

Entrepreneurial Personality Traits of Moto-Couriers in The Gig Economy

Savaş ŞİMŞEK¹, Hava YAŞBAY KOBAL²

Abstract

The positive or negative situations that humans encounter throughout their life require them to adapt to all kinds of situations they encounter in order to continue their life. Every development contributes to the formation of new ways of life. This study is about the gig economy, which has gained momentum with the Covid-19 pandemic that has affected the world and continues to develop by continuing its popularity. Although the gig economy represents a very broad economic system, in some professions there is direct communication with the customer, while in some professional groups the job can be completed by working online. However, the essence of the work is individual entrepreneurship rather than being contracted to any employer. The aim of this study is to determine the entrepreneurial personality characteristics of motor couriers operating in the gig economy. For this purpose, data were collected by online survey method. The "entrepreneurship tendencies" scale developed by İşcan and Kaygın (2011) was used in the study. In this context, the data obtained from 155 motor couriers were analyzed in the SPSS 26 quantitative analysis program. In the analysis program in question, frequency distributions of demographic variables were made, and especially the relationship between the "age distributions" and "professional durations" of the participants were calculated by the Crosstabs method. Based on this, the variables included in the entrepreneurial personality traits were compared with demographic variables using the ANOVA method. As a result of the research, it was understood that the motor couriers who participated in the research generally had entrepreneurial personality traits, and it was observed that there were differences in the levels of "self confidence", "tolerance of ambiguity" and "propensity to take risk" among these traits.

Keywords: Gig Economy, Entrepreneurship, Personality, Entrepreneurial Personality Traits, Human Needs

Jel Codes: L26, D23, L64

Gig Ekonomisinde Motorlu Kuryelerin Girişimci Kişilik Özellikleri

Özet

İnsanların yaşamları boyunca karşılaştıkları olum ya da olumsuz durumlar, yaşamlarını devam ettirmeleri için karşılaştıkları bu her türden duruma uyum sağlamalarını gerektirmektedir. Yaşanan her gelişme yeni yaşam şekillerinin oluşmasına katkı sağlar. Bu çalışma, dünyayı etkisi altına alan Covid-19 pandemisi ile ivme kazanan ve popülerliğini devam ettirerek gelişen gig ekonomisi ile ilgilidir. Gig ekonomisi kapsamı oldukça geniş bir ekonomik sistemi temsil etmekle birlikte, bazı mesleklerde doğrudan müşteri ile iletişim söz konusuysa, bazı meslek gruplarında online çalışma ile iş sonlandırılabilir. Fakat yapılan işin özünde herhangi bir işverene bağlı olmak yerine bireysel girişimcilik söz konusudur. Bu çalışmanın amacı da gig ekonomisinde faaliyet gösteren motorlu kuryelerin girişimci kişilik özelliklerini saptamaktır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda veriler çevrimiçi anket yöntemiyle toplanmıştır. Çalışmada İşcan ve Kaygın (2011) tarafından geliştirilen "girişimcilik eğilimleri" ölçeğinden faydalanılmıştır. Bu kapsamda 155 motorlu kuryeden elde edilen veriler, SPSS 26 nicel analiz programında analiz edilmiştir. Söz konusu analiz programında demografik özelliklerin frekans dağılımları yapılmış olup, özellikle katılımcıların "yaş dağılımları" ile "mesleki süreleri" arasındaki ilişki Crosstabs yöntemi ile ortaya konulmuştur. Buradan hareketle girişimcilik kişilik özelliklerine dâhil olan değişkenler ise yine demografik değişkenler ile ANOVA yöntemiyle karşılaştırmaya tabi tutulmuştur. Araştırma sonucunda araştırmaya katılan motorlu kuryelerin genel anlamda girişimci kişilik özelliklerine sahip oldukları anlaşılmakta olup bu özellikler içerisinde yer alan "kendine güven", "belirsizlik toleransı" ve "risk alma" seviyelerinde farklılıklar olduğu görülmüştür.

Anahtar kelimeler: Gig Ekonomisi, Girişimcilik, Kişilik, Girişimci Kişilik özellikleri, İnsan ihtiyaçları

Jel Kodu: L26, D23, L64

CITE (APA): Şimşek, S., Yaşbay Kobal, H. (2025). Entrepreneurial personality traits of moto-couriers in the gig economy. *İzmir İktisat Dergisi*. 40(4). 1174-1194. Doi: 10.24988/ije.1536944

¹ Assos.Prof., İzmir Kavram Vocational School, İzmir/Türkiye, **EMAIL:** ssim1971@gmail.com, **ORCID:** 0000-0003-2340-3104

² Assos.Prof., Hakkari University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences/Department of Business Administration, Hakkari/Türkiye, **E-MAIL:** havayashbay@hakkari.edu.tr, **ORCID:** 0000-0002-2589-785X

1. INTRODUCTION

Not only the digitalization of many areas in the world, whether in the state or the private sector, the increase in technological innovations and internet use (Yurgiden, 2023: 453), but also in the context of those developments the increasing frequency of natural disasters, the infectious diseases that emerge in certain parts of the world and affect the whole world, has made radical changes in the shapes of people's lives and work. From this perspective, the gig economy expresses a new business organization model that emerged as a result of advances in information and communication technologies (Ünal and Temiz, 2022:169). The concept of the gig economy refers to a business model in which an individual performs the requested work through an internet-based technological platform in order to find and fulfill short-term jobs (Kallaberg and Dunn, 2016:11). From this perspective, it can be seen that "courier work" - especially moto courier work - which has been and still is involved in product distribution, has an important place in the gig economy.

Moto-courier services, a traditional method of delivery, have become increasingly widespread with the rise of the gig economy (Kavurmacı, 2023: 33). In the literature, studies on moto-couriers mainly focus on problems related to working life such as working conditions, occupational health and safety risks, etc. (Kavurmacı, 2023; Öztan and Özkaplan, 2021; Öz, 2023; Uçar et al., 2006; Yertüm and Balcı, 2023). However, it is necessary to study humanoid characteristics as well as external environmental conditions wherever humans are. Because it is important to shed light on future studies in the field based on which personality traits people exhibit certain behaviors while doing a job. In particular, the concept of "entrepreneurial personality", which is included in the classification of personality structures, allows the study to be carried out. Therefore, unlike other studies, this study aimed to determine the entrepreneurial personality traits of motor couriers operating in the gig economy.

