Communication: “The development of the enterprising motivation in tourism students. A comparative analysis between grade and postgraduate students’

Summary

Increasing the number of entrepreneurs and the quality of the entrepreneurship, it is the key thing because its positive influences over the economic activity. For this reason, it turns out essential to understand the factors that determine this phenomenon. This paper develops a model that includes those factors which allows acting on the enterprising intention of the students in the field of tourism. It has been decided on a theoretical approach based on the basics of the intentional theory from a perspective of higher education. A survey with a sample of 122 tourism students has been used – including both graduates and students. Our analysis suggests that curricular and extracurricular activities have a different effect in the intentions, attitudes and capacities for the business’ project development. On the other hand, our results show a weak impact of these activities in the business’ competences.

Keywords:

Entrepreneurship; Entrepreneur; Businessman/woman/person; Expectations, University. Tourism.

JEL classification code: L26: Entrepreneurship

1. Introduction

According to Audretsch and Keilbach (2004), economic growth, job creation and competitiveness in the global markets are fuelled -to a great extent- by an enterprising and knowledge society.

For years, people’s enterprising activity has been boosted as a fundamental way for countries’ development, self-employment and wealth creation. Governments invested vast amounts of resources for developing their citizens’ enterprising ability. Not always this effort has been deliberate, because sometimes it was a response for a necessity, more driven by a craze that by a real belief in this activity.

For Veciana (2005), a sensible and healthy industrial structure assumes the process of starting and ending business in the market. The process of resource allocation, as well as the vitality of the economic system largely depends on, on one hand, the disappearance of inefficient companies from the market, and of the creation of new ones in sufficient number, on the other. This process determines business’ dynamics of a country and produces a certain industrial fabric and density of companies in a country or region.

Spain passed recently the Law July 6th 3/2012, ‘about urgent measures for the reform of job market’, looking for invigorating Spanish job market and thus reducing unemployment that, according to the 1st Economically Active Population Survey (EPA 1, in Spanish) in the first trimester of the 2015, kept a high level, around 23.78%. In the spirit of the law (or *mens legis*), it aims to make the job market more flexible and creating the conditions so jobs can be more easily adapted of every surrounding’s settings. In other words, it balances the ability from businesspersons to make decisions regarding entrepreneurship, with the responsibility assumed by such decisions. Indirectly, this flexibility should stimulate entrepreneurship, hiring people and thus, job creation. Undoubtedly, it is a significant change from the idea of promoting the entrepreneurship at all the levels of the society.

On September the 28th, 2013, it was passed Law September 27th, 4/2013, 'about supporting entrepreneurs and their internationalization'. By means of this law, a number of initiatives were structured in single document that were applied by different administrations to stimulate entrepreneurship in Spain. The law includes from promotion and education to measures that ease business creation and development by entrepreneurs. In its first TITLE 'Support for enterprising initiative', first CHAPTER, 'Education in entrepreneurship', the law mentions the importance of a cross-sectional formation for students since Elementary school to teacher's education in the entrepreneurship issue. Article two, section two says: '[the] Ministry of Education, Culture and Sport, in collaboration with Autonomous Communities, will see that teaching staff's permanent training programmes will include content regarding entrepreneurship, enterprising initiative and creation & development of business.' In the same way it points that 'objectives, competences, contents and assessment criteria of the formation oriented to development and consolidation of entrepreneurial spirit will be included, for kills acquisition for the creation and development of the different models of business, promotion of equal opportunities and the respect for the entrepreneur and the businessperson, as well as to business ethics'. Although this is a strong support for entrepreneurship that the Government pass a law stating the importance of developing the enterprising attitude from the primary education, its implementation falls not in a second place by its magnitude and the complexity to develop this intention.

On the other hand, the tourism sector in Spain is, without doubt, the reference sector of the economy. This has generated an effect in the rest of the economy – like, for example, that is one of the few sectors with a grade of its own. This has boosted the efforts that have been done from the university for training the sector's professionals, but also for developing the knowledge from this perspective.

The first official studies of Tourism go back to 1963, but it is in 1980 when the Tourism studies enter into the universities with the introduction of the 'Touristic Activities' & Business' Technicians '(TEAT in Spanish). Fuelled by an increased demand for this type of studies, public & private universities and businesses' schools do this academic training in two educative levels: degree and postgraduate (Rodriguez et al. 2012)

Curricula struggle between a common university regulatory framework, determined by the official nature of the curricula, and a needed flexibility for he curricular design in order to ease the transition from the university to business (Tribe, 2000a). Similarly to other countries' ideas (Tribe, 2000b: Airey and Tribe, 2005; Fidgeon, 2010), the Tourism academic training has a multidisciplinary character, where this vocational training combines with business and management's skills, including enterprising formation. Nevertheless, the massive irruption of the universities business schools in tourist formation, together with the modular nature of the curricula –where students can combine vocational and business modules-, cause that business training in the curricula did meet varying degrees of success, as much in content as in education form. This, together with the importance of enterprising initiative of tourism in the Spanish economy, and the fact that the relation between entrepreneurship and tourism education has been so little researched (with some exceptions), lead us to think how important is to research how entrepreneurial initiative is being developed among tourism students.

The objective of this research paper is to analyse how higher education institutions are promoting the enterprising motivation among tourism students. We decide on a theoretical approach based on the fundamentals of intentional theory (Shapero and Sokol, 1975; Ajzen, 1991) which is complemented with higher education's perspective (Laukkanen, 2000; Soutaris et al. 2007).

According to Krueger and Brazeal (1994), enterprising formation would have to improve the feasibility and desirability by increasing the knowledge of tools and consequences of the enterprising behaviour. Nevertheless there is little precision within the educative educational process, about which are the suitable educational tools to ease the transfer of knowledge and values that foment the entrepreneurial spirit.

Following Gibb's idea (2005), we should focus this phenomenon in an integral way. From the point of view of academic training, the essential tools that can develop enterprising intention are:

- From the subject's content: academic objectives, competences and subjects and academic enterprising works.
- From the teacher: curriculum, direction and academic training in entrepreneurship.
- Education methodology: case's method; group work as a teaching tool, business games and carried out works and practise.
- Other activities carried out in the training field: presentations, talks from entrepreneurs; business visits, magazines and publications.

