

Social, Cultural, Emotional Intelligence and Entrepreneurial Intention: A Research on Generation Z

Güven ORDUN¹ Cem Güney ÖZVEREN² Kamil MERCİMEK³

Abstract

In terms of this study, cultural, emotional, social intelligence and entrepreneurial tendency of the Z generation were examined and the effect of cultural, social and emotional intelligence on the entrepreneurial tendency was examined. In Turkey, 2563 Z generation participants from seven regions were reached, also the means for each region were shown separately. In Turkey, it has been understood that emotional intelligence in general affects entrepreneurship tendency more than social intelligence and cultural intelligence. The different means found as a result of statistical analyzes specific to Marmara, Aegean, Mediterranean, Central Anatolia, Black Sea, Eastern Anatolia and Southeastern Anatolia regions are remarkable. The relevant data for the research was collected by using the phone application. The received data was analyzed with SPSS. Based on the results of the analysis, it was determined that the average of Social Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence and Entrepreneurship Tendency of the Z generation participants throughout Turkey was above the average level. Among the Z generation participants, the emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence of those living in the Mediterranean Region were found to be significantly higher than those living in other regions. It was understood that the emotional intelligence of the participants was the most influential factor on the entrepreneurial tendency, also it was concluded that the participants with the highest score entrepreneurial tendency lived in the Aegean Region.

Keywords: Social Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence, Entrepreneurial Intention, Generation Z

Sosyal, Kültürel Duygusal Zeka ve Girişimcilik Eğilimi: Z Kuşağı Üzerine Bir Araştırma

Öz

Bu çalışmada Z kuşağının kültürel zekası, duygusal zekası, sosyal zekası ve girişimcilik eğilimi incelenmiş, kültürel, sosyal ve duygusal zekanın girişimcilik eğilimi üzerine etkisi araştırılmıştır. Türkiye genelinde yedi bölgeden Z kuşağı 2563 bireye ulaşılmış, her bir bölge için ortalamalar ayrı ayrı gösterilmiştir. Türkiye özelinde genel olarak duygusal zekanın, sosyal zeka ve kültürel zekaya kıyasla girişimcilik eğilimini daha fazla etkilediği anlaşılmıştır. Marmara, Ege, Akdeniz, İç Anadolu, Karadeniz, Doğu Anadolu ve Güneydoğu Anadolu bölgeleri özelinde yapılan istatistik analizler sonucu bulunan farklı ortalamalar ise dikkat çekicidir. Araştırma için ilgili data telefon uygulaması kullanılarak toplanmıştır. Veriler SPSS ile analiz edilmiştir. Yapılan analiz sonuçlarından hareketle, Türkiye genelinde Z kuşağı katılımcıların sosyal zeka, kültürel zeka, duygusal zeka ve girişimcilik eğilimi ortalamalarının orta düzeyin üzerinde olduğu saptanmıştır. Z kuşağı katılımcılardan Akdeniz Bölgesi'nde yaşayanların duygusal zekası ve kültürel zekası diğer bölgelerde yaşayan katılımcılara göre anlamlı ölçüde yüksek bulunmuştur. Katılımcıların duygusal zekasının girişimcilik eğilimi üzerinde en fazla etkili olan faktör olduğu anlaşılmış olup, girişimcilik eğilimi ortalaması en yüksek olan katılımcıların Ege Bölgesi'nde yaşadığı sonucuna varılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Zeka, Kültürel Zeka, Duygusal Zeka, Girişimcilik Eğilimi, Z Kuşağı

¹ Doç. Dr. İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı, Orcid No: 0000-0002-8535-9594

² Arş. Gör. Dr. İstanbul Üniversitesi İşletme Fakültesi Örgütsel Davranış Anabilim Dalı, Orcid No: 0000-0001-9435-6662

³ 25 Proje Teknoloji Orcid:0000-0001-5937-3977

Introduction

It is obvious that individuals born after 2000 and named as Generation Z will form a significant part of the business world very soon. This undeniable fact leads us to the question of what are the main features that distinguish the generation Z youth from other generations. The most important difference of the generation Z from other generations is that they have used the internet intensively and are still using it.