For the research sample, 155 moto couriers in Izmir, working as individual entrepreneurs for Yemek Sepeti, a leading company in the sector, were selected. In order to determine entrepreneurial personality traits, the Entrepreneurial Personality Characteristics Scale developed by İşcan and Kaygın (2011) was used in the research and this scale was applied by a questionnaire. The first part of the questionnaire includes a demographic information form. In the second part, the questions asked in the Entrepreneurial Personality Characteristics Scale developed by İşcan and Kaygın (2011) are included. The scale contains 28 items on a five-point Likert type (1: strongly disagree, 5: strongly agree). Data analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 22.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Gig Economy and Moto-Couriers

Globalization, rapid progress in communication and information technologies and the digitalization of many fields have caused radical changes in work organization, employment relations and ways of working (Johnston and Kazlauskas, 2018: 3). In addition, economic crises, pandemics, the decrease in the need for labor force and the increasing unemployment due to all these have had a great impact on the widespread use of the gig economy (Dilekoğlu et al., 2022: 344).

It has almost become a fashionable trend to give names to new concrete or abstract phenomena in every aspect of life, as if these names are meant to remind us of the past. It is useful to look at the word gig from this perspective. It is important to evaluate two different historical facts that form the basis for the naming of the English word gig as a name for a newly developing economic trend, in order to clarify the issue. According to the first of these, gig refers a one-time performance of a musician or group of musicians (Cambridge Dictionary, 2022). The concept of gig has been used especially for artists who are employed daily, temporarily or for a certain period of time by the venue or at the request of other intermediaries (by the renter of the venue; birthday/party) (Friedman, 2014: 172). However, in addition to this information about the word, when we go further into the

past, we come across a different source. Namely: Gig is a two-wheeled vehicle with origins dating back to Ancient Egypt and Ancient Rome (Burgess, 1881:4-5), which was first rebuilt in France starting from the 17th century and then started to be used in different parts of the world, especially in Europe. It is a transport vehicle pulled by a single horse (Smith, 1988:85). These vehicles were used in the 17th century and later, instead of the vehicles known today as taxis and used for short distances for commercial purposes (Walrond, 1980:66). Long before these, there were horse-drawn vehicles used for cargo and passenger transportation in various European countries, but especially since human transportation was a very lucrative business (Gilbey, 1903:70), there were increasing traffic problems even at that time (Straus, 1912:139) and low cost of their construction (Smith, 1974:57) caused gigs to become popular at that time. Therefore, it is understood that an economic trend that emerged as a result of changing living conditions in modern usage was given the name "gig" not only because of its application in the music and show industry, as mentioned, but also because of the names of the vehicles used for commercial purposes long before these sectors. Considering the course of development, one of the main sectors that has made the gig economy popular is the transportation of people and goods through digital applications. In short, one-time jobs, the first examples of which we see in the French business world, are not new, and historically, the advancement and increasing use of technology, especially the rapid development of digital platform businesses, have contributed to the rapid spread of such businesses (Wu et al., 2019: 574; Johnston and Kazlauskas, 2018:3). The gig economy is defined as an economic model that includes the exchange of labor in exchange for money between individuals and businesses through digital platforms, based on short-term and job-based payment between providers and customers (Abraham et al., 2018:4).

Not only the lack of earnings but also the absence of a physical space or an employer to which the employee is bound by any employment contract, a predictable work schedule, etc. are the features that distinguish the gig economy from standard labor markets (Abraham, 2019: 357; Balci and Eraslan, 2023:157). Therefore, the positive features of the gig economy include greater spatial and temporal flexibility for employees, freedom to be one's own boss, and control over work-related decisions. Moreover, due to low barriers to entry, the gig economy can seem quite inclusive for all types of workers (Bajwa et al., 2018:3; Keller, 2023: 1; Lehdonvirta, 2018:13; Sherk, 2016:2).

The gig economy, with its increasing spread, currently manifests itself in certain business lines. Among these, tourism, transportation, distribution (food and commodity), performance sectors and finding workers for seasonal or very short-term jobs, etc. can be specified (Abraham et.al., 2019:358, Duggan and Jooss, 2023:54, Janadari and Preena, 2020:1, ILO, 2021:46). As well as the sectors in which it is spread, the ways in which employees in this field do their work is also very important. It is noteworthy that motorcycles and, more recently, bicycles are used as the most important vehicles, especially in the distribution sector (Krier et al., 2022).

The place of moto-couriers in the service sector, which responds to the increasing demand of consumers to quickly provide their daily needs, is becoming increasingly important. After the Covid-19 pandemic, cargo transportation has played a key role in the delivery of shopping, orders or different shipments of products to customers by individuals or institutions by online commerce increasing all over the world. In its most basic form, motor courier service is defined as the delivery of products or services such as cargo, packages, food, goods and documents to the customer safely and at the desired time (Kavurmacı, 2023: 33-34). Although the method, also known as online distribution, is older, it owes its spread to the gig economy. While it was previously possible to order, albeit limited, through moto-couriers, these employees consisted of the restaurants' or markets' own employees. In the gig economy model, these employees sometimes work through an application, sometimes through an online platform, and they generally do not have an organic connection with restaurants or markets (Ostoj, 2021:453; Yertüm and Balci, 2023: 331).

Moto-couriers appear to work in different ways in the service sector. The first of these is moto-couriers who work under contract to an employer (ILO-Ankara, 2022: 42). In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of motorized couriers working in the "self-employment courier" model. Self-employment courier is a business model in which people who want to establish their own business and work as courier "whenever they want" under a certain company. The emphasis on "being your own boss" is at the forefront in tradesman courier business. The courier becomes the owner of the company, not the employee of the company, that is, the courier starts working "for his own business" (Öz, 2023: 90-91; Kıldak, 2021: 44-45). On the other hand, among those who work as motor couriers, there are those who work without being a self-employment courier and without being affiliated with any corporate company. Employees agree with the employer on a daily or hourly wage (Başpınar, 2022: 51). In this segment, in addition to those who work with their own motorbikes, there are also those who provide courier services in restaurants and takeaway services, which are often referred to as "neighbourhood", with the motorbike provided by the employer (İSİG Meclisi (İSİG Assembly), 2022; Kurye Hakları Derneği (Couriers Rights Association), 2022: 27; Kavurmacı, 2023: 35).

In the literature, it is seen that studies on motorized couriers (Kavurmacı, 2023; Öztan and Özkaplan, 2021; Öz, 2023; Uçar et al., 2006; Yertüm and Balcı, 2023) mainly focus on their working conditions, occupational health and safety risks, and problems related to working life. This study aims to determine the entrepreneurial personality traits of moto-couriers operating in the gig economy.