This allows us to close in to academic training from curricular and extracurricular activities included in the training programmes of higher education centres. Curricular activities include the participation in formal learning situations, related to knowledge education, abilities and attitudes, educational methodology, teachers, etc. necessary to carry it out.

On the other hand, extracurricular activities include support of all those complementary activities programmed for the formal program needed to obtain the degree (which they can be done as much in the classroom, as outside of it, as entrepreneurs' talks or business visits, among others).

For our study, we analysed a sample of 127 students of tourism, including the whole educative spectrum, from students of Universidad Politécnica de Madrid's (UPM) Postgraduate Degree in Management and Hotel Administration and Tourism Bachelor Degree's students from Universidad Complutense of Madrid (UCM).

The first question we will try to study is how the academic training develops an enterprising motivation among tourism's masters and degree students.

This analysis allows us to identify how the curricular and extracurricular activities influence the intentions, the attitudes and the capacities for the development of the enterprising motivation among Degree and Master students.

Once analysed the positive influence of curricular and extracurricular activities on the enterprising motivation of the tourism students, a second question is considering how to evaluate the effectiveness of the curricular and extracurricular activities in the enterprising motivations among Degree and Master students.

In the following section, we will introduce a general panorama of notable literature about the academic training of tourism's students and the enterprising motivation. Later, we will describe the methodology of investigation, data collection and its measurement. The data will be analysed, and finally we will introduce the discussion and the implications of the obtained results.

2. Conceptual framework

2.1 Education and entrepeurnership

For many years, educative model in Spanish universities has considered, in a more or less explicit way, that employment prospects of graduated students would preferably take place in private or public companies, being hired by them as employees (Vázquez et al.2009, 2010). This matched largely with the student's very own professional aspirations (Fundación Universidad-Empresa, 2009; García-Montalvo and Peiró, 2009). Nevertheless, the idea that entrepreneurship is a notable way towards employment for university graduates has been growing stronger little by little, besides of the importance of entrepreneurship for economic growth and development. This justifies taking an outstanding interest in this phenomenon, as a major factor for economies' success (Hornaday, 1992), and is one of the best ways to fight serious unemployment in a country or region

Nevertheless, due to the impact of academic training over a high-added value entrepreneurship, the University is set to play a fundamental role in the creation -or rather, development- of the enterprising attitude of its students. Indeed, this lead to various institutions carrying out programs and courses aimed at starting business through the motivation of an enterprising spirit. In past decades, universities directed their efforts towards a greater interaction with society in general and to fortify its enterprising position within the very same society, developing a whole range of institutional support actions and strategies for this new interaction (Palmberg, 2008). If in 2003 there were 37 business creation programmes running (Dalmau et al.2003), in 2012, this number reached 100% of the 79 officially approved higher learning educational institutions, according to the report 'Enterprising Education. Services and Curricula of Spanish Universities (Fundación Universidad-Empresa, 2012)'.

This support from the university makes a distinction between basic entrepreneurship training and those students who already have a clear idea for enterprising. In the former case, they give talks, courses and awareness' actions aimed towards entrepreneurship. For the people in the university who have made the decision of enterprising, support measures are much more clear and concrete, like business incubators with spaces and material resources to very advantageous prices, support in knowledge and advising specialised in business starting, among other actions.

Nevertheless, the greater deficit is exactly in trying to foment the desire to roll out. It is obvious that in order to boost this entrepreneurial spirit it is necessary to make well-designed programmes that emphasize those aspects that have a bigger influence in the enterprising attitude of the people. There are many examples where universities' work has fomented an entrepreneurial spirit in their surroundings. For example, the outstanding role played by Stanford University in the emergence and development of Silicon Valley (Castells and Hall, 1994, Riviezzo, 2003). Nevertheless, there are few examples. The university needs to play a more important role within the set of structures that are destined to foment the economic and social growth in its surroundings (Etzkowitz, 2004).

The relation between higher training and entrepreneurial spirit has given rise to much discussion in the last years; especially in making clear what function universities should have in the development of their student's enterprising vocation (Holmgren et al., 2005; Collins et al., 2005; Ertuna et al., 2011).

Literature has focused on determining if you can actually teach enterprising initiative (Baron, 2002; Booth et al. 2009; Nicolau and Shane, 2009). In order to value the academic impacts, first, research has focused in determining whether entrepreneurs are born or can be made (Aldrich and Martinez, 2001; Gartner, 1988; Nicolau and Shane, 2009). An agreement was been reached: yes, there are essential characteristics that should appear in entrepreneurs; nevertheless, those characteristics can be developed through learning and academic training (Barón, 2002; Gartner, 1988; White, Thornhill

and Hampson, 2006). Therefore, it is relevant to identify what is the impact of academic actions with a potential to develop enterprising attitude.

Another way of focusing this dilemma is based on the premise that enterprising initiative has two faces: 'science' and 'art' (Jack and Anderson, 1998; SAR, 2005). 'Science' deals with cause-effect connections of a stable nature, which means how to act facing certain situations to control the results. Whereas, 'art' involves creative and innovator thinking; a unique answer. In the knowledge area before us, the variables' combination is practically unique in front of each situation. At this juncture, Hills et al.(1988), and Anderson et al.(2008) agree that core competences implied in enterprise behaviour ought to be developed not only within the framework of regulated academic training.

For this reason, they consider that the responsibility in the development of the enterprising motivation should not be limited to the mere inclusion of entrepreneurship-related issues into curricular contents, as starting a business or developing business plans.

Because of this proposal, Liñan (2007) and Soutaris et al. (2007), raise a formative model that combines the regulated academic training with the university's institutional support. These authors point two components: a curricular one, associated with the different subjects of contents and skills that shape the different curricula, focused in in the development of competences; and the second, an extracurricular component, related to not only the consolidation of the previously mentioned competences, but also students' awareness, towards entrepreneurship in this case.

About how effective both curricular and extracurricular activities are towards enterprising intention, we should point that this academic training, within the framework of an enterprising culture, is very effective for increase the enterprising motivation towards the beginning of a new business among the students (Autio et al.1997).

Results confirm that university education (measured in terms of learning and received support from the university) has a positive influence in the perception of the needed abilities and competences to rolling out, and, finally, starting a business (Liñan and Chen, 2009; Dohse and Walter, 2010).

