JOURNAL OF CHANGDE TEACHERS UNIVERSITY-NATURAL SCIENCE EDITION
ISSN: 1009-3818
October 2015. PP. 122-131

Research Paper Received Aug. 14, 2015 Revised Sep. 15, 2015 Accepted Sep. 27, 2015

The Comparison of Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University

Naser Behroozy*[1], Alireza Hajiyakhchali[1], Maryamy Ebrahimyqalaee[2] and Moosa Javdan[3]

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran
2. MA in Educational Psychology, Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz, Ahvaz, Iran
3. Assistant Professor, Department of Humanistic Sciences, Hormozgan University, BandarAbass, Iran

*Correspond author: Behroozy N.

Abstract The purpose of this study was to investigate situation compare the creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University. The statistical population of this was to research included all Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University during the academic year of 2012-2013. The research subjects consisted of 150 Shahid Chamran and Tehran University selected randomly by multi-stage sampling and 150 Shahid Chamran University matched (on grade and faculty) A sample of 100 people from both University evenly Moreover used to assess reliability test was used. To collect data, Questionnaires Creative, Vandn Brook and Cools Innovation Inventory (2007) and comprehensive standard entrepreneurship were used. Two levels of inferential and descriptive statistics by the use of SPSS software have been performed to analyses the data. attention to averages, there is not a so much difference between Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University in term of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship its components. The results of multivariate of variance showed that there is not a significant difference between Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University in term of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship its components.

Keywords: Creativity, Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Introduction

Changes and developments in the wider cultural, social and economic problems and to seek new and it have created new expectations for education systems. To overcome the current challenges require a creative, innovative and entrepreneurial in society. In fact, creativity is a condition of survival for all societies. Creativity and innovation as well as a new phenomenon role in the development of the country in all fields. Creative researchers in their study of the views of individual variables to the variables developed. They found that the opportunities by removing constraints and to provide incentives for innovation (Mumford and Gustafsson, 1988). So creativity and innovation as a new phenomenon, an effective role in the development of the country in all fields. The process of applying innovative science to move from a simple view of the current approach has introduced more dynamic and interactive. Currently, the countries on the path towards an economy based on innovation efforts. In such an economy led by the process of innovation and technology development in universities, the universities, enterprises (industry organizations) to drive innovation, they play an important role in the implementation of the

National Innovation System and innovation as an engine introduced (Bagherinejad, 2010).

To most economic thinkers, entrepreneurship is the main source of job creation and growth. Refers to an individual entrepreneur to take risks, the business chose to organize and take action based on specific skills, knowledge and energy to do (according to the police Jahangiri Saghafy, 2008). Harper 3 (1998) believes that entrepreneurial alertness and the ability to alert and date of conception is not exploitation. (Quoted from Mynyty Nardvn 4 and 5, 2007). New, Zhang and Yang (2007) The relationship between inductive reasoning and creativity in the Hong Kong and US students studied. The results of the study showed a significant relationship between deductive reasoning and creativity was observed. In addition, Hong Kong and American students in creative writings and problem-solving tasks, a significant difference. The practical results of this research can help universities to be aware of the creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in their students, the necessary measures to improve the creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship do. The researchers in this study sought to determine the status of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in Tehran University and martyr Chamran to clarify the current state of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, the basis for future planning to improve it provides.Like martyr Chamran University in three different variable?

The general hypothesis

there is no difference between Shahid Chamran University students and Tehran University students in creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship

Sub-hypothesis

There is no difference between Shahid Chamran University students and Tehran University students in creativity.

There is no difference between Shahid Chamran University students and Tehran University students in innovation.

There is no difference between Shahid Chamran University students and Tehran University students in entrepreneurship.

Methodology

This research method is descriptive and expose-facto which the study was to compare the creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in Tehran University and Shahid Chamran University. The study of population consists of all undergraduate students at Tehran University and Shahid Chamran University who are studying in the academic year 2014-2015. Sampling procedure was performed in two ways:

A. (sampling to validate the questionnaire). First to examine the validity and reliability of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship sample of 100 students (50 students Shahid Chamran University and 50 students from Tehran University) with a multi-stage random sampling method was used. That destroyed all the schools of both the University of five Schools (Science, Literature and Humanities, Mathematics and Computer Science, Engineering and Education and psychology) were selected randomly. Then the two major schools were selected randomly. And then, of course, 5 were selected randomly. After sampling, Abedi creativity questionnaire (1993), innovation and Vandn Cools Brook (2007) and entrepreneurship was conducted on them. Finally, 100 questionnaires were completed fully by the participants.