In terms of the management and psychology literature, a lot of studies are conducted about generations generational differences. Recently, it has been observed that the intention towards Generation Z has increased, and the values, habits and other characteristics of the generation Z youth continue to be investigated. According to Gardner's Theory, there are multiple intelligent styles are seven intelligent area as (Brualdi Timmins, 1996:100): Naturalistic, Logical, Bodily, Linguistic, Spatial, Musical and relational. These aeach area need some important abilities and many of them are related with social, emotional and cultural intelgence. These intelligence areas are found as related with many of jobs. While exaimining the theoretical framework of entrepreneurship, it can be understood that most of the intellegence areas are related with entrepreneurial ability. In terms of this study, only social, emotional and cultural intelligence and their effect on entrepreneurial intention will be examined.

As it is known, healthy economical situations can be maintained with high entrepreneurship actions. Many countries in the world, especially the USA, support entrepreneurship because economies with a low number of entrepreneurs are called cumbersome economies in terms of many theorists. The rule of "big fish eats small fish" has changed to "fast fish eats slow fish" in today's business world. Therefore, there is a significant need for entrepreneurs in order to catch up with technological developments quickly and to provide competitive advantage. At this point, on behalf of our country, it is a promising situation that the entrepreneurial intention of the young people who will manage the economy in the future is high. Therefore, the aim of this study is primarily to reveal the situation in Turkey and to contribute to the relevant institutions and future research on the potential actions to be taken.

1.The Concept of Intelligence: Emotional, Cultural and Social Intellegence

Although the concept of intelligence is as old as human history in terms of its meaning, it was possible to emerge as a concept, to be examined and categorized much later. The concept of intelligence includes some kind of abilities, motivation or power as well as understanding the related knowledge about motivation (Wagner and Sternberg, 1985) and the goal-setting about them (Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Hilgard, 1980; Mayer, 1995; Sutarso, 1998:18).

According to the study as carried out in 1921; intelligence have three elements as (Sutarso, 1998:19):

- Some abilities about problem solving, mental representation and decision making
- Ability for learning
- Adaptation to meet the demands of the environment effectively

In the organizational behavior literature, there are some studies examining the relationship between multiple intelligence skills and entrepreneurial tendencies. According to Gardner's Theory, there are multiple intelligent styles are seven intelligent area as (Garder, 1993; Brualdi Timmins, 1996:100; White, 1998):

- Logical-Mathematical
- Naturalist intelligence
- Bodily-Kinesthetic
- Linguistic Intelligence
- Musical Intelligence
- The Personal Intelligences (Intrapersonal and Interpersonal)
- Spatial Intelligence

Although the concept of emotional intelligence is as old as human being history, it emerged as a concept in the 1990s. Salovey and Mayer (1990) were the first to introduce the concept of emotional intelligence to psychology literature. Goleman is the researcher who brought the knowledge as we know about emotional intelligence today .

According to Gardner (1993), each intellegence is related with brains lef tor right lob. For instance, musical and naturalist intelligence is related with brain's right lob, on the

other hand, logical intelligence and bodily-kinesthetic intelligence related with left lob (White, 1998).

Table 1. The Characteristics of The Left Brain and Right Brain

Left-Brain Dominance	Right-Brain Dominance
Rarely uses metaphors	Frequently uses metaphors
Remembers names	Responds to demonstrated, illustrated, or symbolic instructions
Not good at interpreting body language	Favors intuitive problem solving
Responds to verbal instruction	Intuitive
Controls feelings	More free with feelings
Experiments systematically and with control	Fluid and spontaneous
Prefers multiple-choice tests	Prefers drawing and manipulating objects
Planned and structured	More free with feelings
Prefers multiple-choice tests	Remembers faces
Favors logical problem solving	Experiments randomly and with less restraint
Intellectual	Good at interpreting body language
Reliance on language in thinking and remembering	Makes subjective judgments
	Synthesizing reader

Source: Riyadini, M. V. (2019). Improving Grade VII Students' Speaking Skills Through Integrating Pre-Communicative and Communicative Activities (Doctoral Dissertation, Yogyakarta State University (Adapted from Torrance, 1980 cited in Brown 2007:125)

As Korkmaz (2000), Demirel and Tikici (2010) argued, the "entrepreneurial personality" traits and the traits of the right side of the brain are largely related. But as understood from the related studies, the left side of the brain also affects the entrepreneurial intention of person but it can be said that right side is more related in terms of this view (Demirel, Düşükcan & Ölmez, 2011:100).

Based on the information given above, it would not be wrong to say that especially emotional intelligence, social intelligence and cultural intelligence will significantly explain the entrepreneurial intention. According to the results of the study carried out by Lüthje and Franke (2003), students with high internal locus of control and risk taking characteristics demonstrate more entrepreneurial behaviors.

