneurship intentions among students. The main aim of entrepreneurship education is to teach students how to start a business and develop entrepreneurial skills and to increase their entrepreneurial intentions as reported by Albornoz Pardo (2013). Literature of (Büb, 2015; Fayolle and Gailly, 2015; Piperopoulos and Dimov, 2015) highlighted the entrepreneurship education and its impact on entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions and their results showed a positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and the tendency to become an entrepreneur.

Surprisingly, according to Charney and Libecap (2003) there are many differences in relation to the approach of entrepreneurship education across colleges and universities, for example some offer electives in entrepreneurship, business development or plans preparation, while others offer a wide range of business management courses such as marketing, finance, economics, human resources, feasibility and business plan development. There is a need to fill the knowledge gaps in the standard curriculum. Many programmes throughout the region, including universities in Egypt, provide robust hospitality and tourism business administration degrees. Yet much of the training focuses on preparing students to enter already-established businesses and tackle the problems of mature companies. There are far fewer courses aimed at teaching students how to write good business plan, pitch potential investors, apply for seed funding and grants, or communicate their ideas (El Namaki, 2007). A lack of education can lead to a lack of preparedness that many students face when they are interested in translating their idea into a practical business. Indeed, studies of entrepreneurship have concluded that the vast majority of knowledge required by entrepreneurs can be taught, providing a basis for designing entrepreneurship courses and programmes (El Namaki, 2007).

Since the entrepreneurship education aimed to equip university graduates with many skills required to pursue their career as an entrepreneur, Robertson et al. (2003) recommended sharing the successful case studies and inviting entrepreneurs to give lectures are useful for enhancing self-efficacy beliefs, particularly where students lack work experience. It follows that educational institutions’ curriculum needs to prepare graduates more effectively for a huge skills required to manage this type of work (Atef and Al-Balushi, 2015).

Many scholars have already found positive evidence for the relationship between entrepreneurship education and entrepreneurial attitudes and intentions. However, there is little research has been done to examining another important aspect of higher education, which is to provide university students with certainty of potential future career opportunities through promoting the feasibility of entrepreneurship. This rationale leaded the researcher to the first hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 1:** Entrepreneurship education is influencing student entrepreneurial intentions and behaviours.
Service Orientation
The second factor likely to influence students’ entrepreneurial intentions is their service orientation. Service orientation is considered one of the most important personality traits required to ensure hospitality excellence (Teng and Barrows, 2009). It is defined by Cran (1994), p.36 as “a set of basic individual predispositions and an inclination to provide service, to be courteous and helpful in dealing with customers and associates”. Service orientation was considered not only a personality phenomenon, but also many scholars seen it as a group phenomenon (Kim et al., 2005).

Students of higher service orientation level are distinguished by many characteristics such as: self-control ability; dependent from others; well-balanced; mutual relationships; helping customers (Kusluvan et al., 2010). Service-oriented individuals showed better job performance, as well as higher levels of other desirable social and psychological features that will cause more adaptive customer-service behaviour, more positive service delivery and then higher service quality (Salunke et al., 2013).

Individuals higher in their service orientation have better service attitudes, adapt themselves better to diverse customers, and deliver services in a more positive manner than those lower in this personality trait. This research proposed that successful hospitality entrepreneur should have higher levels of service orientation. These persons will be more likely to find interesting market place and are likely to be more successful in the market. In addition, they may be more attracted to service based work. In contrast, those with lower levels of service orientation will see the industry as a poor fit for their personality traits and may be less likely to enter the industry as depicted by Gwinner et al. (2005). Even if they enter an industry with a poor fit (e.g., students discovered that they selected a wrong major after they experienced hospitality work which will eventually leave their current situation and seek out better fit.

This research supposed that after exposure to service climate, hospitality students who are higher in their service orientation will be more likely entrepreneurs after graduation. This rationale leaded the researcher to the second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2: The higher students’ service orientation, the greater their likelihood of being hospitality entrepreneur.