B. (samples for testing hypotheses). This part of the study sample included 300 male and female students from both undergraduate and Shahid Chamran Tehran University, which has been

selected by multistage random sampling method. First, remove all the schools of Tehran University 5 School (Science, Literature and Humanities, Mathematics and Computer Science, Engineering and Education and psychology) were selected randomly. Then the two major schools were selected randomly. And then, of course, 30 students were selected randomly. And exemplifies the volume of 150 male and female students respectively. Then, Shahid Chamran University in order to match the colleges and courses that were selected at Tehran University was used in the previous sampling, the sample was chosen and exemplifies the volume of 150 students and boys were selected randomly. And finally, both the University exemplifies the 300 male and female students were selected.

Research Tools:

1. Abedi creativity questionnaire (Q CA).
2. Inventory Cools innovation and Vandn Brook ((V. B and CII).
3. Comprehensive questionnaires entrepreneurship (EDI).

Abedi creativity questionnaire: In the present study, to measure the creativity of Abedi creativity questionnaire (1993) was used. The question of the questionnaire four components of a fluid, innovative, flexible and extensible measures. Each question has three choices to score from 1 to 3 are indicative of the low level of creativity too much. Abedi (1993) the basic form tests on 650 third grade high school students in Tehran launched. He used to retest reliability coefficients fluid, initiative, flexibility and expansion, respectively, 0.85, 0.82, 0.84 and 0.80 has reported. Sheheni Yeilaq, Sohrabi and Shokrkon (2005), (1996), Haji Yakhchali (2010), Haqiqat (1998) and Shams Nia, Ahmadi, and Afshar (2011) The reliability of the questionnaire using Cronbach's alpha reported favorable. Table 1 reliability coefficients Abedi creativity questionnaire in this study three Cronbach's alpha, Spearman-Brown split half and Gutman at Chamran University and Tehran University.

Table 1. Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability coefficients of the questionnaire creativity in the students according to university study.

components	Shahid Chamran University Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha Tehran University	Split-half Spearman Shahid Chamran	Split-half Spearman Tehran University	Guttman split-halfShahid Chamran	Guttman split-half Tehran University
Creativity	0.85	0.77	0.84	0.82	0.91	0.86
Total of creativity mark	0.90		0.84		0.91	

In this research, creativity and reliability of its subscales, using Cronbach's alpha, Spearman-Brown split half Gutman in the total number of students at both universities are satisfactory. That means that the more desirable a more near and the 0.50 are not good. Abedi (1993) validity of the questionnaire was also performed on students in Tehran. He correlated the scores of the two test validity coefficient found 0.36. Sheheni yeilaq and colleagues (2005), B. (1996), Haji Yakhchali (2010), Shams Nia et al (2011) obtained the validity of the questionnaire in different ways and it was ideal. In this research through the questionnaire correlated with the questionnaire criterion validity coefficients obtained the results in Table 2, are provided.

Table 2. Shows the creativity and validity criterion validity coefficients in the separation of university students in study

variable	Shahid Chamran University	Tehran University
Total creativity mark	0.63	0.60

Inventory Cools innovation and Vandn Brook: The questionnaire innovation by Cools and Vandn Brook (2007) is made. This tool is a pencil-paper self-report scale that has 18 female subjects to one of five options strongly disagrees, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree response-up. This option is based on the values 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are scoring.