Another contribution has been made by Mortan to the related literature. Mortan et al. (2014) also argued that emotional intelligence has an important effect on entrepreneurial intention.

Social intelligence is a concept that has not been completely agreed upon on its definition, and there are different opinions about its sub-dimensions from different fields. Marlowe (1986) defined social intelligence as the ability to understand the emotions, thoughts, thoughts and behaviors of people, including the person herself in interpersonal situations, and to act in accordance with this perspective.

Thorndike (1920) defines social intelligence as the ability to understand others. All of the models related to social intelligence were created on the basis of this definition. In terms of this definition, empathy has the central role. In the related literature, many of scales were shaped according to different models. An important scale was composed by Silvera et. (2001). According to Silvera et al. (2001) social intelligence has three factors as:

- Social Awareness
- Social Ability
- Social Information Process

Goleman (2007:117) categorized social intelligence in two dimensions as:

- Social Awareness
- Social Facility

Social awareness refers to the perceiving and sensing the emotions and thoughts of other people. On the other hand, social facility determines the situation as a person can understand, the emotions, thoughts and intentions of other people and can use these skills for managing his social relations (Heggstad, 2008:103).

Humphrey (2013) discussed the importance of empathy on entrepreneurial intention. People with enough level of empathy can motivate people and lead easily, so they have more probability to achieve their goals. This claim can also show the importance of emotional intelligence on entrepreneurial intention as it is known that empathy may be labeled as the most important dimension of emotional intelligence.

In terms of the study conducted by Ang, Van Dyne and Koh, (2006), motivational cultural intelligence defines the motivation of the person about learning new cultural patterns and implementing them. Behavioral Cultural Intelligence describes an individual's ability to conduct appropriate behavior when encountering with people from different cultures. According to Earley and Ang (2003), cultural intelligence refers to the ability of a person in terms of adapting to the new culture. The concept was introduced by Earley and Ang (2003)

and constructed with three dimensions. Cultural intelligence was later developed and scaled in four dimensions by Ang et al. (2007) as:

- Cognitive
- Metacognitive
- Behavioral
- Motivational

Cognitive Cultural Intelligence defines the ability of learning and analyzing of elements of a new culture (Helms et al., 2014). Metacognitive Cultural Intelligence refers to the cognitive process used for understanding new culture (Earley & Ang, 2003). In terms of definition, metacognition defines a kind of strategic ability.

2. Entrepreneurial Intention and Z Generation

Entrepreneurial intention defines the belief of being an entrepreneur. Based on our daily life experiences, it is possible to make a few correct predictions about the personality traits of entrepreneurial individuals. Being able to establish good relations with people, taking risks when appropriate, always trying to find something new, being psychologically resilient, not giving up, being determined and taking advantage of opportunities can be some of these characteristics. The studies in the literature have actually listed similar features.

The concept of entrepreneurial orientation (EO) was firstly conceptualized by Miller in 1983. According to the framework as Miller has dawn for the concept, entrepreneurship has three dimensions as (Rauch et al., 2009:763):

- Innovativeness
- Proactiveness
- Risk-Taking

Risk taking refers to the situation where the person takes action by taking responsibility even if there are many unknown issues, despite the possibility of encountering negative results. Proactiveness refers to the fact that the individual realizes and takes action before the potential problems or opportunities that may arise. Innovativeness defines the situation of having motivation for continuous research and gaining new projects.

The point to note here is that the concept put forward by Miller defines organizational entrepreneurship. However, the concept of "entrepreneurial orientation", which was

examined by Miller and later other researchers, emerged by Bolton and Lane (2012) with the application of the relevant concept on an individual basis. According to the results of the study implemented by Bolton and Lane (2012), individual Entrepreneurial orientation (EIO) also demonstrates three dimensions as risk-takin, proaktiveness and innovativeness.

According to Bridge and O'Neil (2012), we can separate the factors effect the entrepreneurial intention in two categories as internal and external factors. Internal factors refer to the features person has, external factors may be related with business environment, organization, family or others related with these factors. Genetic or other features as came from the history of the family also included in individual factors.

Korkmaz (2000), Demirel and Tikici (2010) argued, the "entrepreneurial personality" traits and the traits of the right side of the brain are largely related. But as understood from the related studies, the left side of the brain also effects the entrepreneurial intention of person but it can be said that right side is more related in terms of this view (Demirel, Düşükcan & Ölmez, 2011:100).

In terms of this knowledge, it would not be wrong to say that especially emotional intelligence, social intelligence and cultural intelligence will significantly explain the entrepreneurial intention. According the results of the study carried out by Lüthje and Franke (2003), students with high internal locus of control and risk taking characteristics demonstrate more entrepreneurial behaviors.