Liñán and Chen (2009) indicate that education foments the enterprising attitude; for example, it has an impact over characteristics of personality, including the need of personal fulfilment and tendency to be risk taking, since these characteristics can be considered essential factors that influence in developing and accomplishing the entrepreneurial spirit. On the other hand, the impacts on the development of the skills (both general (as, for example, relational, and specific ones, like how to develop a strategic planning) are identified as basics for starting an enterprise project (Boissin et al. 2009).

Sanchez (2013) shows that developing training programmes has a positive effect in the development of the abilities related to the enterprising initiative -like the assumption of risks; self-efficacy and proactivity. Other authors point to team work, guidance towards objectives, taking risks and confidence as the abilities that must be developed by a training programme, along with technical skills related to the different business functions (Fayolle et al, 2006; Volery et al, 2013; Morris et al, 2013).

There is a bigger controversial about how effective it is with entrepreneurship. Therefore, Peterman and the Kennedys (2003) did find a positive relationship between the educative level of an individual person and his or her intention towards entrepreneurship. Nevertheless, there are arguments against, as shown by Garavan and O'Cinneide (1994) who point how education can influence in the enterprising ability in a positive or negative way. Laukkanen (2000) claims that, traditionally, higher

level educational institutions make their students to become more analytical, hold a bigger ability of diagnosis, and thus, a stronger dislike to risks, unclear matters, and, probably a dislike from students to imply themselves in new business projects.

Ronstadt (1984), and Peterman & Kennedy (2003) also insist that, generally speaking, formal education does not encourage entrepreneurial initiative, but leads to conformity, decrease the tolerance towards ambiguity, reduces the student's ability of creative thinking and, generally speaking, it just prepare the students for working as employees, suppressing their creativity and entrepreneurial spirit.

2.2 Tourism education: a debate between official and unofficial studies

At the beginning of the 90s, programs that combined tourism studies in their business interrelation were seen as the ideal model of curriculum (Tribe, 1999). Therefore, the combination of tourism studies with enterprise ones allowed that those ones were identified like a vocational discipline that provided with abilities and knowledge from business and market (Goodenough and Página, 1993; Koh, 1995; Tribe, 1997, 1999). Haywood & Maki (1992), and Koh (1995) did find that tourist industry needs practical and general skills -like, for example, computer science, staff management, also accountability, financial and quality of service skills.

Koh (1995) considers that tourism curricula should comprise three different typologies of knowledge: for business, management and skills. That is to say, that studies should achieve a harmonic cohabitation of professional modules related with the typical knowledge of the sector -like lodging and restoration management, journey and general leisure industry- with business management modules –strategy, marketing, accounting and innovation; and finally, skills' modules like communication, team work and interpersonal relations.

Tribe (2002b) argues in favour of balancing both objectives -professionals and business'-. Nevertheless, actually, it is difficult to maintain a precise balance between both types of courses (Airey and Johnson, 1999; Airey, 2002).

3. Empirical study

The empirical study was carried out using as sample the students from UCM's Tourism Bachelor Degree and UPM's Postgraduate Degree in Management and Hotel Administration. These universities are among the biggest of Spain, both offering a wide range of degrees and postgraduate courses. In order to collect the data, we handed out a questionnaire to every different group while in class. All the questionnaires were applied in May 2014. We received 97 questionnaires from undergraduate students and 22 from postgraduates. The size of the population is of 525 registered students.

UCM's Tourism Bachelor Degree is 240 ECTS credits, handed out in four academic years. This degree's overall objective is the academic training of tourism's professional workers who should be able to manage in a comprehensive manner every kind of business of this sector, as a whole or just of any of their functions. That is to say, a university degree that, generally, prepares the students to develop its future professional activity in any of the spheres of the activities within Tourism, aimed towards an adapted, territorial and managerial business that would allow a touristic exploitation of resources (natural, cultural, and other natures').

The curriculum is structured in 186 credits for basic and main subjects, 36 credits for optional subjects, 12 credits for internship in business in this sector, and 12 credits for the final project. Among the optional subjects there is "Starting up a tourism business", whose teaching load is six credits, about four hours for week. They also teach business management related subjects within the

curriculum, as Introduction to economy, Statistics, Introduction to accounting, Management and Marketing, administration, marketing and strategic management, with a total teaching load of 42 credits.

UPM's Postgraduate Degree in Hotel Management has a 60 ECTS credits' teaching load, and it is developed in one academic year. Among its main objectives are making hotel management a more qualified, valuable and effective work within the high economic, social, political and technological complexity that business in this sector are forced to coexist with, which, in addition, bring changes to touristic businesses and their surroundings. Credits are structured in the following way: 42 credits for main subjects, 12 credits for internship at hotel companies, and six credits for the final project. Knowledge related to entrepreneurship is partially covered, since it is covered from a financial point of view in the subject 'Budget and Management & Control', in which students must carry out the evaluation of a hotel project.

3.1 Measures

This study has adapted from Souitaris et al.(2007), Kibler et al.(2014), and Kolvereid (1996) the intention, attitude, and behavioural control variables, being conceptualized as perceived dimensions. Following these authors, we measure all items referred to the same behaviour, that is to say, engaging in activities to start a business and the same period (within the coming 12 months). Intention was measured as 'I intend to take steps to start a business in the next 12 months'. Attitude: 'For me, taking steps to start a business in the next 12 months would be unpleasant / attractive. Behavioural control: 'If I want to, I can take steps to start a business in the next 12 months'. Each construction was measured with using a seven-point rating Likert scale.

The curricular activities are referred to student participation in formal learning situations involving the teaching of skills and attitudes related to entrepreneurship competences, as defined by the European Reference Framework on Key competencies For Lifelong Learning (Recommendation 2006/962/CE, section 2.2.1). In order to value the influence of the studies they are attending, students were asked about which issues had a bigger influence in their entrepreneurship motivations.

We adapted from Nabi & Holden (2008), Laukkanen (2000), and Pittaway et al. (2009) the following elements: 1) Contents; 2) Works and practices; 3) Teachers; 4) Cases; 5) Group work; 6) Entrepreneurs' conferences; and 7) Education methodology.