2.2. Historicity and Features of Entrepreneurial Personality

Just as there is a certain historical background in every field, it is seen that different studies were carried out by different scientists on different dates to determine entrepreneurial personality traits, and some similar and some more detailed features were put forward. Accordingly, it is a fact that preliminary studies on the characteristics of entrepreneurial personality were carried out during and after the World War II related to the raising up the capitalist system that was disrupted in the West, through scientific reports. When the issue is viewed from this perspective, in addition to how production will be carried out, what the characteristics of the people (entrepreneurs) who will establish companies to carry out this production should be of great importance. Regarding the subject, Hornaday and Bunker (1970:47) make the following statement:

In 1942, Arthur H. Cole brought into relatively sharp focus the need for definitive research into the general question of the entrepreneur (Cole, 1942). He extended and elaborated the statement in a 1944 report to the Social Science Research Council (Cole, 1944). In 1948 Cole established the Research Center of Entrepreneurial History at Harvard. Despite considerable diversified research and activity over the years, the Harvard Center was discontinued in 1958 and comparable centers were not established elsewhere. However, Harvard, along with Michigan State University, has remained central in the producing of research related to the nature of the entrepreneur. The MSU studies were strongly influenced by W. Floyd Warner (Warner & Abegglen, 1955; Warner 1959; and Warner & Martin, 1959) and led to relatively ambitious studies such as those described by Collins et al. (1964), Smith (1967), and Alpaender (1967). The Harvard studies have been conducted most vigorously by David C. McClelland, whose book, *The Achieving Society*, has been highly influential (McClelland, 1961). His other publications (McClelland, 1962, 1965a, 1965b, 1969; McClelland and Winter, 1969) have dealt with a selection of problems relating to the entrepreneur, and much of McClelland's work was used as a point of departure for this exploratory study.

As a result, it should be accepted that studies on entrepreneurial personality traits were inspired by the work titled "*The Achieving Society*" (1971) written by McClelland. However, although there are earlier studies in the explanations mentioned above by Hornaday and Bunker (1970), it is understood that the real studies started in the 1960s. McClelland mentions a study conducted by Hal

PICKLE (1964) in his study titled "Characteristics of Successful Entrepreneurs" in 1987. (1987:219). As a result of his index study, Pickle mentioned 27 characteristics that ensure success in small American businesses. On the other hand, referring to the study conducted by Hornaday and Bunker (1970), McClelland mentions that the mentioned scientists identified 16 entrepreneurial personality traits, most of which are in Pickle's list.

At the end of the studies carried out before him to determine entrepreneurial personality traits, McClelland grouped the most commonly used entrepreneurial personality traits in indexes under ten headings such as: confidence, perseverance, energy, diligence, resourcefulness, creativity, foresight, initiative, versatility (Knowledge of Product and Market), intelligence and perceptiveness. Later on Bygrave (1989: 13) stated the entrepreneurial personality traits as need for achievement, internal control, ambiguity tolerance, risk-taking, personal values, education, experience, job dissatisfaction, job loss, gender and commitment. In a study conducted by Robinson et al. (1991), entrepreneurial personality traits are stated as achievement, self-esteem, personal control and innovation. In his study, Koh (1996) evaluated the studies conducted by Bygrave and Robinson et al. and accepted the characteristics of need for achievement, locus of control, propensity to take risk, tolerance of ambiguity, self-confidence and innovativeness as a starting point. In this study, the classification of entrepreneurial personality traits put forward by Bygrave (1989) will be taken as basis.

2.2.1. Need for Achievement

When talking about people's basic needs, it would be appropriate to mention the hierarchy of needs of Maslow (1954:77), one of the leading need theories. In Maslow's hierarchy of needs, the need for achievement is included in the individual's need for self-actualization. The basis of the need for success is the individual's desire to be noticed. This desire emerges when employees motivate themselves internally. In short, the desire to succeed is related to being motivated internally rather than externally (Pink, 2009:42). According to Koh (1996: 14), the theory that "the driving force behind human action is the need to achieve", put forward by McClelland (1976), has been suggested as a strong psychological factor affecting entrepreneurial behavior for a long time. Only individuals with a strong desire to succeed can manage a comprehensive system such as planning, coordinating, executing, and managing (Chell, 2008:89). Individuals with high levels of need for achievement set challenging goals for themselves, take risks, do not avoid taking responsibility, and want to observe the results of the decisions they make. These people are more self-confident, they explore their environment, they are active, they are interested in concrete measurements of how good they are, they are not easily satisfied with current achievements, they prefer to strive to achieve goals that pose difficulties but are not beyond their abilities (Cromie, 2000: 16; Lee and Tsang, 2001:586; Chell, 2008: 88-89; Karabulut, 2016). Many studies in the literature have revealed that entrepreneurs generally have a greater need for success than non-entrepreneurs (Shaver and Scott, 1991; Rauch and Frese, 2007; Yan, 2010; Ören and Biçkes, 2011; Şen and Aslan, 2017; Türkoğlu et al., 2017; Mirza and Demiral, 2019).

2.2.2. Propensity to Take Risk

Risk-taking is a concept that generally manifests itself in the act of "decision making" and for this reason it is frequently mentioned in decision-making theories (Slovic, 1964; Shapira, 1994:7). "Risk-taking", which involves the act of choosing between two extreme concepts such as winning and losing, has been tried to be defined by some researchers by highlighting these features. Inspired by the studies done before him, Trimpop defined risk-taking behavior as "any consciously, or non-consciously controlled behavior with a perceived uncertainty about its outcome, and/or about its possible benefits or costs for the physical, economic or psycho-social well-being of oneself or others." (1994: 9). From this perspective, risk-taking is one of the most challenging steps in the process of putting individuals' decisions into action to achieve a certain goal and can be considered an

important personality trait in starting work. When we look at the issue from the perspective of entrepreneurs, being prone to take risks appears as a feature that distinguishes entrepreneurs from other people and managers (Luca, 2017:23). Risk-taking is putting a business idea into action despite the possibility that its outcome may fail. Entrepreneur is defined as the person who assumes the consequences of this risk (Chell, 2008:102). There is data in the literature that entrepreneurs have a tendency to take more risks than other groups (Koh, 1996; Caird, 1991; Cromie and O'Donoghue, 1992; Chen et al.,1998; Cromie, 2000; Chell et al., 1991; Hull et al., 1982; Olson, 2000; Mirza and Demiral, 2011; Ören ve Bıçkes, 2011; Türkoğlu et al., 2017; Yan, 2010).

2.2.3. Tolerance of Ambiguity

The way a person perceives an uncertain situation and organizes available information to approach that situation reflects his or her tolerance for ambiguity. A person with a high tolerance for uncertainty is someone who finds uncertain situations challenging and tries to overcome unstable and unpredictable situations in order to perform well. It is believed that tolerance for uncertainty is an entrepreneurial characteristic, and those who are prone to entrepreneurship are expected to tolerate uncertainty more than others (Koh, 1996: 15). There are studies in the literature confirming that tolerance for uncertainty is one of the main characteristics that distinguish entrepreneurs from non-entrepreneurs (Foxman, 1976; Koh, 1996; Schere, 1982; Sexton and Bowman, 1985; Cromie, 2000).