Emotional Intelligence
Emotional intelligence is one of the most important personality traits that potentially correlated to business success. Kim and Agrusa (2011), p. 1030 defined emotional intelligence as “an individual’s ability to perceive and understand information, and to generate and regulate emotions that promote emotional and intellectual growth”. Mayer et al. (2008) reported the direct effect of emotional intelligence and the probability of enhancing individuals’ competences. Hence, emotional intelligence is consequently ensured persons’ success. One of the most critical side of emotional intelligence is reported by Elfenbein et al. (2006) that education supported and strengthen it through training.

The relationship of emotional intelligence on entrepreneurship is still rarely researched and investigated specially among students. However, emotional intelligence could enable individuals to better understand and manage customers’ emotions by creating the service experience which then customer satisfaction will be gained (Kim and Agrusa, 2011). Since emotional intelligence among students promotes managing themselves, students with higher emotional intelligence levels tend to use more effective emotional labour patterns (Joseph et al., 2015).
Due to its diverse customer base, jobs in service sector are emotionally puzzling. Service staff often needs to balance their true emotions in times of stress and rush. Persons who have emotional intelligence satisfactory levels are more likely to adopt the deep surface acting approach in stress cases, rather than the surface acting approach by hiding the actual emotions (Grandey, 2003).

Emotional intelligence advantages human kind to connect with others and implement effective adaptive strategies to read and engage with any potential customers which in turn will ensure good business entrepreneur in case of hospitality (Prentice and King, 2013). This is why Kim and Agrusa, (2011) announced those higher in emotional intelligence perform better than those lower, both in service provision and service failures recovery. Because of their service orientation, employees with higher emotional intelligence receive higher merit increases and assume higher level positions than their lower emotional intelligence counterparts (Prentice and King, 2013).

Eventually, people who excel in emotional intelligence are able to tolerate themselves in service. As they not only maintain or maximize positive moods and higher self-esteem, but they also resist the deteriorating influences of negative events, such as interactions with trouble making customers. As a result, emotional intelligence can balance factors that cause burnout and stress among customer-contact employees and managers (Lee and Ok, 2012).

This research based on the importance of emotional intelligence on whether faculty students select to enter the service industry as any employees or to be self-employed. Hospitality students’ traits better match the requirements of service climate. Those who are higher in emotional intelligence are more potentially to form more positive attitudes and perceptions about hospitality careers (Kim and Agrusa, 2011). This is because these students are more likely to experience compatible person job fitness and, as a result, have greater intention to pursue hospitality careers.

Hospitality students of higher emotional intelligence will generally manage service encounters through their education and internships more successfully, and further they will be more likely to perceive a better fit for themselves in this line of work (Kernbach and Schutte, 2005). They are thus more likely to form more positive attitudes and perceptions about hospitality careers (Lee and Ok, 2012), and will be more likely to be industry entrepreneurs after graduation (Chang and Tse, 2015). This justification moves the researcher understanding to the third hypothesis:

*Hypothesis 3:* The higher students’ Emotional Intelligence, the greater their likelihood of being hospitality entrepreneur.

**Gender Variation**

The main setting here is to identify if there is any variation among students’ entrepreneurship intentions due to their gender. Since the concept of an entrepreneur has been shown to be highly gendered in that identifying oneself as an entrepreneur is of high importance for men than women (Humbert and Drew, 2010). Equal opportunity and gender equality have not been fully appeared in many countries. Hence, the inequality of gender in the business context is still confusing. Discrepancies of salary between men and women are common in the labour market, whether as an employee or a self-employee (Remeikiené and Startiené, 2008).

Gender differences were emphasized and noted globally from one country to another referring to the variance views that lead men and women to start a new venture (Bosma et al., 2013). There are four factors accounted for disparities between male and female entrepreneurial activities highlighted by Johansen (2013): first, problems in obtaining support; second, fear of failure; third,
self-assessment entrepreneurial gender gap; finally, unfavourable social conception of women entrepreneurship. Bosma et al. (2013) ascertained female entrepreneurs represent an equal engine to the growth of economy in the developing countries, as it plays a leading role in generating productive work, improving gender equality, and reducing poverty. More than one hundred million females were starting or running new businesses over the globe. These women are not only creating jobs for themselves and their co-founders, but they also help others to employ. This rational leads to the last hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 4:** Gender equality affects students’ entrepreneurship behaviours.