The extracurricular activities variable was conceptualized as perceived dimensions, which means the contextual influences in the configuration of the enterprising initiative's intention. After Ramussen & Sorheim (2006), De Faoite et al. (2003) (who measured extracurricular activities as mental support -no matter if informative or formative-, as key activities for increasing the enterprising motivation) we took the following elements into consideration: 1) Conferences and talks from entrepreneurs; 2) Business visits; 3) Business games; 4) Structured programs; 5) Facilities and infrastructures; and 6) Spirit and values passed on by their university.

Following Sánchez (2009); Rasmussen et al. (2011); Morris et al. (2013), who measured enterprising competencies as: psychological (self-efficacy, proactivity, and risk), relationship and management (leadership and group works), and knowledge competences.

Altogether, we took in consideration the following elements: 1) Power of decision over my business project; 2) Effort and concentration until achieving success; 3) Analysis of various solutions and taking the most suitable decision; 4) Work in groups, where you would identify the skills of each person, allowing you to complement each other, building an atmosphere of collaboration; 5) Taking

the initiative, defining goals; 6) Working as long as is necessary to finish the project; 7) New ways to make things; 8) Self-confidence; 9) Leadership and confidence to make people joining your project 10) Disposition for taking risks; and 11) Necessary education to undertake a business.

4. Analysis and results.

In Table 1, we reflected the results of how tourism students perceive attitude, ability and entrepreneurial intention. Our results show that entrepreneurial attitude is approximately a 5 in a 7-point scale (4.85 postgraduate and 5.15 undergraduate), whereas ability to carry out a business project, is 4.27 (3.81 postgraduate; 4.4 undergraduate). We also observed that, as far as the intention to make it in the next 12 months, it was bigger in Postgraduate (3.3) than in undergraduates (3.0) students. We conclude that enterprising intention is lower than enterprising attitude and ability. These results thus provide empirical evidence about attitude, ability and intention in tourism students, showing a high level of motivation to develop a business. To a lesser extent, we observed that the students of tourism feel qualified to develop their projects. We also observed a low intention to develop a project, thus corroborating other studies, which affirm how surroundings' difficulties (Boissin et al.2009b) and high costs of transaction and opportunity have an influence in the decision to develop a new entrepreneurial project (Autio et al.1997).

We also observed a different behaviour between the students from Degree and Master. There is a greater motivation to start a business among students with a lower education level. The causes can be an excess of optimism (Baron, 2006), as result of overestimating the future success of a new company -since they can overestimate his own capacities in managing the newly formed business- and overcoming any future difficulties. On the other hand, we observed a greater definition of enterprise project among postgraduate students, confirming by empirical studies that show how just graduated they have a greater intention to undertake a business (Baron and Ensley, 2006). In order to corroborate these differences between both groups, an analysis MANOVA has been carried out, which shows that, being a homogenous group, there are no differences. (Attitude: F=0.856, sig. 0.357; Ability: F=2.199, sig. 0.141; Intention: F=0.630, sig. 0.429).

---------- Insert Table 1 over here----------

We also analysed the impact of curricular and extracurricular activities' in entrepreneurial motivation among tourism students. In reference to curricular activities, in Table 2 we observed average values that vary between 4.25 and 5.65 for undergraduate students and between 4.74 and 5.37 for Masters' students. We can point out the important role that they play in the entrepreneurial motivation for both groups (5.67 Degree, and 5.37, Master). We also observed that undergraduate students value in a more positive light subjects’ contents, class works and teachers than postgraduates do. Quite the opposite, a change of tendency took place regarding the previous questions, since Postgraduates value more curricular activities related with teaching methodology, like group works, cases and entrepreneurs' talks. Our results provide empirical evidence on the different perception that undergraduates and graduates have about educative activities, thus reinforcing the argument of how necessary is a different educative and institutional treatment, for both postgraduates and undergraduates, as in the well-known case of Business Schools vs. Universities, although this difference between both analysis' groups is negligible, as shown by the multivariate variance analysis (MANOVA, Table 3).

---------- Insert Table 2 over here ----------
---------- Insert Table 3 over here ----------

About to how is perceived the influence of extracurricular activities in the enterprising motivation, we observed, in general, that postgraduates perceive a smaller incidence of extracurricular activities in their intention to start up a business (average: 4,55 and 3.5) in opposition with undergraduates (average: 5.62 to 4.21). We also observed that the lowest value appear in 'university contribution to entrepreneurship spirit & values'. In order to prove if these differences were significant, we carried out a MANOVA analysis, which, as Table 5 shows, do not confirm the difference between both groups.

---------- Insert Table 4 over here ----------

---------- Insert Table 5 over here ----------

Latest research question considered if there is a significant effect from curricular and extracurricular activities over tourism students' needed enterprising competences. At first, we analysed the development of acquired competences in their education. We observe values higher than 4 in both groups (except in knowledge competence for starting a business, where obtained values were lower than 4 in both groups), with no significant differences between both groups, as shown by MANOVA results. Tables 10 & 11 show the result about the effect of curricular and extracurricular activities over the competences for entrepreneurship. In order to achieve this, we made a regression analysis to tell curricular from extracurricular activities for the whole students' sample, since we have a homogeneous group, as shown by MANOVA results. As far as curricular activities, we see that its effect on competencies is heterogeneous. We observed that group works, teaching staff and subjects' contents, have a positive and significant impact largely in competencies. Likewise, we observed that educational methodology has a significant negative impact in various competences, which is a worrying result, since it highlights how students perceive educational methodologies used for teaching tourism. We also observed that using practical cases has not impact at all in any competence. We also observed that practises in class and conferences have no impact in competences. Therefore, curricular development of competencies is based on class' contents, teachers and the group works. More in detail, we observed that curricular activities are mainly directed to develop interaction competences (like leadership and teamwork, and, to a lesser extent, psychological competences, like self-efficiency, the proactivity and risk-taking.

On a similar way, we observed that curricular activities have no impact over the acquired knowledge to start up a business. Leaving aside the argument of insufficient business' content, this result raises some concern, because it can be related to the modular nature of tourism studies (Tribers, 2000).

---------- Insert Table 6 over here ----------

---------- Insert Table 7 over here ----------

---------- Insert Table 8 over here ----------

---------- Insert Table 9 over here ----------

---------- Insert Table 10 over here ----------

Moreover, about the effect of the extracurricular activities in the competences, we have generally observed little impact. This way, talks and facilities have a significant impact in the diverse competences, whereas spirit and institutional culture have a negative impact over the competences.