2.2.4. Locus of Control

Locus of control, a structure developed by Rotter (1954, 1966: 1), refers to a generalized belief that a person can or cannot control his/her own destiny. It is stated that individuals who attribute control of events to themselves have an internal locus of control and individuals who attribute control to external forces have an external locus of control (Koh, 1996: 14; Chell, 2008: 98; Yan, 2010: 23). Individuals with an internal locus of control feel that they can control the results, make more efforts to establish and manage new ventures, and insist on results (Rauch and Frese, 2007: 359). There are empirical findings in the literature that entrepreneurs' internal locus of control is higher than non-entrepreneurs (Cromie and Johns, 1983; Cromie, 1987; Caird, 1991; Cromie ve O'Donoghue, 1992; Robinson et al., 1991; Hansemark, 1998; Koh, 1996; Cromie, 2000; Olson, 2000; Mueller and Thomas, 2000; Gürol and Atsan, 2006; Yan, 2010; Şeşen and Basım, 2012; Karabulut, 2016: 13; Mirza ve Demiral, 2019; Türkoğlu et al., 2017).

2.2.5. Self Confidence

Considering the general concept that an entrepreneur is a person who chooses to enter into his/her own business, self-confidence refers to the belief that an entrepreneur can achieve the set goals (Koh, 1996: 15). Entrepreneurs face numerous challenges and uncertainties in their business. Therefore, their self-confidence affects the entrepreneur's abilities to cope with these conditions. Therefore, a person must believe in his/her own abilities to achieve success (Hallak et al., 2012: 145). Many studies in the literature have shown that entrepreneurs have a higher level of self-confidence than individuals who are not entrepreneurs (Koh, 1996: 15; Mirza and Demiral, 2019; Şeşen and Basım, 2012; Türkoğlu et al., 2017).

2.2.6. Innovation

The concept of innovation is an integral part of entrepreneurship and is one of the most difficult tasks of an entrepreneur. Innovation can include activities such as developing a new product or process, creating a new distribution channel, or developing a new organizational structure or method (Hisrich and Peters, 2002: 9). Wonglimpiyarat (2005: 865) defined the concept of innovation as an integrated process of developing technology frontiers (a development tool), transforming it into optimal commercial opportunities (a distribution tool) and delivering the commercialized product.

Entrepreneurial individuals develop new ideas, identify market opportunities, or combine existing ideas and resources in different ways to create additional value (Cromie, 2000: 20). There is strong empirical evidence in the literature to support the claim that entrepreneurs are more innovative than non-entrepreneurs (Sexton and Bowman-Upton, 1986; Carland et al., 1988; Carland and Carland, 1991; Shane et al., 1991; Robinson et al., 1991; Koh, 1996: 16; Chen et al., 1998; Cromie, 2000; Mueller and Thomas, 2000: 57; Türkoğlu et al., 2017; Mirza and Demiral, 2019).

3. METHOD

The aim of this study is to determine the entrepreneurial personality characteristics of motor couriers operating in the gig economy. The research sample consists of moto-couriers working for the Yemek Sepeti company in Izmir Province. The data of the research were collected using the convenience sampling method between May and June 2024. As a result of the survey application, after eliminating incomplete and unusable surveys, a data set consisting of 155 participants was obtained. A two-part data collection tool was used in the research. The first part of the data collection tool includes a demographic information form. The second part of the data collection tool includes the Entrepreneurial Personality Characteristics Scale developed by İscan and Kaygın (2011) to determine entrepreneurial personality characteristics. The scale contains 28 items on a five-point scale (From “1: strongly disagree” to “5: strongly agree”). Quantitative research method was used in the research. Data analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 22. Hypothesis are as follows:

H1: Moto-couriers have entrepreneurial personality traits.

H2: The level of entrepreneurial personality traits of moto-couriers varies significantly according to demographic variables.

H2a: Tolerance for uncertainty perceptions moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

H2b: Innovation perceptions of moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

H2c: Locus of control perceptions of moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

H2d: Need for success perceptions of moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

H2e: Propensity to take risk perceptions of moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

H2f: Selfconfidence perceptions of moto-couriers show significant differences according to demographic variables.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Demographic variables

The frequency distributions of the demographic variables of the participants are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic variables of Participants

		F	P
As	Sex	Female	10
		Male	145
	Age	20-29	81
		30-39	44
		40 /+	30
	Marital Status	Married	74
		Single	81
	Job Duration	0-5 years	79
		6-10 years	26
		11 years and over	50
	Work Duration	All Day	138
		Half Day	11
		Other	6

seen in Table 1, 6.5% (10 participants) of the moto-couriers in the sample are women, 93.5% (145 participants) are men, and when looking at their age distribution, 52.3% (82 participants) are between 20-29 years old, 28.4% (44 people) are 30-39 years old and 19.4% (30 people) are 40 and over years old. On the other hand, when we look at the job duration of the participants, 51.0% (79 participants) have worked between 0-5 years, 16.8% (26 participants) have worked between 6-10 years, 32.3% (50 people) have worked 11 years or more. Additionally, when evaluated on a daily basis, it is understood that 89.0% of the participants (138 participants) work full time, 7.1% (11 participants) work part time and 3.9% (6 participants) work in other time periods.

4.2.Means of Variables

In the research, a scale consisting of 28 questions and 6 dimensions developed by İşcan and Kaygın (2011) was used to measure the entrepreneurial personality characteristics of moto-couriers. As a result of the reliability analysis of the entrepreneurial personality traits scale, the Cronbach α coefficient was found to be 0.95. Therefore, it can be said that the study conducted is quite reliable. Findings regarding the questions measuring entrepreneurial personality traits are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Frequency Distributions for the Entrepreneurial Personality Traits of

		QUESTIONS	M	SD
Entrepreneurial Personality Traits	Self Confidence	I find myself determined to achieve big goals.	4,19	,03
		I am confident in my ability to succeed.	4,44	,88
		Thanks to my intelligence and capacity, I can cope with the difficulties I encounter.	4,43	,88
		The word entrepreneur describes me.	4,05	,98
		Total	4,28	,80
	Innovation	While other people do not see anything unusual in the environment, I can detect business opportunities.	4,08	,99
		I always believe that there are better methods than the current methods.	4,36	,91
		I have the ability to put forward ideas that will make a difference on a subject.	4,23	,96
		I have the ability to generate new, interesting, even crazy ideas.	4,18	,92
		I don't shy away from changing the way things are done.	4,29	,98
		People are impressed by entrepreneurs.	4,15	,03
		Total	4,21	,76
		I like competition because competition makes me work harder.	4,16	,12