Entrepreneurs may have to work in different environments, different cultures, and meet new people. Within the framework of the studies and approaches in the literature, it can be said that the cultural intelligence and social intelligence of the individual will be significantly effective in coping with such situations effectively.

While examining the studies about Generation Z, it is seen that the main factor that determines it, regardless of the scientific field, is the internet. So who do we mean by Generation Z? The basic characteristics of each generation are affected by the events that occurred during their upbringing and the environmental conditions of the period. Information technologies are undoubtedly the most important factor affecting the children and young people of the generation Z who were born after 2000. Undoubtedly, the generation Z will constitute a significant part of the business world of the 21st century. The most basic feature that distinguishes generation Z from other generations is that the year they

were born started in the early 2000s and information technologies were used intensively in this period.

Table 2: General Characteristics of Generations

	Builders	Baby Boomers	Generation X	Generation Y	Generation Z
Influencers	Officers, Authority	Evidential Experts	Pragmatic Practitioner	Experiential Peers	User-generated Forums
Financial Values	Long-term saving Cash No credit	Long-term needs Cash Credit	Medium-term Goals savvy Life-stage debt	Credit wants Credit dependent Life-style deb	Impulse purchases E-Stores Life-long debt
Learning Environment	Military style Didactic & disciplined	Classroom style Quiet atmosphere	Round-table style Relaxed ambience	Cafe-Style Music & Multi-moda	Lounge room style Multi-stimulus
Purchase Influences	Brand emergence Telling	Brand-loyal Authoritie	Brand switches Experts	No Brand Loyalty Friend	Brand evangelism Trends
Ideal Leaders	Authoritarian Commanders	Commanding Thinkers	Co-ordinating Doers	Empowering Collaborator	Inspiring Co-creators

Sources: Dries N, Pepermans R, De Kerpel E (2008). Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is "satisfied" the new "successful"? J. Manage. Psychol., 23(8): 907-928. Zemke R, Raines C, Filipczak B (2000). Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers and Nexters in your workplace (2nd Ed). American Management Association, New York, NY <https://2qean3b1j1d1s87812ool5j1-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Generations-Defined-Sociologically.pdf>

As can be seen from Table 2, the first of the generations is baby boomers that was born between 1945-1965 and lived after the Second World War. The reason why this group is called baby boomer is the population increased a lot in that period (Mills, 1999).

It is also among the common estimates that the generation Z, which grows up when the way the media disseminates news changes and the process of accessing information becomes very short, will have more difficulty understanding other generations.

According to Pratama (2019:20), baby boomers are more collectivistic, so they have tried to perform some activities about real world with together. Generation X refers to the

people as born between 1960-1979. They are obtained as more material, individualistic and and competitive. Generation Y people can be defined as more globalist and questioning. In their time, the internet was not widely used yet, but later it started to be widely used. Therefore, those born in the last years of the relevant period have had the opportunity to use the internet more. But this interaction was valid for trying to find the sources of knowledge (Pratama, 2019:20).

Generation Z is the native of the cyber world. When they were born, internet was used frequently. They have used frequently twitter, instagram, youtube etc... for interaction. They are also more mobile, give more importance to ethical issues, realistic and unlimited (Pratama, 2019:20).

Method

This study has two main reserach questions. The first one refers to whether social intelligence, cultural intelligence or emotional intelligence effect the entrepreneurial tendency of Z generation individuals more. The second question is to reveal how the averages of social intelligence, cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence and entrepreneurial tendency of generation Z individuals are distributed in seven regions in Turkey⁴.

In terms of the study, 2563 people participated to the research. All of the questions were designed according to a mobil phone application. Then anyone who wanted to participate could enter to the application but the rule for fullfilling the questionnaires was to be born after 2000 (because of being generation Z). The gathered data analzed with SPSS 25.

Entrepreneurial Intention Scale was composed by Güven Ordun by scanning the related literature and scales about entrepreneurial intention (McClelland, 1961; Brockhaus, 1980; Krueger, 2000; Ferreira et al., 2012). Before development of the scale, questions were asked to 150 people from Generation Z in terms of preliminary studies. After conducting the validation and reliability analyses, intellegence scales taken by other authors were analyzed

⁴ For this research, the Department of Ethics Committee of Istanbul University was consulted, and it was considered ethically appropriate at the meeting of the relevant department dated 07.06.2021 and numbered 06. Number of the relevant ethics committee report: 223119

with 200 people for defining whether they are reliable and valid or not. After performing related analyses, all questions were composed.