This questionnaire has three components (knowing style style design and creation of) the measures. The reliability of the questionnaire by Cools and Vandn Brook (2007) with Cronbach's alpha in the study were as follows: style know, 0.73, 0.76, 0.76, light projection, respectively 0.81, 0.82, 0.85, style creation, respectively, 0.79, .79, 0.78, style creation, respectively, 0.79, 0.79, 0.78 and innovation score 0.85, .0.79, 0.85. Also, Haji glacier (2010) in a study on 199 students of Shahid Chamran, the reliability of the questionnaire into three Cronbach's alpha, Spearman-Brown split half and Guttmann for a total score of innovation to the 0.90, .0.83 and 0.82 has reported. Table 3, the coefficient of innovation in reliability study of three Cronbach's alpha, Spearman-Brown split half and Gutman at Chamran University and Tehran University shows Shahid Chamran.

Table 3. Cools innovation and reliability coefficients Vandn Brook Cronbach's alpha and split-half total breakdown of university students to study

components	Shahid Chamran University Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha Tehran University	Split-half Spearman Shahid Chamran	Split-half Spearman Tehran University	Guttman split-halfShahid Chamran	Guttman split-half Tehran University
Innovation	0.86	0.81	0.65	0.70	0.64	0.66
Total of mark	0.88		0.90		0.91	

The concurrent validity of the questionnaire by Cools and Vandn Brook (2007) to correlate with Cognitive style test (Kurten, 1976) was calculated. Cognitive Styles correlation test to know light 0.28 = r by projecting light 0.64 = r, with the creation of light 0.64 = r and innovation with the total score of 0.55 = r, respectively (according to Haji glacier, 2010). Haji Yhakhchali (2010) in a study on 199 students of Shahid Chamran, the validity of the questionnaire correlated with Holistic thinking style Sternberg (1997) for the total score and know the style element, style, design and style creation respectively, 0.32, 0.23, 0.25, and 0.31 as well as the validity of the questionnaire through the questionnaire correlated with the total score and the criterion for knowing the elements of style, style, style, design and creation of respectively .047, .043, .033, and .045 has reported. In this research through the questionnaire correlated with coefficient criterion validity of the questionnaire obtained the results presented in Table 4.

Table 4. coefficients innovation Cools validity and criterion validity Vandn Brook and its components in the separation of university students in study

variable	Shahid Chamran University	Tehran University
innovation	0.64	0.61

Comprehensive questionnaires entrepreneurship: Questionnaires included 54 female and five subscales of entrepreneurial success, power, independence, risk-taking, creativity and determination tend to be. Zali, Madhooshi and Nayj (2007) in their study used questionnaires and Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the questionnaire reported0.62 World et al (2013) to assess the validity of the measurement tool used Cronbach's alpha test. Was estimated based on the validity 0.72 acceptable reliability .table 5, the standard questionnaire reliability coefficients of entrepreneurship in this study three Cronbach's alpha, Spearman-Brown split half and Gutman at the University Shahid Ahvaz and Tehran University shows.

Table 5. coefficients of entrepreneurship to Cronbach's alpha and split-half reliability of the standard questionnaire in all university students, according to study

components	Shahid Chamran University Cronbach's alpha	Cronbach's alpha Tehran University	Split-half Spearman Shahid Chamran	Split-half Spearman Tehran University	Guttman split-halfShahid Chamran	Guttman split-half Tehran University
entrepreneurship	0.83	0.82	0.75	0.79	0.79	0.80
Total of mark	0.82		0.83		0.86	

Zali, Madhoosh and colleagues (2007) to determine the validity of test t (T) and engineering analysis, auditing and concurrent validity of the questionnaire is 0.88 reliability is very high. In this research through the questionnaire correlated with coefficient criterion validity of the questionnaire obtained the results shown in Table 6, is presented.

Table 6. Standard validity coefficients of entrepreneurship and its components with a standard questionnaire in all university students, according to study

variable	Shahid Chamran University	Tehran University
Total mark of entrepreneurship	0.60	0.59

Results

A) **Descriptive Results:** Table 7, statistical indicators, such as mean, standard deviation indicate the subjects studied variables.