### Research Methodology

#### Sampling

The sample for this study consisted of undergraduate students from two different Tourism and Hotels Faculties in Egypt during 2016 semester. The first faculty is located in a private university called Pharos University based in Alexandria in Egypt, while the other one is from the public universities which is the researcher own work on it that is called Fayoum University in Upper Egypt. The aim of using two samples is that this research is considered a comparative study to find any discrepancies or similarities related to the student's perception of entrepreneurship behaviour. As well as to increase the external validity of the results and thus enrich the study’s implications as recommended by Walsh et al. (2015). Moreover, studying behaviour among different groups is endorsed for significant discrepancies among the intended participants (Field, 2013; Saunders et al., 2016). In both universities, students were taking at least a required course in hospitality management either from the freshmen class or from the senior. Many of those participated students has involved in an internship, which provides a great opportunity for prospective career employees to gain experience in in their expected career. Participants were selected based on a convenience sampling technique to answer the research questionnaire, as it is usually the case in the deductive approach that based on theory not the data (Creswell and Clark, 2007; Saunders et al., 2016).

Piloting was conducted among 100 college students to ensure the reliability of the initial survey and to explore any potential misunderstanding among respondents related to the items wording or the length of the survey following Collis and Hussey (2009) assumptions. Finally, the researcher distributed 190 self-administered questionnaires to both faculties during the beginning of the semester. Questions of the questionnaire were based on previous literature that shaped the framework of the conceptual model (see measures section). The response rate was finally 86% as shown in Table 1.

**Table 5: Numbers, percentage of distributed questionnaires and the response rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actually distributed No.</th>
<th>The collected No.</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Final sample size</th>
<th>Final Response Rate (%)</th>
<th>Survey Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fayoum University</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Self-Administered Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos University</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final sample size was then 164 students based in the two faculties after cases with missing values had been excluded (119 from Fayoum University and 45 from Pharos sample). The final response rate was considered accepted for further analysis (Gay and Diehl, 1992; Field, 2013). The researcher emphasized that student responses on the survey would be strictly used for research purposes only and would not affect their course grades. In addition, participation was completely voluntary.

Quantitative analysis was performed through three successive stages of analysis: first, preliminary analysis of screening the data prior to analysis to ensure authority to further testing; second, descriptive analysis in which data were tested for normality of distribution then means and standard deviations were used for data description and ranking, thereafter analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test for significance between groups of respondents; third, multivariate analysis. The multivariate tests employed in this study were reliability and factor analysis to test the scale reliability, validity and dimensionality. Furthermore, structural equation modelling (SEM) was used to investigate the relationship between variables of the measurement model using IPM AMOS 21 and SPSS 22 (Hair et al., 2010).

Questionnaire designing was followed Malhotra (2010) guidelines. The Questionnaire contains a brief introduction regarding the aim of the study and the contact number if there are any concerns about the study. The first section was designed to obtain general information of respondents (Gender, Academic year, Affiliation). The second section contained three questions regarding Entrepreneurship Intentions (EI) construct. In the third section respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement with the mentioned statements on a five- Likert scale type (1=definitely disagree, 5=definitely agree). Four subsections were then followed to figure out students’ perceptions of education effect (2 items), service orientation (5 items), emotional intelligence (16 items) and gender variance (2 items) on entrepreneurship intentions. While the final section includes optional questions about the name in case, the respondents wanted to be informed about the findings of the current study. Finally, the initial structure of the questionnaire included 31 questions in three layout pages.