Social Intelligence Scale was developed by Silvera, Martunissan and Dahl (2001) and adapted into Turkish by Güven Ordun. In terms of the study, there were three factors as:

- social ability,
- social information process
- social awareness.

Cultural Intelligence Scale was developed by Dyne, Ang and Koh (2006) and translated into Turkish by Güven Ordun. The related scale have four factors as

- Metacognition Cultural Intelligence
- Cognitive Cultural Intelligence
- Behavioral Cultural Intelligence
- Motivational Cultural Intelligence

Emotional Intelligence Scale was developed by Schutte et al. (1998) and translated into Turkish by Güven Ordun. In terms of the study, there are four dimensions as:

- Appraisal of Emotions,
- Social Skills
- Utilisation of Emotions
- Mood Regulation

Findings

After coding the obtained data, reliability and factor analysis were conducted for each scale. In terms of Emotional Intelligence Scale, four factors were obtained and labelled as motivation, empathy, social ability and personal control. Cronbach alpha value is 0,916 and KMO value is 0,916. Table 3 demonstrates the detailed findings about the scale.

Table 3: Factor Analysis for Emotional Intelligence Scale

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE	Motivation	Empathy	Social Ability	Personal Control
I don't find that being in a positive mood helps me come up with new ideas	.690			

I motivate myself by imagining a good outcome to tasks I take on	.666	
When I am in a positive mood, solving problems is easy for me.	.629	
I generally don't expect good things to happen	.592	
I generally expect to fail when I try something new	.565	
When I feel a change in emotions, I tend to come up with new ideas	.558	
I seek out activities that make me happy.	.555	
When my mood changes I see new possibilities	.555	
I know what other people are feeling just by looking at them	.764	
I tend to misread peoples' facial expressions	.727	
I find it hard to tell how someone is feeling from their tone of voice.	.696	
I find it hard to understand the non-verbal messages of other people	.503	
I prefer to keep my emotions private.	.656	
I help other people feel better when they are down	.620	
When another person tells me about an important event in his or her life, I almost feel as though I have experienced the event myself.	.570	
I compliment others when they have done something well	.562	
I arrange events others enjoy	.555	
I easily recognize my emotions as I experience them	.733	
I find it hard to control my emotions	.712	
I often don't know why my emotions changes	.666	
When I experience a positive emotion, I know how to make it last.	.505	

In terms of Social Intelligence Scale, three factors were obtained and labelled as social ability, social information processing and social awareness as these factor analytic structure is the same of the original of the study. empathy, social ability and personal control. Cronbach alpha value is 0,836 and KMO value is 0,855. Table 4 demonstrates the detailed findings about the scale.

Table 4: Factor Analysis for Social Intelligence Scale

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE	Social		
	Information Process	Social Awareness	Social Ability
I can anticipate the desires and wishes of others	.746		
I can predict how others will react to my behavior towards them.	.718		
I can understand other people's feelings	.713		
I can predict the behavior of others	.712		
I can understand what other people actually want to say from factors such as facial expressions and body language.	.700		
I can understand what others are trying to achieve before talking to them	.694		
I know how my actions will create feelings on others.	.646		
People's reactions to my actions surprises me.		.742	
People surprise me with their behavior		.659	
I find people incomprehensible		.638	
I can hurt others without realizing it		.629	
Others may get angry at me without giving me a chance to explain why.		.627	
I have trouble understanding other people's judgment		.563	
I have had a hard time getting along with others		.517	
It takes a lot of time for me to really get to know others.		.477	
I easily adapt to social environments			.871
I have difficulty in entering new environments and meeting people.			.857
I'm good at making friends with new people			.827
I have trouble finding conversation topics when I'm with people			.454

In terms of Cultural Intelligence Scale, four factors were obtained and labelled as metacognition, cognitive, bahavioral and motivational cultural intelligence. as this factor analytic structure is the same of the original of the study. Cronbach alpha value is 0,923 and KMO value is 0,942. Table 5 demonstrates the detailed findings about the scale.