Regarding Guerrero and Urbano (2012), this result is also rise concern about which role university institutions are playing in the development of their students' enterprising motivation.

5. Conclusions and Discussion

The major contribution of this research is providing empirical evidence about tourism education's influence in the development of entrepreneurship. We found that, tourism students are especially motivated to start a business of their own -as shown by their attitudes and capacities for entrepreneurship, with no differences with other more classic degrees related to the business world. Also, we observed a difference, although non-significant, in the effect of curricular and extracurricular activities in both study groups. Complying with the Enterprise Directorate General (Dirección General de Empresas, DGE) (2008), it is suggested to develop a training programme for entrepreneurship focused towards the group target, as a political recommendation.

A second conclusion: both curricular and extracurricular activities in tourism education should contribute as much to the development of analysis skills -allowing analysing, comparing, contrasting, criticizing and evaluating, just as creative skills to imagine, construct hypothesis, discover and invent. Following DGE (2008) it is important pointing that both curricular and extracurricular activities should cover the full spectrum of competencies and skills needed for the development of attitudes and behavioural control of the enterprising initiative. In general terms, it is assumed that the learning of core competences and specific knowledge for the creation of a new business requires different methodologies and complementary education strategies (Morris, 2013; Sanchez, 2013). Along with this idea, De Faoite et al.(2003) recommends not making excessive use of the methods based on the theory, but developing independent ways of learning, fomenting learning based on the student's action and direct practise, providing opportunities of learning based on the experience, making possible cooperative learning and interaction, without undervaluing the role of the reinforcement. Therefore, we should recommend a methodological and strategic change in tourism education in order to stimulate the development of competences for entrepreneurship.

More specifically, the curricular activities should develop 'action' programmes; that is, programmes stimulating the search for opportunities and the acquisition of skills aimed towards 'action'. In this sense, Saarinen and Ursin (2012), point out that developing programmes to encourage learning based on problems and projects; it should be a characteristic to achieve learning through practice, within the training programmes.

Thus, the classic programs, in which they are developed, mainly, the knowledge of the company and its surroundings, as soon as they contribute to the development of enterprise competences. It is also indicated that the educative supply would have to intensify the creation of attitudes and capacities for entrepreneurial initiative, using active methodologies for the development of analytical abilities. In particular, it is considered that the methodologies of learning based on projects are very adapted for the development of the following: the independent learning, planning of the time, and the ability to express it of the right way.

On the same way, Laukanen (2000) provides some needed tools in business activity, such as analysis and problem-solving tools, interpersonal skills, negotiation or conflict resolution techniques, among others. Because of the development of competences, the methodology used in education should be based on the work of the students, on their own personal development, and not just on the teacher's work. Thus, classic programmes that mostly develop business' knowledge and its

surroundings, barely contribute to the development of entrepreneurial competences. We point out as well that the educational offer should step up the creation of attitudes and capacities for entrepreneurship, using proactive methodologies for the development of analytical skills. In particular, it is considered that learning methodologies based on projects are quite suitable for the development of capacities directly related to entrepreneurial initiative (Ertunaand Gurel, 2011), like searching and structuring information, working in group, independent learning, time planning and the ability to express it in the right way.

Another aspect that our result shows is the interaction between curricular contents and the modularity of tourism studies. We propose the introduction of compulsory credits in the tourism degrees devoted to entrepreneurial initiative. Following this recommendation, we also propose the inclusion of a minimum number of credits in the area for personal development skills, as well as of interaction and management skills. Therefore, and following Koh, (1995) and Tribe (2002), the curricular content should rest on three different pillars: professional modules, entrepreneurship models and skills' modules.

As regards on how many extracurricular activities should allow students to search for business opportunities, as well as providing a suitable support to develop them, we think that those activities should include some major aspects, such as the development of information centres, infrastructures and material resources. Kirby, Guerrero and Urbano (2011) introduced the idea of an 'entrepreneurial university'. Such entrepreneurial university is 'an instrument that not only provides workforce and value added with the creation or transformation of knowledge but also improves the person values and attitudes towards entrepreneurship'. In this sense, the university should develop several strategies, structures and organizational culture oriented to reinforce creativity and entrepreneurial experiences; coupled with solid collaboration agreements between university and industry

6. Bibliography

Airey, D. (2002). "Growth and change in tourism education". In B. Vukonic, & N. Cavlek (Eds.), *Rethinking of education and training for tourism* (pp. 13-22). Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Graduate School of Economics and Business.

Airey, D. and Johnson, S. (1999). "The content of tourism degree courses in the UK". *Tourism Management*, 20, 229-235.

Airey, D. and Tribe, J. (Eds.). (2005). An international handbook of tourism education. Elsevier. Oxford

Ajzen, I. 1991. "The theory of planned behavior". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50: 179-211.

Aldrich, H.E. & Martínez, M.A. 2001. "Many are called but few are chosen: an evolutionary perspective for the study of entrepreneurship". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 25(4): 41-56.

Anderson, A. R., and Jack, S. L. 2008. "Role typologies for enterprising education: The professional artisan?" *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 15, 259-273.

Audretsch, D., Keilbach, M. 2004. Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance. Regional Studies, vol. 38(8): 949-959.

Autio, E., Keeley, R. H., Klofsten, M., and Ulfstedt, T. 1997. "Entrepreneurial intent among students: Testing an intent model in Asia, Scandinavia and USA". *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson Conference Proceedings. Boston, MA.

Baron, R. (2006). “Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: how entrepreneurs “connect the dots” to identify new business opportunities”. Academy of Management Perspectives 20, 104-119.

Baron, R. A. (2002). OB and entrepreneurship: The reciprocal benefits of closer conceptual links. IN B. Staw and E. Kramer (Eds.), Research in Organizational Behavior, 225-269.

Baron, R. and Ensley, M. (2006). “Opportunity recognition as the detection of meaningful patterns: evidence from comparisons of novice and experienced entrepreneurs”. Management Science 52, 1331–1344.

Belhassen, Y. and Caton, K. (2011). “On the need for critical pedagogy in tourism education”. *Tourism Management* 32, 1389-1396.