Measures
Generally the positivism philosophy requires a robust data collection technique. The survey technique was selected in this research for its advantages as reported by Gray (2009). According to Corbetta (2003) measures for operationalizing the conceptual framework (See Figure 2) were developed on the basis of an extensive review of related literature (Table 2) that identified previously developed and tested measurement scales. Some questions were developed and modified by the researcher to achieve the research objectives. The majority of variables were measured with multiple-item scaling. Finally, the measurement model was consisted from 28 items (3 items for entrepreneurship intentions; 2 items for entrepreneurship education; 5 items for service orientation; 16 items for emotional intelligence; 2 items for gender variation) which is adequate for conducting path analysis using SEM, since Kline (2005) and Hair et al. (2006) suggested that five cases for each item are adequate for path analysis. The current study survey contains 28 indicators (items) measuring five latent constructs; hence, n= 164 can be considered appropriate sample size for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) because it is more than the threshold 140 (5×28).
Table 6: Questionnaire items operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>No. of scale Items</th>
<th>Developed and validated by</th>
<th>Scale dimensions (Latent)</th>
<th>Sample for observed items</th>
<th>Model fit indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Entrepreneurship Intention     | 3 (Q.4:6)          | (Kennedy et al., 2003; Basu and Virick, 2008; Kirkwood, 2009; Turker and Selcuk, 2009) | ➢ Entrepreneurship behaviour | ➢ Starting my own business is my career goal  
 ➢ I will start my own business soon after graduation  
 ➢ I will start my own business at some point in the future | Reliability= 0.77  
P value>.05  
RMSEA= 0.07 |
| Entrepreneurship Education     | 2 (Q.7,8)          | (Samuel et al., 2013)                             | ➢ Knowledge  
 ➢ Skills | ➢ “My education provided the necessary knowledge about entrepreneurship”  
 ➢ “My education developed my entrepreneurial skills and abilities” | Reliability= 0.86  
P value>.05 |
| Emotional Intelligence         | 16 (Q.14:29)       | (Brackett and Mayer, 2003; Brackett et al., 2006) | ➢ Perceiving emotion  
 ➢ Emotion usage  
 ➢ Understanding emotion  
 ➢ Emotion control  
 ➢ Social management of emotions | ➢ “when looking at anyone facial expressions, I recognize the hidden emotions”  
 ➢ “when someone I know is in a bad mood, I can help him calm down and feel better quickly”  
 ➢ “ My personality matched with any work pressure and stress” | Reliability= 0.89  
$\chi^2= 359.24$  
(n=164,df=9  
6,p<.01)  
RMSEA= 0.06  
CFI=0.96  
NFI=0.97 |
| Service Orientation            | 5 Q.9:13           | (Gwinner et al., 2005)                            | ➢ Service Orientation | ➢ “I like helping other”  
 ➢ “The best job I can imagine would involve assisting others”  
 ➢ “I can get along with most anyone”  
 ➢ “I pride myself in providing courteous service”  
 ➢ “It is natural for me to be considerate of others’ needs” | Reliability= 0.79  
$\chi^2= 20.45$  
(n=164,df=1  
0,p =.0.1)  
RMSEA= 0.05  
CFI=0.98  
NFI=0.98 |
| Gender Effect                  | 2 Q.30,31          | The researcher                                   | Gender discrimination | ➢ “Hospitality market needs males more than females”  
 ➢ “Males are encouraged to be entrepreneur models in Egypt” | Reliability= 0.79  
P value>.05 |

Note: Q = Question, $\chi^2$= Chi-square, n= Population, df= degree of freedom, RMSEA= the root mean square error of approximation, CFI= the comparative-fit index, NFI= normed fit index.

For the purpose of testing the differences between the two samples (Fayoum college and Pharos college), the researcher used a dummy variable (1=Fayoum, 0= Pharos) in all the descriptive analyses. I also controlled the respondents gender (1= Male, 2= Female) which has been found to correlate with hospitality students ’entrepreneurship behaviours as Walsh et al. (2015) found in.
their article results of the hospitality career intentions among the American students. Since the variance of the academic year (1= freshmen, 4= senior) was recorded small, the researcher decision was to not control it because of the self-reported questionnaire data. The next section will highlight the main research results.

Results and Discussion
Profile of Respondents
Table 3 showed the main demographic characteristics of the study participants. Nearly both males and females students participated in this study in adequate percent. Most respondents from Fayoum University were males (n=60 which were 50%), while females constituted the high percentage (55%) from Pharos University. This contradiction might because the majority of students enrolled in Pharos from females than males. The Egyptian beliefs are different from Upper to Lower Egypt may also considered the reason for being majority of entrepreneurs are men in one place while most of women might be in another (Hampel-Milagrosa et al., 2015). Most of the respondents were freshmen from Pharos, while the most respondents were senior students in Fayoum University. The participation variation might result from the credit hour system which is implemented in Pharos University.