Table 5: Factor Analysis for Cultural Intelligence

Cultural Intellegence	Cognitive	Motiv.	Beh.	Meta-cog.
I know the marriage systems of other cultures	.756			
I know the non-verbal communication rules and structures of other cultures	.728			

I know the cultural values and belief systems of other cultures	.716	
I know the arts and crafts of other cultures	.715	
I know the legal and economic systems and rules of other cultures	.659	
I know the rules (vocabulary, grammar, etc.) of other cultures	.620	
I enjoy living in cultures that are unfamiliar to me		.782
I enjoy interacting with people from different cultures		.724
I feel confident in socializing with the citizens of that country in a foreign culture		.713
I am confident in adapting to the shopping habits of a different culture		.691
I can cope with the stress of adapting to another culture		.688
I can adapt my facial expression to the requirements of the situation when necessary for intercultural communication.		.741
I can change my non-verbal behavior (expression, body language, etc.) when necessary for intercultural communication.		.739
I use pause and silence differently to suit different cross-cultural situations.		.724
18. I vary the rate of my speaking when a cross-cultural situation requires.		.678
I change my verbal behavior (accent, tone of voice, etc.) when a cross-cultural situation requires it.		.473
I am aware of my cultural knowledge when interacting with people from different cultures		.772
I am aware of the cultural knowledge I have in intercultural interactions		.768
I adjust my cultural knowledge when communicating with people unfamiliar with my own culture.		.695
I check the accuracy of my cultural knowledge as I interact with people from different cultures.		.646

The developed entrepreneurial intention scale by Güven Ordun demonstrated three factors as innovation, power and stability. Cronbach Value is 0,723 and KMO value is 0,840. Table 6 demonstrates the detail values below:

Table 6: Factor Analysis for Entrepreneurial Intelligence Scale

Entrepreneurial Intelligence	Novelty	Power	Determination
I look for new opportunities to reach my dreams	.763		
I want to develop new and different ideas	.751		
I enjoy experiencing new and different things (food, different places)	.732		
I like to discover new places in my travels	.713		
I would like to have a job where I can use my creativity	.653		
I would like to be in a position of high authority		.454	
I prefer to be the owner of my own business rather than being a top manager in an institution.		.780	
I want to be my own boss rather than a job that offers me job security		.732	
You can only earn a lot of money if you can start your own business.		.670	
I seek independence in working life		.616	
I would like to have the decision-making power		.516	
I think that there is not much I can do about the events I encounter.			.673
It is very difficult to find an idea that has not been thought before.			.646
The economic system does not support new enterprises			.586
It makes it difficult to establish and manage a business with laws and regulations.			.580

After conducting factor and reliability analysis, correlation analysis were performed for understanding the relations between variables. Table 7 shows the correlation table:

Table 7: Correlation Table

	Ent. Intention Novelty	Ent. Intention Power	Ent. Determination	Ent. Intention
EI Motivational	,541**	,250**	,214**	,482**
EI Emphaty	,392**	,181**	,119**	,331**
EI Social Ability	,380**	,135**	,136**	,308**
EI Personal Control	,306**	,172**	,163**	,312**
Emotional Intelligence	,517**	,236**	,203**	,459**
SI Social Information Process	,429**	,226**	,117**	,370**

SI Social Awareness	,148**	-,040*	,429**	,269**
SI Social Ability	,338**	,143**	,219**	,340**
Social Intelligence	,411**	,148**	,346**	,441**
CI Cognitive	,249**	,120**	,034	,191**
CI Motivational	,473**	,168**	,158**	,378**
CI Behavioral	,468**	,158**	,174**	,379**
CI Meta Cognitive	,460**	,185**	,153**	,380**
Cultural Intelligence	,505**	,193**	,159**	,406**

(* Correlation significant at ,05 level; ** Correlation significant ,01level; EI: Emotional Intelligence, SI: Social Intelligence, CI: Cultural Intelligence, Ent.: Entrepreneurial)

In terms of the study, means of intellegences and entrepreneurial intention were analyzed and compated eachother. Table 8 shows the related statistic