Table 7. The mean score of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University

variable	Variable statistics			
	Shahid Chamran		**Tehran University**	
creativity innovation	average	standard deviation	average	standard deviation
creativity	135.75	14.27	137.03	15.35
innovation	72.46	9.70	71.88	12.35

entrepreneurship		29.50	4.30	28.98	5.19
Dimension creativity	Fluid	51.01	6.09	51.50	6.21
	Initiative	35.47	5.24	35.68	5.09
	flexibility	26.83	3.36	26.80	3.50
	Expansion	22.43	3.67	23.04	3.68
Dimension innovation	Knowing style	15.73	3.02	16.11	3.50
	style of innovation	28.19	4.14	27.28	5.06
	projection style	28.53	4.36	28.48	5.55
Dimension entrepreneurship	entrepreneurial	7.98	1.37	7.52	1.62
	achievement Independence	2.81	1.18	2.73	1.11
	Risk acceptability	7.31	1.55	7.11	1.74
	Tend to creativity	5.72	1.54	5.82	1.78
	Determination	5.66	1.69	5.79	1.84

B) Results of the Hypotheses

Table 8 summarizes the results of the multivariate analysis of variance for comparing the means of creativity; innovation and entrepreneurship in the subjects studied variables are linked.

Table 8. Summarizes the results for the multivariate analysis of variance to compare means of creativity, innovation, entrepreneurship in Shahidr Chamran University and Tehran University.

Statistical Indicators	value	F Ratio	Df	Hypothesis Df	Error Df	P value	Chi Eta	Ability test
Pillai's trace	0.006	569	3	272	0.63	0.63	0.006	0.16
Wilks Lambda	0.99	569	3	272	0.63	0.63	0.006	0.16
Hotelling effect	0.006	569	3	272	0.63	0.63	0.006	0.16
Roys Largest Root	0.006	569	3	272	0.63	0.63	0.006	0.16

As can be seen in the table above, the hypothesis of no difference equal to the average of the Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students on the dependent variables, creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, confirmed at 0.001. This means that the Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students, in terms of any of the dependent variables, there is no significant difference. Therefore, the hypothesis that there is no difference between university research first martyr of Ahvaz and Tehran University students in terms of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship is confirmed. Table 9 shows results of univariate analysis of variance table (ANOVA) the variables on creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students shows.

Table 9. Results of univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) , variables on creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship in students Shahid Chamran and students at Tehran University

Statistical Indicators	Sum square (SS)	df	Mean of square(MS)	F Ratio	P value	Chi Eta	Ability test
creativity	18.53	1	18.53	0.81	0.36	0.002	0.1
innovation	23.16	1	23.16	0.18	0.66	0.002	0.07
entrepreneurship	112.67	1	112.67	0.47	0.49	0.003	0.14

As can be seen in the table above, the Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students, there is no significant difference in terms of creativity. Therefore, the research hypothesis is confirmed (F = 0.47 and P = 0.49). Also, Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students, there were no significant differences in terms of innovation. Therefore, the research hypothesis is confirmed (F = 0.18 and P = 0.66). And also Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students, there is no significant difference in terms of entrepreneurship. Therefore, the study also confirmed the hypothesis (F = 0.81 and P = 0.36).

Discussion

Creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship as key factors for economic development, social and cultural well-known. So much is at stake related research, so the aim of this study was to compare the creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship at the University of Ahvaz and Tehran University .

Multivariate analysis of variance and univariate results of the first hypothesis shows that Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University students, in terms of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, there is no significant difference. The mean and standard deviation of creativity Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University respectively 135.75, 15.27 and 137.03, 15.63 as well as the mean and standard deviation innovation Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University respectively 72.46, 9.79 and 71.88, 12.35 extrusion. Also, the mean and standard deviation of entrepreneurship Shahid Chamran University and Tehran University respectively 29.50, 4.30 and 28.98, 5.19 extrusion. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference one study martyr Chamran University and Tehran University students, in terms of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship, confirmed the screw. (0.63 = p). The results of this hypothesis by finding Kaufmann, Bear and jenteel(2004), Zaim (2000), Badri et al. (2006), Rezaei and Voyageur (2009), Moradi, et al (2012) Moshirabadi et al. (2013) is consistent. And the findings Torino and Bracken (1983), Zhao et al. (2005), New, Zhang and Yang (2007), Kharkharyn and Samad Poormatlabi (2008), Pirkhaefi et al. (2009), agricultural (2011), Haqiqi et al. (2011), is contrary.