Table 7: Characteristics of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pharos University</th>
<th>Fayoum University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharos University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayoum University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before setting the structural equation modelling approach for the purpose of capturing all the model relationships between the observed and the latent factors, the researcher screened all the 164 cases for some descriptive analysis as exhibited in Table 4.
Table 5 showed differences among the participated samples. Interestingly, noted that Pharos students scored higher on all five key study variables (Entrepreneurship education, emotional intelligence, service orientation and gender variation). Mean values has been settled from 3.36 to 4.90 which is considered equivalent to the choices of agree and definitely agree for Pharos university. While, the respondents of Fayoum University rated from 3.15 to 4.35 which have been equivalent to the choices of neutral and agree choices. This variation was coincided with literature of Jones et al. (2011).

Table 8: Descriptive statistics (N=164)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite So</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.540</td>
<td>1.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite ED</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>1.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite G</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 presented the results of the multiple regression analyses. The first model examined the influence of education on the entrepreneurship intentions. The second model showed the effect of service orientation on entrepreneurship intentions ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .01$), with the Pharos students potentially having much higher levels compared with their Fayoum colleagues. Model 5 examined the control variables (gender, source of sample) on entrepreneurship intentions. Finally, the measurement model endorsed the significant relationships between the dependent factor of entrepreneurship intentions and other independent study variables that were previously captured in figure 2.

Table 9: Sample discrepancies according to school type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample from the questionnaire questions:</th>
<th>Pharos Uni</th>
<th>Fayoum Uni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will start my own business at some point in the future.</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will start my own business soon after graduation.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone I know is in a bad mood, I can help him calm down and feel better quickly.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting my own business is my career goal.</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My education developed my entrepreneurial skills and abilities.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males are encouraged to be entrepreneur models in Egypt</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My education provided the necessary knowledge about entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1=definitely disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=definitely agree.

Table 10: Sample discrepancies according to school type in each model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EI (F5)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ED (F1)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SO(F2)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Em (F3)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. G (F4)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>0.773</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty Name</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>−.55**</td>
<td>−.30**</td>
<td>−.25*</td>
<td>−.35**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>−.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>−.24**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $p < .10$, $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$ (two-tailed test).

The multivariate tests were then performed as a second phase in this study through conducting three techniques: Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and Structural Equation Modelling (SEM). SEM was used to test the measurement model and structural model as well as to test the causal relationship between the latent and observed factors.
(Byrne, 2016). Paths or the causal relationships between the underlying constructs were specified in the structural model (see Figure 3).

Figure 7: Example of oblique factor models using AMOS

All the direct and indirect relationships between education, service orientation, emotional intelligence, gender variation and entrepreneurship behaviour has been drawn and subjected to SEM as shown in Figure 4.

The structural model produced the following goodness of fit indices: Chi-square = 821.23, (df= 223; p < .01), RMSEA= 0.066, CFI= 0.98, NFI= 0.97, IFI= 0.97 SRMR=0.2, GFI= 0.97. The goodness of fit indices suggested that the proposed structural model fits the data well.

CFA results with AMOS outputs (Figure 4) supported the research four hypotheses. Structural equation modelling using AMOS is employed to test the null hypothesis (estimates equals zero) of these relationships (between the latent factors) as shown in figure 4. Those relationships represent the likely direct /indirect relationships between (F1: Education, F2: Service orientation, F3: Emotional intelligence, F4: Gender variation and F5: Entrepreneurship intentions).
Figure 8: Entrepreneurship structure equation model with standardized path coefficients

Note: F1: Education; F2: Service orientation; F3: Emotional intelligence; F4: Gender variation; F5: Entrepreneurship intentions; e1-e33: error terms (residuals).
### Table 11: Results of testing research hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Path estimates</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Null hypothesis</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.1</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.147</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>F1 has a positive direct effect on F5 (effect size = .31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.448</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>F2 has a positive direct effect on F5 (effect size = .30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>4.524</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>F3 has a positive direct effect on F5 (effect size = .33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.4</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>5.856</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
<td>The positive effect of F4 on F5 is not supported at P level &lt;.05 but can be supported at P level &lt;.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 presented selected output from AMOS showing the hypotheses, standardized (estimates) regression weights, standard error, critical ratio, the P-value, and whether the null hypothesis is supported or rejected.