	Need for Achievement	I don't do something just for the sake of doing it, but to do it perfectly.	4,29	,92
		I want to start my own business in the coming years.	4,38	,92
		Nothing can replace great achievements in life.	4,17	,12
		If I don't feel successful, I won't like doing that job, even if it's high-paying.	3,91	,21
		Total	4,18	,83
	Locus of Control	Instead of waiting or watching for something to happen, I prefer to do something myself.	4,27	,92
		Any developments I encounter regarding the work I do are under my control.	4,04	,02
		I control my own actions.	4,36	,87
		I am more successful when there is no supervision from anyone else.	4,31	,02
		Working in your own business is more enjoyable than working in someone else's business.	4,49	,98
		I influence the outcomes of the events in my life, not luck or bad fate.	3,80	,19
		Total	4,22	,75
	Propensity to take risk	I see myself as someone who can take risks.	4,12	,06
		I would not hesitate to invest my money in a partnership whose shares I can calculate will generate profits.	3,77	,17
		I am willing to take great risks to excel in what I do.	4,04	,05

		For success, it is necessary to do the right job at the right time.	4,37	,94
		It is necessary to be entrepreneurial even in crisis situations.	3,93	,08
		Total	4,05	,83
	Tolerance of Ambiguity	It is not important for me that the job is permanent and safe.	2,63	,52
		I enjoy working in irregular conditions.	2,36	,37
		Total	2,49	,27

When Table 2 is examined, it is seen that the moto-couriers participating in the research generally have a high level (3.91) of entrepreneurial personality traits. When evaluated in terms of dimensions, it was determined that motorized couriers had a high tendency in five dimensions except Tolerance of Ambiguity (2.49). According to these results, the H1 hypothesis, which states that the participants in the research have entrepreneurial personality traits, was accepted.

4.3.Comparison of Entrepreneurial Personality Scale Dimensions in Terms of Demographic Variables

Independent Sample T-Test and one-way variance analyzes (ANOVA) were conducted to test the significance of the difference between the entrepreneurial personality traits levels of moto-couriers in terms of demographic variables. As a result of the analysis, it was determined that there was a significant difference in terms of working time only in the tolerance of ambiguity, self-confidence and propensity to take risk sub-dimensions. The ANOVA analysis results regarding the difference are given in Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6. However, before moving on to the analysis of these tables, it will be necessary to include a table (Table 3) comparing the "job duration" and "age groups" of the participants, which will contribute to the explanation of the tables in question. The data in this table was obtained with Crosstabs of both variables.

Table 3: Comparison of Age Groups and Job Duration of Moto-Couriers

	Age Groups				
Job Duration		20-29	30-39	40 and more	TOTAL
	0-5 years	55	15	9	79
	6-10 years	12	14	0	26
	11 years and more	14	15	21	50
TOTAL		81	44	30	155

As can be seen from Table 3, the number of participants in the survey who have been motor couriers for 0-5 years is 79, the number of those who have been motor couriers for 6-10 years is 26, and the number of those who have been motor couriers for 11 years or more is 50.

Table 4: Self-Confidence Levels of Moto-Couriers Evaluation in Terms of "Job Duration"

Variable	Job Duration	N	Mean	F	p
Self Confidence	0-5 years	79	4,43	3,15	0,04
	6-10 years	26	4,18		
	11 years and more	50	4,09		

When the data in Table 4 is examined, it is seen that the self-confidence level is higher in those with a job duration of 0-5 years compared to other groups (4.43).

Table 5: Tolerance of Ambiguity Levels of Moto-Couriers Evaluation in Terms of "Job Duration"

Variable	Job Duration	N	Mean	F	p
Tolerance of Ambiguity	0-5 years	79	2,56	4,20	0,17
	6-10 years	26	3,00		
	11 years and more	50	2,14		

When the data in Table 5 is examined, it is seen that the level of tolerance of ambiguity is higher (3.00) in those who have worked for 6-10 years compared to other groups and decreases in those who have worked for 11 years or more.

Table 6: Propensity to Take Risk Levels of Moto-Couriers Evaluation in Terms of "Job Duration"

Variable	Job Duration	N	Mean	F	p
Propensity to Take Risk	0-5 years	79	4,18	3,22	0,04
	6-10 years	26	4,10		
	11 years and more	50	3,81		

When the data in Table 6 is examined, it is seen that the level of propensity to take risk is higher (4.18) in those with a working period of 0-5 years compared to other groups.

It was determined that there was no significant difference in terms of demographic variables in the other sub-dimensions of the entrepreneurial personality traits scale. Therefore, the H2 hypothesis was rejected.

5. CONCLUSION

The gig economy is not an entirely new economic system; rather, it should be viewed as one that has been revitalized due to cultural, technological, and environmental factors. The transportation sector, which was carried out years ago without being affiliated with any workplace, has recently accelerated its development and adapted itself to today, especially under the influence of environmental factors such as Covid-19.

This study, conducted on the entrepreneurial personality traits of motor couriers, who have an important place in the gig economy, is important in terms of clarifying the topics mentioned in some previous studies. Because the results obtained under the headings such as "propensity to take risk", "tolerance of ambiguity" and "self-confidence", which are stated among the entrepreneurial personality traits of employees in the gig economy, are also mentioned as issues that make a difference in other studies (Wood, 2013; Ashford et al., 2018; Mpofu et al., 2020; Mitchell et al., 2021). When we look at the subject in terms of the results of the study, it can be seen that supporting results have been obtained from the studies conducted on the mentioned variables. For example, it has been concluded that the variable "self confidence" has a significant impact on entrepreneurial personality (Sexton and Bowman, 1983; Busenitz and Barney, 1997; Envick and Langford, 2000; Djankov et al., 2008; Karcsics and Szakács, 2010) and especially young entrepreneurs, due to these features, make decisions more easily and adapt to their environment more easily when establishing their business (Garaika & Margahana, 2019:9). As seen in Table 3, the number of participants aged 20-29 who have been working as moto-couriers for 0-5 years is 55. This group is a group with a younger population than others. In Table 4, data was obtained that the self-confidence levels of the participants whose working period was between 0-5 years were higher than other age groups, and this result coincides with the results of previous researches.

When it comes to "propensity to take risk", which is perhaps one of the most important characteristics of the entrepreneurial personality, it is seen that this variable is closely related to the "self confidence" variable. When Table 6 is examined, as in the comparison of "self confidence" variable and "job duration" and "age groups" comparison, it can be seen that the level of "propensity to take risk" of moto-couriers working between 0-5 years, the majority of whom are young participants, are higher than the groups. Additionally, as a complementary element, it is seen that in addition to the participants with 0-5 years of job duration, the "propensity to take risk" levels of entrepreneurs with 6-10 years of job duration are close to those of the participants with 0-5 years of job duration.

It can be said that the participants' "tolerance of ambiguity" levels are also in line with the results of previous studies (Foxman, 1976; Schere, 1982; Sexton & Bowman, 1985; Kurjono et. al., 2021). As explained in the previous sections of the study, having a high tolerance for uncertainty means trying to the maximum extent to overcome unstable and unpredictable situations in order to perform well. When viewed from this perspective, the entrepreneur's ability to adapt to the changing environment as quickly as possible (Smith, Kroll & Aven, 2007:55) shows that his tolerance for uncertain situations is also high. As seen in Table 5, it is possible to see that the high levels of these participants, who worked as motor couriers between the years 6-10, have now exceeded the starting level (0-5 year period) and can be seen as the time period when environmental adaptation in entrepreneurship is at its highest. On the other hand, in the same table, the fact that these levels of employees with 0-5 years of experience are higher than those of employees with 11 years and above shows us that the young population's level of adaptation to the environment, as an entrepreneurial personality trait, is high.