Boissin, J.P., Chollet, B., and Emin, S. (2009a). “Les déterminants de l’intention de créer une entreprise chez les étudiants : un test empirique ». *M@n@gement* 12(1), 28-51.

Boissin, J.P., Branchet, B., Emin, S., and Herbert, J. (2009b). “Students and Entrepreneurship: A Comparative Study France - United States”, *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* 22(2), 101-22.

Booth, A., McLean, M. and Walkerb, M. (2009). “Self, others and society: a case study of university integrative learning”. *Studies in Higher Education* 34(8), 929-939.

Busby, G. and Huang, R. (2012). “Integration, intermediation and tourism higher education: Conceptual understanding in the curriculum”. *Tourism Management 33, 108-115.*

Castells, M. & Hall. P. 1994. Technopoles of the world. The making of twenty-first century industrial complexes. Londres: Routledge.

Collins, L., Hannon, P.D. and Smith, A. (2004). “Enacting entrepreneurial intent: the gaps between student needs and higher education”. *Education+Training* 46(8-9), 454-63.

Dalmau, J. I., Alonso, J. L., Colomer, J. 2003. Programa IDEAS: un modelo de éxito para fomentar la creación de empresas desde las universidades. Valencia: Universidad, Politécnica.

De Faoite, D., Henry, C., Johnston, K., and Sijde, P. V. (2003). “Education and training for entrepreneurs: A consideration of initiatives in Ireland and The Netherlands”. *Education + Training* 45, 430-438.

Enterprise General Direction (2008). *Survey of entrepreneurship in higher education in Europe. Main report.* Brussels: European Commission.

Ertuna, Z. and Gurel, E. (2011). “The moderating role of higher education on entrepreneurship”. *Education+Training* 53(5), 387-402

Etzkowitz H. 2004. The evolution of the entrepreneurial university. International Journal of Technology and Globalisation, vol. 1(1): 64-77.

Exceltur (2014). Valoración empresarial del año 2014 y perspectivas para 2015. *Perspectivas turísticas* 50, 1-85.

Fayolle, A., Gailly, B. and Lassas-Clerc, N. (2006). “Assessing the impact of entrepreneurship education programmes: a new methodology”. *Journal of European Industrial Training* 30(9), 701-720.

Fidgeon, P. (2010). “Tourism education and curriculum design: a time for consolidation and review?” *Tourism Management* 31(6), 699-723

Fundación Universidad-Empresa. 2009. Compromiso en la empresa: compromiso laboral de los universitarios. Madrid.

Fundación Universidad-Empresa 2012. Educación emprendedora: servicios y programas de las universidades españolas. Madrid.

Garavan, T. N., and O'Cinneide, B. (1994). "Entrepreneurship education and training programmes: A review and evaluation. Part I". *Journal of European Industrial Training* 18, 3-12.

García-Montalvo J. & Peiró, J.M. 2009. Análisis de la sobrecualificación y la flexibilidad laboral. Valencia: Fundación Bancaja-IVIE.

Gartner, W. B. 1988. Who Is an Entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. American Journal of Small Business, vol. 12(4): 11-32.

Guerrero, M., and Urbano, D. (2012). "The development of an entrepreneurial university". *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37(1), 43-74.

Kibler, E., Kautonen , T. and Fink M. (2014). "Regional Social Legitimacy of Entrepreneurship: Implications for Entrepreneurial Intention and Start-up Behaviour", *Regional Studies* 48 (6), 995-1015.

Kirby, D. A., Guerrero, M. &Urbano, D. 2011. "The theoretical and empirical side of entrepreneurial universities: an institutional approach". *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28: 302-316.

Koh, K. (1995). "Designing the four-year tourism management curriculum: a marketing approach". *Journal of Travel Research* 33(1), 68-72.

Kolvereid, L. (1996). "Prediction of employment status choice intentions". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 21(1), 47-57.

Laukkanen, M. (2000). "Exploring alternative approaches in high-level entrepreneurship education: creating micro-mechanisms for endogenous regional growth". *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development* 12(1), 25-47.

Li. L. (2008). "A review of entrepreneurship research published in the hospitality and tourism management journals". *Tourism Management* 29, 1013–1022.

Liñán, F. (2008). "Skill and value perceptions: how do they affect entrepreneurial intentions?" *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* 4(3), 257-72.

Liñán, F., and Chen, Y. (2009). "Development and cross-cultural application of a specific instrument to measure entrepreneurial intentions". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 33, 593-617.

Morris, M., Webb, J., Fu, J. and Singhal S. (2013). "A Competency-Based Perspective on Entrepreneurship Education: Conceptual and Empirical Insights". *Journal of Small Business Management* 51(3), 352–369.

Nabi, G. and Holden, R. (2008). "Graduate entrepreneurship: intentions, education and training". *Education + Training* 50(7), 545-51.

Nicolau, N., and Shane, S. (2009). "Can genetic factors influence the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activity?" *Journal of Business Venturing* 24, 1-22.

Palmberg, C. 2008. "The transfer and commercialization of nanotechnology: a comparative analysis of university and company researchers". *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 33(6): 631-652.

Peterman, N.E. and Kennedy, J. (2003). "Enterprise Education: Influencing Students' Perceptions of Entrepreneurship". *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 28, 129-144.

Pittaway, L., Hannon, P., Gibb, A., and Thompson, J. (2009). "Assessment practice in enterprise education". *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research* 15, 71-93.

Rae, D. (2005). "Entrepreneurial learning: A narrative based conceptual model". *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development* 12, 323-335.

Rasmussen, E. A., and Sorheim, R. (2006). "Action-based entrepreneurship education". *Technovation* 26, 185-194.

Riviezzo A. 2003. Modelli di sviluppo di aree internazionali a forte vocazione tecnologica: analisi dei casi di Irlanda, Scozia, Israele. En Bencardino F. e Napolitano M.R. (a cura di). Economia del Software e Tecnologie dell'Informazione e della Comunicazione, un confronto internazionale per lo sviluppo locale: 125-170. Milano: Franco Angeli

Rodríguez, X, Martínez-Roget, F. and Pawlowska E. (2012). "Academic tourism demand in Galicia, Spain". *Tourism Management* 33(6), 1583–1590.