What follows is the result of these 3 variables, there is not much difference between the two universities In other words, even though the atmosphere of the university as a university and an institution is less, almost the same.

As we know, all the successes and progress of human thought depends on fruitful, dynamic and effective one. The effects of human thought of the most complex and high-creative thinking. The development of creativity, depending on various factors such as intelligence, personal and social, family, personal and social characteristics and overcome obstacles such as fear of failure, restrictive laws and so on. The ability to think and be creative potential inherent in humans, but its appearance requires a deposit has nurtured it. It seems that age, parents' level of education, economic barriers, social conditions and cultural life of the university and the student, experience in entrepreneurship, income, the most important factors affecting creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship Shahid Chamran University and University Tehran and these students at both universities alike are affected. Creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship is the one of the predictor variables other words, creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship are necessary and bound together (Drucker, 1985). In other words, the individual entrepreneur creative innovation

that has always caused a revolution in everyday life.
that factors such as social attitudes, norms, rewards and behaviors, individual and national aspirations, religious schools and Education (Palmer 1987, quoting Hezarjarib) and it seems this is what you should be responsible for higher education5 University in Sweden have pointed out, expectations and perceptions of the environment on the entrepreneurial characteristics of students and thus affect entrepreneurial behavior. Rashid (2000) on the basis of a study on the role of education to enhance entrepreneurial attitudes and characteristics of the data, found people who have been trained in entrepreneurship, higher scores on achievement motivation, self-control, self-esteem and creativity have gained too.
The limitations of this study can be noted that the comparison between the two universities. The research field is a field research with restrictions. Although we try to control influential factors. They should be in higher education. The participants of this study were undergraduate students and extend the results of the above should be performed with caution. The results of this study suggest that the comparison can be carried out in universities and other factors and barriers of creativity in higher education research.

References

Abedi, J. (1993). Creativity and new ways to measure it. *Journal of Psychology*, 2, (1), 54-64.
Badri, E., Liaghatdar, M. J., Abedi, M. R., & parsley, E. (1385*). Entrepreneurship capabilities of the students. Journal* of Research and Planning in Higher Education, 40, 73, 91.
Bagherinejad, J. (2010). Entrepreneurial university ground for job creation, technology development and prosperity. *Journal of Social Welfare and Development Planning*, 6, 6-97.
Behruzy, N. (1996). *The relationship between personality characteristics, creativity and academic achievemen*t, educational psychology M. A. thesis, University of Shahid Chamran.
Charney, A., & Libecap, G. D. (2000). *Impact of entrepreneurship education, insights. A Kauffman Research Servies*.TheKaffmancentre for entrepreneurial education, Missouri, USA.
Cools, E., & Van Den Brook, H. (2007). The cognitive style indicator: Development and Validation of a new measurement tool. *Journal of Interdisciplinary and Applied Pschology, 141*(4), 359-387.
Ghaffari, H. & Younes, H. (2010). PNU Arak entrepreneurship capabilities of the students. *Journal of Higher Education of Iran*, Volume 3(3), 136-115.
GhasemZadeh, F. (1374). *How to nurture creativity in pre-school years. Proceedings of the scientific symposium-Applied,* General Education Quality Improvement of Education Tehran.
Gibb, A. (1990). In pursuit of frameworks for the development of growth models of the small business. *International small business Journal, 19*(1), 15-31.
Haji yakhchali, A.R (1389). *The effect of education on the scientific thinking process, creative problem solving, creativity and innovation Shahid Chamran University*. Educational Psychology PhD thesis, Shahid Chamran University.
Haqiqat, Sh. (1998). *Examine the personality characteristics of creative students and the relationship between creativity and sex, social class, intelligence and academic achievement*, Research Council of Fars province..
Haqiqi, N. f., Rzvanpvr, Ahmad Razvi, . M. (2011). Entrepreneurial characteristics of students of College of Agriculture, Tehran University. *Iranian Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development*, forty-second period, (3), 366-357.

Jahangiry, A. & Kalantari Saghafy, R. (2008). Review and assess the characteristics of entrepreneurial managers. Entrepreneurship Development Quarterly, 1(1), 110-87.