As stated in the previous sections of the study, studies on the gig economy generally focus on the way work is done and the organizational structures in which that work is done. However, as in every business, the main element in the business lines within the gig economy is people, and it is useful to look at the development of this economy on the basis of the needs of the human element. Therefore, in general, entrepreneurship can be considered as one of the basic characteristics of the human element in the gig economy, as in other economic structures. As can be seen from the study results, the existence of entrepreneurial personality traits is also present in the human element that gives life to the gig economy. However, it would be appropriate to evaluate this situation differently. That is to say: When we look at past employee behavior in economic systems, generally the employee who entered a workplace (factory, workshop, etc.) to do that job continued to work in that workplace as long as his/her economic income was sufficient for himself/herself. In short, employees would either work for someone other than themselves or sell their own products. It seems that this dilemma has gained momentum towards working for oneself rather than working for someone else, with the development of the gig economy. In fact, this tendency can be considered as a result of a stance against the option of "working for someone else" and as a manifestation of the strengthening of entrepreneurial characteristics in employees. From this perspective, the situation in question is also an indication that especially the "Y" and "Z" generations are rejecting their parents' old work arrangements and creating different working conditions and orders (Friedman, 2014:179). This situation raises the question of what precautions employers should take for the gig economy in the future. The best answer to this question should be given by taking into account the differences in understanding between generations. Therefore, it is obvious that work designs and employee-employer relations in factories or workshops, where work is done collectively, will no longer be the same. Therefore, employers should take into account the basic principles of the gig economy and intergenerational differences when restructuring workplaces or organizations.

This study is important as it is a preliminary to other studies to be conducted in the future. Especially in Türkiye, it is seen that detailed information about the gig economy and the people working in this economy is not fully included, and the academic studies are less than expected, considering the development course of the economy in question. The study is important in terms of determining the entrepreneurial personality traits of employees in the gig economy and is suitable for updating with more detailed studies. For example, jobs in the gig economy should also be considered as main or second jobs. From this perspective, it is a fact that there may be differences in some entrepreneurial characteristics.

DECLARATIONS

FUNDING / SUPPORT INFORMATION

No financial support was received for the research.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

The conceptualization, writing and editing of the study were done by Assoc. Prof. Dr. Savaş ŞİMŞEK. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hava YAŞBAY KOBAL contributed to the data collection and analysis stages. The editing and auditing processes were carried out with the contributions of both authors.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data in the study were obtained as a result of field work and are publicly available.

ETHICAL STATEMENT

The study was conducted with the decision of Hakkâri University Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee dated 30.04.2024 and numbered 2024/61.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) USAGE STATEMENT

No AI-based tools were used in this study.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, K.G., Haltiwanger, J. Sandusky, K. & Spletzer, J. (2019). The gig Economy: The Rise of Gig Economy: Fact of fiction?. *AEA Papers and Proceedings, Papers and Proceedings of the One Hundred Thirty-First Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association*, 109, 357-361.
- Ashford, S.J., Barker Caza, B., Reid, E.M. (2018). From surviving to thriving in the gig economy: A research agenda for individuals in the new world of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 38, 23-41.
- Bajwa, U., Knorr, L., Ruggiero, Erica Di., Gastaldo D., & Zendel A. (2018). Towards an understanding of worker sexperiences in the global gig economy. *GloMHI* (Global Migration and Health Initiative), Canada, Toronto, 1-41.
- Balcı, A.İ. & Eraslan, E. (2023). GİG ekonomisi: Bibliyometrik bir analiz. Sosyal Siyaset Konferansları Dergisi/ *Journal of Social Policy Conferences*, 85, 155-167.
- Başpınar A. (2022). *Motosikletli kuryelerin covid-19 pandemisi döneminde iş sağlığı güvenliği koşulları ve iş güvencesizliği düzeyi*. Hacettepe Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Halk Sağlığı Anabilim Dalı. Halk Sağlığı Uzmanlık Tezi.
- Biswas, U.N. (2000). Impact of entrepreneurs' personality characteristics on employee perception of organisational climate in small-scale enterprises. *The Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 9(1), 49-62.
- Burgess, J.W. (1881). *A practical treatise on coach-building: historical and descriptive*. London, Crosby Lockwood and Co.
- Busenitz, L.W. & Barney, J.B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, 9-30
- Bygrave, W.D. (1989). The entrepreneurship paradigm (I): a philosophical look at its research methodologies. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 14, 7-26.
- Cambridge Dictionary (2022) <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/tr/>
- Caird, S. (1991). The enterprising tendency of occupational groups. *International Small Business Journal*, 9, 75-81.
- Carland, J. W., Hoy, F., & Carland, J. A. C. (1988). "Who is an entrepreneur?" Is a Question Worth Asking. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12(4), 33-39.
- Carland, J.C., & Carland, J.W. (1991). An empirical investigation into the distinctions between male and female entrepreneurs and managers. *International Small Business Journal*, 9(3):62-72.
- Chell, E. (2008). *Entrepreneurial Personality*. East Sussex : Routledge .
- Chen, C.C., Greene, P.G., & Crick, A. (1998). Does entrepreneurial self-efficacy distinguish entrepreneurs from managers? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13, 295-316.
- Cromie, S. (1987). Motivations of aspiring male and female entrepreneurs. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 8, 251-261.
- Cromie, S., & Johns, S. (1983). Irish entrepreneurs: Some personal characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 4, 317-324.
- Cromie, S., & O'Donoghue, J. (1992). Assessing entrepreneurial inclinations. *International Small Business Journal*, 10, 66-73.