Saarinen, T. and Ursin, J. (2012). "Dominant and emerging approaches in the study of higher education policy change". *Studies in Higher Education* 37(2), 143-156.

Sanchez, J.C. (2013). "The Impact of an Entrepreneurship Education Program on Entrepreneurial Competencies and Intention". *Journal of Small Business Management* 2013 51(3), 447–465.

Shapero, A., and Sokol, L. (1982). "The social dimension of entrepreneurship". In C. A. Kent, D. L. Sexton and K. H. Vesper (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of entrepreneurship*, 72-90. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Souitaris, V. Zerbinati, S., and Al-Laham, A. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing* 22, 566-591.

Tribe, J. (1997). "The indiscipline of tourism". *Annals of Tourism Research* 24, 638-657.

Tribe, J. (2000a). "Indisciplined and unsubstantiated: reply to Leiper". *Annals of Tourism Research* 29(2), 338-357.

Tribe, J. (2000b). "Balancing the vocational: the theory and practice of liberal education in tourism". *The International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research* 2(1), 9-26.

Tribe, J. (2002). "The philosophic practitioner". *Annals of Tourism Research* 29, 38-357.

Vázquez, J.L., Georgiev, I., Gutiérrez, P., Lanero, A. & García, M.P. 2010. "Promoting regional development from University. Students' perception on entrepreneurship motivation and training programs". *The Trakia Journal of Sciences*, 12-13: 1-7.

Vázquez, J.L., Naghiu, A., Gutiérrez, P., Lanero, A. & García, M.P. 2009. "Entrepreneurship potential in the University: Intentions and attitudes towards new venture creation". Bulletin UASVM Horticulture, 66: 507-512.

Veciana, J. M. 2005. La creación de empresas: un enfoque gerencial. Colección de Estudios Económicos, 33. Barcelona: La Caixa.

Table 1. Intention, Attitude and Ability

Descriptive Statistics				
Variables	**Level**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
Ability	Degree	4.4105	1.75944	95
	Master	3.8148	2.11291	27
Intention	Degree	3.0000	1.63733	95
	Master	3.2963	1.95753	27
Attitude	Degree	5.1579	1.47544	95
	Master	4.8519	1.65724	27

Table 2. Curricular Activities

Descriptive Statistics					
Variables		**Level**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
1.	**Content**	Degree	5.5579	1.37389	95
		Master	5.2963	1.43620	27
2.	**Class' Works and practices**	Degree	5.4211	1.38056	95
		Master	5.2222	1.33973	27
3.	**Teachers**	Degree	5.6526	1.35873	95
		Master	5.3704	1.36292	27
4.	**Cases**	Degree	4.5684	1.35782	95
		Master	5.0370	1.53125	27
5.	**Group work**	Degree	4.4000	1.54644	95
		Master	4.8519	1.68029	27
6.	**Entrepreneurs' presentations**	Degree	4.2526	1.83910	95
		Master	5.0000	1.70970	27
7.	**Teaching Methodology**	Degree	4.7158	1.70521	95
		Master	4.7407	1.67774	27

Table 3. MANOVA Curricular Activities / Level (Degree-Master)

Variables	F	Sig.
Content	.747	.389
Works and class' practices	.442	.508
Teachers	.906	.343
Cases	2.365	.127
Group work	1.727	.191
Entrepreneurs' presentations	3.577	.061
Teaching Methodology	.005	.946

Table 4. Extracurricular Activities

Descriptive Statistics				
Variables	**Level**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
1. Conferences and seminars from entrepreneurs.	Degree	5.5263	1.45018	95
	Master	4.5556	2.10006	27
2. Business visits	Degree	5.4105	1.40284	95
	Master	4.2963	2.01561	27
3. Business games	Degree	5.6211	1.43793	95
	Master	3.6667	2.07550	27
4. Programs	Degree	4.5263	1.42800	95
	Master	3.9259	1.97924	27
5. Infrastructures and support	Degree	4.3895	1.55942	95
	Master	3.9630	1.87045	27
6. University's Ethos and Values	Degree	4.2105	1.89003	95
	Master	3.5556	1.98714	27

Table 5. MANOVA Activities Extracurricular / Level (Degree-Master)

Variables	**F**	**Sig.**
Conferences and seminars from entrepreneurs.	2.612	.107
Business visits	1.778	.301
Business games	1.450	.226
Programs	3.098	.081
Infrastructures and support	1.436	.233
University's Ethos and Values	2.468	.119

Table 6. Entrepreneurial skills

Descriptive Statistics				
Variables	**Level**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**	**N**
1. Decision power over my own business project (**Decision**)	Degree	5.5158	1.21920	95
	Master	4.8148	1.88184	27
2. Effort and Concentration to take objectives (**Concentration**)	Degree	5.4000	1.34797	95
	Master	5.0000	1.77591	27
3. Capacity to analyse different solutions (**Analysis**)	Degree	4.9263	1.33880	95
	Master	4.9630	1.55617	27
4. Group work **(Group work)**	Degree	4.8632	1.44848	95
	Master	4.6296	1.54791	27
5. Taking the initiative, defining goals (**Initiative**)	Degree	5.1368	1.41880	95
	Master	4.7407	1.87273	27
6. Working as much as needed to end a project **(Tenacity**)	Degree	5.4842	1.25362	95
	Master	5.1111	1.69464	27
7. New ways of doing things (**Creativity**)	Degree	5.3053	1.22104	95
	Master	4.7778	1.71718	27
8. Self-confidence (Self-confidence)	Degree	4.7895	1.55669	95
	Master	4.4444	1.45002	27
9. Leadership to convince other people for working in your own projects (**Leadership**)	Degree	5.0526	1.25790	95
	Master	4.7037	1.89767	27
10. Ability of taking risks (**Risk**)	Degree	4.2737	1.53984	95
	Master	4.3704	1.66752	27
11. To have the knowledge needed to run a business (**Knowledge**)	Degree	3.7368	1.62566	95
	Master	3.5556	1.69464	27

Table 7. MANOVA Competencies Curricular / Level (Degree-Master)

Variables	F	Sig.
Decision	3.348	.062
Concentration	1.597	.209
Analysis	.015	.904
Equipment	.530	.468
Initiative	1.412	.237
Tenacity	1.579	.211
Creativity	3.238	.074
Self-confidence	1.063	.305
Leadership	1.267	.263
Risk	.080	.778
Knowledge	.257	.613