An examination of the path coefficients and the related P-value to assess the relationship among factors revealed that three out of four factors (F1:F3) have a strong effect on F5. First, entrepreneurship education (F1) and entrepreneurship intentions (F5) revealed that F1 has a direct positive effect on F5. The path coefficient between them is 0.31 with a high significance P-value (P<0.001). This highly significant (P <0.001) path coefficient provide an evidence to reject the null hypothesis (no relationship exists) and indicates that F1 has a positive direct effect on F5. Therefore, Hypotheses 1 posited a positive relationship between entrepreneurship education and the student intention of being an entrepreneur as matched with past literature of (El Namaki, 2007; Atef and Al-Balushi, 2015).

Surprisingly, the gender variation factor revealed the weakest effect on the student intention of being an entrepreneur (path estimate= .11). this contradiction was agreed with Humbert and Drew (2010) because of the concept of an entrepreneur has been highly gendered from one place to another.

### Conclusion and Further Extensions

This research aimed to understand the student behaviour for entrepreneurship and the factors affecting entrepreneurial intentions in the Tourism and Hospitality Faculties in two different samples of universities in Egypt. One is private and the other one is public to discover any differences among them. The findings have shown that education system in both the two universities supported the students' tendencies to be future hospitality entrepreneurs. This empirical data was previously depicted and discussed by Jamali and Lanteri (2015).

From the year of 2000, Egypt has been released many projects to motivate the young generation and to promote the entrepreneurship among the higher education institutions. Gamal Mubarak Initiative was one of the leading experiences in promoting the idea of small and medium sized projects that helped the Egyptian youth and from my point of view it was the seed in the entrepreneurship land. Recently, the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in Egypt supported many programs related to powering the entrepreneurs wherever they are based in any governorates (such as: “INTLAC 2016” ; “Cairo Innovates”; The national Program for Supporting Society innovation “apply your ideas”) projects (Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, 2016).
The academy of scientific research and technology in Cairo has been considered the supported sponsor for the Egyptian youth and the young researchers through many national initiatives such as: My Project- My Start, National Program for Technological Specialized Incubators “INTILAC” and Scientists for Next Generation (SNG). Moreover, The Academy offers grants for a new generation of graduates to a master's degree, in order to bridge the gap between scientific research and the requirements of the national labour market, which requires a high degree of skill in the performance, to get good opportunities for cooperation with leading scientists and participate in research projects in scientific fields of national interest.

As far as the second factor of service orientation is concerned. It has been offered a significant relationship with the entrepreneurial intentions among students with little variation between the two selected samples. Thirdly, emotional intelligence factor was the highly affecting factor that affects entrepreneurial behaviour among hospitality students. The findings also showed that in general, entrepreneurship offers significant opportunities for individuals and economies by recommending the new entry projects in hospitality. Respondents reported they are considering and interested in entrepreneurship in the long run. Personality factors stick to influence and shape their entrepreneurship intentions. For respondents, entrepreneurship is a long-term goal.

Entrepreneurial intention was higher in female respondents based in Pharos University than male respondents based in Fayoum. Overall, the effects of the independent factors depicted from the theoretical framework (Figure2) were slightly higher according to the Pharos responses than its equivalent from Fayoum University. Thus further research may be needed to capture these discrepancies in a huge scale.

This research has some limitations as it was elaborated for a small-scale sample and was restricted upon only two tourism and hospitality faculties in Egypt. Therefore, generalizability of these results will be restricted. It is focused on only four independent factors in relation to student’s intentions towards entrepreneurship, albeit that these factors are of paramount importance. Therefore, further research may include other factors into account such as organizational factors and finance. A second limitation is that it is based on a sample of hospitality undergraduates. It could be useful to investigate whether similar results would be the same or not if the sample has been selected from graduates. Further research will be needed to gain better support for the proposed final model by using mixed method research to evaluate different perspectives on entrepreneurship.
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