Table 8: Means of Each Region in terms of the Variables

	Marmara	Mediterranean	Aegean	Central Anatolia	Southeastern Anatolia	Black Sea	Eastern Anatolia	Turkey Average
EI Motivational	4,21	4,13	4,17	4,08	4,04	4,11	4,14	4,14
EI Emphaty	4,03	4,08	4,02	3,99	3,98	4,17	4,03	4,03
EI Social Ability	3,88	3,88	3,82	3,68	3,80	3,97	3,85	3,85
EI Personal Control	3,90	3,90	3,82	3,81	3,70	3,70	3,84	3,84
Emotional Intelligence	4,00	4,00	3,96	3,89	3,88	3,99	3,97	3,97
SI Social Information Process	3,91	3,96	3,94	3,89	3,86	4,09	3,93	3,93
SI Social Awareness	3,32	3,21	3,29	3,17	3,14	2,98	3,27	3,27
SI Social Ability	3,71	3,58	3,67	3,70	3,66	3,69	3,67	3,67
Social Intelligence	3,65	3,58	3,63	3,59	3,55	3,59	3,63	3,63
Ent. Intention Novelty	4,55	4,53	4,51	4,48	4,47	4,52	4,51	4,51
Ent. Intention Power	3,83	3,82	3,84	3,89	3,92	3,78	3,83	3,83
Ent. Determination	3,13	3,09	3,24	3,15	2,92	3,07	3,13	3,13
Ent. Intention	3,84	3,81	3,86	3,84	3,77	3,79	3,83	3,83
CI Cognitive	3,24	3,29	3,22	3,15	3,06	3,28	3,23	3,23
CI Motivational	3,98	3,95	3,98	3,93	3,88	3,83	3,98	3,98
CI Behavioral	4,05	4,06	4,02	3,99	3,90	4,14	4,02	4,02
CI Meta Cognitive	4,01	4,09	4,06	3,98	3,87	4,17	4,02	4,02
Cultural Intelligence	3,82	3,85	3,82	3,76	3,68	3,85	3,81	3,81

Generation Z youth people from Aegean but participants from Blacksea has the lowest point. In terms of Social Intelligence, young people from Mediterrean took the highest score and participants from Blacksea have the lowest score. While examining cultural intelligence score, participants from Aegean have the highest score and participants from Black Sea have the lowest score. In terms of Entrepreneurial Intention, participants from Central Mediterrean have the highest score. In terms of the intelligences and entrepreneurial intention, it is understood that means of Generation Z noticeably have low score in terms of Social Intelligence, so this is an issue that needs to be addressed.

Discussion

Within the framework of this study, the means of social intelligence, cultural intelligence, emotional intelligence and entrepreneurial intention of Z generation participants were examined and it was tried to determine which type of intelligence had more effect on the entrepreneurial intention of young people. Considering the analyzes made specifically for the regions, it was concluded that emotional intelligence affects entrepreneurship intention more than social intelligence and cultural intelligence. This result is consistent with the studies carried out in the related literature.

Aegen Region is the place where entrepreneurial intention of Generation Z participants is highest. It is an issue that should be emphasized that the social intelligence of the Z generation participants living in the Marmara Region is higher compared to other regions. It is thought that these differences are significantly affected by the socio-demographic structure and cultural point of view of the Marmara, also it is understood that a more detailed research is needed at this point.

In order to support entrepreneurial intention, it can be stated that training programs aimed at raising awareness for different cultures and promoting cultural values and habits will support the entrepreneurial tendency. Considering the means that emerged in our country, it is obvious that trainings to develop social skills should also be given. Thus, the entrepreneurial tendency of the Z generation will also be significantly positively affected.

The fact that the means of Social Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Emotional Intelligence and Entrepreneurial Intention were high but social intelligence level is above the average throughout Turkey. The fact that the study was conducted during the Covid-19 period may have affected these results, but it was understood that more research should be conducted on this subject. Because the picture that emerged as a result of the analysis of these data obtained from 2563 participants shows the potential to reveal negative results both materially and morally for the future of our country. The large difference in the number of participants between some regions can be considered as a limitation of the research.

We declare that there is no conflict of interest between the authors for this study. This work has not received support from any organization such as public, commercial or non-profit organizations. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants comply with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and

the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. Informed consent form was obtained from all individual participants who participated in the exercise. While preparing the article, publication ethics were complied with.

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author declares that there is no conflict of interest. For this research, the Department of Ethics Committee of Istanbul University was consulted, and it was considered ethically appropriate at the meeting of the relevant department dated 07.06.2021 and numbered 06. Number of the relevant ethics committee report: 223119