Jahani. N., Alaqemand, A. & MIrud, H. (2013) Assessment of entrepreneurship students of Babol University of Medical Sciences. *Iranian Journal of Medical Education*, 13, 420-413.

Kaufman, J. C., Bear J. & Gentile, C. A. (2004). Differences in gender and ethnicity as measured by ratings of three writing tasks. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 38*, 56–69.

Kharkhurin, A. V., & samadpourMotalleebi, S. (2008). The impact of culture on the creative potential of American, Russian, and Iranian college students. *Creativity Research Journal, 21*(1), 111-116.

Larsen, J. K. (1980). Knowledge utilization - What is it? Knowledge: *Journal of Creation, Diffusion, Utilization, 1*(3), 421-442.

Mahdavi, D, & Hatami, H. R. (2008). Innovation and development (principles, foundations, obstacles and a procedure). *Police Human Development Journal*, 16, 8-36.

Mahinzaeem, B. (2000). *Comparing the level of creativity and personality traits freshmen Arts, Humanities*, Tehran University of Medical Engineering, Master's thesis Al-Zahra University.

Minniti, M. & Nardone, C. (2007). Being in Someone Else's Shoes: Gender and Nascent Entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics Journal, 28*(2-3), 223-239.

Moradi, Bizani, M., Karami, GH. & Falah Haqiqi, N. (2012). Evaluation of psychological characteristics that influence entrepreneurial attitudes in students of Agricultural Engineering (Case Study: University of Agriculture Natural Resources Ramin Khuzestan). *Journal of Engineering Education*, 53, 81 65.

Moshirabady, Z., Seyed Fatemi, N., Borimnejad, L., Haqqani, &. Yazdany Zenouz, M. (2013). Comparing the first and fourth year nursing students' creative skills. Nursing Care Research Center, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, *Nursing Research* 8(28), 57-49.

Mumford, M. D., & Gustafson, S. B. (1988). Creativity syndrome: Integration, application, and inoovation. *The Journal of Psychological Bulletin, 103*, 27-43.

Niu, W., Zhang, J. X., & Yang, Y. (2007). Deductive reasoning and creativity: A cross-cultural study. *The Journal of Psychological Reports, 100*(2), 509-519.

Oosterbeek, H., Van Praag, M., & Ijsselstein, A. (2009). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *The Journal of European Economic Review, 54*, 442-454.

Pirkhaefi, A.R, Borjali, Ahmad, Delaware, Ali and Eskandarr, H. (2009). The impact of creative education on cognitive components of students' creative thinking. Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, *Islamic Azad University of Garmsar* , 2, 61-51.

Rezaei, M.H., & Rahsepar, T. (2009). Check how the entrepreneurial characteristics of students of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. New approach in Educational Administration Quarterly, 2(4), 62-45.

Shaheni yeilaq, M., Sohrabi. F. & Shokrkon, H. (2005). Effect of brainstorming, creativity martyr Chamran University students with intelligent control. *Journal of Education and Psychology, Shahid Chamran University*, 3(1), 26-1.

Shamsneya,S. A. AhmadiA., & Afshar, M. (2011). Investigate the relationship between entrepreneurship and creativity with education in science and technology park staff Shiraz city. *Quarterly new ideas in educational sciences*, 6,4.

Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. New York: Bantam Books.

Troiano, A. B., & Bracken, B. A. (1983). Creative thinking and movement styles of three culturallyhomogeneous kindergarten groups. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment,1, 35–46.*

Vahedi, M., Moradnezadi, M., Sharif-Zadeh, A., & Sharifi, M. (2009). Study of Entrepreneurial University of Ilam Islamic Azad. Iranian Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development, Forty course, 2, 101-93.

Zali H. R., Madhoushi. M. & Kurdnaeej, A. (2007). Assessment of entrepreneurial characteristics of students Mazandaran University. *Journal of Management Humanities teacher*, fall 86.

Zaree, J. (2011). *The effect of teaching foster creativity in children, the vocation of creative art students in Ahvaz junior girl child care*. M.A. thesis in educational research,Shahid Chamran University.

Zhao, H., Hills, G. E., and Siebert, S. E. (2005). The mediating role of selfefficacy in the development of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (12), 1265-72.