- Cromie, S. (2000). Assessing entrepreneurial inclinations. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 9(1), 7-30.
- Dilekoğlu Çalca, S. & Aydın, Ü. (2022). Tarihsel süreç içerisinde çalışma ve GİG ekonomisi. *Dokuz Eylül University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 24, 337-350.
- Djankov, S., Qian, Y., Roland, G., & Zhuravskaya, E. (2008). *What makes an entrepreneur?* International Differences in Entrepreneurship, Doing Business.org.
- Duggan, J. & Jooss S. (2023). Gig work, algorithmic technologies, and the uncertain future of work. In *The Future of Work Challenges and Prospects for Organisations, Jobs and Workers*, (Eds. Theo Lynn ,Pierangelo Rosati, EdelConway, Lisa van der Werff), Palgrave-Macmillan, Switzerland.
- Envick, B.L. & Langford, M. (2000). The five-factor model of personality: assessing Entrepreneurs and managers. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*, 6(1), 6-17.
- Estay, C., Durrieu, F. & Akhter, M. (2013). Entrepreneurship: From motivation to start-up. *Journal of International Entrepreneurship*, 11, 243-267.
- Friedman, G. (2014). Workers without employers: shadow corporations and the rise of the gig economy. *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 2(2), 171-188.
- Foxman, P. (1976). Tolerance for Ambiguity and Self-Actualization. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 40(1), 67-72.
- Garaika, G. & Margahana, H. (2019). Self-efficacy, self-personality and self confidence on entrepreneurial intention: Study on young enterprises. *Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 22 (1), 1-12.
- Gilbey, W. (1903). *Early Carriages and Roads*. London, Vinton & Co., Ltd.
- Goldsmith, R. E. & Foxall, G. R. (2003). The measurement of innovativeness. *The International Handbook on Innovation*, USA: Elsevier, 321-330.
- Gürol, Y., & Atsan, N. (2006). Entrepreneurial characteristics amongst university students. *Education and Training*, 48, 25-38.
- Hallak, R., Brown, G. & Lindsay, N.J., (2011). The place identity performance relationship among tourism entrepreneurs: A structural equation modelling analysis. *Tourism Management*, 33(1), 143-154.
- Hansemark, O. C., (1998). The effects of an entrepreneurship programme on need for achievement and locus of control of reinforcement. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 4(1), 28-50.
- Hisrich, R., & Peters, M.P. (2002). *Entrepreneurship*. McGraw Hill Publications: USA.
- Hornaday, J.A & Bunker, C.S. (1970). The Nature of the entrepreneur. *Personnel Psychology*, 23, 47-54.
- Hull, G.T., Scott, P.B. & Smith, B. (1982). *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Old Westbury New York, Feminist Press.
- ILO (2021). *World Employment and Social Outlook, The role of digital labour platforms in transforming the world of work*, International Labour Office, Geneva.
- İSİG Meclisi (2022). *Moto kuryelerin sorunları ve çözüm önerileri raporlaştırıldı*. [https://www.isigmeclisi.org/20757-moto-kuryelerin-sorunlari-ve-cozum-onerileri-raporlastirildi].

- Janadari, M.P.N. & Preena, G.R. (2020). The Gig economy and workforce. In *Contemporary Developments in Human Resource Management*, (Eds. H. M. S. V. Silva, G. R. Preena, P. Wijewantha, T. D. Weerasinghe, Sunani Fernando), Department of Human Resource Management, University of Kelaniya, Sri Lanka.
- Johnston, H. & Kazlauskas, C. L. (2018). Organizing on-demand: representation, voice, and collective bargaining in the GIG economy. *Conditions of Work and Employment Series*, 94, 1-47. International Labour Office-Geneva.
- Kalleberg, A. L. & Dunn, M. (2016). Good job, bad jobs in the GIG economy. *Perspectives on Work*, 20, 10-14.
- Karabulut, A. T. (2016). Personality traits on entrepreneurial intention. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 229, 12-21.
- Karcsics, E. & Szakács, F. (2010). Personality factors of entrepreneurial competitiveness. *Society and Economy*, 32 (2), 277-295.
- Kaufmann, J. P., Welsh, H.B D. & Bushmarin, N. (1995). Locus of control and entrepreneurship in the russian republic. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20 (1), 43-56.
- Kavurmacı, A. (2023). Determining factors that will improve working conditions of moto-couriers: a qualitative research. *Sosyal Güvenlik Dergisi*, 13(1), 33-54.
- Keller, M. (2023). Getting the first Gig: Exploring the affective relations of accessing place based platform labour. *Digital Geography and Society*, 5, 1-09.
- Kıdak, E. (2021). *Kargo Taşımacılığında Kendi Hesabına Çalışma Aldatmacası: Esnaf Kurye Modeli* (Self-Employment Scam in Cargo Transportation: Self Employment Courier Model). İstanbul, TÜMTİS Yayınları.
- Koh, C. H., (1996). Testing hypotheses of entrepreneurial characteristics: A study of Hong Kong MBA students. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 11(3), p.12-25.
- Korkmaz, O. (2012). Üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik eğilimlerini belirlemeye yönelik bir araştırma: Bülent Ecevit Üniversitesi Örneği. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 14(2), 209-226.
- Krier C., Dablanc L., Aguiléra A., Louvet N. (2022). Sharing within the gig economy: The use of shared e-bikes by on-demand platform-based instant meal delivery workers in Paris. *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, 10(4), 2280-2289.
- Kurye Hakları Derneği (2022). *Moto kurye ölümleri raporu-2022*. [<https://kuryehaklari.org/moto-kuryeolumleri-raporu-2022/>].
- Lee, D.Y. & Tsang, E.W.K. (2001). The effects of entrepreneurial personality, background and network activities on venture growth. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(4), 583-602.
- Lehdonvirta, V. (2018). Flexibility in the Gig economy: Managing Time on three online piecework platforms. new technology. *Work and Employment*, 33(1), 13- 29.
- Lepanjuuri, K., Wishart R., & Cornick P. (2018). *The characteristics of those in the Gig Economy final report*. <https://apo.org.au/node/244361>.
- Littunen, H. (2000). Entrepreneurship and the characteristics of entrepreneurial personality. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship behaviour and Research*, 6(6), 296-309.
- Luca, M. R. (2017). Entrepreneurial personality and entrepreneurial behaviour. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braşov Series VII: Social Sciences*, 10(59), 19-28.