References

- Ang, S., Van, D. L. & Koh, C. (2006). Personality correlates of the four-factor model of cultural intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31(1), 100-123.
- Ang, S., Van, D. L., Koh, C., NG, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C. & Chandrasekar, A. (2007). Cultural intelligence: Its measurement and effects on cultural judgment and decision making, cultural adaptation and task performance, *Management and Organization Review*, 3(3), 335-371.
- Bolton, D. L., & Lane, M. D. (2012). Individual entrepreneurial orientation: Development of a measurement instrument. *Education + Training*, 54(2/3), 219-233.
- Brockhaus, R.H. (1980), Risk taking propensity of entrepreneurs, *Academy of Management Journal*, 23(3), 509-520.
- Bridge, S., and O'Neil, K. (eds) (2013), *Understanding enterprise, entrepreneurship and small business* Palgrave-Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Brualdi Timmins, A. C. (1996). Multiple intelligences: Gardner's theory. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 5(10), 1-3.
- Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J. F. (1987). *Personality and Social Intelligence*. Prentice Hall.
- Demirel, E. T., Düşükcan, M., & Ölmez, M. (2011). Çoklu zekâ alanlarının girişimcilik davranışına etkisi. *Organizasyon ve Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 3(2), 97-105.
- Dries N, Pepermans R, De Kerpel E (2008). *Exploring four generations' beliefs about career: Is "satisfied" the new "successful"?* J. Manage. Psychol., 23(8), 907-928.
- Early, P. C. & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*, California: Stanford University Pres.
- Ferreira, J. J., Raposo, M. L., Rodrigues, R. G., Dinis, A., & do Paço, A. (2012). A model of entrepreneurial intention: An application of the psychological and behavioral approaches. *Journal of small business and enterprise development*. 19(3), 424-440
- Gardner, H. (1993) *Multiple intelligences: the theory in practice* (New York, Basic Books).
- Goleman, D. (2007). *Social intelligence*. Random house.
- Heggstad, E. D. (2008). A really big picture view of social intelligence: Social intelligence: The New Science of Human Relationships. Goleman, D. New York: Bantam Dell, 2006. 403pp. ISBN: 0-553-80352-2, \$28. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 90(1), 102-104.
- Helms, M. M., Rutti, R. M., Lorenz, M., Ramsey, J. & Armstrong, C. E. (2014). A quest for global entrepreneurs: The importance of cultural intelligence on commitment to entrepreneurial education, *International Journal of Entrepreneurship And Small Business*, 23(3), 385-404.
- Hilgard, E. R. (1980). The trilogy of mind: cognition, affection, and conation. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 16, 107-117.
- Humphrey, R. H. (2013, The benefits of emotional intelligence and empathy to entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 3(3), 287-294.

- Korkmaz, S. (2000). Girişimcilik ve üniversite öğrencilerinin girişimcilik özelliklerinin belirlenmesine yönelik bir çalışma. *Hacettepe Üniv. İ.İ.B.F. Dergisi*, 18(1), 163-179.
- Krueger, N.F. (2000), The cognitive infrastructure of opportunity recognition, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 5-23.
- Lüthje, C. & Franke, N. (2003). The making of an entrepreneur: Testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT”, *R&D Management*, 33(2), 135-147.
- Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 78(1), 52-58.
- Mayer, J. D. (1995). A framework for the classification of personality components. *Journal of Personality*, 63(4), 819-878.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961), *The achieving society*, D. Van Nostrand, Princeton, NJ
- Mills, T. L. (1999), When grandchildren grow up: Role transition and family solidarity among baby boomer grandchildren and their grandparents, *Journal of Aging Studies*, Summer, 13(2), 219-239.
- Mortan, R. A., Ripoll, P., Carvalho, C. & Bernal, M. C. (2014). Effects of emotional intelligence on entrepreneurial intention and self-efficacy, *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, (30), 97-104.
- Pratama, H. (2019). *Linguistic Politeness in Online Communication*. LPMM
- Rauch, A., Wiklund, J., Lumpkin, G. T., & Frese, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial orientation and business performance: An assessment of past research and suggestions for the future. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(3), 761-787.
- Riyadini, M. V. (2019). *Improving grade VII students' speaking skills through integrating pre-communicative and communicative activities* (Doctoral Dissertation, Yogyakarta State University).
- Salovey P & Mayer JD (1990) *Emotional intelligence. imagination, cognition and personality*, 9, 185-211.
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T., Golden, C. J., & Dornheim, L. (1998). Development & validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and individual differences*, 25(2), 167-177.
- Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The tromsø social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313–319.
- Sutarso, P. (1998). *Gender differences on the emotional intelligence inventory (EQI)*. The University of Alabama.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). *Intelligence and its uses*. Harper's magazine.
- Wagner, R. K., & Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Practical intelligence in real-world pursuits: The role of tacit knowledge. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 49(2), 436-458.
- White, J. (1998) Perspectives on education policy: do Howard Gardner's multiple intelligences add up? (London, Institute of Education).
- Zemke R, Raines C, Filipczak B (2000). Generations at work: Managing the clash of Veterans, Boomers, Xers and Nexters in your workplace (2nd Ed). *American Management Association*, New York, NY.