Table 8. Correlation. Curricular Activities

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
1. Content	1																
2. Class' works and practices	.575**	1															
3. Teachers	.491**	.408**	1														
4. Cases	.450**	.507**	.496**	1													
5. Groups	.322**	.577**	.342**	.498**	1												
6. Conferences	.239**	.411**	.196*	.372**	.492**	1											
7. Methods	.370**	.485**	.528**	.566**	.497**	.425**	1										
8. Decision	.346**	.232*	.267**	.081	.067	.066	.035	1									
9. Concentration	.266**	.339**	.287**	.212*	.241**	.193*	.260**	.543**	1								
10. Analysis	.203*	.179*	.289**	.206*	.280**	.203*	.208*	.240**	.409**	1							
11. Equipment	.339**	.225*	.342**	.242**	.408**	.202*	.165	.332**	.407**	.600**	1						
12. Initiative	.241**	.133	.181*	.023	.140	-.025	.018	.438**	.479**	.372**	.460**	1					
13. Tenacity	.273**	.170	.237**	.151	.236**	.065	.156	.400**	.577**	.351**	.422**	.489**	1				
14. Creativity	.209*	.180*	.226*	.180*	.229*	.011	.142	.360**	.338**	.452**	.446**	.278**	.307**	1			
15. Self-confidence	.150	.060	.276**	.098	.128	.249**	.093	.200*	.344**	.513**	.493**	.287**	.308**	.376**	1		
16. Leadership	.287**	.158	.264**	.132	.230*	.140	.069	.436**	.487**	.507**	.576**	.630**	.448**	.422**	.519**	1	
17. Risk	.187*	.091	.166	.120	.221*	.069	-.009	.337**	.290**	.460**	.356**	.343**	.254**	.328**	.532**	.505**	1
18. Knowledge	.151	.207*	.081	.111	.353**	.205*	.217*	.251**	.335**	.305**	.427**	.286**	.177	.242**	.357**	.480**	.443**

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Table 9. Correlation. Extracurricular Activities

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Conferences	1															
2. Visits	.619**	1														
3. Game	.463**	.526**	1													
4. Programs	.373**	.457**	.530**	1												
5. Supports	.259**	.469**	.422**	.522**	1											
6. University's Ethos and Values	.214*	.403**	.379**	.381**	.451**	1										
7. Decision	.389**	.270**	.225*	.121	.047	.070	1									
8. Concentration	.206*	.263**	.200*	.202*	.166	.140	.543**	1								
9. Analysis	.103	.108	.179*	.152	.162	.086	.240**	.409**	1							
10. Equipment	.286**	.170	.149	.122	.227*	.054	.332**	.407**	.600**	1						
11. Initiative	.248**	.157	.117	.084	.113	-.060	.438**	.479**	.372**	.460**	1					
12. Tenacity	.182*	.093	.101	.076	.165	.043	.400**	.577**	.351**	.422**	.489**	1				
13. Creativity	.139	.136	.030	.100	.057	-.119	.360**	.338**	.452**	.446**	.278**	.307**	1			
14. Self-confidence	.058	.042	.177	.030	.050	.180*	.200*	.344**	.513**	.493**	.287**	.308**	.376**	1		
15. Leadership	.245**	.145	.181*	.203*	.213*	.052	.436**	.487**	.507**	.576**	.630**	.448**	.422**	.519**	1	
16. Risk	.031	-.036	.021	.036	.095	-.040	.337**	.290**	.460**	.356**	.343**	.254**	.328**	.532**	.505**	1
17. Knowledge	.084	.131	.068	-.017	.235**	.119	.251**	.335**	.305**	.427**	.286**	.177	.242**	.357**	.480**	.443**

*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01

Table 10. Regression model. Curricular activities

	Interaction			**Psychology (Self-efficacy, Proactivity, Risk)**							**Knowledge**
	Decision	**Leadership**	**Group work**	**Concentration**	**Analysis**	**Initiative**	**Tenacity**	**Creativity**	**Self-confidence**	**Risk**	**Knowledge**
Module	**.276****	**.250****	**.256****	.054	.073	**.242****	**.232****	.110	.076	.175	.101
Class' woks and practices	.138	-.115	-.187	**.214***	-.092	-.007	-.088	-.006	-.164	-.140	-.025
Teachers	**.241****	**.234****	**.249****	.155	**.223***	.155	.124	.127	**.346****	.154	-.082
Cases	-.117	-.068	-.027	-.059	-.013	-.153	-.057	.029	-.075	.027	-.140
Groups	-.057	**.230***	**.433*****	.026	**.207***	.198	**.236***	**.226***	.041	**.304****	**.356****
Entre/lectures	.046	.079	.046	.047	.095	-.100	-.071	-.147	**.299****	.003	.032
Method	-.187	**-.200***	**-.191***	.056	-.028	-.119	-.007	-.030	-.143	**-.256****	.124
R^2	.419	.395	.527	.385	.362	.332	.345	.319	.395	.345	.383

*p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01

Table 11. Regression model. Extracurricular activities

	Interaction			Psychology (Self-efficacy, Proactivity, Risk)							Knowledge
	Decision	**Leadership**	**Team work**	**Concentration**	**Analysis**	**Initiative**	**Tenacity**	**Creativity**	**Self-confidence**	**Risk**	**Knowledge**
Conferences	**.340****	**.235****	**.310****	.053	.028	**.239****	**.214***	.079	.029	.086	.057
Visits	.077	-.111	-.085	.163	-.037	.020	-.098	.149	-.102	-.145	.045
Games	.089	.042	.004	.039	.124	.023	.014	-.074	**.213***	.015	-.003
Program	-.036	.081	-.060	.074	.045	-.024	-.055	.105	-.103	.006	**-.231****
Facilities	-.090	.181	**.247****	.015	.104	.123	**.194***	.046	-.030	.169	**.302****
Spirit university	-.013	-.082	-.068	.014	-.016	**-.174***	-.035	**-.228****	**.187***	-.084	.042
R^2	.404	.316	.346	.284	.208	.296	.240	.263	.253	.167	.300

*p < 0.10; **p < 0.05; ***

We have got the VIF for each variable, and all values are less 2.5