- Maslow, A.H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. Harper&Row,Publishers, Inc.:USA.
- McClelland, D.C. (1976). *The Achieving Society*.(2nd Edition). New York, Irvington Publishers, Inc.
- McClelland, D.C. (1987). Characteristics of successful entrepreneurs.*The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 21(3), 219-233.
- Mirza, Ş. & Demiral, G. (2019). Kişilik özelliklerinin girişimcilik eğilimleri üzerindeki etkileri ve yüksek lisans öğrencileri üzerinde bir uygulama. *İşletme Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 11 (4), 3256-3268.
- Mitchell, J., Xiao, L., & Decker, P. (2021). Gig workers' financial confidence and behavior. *Global Journal of Accounting & Finance (GJAF)*, 2021, 5 (2),88.
- Mueller, S.L. & Thomas, A.S. (2000). Culture and entrepreneurial potential: A nine country study of locus of control and innovativeness. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 51-75.
- Mpofu, T., Tsibolane, P., Heeks, R., Van Belle, JP,. (2020). Risks and risk-mitigation strategies of GIG economy workers in the global south: The case of ride-hailing in Cape Town. In *Information and Communication Technologies for Development*, (eds.: Julian M. Bass &P. J. Wall),26-38.
- Olson, D.E. (2000). The role of entrepreneurial personality characteristic on entry decisions in a simulated market, *USASBE/SBIDA*, 1-13.
- Ostoj, I. (2021).The Logic of Gig Economy (Origins and Growth Prospects). *Studies in Logic Grammar and Rhetoric*, 66(4), 451-462.
- Ören, K. & Biçkes, M. (2011). Kişilik özelliklerinin girişimcilik potansiyeli üzerindeki etkileri (Nevşehir'deki yüksek öğrenim öğrencileri üzerinde yapılan bir araştırma). *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*,16(3), 67-86.
- Öz, İ. (2023). Platform ekonomisinde kolektif eylemi yeniden düşünmek: Trendyol ve Yemeksepeti kuryelerinin eylemleri. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi*, 21(82), 87-116.
- Özcan, B., Çelteç, E.E., Sönmez, N. & Kırım, B. (2018). girişimci kişilik özelliklerinin ve girişimcilik eğitiminin girişimcilik eğilimine etkisi- Kocaeli Üniversitesi Örneği. *UIİİD-IJEAS*, (18. EYİ Special Issue), 37-54.
- Öztan, E. & Özkaplan, N. (2021). *Pandemi Koşullarında Hizmet Sektöründe Çalışanların Beklentileri: Alışveriş Merkezi Çalışanları, Moto Kuryeler ve Özel Güvenlik Görevlileri*. İstanbul Planlama Ajansı- İstanbul, İPA Enstitü.
- Pickle, H. B. (1968). *Personality and success: An evaluation of personal charactetistics of successful small business managers*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Small Business Administration.
- Pink, D.H. (2009). *Drive*. New York, Riverhead Books.
- Robinson, P.B.,Stimpson, D.V., Huefner, J.C. & Hunt, H.K. (1991). An attitude approach to the prediction of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 15(4),13-31.
- Rotter, J. B. (1954). *Social learning and clinical psychology*. New Jersey,Prentice-Hall.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80(1), 1-20.
- Rauch, A. & Frese, M. (2007) Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: A meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 16(4), 353-385.

- Schere, J. L. (1982). Tolerance of ambiguity as a discriminating variable between entrepreneurs and managers. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1982(1), 404–408.
- Sexton, D.L. & Bowman, N. (1983). Determining entrepreneurial potential of students. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1983(1), 408-412.
- Sexton, D.L. & Bowman, N. (1985). The entrepreneur: A capable executive and more. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 1(1), 129-140.
- Sexton, D.L., & Bowman-Upton, N.B. (1986). Validation of personality index: Comparative psychological characteristics analysis of female entrepreneurs, managers, entrepreneurship students and business students. R. Ronstadt, J. Hornaday, R. Peterson, and K. Vesper, eds., In *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College.
- Shane, S., Locke, E.A. and Collins, C. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13, 257-79.
- Shaver, K. G. & Scott, L. R. (1991). Person, process, choice: The psychology of new venture creation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(2), 23–45.
- Sherk, J. (2016). The rise of the “GIG” economy: good for workers and consumers. *The Heritage Foundation*, 7, 1-8.
- Shimoli, S. M., Cai, W., Naqvi, M. H. A. & Lang, Q., (2020). Entrepreneurship success traits. Do Kenyans possess the desired entrepreneur personality traits for enhanced Entrepreneurship? Case study of Kenyan students in the People’s Republic of China. *Cogent Business & Management*, 7 (1), 1-17.
- Shapira, Z. (1994). *Risk-taking: A managerial perspective*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Slovic, P. (1964). Assessment of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 61(3), 220–233.
- Smith, D.J. (1974). *Discovering Horse-Drawn Carriages*. Shire Publications Ltd., U.K.
- Smith, D.J. (1988). *A Dictionary of Horse-Drawn Vehicles*. J. A. Allen & Co. Ltd., London.
- Straus, R. (1912). *Carriages & Coaches : Their History & Their Evolution*. London, Martin Secker.
- Şen, E. & Aslan, İ. (2017). Girişimci kişilik özelliklerinin girişimcilik eğilimi üzerine etkisi. *Journal of Social And Humanities Sciences Research*, 4(15), 1847-1855.
- Şeşen, H. & Basım, N. (2012). Demografik faktörler ve kişiliğin girişimcilik niyetine etkisi: Spor bilimleri alanında öğrenim gören üniversite öğrencileri üzerine bir araştırma. *Ege Akademik Bakış*, 12, 21-28.
- Trimpop, R.M. (1994). *The Psychology of Risk-Taking Behavior*. USA, Elsevier.
- Türkoğlu, T., Tetik, S., & Açıkgöz, A. (2017). Meslek yüksekokulu öğrencilerinin sosyo-demografik özellikleri ile girişimci kişilik özellikleri arasındaki ilişkinin araştırılması. *Journal of Yaşar University*, 12(45), 1-13.
- Uçar, M. S., Bakırcı, N. ve Harmanlı, H. (2006). İstanbul’daki motosikletli kuryelerde iş kazası niteliğindeki trafik kazaları. *TTB Mesleki Sağlık ve Güvenlik Dergisi*, 7(25). 48-52.
- Ünal, Ö., & Temiz, H. E. (2022). GİG ekonomisi bağlamında iş ilişkisinin değişen yüzü: UBER Örneği. *Çalışma Ve Toplum*, 1(72), 167-206.
- Walrond, S. (1980). *Looking at Carriages*. Pelham Books: London.
- Wonglimpiyarat, J. (2005). Does complexity affect the speed of innovation?. *Technovation*, 25, 865–882.

- Wood, S. (2013). *Generation Z as Consumers, Trends and Innovation*. <https://archive.iei.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/GenZConsumers>
- Wu, Q.,Zhang, H., Li, Z. & Liu, K. (2019). Labor control in the GIG economy: Evidence from Uber in China. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 61/4, 574-596.
- Yan, J. (2010). The impact of entrepreneurial personality traits on perception of new venture opportunity. *New England Journal of Entrepreneurship*, 13(2), 21-35.
- Yertüm, U.,& Balcı, B. (2023). Motor-kurye çalışanlarının çalışma koşullarına yönelik bir araştırma: İstanbul Örneği. *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*,18(2),328-350.
- Yıldırım, M.H., Demirel, Y. & İçerli, L. (2011). İşletme sahibi yöneticilerin girişimci kişilik özellikleri ile girişimcilik becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin tespiti: Aksaray Örneği. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 189-199.
- Yurgiden, H. (2023). Türkiye’de GIG ekonomisinin işgücü piyasasına etkisi: İşin olsun örneği. *R&S-Research Studies Anatolia Journal*, 6(4). 452-472.
- Yüksel, H., Cevher, E. & Yüksel, M. (2015). Öğrencilerin girişimci kişilik özellikleri ile girişimcilik eğilimleri üzerine bir araştırma. *Çankırı Karatekin Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 5(1), 143-156.



© Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY NC) license.
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).